



Knowledge, Perception and Awareness of Dog Related Zoonosis in Uyo Metropolis, Nigeria

Adams E. G. ^{a*}, Asuquo Akanimo ^a and Bassey B. E. ^b

^a *Department of Biological Science, Akwa Ibom State Polytechnic, Ikot Osurua, Nigeria.*

^b *Department of Microbiology, Federal University of Technology, Ikot Abasi, Nigeria.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author AEG designed the study, performed the field work and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author AA managed the analyses of the study and also performed the field work. Author BBE performed the statistical analysis and also contributed to the final draft of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/bji/2024/v28i5740>

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/121640>

Original Research Article

Received: 22/06/2024

Accepted: 25/08/2024

Published: 05/09/2024

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The interaction of humans and animals especially dogs, has made zoonotic diseases remain a genuine threat to the health and survival of humans.

Aim: The study was aimed at assessing the level of knowledge and risk perception of dog owners regarding canine and their zoonotic potential in Uyo, Akwa, Ibom.

Methodology: Structured questionnaires were employed for the cross sectional study.

Result: A total of 200 respondents were employed for the study and all (100%) were aware that some animal diseases (zoonoses) are transmissible to humans, including those of dogs. A high level of awareness of 100% (200) was recorded for rabies and its route of transmission (bite) and

*Corresponding author: E-mail: adamsekamma@gmail.com;

75% (157) for dermatophytosis while 96.5% (193) were ignorant on dog helminthic zoonosis. Some of the encountered factors that predisposed infectivity included: compromised sanitary conditions of the kennel (50%), inappropriate disposal of dog feces (51.5%), poor veterinary attention (58%), and feeding of dogs with both raw animal products and household leftovers (53%).

Conclusion: This revealed a high potential of zoonotic infectivity among the human population in the area, mostly on zoonotic helminth infections, as they were misperceived. Therefore, there is a need for increased awareness, strategy formulation, and implementation toward the control and eradication of zoonotic diseases.

Keywords: Zoonoses; dogs; awareness; veterinary; zoonotic diseases; zoonotic potential; bacterial diseases.

1. INTRODUCTION

Zoonoses are diseases that are naturally transmitted between animals and humans. Zoonoses constitute a diverse group of viral, bacterial, rickettsial, fungal, parasitic, and prion diseases with a variety of animal reservoirs, including wildlife, livestock pet animals, and birds [1]. In most cases, animals play an essential role in maintaining infection in nature and contribute to varying degrees to the distribution and actual transmission of infection in human and animal populations. These diseases have a variety of transmission mechanisms that may be direct, such as in rabies and anthrax, or indirect, via vectors, food, water, and the environment, as in the case of cysticercosis. Some diseases, such as brucellosis, have multiple routes of infection. With the constant and inevitable interaction of humans and animals, zoonotic diseases remain a genuine threat to the health and survival of people, their livestock, companion animals, and wildlife [2].

Worldwide, dogs are one of the most common household companion animals, and have been reported to contribute to the physical, social, and emotional well-being of humans [3,4,5]. Because of their close proximity to humans, they can be a direct or indirect source of many zoonotic infections [6]. A wide range of zoonotic infections have been documented that can be transmitted from dogs [7,8], some of which include some helminthic infections such as *Toxocara* infection in humans resulting in visceral larva migrans, sometimes leading to blindness [9] and hookworm infection in humans resulting in cutaneous larva migrans [10]. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that worldwide, an estimate of 1 to 3 million people are zoonotically infected with *Toxocara* migrans every year. In addition to endoparasites, dogs also harbor ectoparasites, which are known to be vector to some zoonotic diseases [11],

such as fleas, which are known to transmit human plague rickettsiosis murine typhus, and leishmaniasis [12], and serve as intermediate hosts for dog tapeworm (*Dipylidium caninum*). *Rhipicephalus* ticks are known to parasitize humans [13] and vector rickettsial diseases and visceral leishmaniasis [14].

Fortunately, most of these infections can be clinically prevented by appropriate prophylactic interventions [15], but this is not the case in most tropical regions, as zoonosis remains a major challenge. Limited information exists on the level of knowledge and risk perception of dog owners regarding canine and their zoonotic potential. Therefore, this work is aimed at bridging the gap with the intention of providing baseline information that will facilitate the development of effective joint veterinary–medical policies and guidelines for controlling zoonotic diseases (dog zoonosis) in the area, as information assessing practices and attitudes among at-risk populations can provide a suitable format to evaluate existing programs and to identify effective strategies for behavioral changes.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Area and Population

This study was conducted among dog owners in Uyo Metropolis, the capital city of Akwa Ibom State of Nigeria. Uyo is at latitude 5.02° North and longitude 7.92° East. It is within the tropical belt with evergreen foliage of trees, shrubs, and oil palm trees, and two distinctive climatic seasons, namely, the wet season, which lasts between April and October, and the dry season, which lasts between November and March. The dry season experiences harmattan during December and January. It has an annual rainfall of 3300 mm with a landmass of 95 km² [16]. The population of Uyo metropolis is estimated to be approximately 1.3 million, and the indigenes are

mainly the Ibibio-speaking tribe. As a center of commerce, the population increases every day due to the high level of rural–urban migration. The inhabitants are public servants, traders, and farmers [17].

2.2 Data Collection

A semi-structured questionnaire was used to obtain data from the participants, which comprised randomly selected dog owners within the study area. A total of 200 dog owners made up the study population and responded to an interviewer-guided questionnaire that, probed demographic data and information on knowledge, attitudes, and risk factors related to zoonoses, with a particular emphasis on dog zoonoses. It was designed to be completed within 20 min for an average respondent. All technical terms in the questionnaire were translated into the Ibibio language and explained by the interviewer. Confidentiality was assured to each participant, and demographic data of the study participants, including sex, marital status, and educational status, were collected and presented in a tabular format.

2.3 Statistical Analysis

The collected data were processed using SPSS version 20 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). The Fisher exact test was used to evaluate the significance of differences, with $P \leq 0.05$ considered to indicate significant differences. Frequency and percentage were computed for all variables.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Demographic Characteristics

Of the 200 participants, more were female (67.5%) than male (32.5%) (Table 1). As reported by the respondents, 65.5% (131) were

single and 34.5% (69) were married. In terms of educational status, 66% (132) of the respondents had a secondary education, 22.5% (45) had only a primary education, 10% (20) had a tertiary education, and 3 (1.5%) of the respondents had no form of formal education.

3.2 Awareness of Zoonotic Diseases

All the respondents were aware that some animal diseases are transmissible to humans as shown in Table 2, including those of dogs, with 42% (84) reporting that their dogs at one point or another have been diagnosed with such diseases, while 58% (116) had no idea. However, none agreed to any member of their household being infected with any such disease. Regarding dog helminthic zoonosis, 3.5% (7) were aware 96.5% (193) were ignorant.

3.3 Knowledge on Specific Zoonotic Diseases

Only 3.5% (7) of the respondents were aware that dog helminthic infections, such as visceral/cutaneous larva migrant and echinococcus, can be transmitted to humans as shown in Table 3. Regarding insect-related dog zoonosis, 78.5% (157) were aware of murine typhus and leishmaniasis as zoonotic with Flea as the vector, 87.5% (175) were aware that rickettsial diseases are zoonotic with Rhicephalus tick as the vector, and 75% acknowledged scabies as zoonotic with mites as the vector. Approximately 51%–75% acknowledged that most of the diarrheal infections resulting from protozoans and bacteria such as giardiasis and salmonellosis could be because of dogs in their houses. High levels of awareness of 100% (200) and 75% (157) were recorded for rabies and dermatophytosis, which are viral and fungal infections associated with dogs, respectively.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	65	32.5
Female	135	67.5
Educational status		
Primary	45	22.5
Secondary	132	66
Tertiary	20	10
None	3	1.5
Marital status		
Married	69	34.5
Single	131	65.5

Table 2. Zoonotic disease awareness

Variable	Frequency (%)	χ^2	P-value
Awareness of diseases that are transmissible from animals to humans			
Yes	200 (100)		
No`	-		
Awareness of intestinal nematode parasites of dogs that can be transmissible to humans			
Yes	7	86.49	<0.05
No	193		
Have your dog ever been diagnosed any disease probably transmissible to humans			
Yes	84(42)	2.56	<0.05
No`	-		
No idea	116(58)		
Member of your household being Diagnosed of any disease(s) linked to the presence of dogs in your house			
Yes	-		
No	75 (37.5)	6.25	<0.05
No idea	125 (62.5)		

Table 3. Knowledge on some dog-related zoonotic diseases

Variable	Frequency (%)	χ^2	P-value
Helminthic infections			
Visceral larva migrans	7(3.5)	147.92	<0.05
Cutaneous larval	7(3.5)		
Echinococcosis/Cysticercosis	7(3.5)		
Insect-related dog zoonoses			
Human plague, Rickettsioses, Murine typhus and Leishmaniasis(flea)	157(78.5)	2.07	5.91
Rickettsial Diseases and Visceral leishmaniasis (<i>Rhipicephalus</i> ticks)	175(87.5)		
Scabies (mites)	150(75)		
Protozoan infections			
Giardiasis	102(51)	37.78	<0.05
Cryptosporidium infection	10(5)		
Virus infections			
Rabies	200(100)	85.95	<0.05
Norovirus infection	10 (5)		
Bacterial infections			
Salmonellosis	10(5)	59.96	1.000
Campylobacteriosis	7 (3.5)		
Pasteurella infection (cellulitis)	70 (35)		
Leptospirosis(spirochete)	59 (29.5)		
Capnocytophaga infection	50 (25)		
Staphylococcus infection	150 (75)		
Bordetella infection (pertussis/whooping cough)	13 (6.5)		
Yersiniosis	2 (1)		
Q-fever	10 (5)		
Fungi infections			
Dog ringworm/dermatophytosis	157(78.5)		

3.4 Awareness of Disease Transmission

Analysis of knowledge on the possible mode of transmission of some zoonotic diseases of dogs

in Table 4 showed that 100%(200) of the respondents were aware of dog bites as a major route of zoonotic disease transmission and 91.5% (183) were aware of the danger

associated with not washing hands after handling or playing with dogs. The majority of the respondents (96.5%) attested to having a kennel for their dog, but the sanitary condition of the doghouse was compromised by 50% of the population, while 3.5% had no provision for such a facility.

Table 4. Awareness on dog zoonotic disease transmission

Variables	Frequency (%)	χ^2	P-value
Bite from dogs			
Yes	200 (100)		
No	-		
Washing hands after handling dogs			
Yes	183 (91.5)	68.89	<0.05
No	17 (8.5)		
Presence/sanitary condition of kennels in houses with dogs			
Yes	7 (3.5)	86.49	<0.05
No	193 (96)		
Restriction of dog movement within the house			
Yes	33 (16.5)	246.89	1.0000
No	167(83.5)		
Sharing of food and drinking water sources and household utensils with dogs			
Yes	5(2.5)	45.25	1.0000
No	195(97.5)		
Restriction of children's playgrounds at home			
Open space	86(43)	82.02	1.0000
Indoor	12 (6)		
Open space/indoor	102 (51)		
Disposal of dog feces			
Manure	103(51.5)	73.95	1.0000
Burying	47(23.5)		
Allowed to decompose on its own	6(3)		
Refuse bin outlet	44(22)		

Table 5. Veterinary attention

Variable	Frequency (%)	χ^2	P-value
Does your dog have any form of veterinary attention?			
Yes	200 (100)		
No	-		
What form of veterinary attention your dog get?			
Visit the veterinary clinic	20(10)		
Visit form the veterinary doctor	64(32)		
Other forms (such as self-administration of drugs, use of herbs and leaves extracts, etc.)	116 (58)	79.52	1.000
How often does your dog get Veterinary attention stated above?			
Weekly	-		
Monthly	-		
Quarterly	-		
Once every 6 months	10(5)		
Once a year	43(21.5)		
Only when necessary	147(58)	135.58	<0.001
What type of food do you give your dog?			
Raw animal products	12(6)		
Cooked animal product	8(4)		
Household leftovers	74(37)		
Raw animal products and Household leftovers	106(53)	169.2	<0.001

The movement of dogs within the house was restricted by 16.5% (33) of the respondents, whereas 83.5% (167) gave their dogs access to their houses (bedroom). Five of the respondents (2.5%) agreed to sharing food, drinking water sources, and household utensils with their dogs. Children's playgrounds were restricted to indoors by 6% (12) of the respondents, whereas 43% (86) allowed children within their households to play in open spaces, and 51% (102) did not have restrictions on playgrounds as such they could play anywhere. The description of the open space included sandy soil in front of their houses (sand pits), fields, and streets (mostly untared). Regarding the manner in which they disposed of their dog feces, 51.5% (103) packed the feces only to dump them in a nearby garden or field around their houses (some as manure), 23.5% (47) buried the feces in holes. Regarding the depth of the holes in which the feces were buried, 18% (36) buried their dogs' feces in shallow holes while 5.5% (11) buried it in holes of about 8-12 inches. Feces were allowed to decompose at the site of defecation by 3% (6) of the respondents, especially if it was a field or sand pit.

3.5 Veterinary Attention and Feeding Practices

All the respondents said their dogs were given veterinary attention, as shown in Table 5. The forms in which the veterinary attention was given were as follows: 10% (20) of the respondents took their dogs to a veterinary clinic, 32% (64) had their dogs visited at home by a veterinary attendant, and 58% (116) gave their dog un-prescribed medication. The frequency in which the attention was given to the dogs was as follows: 5% (10) had veterinary attention once in six months, 21.5% (43) had it once a year while 73.5% (147) had it only when necessary (i.e when the dog is ill).

Regarding the type of feed given to the dog, 6% of the respondents (12) fed their dogs with raw animal products. Household leftovers were fed to dogs by 37% (74) of the respondents, while 53% (106) gave their dogs both raw animal products and household leftovers. Based on the discussion, it was reported that most of the dogs do not only feed on what they are given by their owners as their movements were not restricted as such the probability of feeding on contaminated organic matter such as feces, uncooked offal, etc. found within the surroundings was very high.

4. DISCUSSION

The study revealed that all the respondents were aware of zoonotic diseases, which conformed to the report of Sandhu and Sing, [18] in New York. Also, a higher percentage of the respondents had basic awareness of dog zoonosis, which varies with other studies, such as higher than the report of Bitsu et al. [19], Amadi, et al. [20], Issah et al. [21], Vinus et al. [22] but lower than the report of Kebede and Zekarias, [23]. This could be attributed to the outbreak of Ebola and COVID-19 which caused government and non-governmental organizations to increase /support the creation of zoonotic awareness using various media channels [24]. The varying level of dog-related zoonosis specifically could be attributed to the varying educational level of the respondents. In addition, most of the dog owners in the study acquired their dogs without any veterinary consultation and registration as such do not have formal guidelines/information related to dogs and their potential risk to their owners and other persons within the environment.

The most known dog-related zoonoses reported in the study were Rabies and insect vector-related dog zoonosis. Rabies is one of the most popular dog-related zoonosis known in most areas, as reported by Ahmed et al. [25]; Vinu et al. [22]; and Hundal et al. [26], Alho et al., [27], because it is associated with active transmission through dog bites. In Nigeria, it is one of the ten zoonotic diseases adopted by the one health approach [28]. Insect vector-related dog zoonosis, which was also commonly acknowledged by the respondents, was also in accordance with the study of Sandhu and Singh, [18]. This could be attributed to the study location, which is a coastal region that serves as a habitat for various types of insect orders such as diptera, coleoptera, and hymenoptera, which are implicated as vectors of various zoonotic diseases [29,30].

A low level of awareness was recorded for helminth zoonotic infections, which was lower than that reported by Alho et al., [27], gross negligent of preventive measures such as provision and care of kennels, proper feeding with non-contaminated food (uncooked offal), and veterinary attention were also recorded in the study and could be attributed to the lack of proper awareness and poor perception of helminth infections by people in the area, which is encompassed as neglected tropical diseases in the study region. This agrees with Tesfaye et

al. [31], who acknowledged that the perception of the community on the risk factors and routes of transmission and life cycle of zoonotic diseases is a crucial step toward the development and implementation of appropriate disease prevention and Control strategies.

5. CONCLUSION

The study revealed a need for strategy formulation and implementation toward the control and subsequent eradication of zoonotic diseases in the tropics, which in most cases are neglected, especially in Nigeria, as most dogs among humans are not acquired with the consent of a veterinarian.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology.

Details of the AI usage are given below:

1. Grammarly for Chrome (2024@Grammarly Inc.) use to check grammatical errors
2. Trinkai.ai for chrome (Crimson Ai, 2024) used for proofreading

CONSENT

Written consent was obtained from each participant before data collection.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Animal Ethic committee approval has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Nkuchia MM, Lynfield R, Kathleen GJ, Beneden CAV, Henriette DV. Infectious diseases surveillance. Second Edition. 2007;1-20
2. WHO. Zoonoses: veterinary Public health; 2017. Available:www.who.int/zoonoses/Vph/en/ accessed 20 December 2023.
3. Dohoo IR, McDonnell WN, Rhodes CS, Elazhary YL. Veterinary research and human health. *Can. Vet. Journal.* 1998;39: 548-56.
4. Robertson ID, Irwin PJ, Lymbery AJ, Thompson RC. The role of companion animals in the emergence of parasitic disease. *Int J Parasitol.* 2000;30:1369-77.
5. McCarthy J, Moore TA. Emerging helminth zoonoses. *Int J Parasitol.* 2000;30:1351-60.
6. Morrison G. Zoonotic infection from pets. Understanding the risk and treatment. *Postgrad Med.* 2001;110:24-6, 29-30, 35-6.
7. Elliot DL, Tolle SW, Goldberg L, Miller JB. Pet-associated illness. *N Engl J Med.* 1985;313:985-95.
8. Ugbomoiko US, Ariza L, Heukelbach J. Parasites of importance for human health in Nigerian dogs: High prevalence and limited knowledge of pet owners. *BMC Vet Res.* 2008;4:49.
9. Taylor MR. The epidemiology of ocular toxocariasis. *J Helminthol.* 2001;75:109-18.
10. Heukelbach J, Walton SF, Feldmeier H. Ectoparasitic infestations. *Curr Infect Dis Rep.* 2005;7:373-80.
11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC); 2014. Available: <http://www.cdc.gov/ncezid/dvbd/> Retrieved on November 2023.
12. Coutinho MT, Linardi PM. Can fleas from dogs infected with canine visceral leishmaniasis transfer the infection to other mammals? *Vet Parasitol.* 2007;147: 320-5.
13. Dantas-Torres F, Figueredo LA, Brandao-Filho SP. *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* (Acari: Ixodidae), the brown dog tick, parasitizing humans in Brazil. *Rev Soc Bras Med Trop.* 2006;39:64-7.
14. Coutinho MT, Bueno LL, Sterzik A, Fujiwara RT, Botelho JR, De Maria M. Participation of *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* (Acari: Ixodidae) in the epidemiology of canine visceral leishmaniasis. *Vet Parasitol.* 2005;128:149-55.
15. Irwin PJ. Companion animal parasitology: Clinical perspective. *Int J Parasitol.* 2002; 32:591-3.
16. Udotung IR, Udoessein EI, Sokari TIJ. Akwa Ibom State Coastal Zone Management Framework for Sustainable Development, Uyo, Nigeria; 2008.

17. World Population Prospect. Population Division; 2022. Available:<https://www.macrotrends.net/cities/206379/uyo/population>>Uyo Nigeria Metro Area Population 1950-2024. Available:www.macrotrends.net Retrieved 2024-01-23.
18. Sandhu GK, Singh D. Level of awareness regarding zoonotic diseases among dog owners of Ithace, New York. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*. 2019; 3(4):418-423.
19. Bitsu K, Abdurahaman AH, Eguale T. Investigation on public knowledge, attitude and practices related to pet management and zoonotic canine diseases in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia *Veterinary Journal*. 2016; 20(1):67-78.
20. Amadi AN, Amadi ANC, Obeten PI, Chukwuemeka BC. Prevalence of helminthes parasites among dogs and risk factors in bende Local Government Area, Abia State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Parasitology*. 2021;10(2):58-63.
21. Issah B, Anash T, Alagma HA. Awareness of zoonotic diseases among pet owners in Wa municipality of Ghana. *UDS International Journal of Development*. 2020;7(2):387-397.
22. Vinu C, Dugg P, Khana AM. Prevalence of pet dog ownership in an urban colony of east Dehli and awareness regarding canine zoonotic diseases and responsible pet ownership among dog owners. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*; 2020.
23. Kebede T, Zekarias T. Perception of the public on the common zoonotic diseases and attitude to the one health approach in Shalls district Oromiya, Ethiopia *Veterinary Journal*. 2020;27(1):60-72.
24. Adams, Eka, Ekott Emmanuel. Anthelmintic Potential of *Vernonia amygdalina* on *Toxocara canis* in dogs. *Biotechnology Journal International*. 2023;27(6):43-51.
25. Ahmed ZA, Salah HM, Mohammed MOS, Mio JB. Public health awareness status of zoonotic diseases in Mogudisha, Somalia. *American Journal of Aquaculture and Science*. 2023;2(1):7-12.
26. Hundal JS, Sdhi SS, Gupta A, Singh J, Chahai US. Awareness, knowledge and risk of zoonotic diseases among livestock farmers in Punjab. *Vet World*. 2016;9(2): 186-19.
27. Alho AM, Lima C, Colella V, deCarvalho LM, Otranto DO, Cardoso L. Awareness of zoonotic diseases and parasites control practices a survey of dog and cat owners in Qatar. *Arasite and Vector*; 2018.
28. Ihekweaza C, Michael CA, Nguku PM, Waziri NE, Habib AG, Muturi M, et al. Prioritization of zoonotic diseases of public health significance in Nigeria using the one health Approach. *One Health*. 2021;13: 100257.
29. Alafia AO, Ajelara KO, Onyema HE, Reis GA, Ogun ML, Anikwe JC, et al. Insect diversity and abundance in the three forest areas of Lagos state. *The Zoologist*. 2023;22:40-47.
30. Kehinde TO. Conserving Insect diversity in the Tropics: Challenges and prospect. *Nigerian Journal of Entomology*. 2017;33: 7-15.
31. Tesfaye D, Fekede D, Tigre W, Regassa A, Fekadu A. Perception of the public on the common zoonotic diseases in Jimma, Southwestern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences*. 2013;5(6):279-285.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/121640>