

Emerging Infectious Diseases in Livestock Management

S.S. Mehesare^{*1}

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Veterinary Clinical Complex (Veterinary Medicine), Mahatma Gandhi Mission, MGM's Dr. Rajendra Suryawanshi College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Gandheli, Chhatrapati Sambhaji Nagar, Maharashtra

*Corresponding Author Email: sopuvet@gmail.com

Abstract

Emerging infectious diseases are infections that newly appear in a population, expand into new geographic areas or hosts, or increase rapidly in incidence or impact. Livestock production is vulnerable because animals, people, wildlife, feed, vehicles and products can move pathogens over long distances. Climate variability can alter vector distribution, while intensification and high animal density may increase opportunities for transmission when biosecurity is weak. Early detection is therefore central to livestock management. Farmers and veterinarians should monitor unusual mortality, fever, respiratory disease, abortions, neurological signs, sudden production losses and disease patterns that differ from the normal seasonal profile. Rapid reporting, isolation, diagnostic sampling and movement control can reduce the size of an outbreak. Vaccination is valuable for many established and emerging threats, but it must be integrated with surveillance and biosecurity because vaccines may not be available for every pathogen. Wildlife interfaces and zoonotic risk require a One Health approach that links animal, human and environmental information. Antimicrobial resistance also increases the difficulty of managing bacterial disease. Preparedness depends on farm-level protocols, laboratory networks, trained personnel and transparent communication. Effective control focuses on prevention and early action rather than waiting for widespread clinical disease.

Keywords: Emerging infections, livestock disease, biosecurity, surveillance, One Health, outbreak response

How to Cite this article: Mehesare, S. (2026). Emerging Infectious Diseases in Livestock Management. *Future Agriculture e-magazine*, September 2026, Issue 3, pp. 273-280.

Introduction

An infectious disease may be considered emerging when it is newly recognised, spreads into a new area or host, or begins to cause greater impact than before. Livestock systems are particularly sensitive because disease can reduce production rapidly and may trigger movement restrictions, trade losses or zoonotic concern. Practical implementation of introduction should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to recognising new or changing disease patterns early enough to protect animals, people, trade and farm continuity. A practical plan is to define normal seasonal disease baselines and establish clear reporting

routes for unusual mortality, abortions, respiratory signs, neurological disease or sudden production loss. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include morbidity, mortality, abortions, feed intake, production change, geographic clustering and time from first sign to veterinary notification. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that not every unusual event is infectious, so surveillance must be linked with diagnosis rather than assumption. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm,

veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Not every unusual illness is an emerging disease, so diagnosis and surveillance are essential. The management challenge is to recognise abnormal patterns early enough to investigate before infection is widespread. The value of introduction also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect recognising new or changing disease patterns early enough to protect animals, people, trade and farm continuity with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for morbidity, mortality, abortions, feed intake, production change, geographic clustering and time from first sign to veterinary notification. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because not every unusual event is infectious, so surveillance must be linked with diagnosis rather than assumption, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Drivers of Disease Emergence

Animal movement, trade, wildlife contact, changing land use and high stocking density can create new transmission opportunities. Pathogens may be introduced with apparently healthy carrier animals, contaminated equipment or feed ingredients. Practical implementation of drivers of disease emergence should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to understanding how movement, wildlife contact, climate, intensification, land-use change and

pathogen evolution create transmission opportunities. A practical plan is to review animal purchases, transport routes, wildlife interfaces, vector seasons, stocking density and shared equipment as part of farm risk assessment. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include animal introductions, visitor frequency, wildlife contact, vector abundance, crowding, travel history and disease occurrence by season. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that multiple drivers commonly act together, so focusing on only one route can leave important vulnerabilities unaddressed. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Climate influences vectors such as ticks and mosquitoes and can change the season in which disease occurs. Genetic change in pathogens and changes in population immunity can also alter disease patterns. These factors often interact rather than acting alone. The value of drivers of disease emergence also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect understanding how movement, wildlife contact, climate, intensification, land-use change and pathogen evolution create transmission opportunities with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for animal introductions, visitor frequency, wildlife contact, vector abundance, crowding, travel history and disease occurrence by season. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because multiple drivers commonly act together, so focusing on only one route can leave important vulnerabilities unaddressed, weak results

should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Farm Surveillance and Early Warning

Farmers are usually the first people able to notice that something is different. Sudden mortality, clusters of fever, respiratory disease, diarrhoea, abortion, neurological signs or a sharp fall in milk or feed intake should be reported promptly. Practical implementation of farm surveillance and early warning should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to detecting abnormal patterns through daily observation, production records and prompt investigation. A practical plan is to train workers to recognise syndromes, record cases consistently and escalate clusters or severe signs to the veterinarian without delay.



Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include case counts, mortality, fever, abortions, respiratory disease, diarrhoea, milk decline, feed intake and time to reporting. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that digital alerts can support surveillance but cannot replace physical examination, diagnostic sampling or local epidemiological judgement. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be

maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Routine production records improve surveillance because they provide a baseline. A rise in calf mortality or abortion may be significant even if individual cases are not dramatic. Digital sensors can add information but cannot replace clinical examination and laboratory testing. The value of farm surveillance and early warning also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect detecting abnormal patterns through daily observation, production records and prompt investigation with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for case counts, mortality, fever, abortions, respiratory disease, diarrhoea, milk decline, feed intake and time to reporting. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because digital alerts can support surveillance but cannot replace physical examination, diagnostic sampling or local epidemiological judgement, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Table 1. Early warning signs that require prompt investigation.

Observation	Why it matters
Sudden unexplained deaths	May indicate severe infectious, toxic or emerging disease.
Cluster of abortions	Can signal infectious reproductive disease with possible zoonotic risk.
Rapid respiratory outbreak	May spread quickly within housed or transported groups.
Neurological signs	Require urgent differential diagnosis and safe handling.
Sharp production decline	Can be an early population-level indicator before severe clinical signs.
Unusual vector activity	May precede increased risk of tick- or mosquito-borne disease.

Biosecurity and Movement Control

Preventing pathogen introduction is more effective than controlling a large outbreak. New

animals should be sourced carefully, isolated and observed before joining the resident herd. Shared vehicles, equipment and visitors need appropriate hygiene measures. Practical implementation of biosecurity and movement control should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to preventing introduction and limiting spread through controlled animal, people, vehicle and equipment movement. A practical plan is to source animals carefully, isolate new arrivals, separate sick groups, clean shared tools and maintain movement records that can be traced during an outbreak. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include quarantine compliance, introductions, cleaning records, movement contacts, isolation time and secondary cases. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that biosecurity fails when protocols are impractical or inconsistently applied during busy periods, markets or emergencies. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

During a suspected outbreak, movement of animals, people and equipment should be limited. Sick animals should be separated where possible, and dedicated clothing or tools should be used. Cleaning should remove organic material before disinfectants are applied. The value of biosecurity and movement control also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect preventing introduction and limiting spread through controlled animal, people, vehicle and equipment movement with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed,

particularly for quarantine compliance, introductions, cleaning records, movement contacts, isolation time and secondary cases. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because biosecurity fails when protocols are impractical or inconsistently applied during busy periods, markets or emergencies, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Diagnostic Preparedness

Correct samples and rapid transport to a laboratory are essential. The veterinarian should select specimens based on clinical signs, stage of disease and likely pathogens. Molecular tests can provide rapid detection, while culture, serology, pathology and sequencing may provide additional information. Practical implementation of diagnostic preparedness should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to obtaining the right samples at the right time and delivering them safely to laboratories capable of confirming or excluding priority diseases. A practical plan is to prepare sampling materials, maintain cold-chain options, record treatment history and coordinate specimen selection with veterinarians and laboratories. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include sample quality, transport time, test turnaround, repeat testing, diagnostic yield and agreement between clinical and laboratory findings. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that a negative test may reflect poor timing or sample quality and should not automatically end investigation when the epidemiological picture remains concerning. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important

deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

A negative result does not always exclude disease if sampling was too early, too late or poorly handled. Diagnostic results should therefore be interpreted with epidemiological and clinical findings. The value of diagnostic preparedness also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect obtaining the right samples at the right time and delivering them safely to laboratories capable of confirming or excluding priority diseases with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for sample quality, transport time, test turnaround, repeat testing, diagnostic yield and agreement between clinical and laboratory findings. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because a negative test may reflect poor timing or sample quality and should not automatically end investigation when the epidemiological picture remains concerning, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Zoonotic and One Health Considerations

Some emerging livestock infections can affect people, and human cases may occasionally provide the first warning of an animal problem. Coordination between veterinary, public-health and wildlife services can improve detection and control. Practical implementation of zoonotic and one health considerations should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging

infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to coordinating animal, human and environmental information where pathogens can cross species boundaries. A practical plan is to use protective equipment for high-risk tasks, report occupational illness, manage carcasses and abortions safely, and share relevant findings with public-health partners. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include worker exposure, zoonotic diagnoses, wildlife events, environmental contamination and use of protective measures. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that delayed communication between sectors can allow an animal-health event to become a larger human or environmental problem. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Farm workers should use appropriate protective equipment when handling abortions, carcasses or animals with unexplained severe illness. Safe milk, meat and waste handling also reduces zoonotic risk. The value of zoonotic and one health considerations also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect coordinating animal, human and environmental information where pathogens can cross species boundaries with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for worker exposure, zoonotic diagnoses, wildlife events, environmental contamination and use of protective measures. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because delayed communication between sectors can allow an animal-health event to become a larger human or environmental problem, weak results should

first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Table 2. Immediate farm actions during suspected infectious disease.

Action	Purpose
Notify veterinarian	Begin clinical investigation and sampling quickly.
Isolate affected animals	Reduce direct transmission to healthy groups.
Restrict movements	Limit spread by animals, people, vehicles and equipment.
Record cases and contacts	Support tracing and epidemiological investigation.
Strengthen hygiene	Reduce environmental transmission after removal of organic material.
Protect workers	Use PPE and safe carcass/abortion-material handling when zoonotic risk is possible.

Vaccination and Population Immunity

Vaccines can reduce susceptibility, clinical severity and pathogen circulation for many diseases. Coverage and correct administration are important because gaps in immunity allow outbreaks to continue. Cold-chain failure or incorrect timing can reduce vaccine effectiveness. Practical implementation of vaccination and population immunity should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to maintaining adequate immunity against preventable threats while recognising that vaccines are not available for every emerging pathogen. A practical plan is to design schedules according to local risk, age, maternal immunity and product instructions, and store and administer vaccines correctly. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include coverage, booster completion, cold-chain integrity, post-vaccination response where assessed, outbreak severity and breakthrough cases. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that poor timing, inadequate coverage or incorrect storage can reduce apparent vaccine effectiveness and create false

reassurance. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

For newly emerging pathogens, a vaccine may not be immediately available. Biosecurity, surveillance and movement control therefore remain necessary even in vaccination programmes. The value of vaccination and population immunity also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect maintaining adequate immunity against preventable threats while recognising that vaccines are not available for every emerging pathogen with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for coverage, booster completion, cold-chain integrity, post-vaccination response where assessed, outbreak severity and breakthrough cases. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because poor timing, inadequate coverage or incorrect storage can reduce apparent vaccine effectiveness and create false reassurance, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Outbreak Response and Recovery

A farm outbreak plan should identify who to contact, where sick animals will be isolated and how movement records can be accessed. Early veterinary notification allows diagnostic and regulatory actions to begin quickly. Practical implementation of outbreak response and recovery should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to containing infection quickly while

maintaining animal welfare, records, communication and essential farm functions. A practical plan is to activate isolation, movement restriction, sampling, cleaning, disposal and contact-tracing procedures under veterinary and regulatory guidance. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include new cases by day, affected groups, contacts, mortality, response time, cleaning completion and time to safe restocking or normal operations. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that rapid action must still be evidence-based because indiscriminate movement, treatment or culling can create additional welfare and economic harm. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

After control, the farm should review how infection entered or spread. Restocking, vaccination, cleaning and surveillance may need to be phased. Psychological and financial stress on farm families should also be recognised during severe outbreaks. The value of outbreak response and recovery also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect containing infection quickly while maintaining animal welfare, records, communication and essential farm functions with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for new cases by day, affected groups, contacts, mortality, response time, cleaning completion and time to safe restocking or normal operations. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because rapid action must still be evidence-based because indiscriminate movement, treatment or culling can create additional

welfare and economic harm, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Preparedness, Communication and Regional Coordination

Preparedness extends beyond the individual farm. Veterinary laboratories, local animal-health authorities, producer organisations and neighbouring farms need clear channels for reporting and feedback. Contact lists should be kept current, and important records such as animal movements, vaccination history, mortality and visitor logs should be available quickly during an investigation. Training workers to recognise unusual signs and to report them without delay can shorten the interval between the first case and an organised response. Practical implementation of preparedness, communication and regional coordination should start with a clear baseline and a defined management objective. For preparedness and control of emerging infectious diseases in livestock, priority should be given to linking farms, laboratories, authorities and producer networks so warnings and control measures are timely and consistent. A practical plan is to maintain updated contact lists, practise outbreak roles, participate in regional surveillance and communicate restrictions or biosecurity instructions in plain language. Changes should be introduced consistently so their effects can be interpreted. Workers should know the normal range and the signs that require attention. Monitoring can include reporting completeness, laboratory access, response coordination, message reach, compliance and lessons identified after exercises or outbreaks. Trends are more useful than isolated readings because season, production stage and local conditions alter expected performance. One limitation is that rumours and unclear messages can reduce cooperation, so communication should be transparent about what is known, unknown and required. Therefore records should be reviewed regularly and important deviations checked by

the relevant farm, veterinary, technical or crop specialist. Measures that fit available labour, infrastructure and budget are more likely to be maintained and to produce reliable long-term benefit.

Communication during an outbreak should be accurate and practical. Farmers need to know which movements are restricted, how sick and dead animals should be handled, and what cleaning measures are required. Rumours or incomplete information can encourage unplanned animal movement and undermine control. After the event, regional review of laboratory results, tracing information and response timelines can identify weaknesses and improve preparedness for the next disease threat. The value of preparedness, communication and regional coordination also depends on integration with the wider production system. Management should connect linking farms, laboratories, authorities and producer networks so warnings and control measures are timely and consistent with routine records, clear responsibilities and a response plan. Where equipment, biological processes or field operations are involved, timing, maintenance and quality control matter as much as the initial choice. Records should show what was done and the response observed, particularly for reporting completeness, laboratory access, response coordination, message reach, compliance and lessons identified after exercises or outbreaks. Evaluation should consider productivity together with health or soil function, labour, input use, risk and economics. Because rumours and unclear messages can reduce cooperation, so communication should be transparent about what is known, unknown and required, weak results should first prompt a review of implementation and local constraints. Comparison with a previous season, baseline or similar group helps separate real improvement from normal variation. This adaptive process allows timing, thresholds and resource use to be refined as experience accumulates.

Conclusion

Emerging infectious diseases require a management system that can detect change, report quickly and apply biosecurity before losses become widespread. Surveillance,

diagnostics, vaccination and movement control work best when planned before an emergency.

A One Health approach is especially important where livestock, wildlife and people interact. Prepared farms protect animal welfare, farm income and public health by making early action a routine part of disease management.

References

- Allen, T., Murray, K. A., Zambrana-Torrel, C., et al. (2017). Global hotspots and correlates of emerging zoonotic diseases. *Nature Communications*, 8, 1124.
- Jones, K. E., Patel, N. G., Levy, M. A., et al. (2008). Global trends in emerging infectious diseases. *Nature*, 451, 990-993.
- Karesh, W. B., Dobson, A., Lloyd-Smith, J. O., et al. (2012). Ecology of zoonoses: Natural and unnatural histories. *Lancet*, 380, 1936-1945.
- Morse, S. S., Mazet, J. A. K., Woolhouse, M., et al. (2012). Prediction and prevention of the next pandemic zoonosis. *Lancet*, 380, 1956-1965.
- World Organisation for Animal Health. (2024). Terrestrial Animal Health Code. WOA, Paris.
- World Health Organization, FAO, & WOA. (2022). One Health Joint Plan of Action (2022-2026).