



The coverage of literature on “Economics of Animal Health”

Results* of assessment regarding the use of economics in animal health-related literature

Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To get an overview of literature that is available in the field of economics applied to animal health (EAH)
Methodologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Search for peer-reviewed and other literature in Ebsco Discovery Service (EDS) reference database Complementary data from AgEconSearch (ageconsearch.umn.edu), SVEPM proceedings, journals and textbooks and NEAT partners Relevant literature (850 publications) was examined by NEAT Publications were categorised by their content and type
Evaluation criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bibliographical information (e.g. publication channel and type) Content (e.g. disease, species, geographical focus, methods used) Specific remarks
Geographical coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Europe (50% of publications examined) North America (17%) Rest of the World (33%)
The most common topics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generic or multiple-disease focus in 19% of publications Highly contagious animal diseases: FMD 10%, CSF 5%, AI 3% Endemic diseases: Mastitis (5%), BDV (3%) and Johne’s disease (3%) Food safety hazards: salmonella (5%) and BSE (3%) Bovines (48%) are covered more frequently than other species although 16% of publications cover multiple species Simulation (20%), review & discussion (16%) and survey (13%) are the most frequently used methods In the recent years more emphasis on positive research methods
Scientific articles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Veterinary medicine journals published 55% of EAH articles Applied economics journals published 21% of EAH articles
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publications frequently focus on highly contagious animal diseases, bovines and industrialized countries. More attention on endemic diseases, poultry, Eastern Europe and Asia is warranted. Lack of consistency of approach (methods, theory) hampers the ability to compare studies and calls for consistent training Better empirical illustrations and rigorous economic work is needed to improve the quality of training material and research on EAH. Description of data, keywords and methods need to be harmonized Partial segregation of research lines of EAH. The field would benefit from better interaction between the different lines of research.

This review was carried out within the scope the NEAT project.

The project has been funded with support from the European Commission. The publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

*The full report can be obtained from info@neat-network.eu.

Project:

NEAT

Duration:

36 months

Website:

www.neat-network.eu