

Application of a new One Health evaluation framework to two research initiatives addressing antimicrobial resistance and obesity

Liza Rosenbaum Nielsen^{*1}, Anaïs Léger², Asta Tvarijonavičiute³, Sara Savic⁴, Barbara Häslér⁵ and Simon R. Ruegg⁶

* corresponding author:

Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, DK-1870 Frederiksberg C, Denmark,

Email: liza@sund.ku.dk ; Phone: +45 35 33 30 15; Fax: +45 35 33 30 22

Objective

The “Network of Evaluation of One Health” ([NEOH](#)) consortium has recently developed a new framework with tools for evaluating One Health (OH) initiatives. Aiming to illustrate the use and assess the utility of the new method for different types of OH initiatives, we applied the framework and tools to a portfolio of case studies including two research projects that were considered OH-initiatives by the project actors.

Methods

First, an external NEOH-evaluation was carried out on the ‘University of Copenhagen Research Centre for Control of Antibiotic Resistance ([UC-Care](#))’, a 4-year transdisciplinary research project aiming to produce new knowledge and methods to reduce the development of antimicrobial resistance. Information was extracted from the project proposal and the mid-term evaluation report as well as from UC-Care actors through semi-open, 1-hour-long interviews with consortium members and an online survey for external participants and stakeholders.

Second, a questionnaire-based obesity research project was evaluated internally by actors involved in the obesity project itself and in the NEOH consortium. The research project was a joint effort between human and animal health sector scientists across 11 European countries aiming to identify underlying common factors associated with obesity in dog-owners and their dog a task considered unachievable by single-sector research initiatives.

Results

The initiatives were described as part of their context and the theory of change of behind the initiatives including outcomes and impacts were deducted. The process evaluation of the OH characteristics showed limited information and data sharing, as well as limited learning within both initiatives despite a reasonably high level of OH-thinking and systemic organisation. In one project, integrated working approaches were limited despite initial plans to emphasise these.

Conclusion

Although the framework was initially found challenging to understand, it proved useful to identify, discuss and learn about potentially impact productive and counter-productive characteristics in OH-initiatives.

¹ Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

² SAFOSO AG, Switzerland

³ Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Universidad de Murcia, Spain

⁴ Scientific Veterinary Institute, Novi Sad, Serbia

⁵ Royal Veterinary College, London, United Kingdom

⁶ Vetsuisse-Faculty, University of Zürich, Switzerland