<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

The role of protected areas in supporting human health : a call to broaden the assessment of conservation outcomes

Terraube, Julien

2017-04

Terraube , J , Fernandez-Llamazares , A & Cabeza , M 2017 , ' The role of protected areas in supporting human health : a call to broaden the assessment of conservation outcomes ' , Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability , vol. 25 , pp. 50-58 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.08.005>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/311876>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.08.005>

cc_by_nc_nd

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

1 **The role of Protected Areas in supporting human health: a call to broaden the assessment of**
2 **conservation outcomes**

3 Julien Terraube^{1*}, Álvaro Fernández-Llamazares¹ & Mar Cabeza¹

4

5 ¹ Metapopulation Research Centre (MRC), Department of Biosciences, University of Helsinki,
6 Finland.

7

8 ***Corresponding author:** Julien Terraube

9 Address: Metapopulation Research Centre (MRC), Department of Biosciences, University of
10 Helsinki, Finland. Email: julien.terraube-monich@helsinki.fi. Tel: +358 468423149.

11 **Abstract**

12 Ongoing global biodiversity loss has far-reaching consequences for human health and well-being.
13 While Protected Areas (PAs) have become a major policy instrument for biodiversity conservation,
14 their role in supporting human health remains unclear. Here, we synthesize both positive and negative
15 aspects of PAs on different dimensions of human health and provide several theoretical advances to
16 assess the effectiveness of PAs in promoting human health. We finally identify three major research
17 gaps requiring urgent attention. Implementing an interdisciplinary research program remains a
18 priority to better comprehend the linkages between human health, ecosystem services and
19 conservation policies at global scale. We believe this is key to improve the management of PAs and
20 their surrounding areas and foster co-benefits for biodiversity and human health.

21

22 **Keywords**

23 Conservation; Ebola; Food Security; Human health; Protected Area Effectiveness.

24

25 **Highlight**

- 26 • Global biodiversity loss impacts human health and well-being
- 27 • The overall health potential of PAs remains under-recognized
- 28 • PAs have both positive and negative effects on human health and well-being
- 29 • Integrated approaches linking PA management, health and well-being are required
- 30 • In view of Aichi Target 11, we need to assess the linkages between PAs and health

31

32

33

34 **Linkages between environmental degradation and human health**

35 Global biodiversity is decreasing at unprecedented rates, as a result of a wide range of anthropogenic
36 activities [1,2,3]. Such planetary-scale transformations erode the ecosystem services on which society
37 relies, posing numerous threats to human health [2,3]. Epidemiological studies have argued that a
38 significant proportion of the global burden of illness is attributable to degraded ecosystems [4]. In
39 this context, several policy instruments have been developed to bridge environmental and health
40 policy agendas. For example, the notion that ecosystem health and human well-being are mutually
41 reinforcing (Box 1) is increasingly being picked up by several international health strategies such as
42 *OneHealth* [5] or *Planetary Health* [6**]. Similarly, the importance of biodiversity for human well-
43 being is a core element of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

44 Environmental change and biodiversity loss have been shown to affect existing health burdens,
45 increasing food insecurity and annihilating rates of human development [7,8]. As a case in point, the
46 decline in the availability of fish stocks is expected to spell malnutrition in many countries [9].
47 Furthermore, according to the “biodiversity hypothesis”, reduced contact of people with natural
48 environments leads to inadequate stimulation of immunoregulatory circuits. Declining biodiversity
49 in an increasingly urbanized world may thus explain the global rise in the prevalence of allergies and
50 chronic inflammatory diseases [3]. Rapid population growth, land-use change and increasing overlap
51 between human and wildlife populations are also related to the recent spread of zoonotic and vector-
52 borne diseases [10]. Finally, there is increasing evidence that degraded ecosystems also affect mental
53 health [11].

54 Biodiversity-health linkages have often been explored by looking at ecosystem service flows (e.g.,
55 water provision) at multiple scales [4,12**], but rarely taking PAs as a leading analytical unit.
56 Consequently, the health outcomes of PAs have been largely overlooked. Calls for increasing the
57 coverage of PAs have resulted in growing research addressing their performance in halting
58 biodiversity loss and securing ecosystem services, with overall positive (albeit modest) outcomes

59 [16]. This scholarly work is gradually broadening its analytical scope to link PAs with larger debates
60 on human health and wellbeing [17*]. Yet, a substantial share of the research has focused on
61 examining predominantly the negative impacts of PAs on human health. This is partly because
62 conservation planning is inherently spatial, often segregating people from nature and undermining
63 the well-being of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) living close to PAs [13]. Such
64 potential negative impacts of PAs on human well-being were recognized in the Convention on
65 Biological Diversity, asserting that PAs should not harm the well-being of IPLCs [14**]. Along these
66 lines, the Conceptual Framework of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity
67 and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) explicitly incorporates the notion of “good quality of life” in the
68 analysis of institutional arrangements for biodiversity governance [15].

69 In the following section, we review the contributions of PAs to human health and well-being from a
70 diversity of angles.

71

72 **Do Protected Areas support human health?**

73 Despite increasing awareness of the inter-linkages between nature and human health (Box 1), the
74 overall health potential of PAs remains under-recognized. The few case-based studies assessing the
75 impacts of PAs on human health have been addressed in different strands of literature, with distinct
76 theoretical and methodological frames. For instance, while some of the works focus on biophysical
77 indicators, most of them rely only on notions of subjective well-being or good quality of life [14**],
78 with few works integrating health and well-being outcomes (Fig. 1).

79 A first body of literature has examined the effectiveness of PAs in delivering ecosystem services with
80 direct health benefits that would have potentially been eroded had the PAs not been established
81 [18,19]. For example, it has been shown that nearly two-thirds of the global population relies directly
82 on PAs for freshwater provision [20]. Similarly, several studies have demonstrated the role of PAs in

83 providing pollination services for food production [21] or in contributing to air purification and
84 temperature regulation [22]. Many works have also underlined the positive role of PAs in conserving
85 medicinal plants that sustain both local and global pharmacopeias [23], or the numerous recreational
86 services provided by PAs, promoting healthy lifestyles [24].

87 In contraposition to this literature, some works have focused on examining the health impacts of PAs
88 in the light of ecosystem disservices [25]. Under the idea that “nature sometimes kills us”, this
89 literature argues that IPLCs often carry a disproportionate burden of the health risks derived from
90 living close to PAs [26*]. Some of these ecosystem disservices include the spread of vector-borne
91 diseases [27], animal attacks on humans living close to PAs [28], or lower food security through the
92 destruction of crops by wildlife [29].

93 Precisely, research on social aspects of conservation has also looked at the impact of some PAs upon
94 nutrition, showing that displacements of IPLCs and restrictions to resource extraction have often
95 resulted in increasing food insecurity and malnutrition [30,31] Although the research on PAs and
96 nutrition is not particularly comprehensive [32], some works have shown that closing off forests to
97 IPLCs through strict regulations generally leads to reduced food supply and nutrition deficits, e.g.,
98 anemia [33*,34].

99 However, other studies have also shown PAs under some circumstances can contribute to alleviate
100 malnutrition, by maintaining stocks of wild food to later be harvested beyond PA boundaries [35,13].
101 With most evidence confined to marine environments, this literature has shown that strict PAs may
102 enhance local nutrition and health by rebuilding wildlife stocks, improving catch rates outside PAs
103 and helping local people to meet their dietary requirements [36,37]. As for terrestrial ecosystems,
104 some authors have showed that children stunting is lower close to PAs in the Congo Basin [38].
105 Moreover, it has also been discussed that the establishment of PAs often introduces new livelihoods
106 that can result in positive health effects through PA-related income [13,39]. As a consequence, there
107 is debate on whether the net impact of PAs on local people’s nutrition is positive or negative [14**].

108 Part of this debate is arguably explained by the distinct health effects of PAs under different
109 management categories [17*]. Moreover, with the establishment of new PAs promoting co-
110 management, agrobiodiversity or sustainable production systems in the PA periphery, the potential
111 of PAs to improve food security should not be under-stated [40,41].

112 Arguably the most well-researched aspect of the link between PAs and health is their effects on
113 psychological well-being [11,14**]. Research has shown the restorative capacity of PAs and their
114 role in fostering recovery from mental fatigue, reducing stress levels, assisting cognitive functioning,
115 and improving the overall psychological state [32,42]. Interestingly, these psychological benefits
116 have been shown to be higher in areas of greater biodiversity [43,44]. Recent research on nature-
117 based tourism has documented that visiting PAs often results in increased wellbeing [45]. Indeed,
118 there is increasing understanding of the positive health outcomes of PAs, with the Australian program
119 “Healthy Parks, Healthy People” being one of the most paradigmatic examples of this trend [11].

120 Nevertheless, evidence on the impacts of PAs on the well-being of IPLCs is still contentious. While
121 there are works showing how conservation has improved the health status of many IPLCs near PAs
122 [14**,39], the opposite also holds true. Due to the colonial legacy of conservation (e.g., displacement
123 and exclusion), there are numerous cases in which the establishment of strict PAs has contributed to
124 higher levels of psychological distress and mental illness amongst IPLCs [46,47]. While many IPLCs
125 indeed find spiritual connections with nature as a source of wellbeing [48], the psychological
126 implications of exclusionary PAs are significant.

127 Finally, an emerging body of literature is trying to assess the role of PAs in relation to Emerging
128 Infectious Diseases (EIDs). PAs shape many socio-ecological factors related to disease prevalence,
129 including land-use, biodiversity, and socioeconomic conditions [49,50]. Hence, PAs may drive
130 disease prevalence by influencing vector and host presence and by controlling human exposure to
131 vector species (Box 2). For instance, it is known that deforestation and hunting in non-protected areas

132 disrupt ecological communities with positive knock-on effects on mosquito populations (e.g., through
133 predation release, improved breeding habitat or increased abundance in dead-end hosts; [10]).

134 However, there is debate on the pathways through which PAs shape the distribution of infectious
135 diseases (e.g., malaria). While some authors have discussed that PAs could reduce malaria risk by
136 decreasing human exposure to anopheline breeding habitats [51], others have argued that PAs actually
137 favor higher exposure to malaria [52]. At the same time, other works have emphasized that PAs could
138 reduce malaria prevalence through improved socio-economic conditions [53]. Such contradictory
139 findings are partly explained by different methods and datasets at various spatio-temporal scales, with
140 certain confounding factors largely unaddressed. As a result, evidence on the role of PAs in shaping
141 EIDs dynamics remains inconclusive. Moreover, and although positive cases of co-benefits between
142 biodiversity conservation and disease control exist, it is noteworthy that the complex effects of PAs
143 on EIDs vary with disease ecology, PA management categories and landscape attributes at various
144 spatio-temporal scales [51,54].

145

146 **Need for systematic integrative approaches**

147 With progress to achieve Aichi Target 11 of protecting at least 17% of terrestrial and 10% of marine
148 areas globally by 2020, assessing the role of PAs in supporting human health remains paramount.
149 Yet, such role cannot be directly extrapolated from studies on the health benefits of nature, given that
150 PAs, as organizational units embedded within certain socio-political contexts, inevitably alter human-
151 nature interactions [55]. Responding to recent calls to improve our knowledge of the role between
152 PAs and human health and well-being [14**], we integrate developments from different research
153 fronts with the aim of bringing forward the discussion and stimulate new analytical approaches.

154 Assessments of the social impacts of PAs should acknowledge different dimensions of human health
155 and well-being (Box 1). The evidence to date on positive and negative aspects of PAs derives from

156 an heterogeneous sample of studies addressing very specific aspects of health, which have been often
157 conducted opportunistically and mostly lacking robust study designs and/or baseline measures
158 [14**], thus not allowing to guide policy actions. Yet baseline data exists for a number of health
159 indicators globally, and different long-term health monitoring schemes are being promoted in the
160 vicinity of many PAs. Examples include USAID’s Health Survey Data, the World Bank’s Living
161 Standards or the database of the Poverty Environment Network [14**,56], all of which could
162 potentially be analyzed from a PA perspective. Similarly, in countries such as Canada or Australia
163 large amounts of indigenous health data exist [57], some of which have been collected near PAs.
164 There are also numerous PAs with health monitoring programs in neighboring local communities.
165 Such datasets could serve a purpose in furthering our understanding of the linkages between PAs and
166 health. Yet, the establishment of monitoring networks that include simultaneous measures of both
167 aspects of PA effectiveness (ecosystem and human health) should be a priority.

168 PA impacts on health may be direct or indirect, *in situ* or *ex situ* (Figure 2, Panel A). Given that the
169 core areas of PAs are generally uninhabited, most health impacts are expected at the PA periphery.
170 Yet, some of them take place at larger scales. For instance, the rising numbers of tourists visiting PAs
171 challenge the assessment of health impacts only at the local level, but also raise important questions
172 on “whose health” is being evaluated. Research on the links between PAs and health should ideally
173 account for both local and non-local impacts, avoiding biased samples (only surveying tourists) that
174 serve certain political or economic agendas. Moreover, it is also important to evaluate the role of PAs
175 in supporting future health. For instance, many PAs conserve plants underpinning the future
176 provisioning of medicines for both local and prospective global uses [58]. Assessments of the linkages
177 between PAs and health should thus find a balance between the health prospects of both present and
178 future generations.

179 Along these lines, it is crucial to recognize that health is also dependent on the socio-economic
180 context. Socio-economic factors are known to affect the conservation effectiveness of PAs [59]; yet,

181 they are rarely considered when evaluating PA impacts on health or well-being. Aspects such as PA
182 permeability have been also argued to impact health [54]. For example, strict PAs (IUCN Category
183 I) will have different impacts than PAs with sustainable use of natural resources (Category VI). PA
184 size and isolation will also play an important role. Panel B in Figure 2 illustrates a few alternative
185 settings of PAs varying in governance type, size and isolation, particularly due to land-use changes
186 at the PA periphery. Here we deliberate on the potential health consequences of such scenarios, while
187 stressing that empirical evidence is largely lacking and that analytical approaches accounting for PA
188 attributes are urgently needed.

189 PAs of Type A (i.e., small size, strict protection and highly degraded periphery) have often induced
190 exclusion of IPLCs (through restrictions on resource use), undermining food security and well-being
191 [35,60**]. Malnutrition increases immunity deficiency and susceptibility to infection. IPLCs living
192 in degraded PA peripheries are thus potentially more vulnerable to zoonotic and vector-borne
193 diseases, following changes in the distribution of vector species. Potential benefits associated to Type
194 A would be contingent on infrastructure development and poverty alleviation initiatives, which
195 should be rarer for small areas of strict protection compared to Types B and C. Such developments
196 could bring about improvements in healthcare delivery; yet, these are unlikely to counterbalance most
197 health costs.

198 Types B and C may instead lead to more co-benefits for both health and biodiversity. Increased PA
199 size associated to sustainable resource extraction either within Type B or within the buffer zone of
200 Type C would decrease health costs associated to alienation and malnutrition, while incomes from
201 tourism could bring livelihood diversification and poverty alleviation in the periphery (Type B, Fig.
202 1). From the perspective of EIDs, the evidence is still inconclusive, and outcomes may well be
203 disease-dependent as well as context-specific (Box 2). Yet, we expect that large core areas of strict
204 protection surrounded by sustainable-use peripheries (Type C), would decrease the probability of
205 EIDs expansion, while best conserving species and habitats. In this case, a well-managed buffer zone

206 would hold a significant portion of semi-natural habitats allowing for sustainable use by IPLCs, with
207 benefits in terms of livelihoods, nutrition and well-being.

208

209 **Future research directions**

210 While research on the linkages between human and ecosystem health grows, this review stresses an
211 urgent need to address specifically the role of PAs in supporting human health. In this review, we
212 have identified important research gaps that preclude us from developing a clear picture of the overall
213 health effects of PAs. These include among others: i) integration and comparison of the heterogeneous
214 set of health dimensions, ii) a comprehensive overview of different human population targets for
215 health assessments (i.e. whose health is being evaluated; within and beyond PAs), and iii) a context-
216 dependent analytical framework incorporating spatial, environmental and socio-economic factors
217 (including PA management types). Additionally, while studies on the effectiveness of PAs in
218 safeguarding biodiversity are becoming ever more common, we are not aware of any single study
219 linking effectiveness of biodiversity conservation with health outcomes. Research at all these fronts
220 will shed light into many ongoing debates, and be able to clarify why some PAs may promote health
221 while others not.

222 In order to tackle the abovementioned gaps, we highlight that tools and datasets are already available
223 to support substantial advances, while others need yet to be implemented. For instance, many of the
224 health monitoring databases mentioned above could be used to develop a more integrated overview
225 of the health impacts of PAs. Similarly, diverse large-scale environmental, geographical and socio-
226 political datasets can already be linked to disentangle the effects of particular health indicators in
227 different contexts. Research systematically comparing the health outcomes of PAs under different
228 management categories is particularly called upon and a straightforward step given the available data.

229 At finer scales, emphasis should be placed on buffer zones around PAs in order to disentangle the
230 complex linkages between land-use change, natural resource use and socio-economic conditions and
231 understand how they influence different aspects of health, for instance linking nutrition and emerging
232 infectious disease impacts. Replicated and standardized studies of this type in multiple contexts are
233 very much in order.

234 All things considered, however, we view as paramount the need to strategically develop and
235 implement, integrated, large scale co-monitoring schemes in order to assess synergies and trade-offs
236 between biodiversity conservation and human health. Monitoring biodiversity responses to human
237 disturbance inside PAs, as well as in the PA periphery and buffer zones, and understanding how this
238 in turn affects different dimensions of human health across different types of PAs is an urgent priority.

239 We end with a note of warning regarding reports of negative impacts of PAs on human health. While
240 empirical research on the reality of health risks is desirable, caution is needed when communicating
241 research outcomes to wider audiences in order to avoid misinformed and unsupported health concerns
242 undermining long-term conservation efforts [61].

243

244 **Acknowledgements**

245 This research was funded by the Academy of Finland (grant agreement nr. 292765). JT was supported
246 by the Nessling Foundation. ÁF-LL was also supported by the Kone Foundation. We also thank J.
247 Helle for cartographic assistance, and A. Villers for insightful comments and ideas.

248

249

250

251

252

253 **References and recommended reading**

254 Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

255 *of special interest

256 **of outstanding interest

257

258 1. Barnosky AD, Matzke N, Tomiya S, Wogan GOU, Swartz B, Quental TB, Marshall
259 C, McGuire JL, Lindsey EL, Maguire KC, et al.: **Has the Earth's sixth mass extinction already**
260 **arrived?** *Nature* 2011, **471**:51–57.

261 2. Cardinale BJ, Duffy JE, Gonzalez A, Hooper DU, Perrings C, Venail P, Narwani A,
262 Mace GM, Tilman D, Wardle DA, et al.: **Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity.** *Nature*
263 2012, **489**:326–326.

264 3. Hanski I, von Hertzen L, Fyhrquist N, Koskinen K, Torppa K, Laatikainen T, Karisola
265 P, Auvinen P, Paulin L, Makela MJ, et al.: **Environmental biodiversity, human microbiota, and**
266 **allergy are interrelated.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2012, **109**:8334–8339.

267 4. Raudsepp-Hearne C, Peterson GD, Bennett EM: **Ecosystem service bundles for**
268 **analyzing tradeoffs in diverse landscapes.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2010, **107**:5242–5247.

269 5. Buttke DE, Decker DJ, Wild MA: **The role of One Health in wildlife conservation:**
270 **a challenge and opportunity.** *J Wildl Dis* 2015, **51**:1–8.

271 6**. Whitmee S, Haines A, Beyrer C, Boltz F, Capon AG, De Souza Dias BF, Ezeh A,
272 Frumkin H, Gong P, Head P, et al.: **Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch:**
273 **Report of the Rockefeller Foundation-Lancet Commission on planetary health.** *Lancet* 2015,
274 **386**:1973–2028.

275 Key reading on the linkages between environmental degradation and human health.

276 7. Redford KH, Myers SS, Ricketts TH, Osofsky SA: **Human health as a judicious**
277 **conservation opportunity.** *Conserv Biol* 2014, **28**:627–629.

278 8. Morris AL, Guégan J-F, Andreou D, Marsollier L, Carolan K, Le Croller M, Sanhueza
279 D, Gozlan RE: **Deforestation-driven food-web collapse linked to emerging tropical infectious**
280 **disease, *Mycobacterium ulcerans*.** *Sci Adv* 2016, **2**:e1600387.

281 9. Golden CD, Allison EH, Dey MM, Halpern BS, McCauley DJ, Smith M, Vaitla B,
282 Zeller D, Myers SS, Cheung WWL, et al.: **Fall in fish catch threatens human health.** *Nature*
283 2016, **534**:317–320.

284 10. Laporta GZ, Prado PIK, Kraenkel RA, Coutinho RM, Sallum MAM: **Biodiversity**
285 **Can Help Prevent Malaria Outbreaks in Tropical Forests.** *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2013, **7**:e2139

- 286 11. Maller C, Townsend M, Leger LS, Henderson-Wilson C, Pryor A, Prosser L, Moore
287 M: *Healthy parks, healthy people: The health benefits of contact with nature in a park context*.
288 Melbourne, Australia: Deakin University and Parks Victoria; 2008.
- 289 12**. Bennett EM, Cramer W, Begossi A, Cundill G, Díaz S, Egoh BN, Geijzenborffer IR,
290 Krug CB, Lavorel S, Lazos E, et al.: **Linking biodiversity, ecosystem services, and human well-
291 being: three challenges for designing research for sustainability**. *Curr Opin Environ Sustain*
292 2015, **14**:76–85.
- 293 The authors address the need to link ecosystem services, human well-being and biodiversity in order to
294 improve sustainable ecosystem management.
- 295 13. Turner WR, Brandon K, Brooks TM, Gascon C, Gibbs HK, Lawrence KS,
296 Mittermeier RA, Selig ER: **Global Biodiversity Conservation and the Alleviation of Poverty**.
297 *Bioscience* 2012, **62**:85–92.
- 298 14**. McKinnon MC, Cheng SH, Dupre S, Edmond J, Garside R, Glew L, Holland MB,
299 Levine E, Masuda YJ, Miller DC, et al.: **What are the effects of nature conservation on human
300 well-being? A systematic map of empirical evidence from developing countries**. *Environ Evid*
301 2016, **5**:8.
- 302 Key meta-analysis investigating the linkages between conservation and human well-being. The paper shows
303 that most articles on this topic do not evaluate human health outcomes, and that biases in the extent and
304 robustness of articles are still common.
- 305 15. Díaz S, Demissew S, Carabias J, Joly C, Lonsdale M, Ash N, Larigauderie A,
306 Adhikari JR, Arico S, Báldi A, et al.: **The IPBES Conceptual Framework - connecting nature
307 and people**. *Curr Opin Environ Sustain* 2015, **14**:1–16.
- 308 16. Geldmann J, Barnes M, Coad L, Craigie ID, Hockings M, Burgess ND: **Effectiveness
309 of terrestrial protected areas in reducing habitat loss and population declines**. *Biol Conserv*
310 2013, **161**:230–238.
- 311 17*. Ban NC, Davies TE, Aguilera SE, Brooks C, Cox M, Epstein G, Evans LS, Maxwell
312 SM, Nenadovic M: **Social and ecological effectiveness of large marine protected areas**. *Glob*
313 *Environ Chang* 2017, **43**:82–91.
- 314 This global meta-analysis investigates social, ecological and governance characteristics of successful large
315 marine PAs. This study constitutes an important first step in identifying factors affecting social well-being in
316 marine PAs.
- 317 18. Naeem S, Chazdon R, Duffy JE, Prager C, Worm B: **Biodiversity and human well-
318 being: an essential link for sustainable development**. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 2016, **283**:20162091.
- 319 19. Xu W, Xiao Y, Zhang J, Yang W, Zhang L, Hull V, Wang Z, Zheng H, Liu J, Polasky
320 S, et al.: **Strengthening protected areas for biodiversity and ecosystem services in China**. *Proc*
321 *Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2017, **114**:1601–1606.
- 322 20. Harrison IJ, Green PA, Farrell TA, Juffe-Bignoli D, Sáenz L, Vörösmarty CJ:
323 **Protected areas and freshwater provisioning: a global assessment of freshwater provision,
324 threats and management strategies to support human water security**. *Aquat Conserv Mar*
325 *Freshw Ecosyst* 2016, **26**:103–120.

21. IPBES: *The assessment report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services on pollinators, pollination and food production*. Bonn, Germany: Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services; 2016.
22. Baró F, Chaparro L, Gómez-Baggethun E, Langemeyer J, Nowak DJ, Terradas J: **Contribution of ecosystem services to air quality and climate change mitigation policies: the case of urban forests in Barcelona, Spain**. *Ambio* 2014, **43**:466–479.
23. Amjad MS, Qaeem M faisal, Ahmad I, Khan SU, Chaudhari SK, Zahid Malik N, Shaheen H, Khan AM: **Descriptive study of plant resources in the context of the ethnomedicinal relevance of indigenous flora: A case study from Toli Peer National Park, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan**. *PLoS ONE* 2017, **12**:e0171896.
24. Wolf ID, Wohlfart T: **Walking, hiking and running in parks: A multidisciplinary assessment of health and well-being benefits**. *Landsc Urban Plan* 2014, **130**:89–103.
25. Von Döhren P, Haase D: **Ecosystem disservices research: A review of the state of the art with a focus on cities**. *Ecol Indic* 2015, **52**:490–497.
- 26*. Shackleton CM, Ruwanza S, Sinasson Sanni GK, Bennett S, De Lacy P, Modipa R, Mtati N, Sachikonye M, Thondhlana G: **Unpacking Pandora's Box: Understanding and Categorising Ecosystem Disservices for Environmental Management and Human Wellbeing**. *Ecosystems* 2016, **19**:587–600.
- The authors review the concept of ecosystem disservices and their implications in terms of human well-being.
27. Malan HL, Appleton CC, Day JA, Dini J: **Wetlands and invertebrate disease hosts: Are we asking for trouble?** *Water SA* 2009, **35**:753–768.
28. Barua M, Bhagwat SA, Jadhav S: **The hidden dimensions of human-wildlife conflict: Health impacts, opportunity and transaction costs**. *Biol Conserv* 2013, **157**:309–316.
29. Nyamwamu RO: **Implications of Human-Wildlife Conflict on Food Security among Smallholder Agro-Pastoralists: A Case of Smallholder Maize (Zea mays) Farmers in Laikipia County, Kenya**. *World J Agric Res* 2016, **4**:43–48.
30. Foale S, Adhuri D, Aliño P, Allison EH, Andrew N, Cohen P, Evans L, Fabinyi M, Fidelman P, Gregory C, et al.: **Food security and the Coral Triangle Initiative**. *Mar Policy* 2013, **38**:174–183.
31. Nakamura EM, Hanazaki N: **Protected Area Establishment and Its Implications for Local Food Security**. *Hum Ecol Rev* 2016, **22**:1–22.
32. Stolton S, Dudley N: *Vital Sites. The contribution of protected areas to human health*. Gland, Switzerland: World Wide Fund for Nature and Equilibrium Research; 2010.
- 33*. Golden CD, Fernald LCH, Brashares JS, Rasolofoniaina BJR, Kremen C: **Benefits of wildlife consumption to child nutrition in a biodiversity hotspot**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2011, **108**:19653–19656.
- The authors show that declining fish stocks will undermine food security in many developing countries.

- 365 34. Sylvester O, Segura AG, Davidson-Hunt IJ: **The protection of forest biodiversity**
366 **can conflict with food access for Indigenous people.** *Conserv Soc* 2016, **14**:279–290.
- 367 35. Dudley N, Mansourian S, Sukuwana S: *Arguments for Protection: Protected areas*
368 *and poverty reduction.* Gland, Switzerland: World Wide Fund for Nature and Equilibrium
369 Research; 2008.
- 370 36. McNally CG, Uchida E, Gold AJ: **The effect of a protected area on the tradeoffs**
371 **between short-run and long-run benefits from mangrove ecosystems.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
372 2011, **108**:13945–13950.
- 373 37. Alva S, Johnson K, Jacob A, D'Agnes H, Mantovani R, Evans T: **Marine protected**
374 **areas and children's dietary diversity in the Philippines.** *Popul Environ* 2016, **37**:341–361.
- 375 38. Fa JE, Olivero J, Real R, Farfán MA, Márquez AL, Vargas JM, Ziegler S, Wegmann
376 M, Brown D, Margetts B, et al.: **Disentangling the relative effects of bushmeat availability on**
377 **human nutrition in central Africa.** *Sci Rep* 2015, **5**:8168.
- 378 39. Baird TD: **Conservation and unscripted development: proximity to park**
379 **associated with development and financial diversity.** *Ecol Soc* 2014, **19**:4.
- 380 40. Harvey CA, Komar O, Chazdon R, Ferguson BG, Finegan B, Griffith DM, Martínez-
381 Ramos M, Morales H, Nigh R, Soto-Pinto L, et al.: **Integrating agricultural landscapes with**
382 **biodiversity conservation in the Mesoamerican hotspot.** *Conserv Biol* 2008, **22**:8–15.
- 383 41. Webster FJ, Cohen PJ, Malimali S, Tautai M, Vidler K, Mailau S, Vaipuna L,
384 Fatongiatau V: **Detecting fisheries trends in a co-managed area in the Kingdom of Tonga.** *Fish*
385 *Res* 2017, **186**:168–176.
- 386 42. Wolf ID, Stricker HK, Hagenloh G: **Outcome-focused national park experience**
387 **management: transforming participants, promoting social well-being, and fostering place**
388 **attachment.** *J Sustain Tour* 2015, **23**:358–381.
- 389 43. Fuller RA, Irvine KN, Devine-Wright P, Warren PH, Gaston KJ: **Psychological**
390 **benefits of greenspace increase with biodiversity.** *Biol Lett* 2007, **3**:390–4.
- 391 44. Wolf LJ, zu Ermgassen S, Balmford A, White M, Weinstein N: **Is Variety the Spice**
392 **of Life? An Experimental Investigation into the Effects of Species Richness on Self-Reported**
393 **Mental Well-Being.** *PLoS ONE* 2017, **12**:e0170225.
- 394 45. Puhakka R, Pitkänen K, Siikamäki P: **The health and well-being impacts of**
395 **protected areas in Finland.** *J Sustain Tour* 2017, doi:10.1080/09669582.2016.1243696.
- 396 46. Dowie, M: *Conservation Refugees. The Hundred-Year Conflict between Global*
397 *Conservation and Native Peoples.* London, United Kingdom: Massachusetts Institute of
398 Technology; 2009.
- 399 47. Snodgrass JG, Upadhyay C, Debnath D, Lacy MG: **The mental health costs of**
400 **human displacement: A natural experiment involving indigenous Indian conservation**
401 **refugees.** *World Dev Perspect* 2016, **2**:25–33.
- 402 48. Sangha KK, Le Brocque A, Costanza R, Cadet-James Y: **Ecosystems and indigenous**
403 **well-being: An integrated framework.** *Glob Ecol Conserv* 2015, **4**:197–206.

- 404 49. Cumming GS, Abolnik C, Caron A, Gaidet N, Grewar J, Hellard E, Henry DAW,
405 Reynolds C: **A social-ecological approach to landscape epidemiology: geographic variation**
406 **and avian influenza**. *Landsc Ecol* 2015, **30**:963–985.
- 407 50. de Vos A, Cumming GS, Cumming DHM, Ament JM, Baum J, Clements HS, Grewar
408 JD, Maciejewski K, Moore C: **Pathogens, disease, and the social-ecological resilience of**
409 **protected areas**. *Ecol Soc* 2016, **21**:20.
- 410 51. Bauch SC, Birkenbach AM, Pattanayak SK, Sills EO: **Public health impacts of**
411 **ecosystem change in the Brazilian Amazon**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2015, **112**:7414–7419.
- 412 52. Valle D, Clark J: **Conservation Efforts May Increase Malaria Burden in the**
413 **Brazilian Amazon**. *PLoS ONE* 2013, **8**:e57519.
- 414 53. Taber ED, Smithwick EAH: **Influence of protected areas on malaria prevalence in**
415 **Sub-Saharan Africa**. *Appl Geogr* 2015, **64**:35–45.
- 416 54. Hahn MB, Olson SH, Vittor AY, Barcellos C, Patz JA, Pan W: **Conservation efforts**
417 **and malaria in the Brazilian Amazon**. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2014, **90**:591–594.
- 418 55. Milner-Gulland EJ: **Interactions between human behaviour and ecological**
419 **systems**. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci* 2012, **367**:270–278.
- 420 56. Reyes-García V, Babigumira R, Pyhälä A, Wunder S, Zorondo-Rodríguez F,
421 Angelsen A: **Subjective Wellbeing and Income: Empirical Patterns in the Rural Developing**
422 **World**. *J Happiness Stud* 2016, **17**:773–791.
- 423 57. Stephens C, Porter J, Nettleton C, Willis R: **Disappearing, displaced, and**
424 **undervalued: a call to action for Indigenous health worldwide**. *Lancet* 2006, **367**:2019–2028.
- 425 58. Chen SL, Yu H, Luo HM, Wu Q, Li CF, Steinmetz A: **Conservation and sustainable**
426 **use of medicinal plants: problems, progress, and prospects**. *Chin Med* 2016, **11**:37.
- 427 59. Eklund J, Cabeza M: **Quality of governance and the effectiveness of protected**
428 **areas: crucial concepts for conservation planning**. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2017,
429 doi:10.1111/nyas.13284.
- 430 60**. Oldekop JA, Holmes G, Harris WE, Evans KL: **A global assessment of the social**
431 **and conservation outcomes of protected areas**. *Conserv Biol* 2016, **30**:133–141.
- 432 This global meta-analysis explores how PAs affect the well-being of local peoples, revealing that PAs
433 associated with positive socioeconomic outcomes often report positive conservation outcomes.
- 434 61. Hanisch-Kirkbride SL, Riley SJ, Gore ML: **Wildlife Disease and Risk Perception**. *J*
435 *Wildl Dis* 2013, **49**:841–849.
- 436 62. Biedenweg K, Stiles K, Wellman K: **A holistic framework for identifying human**
437 **wellbeing indicators for marine policy**. *Mar Policy* 2016, **64**:31–37.
- 438 63. Loring PA, Hinzman MS, Neufeld H: **Can people be sentinels of sustainability?**
439 **Identifying the linkages among ecosystem health and human well-being**. *Facets* 2016, **1**:148–
440 162.

- 441 64. Aronson JC, Blatt CM, Aronson TB: **Restoring ecosystem health to improve**
 442 **human health and well-being: physicians and restoration ecologists unite in a common cause.**
 443 *Ecol Soc* 2016, **21**:39.
- 444 65. Donatuto J, Grossman EE, Konovsky J, Grossman S, Campbell LW: **Indigenous**
 445 **Community Health and Climate Change: Integrating Biophysical and Social Science**
 446 **Indicators.** *Coast Manag* 2014, **42**:355–373.
- 447 66. Jones KKE, Patel NGN, Levy MA, Storeygard A, Balk D, Gittleman JL, Daszak P:
 448 **Global trends in emerging infectious diseases.** *Nature* 2008, **451**:990–993.
- 449 67. Karesh WB, Dobson A, Lloyd-Smith JO, Lubroth J, Dixon MA: **Ecology of**
 450 **zoonoses: natural and unnatural histories.** *Lancet* 2012, **380**:1936–1945.
- 451 68. Basler CF: **West African Ebola Virus Strains: Unstable and Ready to Invade?.**
 452 *Cell Host Microbe* 2017, **21**:316–318.
- 453 69. Judson SD, Fischer R, Judson A, Munster VJ: **Ecological Contexts of Index Cases**
 454 **and Spillover Events of Different Ebolaviruses.** *PLoS Pathog* 2016, **12**:e1005780.
- 455 70. Rouquet P, Froment JM, Bermejo M, Kilbourn A, Karesh W, Reed P, Kumulungui B,
 456 Yaba P, Délicat A, Rollin PE, et al.: **Wild animal mortality monitoring and human ebola**
 457 **outbreaks, Gabon and Republic of Congo, 2001-2003.** *Emerg Infect Dis* 2005, **11**:283–290.
- 458 71. Leendertz SAJ: **Testing new hypotheses regarding ebolavirus reservoirs.** *Viruses*
 459 2016, **8**:30.
- 460 72. Singh RK, Dhama K, Malik YS, Ramakrishnan MA, Karthik K, Khandia R, Tiwari R,
 461 Munjal A, Saminathan M, Sachan S, et al.: **Ebola virus – epidemiology, diagnosis and control:**
 462 **threat to humans, lessons learnt and preparedness plans - an update on its 40 year’s journey.**
 463 *Vet Q* 2017, doi:10.1080/01652176.2017.1309474.
- 464 73. Koerner SE, Poulsen JR, Blanchard EJ, Okouyi J, Clark CJ: **Vertebrate community**
 465 **composition and diversity declines along a defaunation gradient radiating from rural villages**
 466 **in Gabon.** *J Appl Ecol* 2017, doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12798.
- 467 74*. Rulli MC, Santini M, Hayman DTS, D’Odorico P: **The nexus between forest**
 468 **fragmentation in Africa and Ebola virus disease outbreaks.** *Sci Rep* 2017, **7**:41613.
- 469 The authors illustrate that in recent outbreaks of Ebola virus disease, most index cases in humans (or
 470 spillover from wildlife reservoirs) occurred in hotspots of forest fragmentation.
- 471 75. Leendertz SAJ, Wich S, Ankrenaz M, Bergl R, Gonder M, Humle T, Leendertz FH:
 472 **Ebola in great apes – current knowledge, possibilities for vaccination and the implications for**
 473 **conservation and human health.** *Mamm Rev* 2017, doi:10.1111/mam.12082.

474

476 **Box 1. Human Health, Well-Being and Ecosystem Health**

477 Numerous frameworks exist for conceptualizing health and well-being, ranging in focus from the individual
478 to the nation, and hailing from such diverse disciplines as anthropology, economics or epidemiology [62,63].
479 Such frameworks have used a wide array of indicators to measure the health, ranging from mortality (e.g.,
480 child mortality), morbidity (e.g., prevalence, incidence), health status (e.g., high blood pressure), nutritional
481 (e.g., children stuntedness), social health (e.g., substance abuse), or health-system (e.g., healthcare delivery)
482 indicators.

483 Although a full review of these frameworks is beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to note that despite
484 their theoretical differences, most of these works share a general vision of linking human and ecosystem health
485 [18,64]. Frameworks in this vein resonate with indigenous peoples’ philosophical concepts of living in
486 harmony with nature (e.g., Andean notion of Mother Earth), identifying kinship between people and nature as
487 a determinant of human well-being [15]. Overall, these ever-more holistic definitions of human health
488 (reflecting the origin of the word, derived from the Greek ‘*hal*’ or ‘whole’) are providing new opportunities
489 for conservation managers to play a greater role in supporting human health than in the past [32]. As a result,
490 there have been recurrent calls for a shift from purely biophysical measures of health to broader well-being
491 indicators, targeting life satisfaction, good quality of life, or happiness, to cite just a few [62,65]. Many of
492 these indicators have also started to gain prominence in environmental discourses (e.g., *Sumak Kawsay* in
493 Ecuador; Gross National Happiness in Bhutan).

494

Box 2. Protected Areas or their periphery as hotspots of infectious disease emergence?

Up to two-thirds of known human infectious pathogens have emerged from animals [66]. This transmission from other species to humans fits with pathogen ecology and evolution, but the opportunities for animal-to-human pathogen spillover are higher with increasing human encroachment in natural habitats, particularly in the tropics [67]. Major disease hotspots appear to be at the interface between natural and degraded ecosystems, such as at the periphery of PAs. However, few studies have taken PAs as a leading analytical unit in epidemiological studies [53].

A topical case is that of Ebolaviruses, extremely contagious pathogens causing lethal hemorrhagic fever disease in humans and animals with high fatality rates. They have been repeatedly reemerging across the African equatorial belt since 1976 [68]. Despite the multiple Ebola outbreaks, we still have limited understanding of the reservoir host species and the environmental contexts favoring animal-to-human transmissions [69]. For instance, RNA of the Zaire Ebola virus (EBOV) has been detected in multiple wildlife species such as three species of bats, duikers (*Cephalophus* species), gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla*), chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) and various rodents, remaining debatable which are the natural reservoirs [70,71].

Ebola outbreaks have indeed been linked to contacts with wildlife. The cases in Gabon and DRC, in proximity to Odzala Kokoua National Park in 2001-2003 (Fig. 2), started when locals found and manipulated carcasses of infected mammals at the PA periphery [72]. Hunting pressure is high in North-eastern Gabon and affects large-scale animal communities [73], highlighting the role of bushmeat familial consumption as a high-risk behavior in these local communities. Yet outbreaks have also been linked to environmental change in Central and West Africa, with index cases in humans occurring in hotspots of forest fragmentation [74*]. The maps below (Fig. 2) illustrate how Ebola emergence locations (marked A, B and C) correspond to areas of recent deforestation, in the periphery of the Odzala Kokoua National Park. This suggests an interaction between land-use change and bushmeat hunting enhancing zoonotic disease outbreaks. While the role of PAs in the spatial dynamics of EVD outbreaks has not been investigated, caution is needed when interpreting spatial patterns. Although PAs are sometimes portrayed as EIDs hotspots because of the species they protect within [52], EIDs emergence might instead be attributable to the processes of fast land degradation happening beyond their borders.

Given that EIDs are responsible for over one billion human cases per year, we urge research to investigate i) how the interaction of deforestation and bushmeat consumption affect wildlife communities and particularly the host species around PAs; ii) how this resonates into spatial dynamics of EID emergence taking into account variation in livelihoods, human malnutrition and variation in PA governance and law enforcement; iii) the feasibility of an international protected area network of wildlife and human health monitoring combined with public education about zoonotic diseases particularly at PA periphery [75].

A) Scale of impacts on health related Ecosystem Services

B) Context dependence: PA governance and design (size and isolation)

529

530

531

532 **Figure 1. Linkages between human health, ecosystem services and PA management.** Panel

533 A. Scale of impacts on health through different ecosystem services. Impacts can be local or global,

534 within or outside the PA. Processes marked in cursive. Panel B illustrates different PA settings.

535 Protected areas can have different restrictive uses, from complete exclusion of human actions to

536 sustainable extractive uses of different types. In addition, they vary in their spatial design, with

537 aspects of shape, size and isolation affecting both biodiversity as well as health impacts.

538

539

Figure 2. Ebola virus emergence in the periphery of Odzala Kokoua National Park in relation to forest loss patterns (Congo – Gabon).