

Local Views On Community Engagement and Public Health Ethics during Outbreaks Protection in Zika Affected In Humans

Matthias Coutsoudis*

Department of Administration and Organization Theory, University of Bergen, Norway

Corresponding author:

Matthias Coutsoudis

✉ Matthias89@gmail.comCoutsoudis

Department of Administration and Organization Theory, University of Bergen, Norway

Citation: Coutsoudis M (2021) Local Views On Community Engagement and Public Health Ethics during Outbreaks Protection in Zika Affected In Humans. Health Sys Policy Res, Vol.9 No. 11: 158.

Abstract

A public health intervention used to manage vector borne illnesses involves aerial spraying of chemicals to kill mosquito larvae or adult mosquitoes. The action has caused controversy and community opposition in certain outbreaks. In this study, local opinion leaders in Zika-affected US communities were asked what they thought about community involvement in public health strategies for epidemic response. Focus groups were held in Houston, Texas, New Orleans, Louisiana, Miami, Florida, and Brooklyn, New York from December 2017 to March. They talked about a fictitious situation where spraying from the air was used to control vectors. Under the following 4 circumstances, participants more quickly accepted this vector control method: They were made aware of the alternatives, advantages, and environmental and human health risks. Claims about public health were supported by impartial data and an unbiased authority in the benefit of the neighbourhood. They got prompt information on how to reduce their exposure to toxins. Additionally, aerial spraying aided in protecting the weak. The local opinion leaders' demands for community involvement are consistent with the fundamental tenets of contemporary public health ethical frameworks, including individual liberty, openness, rationality, and solidarity.

Keywords: Vector control; Zika; Public health; Ethics; Disease outbreak; Community engagement

Received: 03-Nov-2022, Manuscript No. IPHSPR-22-13249; **Editor assigned:** 07-Nov-2022, PreQC No. IPHSPR-22-13249; **Reviewed:** 18-Nov-2022, QC No. IPHSPR-22-13249; **Revised:** 24-Nov-2022, Manuscript No. IPHSPR-22-13249 (R); **Published:** 30-Nov-2022, DOI: 10.36648/2254-9137.22.9.158

Introduction

Participants predicted that at a time of rising social media use and scepticism toward governmental and scientific authority, there would be issues with community consent [1]. They also discussed whether health officials should convey the hazards and advantages of aerial spraying using moral justifications in addition to scientific ones [2]. In order to stop the Zika virus from spreading, communities around the Americas, including the United States, implemented public health initiatives [3]. The Zika virus disease's characteristics and its management hindered the epidemic response. These included a variety of viral transmission routes, such as mosquito bites, sexual contact, and mother-to-fetus transmission; the lack of an effective vaccine; prevention through alterations in personal behaviour and environmental changes; and potential health effects for affected infants Oussayef [4]. As a result, public health practitioners had to deal with

several ethical dilemmas: Women had access to comprehensive reproductive healthcare. Community involvement, or the exchange of knowledge, confidence, and accountability between health authorities and the communities in question. For instance, the Nuffield Council on Bioethics and the Pan American Health Organization both recommended educating the public on the health effects, such as congenital Zika syndrome, local incidence and prevalence, individual protective measures, and public health interventions [5].

Discussion

Additionally, they promoted community involvement in the selection of interventions that might have an impact on them as well as building public trust through reciprocal communication [6]. Analysis of the public health ethics of controlling Zika virus vectors revealed the importance of community involvement.

Interventions that are viewed as at odds with community values may spark opposition [7]. For example, the release of genetically altered mosquitoes may cause public concern about artificial interventions that may affect the ecosystem [8]. Additionally, entering private land to find mosquito homes could annoy locals who value their independence, dislike government intrusion, and respect their property rights [9]. Public health experts have a better chance of gaining the trust and cooperation of the general public by outlining control possibilities, soliciting community feedback on appropriate interventions, and communicating the justification for particular decisions [10]. Additionally, integrating locals in a planned effort to decrease mosquito breeding grounds at the neighbourhood level, such as having entire neighbourhoods vacant or cover Containers containing standing water can increase the probability that vector control will be effective.

Conclusion

More and more neighbourhood people are becoming involved in decentralised programmes to combat additional mosquito-borne illnesses. In broader talks regarding an ethics framework to direct public health practise, community participation has also

been a key topic. Acute severe respiratory syndrome Pandemic flu, Middle East respiratory disease, and Ebola have all caused Singer to evaluate epidemic ethics. In light of this, our study investigated the presumptions that local opinion leaders in four US cities with a high risk of Zika transmission had regarding community engagement in the formulation of public health policies for outbreak response. They talked about what influences their own community's readiness to approve of aerial spraying, a contentious outbreak control method. This investigation focused on two major issues: based on local customs how can US practitioners effectively include the public in vector management in the future given the values and procedural expectations that aerial spraying sets off how can an epidemic response that incorporates aerial spraying compare to lay community ideals and public health ethics.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

- 1 Yarborough M, Sharp RR (2002) Restoring and preserving trust in biomedical research. *Acad Med* 77: 8-14.
- 2 Yarborough M, Fryer Edwards K, Geller G, Sharp RR (2009) Transforming the culture of biomedical research from compliance to trustworthiness: Insights from nonmedical sectors. *Acad Med* 84: 472-77.
- 3 Trinidad SB, Fullerton SM, Bares JM, Jarvik GP, Larson EB, et al. (2012) Informed consent in genome-scale research: What do prospective participants think? *AJOB Empir Bioeth* 3: 3-11.
- 4 Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, et al. (2015) UK Biobank: An open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLOS One* 12: e1001779.
- 5 Spencer K, Sanders C, Whitley EA, Lund D, Kaye J, et al. (2016) Patient perspectives on sharing anonymized personal health data using a digital system for dynamic consent and research feedback: A qualitative study. *J Medical Internet Res* 18: e66.
- 6 Shavers VL, Lynch CF, Burmeister LF (2000) Knowledge of the Tuskegee study and its impact on the willingness to participate in medical research studies. *J Natl Med Assoc* 92: 563-72.
- 7 Rose SL (2013) Patient advocacy organizations: Institutional conflicts of interest, trust, and trustworthiness. *J Law Med Ethics* 41: 680-87.
- 8 Richardson HS, Belsky L (2004) The ancillary-care responsibilities of medical researchers. *Hastings Center Report* 34: 25-33.
- 9 Resnik DB (2009) The clinical investigator-subject relationship: A contextual approach. *Philos Ethics Humanit Med* 4: 16.
- 10 Rahm AK, Wrenn M, Carroll NM, Feigelson HS (2013) Biobanking for research: A survey of patient population attitudes and understanding. *J Community Genet* 4: 445-50.