

1 **Why is leptospirosis hard to avoid for the impoverished? Deconstructing leptospirosis**
2 **transmission risk and the drivers of knowledge, attitudes, and practices in a**
3 **disadvantaged community in Salvador, Brazil**

4
5 Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma^{1¶}, Federico Costa^{1, 2¶*}, Ricardo Lustosa¹, Hamed O. Mogaji¹,
6 Daiana Santos de Oliveira², Fábio Neves Souza³, Mitermayer G. Reis^{2, 6, 7}, Albert I. Ko^{2, 7},
7 Michael Begon^{5¶} and Hussein Khalil^{4¶±}

8
9 ¹Federal University of Bahia, Salvador/Institute Health Collective, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil; ²
10 Instituto Gonçalo Moniz, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Ministério da Saúde, Salvador, Bahia,
11 Brazil; ³Federal University of Bahia/Institute of Biology, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil; ⁴Department
12 of Wildlife, Fish, and Environmental Studies, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences,
13 Umeå, Sweden; ⁵ Department of Evolution, Ecology and Behaviour, The University of
14 Liverpool, United Kingdom; ⁶ Faculdade de Medicina da Bahia, Federal University of Bahia,
15 Salvador, Brazil; ⁷ Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public
16 Health, New Haven, United States of America

17
18
19 *Corresponding author, e-mail: fcosta2001@gmail.com

20 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

21 **Abstract**

22 Several studies have identified socioeconomic and environmental risk factors for infectious
23 disease, but the relationship between these and knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP), and
24 more importantly their web of effects on individual infection risk, have not previously been
25 evaluated. We conducted a cross-sectional KAP survey in an urban disadvantaged community
26 in Salvador, Brazil, leveraging on simultaneously collected fine-scale environmental and
27 epidemiological data on leptospirosis transmission. Residents' knowledge influenced their
28 attitudes which influenced their practices. However, different KAP variables were driven by
29 different socioeconomic and environmental factors; and while improved KAP variables
30 reduced risk, there were additional effects of socioeconomic and environmental factors on risk.
31 For example, males and those of lower socioeconomic status were at greater risk, but once we
32 controlled for KAP, male gender and lower socioeconomic status themselves were not direct
33 drivers of seropositivity. Employment was linked to better knowledge and a less contaminated
34 environment, and hence lower risk, but being employed was independently associated with a
35 higher, not lower risk of leptospirosis transmission, suggesting travel to work as a high risk
36 activity. Our results show how such complex webs of influence can be disentangled. They
37 indicate that public health messaging and interventions should take into account this
38 complexity and prioritize factors that limit exposure and support appropriate prevention
39 practices.

40 **Key words:** Leptospirosis. Health, knowledge, attitudes and practice. Risk factors.

41 **Introduction**

42 The incidence of infectious diseases in disadvantaged communities, especially in large urban
43 centers, is higher than incidence elsewhere [1]. There are demographic, socioeconomic, and
44 environmental risk factors contributing to the maintenance of such disparity [2]. Indeed, there
45 is a consensus regarding the importance of socioeconomic differences in explaining ill health
46 [3], and differences in education, employment, and income are consistently associated with
47 health inequalities [4-6]. In disadvantaged neighborhoods, the inadequate environmental and
48 infrastructural conditions, such as the presence of trash, open sewers, and standing water, also
49 contribute to the proliferation of pathogens and their hosts, and increase resident exposure to a
50 range of pathogens [7,8].

51 In addition to contextual risk factors that directly or indirectly expose people to pathogens,
52 differences in knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) towards diseases also contribute to
53 health disparities. Many recent studies highlight the importance of KAP for COVID-19 [9],
54 tuberculosis [10], malaria [11], leptospirosis [12], and arboviruses such as zika [13] and dengue
55 [14]. Most of these studies rely on the assumption that the risk of acquiring infection is
56 determined by individual patterns of behavior (practices). These practices are assumed to be
57 driven by attitudes, which are determined, in turn, by the level of knowledge of a disease and
58 its associated risk factors [10-14]. However, rarely has KAP been related to objective measures
59 of risk such as probabilities of infection computed from field data [15,16]. While a number of
60 studies have considered the role of demographic and socioeconomic factors in shaping KAP,
61 the role of environmental conditions has been largely overlooked. Furthermore, available KAP
62 studies have implicitly assumed that knowledge, attitudes, and practices all share the same
63 determinants. Indeed, there is an apparent absence of studies that have disentangled the direct

64 effects of socioeconomic [15,16], and environmental variables [17], on disease risk, and also
65 their indirect effects, acting separately, through knowledge, attitudes and practices in urban
66 communities. Strategies to reduce disease risk are often top-down and overlook local
67 knowledge, and more importantly, local barriers, facilitators of preventative measures, and risk
68 perception [2]. Hence, to identify appropriate intervention targets that are more consistent with
69 the reality of the most impoverished populations, it is crucial to trace and quantify the
70 relationships between perceptions and practices of residents, measured through KAP, and the
71 socioeconomic, demographic, and environmental factors as both groups of factors combine,
72 ultimately, to determine risk.

73 In this study, we present an analysis aimed at disentangling these various and potentially
74 interrelated pathways to leptospirosis transmission risk in the city of Salvador, Brazil.
75 Leptospirosis is a globally distributed and neglected disease that disproportionately affects
76 vulnerable urban residents in low-income communities. Earlier, we have identified
77 socioeconomic and environmental risk factors for leptospirosis [7,18,19], and found a strong
78 link between socioeconomic status, infrastructure and sanitation on the one hand, and exposure
79 to *Leptospira* on the other. Here, we conducted a cross-sectional and detailed KAP study in an
80 urban low-income community, leveraging simultaneously collected fine-scale environmental
81 and epidemiological data, to understand how demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental
82 factors interact to determine KAP of residents, and how the combination of aforementioned
83 factors determines infection risk.

84

85

86 **Materials and Methods**

87 **Study area**

88 Our project, initiated in 2017, is based in four low-income communities in the city of Salvador,
89 Brazil (ca. 2.872.347 million inhabitants in 2019) [20]. In those four communities, we
90 conducted a sero-survey of 1,318 residents in 2018, where trained phlebotomists and nurses
91 collected blood samples and applied individual and household-level questionnaires to
92 document sociodemographic and environmental (household and peri-domiciliary) factors [7].

93 In this study, we conducted an in-depth KAP survey in one of those four communities, namely
94 Marechal Rondon (MR), located in the northwestern periphery of Salvador (Fig 1). MR is
95 considered a low-income urban community with poor social and environmental conditions
96 (infrastructure and sanitation), as well with high concentration of families in vulnerable areas
97 at risk [21]. Unadjusted seroprevalence for *Leptospira* in MR was 12.0% (n= 338) [7].

98 **Fig 1. Socioeconomic and environmental profile of the study area, Marechal Rondon,** 99 **Salvador, Bahia, Brazil**

100 First, we identified all residents that had participated in the serological survey ($N = 338$) and,
101 approached those eligible to participate in this KAP study ($N = 304$). We confirmed the
102 adequacy of sample size for this study based on the previously reported 12% seroprevalence
103 for leptospirosis with 95% CI and an assumed non-response rate of 10% [22,23]. Eligible
104 residents were men and women 15 years or more of age, who slept in the household for at least
105 three nights per week, and had participated in the sero-survey in 2018. Trained team members
106 visited the residents between April and June 2019, explained the objectives of the research,
107 before inviting them to participate. Upon recruitment, the team applied a standardized

108 questionnaire to document KAP of the study participants giving the participants a sufficient
109 time to recall. Participants <18 years of age provided written informed assent and their legal
110 guardians provided written informed consent.

111

112 **Data collection**

113 The items in our questionnaire were based on previous KAP studies on leptospirosis [12,24,25],
114 and adapted to the context and objectives of this study. The 67 items (S1 File) were organized
115 into four main categories: (1) sources of information on leptospirosis, (2) variables related to
116 knowledge (what leptospirosis is; transmission, signs and symptoms; complications; control
117 and prevention practices), (3) attitudes (individual, household and peri-domiciliary) and (4)
118 practices (individual, household and peri-domiciliary). Demographic, socioeconomic, and
119 environmental data at household and peri-domiciliary level were available from our previous
120 study [7].

121 For the “knowledge” section, only residents who had heard of leptospirosis proceeded to
122 answer the rest of the questions; those who had never heard of leptospirosis were not considered
123 in subsequent analyses. For answers given by participants to questions based on statements that
124 were true, each “correct” answer was assigned a score of 2, a “do not know” answer was
125 assigned 1, and an “incorrect” answer was assigned 0; for false statements the scales were
126 reversed [25].

127 For questions on attitudes and practices, we used a three-point Likert scale [25,26]. For each
128 question on satisfactory attitudes, a “yes” answer was given a score of 2, “maybe” a score of
129 1, and “no” was given 0 score. For preventative (satisfactory) practices, a “yes” answer was
130 given a score of 2, a “sometimes” answer received a score of 1, and a “no” answer was given

131 a 0. For questions on unsatisfactory attitudes and practices, the scales were reversed. We
132 summed the scores for each individual to obtain the total score for each dimension of KAP.
133 Questions on attitudes were related, among others, to the perceived seriousness of the disease,
134 perceived vulnerability to infection, and importance of protecting oneself (for full list see
135 supplementary information S3 Table and Appendix S1). For the practices dimension, the
136 questionnaire sought information on protective measures taken by residents to avoid contact
137 with sources of environmental contamination (e.g., wearing gloves when handling trash) and
138 to reduce resources for rats within or near the household (e.g., adequate trash disposal, food
139 storage, etc.). The maximum score for knowledge, attitudes, and practices sections was 60, 30,
140 and 28, respectively.

141 142 **Statistical analysis**

143 For all participants, scores for each dimension of KAP were analyzed as the number of points
144 obtained as a proportion of the maximum possible score [12,26]. We combined KAP data with
145 previously collected data on serostatus for leptospirosis, demographic, socioeconomic, and
146 environmental/exposure factors [7,20]. Here, demographic data consisted of the following
147 variables: “gender (male/female)”, “age (below/above 40)”, and “race (black or mixed/non-
148 black)”. Socioeconomic variables were “finished primary school (yes/no)”, “family income
149 (lower/higher than minimum wage)”, “employment status (employed/ unemployed)”, and
150 whether a participant “knows someone who had leptospirosis (yes/no)”. Family income was
151 categorized based on whether it was above or below the minimum wage of R\$ 950, as defined
152 by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics [20]. Data on race was also based on
153 IBGE data, which recognized five different races (white, black, mixed, indigenous, Asian), but
154 classified here as either “black” or “non-black” as the majority of residents were black or mixed

155 race (Table 1). The environmental/exposure variables were “Owns animals (yes/no)”, “Owns
156 backyard (yes/no)”, “Presence of trash within 10 meters of house (yes/no)”, “Presence of open
157 sewer within 10 meters of the house (yes/no)”, “Walked barefoot in the last 12 months
158 (yes/no)”, and “Had contact with sewage in the last 12 months (yes/no)”.

159 For each dimension of KAP and for seropositivity, we first fitted bivariate analyses using a
160 generalized linear model (GLM) with a binomially distributed error structure. KAP scores and
161 seropositivity were the response variables, and each of the demographic, socioeconomic, and
162 environmental factors were included as predictors. Predictors with p-value < 0.15 were then
163 included in the full model for each dimension of KAP. In addition to these variables, we
164 included knowledge score as a predictor for the attitudes model, and both knowledge and
165 attitudes scores as predictors for the practices model. Finally, in addition to three models (one
166 for each dimension of KAP), we fitted an infection model (GLM with a binomially distributed
167 error structure), with serostatus as the response variable and KAP as predictors, in addition to
168 demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental variables with p-value <0.15 in the bivariate
169 analysis for seropositivity.

170 For all multivariate models, we used a mixed (forward and backward) selection approach using
171 the *dredge()* function in the statistical software R. To select the final model parsimoniously in
172 each case, we identified the model with the lowest value of Akaike Information Criteria (AIC).
173 If two or further models were within two AIC values of this minimum, we selected the model
174 with the fewest number of predictors. For the final GLM models, we tested for multicollinearity
175 among the predictors using the variance inflation factor (VIF), where a VIF < 10 was
176 considered acceptable [27]. We performed all analyses in R [28], using MuMin() and lme4()
177 packages [29,30].

178

179 **Ethics statement**

180 This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Institute of Collective
181 Health/ Federal University of Bahia (CEP/ISC/UFBA) with CAAE number
182 68887417.9.0000.5030, and a National Research Ethics Committee (CONEP) linked to
183 Brazilian Ministry of the Health under approval numbers 2.245.914–2.245.914.17–3.315.568.

184

185 **Results**

186 **Demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental characteristics** 187 **of study participants**

188

189 Out of 304 eligible residents, 248 (81.6%) participated in this study (2.3% had moved out of
190 the study site, 0.3% died, 4.6% refused to participate, and 11.2% were not found at home on
191 three or more separate visits). The majority of participants were female (n=157, 63.3%), with
192 a mean age of 44.2 (range 15-102 years; see Table 1 for a summary of the demographic and
193 environmental variables).

194 **Table 1. Sociodemographic and environmental characteristics of study population in**
195 **Marechal Rondon, Salvador-Bahia, Brazil (n = 248).**

	Frequency or Median	%, SD or IQR^a
Characteristic		
Demographics		
Male gender	91	36.7

Age (in years) ^a	44.2	18.4
Socioeconomic indicators		
Incomplete primary school	68	27.4
Black or mixed race	226	91.1
Household per capita income (in Brazilian Reais) ^a	300	77 - 485
Occupation (n= 86)		
Informal work ^b	65	75.6
Work-related exposures (n= 86)		
Contact with contaminated environment ^c	64	74.4
Risk occupation ^d	22	25.6
Individual exposure factors		
Sighting of rat (last year > 10 meters of house) ^e	138	61.6
Walked barefoot (last year)	72	29.0
Contact with sewage water (last year)	72	29.0
Contact with mud (last year)	115	46.4

196 ^a Standard deviation (SD) (for means) and Interquartile ranges (for medians) are shown for
 197 continuous variables of age and per capita household.

198 ^b Defined by income-generating activities and without a formal contract.

199 ^c Reported exposure to mud, refuse, flooding water or sewage water in the workplace.

200 ^d Occupation as construction worker, refuse collector or mechanic, which is associated with a
 201 workplace environment characterized by high rat infestation.

202 ^e Data is missing for twenty-four respondents.

203

204 **Knowledge of study participants about leptospirosis**

205 Most participants (92.2%) had previously heard about leptospirosis. Among those, 48.4%
 206 identified television/radio as the main sources of information, and 24.0% and 10.2% reported
 207 that they obtained the information from neighbors and school, respectively (S1 Table). The
 208 majority of participants who had heard about leptospirosis identified it as a disease associated
 209 with rats (93.9%) and contact with rat urine, with walking barefoot (98.4%), contact with trash

210 (95.5%) and flood water (93.9%) as the main modes of transmission. However, 22.4%
211 answered that leptospirosis is transmitted *via* mosquito bites and 12.6% believed it can be
212 spread from person to person (S1 Table).

213

214 **Attitude and practices of study participants about leptospirosis**

215 Most of the participants viewed leptospirosis a serious disease (98.4%) and had worries about
216 being infected (95.2%). However, 16.9% were not worried about the presence of rats near their
217 household, and 19% responded that they would not participate in leptospirosis prevention and
218 control activities organized by local health centers (S2 Table). Participant responses suggested
219 generally satisfactory preventative practices; 91.9% answered that they avoid contact with
220 sources of contamination. However, 21.0% of the participants reported that they do not use
221 gloves or boots when being in contact with garbage or sewage water, and 49.6% used illegal
222 rodenticides to control rats in their homes (S3 Table).

223

224 **Demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental drivers of the** 225 **knowledge, attitudes, and practices**

226 Knowledge score was associated with demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental
227 factors. Knowledge scores were lower for males compared to females (OR=0.83, 95%
228 CI=0.76–0.92), and for participants who did not finish primary education compared to those
229 who did (OR=0.73, 95% CI=0.66–0.80) (Table 2). Knowledge scores were higher for
230 participants who were employed (OR=1.13, 95%CI=1.02–1.24), who lived in households with
231 a family income > 950 R\$ (OR=1.14, 95% CI=1.04–1.24), and participants who personally

232 knew someone who had leptospirosis (OR=1.23, 95%CI=1.12–1.35). Among the
233 environmental variables, having an unpaved backyard was associated with a lower knowledge
234 score compared to those who did not (OR= 0.86, 95% CI = 0.79–0.95) (Table 2).

235 For attitudes, the final model included knowledge score as a predictor, whereby a higher
236 knowledge score was associated with higher, hence more satisfactory, attitudes score (OR=
237 1.03, 95% CI = 1.02 – 1.05) (Table 2). Similar to the knowledge score model, demographic,
238 socioeconomic, and environmental factors were also associated with attitudes score beyond
239 their indirect effects, acting through knowledge. Male participants were more likely to have a
240 lower attitudes score compared to female participants (OR=0.77, 95% CI=0.64–0.91), and
241 those >40 years of age were more likely to have a higher attitudes score compared to younger
242 participants (OR=1.36, 95% CI=1.14–1.63). Being employed was associated with a higher
243 attitude score (OR=1.36, 95% CI=1.13–1.63), and participants who did not finish primary
244 education had lower attitudes scores compared to those who did (OR=0.80, 95%CI=0.65 –
245 0.98). Participants who consider themselves black race had higher attitudes score compared
246 with non-black participants (OR=1.72, 95%CI=1.35–2.18). Among environmental factors,
247 ownership of animals was associated with a lower attitudes score (OR=0.71, 95% CI=0.60–
248 0.84). On the other hand, the presence of trash within 10 meters of household was associated
249 with a higher attitudes score (OR=1.23, 95% CI=1.05–1.45) (Table 2).

250 For practices, the final model suggested that a higher practices score, and thus more satisfactory
251 practices, was associated with a higher attitudes score (OR=1.11, 95% CI=1.09–1.13), in
252 addition to two environmental (but not demographic or socioeconomic) variables, which had
253 effects beyond their indirect effects, acting through knowledge and attitudes (Table 2). Lower
254 practices scores were found for participants who had walked barefoot in the past 12 months
255 compared to those who did not (OR=0.81, 95% CI=0.67–0.97) and who had contact with

256 sewage in the past 12 months (OR=0.84, 95% CI = 0.70 – 1.01), the latter association being
 257 near significant. Participants who reported the presence of trash within 10 m of the household
 258 also had lower practices scores than those who did not (OR=0.82, 95% CI= 0.69 – 0.98) (Table
 259 2).

260 **Table 2. Final three multivariate binomial regression (GLM) models explaining**
 261 **knowledge score, attitudes score, and practices score using demographic, socioeconomic,**
 262 **and environmental variables (n = 246).**

Variables	aOR (95% CI) ^a	P-value ^b
Knowledge Score		
Male	0.83 (0.76 – 0.92)	<0.001
Did not finish primary education	0.73 (0.66 – 0.80)	<0.001
Employed: yes	1.13 (1.02 – 1.24)	0.018
Family income > R\$ 950 (minimum wage)	1.14 (1.04 – 1.24)	0.006
Knows someone who had leptospirosis	1.23 (1.12 – 1.35)	<0.001
Has a backyard	0.86 (0.79 – 0.95)	0.002
Attitude Score		
Knowledge score	1.03(1.02 – 1.05)	<0.001
Male	0.77 (0.64 – 0.91)	<0.001
Older than 40	1.36 (1.14 – 1.63)	0.018
Employed: yes	1.36 (1.13 – 1.63)	0.006
Did not finish primary education	0.80 (0.65– 0.98)	<0.001
Race Black	1.72(1.35– 2.18)	0.002
Owns animals	0.71 (0.60 – 0.84)	<0.001

Presence of trash within 10 meters of house	1.23 (1.05 – 1.45)	0.011
Practice Score		
Attitude score	1.11 (1.09 – 1.13)	<0.001
Walked barefoot outside	0.81 (0.67 – 0.97)	0.020
Presence of trash within 10 meters of house	0.82 (0.69 – 0.98)	0.028
Contact with sewage in last 12 months	0.84 (0.70 – 1.01)	0.057

263 ^a aOR = Adjusted odds ratio

264 ^b $p \leq 0.05$

265

266 **KAP as a driver for *Leptospira* seropositivity**

267 Among the 248 participants in this study, 29 (11.7%) were seropositive to leptospirosis.
 268 Participants' >40 years of age were more likely to be seropositive for leptospirosis compared
 269 to younger participants (OR=3.45, 95% CI= 1.27 – 9.35), as were employed participants
 270 compared to unemployed ones (OR=2.45, 95% CI= 1.03 – 5.86). Contact with sewage in the
 271 past 12 months was also associated with a higher seropositivity (OR=3.40, 95% CI = 1.43 –
 272 8.07). Finally, higher scores for knowledge and practices were associated with lower
 273 seropositivity (OR = 0.89, 95% CI = 0.82 – 0.97 for knowledge; OR = 0.82, 95% CI = 0.70 –
 274 0.96 for practices) (Table 3).

275 **Table 3. Final multivariate logistic regression (GLM) predicting seropositivity of**
 276 **residents using KAP, demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental variables (n=**
 277 **246).**

	aOR^a (95% CI)	P-value^b

Variables		
Older than 40	3.45 (1.27 – 9.35)	0.015
Employment	2.45 (1.03 – 5.86)	0.044
Contact with sewage in last 12 months	3.40 (1.43 – 8.07)	0.006
Knowledge score	0.89 (0.82 – 0.97)	0.006
Practice score	0.82 (0.70 – 0.96)	0.016

278 ^a aOR = Adjusted odds ratio

279 ^b $p \leq 0.05$

280

281 Discussion

282 In this cross-sectional study, we evaluated the contributions of knowledge, attitudes and
283 practices (KAP), and their respective determinants, to *Leptospira* seropositivity in a
284 disadvantaged community in the city of Salvador, Brazil. Our final model for seropositivity
285 indicated that residents who had recent contact with sewage were three times more likely to be
286 seropositive compared to those who did not, and employed residents were more than twice as
287 likely to be positive compared to unemployed residents. However, seropositivity was also
288 lower in residents with higher knowledge of the disease and for those who adopted protective
289 practices. Crucially, knowledge and practices themselves were determined by a range of
290 demographic, socioeconomic and environmental factors. These direct and indirect pathways
291 are summarized in Fig 2.

292 **Fig 2. The network of relationships linking socioeconomic, demographic, and**
293 **environmental factors to knowledge, attitudes, practices scores, and showing how both**

294 **groups of factors determine, directly and indirectly, leptospirosis sero-positivity. The**
295 **diagram represents the output from four generalized linear models, and the individual**
296 **variables can be found in tables 5 and 6.**

297 The scores for knowledge, affecting seropositivity indirectly, were lower in males, in those
298 who did not complete their primary education, and who had a back yard. Knowledge scores
299 were higher in those who were employed, had a family income higher than the minimum wage,
300 and who knew someone who had had leptospirosis. The scores for attitude were higher in those
301 with better knowledge, and so each of the factors affecting knowledge affected attitudes
302 indirectly. Attitude scores were also higher in residents over 40, those who were employed,
303 those who identified as black, and those with trash within 10 meters of their house, and were
304 lower in males, in those who failed to finish primary education, and those who owned animals.
305 Finally, the factors that drive practices affect exposure indirectly, and so each of the factors
306 affecting attitudes, including those acting indirectly through knowledge, affected practices
307 indirectly. Practices scores were also lower in those who walked barefoot, those with trash
308 within 10 meters of their house, and those who had come into contact with sewage in the last
309 12 months.

310 Of the many pathways and drivers of *Leptospira* seropositivity identified, a number of
311 pathways are particularly notable. First, our earlier research has shown that males had a higher
312 risk of leptospirosis [7,18], a pattern commonly observed for several environmentally-
313 transmitted and vector-borne diseases [31-33]. Both behavioral and physiological differences
314 between men and women contribute to sex/gender biases in risk [34]. Also, cultural variables,
315 such as gender stereotypes, contribute to differentials in attitudes to risk [35]. Here, we found
316 that men had lower knowledge and attitudes scores compared to women, which contributed
317 directly and indirectly, through sub-optimal practices, to an observed higher risk of infection

318 in men. However, once we controlled for KAP, male gender was not a significant (direct) driver
319 of seropositivity, suggesting that gender-specific attitudes and exposure patterns [35], and not
320 differences in physiology, were responsible for the higher leptospirosis risk in males observed
321 in previous studies. Indeed, gender biases in leptospirosis risk become even larger in rural
322 settings, due to higher *Leptospira* exposure for men during agricultural and fishing activities
323 [34].

324 In previous studies, lower scores for socioeconomic variables such as income and education
325 have been linked to a higher risk of leptospirosis and other zoonotic and vector-borne diseases
326 [7,18,19,36]. Here too, higher family income, completing primary education, and being
327 employed were associated with higher knowledge scores, and being employed was also
328 associated with better attitudes. Hence, higher socioeconomic status leads to better knowledge,
329 attitudes, and consequently more satisfactory practices that ultimately contributed to lower
330 seropositivity. These patterns are thus consistent with previous studies, indicating that even
331 after controlling for demographic and environmental factors, lower socioeconomic status was
332 a direct predictor of leptospirosis risk [7]. Notably, however, socioeconomic status here had no
333 direct negative impact on seropositivity, suggesting KAP as the causal route to such health
334 inequalities.

335 Furthermore, having employment was independently associated with a higher, not a lower risk
336 of *Leptospira* exposure (Fig 2). In an earlier study, we proposed that exposure away from the
337 household is understudied and remains difficult to account for [7]. Our present results support
338 this view, suggesting that while employment, among other proxies of higher socioeconomic
339 status, are linked to better knowledge and a less contaminated peri-domestic environment [7],
340 work- or travel-related exposure away from the household remains inevitable given the
341 inadequate environmental and sanitary conditions that are ubiquitous in the community.

342 Frequent large-scale flooding events that affect public and private spaces, inadequate
343 infrastructure, and poor access to main roads and public transit make travel to work and work
344 itself risky activities, with negative consequences on health and potentially income [37]. This
345 inability to avoid environmental contamination due to lack of alternatives is a common
346 challenge in low-income settings. In northern Senegal, for example, villagers were aware of
347 schistosomiasis risk in nearby lakes, but had no option but to continue fishing and agricultural
348 activities in or in close proximity to those lakes [38].

349 Residents who identified as black/mixed race had better attitudes towards leptospirosis
350 compared to non-black residents. However, there were no differences between the two groups
351 in knowledge, practices, or seropositivity, in contrast to previous studies, which showed that
352 black/mixed residents were at a higher risk of leptospirosis [18]. Our findings therefore suggest
353 that while residents of black/mixed ethnicity disproportionately recognized leptospirosis as a
354 potentially serious health issue, they were at a similar (and in previous studies higher) risk of
355 leptospirosis compared to non-black residents. Our findings are in line with those reported for
356 other diseases and contexts. Historically marginalized ethnic groups in the US were more likely
357 to perceive COVID-19 as a major threat to society [39], yet incidence and severe COVID-19
358 infections are disproportionately higher in marginalized ethnic minorities [40].
359 Hospitalizations due to infectious diseases in general are higher for indigenous ethnic
360 communities, especially for the most deprived groups [41]. Here, despite the better attitudes
361 observed towards disease risk, socioeconomic and environmental inequalities, manifested by
362 types of employment, living and environmental conditions, and sociodemographic factors, kept
363 marginalized ethnic groups at a disproportionate risk of infectious diseases [42].

364 Previous studies on leptospirosis have reported that poor environmental and sanitary conditions
365 increase the risk of infection [18,19,24,43]. Here we found an additional, indirect contribution
366 of poor environmental conditions to *Leptospira* risk, acting through KAP. For example, while

367 the presence of trash near the household contributed to better attitudes towards leptospirosis,
368 as it likely made residents aware of high levels of rat infestation, it nevertheless made residents
369 less likely to adopt satisfactory practices. Further, recent exposure to sewage, in addition to
370 directly contributing to higher seropositivity, also made residents less likely to adopt
371 satisfactory practices. Indeed, no socioeconomic or demographic factor directly influenced
372 practices, and thus their effect was strictly indirect, mediated through knowledge and attitudes
373 scores. Inadequate environmental conditions, therefore, appeared to form barriers against the
374 adoption of protective practices. We hypothesize that a degraded peri-domiciliary environment,
375 e.g., the presence of trash piles near the household, despite being associated with better
376 attitudes, results in protective practices being seen as useless or of limited value given the
377 overwhelming physical reality that expose residents to a wide range of risk factors. In future
378 studies, residents should be specifically asked about their degree of belief in the effectiveness
379 of protective measures, which could then be tested against environmental and infrastructural
380 conditions near the household. Indeed, variables representing inadequate environmental
381 conditions were doubly important, as they not only contributed to seropositivity indirectly by
382 making residents less likely to adopt preventative practices, but also directly, after KAP had
383 been taken into account.

384 This study has several limitations. The first is the impossibility of establishing causality for the
385 associations presented here given the cross-sectional design of the study. Another limitation is
386 related to memory bias of participants, since the variables related to exposure in the year were
387 self-reported.

388

389

390

391 **Conclusion**

392 Our results indicate that to understand the links between KAP and disease risk, we need to
393 account for the pathways by which demographic, socioeconomic, and environmental factors
394 influence the KAP dimensions and the risk of human leptospirosis, and the options available
395 for residents to mitigate it. Irrespective of factors such as education, income, knowledge,
396 attitudes, and protective measures taken by residents, the inadequacy of the environment and
397 socioeconomic disadvantage remain central, as they render residents helpless in avoiding
398 exposure and ultimately becoming infected. Our findings are important for identifying potential
399 barriers that limits prevention practices and continue to expose residents, and suggest that
400 public health messaging and interventions should take into account both the socioeconomic
401 and environmental determinants of at-risk groups.

402

403 **Authors' contribution**

404 **Conceptualization:** Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma, Hussein Khalil, Federico Costa.

405 **Data curation:** Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma, Hussein Khalil, Daiana de Oliveira, Federico
406 Costa.

407 **Formal analysis:** Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma, Hussein Khalil, Fábio Neves Souza, Federico
408 Costa.

409 **Funding acquisition:** Michael Begon, Federico Costa, Albert I. Ko, Mitermayer G. Reis

410 **Investigation:** Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma, Hussein Khalil, Daiana de Oliveira, Federico
411 Costa.

412 **Methodology:** Hussein Khalil, Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma, Federico Costa.

413 **Project administration:** Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma, Hussein Khalil, Federico Costa.

414 **Resources:** Daiana de Oliveira, Hussein Khalil, Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma, Ricardo
415 Lustosa, Federico Costa.

416 **Software:** Hussein Khalil, Fábio Neves Souza

417 **Supervision:** Hussein Khalil, Federico Costa

418 **Validation:** Hussein Khalil, Michael Begon, Federico Costa

419 **Visualization:** Hussein Khalil, Ricardo Lustosa, Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma e Fábio Neves
420 Souza

421 **Writing – original draft:** Fabiana Almerinda G. Palma, Hussein Khalil, Michael Begon, Fábio
422 Neves Souza, Hammed O. Mogaji, Federico Costa

423 **Writing – review & editing:** Hammed O. Mogaji, Hussein Khalil, Michael Begon, Fábio
424 Neves Souza, Federico Costa

425

426 **Declaration of interests**

427 The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

428

429 **Acknowledgements**

430 We deeply appreciate all the residents and community leaders of the neighborhood Marechal
431 Rondon for their contributions in supporting the research and participation in this study. We
432 thank the members of the project for their constructive suggestions for this manuscript.

433

434 **Availability of data and materials**

435 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study cannot be shared publicly because
436 of personal information of participants in the KAP survey, sero-survey, at the individual and
437 household and peri-domiciliary level. Researchers who wish to access the data can contact the
438 data manager at the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Nivison Junior.

439

440 **Funding**

441 The study was funded by Medical Research Council (UK) (MR/ P024084/1) to MB, Fundação
442 de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado da Bahia (BR) (1502/2008). The funders had no role in the
443 design, data collection, analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of manuscript.

444

445

446 **References**

- 447 1. Neiderud C-J. How urbanization affects the epidemiology of emerging infectious diseases.
448 *Infect Ecol Epidemiol.* 2015;5: 27060.
- 449 2. Corburn J, Riley L. *Slum Health: From the Cell to the Street.* Univ of California Press;
450 2016.
- 451 3. Nery JS, Ramond A, Pescarini JM, Alves A, Strina A, Ichihara MY, et al. Socioeconomic
452 determinants of leprosy new case detection in the 100 Million Brazilian Cohort: a
453 population-based linkage study. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2019;7: e1226–e1236.
- 454 4. Mackenbach JP, Karanikolos M, McKee M. The unequal health of Europeans: successes
455 and failures of policies. *Lancet.* 2013;381: 1125–1134.
- 456 5. Barata RB. *Como e por que as desigualdades sociais fazem mal à saúde.* 2009.
- 457 6. Quinn MM, Sembajwe G, Stoddard AM, Kriebel D, Krieger N, Sorensen G, et al. Social
458 disparities in the burden of occupational exposures: results of a cross-sectional study. *Am*
459 *J Ind Med.* 2007;50: 861–875.
- 460 7. Khalil H, Santana R, de Oliveira D, Palma F, Lustosa R, Eyre MT, et al. Poverty,
461 sanitation, and *Leptospira* transmission pathways in residents from four Brazilian slums.
462 *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2021;15: e0009256.
- 463 8. Telle O, Nikolay B, Kumar V, Benkimoun S, Pal R, Nagpal BN, et al. Social and
464 environmental risk factors for dengue in Delhi city: A retrospective study. *PLoS Negl Trop*
465 *Dis.* 2021;15: e0009024.
- 466 9. Ferdous MZ, Islam MS, Sikder MT, Mosaddek ASM, Zegarra-Valdivia JA, Gozal D.

- 467 Knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 outbreak in Bangladesh: An
468 online-based cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*. 2020;15: e0239254.
- 469 10. Shrestha A, Bhattarai D, Thapa B, Basel P, Wagle RR. Health care workers' knowledge,
470 attitudes and practices on tuberculosis infection control, Nepal. *BMC Infectious Diseases*.
471 2017. doi:10.1186/s12879-017-2828-4
- 472 11. Molineros-Gallón LF, Hernández-Carrillo M, Castro-Espinosa J, Trujillo de Cisneros E.
473 [Knowledge, attitudes, perceptions and community practices for urban malaria. Tumaco,
474 Colombia]. *Rev Salud Publica* . 2018;20: 82–88.
- 475 12. Ricardo T, Bergero LC, Bulgarella EP, Andrea Previtali M. Knowledge, attitudes and
476 practices (KAP) regarding leptospirosis among residents of riverside settlements of Santa
477 Fe, Argentina. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2018. p. e0006470.
478 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0006470
- 479 13. Maharajan MK, Rajiah K, Belotindos J-AS, Basa MS. Social Determinants Predicting the
480 Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices of Women Toward Zika Virus Infection. *Front Public*
481 *Health*. 2020;8: 170.
- 482 14. Castañeda-Porras O, Segura O, Garón-Lara EC, Manosalva-Sánchez C. Conocimientos,
483 actitudes y prácticas frente al control del vector *Aedes aegypti*, Villanueva-Casanare,
484 Colombia, 2016. *Revista médica Risaralda*. 2017;23: 14–22.
- 485 15. Alghazali KA, Teoh B-T, Sam S-S, Abd-Jamil J, Johari J, Atroosh WM, et al. Dengue
486 fever among febrile patients in Taiz City, Yemen during the 2016 war: Clinical
487 manifestations, risk factors, and patients knowledge, attitudes, and practices toward the
488 disease. *One Health*. 2020;9: 100119.

- 489 16. Sakinah S.N.S, Suhailah S, Jamaluddin T Z M, Norbaya SM, Malina O. Seroprevalence
490 of Leptospiral Antibodies And Knowledge, Attitude and practices of Leptospirosis to non-
491 high risk group In Selangor. International Journal of Public Health and Clinical Sciences.
492 2015;2: 92–104.
- 493 17. Knowledge, Attitudes, Risk Factors and Practices (KARP) that Favor Leptospira Infection
494 among Abattoir Workers in North Central Nigeria. [cited 23 Dec 2021].
495 doi:10.3923/aje.2015.104.113
- 496 18. Hagan JE, Moraga P, Costa F, Capián N, Ribeiro GS, Wunder EA Jr, et al. Spatiotemporal
497 Determinants of Urban Leptospirosis Transmission: Four-Year Prospective Cohort Study
498 of Slum Residents in Brazil. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2016;10: e0004275.
- 499 19. Reis RB, Ribeiro GS, Felzemburgh RDM, Santana FS, Mohr S, Melendez AXTO, et al.
500 Impact of environment and social gradient on Leptospira infection in urban slums. PLoS
501 Negl Trop Dis. 2008;2: e228.
- 502 20. IBGE – Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. In: Censo Demográfico 2020
503 [Internet]. [cited 23 Dec 2021]. Available: <https://www.ibge.gov.br/>
- 504 21. Santos E, Pinho JAG de, Moraes LRS, Fischer T. O caminho das águas em Salvador:
505 bacias hidrográficas, bairros e fontes. Salvador: ciags/ufba. 2010.
- 506 22. Kaggwa Lwanga S, Lemeshow S, Lemeshow S, World Health Organization. Sample Size
507 Determination in Health Studies: A Practical Manual. World Health Organization; 1991.
- 508 23. Gorstein J, Sullivan K, Parvanta I, Begin F. Indicators and Methods for Cross-Sectional
509 Surveys of Vitamin and Mineral Status of Populations. The Micronutrient Initiative
510 (Ottawa) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.(Atlanta). Centers for

- 511 Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta; 2007.
- 512 24. Navegantes de Araújo W, Finkmoore B, Ribeiro GS, Reis RB, Felzemburgh RDM, Hagan
513 JE, et al. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to Leptospirosis among urban slum
514 residents in Brazil. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2013;88: 359–363.
- 515 25. Azfar ZM, Nazri SM, Rusli AM, Maizurah O, Zahiruddin WM, Azwany YN, et al.
516 Knowledge, attitude and practice about leptospirosis prevention among town service
517 workers in northeastern Malaysia: a cross sectional study. *J Prev Med Hyg.* 2018;59: E92–
518 E98.
- 519 26. Lyu Y, Hu C-Y, Sun L, Qin W, Xu P-P, Sun J, et al. Impact of an intervention programme
520 on knowledge, attitudes and practices of population regarding severe fever with
521 thrombocytopenia syndrome in endemic areas of Lu’an, China. *Epidemiology & Infection.*
522 2018;146: 125–136.
- 523 27. Miles J. Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor. Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference
524 Online. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2014.
525 doi:10.1002/9781118445112.stat06593
- 526 28. Team RC. R: 2019. A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing version.
527 2020;3.
- 528 29. Barton K. MuMIn: multi-model inference. R package version 0.13. 17. [http://CRAN R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn)
529 [project org/package= MuMIn](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn). 2010. Available: <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/20000871529/>
- 530 30. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using
531 lme4. *arXiv [stat.CO]*. 2014. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.5823>
- 532 31. Eid D, Guzman-Rivero M, Rojas E, Goicolea I, Hurtig A-K, Illanes D, et al. Risk factors

- 533 for cutaneous leishmaniasis in the rainforest of Bolivia: a cross-sectional study. *Trop Med*
534 *Health*. 2018;46: 9.
- 535 32. Grigg MJ, Cox J, William T, Jelip J, Fornace KM, Brock PM, et al. Individual-level factors
536 associated with the risk of acquiring human *Plasmodium knowlesi* malaria in Malaysia: a
537 case-control study. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2017;1: e97–e104.
- 538 33. Musso D, Gubler DJ. Zika Virus. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2016;29: 487–524.
- 539 34. Guerra-Silveira F, Abad-Franch F. Sex bias in infectious disease epidemiology: patterns
540 and processes. *PLoS One*. 2013;8: e62390.
- 541 35. Ronay R, Kim D-Y. Gender differences in explicit and implicit risk attitudes: a socially
542 facilitated phenomenon. *Br J Soc Psychol*. 2006;45: 397–419.
- 543 36. Gazzinelli A, Velasquez-Melendez G, Crawford SB, LoVerde PT, Correa-Oliveira R,
544 Kloos H. Socioeconomic determinants of schistosomiasis in a poor rural area in Brazil.
545 *Acta Trop*. 2006;99: 260–271.
- 546 37. Garchitorena A, Sokolow SH, Roche B, Ngonghala CN, Jocque M, Lund A, et al. Disease
547 ecology, health and the environment: a framework to account for ecological and socio-
548 economic drivers in the control of neglected tropical diseases. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B*
549 *Biol Sci*. 2017;372. doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0128
- 550 38. Lund AJ, Sam MM, Sy AB, Sow OW, Ali S, Sokolow SH, et al. Unavoidable Risks: Local
551 Perspectives on Water Contact Behavior and Implications for Schistosomiasis Control in
552 an Agricultural Region of Northern Senegal. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2019;101.
553 doi:10.4269/ajtmh.19-0099
- 554 39. Niño M, Harris C, Drawve G, Fitzpatrick KM. Race and ethnicity, gender, and age on

555 perceived threats and fear of COVID-19: Evidence from two national data sources. *SSM*
556 *Popul Health*. 2021;13: 100717.

557 40. Pan D, Sze S, Minhas JS, Bangash MN, Pareek N, Divall P, et al. The impact of ethnicity
558 on clinical outcomes in COVID-19: A systematic review. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020;23:
559 100404.

560 41. Baker MG, Barnard LT, Kvalsvig A, Verrall A, Zhang J, Keall M, et al. Increasing
561 incidence of serious infectious diseases and inequalities in New Zealand: a national
562 epidemiological study. *Lancet*. 2012;379: 1112–1119.

563 42. Bentley GR. Don't blame the BAME: Ethnic and structural inequalities in susceptibilities
564 to COVID-19. *Am J Hum Biol*. 2020;32: e23478.

565 43. Felzemburgh RDM, Ribeiro GS, Costa F, Reis RB, Hagan JE, Melendez AXTO, et al.
566 Prospective study of leptospirosis transmission in an urban slum community: role of poor
567 environment in repeated exposures to the *Leptospira* agent. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2014;8:
568 e2927.

569

570 **Supporting information**

571 S1 Appendix File. List of KAP questions

572 S1 Table. Summary of knowledge questions on leptospirosis (n= 246)

573 S2 Table. Summary of attitudes questions on leptospirosis (n= 248)

574 S3 Table. Summary of practices questions on leptospirosis (n= 248)

575



Familiar income

- Low
- Medium
- High

Study Area




Fig 1




Fig 2