

1 **Title**

2 Exploring rat meat consumption patterns, and perception of risks regarding urban rats; implications
3 for rat-borne zoonoses outbreaks and drug resistant pathogens spread in urban areas of Ghana

4 **Subtitle**

5 Rat meat consumption and risks perception associated with urban rats in Ghana

6 **Authors**

7 Godwin Deku (GD)^{1,2,3,5} deku.godwin@student.usm.my

8 Emmanuel Younge (EY)¹ youngeemma@gmail.com

9 Stephen L. Doggett (SLD)⁴ Stephen.Doggett@health.nsw.gov.au

10 Rofela Combey (RC)⁵ rcombey@ucc.edu.gh

11 Isaac Kwame Badu (IKB)⁶ ibadu@ed.ac.uk

12 Mercy Amo Paintsil (MAP)⁷ mpaintsil21sw@sph.ugas.edu.gh

13 Smile Kwabena Ametsi (SKA)^{1,2} smiledoe2019@gmail.com

14 Angela Ama Wills (AAW)⁸ willsangela21@gmail.com

15 Rabiatu Bonnoua Bonney (RBB)⁸ rbonney001@st.ug.edu.gh

16 Kwabena Owusu Amoah (KOA)^{1,2} owusuowusu22@gmail.com

17 **Affiliations**

18 ¹Department of Environmental Health, Accra School of Hygiene, Ministry of Sanitation and

19 Water Resources, Ghana¹

20 ²Ministry of Health, Ghana

21 ³Centre for Chemical Biology, University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

22 ⁴Department of Medical Entomology, Westmead Hospital, Sydney, Australia

23 ⁵Department of Conservation Biology and Entomology, School of Biological Science,
24 University of Cape Coast, Cape coast, Ghana

25 ⁶Global Change Research Institute, School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Scotland,
26 UK

27 ⁷Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ghana

28 ⁸Department of Psychology, College of Humanities, University of Ghana, Ghana

29

30 **Correspondent Authors**

31 *Email: deku.godwin@student.usm.my (G.D)

32 Orcid Id: 0000-0001-6917-6256

33

34 Email: Stephen.Doggett@health.nsw.gov.au (SLD)

35 Orcid Id: 0000-0001-5636-627X

36

37 Email: rcombey@ucc.edu.gh (RC)

38 Orcid Id: 0000-0003-4645-4588

39

40 **Abstract**

41 **Introduction**

42 This research explores rat meat consumption patterns among urban Ghanaians and their perception
43 of risks associated with urban rats. Two hypotheses on risk perception among urban inhabitants
44 were proposed: the risk of contracting diseases by consuming rat meat and the risk of contracting
45 diseases from peridomestic rats.

46 **Method/Findings**

47 To achieve the objective, a descriptive cross-sectional survey using a questionnaire was conducted
48 that recruited participants from urban settings in Ghana. Of the 829 respondents recruited, around
49 65% consumed rodents, and of these, 35% consumes rat meat. Through statistical analyses, our
50 data revealed gender, age, region, religion, ethnicity, education, profession and income
51 significantly influenced rat meat consumption and residents' perception of disease risk. An
52 adjusted multivariable model identified males aged 27 to 34 years with no formal or a basic
53 education in southern Ghana as the most likely rat meat consumers. The majority of the participants
54 (60.3%) indicated rats are often present in homes and community drains, and have some awareness
55 where rats can be found in their place of residence. Low perception scores regarding disease risks
56 associated with rat meat consumption were recorded, with the majority of respondents (55-74.9%
57 of 829) perceiving that there were minimal disease threats associated with peridomestic rats. The
58 outcome of this belief was that participants undertook limited rat control in their neighborhood.

59 **Conclusion**

60 The poor perceptions of disease risks regarding rats increases the vulnerabilities of urban
61 Ghanaians to zoonotic spillovers. This underscores the critical need for public education on rat-
62 borne zoonoses in urban Ghana. This survey presents the first baseline study on urban inhabitants'
63 interactions with peridomestic rats in Ghana and the data will be crucial in the on-going
64 interventions by the Ghana Health Service to minimize transmission of Lassa fever and other
65 rodent-borne diseases and the spread of rodent related drug resistant pathogens.

66 **Author Summary**

67 Human engagement with rats in urban settings provides a mechanism of transferring rat-related
68 zoonoses to the human population. Unlike some other African nations, instances of zoonoses
69 relating to rats are not common in Ghana. Consequently, the public's perceptions of disease threats
70 posed by urban rats remain largely unexplored. Ghana's Lassa fever problems began in 2012, and
71 in 2023, the country experienced 14 cases with one death. The study herein enhances our
72 understanding of the epidemiological risk factors in evaluating Ghanaians preparedness against
73 rat-borne zoonoses in urban settings, by examining rat meat consumption patterns and associated
74 risk perception with the rats. A total of 829 Ghanaians were interviewed from urban residential
75 areas on rodent risk behaviors. Results revealed that around 35% of people consume rat meat in
76 urban settings of Ghana and low perception scores on disease risks pertaining to the rats were
77 recorded. The low scores are reflected in the limited attempts by the public to control rats. Rat
78 meat consumption and perception of risks were driven by several sociodemographic variables. Our
79 data could be used by the Ghana Health Service to justify implementation measures for rodent
80 management to mitigate Lassa fever and the spread of antimicrobial resistant pathogens.

81 **Introduction**

82 Global population growth and rapid urbanization poses a critical economic and health challenges
83 [1,2]. This has correlated with the escalation of urban pest populations, including disease vectors,
84 leading to the emergence of new vector-borne illnesses [2,3]. The United Nations estimated that
85 4.2 billion people currently reside in urban areas worldwide with projections indicating that by
86 2030, 75% of the global population will live in urban areas [4]. Even Africa and Asia, the least
87 urbanized continents, are anticipated to witness substantial urbanization by 2050 [5] with Ghana
88 having over 50% of its population currently residing in urban areas [6]. As population growth
89 drives expansion of urban land cover, estimated to increase by 1.2 million km², biodiversity loss

90 becomes inevitable to sustain human population density [7]. Consequently, a significant portion
91 of the world's population is expected to coexist with urban pests in the foreseeable future [8] and
92 human-pest interactions may increase if control measures are not implemented [9]. Urbanization
93 facilitates pest proliferation due to factors such as industrialization, agricultural and infrastructural
94 development, habitat degradation, forest decline, excessive waste generation, and poor
95 environmental management [10,11]. Rats (*Rattus* sp.), classified as small mammals within the
96 order Rodentia, inhabit forests, peri-urban and urban areas [12]. Their biology, behavior, ecology
97 and adaptability to human environments have been extensively studied due to their economic,
98 medical, social and scientific importance [12,13,14,15,16]. Of the 130 species in the *Rattus* genus,
99 *Rattus norvegicus* (Norway rat), *Rattus rattus* (black rats) and *Rattus. tanezumi* have successfully
100 colonized urban ecosystems throughout much of human civilization [17,18]. The Norway rat also
101 called the brown rat or the sewer rat is distinguishable from the black rat by its tail, colour, ears
102 and by other morphophysiological features [17]. It exhibits superior competitive aggressiveness
103 and has become one of the most dominant mammals globally [19]. The rise in global rat population
104 can be attributed to shifts in human environment, ecology and climate ([2,20] with research
105 indicating a heightened risk of rat infestation in neighborhoods characterized by high poverty
106 levels, aged buildings, dense housing systems and inadequate sanitation [11,21].

107 Rat meat serves as an important protein source in many countries particularly across Africa, Asia
108 and the Middle East [22,23,24,25,26]. Research in Guinea revealed that 91.5% of the population
109 highly value protein from rodent sources [24]. In Nigeria, of the 200 and 155 study respondents
110 interviewed from urban and peri-urban neighborhoods, 33.5% and 31.1% respectively, consume
111 urban rodents [23]. Various rodent species are consumed in Ghana [27,28]. However, over the past
112 six decades, the majority of the 300+ newly identified infectious diseases have stemmed from

113 wildlife with human-wildlife contact serving as a major transmission pathway [29]. Rodents alone
114 provides reservoir of an estimated 50% of emerging zoonotic pathogens and commensal rats are
115 an ecosystem of numerous disease agents with over fifty-three infectious agents identified thus far
116 [3,20,30,31,32,33]. Diseases such as toxoplasmosis, salmonellosis, plague, leptospirosis, rat-bit
117 fever, hemorrhagic fevers, and zoonotic babesiosis have been associated with rats [3,33].
118 Transmission of these disease pathogens to humans occurs through various means, including via
119 contamination of water and food, and contact with rat feces and urine [3]. Consuming rat meat
120 raises a more critical risk facilitating the transmission of zoonotic pathogens and epizootics from
121 rat populations to densely populated humans. The act of inhaling aerosolized pathogens from rat
122 fur, the potential exposure to blood-borne and saliva related infections during the carcass handling
123 and butchering, as well as the consumption of undercooked meats, further heighten the risk of
124 zoonotic transmission [34]. These risks were underscored by studies such as Douno and colleagues
125 [35], which explore hunting and consumption of rodents and Mangessho and Colleagues [36]
126 which examine knowledge and perception of pastoralists in Tanzania and hunting and
127 consumption of peridomestic rodents and disease transmission risks in relation to this issue were
128 also discussed by Ter Meulen and colleagues [24]

129 Regions such as West and East Africa have witnessed a prevalence of rat-borne diseases, with
130 Madagascar experiencing frequent plague outbreaks in recent decades [37,38,39,40,41]. Lassa
131 Fever, endemic in most African countries, poses a more critical threat, primarily transmitted by
132 rats in the genus *Mastomys* [42]. Among the major zoonoses in West Africa, Lassa Fever causes
133 approximately 100,000-300,000 infections with around 5,000 deaths annually [42,43],
134 Transmission of the disease may occur through contact with rat feces and body fluids [43,44].
135 Several studies have demonstrated a correlation between increases in rat populations and the

136 proliferation of pathogens vectored by rats [20,45,46]. This escalates the risk of epizootic events
137 spilling over into human communities, highlighting the importance of human-rat interactions.
138 Urban rats inhabits diverse habitat types that are under high chemical/drug selection pressures for
139 pathogens and include waste disposal sites, livestock yard, urban agriculture sites, municipal waste
140 water systems, and biomedical/health care/hospital wastes depots which all harbor a wide range of
141 pathogens [47]. These pathogens may be spread to community food sources, water bodies,
142 household insects, and domestic animals including poultry, and pets through commensal rat
143 activities [47,48]. Drug resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* were found in household soil, rodents
144 and chickens in Tanzania [49]. In a recently published study, the common rats; *R. norvegicus* and
145 its cousin *R. rattus* were identified in mediating the transfer of multiple drug resistant
146 *Enterobacteriaceae* from livestock into human environment [48]. In this study, 28 of the 53 *E. coli*
147 strains and two of the five *Salmonella* strains identified were multiple drug resistant suggesting
148 urban may be playing a crucial role in the dissemination of antimicrobial resistant pathogens
149 (AMR) [31,32,47,48,49,50,51].

150 Reducing rat populations, particularly in urban settings, presents significant challenges due to
151 various factors. These include dense human populations, extensive infrastructural development
152 [52], nocturnal and sub-nocturnal rodent behavior, the opportunistic nature of urban rats, and their
153 adeptness at establishing nests in obscure locations within human dwellings, and their prolific
154 reproductive ability. Moreover, the behavioral resistance of rats to toxic baits [53] and the
155 resurgence of pesticide resistant rat populations, the banning of glue traps, and second generation
156 anticoagulants, have further exacerbated the global challenge of rat control [54]. In 2020, the
157 Ghanaian media reported a significant event where approximately ten thousand urban rats were
158 killed overnight in the capital city following a major pesticide incident during the active phase of

159 the COVID-19 pandemic, which was indicative that urban rats' in the capital city have greatly
160 increased. The escalating density, particularly in public places implies an augmented risk of rat-
161 related pathogen transmission to the Ghanaian populace. Despite the cohabitation of Ghanaian
162 urban residents with commensal rats, scant literature addresses the perceptions and apprehensions
163 of the community regarding these rodents. To the best of our knowledge, no prior assessment has
164 been conducted to characterize commensal rats in peridomestic and urban areas in Ghana and the
165 associated potential disease risks. Additionally, public knowledge, perception and awareness of
166 the health risks of rats remain largely unexplored. Previous research in a rural area in Ghana and
167 most countries in Africa and Asia suggested poor knowledge and perceptual unawareness on the
168 disease risks associated with wild animals [55,56,57,58]. This research herein aims to provide a
169 comprehensive overview of the Ghanaian public's rat meat consumption patterns and their
170 perceptions regarding urban rats. We consider two pathways as determinants for potential zoonotic
171 outbreaks: rat meat consumption and human interaction with rats in the urban environment. This
172 paper examines the potential risk for rodent-borne diseases in urban settings of Ghana.

173 **Materials and Methods**

174 **Ethical Clearance**

175 The study received ethical review and approval from the research and publication committee of
176 Accra School of Hygiene under the Ministry of Sanitation and Water Resources affiliated to the
177 University of Cape Coast, Ghana (Approval number: SOH/MSWR/06/01/2023/001). Voluntary
178 anonymous respondents were informed on their willingness to form part of the survey. None of
179 our study participants is below the age of 18(yrs.) and all participants provided informed oral
180 consent before the interview. Written consent were not obtained because not all our study

181 participants were literate hence, the facilitator approved the consent note on their behalf after
182 seeking for their consent response.

183 **Study area**

184 According to the recent population Census [6], Ghana's population has increased by approximately
185 six million since 2010, reaching a current total population of over 30.8 million in 2021.
186 Administratively, the country is divided into 16 regions (Fig 1) comprising 261 districts. Seven
187 are urbanized and currently over 17 million of the total population is now residing in urban areas.
188 Southern Ghana has eleven (11) regions whereas, the North has five (5). The country has two
189 major religious groups with Christianity being the predominant religion followed by Islam and
190 traditional beliefs. Islam is more prevalent in the northern region of Ghana. Ghana is linguistically
191 diverse, some 79 ethnic groups speaking over 40 languages and 75 dialects [59] with English
192 serving as the national language. The five largest ethnic groups are Akans, Mole-Dagbon, Ewes,
193 Guans, and the Ga-Adangbe. The Akan ethnic group include subgroups such as Asante, Fantes,
194 Akuapim, Akropong, and Akyems constitute around half (47.5%) of the nation's population and
195 is mainly distributed in the south. Northern Ghana is dominated by the Mole-Dagbon ethnic group
196 and include the Dagombas majority, Mossi, Mamprusi, Nanumbas and Gonja ethnic group
197 comprising 16.6% of the nation's population [59]. The remaining ethnic groups, including the
198 Ewe, Ga and Guans constitute about 35.9% of the population [59].

199 Figure 1. Map of Ghana showing the 16 administrative regions in the north and southern divisions

200 **Study design and data collection instrument**

201 This study utilized a descriptive cross-sectional survey aimed at providing a general overview of
202 the rat meat consumption rate among the Ghanaian public, as well as their perception of associated
203 risks, and the sociodemographic drivers. Data collection was conducted solely through

204 interviewer-administered structured questionnaires, predominantly comprising closed ended
205 questions. Respondents were interviewed and guided by a facilitator to complete the questionnaire,
206 with the process typically taking around 10-15mins per participant. The questionnaire design drew
207 upon previous publications [23,34,56 60,61]. Prior to implementation, the questionnaire was pre-
208 tested on 20 respondents in the capital city, Accra Ghana and was subsequently converted to
209 Google forms and shared among interviewers.

210 **Data collection**

211 Environmental health officers and environmental health trainees collected the data for the study.
212 The questionnaire links were sent to these groups via email, and WhatApps to individual
213 Environmental health officers and trainees in the 261 districts located in the 16 administrative
214 regions in Ghana. The questionnaire provided clear instructions and guidelines at the outset,
215 accompanied by the inclusion of a brown rat logo to facilitate recognition by participants.
216 Interviewing Officials who required clarification utilized a phone number provided in the
217 questionnaire. In collecting the data, the officers and trainees firstly displayed the rat picture logo
218 featuring the popular rat local name ‘ekusie’ to aid in recognition by the participants. Interviews
219 were conducted exclusively with individuals residing in urban areas. Participants were anonymous
220 randomly approached at various locations such as streets, lorry stations, shops, hospitals
221 neighbourhood, schools, and other meeting points. Upon consenting, participants were given the
222 questionnaire by the interviewer. Completed questionnaires were submitted to the authors online
223 by the official interviewers. Personal information such as participants’ names, and phone numbers
224 were not collected to maintain confidentiality. The survey was conducted over a period of five
225 months from September 2023 to January 2024 and inclusion criteria was based on the respondents

226 who resided in an urban area of Ghana. Participant from rural areas/villages and unknown areas
227 were excluded. Only participants above the age of 18years were interviewed.

228 The questionnaire was divided into five sections. The first section collected data on socio-
229 demographic characteristics of the study respondents. Data such as region of the respondent,
230 gender, ethnicity, age, education, profession, monthly income, and marital status were recorded.
231 The second section of the questionnaire which included mainly ‘Yes or No’ responses, collected
232 data on rat meat consumption. This included information on whether participants were familiar
233 with rodents and if they consume rodent/rat meats and whether they have different preferences for
234 town rats or wild rats/bush rats, and if willingly purchased rat sold in restaurants. The third section
235 addressed perceptions about health risks associated with rat meat consumption, including if
236 participants perceive that rat carried disease agents and if they believe people could contract
237 diseases from consuming rats. The fourth section collected data on people’s awareness on rat
238 populations in their neighbourhood, such as if they have sighted rats in recent times or observed
239 any rise in the rodent population within their neighborhood. The factors accounting for the rodent
240 increases were recorded along with what they do if they detect rats in their premises. The final
241 section of the questionnaire addressed opinions on the rat population, such as if respondents were
242 concerned about rats, their reasons for the concern, and if attempts were made to manage rats in
243 their neighborhood and homes.

244 **Data processing and statistical analysis**

245 The questionnaire data was exported into Microsoft Excel version 2010 as an Excel file. The data
246 was processed and checked for completeness and consistency. The cleaned data was imported into
247 SPSS v26 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY) for analysis. Descriptive statistics were presented in
248 frequency and percentage proportions. The analyses of the study data utilized Independent

249 Pearson's Chi-square test and binary logistic regression (logit) models to demonstrate association
250 between independent variables/predictors (sociodemographic variables) and dependent variables
251 (Yes/No responses). Odd ratios and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals were determined
252 from the logistic models. Perception is a latent construct and perception responses were measured
253 using Likert scale. The Likert scale employed five optional responses which included, agree
254 strongly, agree, neutral, disagree and disagree strongly. The highest correct perception score
255 response was ranked/assigned 0.5, and 0.3 for neutral and 0.1 for every incorrect/lowest perception
256 score about a statement. Mean perception scores were compared using non-parametric tests. Mann
257 Whitney U test was used to test the significant proportional differences between two independent
258 variables and the Likert responses (mean perception scores). Whereas, Kruskal Wallis tests of
259 independence were used to compare significant proportional differences among three or more
260 independent variables/predictors and their Likert responses. Pairwise post hoc analysis was
261 employed with Bonferroni correction for multiple tests to separate means and the adjusted p-values
262 were recorded. All assumptions behind the statistical parameters and fitness tests were met.

263 **Results**

264 **Sociodemographic characteristics of the general public respondents**

265 Table 1 depicts the sociodemographic profile of the respondents. In all, 829 questionnaires were
266 received from 79 districts spanning 16 administrative regions throughout Ghana. The study
267 encompassed 28 out of the 75 ethnic groups in Ghana with the Akans, Ewes, Gas and Mole-
268 Dagbon constituting the predominant groups. The Akans and Mole-Dagbon, the primary ethnic
269 entities in Ghana comprised the majority (61%) of the study participants. A higher proportion of
270 responses originated from southern Ghana (65.7%) compared with the north. The gender
271 distribution skewed towards males (59.8%). About half (53.2%) of the participants were

272 unmarried. The age distribution revealed a significant majority (79.1%) falling within the 21-44
 273 years group. A substantial proportion (63.6%) of the participants had attained senior high school
 274 education, or higher. Regarding religious affiliation, Christians accounted for more than half
 275 (53.4%). In terms of profession, students and traders constituted around 44.6%, while health
 276 professionals, teachers and others comprised about 38.3%. Nearly half of the study participants
 277 were not engaged in any form of employment. Regarding income 30.2% of the survey respondents
 278 reported earning between 300-500 Ghanaian cedis monthly while 27.9% reported incomes
 279 ranging from 600-1100 Ghanaian cedis monthly. Additionally, around half of the study
 280 participants resided in family-owned homes.

281 Table 1. Sociodemographic information of the study respondents.
 282

Sociodemographic variables	N (%)
Gender	
Male	496 (59.8)
Female	333 (40.2)
Marital Status	
Single	441 (53.2)
Married	333 (40.2)
Married in the past	55 (6.6)
Age	
<21	63 (7.6)
21-26	245 (29.6)
27-34	232 (28.0)
35-44	178 (21.5)
45-54	79 (9.5)
55+	32 (3.9)
Education level	
No formal edu. /Primary	200 (24.1)
Junior High School	102 (12.3)
Senior High School	325 (39.2)
Bachelor and above	202 (24.4)
Regional Zones	
Northern Ghana	284 (34.3)
Southern Ghana	545 (65.7)
Religion	

Christianity	443 (53.4)
Islamic	324 (39.4)
Traditionalist/Atheist/Others	59 (7.0)
No data	3 (0.4)
Ethnicity	
Dagomba	253 (30.6)
Akan	252 (30.4)
Ga	104 (12.5)
Ewes	81 (9.8)
Mamprusi	22 (2.7)
Dagati	20 (2.4)
Frafra	11 (1.3)
Guan	5 (0.6)
Others	82 (9.9)
Profession	
Students	202 (24.5)
Health Professionals/Teachers	165 (19.9)
Traders	224 (27.1)
Others	234 (28.5)
No data	4 (0.5)
Employment status	
Not employed	385 (46.7)
Employed	436 (52.8)
Retire	4 (0.5)
No data	4 (0.5)
Income (GHS.) (\$1= GHS. 13)	
<500/No income	254 (30.6)
600-1100	231 (27.9)
1200+	145 (17.7)
No data	199 (24.0)
Residential status	
Own the home	155 (18.8)
Family home	440 (53.3)
Renting	216 (26.1)
Not classified	15 (1.8)

283

284 **Rat meat consumption**

285 Table 2 presents the findings on the participants' consumption practices. Out of the 829
 286 participants, the high majority (82.2%) exhibited familiarity with rodents and most (64.8%)
 287 acknowledged consuming such animals. However approximately 35% of those who consumed

288 rodents consume rat meat. Around 22% had consumed rat meat recently and about 34% expressed
 289 willingness to consume the meat when presented with the opportunity. On average, 26% of the
 290 respondents could recall someone who had consumed rat meat recently, expressed willingness to
 291 buy rat killed from their neighbourhood, consumed rat meat sold in a restaurant or engage in
 292 hunting and consuming rats that visited their premises.

293 **Table 2.** Rat meat consumption among the respondents
 294

Statement/Question	Response	
	Yes (%)	No (%)
Familiar with rodents (such as grass cutter, rat and mice)	698 (82.2)	125 (15.1)
Consumes rodent meat.	537 (64.8)	288 (34.7)
Consumes rat meat.	290 (35.0)	535 (64.5)
Ate rat meat recently.	184 (22.2)	636 (76.7)
Willing to consume rat meat when presented with one today.	278 (33.9)	542 (66.1)
Remembered someone that consumed rat meat recently.	204 (24.7)	619 (74.9)
Willing to buy rat killed from the neighbourhood and sold at cheap price.	202 (24.4)	616 (74.3)
Willing to buy town rat meat sold in a restaurant/chop bar.	198 (23.9)	626 (75.5)
Willing to buy bush rat meat sold in a restaurant/chop bar	234 (28.2)	400 (48.3)
Willing to kill and consume rat that has visited your home.	206 (25.0)	623 (75.0)
Average	26.04%	

295
 296 **Sociodemographic predictors of rat meat consumption**

297 Table 3 presents frequency and percentage summaries demonstrating that a higher proportion of
 298 males (23.8% of 829) consume rat meat than females (11.4%). Additionally unmarried (singles)
 299 consume rat meat more than those who are married. Those in age 27-34 years consume rat meat
 300 more than the other age groups. Ethnically, Ewes (n=47 > 34), and the Mamprusi (n=15>7),
 301 significantly surpass non-rat meat consumers. Those with senior high school education, residing
 302 in the southern region part of the country, Christians and Akans, unemployed, and people having
 303 an income of less than 500 Ghanaian cedis, monthly, demonstrated a higher proportion of rat meat
 304 consumption than their counterparts. Thus there were associations between rat meat consumption

305 and sociodemographic variables. Pearson’s Independent Chi-square test suggested that at 95%
 306 Confidence Interval (CI), gender, age, education, region, religion, ethnicity, profession, and
 307 income independently associated with rat meat consumption in Ghana (Table 3). However, no
 308 significant association exist between marital status, employment, and residential status with rat
 309 meat consumption (Table 3).

310

311 Table 3. Sociodemographic variables and rat meat consumption

312

Sociodemographic variables	Consume rat meat		Chi-square test (95% CI)
	Yes (%)	No (%)	
Gender			
Male	196 (23.8)	298 (36.1)	$\chi=11.1$; $p=0.01$; df=1
Female	94 (11.4)	237 (28.7)	
Marital Status			
Single	163 (19.8)	277 (33.6)	$\chi=4.7$; $p=0.10$; df=2
Married	103 (12.5)	227 (27.5)	
Married in the past	28(3.4)	31(3.7)	
Age			
<21	15 (1.8)	48 (5.8)	$\chi=15.3$; $p=0.01$; df=5
21-26	70 (8.5)	175 (21.2)	
27-34	95 (11.5)	136 (16.5)	
35-44	62 (7.5)	114 (13.8)	
45-54	34 (4.1)	44 (5.3)	
55+	14 (1.7)	18 (2.2)	
Education level			
No formal edu. /Primary	68 (8.2)	130 (15.8)	$\chi=20.9$; $p=0.000$; df=3
Junior High School	55 (6.7)	46 (5.6)	
Senior High School	110 (13.3)	215 (26.1)	
Bachelor and above	57 (6.9)	144 (17.5)	
Regional division			
Northern Ghana	57 (6.91)	226 (27.4)	$\chi=42.6$; $p=0.000$; df=1
Southern Ghana	233 (28.2)	309 (37.5)	
Religion			
Christianity	183 (22.9)	259 (32.4)	$\chi=34.6$; $p=0.000$; df=2
Islamic	80 (10.0)	244 (30.5)	
Traditionalist/Atheist/Others	21 (1.5)	12 (2.6)	
Ethnicity			

Mole-Dagbon	51 (6.4)	200 (25.0)	$\chi=61$; $p=0.000$; df=9
Akan	102 (12.8)	149 (18.6)	
Ga	39 (4.9)	65 (8.1)	
Ewes	47 (5.9)	34 (4.3)	
Mamprusi	15 (1.9)	7 (0.9)	
Dagati	6 (0.8)	15 (1.9)	
Frafra	3 (0.4)	8 (1)	
Guan	4 (0.5)	2 (0.25)	
Others	17 (2.1)	36 (4.5)	
Profession			
Students	53 (6.4)	150 (18.2)	$\chi=9.8$; $p=0.02$; df=3
Health Professionals/Teachers	64 (7.8)	100 (12.1)	
Traders	83 (10.1)	140 (17)	
Others	90 (10.9)	145 (17.6)	
Employment status			
Employed	161 (19.5)	275 (33.3)	$\chi=1.3$; $p=0.26$; df=1
Not Employed/Retired	129 (15.6)	260 (31.5)	
Income (GHC.)			
<500/No income	104 (12.6)	150 (18.2)	$\chi=10.3$; $p=0.02$; df=2
600-1100	64 (7.8)	167 (20.2)	
1200+	56 (6.8)	89 (10.8)	
Residential status			
Own the home	57 (6.9)	98 (11.9)	$\chi=7.2$; $p=0.07$; df=2
Family home	138 (16.7)	308 (36.6)	
Renting	90 (10.9)	125 (15.2)	

313

314 **Logistic regression analysis of sociodemographic predictors and rat** 315 **meat consumption**

316 Bivariate and multivariable odd ratios from logistics regression models regressing
317 sociodemographic variables (independent variables) with rat meat consumption variables unveiled
318 significant associations. In the bivariate analysis, males exhibited 3.3 and 1.7 times higher odds of
319 consuming rodent meat (OR=3.34; 95% CI: 2.47-4.50) and rat meat (OR=1.67; 95% CI: 1.23-
320 2.23) respectively, compared to females. Participants aged 27-34years had 2.3 and 1.8 times higher
321 odds of consuming rodent meat (OR=2.3; 95% CI: 1.62-3.32) and rat meat (OR=1.83; 95% CI:
322 1.28-2.63) respectively, compared to participants less than 26 years old. Participants with an age

323 35 years and above (35+) had 4.7 times and 1.6 times higher odds of consuming rodent meat
324 (OR=4.676; 95%CI: 3.226-6.779) and rat meat (OR=1.64;95% CI:1.16-2.32) respectively, than
325 those with age 26 years and below. Compared to Christians, Muslims had 1.4 times higher odds
326 of consuming rodent meat (OR=1.45; 95% CI: 1.07-1.97). On the contrary, Muslims had 0.46
327 times lower odds of eating rat meat than Christians (OR=0.46; 95% CI: 0.34-0.64). Compared to
328 the Akans ethnic group, Mole-Dagbon (OR=2.06; 95% CI: 1.42-3.1) and others (OR=1.75; 95%
329 CI: 1.23-2.48), had high odds of eating rodent meat. On the contrary, Mole-Dagbon had 0.4 times
330 lower odds of eating rat meat compared to the Akans (OR=0.37; 95% CI: 0.25-0.56). Regarding
331 professions, health professionals/teachers (0.53; 95%CI: 0.34-0.82), and students (OR=0.28;
332 95%CI: 0.19-0.43), had lower odds of consuming rodent meat than traders. Students had 0.6 times
333 lower odds of eating rat meat than traders (OR=0.6; 95% CI: 0.39-0.90). Compared with those
334 receiving monthly income of 600 (GHS.) and above, those with 500(GH.) and below (including
335 those with no monthly income) had 1.8 times higher odds of eating rat meat (OR=1.81; 95%CI:
336 1.24-2.65). With reference to region, Southerners had 0.6 times lower odds of consuming rodents
337 than the Northerners (OR=0.63; 95%CI: 0.46-0.86). On the contrary, southerners had three times
338 higher odds of consuming rat meat than Northerners (OR=2.99; 95%CI: 2.14-4.19). Compared to
339 those below senior high school education (<SHS)/basic education/no formal education those to
340 Bachelor degree, the latter ground had a 0.6 and 0.4 times lower odds of consuming rodent
341 (OR=0.39; 95% CI: 0.27-0.57) and rat meat (OR=0.57; 95% CI: 0.39-0.83) respectively. Those
342 with SHS education had 0.59 times less odds of eating rodent meat than those below SHS
343 education (OR=0.59; 95% CI: 0.42-0.83). A strong association existed between those who
344 consume both rodent and rat meat ($\chi^2=148$; $p=0.000$; $df=3$). Multivariable binary regression model
345 adjusting for other sociodemographic variables including those with $p\leq 0.25$ during the bivariate

346 test suggested that being a male between 27-34yrs. of age, with no basic education/no formal
 347 education in the southern part of the country is most likely to consume rat meat (Table 4). The
 348 Table 4 contains only sociodemographic variables that showed significance in the adjusted model.
 349
 350 Table 4. Multivariable logistics regression analysis of sociodemographic predictors and rat meat
 351 consumption in the participants
 352

Sociodemo-graphic variables	N (%)	P-value (0.05)	Odd Ratio(OR)	p-value (0.05)	Adjusted odd Ratio(AOR)
Gender					
Male	496 (59.8)	0.000	1	0.001	1
female	333 (40.2)		0.60 (0.45-0.81)		0.459 (0.325-0.649)
Age					
≤26yrs	308 (37.1)		1		1
27-34	232 (28.0)	0.001	1.83 (1.28-2.63)	0.001	2.08 (1.28-3.36)
≥35+	289 (34.9)	0.005	1.64 (1.16-2.32)	0.08	1.070 (0.63-1.816)
Education level					
Basic (No formal/ Primary/JHS)	302 (36.4)		1		1
Senior High School	325 (39.5)	0.06	0.73 (0.53-1.01)	0.082	0.703 (0.472-1.046)
Bachelor and above	202 (24.4)	0.004	0.57 (0.39-0.83)	0.000	0.312 (0.176-0.554)
Regional division					
Southern	545 (65.7)		1		1
Northern	284 (34.3)	0.000	0.63 (0.46-0.86)	0.001	0.236 (0.103-0.540)

353
 354 **Perception of disease risks associated with rats**
 355 The results in Table 5 indicates the perception of disease risk associated with rat meat
 356 consumption. The findings generally indicate that, more than half of the study participants had
 357 very low to low perception scores on disease risks associated with rat meat consumption. Of the
 358 829 participants, more than half (disagreed/strong disagreed=54.8%) indicated that rats found in
 359 the bush were different from rats found in towns whereas around 17% were indeterminate
 360 (neutral). A Significant number of participants (disagreed/strongly disagreed=61.4%) thought

361 there were no disease risks associated with consuming rats from the bush and that rats from such
 362 locations did not carry disease agents, whereas, 13.5% had a neutral perception on the issue. About
 363 38% of the participants disagreed that they could contract diseases by consuming rats in their
 364 neighborhood which was around half of the participants who indicated that rats from the bush
 365 cannot carry disease agents. Around 27% of the respondents had a neutral perception about
 366 contracting diseases from consuming town rats. This constituted twice the number of those who
 367 had a neutral perception of the disease agents' status of bush rats (Table 5). Participants had low
 368 perception scores on rat-associated health risks in their neighbourhood (Table 5) primarily due to
 369 limited knowledge on rat-borne zoonoses. A significant majority (74.9%) perceived that rats in
 370 their neighbourhood posed a less severe (28%) to no health risks (46.9%). When asked if rats in
 371 their neighbourhood may transmit/carry any disease agents, 41% of the participants disagreed,
 372 whereas, 14.2% were neutral. On average 93% had no knowledge of anyone that had died or fallen
 373 sick due to rat meat consumption

374
 375 Table 5. Participants' perception of disease risks concerning rat meat consumption and rat
 376 infestation in neighbourhood.

377

Statement/question	Response (%)
I. I do not consider any difference between bush rat and town rat.	
Agree strongly	74 (8.9)
Agree	159 (19.2)
Neutral	142 (17.1)
Disagree	382 (46.1)
Disagree strongly	72 (8.7)
II. You can contract diseases by consuming rat killed from the bush	
Agree strongly	60 (7.2)
Agree	147 (17.7)
Neutral	112 (13.5)
Disagree	429 (51.7)

Strongly disagree	80 (9.7)
III. You can contract diseases by consuming rat killed from the neighbourhood	
Agree strongly	64 (7.7)
Agree	224 (27.0)
Neutral	224 (27.0)
Disagree	246 (29.7)
Strongly disagree	70 (8.4)
IV. know someone that has fallen sick from eating rat meat	No=779 (94.0)
V. Know someone that has died from eating rat meat.	No=762 (92.0),
I. Rats in my neighbourhood have:	
highly severe health risk	208 (25.1)
Less severe health risk	232 (28)
No health risk	389 (46.9)
II. Rats in your neighbourhood may carry disease agents/transmit disease	
Agree strongly	126 (15.2)
Agree	241 (29.1)
Neutral	118 (14.2)
Disagree	311 (37.5)
Strongly disagree	33 (4.0)

378

379

380 **Sociodemographic predictors of perception scores on disease risk**

381 **associated with rats**

382 Mann Whitney U test results detailed in Table 6 suggested a significant proportional difference in

383 mean perception scores on health risks associated with rat meat consumption between the genders.

384 No significant difference exist between southern and northern Ghana in mean perception scores

385 on disease risks associated with rat meat consumption. More males than females considered there

386 was a difference between town and bush rats. Both males and females equally indicated that

387 diseases can be contracted by consuming rats from their neighbourhood, however, more males

388 than females perceive a disease risk with consuming bush rats. There was no significant difference

389 between northerners and southerners perceptions of the disease risks pertaining to consuming rat

390 killed from the bush or town. However, a high proportion of northerners than southerners perceive
 391 a difference between town and bush rat (Mann Whitney U= 99367; p=0.000). A significant
 392 proportion of participants that consumed rat meat rejected the assumption that they can contract
 393 diseases by consuming town rat meat (Whitney U=67956.0; p=0.003). They significantly
 394 disagreed that rats in their neighbourhood may carry disease agents (Mann Whitney U= 60101;
 395 p=000). However no significant difference exist in their perception of disease risk on consuming
 396 bush rat (Whitney U=78542.0; p= 0.675). Kruskal-Wallis test of independence and pairwise post
 397 hoc tests adjusted by Bonferroni correction for multiple tests detailed in Fig 2 suggested a
 398 significant proportional differences in mean perception scores on disease risks associated with
 399 consuming neighbourhood/town rats between the education levels, ethnic and professional
 400 groupings. Akan ethnicity, those with bachelors' education and above, and health
 401 professionals/teachers, had significantly high mean risk perception scores compared with their
 402 counterparts. However, no significant difference existed in the mean risk perception scores among
 403 the religious groups. A one way ANOVA showed no significant difference among the age groups
 404 regarding their perceptions that diseases can be contracted through the consumption of bush rat
 405 meat (F=0.69;p=0.51; df=2) or town rat meat (F=0.21;p=0.81;df=2)

406

407 Table 6. Mann Whitney U test analysis of correlation between sociodemographic variables and
 408 perception scores on disease risks associated with rat meat consumption [95%CI].

409

Socio. variables	Statement/question: Perceptions about disease associated with rats		
	I. Considers difference between bush and town rat.	II. Can contract diseases by eating rat killed from the bush.	III. Can Contract diseases by eating rat killed from neighbourhood/town

Gender	U = 69009; z-score= 4.3 p=0.000	U 76567.5; z-score = - 2.1; p=0.033	U=84266; z-score=0.57; p=0.57
Male: mean rank	442.1	426.3	410.8
Female: mean rank	374.2	396.9	420.5
Region	U=99367; p=0.000; z- score =7.13	U=73208; p=0.13; z- score= -1.5	U=71099.0; p=0.051; z- score= -1.9
Southern: mean rank	374.7	421.9	425.8
Northern: mean rank	492.4	400.3	392.9

410

411

412 **Fig 2:** Correlation between respondents' sociodemographic profile and perception scores on
 413 disease risks associated with consuming neighbourhood rats. Ethnicity (a), Profession (b), Religion
 414 (c), Education (d)

415

416 Males, basic education leavers, those from Mole-Dagbon ethnicity, traders, those who are
 417 Islamic/Muslim, and reside in northern Ghana proportionally showed low perception scores about
 418 disease risk associated with rats in their neighborhood (Table 6 and Fig 3). Between the genders,
 419 a significant proportion of females than males perceived a disease risks associated with rats in their
 420 neighbourhood (U = 95867; P=0.000; z-score=4.1). More southerners than northerners perceive
 421 disease risks associated with rats in their neighbourhood (U=47887.0; p=0.00; z-score = -9.4).
 422 Kruskal-Wallis test of independence and pairwise post hoc tests adjusted by Bonferroni correction
 423 for multiple tests suggested a significant proportional differences in mean perception scores on
 424 disease risks associated with rats in neighbourhood among the religious groups, educational levels,
 425 ethnic and profession groupings (Fig 3). Christians compared with Islamic/Muslims have a higher

426 perception of the disease risk associated with rats in their neighbourhood (Fig 3). Mean perception
427 scores increased significantly from a low perception score in basic education leavers to
428 intermediate/neutral perception in senior high school to a higher perception score in bachelor
429 education and above (Fig 3). Among the professions, health professionals/teachers and students
430 obtained higher mean perception scores than traders . Among the ethnic groups, Akans had a
431 higher perception score than the Mole-Dagbon.

432
433 Fig 3. Correlation between respondents' sociodemographic profile and perception scores on
434 neighborhood rats as carrier of disease agents. Ethnicity (e), Educational level (f), Age (g),
435 Religion (h), Profession (I)

436

437 **Survey respondents' awareness about rat infestation**

438 This section presents a summary on respondents' awareness about rat population increases in their
439 neighbourhood (Table 7). In general, participants had high awareness level of rat infestations in
440 their neighborhood. Of the 829 study participants, a significantly high number (35.7%) of them
441 confirmed seeing rats daily. About 11.9% of the participants sighted rats weekly and 13.6% and
442 31.1% sighted rats in their neighborhood on monthly and occasional basis respectively (Table 7).
443 About 17.9% of the survey respondents believe that rats' population has increased in their
444 neighborhood whereas 24.5% observed that the rats are already common within their
445 neighborhood (Table 7). Regarding factors that accounted for rats' infestations, half of the
446 participants have no knowledge of the factors accounting for the presence of rats in their
447 neighborhood. Less than 20% of the participants attributed the rodents to poor drainage systems,
448 change in weather conditions, poor sanitation and poor housing (Table 7). A significantly high

449 number of the participants (60.3%) indicated rats are mostly found in houses and community drains
 450 and more than half of the participants know a place around and in their residence where rats are
 451 presently found. Some 19.9% indicated that rats often visit their homes (Table 7).

452

453 Table 7. Respondents' awareness about rat infestations in their neighbourhood.

Statement/Question	Response (%)
I. How often do you see rats in your neighbourhood?/rat sighting frequency	
Daily	295 (35.7%)
weekly	99 (11.9)
monthly	113 (13.6)
Occasionally	258 (31.1)
Can't recall	34 (3.8)
II. Do you observe that rat population in your neighbourhood has increased?	
I haven't noticed	473 (57.1)
I have observed that	148 (17.9)
Already common and haven't noted increase	203 (24.5)
III. Do you have any idea on what can account for rats' prevalence in your neighbourhood?	
No idea	416 (50.2)
Poor drainage system	14 (1.7)
Change in weather condition	44 (5.3)
Poor sanitation/filthy Environment	64 (7.7)
Poor housing structure	37 (4.5)
IV. Know a place in the home presently where rats are.	Yes = 465(56.1)
V. If no, do they visit the home occasionally	Yes 165(19.9)
VI. In which season do you commonly find rats in your neighbourhood?	
Both	444 (53.6)
Dry	283 (34.1)
Rainy	72 (8.7)
VII. Where are rats mostly found in your neighbourhood?	
Houses	286 (34.5)
Community drains	214 (25.8)
Public places	65 (7.8)
Others	110 (13.3)
Can't tell	154 (18.6)

454

455

456 **Survey participants’ concerns about rats in their neighbourhood**

457 Table 8 indicates the results of the 829 survey participants concerns about rats in their
 458 neighbourhood. Although a significant majority of the respondents (70%) were concerned about
 459 rats in their neighborhood/home, the majority made no attempt (56%) to control the rats. Of those
 460 concerned about rats, the highest number of them were concerned about the economic damage
 461 rats’ cause to properties and food products (41%). Others were concerned about the disease/health
 462 risk (18.0%) and public nuisance (10.4%). Around 28.2% were not concerned about rats at all..
 463 When finally asked what participants will do when rats enter their homes, half the survey
 464 participants will attempt to kill the rat and dispose of it, 24% will kill the rat for food, 4.1% will
 465 contract someone to kill the rat, and a high number (16.9%) will do nothing.

466
 467 Table 8. Participants’ concerns about rat infestation in their neighbourhood
 468

Statement/Question	Response (%)
I. Are you concerned about rat infestations in your neighbourhood/residence?	
Concerned	585 (70.6)
Not concerned	234 (28.2)
II. If concerned why?	
Concerned because they are a disease risk	149 (18.0)
Concerned about their presence and not any health risk (public health nuisance)	86 (10.4)
Concerned because of the damaging they incur to properties and food produce (Economic damage)	341 (41.1)
III. Have you made any attempt in the past to control rat infestation in your neighbourhood /home?	
No attempt	470 (56.7)
Little attempt	241 (29.1)
High attempt	118 (14.2)
IV. If a rat should visit your home now, what will you do?	
Will kill it and dispose it of/drive them away	421 (50.8)
Will kill it and consume	199 (24.0)
Will contract the pest control officer/someone to kill it	41 (4.9)
Will do nothing	140 (16.9)

469

470 **Discussion**

471 This survey presents the first baseline study on urban residents' interactions and attitudes towards
472 rodents in Ghana, which is particularly pertinent given the recent emergence of Lassa fever in the
473 country, and the widespread occurrence of drug resistant pathogens. Our research has identified
474 weaknesses in community knowledge of rodents and the diseases they may spread. Hopefully our
475 data contribute to the on-going efforts by the Ghana Health Service to minimize these health
476 problems through targeted educational campaigns aimed at those groups that where knowledge
477 gaps were identified. Proportionally, our study population was predominantly represented by the
478 two ethnic majorities in Ghana, the Akans and the Mole-Dagbon that collectively constitute 63%
479 of Ghana's population, which is why approximately 61% of our study subjects were from these
480 ethnic categories. The Akans are regionally prevalent in southern Ghana whereas, the Mole-
481 Daghbons are widespread in the North, as well as Muslim religious groups. We received a higher
482 number of people originating from southern Ghana (65.7%) compared to north, which was
483 attributed to the greater urbanization and population density in the south.

484 The present study delved into rat meat consumption patterns and perception of disease risks
485 pertaining to peridomestic rats. Sociodemographic determinants associated with the risk of rodent-
486 borne diseases were also assessed. In summary, our findings revealed that rats including
487 commensal species are consumed by a considerable number of Ghanaians in urban settings. Both
488 rat meat consumption and perception of disease risks were driven by sociodemographic variables.
489 Overall statistical analyses showed that, except for education and profession that showed some
490 positive influence on the practice of rat meat consumption and perception of risks, rat meat
491 consumption did not correlate with perceive risk in most sociodemographic categories. The

492 perception of risks about rat meat consumption and rat infestation in urban environments were
493 generally low among the participants allowing us to reject our hypothesis that urban dwellers in
494 Ghana have high risks perceptions pertaining to peridomestic rats. We surmised that this low
495 perception may have contributed to the limited efforts made by the public to control rats.
496 Our literature search revealed a publication scarcity on the consumption rate of rats in various
497 country settings and regions. Previous research primarily focused on either rodent or bush meat
498 consumption in general, therefore our findings were discussed in that regard. In our study,
499 approximately 65% consumed rodents. This finding aligns with recent studies in Ghana indicating
500 that 67% of Ghanaians [28] prefer bush meat, including rodents, due to the flavor and taste.
501 However, the rate of rodent consumption was higher in Guinea, West Africa, where a study showed
502 that 91.5% of the population considers rodents as an important protein source [24] and also that
503 they are common and easy to obtain at mere/no cost implication. In the present research, we found
504 that approximately 35% of rodent meat consumers also consumed rat meat, and 26% will consume
505 commensal rat in their neighbourhood when available. These findings closely coincide with a
506 related study in Nigeria, which found 33.5% and 31.1% of the study respondents interviewed from
507 urban and peri-urban neighborhood respectively consume urban rodents [23].
508 Preferences for consuming wild meats in Ghana and across Africa are influenced by various
509 sociodemographic factors [57,62,63]. In this study, we identified gender, education, sex, age,
510 religion, ethnicity, region, income, and profession as independently associated with rat meat
511 consumption. Rat meat consumption correlated with religious beliefs with higher consumption
512 rates in Christians than Muslims aligning with the report by [28] which could be attributed to their
513 religious beliefs. Additionally, cultural beliefs among different ethnic communities contribute to
514 varying levels of bush rat meat consumption. Particularly, high rat meat consumption was observed

515 among the Akan ethnicity as observed by [59]. Although limited data were available for the Ewes
516 and the Mamprusi ethnicities, our data indicates that there is a higher proportion of rat meat
517 consumers within this group. The influence of ethnicity on bush meat consumption has been well-
518 documented in the literature [57,62,63,64]. Regarding regional disparities, our study revealed, a
519 lower consumption rate among the northerners compared to the southerners which was attributed
520 to a higher number of Muslims in the region particularly among Mole-Dagbon ethnic group who
521 probably appear to exhibit less preference for rat meat, presumably due to their beliefs. Gender
522 imbalances in wild meat consumption, with females exhibiting reduced preferences were
523 previously evidenced in Ghana [57]. Regarding age and educational related disparities, our
524 findings are consistent with related research indicating that individuals with at least senior high
525 school education demonstrated reduced wild meat consumption [57]. Higher educational levels
526 have been associated with decreased hunting and wild meat eating behaviours [57]. Regarding
527 income, there are prevailing arguments on if wild meats are a luxury or necessary survival food
528 for the poor [65]. In our research, participants with low or no income associated strongly with rat
529 meat consumption, especially males aged 27 to 34years with no formal/basic education in southern
530 Ghana. The monthly minimum wage in Ghana is only around 500 cedis (USD\$37.0 equivalence)
531 suggesting that there is a correlation between rat meat consumption and poverty or low living
532 standards. This finding aligns with **the research by** [66]. While previous study found no
533 relationship between bush meat consumption and profession [66] the present study did find such
534 an association. Health workers/teachers and students consumed less rat meat than traders,
535 attributable to the high perception scores of disease risks in those with a higher education. We also
536 found that education, profession, religion, and ethnic disparities produced significance differences
537 between the respondents regarding the disease risks associated with peridomestic rats. Male

538 genders, Traders, those with a basic education, Muslims, the Mole-Dagbon ethnic group, and
539 northerners obtained lower perception scores on the disease risks associated with rats in their
540 environment. Regarding the regional distribution of perception scores regarding commensal rats,
541 proportionally, higher perception scores were recorded in southern Ghana than the north. As
542 highlighted earlier, there are more Muslims widespread in the north of Ghana and among the Mole-
543 Dagbon ethnic group who have less preference for rat meat, yet still had low perception scores on
544 disease risk of rodent-borne diseases. Southern Ghana encompasses the major cities of the country
545 and is highly urbanized, with higher levels of education. As noted, other studies have found that
546 education is a strong determinant for knowledge on animal related disease risks [57,67]. In a
547 related study, perception risk scores varied regionally, and by education; rural based cities obtained
548 lower perception scores than urban areas and those with higher education had high risk perception
549 scores than those with a basic education [57]. This again demonstrates that education is a strong
550 determinant for risk perception hence, education and awareness programs are an important
551 intervention strategy to enhance knowledge and improve perceptual awareness on rat-borne
552 diseases. In our study, there were some notable discrepancies in the perception scores between the
553 genders, with males having a lower perception score on the health risks and disease transmission
554 risks associated with commensal rats. This is probably why men tend to consume rat meat more
555 often than the females. In the study herein participants showed significantly high concerns about
556 rat infestation in their neighborhood mainly due to the economic hazard caused by rats such as
557 damage to food and property. Despite their concerns, limited attempts were made to manage rats
558 in their residence/neighbourhood. The limited control attempts can be attributed to the low
559 prevalence of the disease risks associated with rats.

560 In our current investigation, 35% of the participant reported a daily encounter with commensal
561 rats. Considering the reported weekly, monthly and occasional sightings. A rise in rodent numbers
562 can be attributed to shifts in human environment, ecology and climate [2-20] with research
563 indicating a heightened risk of rat infestation in neighborhoods characterized by high poverty
564 levels, aged buildings, dense housing systems and inadequate sanitation [11,20,21]. Similar to
565 most other African nations, Ghana has a persisting sanitation challenges and poor drainage
566 management contributing to the proliferation and establishment of pest populations.

567 Despite a significant proportion of participant Ghanaian's across the various sociodemographic
568 categories interact seeing rats in their neighborhood and that a considerable number consume them,
569 the perceptual awareness on the disease risks regarding rats is low. It is probable that the lack of
570 education and awareness programs pertaining to rat-borne zoonoses in Ghana and the rare
571 occurrences of rat-related zoonoses in the past is the cause for the lack of awareness of the current
572 disease risks. Over 93% of the study participants have no knowledge of anyone suffering from any
573 rat borne zoonoses or have died from rat meat consumption, neither had they seen any information
574 on this topic from the media. Poor perceptual awareness on disease risks associated with human
575 interaction with rats has been previously noted across Africa and Asia [36,55,56,57,58,]. A study
576 conducted in rural Ghana documented low awareness level among rural dwellers regarding the
577 potential risks of consuming wild meats [56]. Similarly, in a related study on the consumption of
578 fruit bats in Ghana, although consumption of these species was high among the locals, participants
579 held little beliefs on disease risks [57]. In Malaysia, despite a high proportion of respondents
580 consuming bush meat, the majority had minimal knowledge of the disease risks [58]. Likewise, in
581 Tanzania, more than half the proportion of local population were unaware of the disease risks
582 relating to handling bush meats [55]. The significant majority of the study participants in our

583 investigations found no disease risks associated with consuming rats from the bush compared to
584 rats from town. This aligns with a related study in Uganda, where cooks of bushmeat considered
585 common edible bush rat meat consumption as the least likely to result in any sickness [34]. Among
586 pastoralists in northern and eastern Tanzania, there was a widespread of skepticism that zoonotic
587 illnesses could be spread through the consumption of animal products [36]. We found that the
588 proportion of participants willing to buy bush rat or town rat meat sold in a restaurant were similar
589 suggesting that rat meat consumers consume both commensal and bush rat. People interacting with
590 rats' may inhale aerosolized pathogens from the fur of rats, can contract blood-borne infections
591 during the handling and butchering process of the carcasses, and can be exposed to pathogens
592 through the consumption of undercooked rat meats [24,34,36]. *Mustomys* rats that transmit Lassa
593 Fever are highly prolific and commensal in West, Central and East Africa inhabiting areas that are
594 overcrowded and unsanitary [43,44,68] enhancing tendency of being consumed. In Nigeria, the
595 over 85% of the study respondents who had no knowledge of LF and disputed the existence of
596 Lassa Fever virus in rats consume the *Mastomys* rat vectors [23] exposing them to disease risks.
597 In our investigation, the majority of our respondents indicated rats are most present in their homes
598 and community drains. In the previous study, 28% of households who had rodents in their
599 residence come into contact with their urine and droppings and 24% eat rodent contaminated foods
600 [23]. Human interactions with rats in the home provides a pathway of transferring zoonotic
601 illnesses into the human population via direct and indirect route [32]. Contact with rats through
602 scratches or bites, and exposure to their secretions constitute direct transmission route [3,69].
603 Hantavirus Pulmonary Syndrome is contracted via direct transmission through breathing in
604 aerosolized secretions from rats [70]. Indirectly, rats could transmit diseases to human through
605 stepping on household water sources, food, clothing and floors [71] and exposure to air-borne

606 diseases from rats through inhaling sweeping dust can also occur [72]. Peridomestic rats are
607 sentinels, reservoir and vectors in the transmission of AMR pathogens to humans and other animals
608 since they share similar environment with people, domestic pets and insect vectors [47]. The
609 inhabiting of diverse habitats including municipal waste water systems, livestock, urban
610 agriculture sites, cemeteries, mortuaries and biomedical/healthcare/hospital wastes disposal sites,
611 makes urban rats' good candidates in the transmission of a wide range of AMR [47]. These
612 pathogens may be spread to homes, and domestic animal populations [48] with widespread reports
613 of multiple drug resistant pathogens being spread by commensal rats [31,32,49,50,51]. Rats are
614 also responsible for nosocomial infection transfer [73], and homes close to healthcare and
615 cemeteries in urban areas may be at a higher risk of infections. Rats cause cross food contamination
616 in homes and restaurants by transferring pathogens and chemicals from the various sites to cooked
617 food and stored products [74]. The detrimental implications associated with rats make their
618 presence in urban settlements a critical health risk.

619 **Conclusion**

620 In summary, this study investigated rat meat consumers among urban Ghanaians and examined
621 the perception of risk in the consumption of rat meat and the presence of rat infestations. The study
622 characterized the sociodemographic determinants of rat meat intake and the perceived risk
623 associated with rats. The findings revealed that a considerable proportion of the Ghanaian
624 population in urban areas consume rats, including commensal species. Risk perceptions relating
625 to disease risk associated with rat meat consumption and peridomestic rats were generally low
626 hence, limited attempts were made to control rodents in their neighborhood. The lack of public
627 education and awareness programs on rat-borne zoonoses may be a contributing factor for the low
628 risk perception. Sociodemographic determinants of rat meat consumption and risk perception were

629 identified as targets for future interventions. Our findings reveal that Ghanaians in urban areas are
630 at a threat of zoonotic spillover, which highlights the critical need for public education on rat-
631 borne zoonoses. In addition, rodent management in urban Ghana requires an immediate
632 prioritization, as rodents are a source of drug resistant pathogens that can be spread through
633 communities. Our study will be useful to the Ghana Health Service in the on-going measures to
634 prevent Lassa fever re-occurrence and the spread of drug resistant pathogens in urban areas.

635 **Acknowledgement**

636 We acknowledge the support of executives of the Ghana Environmental Health Officers
637 Association, health officers and trainees from the Accra School of Hygiene from the various
638 administrative regions in Ghana. We especially wish to thank these trainees, Miss Matilda
639 Owusuaa from the Bono region of Ghana, Mr. Alhassan Baako Abdullai from Yendi, Northern
640 Ghana and Mr. Bentum Gabriel for their efforts.

641 **Reference**

- 642 1. Kuddus MA, Tynan E, McBryde E. Urbanization: a problem for the rich and the poor?. Public
643 health Rev. 2020; 41:1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-019-0116-0>
644
- 645 2. Bonnefoy X, Kampen H, Sweeney K, Public health significance of urban pests. Denmark: World
646 Health Organization Regional Office for Europe; 2008. pp. 53-155.
647
- 648 3. Akhtar N, Hayee S, Idnan M, Nawaz F, BiBi S. Rodents Human Zoonotic Pathogens
649 Transmission: Historical Background and Future Prospects. Rodents and Their Role in Ecology,
650 Medicine and Agriculture. IntechOpen; 2023. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1001283>

651

652 4. Gu C. Urbanization: Processes and driving forces. *Sci China Earth Sci.* 2019; 62:1351-1360.

653 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11430-018-9359-y>

654

655 5. Cohen B. Urbanization, City growth, and the New United Nations development agenda.

656 *Cornerstone.* 2015; 3(2):4-7.

657

658 6. Ghana Statistical Service (GSS). Ghana 2021 Population and housing census general report:

659 age and sex profile. Accra. 2021. Volume 3B.

660

661 7. Angel S, Parent J, Civco DL, Blei A, Potere D. The dimensions of global urban expansion:

662 Estimates and projections for all countries, 2000–2050. *Progress in Plann.* 2011; 75(2):53-107.

663 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2011.04.001>

664

665 8. Cohen JE. Human population: the next half century. *Science.* 2003; 302(5648):1172-1175.

666 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1088665>

667

668 9. Parsons MH, Banks PB, Deutsch MA, Corrigan RF, Munshi-South J. Trends in urban rat

669 ecology: a framework to define the prevailing knowledge gaps and incentives for academia, pest

670 management professionals (PMPs) and public health agencies to participate. *Journal of Urban*

671 *Ecology* 2017; 3(1):jux005. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jue/jux005>

672

673 10. Santos NJ, Sousa E, Reis MG, Ko AI, Costa F. Rat infestation associated with environmental
674 deficiencies in an urban slum community with high risk of leptospirosis transmission. *Cadernos*
675 *de Saúde Pública*. 2017; 33:e00132115. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00132115>

676

677 11. Masi E, Pino FA, Santos MD, Genehr L, Albuquerque JO, Bancher AM, et al. Socioeconomic
678 and environmental risk factors for urban rodent infestation in Sao Paulo, Brazil. *J Pest Sci*. 2010;
679 83:231-41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-010-0290-9>

680

681 12. Banks PB, Smith HM. The ecological impacts of commensal species: black rats, *Rattus rattus*,
682 at the urban–bushland interface. *Wildlife Research*. 2015; 42(2):86-97.
683 <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR15048>

684

685 13. Feng AY, Himsworth CG. The secret life of the city rat: a review of the ecology of urban
686 Norway and black rats (*Rattus norvegicus* and *Rattus rattus*). *Urban Ecosyst*. 2014; 1: 49-62.
687 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11252-013-0305-4>

688

689 14. Barnett SA. *The rat: A study in behavior* (1st ed.). Routledge. Taylor & Francis, Group; 2017;
690 pp. 72-78. <https://doi/10.4324/9781315134468>

691

- 692 15. Baker, Henry J., Russell JL, Steven HW, eds. *The laboratory rat: biology and diseases* Vol.
693 1. Elsevier; 2013; pp. 73-103
694
- 695 16. Singleton GR, Hinds LA, Krebs CJ, Spratt DM. Rats, mice and people: rodent biology and
696 management. Sokoine. Australia Centre for International Agricultural Research; 2003; pp. 11-176
697
- 698 17. Kohn DF, Clifford CB. Biology and diseases of rats. Laboratory animal medicine. Laboratory
699 Animal Research Center, Rockefeller University, New York, New York. 2002; pp. 121-165.
700
- 701 18. Kosoy M, Khlyap L, Cosson JF, Morand S. Aboriginal and invasive rats of genus *Rattus* as
702 hosts of infectious agents. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*. 2015; 15(1):3-12.
703 <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2014.1629>
704
- 705 19. Puckett EE, Park J, Combs M, Blum MJ, Bryant JE, Caccone A, et al. Global population
706 divergence and admixture of the brown rat (*Rattus norvegicus*). *Proc Royal Soc B: biological*
707 *sciences*. 2016; 283(1841):2016-1762. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.1762>
708
- 709 20. de Cock MP, de Vries A, Fonville M, Esser HJ, Mehl C, Ulrich RG, et al. Increased rat-borne
710 zoonotic disease hazard in greener urban areas. *Sci Total Environ*. 2023; 896:165069.
711 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.165069>
712

- 713 21. Lam R, Byers KA, Himsworth CG. SPECIAL REPORT: Beyond zoonosis: The mental
714 health impacts of rat exposure on impoverished urban neighborhoods. *J Environ Health*. 2018;
715 81(4):8-13. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26530743>
716
- 717 22. Assogbadjo AE, Codjia JT, Sinsin B, Ekue MR, Mensah GA. Importance of rodents as a human
718 food source in Benin. *Belg J Zool*. 2005; 135:11-5.
719
- 720 23. Reuben CR, Gyar SD. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of Lassa fever in and around Lafia,
721 Central Nigeria. *Int. J Public Health Epid Res*. 2016; 2(1):014-9.
722
- 723 24. Ter Meulen J, Lukashevich I, Sidibe K, Inapogui A, Marx M, Dorlemann A, et al. Hunting of
724 peridomestic rodents and consumption of their meat as possible risk factors for rodent-to-human
725 transmission of Lassa virus in the Republic of Guinea. *Am. J Trop Med Hyg*. 1996; 55:661-6.
726 <http://dx.doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.1996.55.661>
727
- 728 25. Friant S, Paige SB, Goldberg TL. Drivers of bushmeat hunting and perceptions of zoonoses in
729 Nigerian hunting communities. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2015; 9(5):e0003792.
730 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0003792>
731
- 732 26. Gruber K. Rodent meat—a sustainable way to feed the world? Using rodents as food has a long
733 tradition in many parts of the world. *EMBO reports*. 2016; 17(5):630-3.
734 <https://doi.org/10.15252/embr.201642306>
735

736 27. Teye M, Fuseini A, Odoi FN. Consumer acceptance, Carcass and sensory characteristics of
737 meats of farmed and wild cane rats (*Thryonomys swinderianus*). Sci Afr. 2020; 8:e00461.
738 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2020.e00461>

739

740 28. Bannor RK. Bushmeat in Ghana: Consumer profiles may point the way to conservation. The
741 Conservation. 2021.

742

743 29. Jones KE, Patel NG, Levy MA, Storeygard A, Balk D, Gittleman JL, Daszak P. Global trends
744 in emerging infectious diseases. Nature 2008; 451(7181):990-993.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06536>

746

747 30. Strand TM, Lundkvist Å. Rat-borne diseases at the horizon. A systematic review on infectious
748 agents carried by rats in Europe 1995–2016. Infect Ecol Epidemiol. 2019; 9(1):1553461.
749 <https://doi.org/10.1080/20008686.2018.1553461>

750

751 31. Jahan NA, Lindsey LL, Larsen PA. The role of peridomestic rodents as reservoirs for
752 zoonotic foodborne pathogens. Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2021; 21(3):133-48.
753 <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2020.2640>

754

- 755 32. Uea-Anuwong T, Byers KA, Wahl LC, Nekouei O, Grohn YT, Magouras I. Antimicrobial
756 resistance in bacteria isolated from peridomestic Rattus species: A scoping literature review. One
757 Health. 2023; 16:100522. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2023.100522>
758
- 759 33. Dahmana H, Granjon L, Diagne C, Davoust B, Fenollar F, Mediannikov O. Rodents as hosts
760 of pathogens and related zoonotic disease risk. Pathogens. 2020; 9(3):202.
761 <https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens9030202>
762
- 763 34. Dell BM, Souza MJ, Willcox AS. Attitudes, practices, and zoonoses awareness of community
764 members involved in the bushmeat trade near Murchison Falls National Park, northern Uganda.
765 PLoS One. 2020; 15(9):e0239599. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239599>
766
- 767 35. Douno M, Asampong E, Magassouba NF, Fichet-Calvet E, Almudena MS. Hunting and
768 consumption of rodents by children in the Lassa fever endemic area of Faranah, Guinea. PLoS
769 Negl Trop Dis. 2021; 15(3):e0009212. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0009212>
770
- 771 36. Mangesho PE, Neselle MO, Karimuribo ED, Mlangwa JE, Queenan K, Mboera LE, Rushton
772 J, Kock R, Häsler B, Kiwara A, Rweyemamu M. Exploring local knowledge and perceptions on
773 zoonoses among pastoralists in northern and eastern Tanzania. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2017;
774 11(2):e0005345. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005345>
775

- 776 37. Rakotosamimanana S, Kassie D, Taglioni F, Ramamonjisoa J, Rakotomanana F, Rajerison M.
777 A decade of plague in Madagascar: a description of two hotspot districts. BMC Public Health.
778 2021; 21(1):1112. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-11061-8>
779
- 780 38. Lukashevich IS, Clegg JC, Sidibe K. Lassa virus activity in Guinea: Distribution of human
781 antiviral antibody defined using enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay with recombinant antigen.
782 J Med Virol. 1993; 40(3):210-7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.1890400308>
783
- 784 39. Fichet-Calvet E, Rogers DJ. Risk maps of Lassa fever in West Africa. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.
785 2009; 3(3):e388. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0000388>
786
- 787 40. World Health Organization (WHO). Plague - Madagascar-Disease outbreak. 2021.
788 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/disease-outbreak-news/item/plague---madagascar>
789
- 790 41. Rabaan AA, Al-Ahmed SH, Alsuliman SA, Aldrazi FA, Alfouzan WA, Haque S. The rise of
791 pneumonic plague in Madagascar: current plague outbreak breaks usual seasonal mould. J Med
792 Microbiol. 2019; 68(3):292-302. <https://doi.org/10.1099/jmm.0.000915>
793
- 794 42. Grace JU, Egoh IJ, Udensi N. Epidemiological trends of Lassa fever in Nigeria from 2015-
795 2021: A review. Ther Adv Infect Dis. 2021; 8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20499361211058252>

796

797 43. Centre for Disease Control (CDC). Lassa Fever. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,
798 National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID), Division of High-
799 Consequence Pathogens and Pathology (DHCPP), Viral Special Pathogens Branch (VSPB).
800 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/lassa/index.html>

801

802 44. Bonwitt J, Kelly AH, Ansumana R, Agbla S, Sahr F, Saez AM, et al. Rat-atouille: a mixed
803 method study to characterize rodent hunting and consumption in the context of Lassa fever.
804 Ecohealth. 2016; 13:234-247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-016-1098-8>

805

806 45. Keeling MJ, Gilligan CA. Metapopulation dynamics of bubonic plague. Nature. 2000;
807 407(6806):903-906. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35038073>

808

809 46. Didelot X, Whittles LK, Hall I. Model-based analysis of an outbreak of bubonic plague in
810 Cairo in 1801. J R Soc. Interface. 2017; 14(131):20170160.

811 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2017.0160>

812

813 47. Gwenzi W, Chaukura N, Muisa-Zikali N, Teta C, Musvuugwa T, Rzymiski P, et al. Insects,
814 rodents, and pets as reservoirs, vectors, and sentinels of antimicrobial resistance. Antibiotics.
815 2021; 10(1):68. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics10010068>

816

- 817 48. Dominguez JE, Rosario L, Juliana S, Redondo LM, Chacana PA, Regino C, et al. Rats as
818 sources of multidrug-resistant Enterobacteriaceae in animal production environments. *Zoonoses*
819 and Public Health. 2023; 70(7):627-35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.13071>
820
- 821 49. Sonola VS, Misinzo G, Matee MI. Occurrence of multidrug-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
822 among humans, rodents, chickens, and household soils in Karatu, Northern Tanzania. *Int. J.*
823 *Environ. Res. Public Health*. 2021;18(16):8496. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168496>
824
- 825 50. Furness LE, Campbell A, Zhang L, Gaze WH, McDonald RA. Wild small mammals as
826 sentinels for the environmental transmission of antimicrobial resistance. *Environ. Res*. 2017;
827 154:28-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2016.12.014>
828
- 829 51. Le Huy H, Koizumi N, Ung TT, Le TT, Nguyen HL, Hoang PV, Nguyen CN, et al. Antibiotic-
830 resistant *Escherichia coli* isolated from urban rodents in Hanoi, Vietnam. *J Vet Med Sc*. 2020;
831 82(5):653-660. <https://doi.org/10.1292/jvms.19-0697>
832
- 833 52. Byers KA, Lee MJ, Patrick DM, Himsworth CG. Rats about town: A systematic review of rat
834 movement in urban ecosystems. *Front Ecol Evol*. 2019; 7:13.
835 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00013>
836

837 53. Brunton CF, Macdonald DW, Buckle AP. Behavioural resistance towards poison baits in
838 brown rats, *Rattus norvegicus*. *Appl Anim Behav Sci*. 1993; 38(2):159-74.

839 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591\(93\)90063-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591(93)90063-U)

840

841 54. Krijger IM, Strating M, van Gent-Pelzer M, Van Der Lee TA, Burt SA, Schroeten FH, et al.
842 Large-scale identification of rodenticide resistance in *Rattus norvegicus* and *Mus musculus* in the
843 Netherlands based on *Vkorc1* codon 139 mutations. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2023; 79(3):989-995.

844 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.7261>

845

846 55. Foya YR, Mgeni CP, Kadigi RM, Kimaro MH, Hassan SN. The knowledge about the potential
847 health risks of illegal bushmeat activities among local communities adjacent to Western Nyerere
848 National Park, Tanzania. *Open Journal of Ecology* 2023; 13(1):22-36.

849 <https://doi.org/10.4236/oje.2023.131003>

850

851 56. Suu-Ire R, Obodai E, Bel-Nono SO, Ampofo WK, Mazet JA, Goldstein T, et al. Surveillance
852 for potentially zoonotic viruses in rodent and bat populations and behavioral risk in an agricultural
853 settlement in Ghana. *One health outlook*. 2022; 4(1):6. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s42522-022-00061-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s42522-022-00061-2)

854 [2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s42522-022-00061-2)

855

856 57. Kamins AO, Restif O, Ntiamo-Baidu Y, Suu-Ire R, Hayman DT, Cunningham AA, et al.
857 Uncovering the fruit bat bushmeat commodity chain and the true extent of fruit bat hunting in
858 Ghana, West Africa. *Biolog Conserv*. 2011; 144(12):3000-8.

859 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.09.003>

860

861 58. Maideen SF, Lau SF, Rashid A, Hod R, Shafie IN. Knowledge and practices of bush meat
862 consumption among indigenous people in Belum Forest, Malaysia: an analytical cross-sectional
863 study. *Journal Clinical Health Science*. 2022; 7(1):25-36.

864

865 59. Ohene-Adjei S, Bediako NA. What is meat in Ghana?. *Animal Frontiers*. 2017; 7(4):60-2.
866 <https://doi.org/10.2527/af.2017.0447>

867

868 60. Salmón-Mulanovich G, Powell AR, Hartinger-Peña SM, Schwarz L, Bausch DG, et al.
869 Community perceptions of health and rodent-borne diseases along the Inter-Oceanic Highway in
870 Madre de Dios, Peru. *BMC Public Health*. 2016; 16:1-0. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3420-3)
871 [3420-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3420-3)

872

873 61. Issae AR, Katakweba AS, Kicheleri RP, Chengula AA, Van Zwetselaar M, Kasanga CJ.
874 Exploring pathogenic and zoonotic bacteria from wild rodents, dogs, and humans of the
875 Ngorongoro district in Tanzania using metagenomics next-generation sequencing. *Zoonotic Dis*.
876 2023; 3(3):226-42. <https://www.mdpi.com/2813-0227/3/3/19#>

877

878 62. East T, Kümpel NF, Milner-Gulland EJ, Rowcliffe JM. Determinants of urban bushmeat
879 consumption in Rio Muni, Equatorial Guinea. *Biolog. Conserv*. 2005; 126(2):206-15.
880 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2005.05.012>

881

882 63. Willcox AS, Nambu DM. Wildlife hunting practices and bushmeat dynamics of the Banyangi
883 and Mbo people of Southwestern Cameroon. *Biolog. Conserv.* 2007; 134(2):251-61.

884 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.08.016>

885

886 64. Suwannarong K, Chapman RS, Lantican C, Michaelides T, Zimicki S. Hunting, food
887 preparation, and consumption of rodents in Lao PDR. *PLoS One.* 2015; 10(7):e0133150.

888 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0133150>

889

890 65. Davies G, Brown D, editors. *Bushmeat and livelihoods: wildlife management and poverty*
891 *reduction.* John Wiley & Sons; 2008; 73-92

892

893 66. Van Vliet N, Nebesse C, Nasi R. Bushmeat consumption among rural and urban children
894 from Province Orientale, Democratic Republic of Congo. *Oryx.* 2015; 49(1):165-74.

895 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605313000549>

896

897 67. Diriba WW, Gebremedhin EZ. Assessment of knowledge, attitude, and practices towards
898 canine visceral leishmaniasis based on the one health concept in Weliso and Ejaji Towns, Oromia,
899 Ethiopia. *Sci Rep* 2023; 13(1):20765.

900

901 68. Korsman SN, Van Zyl G, Preiser W, Nutt L, Andersson MI. Virology E-Book: An Illustrated
902 Colour Text. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2012.

903

904 69. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Emerging and
905 Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID). 2023. [How to Control Wild Rodent Infestations |](#)
906 [Healthy Pets, Healthy People | CDC](#)

907

908 70. Louisiana Department of Health, Hantavirus infections. 2017.
909 www.infectiousdisease.dhh.louisiana.gov

910

911 71. Islam MM, Farag E, Mahmoudi A, Hassan MM, Mostafavi E, Enan KA, et al. Rodent-related
912 zoonotic pathogens at the human–animal–environment interface in Qatar: A systematic review
913 and meta-analysis. Int. J Environ Res Public Health. 2021; 18(11):5928.
914 <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/11/5928#>

915

916 72. CDC. Hantavirus Pulmonary Syndrome (HPS). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,
917 National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID), Division of High-
918 Consequence Pathogens and Pathology (DHCPP). 2013. [CDC - Hantavirus Pulmonary](#)
919 [Syndrome \(HPS\) - Hantavirus](#)

920

921 73. Katzir Z, Biro A, Didkovsky E, Hussain A, Schreiber L, Barnea Z, et al. An unusual
922 infection outbreak in rats held in a human hospital research laboratory. *Laboratory animals*.
923 2015; 49(3):255-7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023677215575864>

924

925 74. Abdolshahi A, Shokrollahi Yancheshmeh B. Food contamination. *Mycotoxins and food*
926 *safety*. Intech Open, London. 2020; pp. 5:5-16.

927





