

1 **Have you heard of Rift Valley fever? Findings from a multi-country study in East and**  
2 **Central Africa**

3 Raymond Odino<sup>1</sup>, Jeanette Dawa<sup>1,2</sup>, Silvia Situma<sup>1,3</sup>, Luke Nyakarahuka<sup>4,5,6</sup>, Luciana  
4 Lepore<sup>7</sup>, Veerle Vanlerberghe<sup>7</sup>, Carolyne Nasimiyu<sup>1</sup>, Sheila Makiala<sup>8</sup>, Christian Ifufa<sup>8</sup>, Daniel  
5 Mukadi<sup>8</sup>, Herve Viala<sup>8</sup>, Nicholas Owor<sup>4</sup>, Barnabas Bakamutumaho<sup>4</sup>, Deo Ndumu<sup>9</sup>, Justin  
6 Masumu<sup>8</sup>, Robert F. Breiman<sup>6,10</sup>, Kariuki Njenga<sup>1,11</sup>

7 \*Correspondence: [raymond.odino@wsu.edu](mailto:raymond.odino@wsu.edu); and [jdawa@cartafrica.org](mailto:jdawa@cartafrica.org)  
8

9 <sup>1</sup>Washington State University Global Health Program, Nairobi, Kenya

10 <sup>2</sup>Center for Epidemiological Modelling and Analysis, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

11 <sup>3</sup>Department of Animal Science, Pwani University, Kilifi, Kenya

12 <sup>4</sup>Uganda Virus Research Institute, Entebbe, Uganda

13 <sup>5</sup>Department of Biosecurity, Ecosystems, and Veterinary Public Health, College of Veterinary  
14 Medicine, Animal Resources, and Biosecurity, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

15 <sup>6</sup>Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, US

16 <sup>7</sup>Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium

17 <sup>8</sup>Institut National de la Recherche Biomédicale, Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of Congo

18 <sup>9</sup>Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Entebbe, Uganda

19 <sup>10</sup>Infectious Diseases and Oncology Research Institute, University of Witwatersrand,  
20 Johannesburg, South Africa

21 <sup>11</sup>Paul G Allen School of Global Health, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

22  
23 The authors contributed equally to this work.

24  
25  
26  
27

28 **Abstract**

29 **Introduction**

30 Rift Valley Fever (RVF) has caused outbreaks in Africa, impacting human health and animal  
31 trade. Recently, sporadic detections among humans and animals in East Africa have  
32 replaced large-scale outbreaks. We assessed RVF knowledge levels in East and Central  
33 Africa across countries with different epidemiological profiles.

34 **Materials and Methods**

35 Individuals aged  $\geq 10$  years with acute febrile illness were enrolled from six health facilities  
36 in Kenya, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Sociodemographic  
37 information was collected and participants asked questions on RVF transmission, symptoms,  
38 prevention, and control. Blood samples were tested for anti-RVF antibodies (IgG and IgM).  
39 Knowledge was categorized as absent, basic, or advanced. Descriptive and ordinal logistic  
40 regression analysis identified factors associated with RVF knowledge.

41 **Results**

42 Among 4,806 participants (median age 31, IQR 22–44, 57.5% female), only 20.5%  
43 demonstrated any RVF knowledge (16.4% basic, 4.1% advanced). Knowledge levels varied  
44 by country: DRC (3.1%), Uganda (16.1%), and Kenya (42.6%). Factors associated with RVF  
45 knowledge included age 20–40 years aOR 1.72 (95%CI 1.24–2.22) and  $>40$  years 2.42  
46 (95%CI 1.74–3.420), male gender aOR 1.54 (95%CI 1.31–1.82), healthcare workers aOR  
47 7.95 (95%CI 5.25–12.1), residence in Kenya aOR 23.5 (95%CI 15.8–35.8) or Uganda 5.4  
48 (95%CI 3.68–8.38), completing primary education aOR 3.24 (95%CI 1.94–5.75) with  
49 advanced education shown to increase knowledge, postgraduate aOR 11.5 (95%CI 4.0–  
50 32.4). Other factors included presence of livestock within the homes aOR 1.30 (95%CI 1.06–  
51 1.59) and prevention of mosquito bites aOR 1.55 (95%CI 0.46–0.66). Animal farmers,  
52 butchers, and those with close animal contact showed no association, despite being at-risk  
53 populations.

54 **Conclusion**

55 RVF knowledge was low overall, varying by country, age, education, and environmental  
56 factors. Increased awareness is crucial for high-exposure groups in all regions, particularly in  
57 Uganda, where exposure is higher, but knowledge remains low.

58  
59 **Keywords:** Knowledge; Practice; Rift Valley Fever, Multi-country, East and Central Africa

60

## 61 **Introduction**

62 Rift Valley Fever (RVF) is a zoonotic viral disease that poses significant threats to human  
63 and animal health across Africa and the Middle East [1] with potential for substantial  
64 economic losses [2]. RVF virus is transmitted to humans primarily through contact with  
65 infected animal tissues or fluids and occasionally via mosquito bites [3]. Certain factors, such  
66 as direct exposure to livestock and handling animal products, have been associated with an  
67 increased risk of severe RVF infection [4].

68 In East and Central Africa, RVF has been a recurring public health concern, with outbreaks  
69 reported in over 30 African countries including large outbreaks in Kenya [5] and the detection  
70 of sporadic cases in Uganda [6], [7]. Although there have been no documented reports of  
71 outbreaks in DRC [8], there is reported circulation of the virus among ruminant animals [9]  
72 and *Aedes* mosquitos [10].

73 The 2006-2007 RVF outbreak in Kenya resulted in 700 human cases and 170 deaths [2]  
74 with an estimated loss of USD 32 million as a result of livestock deaths, trade bans, and  
75 reduced agricultural productivity [11]. The potential impact of large RVF outbreaks calls for  
76 effective disease surveillance, prevention, and control measures. However, the success of  
77 these measures is significantly dependant on the level of awareness and knowledge about  
78 RVF among community members.

79 Knowledge studies serve as crucial tools for assessing public awareness and behaviours  
80 related to specific health issues [12]. Increasing awareness can contribute to the early  
81 detection of an outbreak and help reduce the number of infected individuals and lower the  
82 peak of an epidemic [13]. While knowledge attitude and practice (KAP) studies on RVF have  
83 been conducted previously, there remains need to explore findings across different  
84 geographical regions with varying levels of disease exposure given the changing  
85 epidemiology of RVF in the recent past [14]. Our study aims to fill this gap by providing  
86 comparative multi-country insights into RVF knowledge across Kenya, Uganda, and DRC.  
87 Each country has a distinct epidemiological background regarding RVF: Kenya and Uganda  
88 have documented human outbreaks, while the DRC has not reported related haemorrhagic

89 fever in humans to date. By examining sociodemographic characteristics, occupational  
90 factors, and differences across countries, we not only identify gaps in knowledge but also  
91 explore how these factors relate with key preventive practices such as prevention of  
92 mosquito bites.

93


94

95

96 **Materials and Methods**

97 **2.1 Study setting**

98 The knowledge assessment was carried out as part of a 2-year longitudinal hospital-based  
99 study, conducted across three countries: Kenya, Uganda and DRC from October 2021 to  
100 February 2024. In Kenya, the study was conducted in Murang'a county at Kigetui  
101 dispensary and Kandara sub-county hospital in the central highlands. Uganda study sites  
102 were Kabale Regional Referral Hospital, Hamurwa Health Centre IV and Rwekubo Health  
103 Centre IV located in Kabale, Rubanda and Isingiro districts respectively in the Southwestern  
104 region. Notably, Uganda experienced an RVF outbreak in Mbarara district of western  
105 Uganda between January–March 2023, [15] which was during the study period. In DRC the  
106 study took place at Hôpital Général de Référence de Virunga, Goma located in the Eastern  
107 part of the country. Based on the primary study objective, which was to determine the  
108 prevalence of RVF virus antibodies among patients attending the healthcare facilities we  
109 planned to enrol 707 study participants from each facility in Kenya and Uganda, and 1,600  
110 participants from the healthcare facility in DRC.



111

112  
113

\*\* Shaded region (Nord Kivu, DRC): Represents the study site of Goma. Because of small geographic size of Goma, the broader region of Nord Kivu is used for better visibility. shaded regions (Kenya & Uganda): Represent study regions at comparable administrative levels.

114  
115

**Figure 1. Geographical map showing Rift Valley Fever study regions in Kenya, Uganda and DRC from 2021 to 2024.**

## 116 **2.2 Sample size**

117 **2.2.1 Sample size calculation DRC:** We estimated a sample size of 1,600 human  
118 participants to be recruited over the 2 years. This calculation assumed an expected RVF  
119 seroprevalence of 3%, power of 80%, precision of 2% and confidence level of 95% [16].

120 **2.2.1 Sample size calculation in Kenya and Uganda:** We estimated a sample size of 707  
121 human participants to be recruited over the 2 years at each site. This being a subset of a  
122 larger prevalence study, it assumed RVF seroprevalence of 8%, a power of 80%, precision  
123 of 2%, and confidence level of 95% [17].

## 124 **2.3 Study population**

125 We enrolled a convenience sample of patients 10 years or older who presented with acute  
126 undifferentiated fever of ( $\geq 37.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  for  $>24$  hours and  $\leq 28$  days) at each of the healthcare  
127 facilities. To ensure the study participants were recruited throughout the year, we estimated  
128 the average recruitment rate per day to attain the required sample size over 2 years. We  
129 also enrolled all individuals with (i) unexplained bleeding or (ii) severe illness of unknown  
130 infectious aetiology lasting  $>7$  days that was unresponsive to treatment. Persons with a  
131 clearly defined clinical disease, such as, an acute upper respiratory tract infection or urinary  
132 tract infection were not included. We enrolled patients who tested positive for malaria due to  
133 common risk factors for both malaria and RVF infection, however, we limited enrolment of  
134 patients who had positive rapid diagnostics for malaria to represent no more than 20% of the  
135 enrolled study participants.

## 136 **2.4 Study procedures**

137 After consenting, the study participants were guided through a standardized questionnaire  
138 designed to collect responses including socio-demographic information, risk factors related  
139 to RVF transmission and knowledge of RVF (Supplementary table 1). Serum samples were  
140 collected to detect antibodies against RVF. De-identified data was collected through the  
141 REDCap [18] by research assistants. Details of the study procedures, including specific tests  
142 used, quality control measures, and information on sensitivity and specificity, have been  
143 previously described [19].

## 144 **2.5 Determining knowledge scores**

145 There were 10 knowledge related questions with either single or multiple correct answers  
146 (Supplementary Table 1). To assess the study participants' knowledge levels about RVF, a  
147 composite index was made by adding the scores on the individual questions. A correct  
148 response was scored as 1, while an "incorrect" or "I don't know" answer was scored as 0. In  
149 instances where there were multiple correct responses for a single question, the score would  
150 be up to 2 depending on the number of responses the participant was able to list  
151 (Supplementary Table 1). The aggregate scores ranged from 0–14. Participants who scored  
152 an aggregate of 0 were categorized as No Knowledge, 1–10 as Basic Knowledge and 11–14  
153 as Advanced Knowledge.

## 154 **2.6 Data analysis**

155 Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages for each independent variable,  
156 were used to summarize data. In bivariate analysis, we used chi-square tests to assess the  
157 association between each independent variable and RVF knowledge levels. Variables with  
158  $p < 0.05$  in bivariate analysis were included in the multivariable analysis. A multivariable  
159 ordinal logistic regression model was constructed to identify independent variables  
160 associated with knowledge, while controlling for potential confounders. The backward  
161 elimination method, based on the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), was employed for  
162 variable selection, where variables were sequentially removed from the model. This  
163 approach enabled the identification of the most parsimonious model. The proportional odds  
164 assumption of the multivariable model was assessed using the Brant test. Crude odds  
165 ratios (cOR) from bivariate analysis and adjusted odds ratios (aOR) from multivariable  
166 model along with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated and reported to measure  
167 the strength of associations. All analyses were considered statistically significant at a p-value  
168 of  $< 0.05$ . Data was analysed using R statistical software version 4.4.1 [20].

## 169 **2.7 Ethical considerations**

170 Study ethical approval was obtained from the Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) -  
171 Research Ethics Committee (ref: SERU 4169) licensed by the National Commission for

172 Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI: License No: NACOSTI/P/24/38396),  
173 Uganda Virus Research Institute (UVRI) (Ref: GC/127/849), Ethical Committee of the School  
174 of Public Health, University of Kinshasa, DRC, the Institut National de la Recherche  
175 Biomedicale in DRC (Ref: ESP/CE/108/2021), the Institutional Review Board of the Institute  
176 of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp and the Ethical Committee of the Antwerp University Hospital  
177 in Belgium. In addition, administrative approval was obtained from the respective Ministries  
178 of Health of each country, and from the local administration where the health facilities were  
179 located.

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194



195

## 196 **Results**

### 197 **Characteristics of the study population**

198 A total of 4,806 individuals were enrolled as follows: 1,968 in Uganda, 1,468 in Kenya, and  
199 1,370 in DRC. Of enrolled participants, 57.5%, (n=2,762) were females; 58.3% (n=2,804)  
200 were 20–40 years old (median age of 31 years, IQR 22–44=34.5 years), and 34.1%  
201 (n=1,640) had completed primary education (Table 1). Type of occupation differed between  
202 countries, with crop farming being the most common occupation overall (34.0%), particularly  
203 prevalent in Uganda (60.8%). Animal farming was identified as the primary occupation by  
204 13.9% of participants, although it was low in DRC (0.8%). In contrast, a larger proportion of  
205 the study participants (53.1%) reported that there are livestock (cattle, goat or sheep) kept  
206 within their homes which also varied across countries, with only 6.6% in DRC, compared to  
207 79.1% in Kenya and 66.2% in Uganda. RVF seropositivity was 10.4% in Uganda, with much  
208 lower rates in Kenya (2.0%) and DRC (1.5%), (Table1).

### 209 **Exposure factors for RVF infection**

210 Of the known exposure factors for RVF infection, presence of livestock within the homes,  
211 was reported by 53.1% of all participants, including 79.1% Kenyans, 66.2% Ugandans, and  
212 6.6% in DRC participants. Close contact with livestock, a known risk factor was common  
213 across all three countries (89.7% overall), this was reported even among participants who  
214 did not own livestock. Types of close contact included herding, milking, slaughtering,  
215 handling raw meat, cleaning livestock sheds, sleeping in the same room as livestock,  
216 feeding, and treating or spraying livestock. About half (50.2%) of the participants lived near  
217 a swamp, quarry or irrigation scheme, including 68.7% of Ugandans, 58.5% of Kenyans, and  
218 14.9% of DRC participants. Of all participants, 19.4% reported involvement in slaughtering  
219 sick animals, primarily in Uganda (22.3%) and Kenya (14.5%). Only a minimal number  
220 (4.3%) of participants reported drinking raw milk. Nearly half of study participants (46.3%)  
221 did not use any methods to prevent mosquito bites at home including 67.8% in Kenya,

222 54.7% in DRC and 24.3% in Uganda. Only a minimal number (4.3%) of participants reported

223 drinking raw milk.

224

225 **Table 1. Characteristics of study participants in DRC, Kenya and Uganda, RVF study**

226 **2021-2024**

Variable	Distribution, n (%)			
	Overall N = 4,806 <sup>1</sup>	DRC n = 1,370 <sup>1</sup>	Kenya n = 1,468 <sup>1</sup>	Uganda n = 1,968 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Age group (years)</b>				
10-19	508 (10.6)	133 (9.7)	138 (9.4)	237 (12.0)
20-40	2,804 (58.3)	861 (62.8)	762 (51.9)	1,181 (60.0)
Above 40	1,494 (31.1)	376 (27.4)	568 (38.7)	550 (27.9)
<b>Sex</b>				
Female	2,762 (57.5)	939 (68.5)	734 (50.0)	1,089 (55.3)
Male	2,044 (42.5)	431 (31.5)	734 (50.0)	879 (44.7)
<b>Education level</b>				
No education	283 (5.9)	101 (7.4)	39 (2.7)	143 (7.3)
Primary incomplete	1,122 (23.3)	128 (9.3)	238 (16.2)	756 (38.4)
Primary complete	1,640 (34.1)	439 (32.0)	636 (43.3)	565 (28.7)
Secondary complete	1,194 (24.8)	502 (36.6)	384 (26.2)	308 (15.7)
Tertiary complete	525 (10.9)	165 (12.0)	169 (11.5)	191 (9.7)
Postgraduate complete	42 (0.9)	35 (2.6)	2 (0.1)	5 (0.3)
<b>Occupation types</b>				
Healthcare worker	183 (3.6)	97 (6.9)	17 (1.0)	69 (3.4)
Other professionals	463 (9.6)	169 (12.0)	144 (9.9)	150 (7.7)
Unskilled workers	530 (11.1)	111 (8.2)	280 (19.3)	139 (7.1)
Animal farmer	669 (13.9)	11 (0.8)	355 (24.1)	303 (15.3)
Crop farmer	1,634 (34.0)	37 (2.6)	400 (27.2)	1,197 (60.8)
Butcher/Slaughterhouse worker	33 (0.6)	3 (0.2)	15 (0.8)	15 (0.7)
Undisclosed	25 (0.5)	7 (0.5)	2 (0.1)	16 (0.8)
Student	619 (12.9)	233 (17.0)	155 (10.6)	231 (11.7)
<b>Presence of livestock within household</b>				
No	2,253 (46.9)	1,280 (93.4)	307 (20.9)	666 (33.8)
Yes	2,553 (53.1)	90 (6.6)	1,161 (79.1)	1,302 (68.2)
<b>Slaughter sick livestock</b>				
No	241 (80.6)	1 (100.0)	94 (85.5)	146 (77.7)
Yes	58 (19.4)	0 (0.0)	16 (14.5)	42 (22.3)
<b>Mosquito prevention at household</b>				
No	2,224 (46.3)	749 (54.7)	996 (67.8)	479 (24.3)
Yes	2,582 (53.7)	621 (45.3)	472 (32.2)	1,489 (75.7)
<b>Drinking raw milk</b>				
No	4,600 (95.7)	1,331 (97.2)	1,448 (98.6)	1,821 (92.5)
Yes	206 (4.3)	39 (2.8)	20 (1.4)	147 (7.5)
<b>Close contact with livestock</b>				
No	495 (10.3)	251 (18.3)	55 (3.7)	189 (9.6)
Yes	4,311 (89.7)	1,119 (81.7)	1,413 (96.3)	1,779 (90.4)
<b>Close proximity to a swamp/quarry/irrigation scheme</b>				
No	2,393 (49.8)	1,169 (85.1)	607 (41.5)	617 (31.3)

Yes	2,413 (50.2)	201 (14.9)	861 (58.5)	1,351 (68.7)
<b>RVF seropositivity (IgM/IgG)</b>				
Negative	4,547 (94.7)	1,345 (98.5)	1,439 (98.0)	1,763 (89.6)
Positive	253(5.3)	19 (1.5)	29 (2.0)	205 (10.4)

<sup>†</sup> n (%)

227 **RVF knowledge**

228 As shown in Table 2, only 1 in 5 participants had heard of RVF, including 42.6% Kenyans,  
229 followed by 16.1% Ugandans and 3.1% DRC participants. Of the participants that had heard  
230 of RVF, 58.4% knew humans can be infected by the RVF virus. The top responses on how  
231 RVF can be transmitted in humans included eating raw meat from sick animals and  
232 mosquito bites at 37.3% and 33.2% respectively. Sixty-six percent knew RVF virus can infect  
233 livestock, 75.6% believing that animal infection can be prevented with vaccination (84%)  
234 listed as the top prevention method.

235

236 **Table 2: Distribution of Rift Valley Fever knowledge and information sources among**  
 237 **study participants in DRC, Kenya, and Uganda**

Variable	Distribution, n (%)			
	Overall	DRC	Kenya	Uganda
<b>Have you heard of RVF</b>				
No	3816 (79.5)	1323 (96.9)	842 (57.4)	1651 (83.9)
Yes	985 (20.5)	42 (3.1)	626 (42.6)	317 (16.1)
<b>Can humans be infected with RVF virus? (n=985)</b>				
I don't know	335 (34.0)	3 (7.1)	253 (40.4)	78 (24.6)
No	77 (7.8)	0 (0.0)	69 (11.2)	8 (2.5)
Yes	573 (58.2)	39 (92.9)	303 (48.4)	231 (72.9)
<b>Knowledge of how RVF is transmitted in humans (multiple responses, n=573)</b>				
Mosquito bites	190 (33.2)	36 (92.3)	47 (15.6)	107 (46.3)
Eating raw meat from a sick animal	214 (37.3)	33 (77.0)	111 (36.7)	70 (30.3)
Drinking raw milk from a sick animal	166 (30.0)	30 (76.9)	88 (29.0)	48 (20.8)
Slaughtering/skinning sick animals	126 (22.0)	28 (71.8)	66 (21.8)	32 (13.9)
Handling abortus	59 (10.3)	28 (71.8)	23 (7.6)	8 (3.5)
Milking sick animals	80 (14.0)	21 (53.8)	40 (13.2)	19 (8.2)
Contact with blood of a sick animal	132 (23.0)	26 (66.7)	63 (20.8)	43 (18.7)
<b>Can RVF be prevented in humans? (n=573)</b>				
I don't know	219 (38.2)	2 (5.1)	152 (50.2)	61 (26.5)
No	12 (2.1)	1 (2.6)	6 (2.0)	5 (2.2)
Yes	342 (59.7)	36 (92.3)	142 (46.9)	164 (71.3)
<b>Knowledge of prevent RVF in humans (among respondents aware that RVF is preventable, n=342)</b>				
Avoid consuming uninspected meat/raw milk	240 (70.2)	34 (94.3)	105 (73.9)	101 (61.6)
Use protective gear for aborted materials	83 (24.3)	29 (80.6)	33 (23.2)	21 (12.8)
Avoid contact with fluids from sick animals	152 (44.4)	31 (86.1)	74 (52.1)	47 (28.7)
Drain stagnant waters/clearing bushes	42 (12.3)	24 (66.7)	5 (3.5)	13 (8.0)
<b>Can animals be infected with the RVF virus? (n=985)</b>				
I don't know	300 (30.4)	5 (12.0)	199 (31.8)	96 (30.3)
No	35 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	22 (3.5)	13 (4.1)
Yes	650 (66.0)	37 (88.0)	405 (64.7)	208 (65.6)
<b>Knowledge of how RVF is transmitted in animals (multiple responses, n=650)</b>				
Mosquito	171 (26.3)	34 (91.9)	40 (10.0)	97 (46.6)
Ticks	73 (11.2)	13(35.1)	0 (0.0)	60 (28.8)
Biting flies	42 (6.5)	19 (51.4)	3 (0.7)	20 (9.6)
<b>Can RVF be prevented in animals?</b>				
I don't know	86 (13.1)	0 (2.6)	69 (17.6)	12 (6.2)
No	74 (11.3)	0 (0.0)	38 (9.3)	36 (17.2)
Yes	495 (75.6)	37 (97.4)	298 (73.0)	160 (76.6)
<b>Knowledge of ways to prevent RVF in animals</b>				
Vaccination	416 (84.0)	27 (73.0)	282 (94.6)	107 (66.9)
Treatment	283 (57.1)	12 (12.4)	202 (67.8)	69 (43.1)
Avoiding contact with sick herd	54 (10.9)	32 (86.5)	9 (3.0)	13 (8.1)
Quarantine	94 (19.0)	29 (78.4)	3 (1.0)	62 (38.8)

<sup>1</sup>n (%)

238

239 **Factors associated with RVF knowledge.**

240 In bivariate analysis, age was an important factor associated with knowledge on RVF, with  
241 individuals aged 20–40 years (cOR: 2.2, 95% CI: 1.7–3.0,  $p < 0.001$ ) and those above 40  
242 years (cOR: 2.8, 95% CI: 2.1–3.8,  $p < 0.001$ ) more likely to have advanced knowledge  
243 compared to the 10-19 years' age group. Males had higher odds of advanced knowledge  
244 (cOR: 1.8, 95% CI: 1.6–2.1,  $p < 0.001$ ). Education level showed positive association with RVF  
245 knowledge, with tertiary education completion having the highest odds ratio (cOR: 9.3, 95%  
246 CI: 5.7–16.3,  $p < 0.001$ ), (Supplementary Table 2).

247 Occupational categories show varying associations with RVF knowledge levels. Healthcare  
248 workers had significantly higher odds of advanced knowledge (cOR: 4.4, 95% CI: 3.2–6.1,  
249  $p < 0.001$ ). Positive associations were also observed in other groups, other professionals  
250 (cOR: 1.5, 95% CI: 1.1–1.8,  $p < 0.001$ ) and animal farmers (cOR: 1.9, 95% CI: 1.6–2.2,  
251  $p < 0.001$ ). Unskilled workers also showed higher odds of better knowledge (cOR: 1.7, 95%  
252 CI: 1.4–2.1,  $p < 0.001$ ), while crop farmers and butchers/slaughterhouse workers were not  
253 significantly associated with high degrees of knowledge. Seropositive individuals showed  
254 marginally higher odds of having better knowledge (cOR: 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8–1.5,  $p = 0.14$ ),  
255 (Supplementary Table 2).

256 Presence of livestock within homes was strongly associated with better knowledge (cOR:  
257 3.2, 95% CI: 2.8–3.8,  $p < 0.001$ ), as was close contact with animals (cOR: 2.8, 95% CI: 2.1–  
258 3.9,  $p < 0.001$ ). The presence of swamps, quarries, or irrigation schemes in the vicinity of the  
259 home was also associated with higher knowledge levels (cOR: 3.4, 95% CI: 2.9–3.9,  
260  $p < 0.001$ ). Practicing mosquito prevention was also associated with better knowledge (cOR:  
261 1.8, 95% CI: 0.7–0.9,  $p < 0.001$ ), while drinking raw milk showed negative association (cOR:  
262 0.6, 95% CI: 0.4–0.9,  $p = 0.021$ ). There were also differences in knowledge levels across  
263 countries, with Kenya showing the highest odds of better knowledge compared to DRC  
264 (cOR: 21.4, 95% CI: 15.7–30.0,  $p < 0.001$ ), (Supplementary Table 2).

265

266 In multivariable analysis, age was associated with advanced RVF knowledge, individuals  
267 aged 20–40 years (aOR: 1.72, 95% CI: 1.22–2.42) and those above 40 years (aOR: 2.42,  
268 95% CI: 1.74–3.42) were more likely to have higher knowledge levels compared to the 10-19  
269 years' age group. Males were more likely to have higher knowledge levels compared to  
270 females (aOR: 1.54, 95% CI: 1.31–1.82).

271 Compared to those with no education, individuals with postgraduate education had the  
272 highest odds of better knowledge (aOR: 11.5, 95% CI: 4.00–32.4), followed by those with  
273 tertiary (aOR: 7.20, 95% CI: 4.13–13.2) and secondary education (aOR: 5.53, 95% CI: 3.26–  
274 9.95). Being a healthcare worker was strongly associated with higher knowledge levels  
275 (aOR: 7.95, 95% CI: 5.25–12.1). Country of residence was also a significant factor, with  
276 participants from Kenya (aOR: 23.5, 95% CI: 15.8–35.8) and Uganda (aOR: 5.4, 95% CI:  
277 3.68–8.38) showing higher odds of better knowledge compared to those from DRC.

278 Environmental factors such as presence of swamps, quarries, or irrigation schemes near the  
279 subject's home were associated with higher knowledge levels (aOR: 2.87, 95% CI: 2.40–  
280 3.44). Individuals who reported preventing mosquito bites were likely to have higher  
281 knowledge levels (aOR: 1.56, 95% CI: 0.46–0.66). Respondents who reported to be having  
282 presence of livestock within their homes were likely to have better knowledge levels (aOR:  
283 1.30, 95% CI 1.06–1.59,  $p=0.01$ ). Other factors such as RVF seropositivity, drinking raw milk,  
284 other occupation categories, and having close contact with livestock did not show statistically  
285 significant associations with RVF knowledge levels in this multivariable model.

286

287

288

289

290

291

292 **Table 4: Multivariable model results showing factors associated with RVF knowledge**  
 293 **among study participants in DRC, Kenya and Uganda (2021-2024)**

Variable	Crude Odds Ratios			Adjusted Odds Ratios		
	cOR <sup>1</sup>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	aOR <sup>1</sup>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
<b>Age group (years)</b>						
(ref 10-19)	□	□	<0.001	□	□	<0.001*
20-40	2.23	1.67, 3.04		1.72	1.24, 2.42	
Above 40	2.77	2.06, 3.81		2.42	1.74, 3.42	
<b>Sex</b>						
(ref=Female)	□	□	<0.001	□	□	<0.001*
Male	1.83	1.59, 2.11		1.54	1.31, 1.82	
<b>Education Level</b>						
(ref=No education)	□	□	<0.001	□	□	<0.001*
Primary complete	4.37	2.73, 7.51		3.24	1.94, 5.75	
Primary incomplete	2.06	1.26, 3.59		1.51	0.89, 2.71	
Secondary	4.78	2.96, 8.24		5.53	3.26, 9.95	
Tertiary	9.33	5.69, 16.3		7.20	4.13, 13.24	
Postgraduate	6.02	2.45, 14.3		11.5	4.00, 32.4	
<b>Healthcare workers</b>						
(ref=No)	□	□	<0.001	□	□	<0.001*
Yes (ref=No)	4.42	3.22, 6.06		7.95	5.25, 12.1	
<b>Country</b>						
(ref=DRC)	□	□	<0.001	□	□	<0.001*
Kenya	21.4	15.7, 30.0		23.5	15.8, 35.8	
Uganda	6.06	4.41, 8.54		5.4	3.68, 8.38	
<b>Presence of Livestock within households</b>						
(ref=No)	□	□	<0.001	□	□	0.01
Yes	3.18	2.72, 3.72		1.30	1.06, 1.59	
<b>Preventing mosquito bites</b>						
(ref=No)	□	□	0.007	□	□	<0.001*
Yes (ref=No)	1.83	0.72, 0.95		1.55	0.46, 0.66	
<b>Drinking raw milk</b>						
(ref=No)	□	□	0.011	□	□	0.111
Yes	0.61	0.40, 0.90		0.70	0.44, 1.08	
<b>Having close contact with animals</b>						
(ref=No)	□	□	<0.001	□	□	0.108
Yes	2.83	2.09, 3.94		1.35	0.94, 1.99	
<b>Presence of swamp/quarry/irrigation scheme</b>						
(ref=No)	□	□	<0.001	□	□	<0.001*
Yes	3.20	2.75, 3.74		2.87	2.40, 3.44	

294

295

296

297

298

299

## 300 **Discussion**

301 In this study, we evaluated knowledge of RVF among 4,806 individuals across Kenya,  
302 Uganda, and the DRC. Our findings indicate that levels of knowledge related to RVF were  
303 low, highlighting significant gaps that may hinder effective disease prevention and control  
304 efforts in these regions despite ongoing transmission of the disease. Factors associated with  
305 better RVF knowledge included age, education level, sex, occupation, country of residence,  
306 presence of a water body near the home and those who are proactive about preventing  
307 mosquito bites.

308 We observed better RVF knowledge in older age groups, suggesting that cumulative  
309 exposure to information may play a key role in enhancing awareness. In Baringo, Kenya  
310 families with older household heads had greater RVF knowledge compared to families with  
311 younger household heads [13]. Similarly a study among livestock farmers in Malawi found  
312 that those over 45 years of age demonstrated better knowledge and attitudes toward the  
313 disease [21]. This is also consistent with various studies in Uganda including RVF  
314 knowledge study among slaughterhouse workers and community members in Kabale district  
315 which found out that older individuals were more knowledgeable about RVF [22]. An Ebola  
316 and Marburg virus knowledge study in Uganda also showed that older age was associated  
317 with greater awareness [23], reinforcing the link between age and knowledge. These findings  
318 indicate a potential vulnerability to RVF among younger populations especially given the lack  
319 of large outbreaks in the recent past and points to the need for targeted educational  
320 interventions aimed at younger age groups.

321 Education showed strong association with RVF knowledge, with higher levels of education  
322 corresponding to increased awareness. Postgraduate education was associated with eleven  
323 times higher awareness of RVF highlighting the significant impact of advanced education on  
324 RVF knowledge. This finding aligns with recent research conducted in Tanzania, which  
325 demonstrated that RVF knowledge is significantly related to sex, education, and locality [24].  
326 The disparities in RVF knowledge across different educational levels shows the importance  
327 of making RVF information accessible and understandable to those with lower education



328 levels possibly through community-based education programs. Community-based education  
329 programs in West Africa during the Ebola outbreak were instrumental in increasing public  
330 understanding of the disease, leading to improved prevention practices and a reduction in  
331 the spread of the virus [25].

332 While healthcare workers exhibited higher levels of knowledge, likely due to their training,  
333 this was not the case for other occupational groups, including those at greater risk of  
334 exposure. An important finding of the study is the significant gap in RVF knowledge among  
335 high-risk occupational groups, such as animal farmers, butchers and slaughterhouse  
336 workers. This brings out the need for targeted interventions to raise RVF awareness among  
337 these higher at-risk groups, ensuring that those considered highly vulnerable are adequately  
338 informed and protected.

339 Participants from Kenya and Uganda demonstrated greater likelihood for higher levels of  
340 RVF knowledge compared to those from DRC. Kenya has had recurrent RVF epidemics with  
341 cases documented in 36 out of 47 counties in Kenya, including Murang'a, our study site [26].  
342 Similarly, the Uganda Institute of Public Health reported confirmed RVF cases across 21 of  
343 135 districts in Uganda from 2017 to 2023 [27]. These reports may have contributed to  
344 increased awareness and higher levels of knowledge about RVF in both countries. Although  
345 Uganda had the highest seroprevalence (10.4%), it did not have the highest knowledge  
346 levels. Transmission of RVF has been predominantly cryptic in the recent past; lack of  
347 awareness of ongoing RVF transmission has resulted in limited public education programs  
348 on the virus. Kenya demonstrated high odds of knowledge and a much lower seroprevalence  
349 (2.0%), even though small RVF outbreaks are a common occurrence in country, raising the  
350 possibility that community awareness on how to prevent RVF could have led to effective  
351 behavior modifications and lower rates of exposure. Recent analysis by [14] detail the  
352 distribution and frequency of these RVF cases in Kenya's highlands, illustrating the virus's  
353 cryptic presence in non-epidemic settings. DRC, with the lowest seroprevalence (1.5%), also  
354 had the lowest odds of RVF knowledge. No RVF outbreak has been detected in DRC which  
355 then limits the need for communication and awareness campaigns regarding the disease. In

356 addition, the risk of transmission of RVF virus has been much lower in Goma, DRC where  
357 we carried out our study, limiting the need for behavior modifications there to prevent  
358 transmission. Our findings suggest that several factors could influence awareness regarding  
359 the disease. These include exposure to the virus, the magnitude and frequency of outbreaks,  
360 the extent of public health campaigns, environmental factors, occupation and different  
361 practices. Future research should aim to identify and quantify these factors to inform tailored,  
362 country-specific strategies for RVF education and prevention.

363 We observed a positive association between mosquito bite prevention and RVF knowledge,  
364 aligning with previous studies. For instance [28] reported a positive correlation between RVF  
365 knowledge and the use of mosquito nets in Senegal yet [29] in Tanzania found that  
366 individuals with higher RVF knowledge were not necessarily more likely to use mosquito  
367 nets. Across the three countries, use of mosquito bite prevention methods was higher than  
368 RVF knowledge. This proposes that mosquito bite prevention may be better framed as a  
369 general health intervention that prevents the transmission of several mosquito borne  
370 diseases. Broad community-wide health interventions often have a greater impact on health  
371 improvement than disease-specific strategies alone [30].

372 We found that presence of livestock within homes was significantly associated with improved  
373 RVF knowledge, however, there was no association between individuals who reported  
374 animal farming to be their primary occupation and RVF knowledge. These findings suggest  
375 gaps in occupational health knowledge of RVF among animal farmers that needs to be  
376 addressed.

377 Our study had a few limitations. We relied on self-reported data which can at times lead to  
378 participants reporting socially favourable behaviours. One of the key strengths however is  
379 that the study was able to achieve and surpass the target sample size indicating better  
380 precision.

### 381 **Conclusions**

382 In conclusion, our study reveals significant gaps in RVF knowledge across Kenya, Uganda,  
383 and DRC, with notable variations associated with sociodemographic factors, occupation, and

384 geographical location. The disparity in awareness pinpoints the need for targeted, context-  
385 specific interventions to enhance RVF knowledge and prevention practices. We recommend  
386 the development of tailored educational programs that address the unique needs of different  
387 age groups, education levels, and occupational sectors, with a particular focus on younger  
388 populations and, those with lower formal education. There is also needed to bridge the  
389 knowledge gap among high-risk groups, especially animal farmers, butchers and  
390 slaughterhouse workers.

391

392 **Supporting information:** The following supplementary material is included in this  
393 manuscript: Supplementary Table 1. A description on the criteria of knowledge scoring and  
394 Supplementary Table 2. Bivariate analysis investigating factors associated with RVF  
395 knowledge levels.

396 **Acknowledgments:** We extend our heartfelt gratitude to all individuals and institutions that  
397 contributed to the success of this study. Special thanks go to the study participants for their  
398 invaluable cooperation and to our partners, including the Ministries of Health in Kenya,  
399 Uganda, and DRC. We acknowledge the financial support provided by the U.S. National  
400 Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases/National Institutes of Health (NIAID/NIH), under  
401 grant number U01AI151799, through the Centre for Research in Emerging Infectious  
402 Diseases-East and Central Africa (CREID-ECA). We also sincerely appreciate the guidance  
403 and support of our colleagues and collaborators throughout this research.

404

405

406 **Supplementary Table 1. Description of the criteria of knowledge scoring**

Question	Correct answer	Score
Have you ever heard of Rift Valley Fever?	Yes	1
Can humans get RVF?	Yes	1
If yes, how does one get RVF	8 answers	Score of 0 if no answer ticked. Score of 1 if 1 answer ticked. Score of 2 if 2 or more answers picked
What are the signs and symptoms of RVF in humans	22 answers	Score of 0 if no answer ticked. Score of 1 if 3 answers ticked. Score of 2 if 4 or more answers picked
Is RVF preventable in humans	Yes	1
How is RVF prevented in humans	4 answers	Score of 0 if no answer ticked. Score of 1 if 1 answer ticked. Score of 2 if 2 or more answers picked
Can animals get RVF	Yes	1
If yes, what do you think transmits RVF in animals	Yes	1
Can RVF be prevented in animals	Yes	1
If Yes, what methods can be used to prevent RVF in animals	4 answers	Score of 0 if no answer ticked. Score of 1 if 1 answer ticked. Score of 2 if 2 or more answers picked

407

408

409 **Supplementary Table 2. Bivariate analysis of factors associated with RVF knowledge**  
 410 **levels among healthcare facility participants from Kenya, Uganda and DRC, 2022–**  
 411 **2024**

Variable	Overall, N = 4,806 <sup>1</sup>	No knowledge, n = 3,821 <sup>1</sup>	Basic knowledge, n = 786 <sup>1</sup>	Advanced knowledge, n = 199 <sup>1</sup>	cOR (95 CI)	p- value <sup>2</sup>
<b>Country</b>						<0.001*
DRC	1,370 (28.5)	1,328 (34.8)	7 (0.9)	35 (17.6)	ref	
Kenya	1,468 (30.5)	842 (22.0)	548 (69.7)	78 (39.2)	21.4 (15.7,30.0)	
Uganda	1,968 (40.9)	1,651 (43.2)	231 (29.4)	86 (43.2)	6.1 (4.4,8.5)	
<b>Age group (years)</b>						<0.001*
10–19	508 (10.6)	455 (11.9)	50 (6.4)	3 (1.5)	ref	
20–40	2,804 (58.3)	2,236 (58.5)	434 (55.2)	134 (67.3)	2.2 (1.7,3.0)	
Above 40	1,494 (31.1)	1,130 (29.6)	302 (38.4)	62 (31.2)	2.8 (2.1,3.8)	
<b>Sex</b>						<0.001*
Female	2,762 (57.5)	2,314 (60.6)	357 (45.4)	91 (45.7)	ref	
Male	2,044 (42.5)	1,507 (39.4)	429 (54.6)	108 (54.3)	1.8 (1.6,2.1)	
<b>Education Level</b>						<0.001*
No education	283 (5.9)	266 (7.0)	15 (1.9)	2 (1.0)	ref	
Primary complete	1,640 (34.1)	1,277 (33.4)	317 (40.3)	46 (23.1)	4.4 (2.7,7.5)	
Primary incomplete	1,122 (23.3)	991 (25.9)	115 (14.6)	16 (8.0)	2.1 (1.3,3.6)	
Secondary complete	1,194 (24.8)	915 (23.9)	224 (28.5)	55 (27.6)	4.8 (3.0,8.2)	
Tertiary complete	525 (10.9)	340 (8.9)	113 (14.4)	72 (36.2)	9.3 (5.7,16.3)	
Postgraduate	42 (0.9)	32 (0.8)	2 (0.3)	8 (4.0)	6.0 (2.5,14.3)	
<b>Occupation</b>						<0.001*
Healthcare workers						
No	4,623 (96.2)	3,714 (97.2)	768 (97.7)	141 (70.9)	ref	
Yes	183 (3.8)	107 (2.8)	18 (2.3)	58 (29.1)	4.4 (3.2,6.1)	
Non-healthcare worker professionals						0.003*
No	4,343 (90.4)	3,481 (91.1)	688 (87.5)	174 (87.4)	ref	
Yes	463 (9.6)	340 (8.9)	98 (12.5)	25 (12.6)	1.5 (1.1,1.8)	
Unskilled workers						<0.001*
No	4,276 (89.0)	3,449 (90.3)	644 (81.9)	183 (92.0)	ref	
Yes	530 (11.0)	372 (9.7)	142 (18.1)	16 (8.0)	1.7 (1.4,2.1)	
Animal farmer						<0.001*
No	4,137 (86.1)	3,363 (88.0)	597 (76.2)	177 (88.9)	ref	
Yes	669 (13.9)	458 (12.0)	189 (23.8)	22 (11.1)	1.9 (1.6,2.2)	
Crop farmer						0.023*
No	3,172 (66.0)	2,529 (66.2)	497 (63.2)	146 (73.4)	ref	
Yes	1,634 (34.0)	1,292 (33.8)	289 (36.8)	53 (26.6)	1.0 (0.9,1.2)	
Butcher/Slaughterhouse worker						0.2
No	4,773 (99.3)	3,797 (99.4)	777 (98.9)	199 (100.0)	ref	
Yes	33 (0.7)	24 (0.6)	7 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	1.2 (0.5,2.6)	
Undisclosed						0.7
No	4,781 (99.5)	3,799 (99.4)	783 (99.6)	199 (100.0)	ref	
Yes	25 (0.5)	22 (0.6)	3 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	0.5 (0.1,1.5)	
Student						0.2
No	4,187 (87.1)	3,323 (87.0)	696 (88.5)	168 (84.4)	ref	

Yes	619 (12.9)	498 (13.0)	90 (11.5)	31 (15.6)	1.0 (0.8,1.2)	
<b>RVF Seropositivity</b>						0.044*
Negative	4,558 (94.8)	3,625 (94.9)	750 (95.4)	183 (92.0)	<b>ref</b>	
Positive	248 (5.2)	196 (5.1)	36 (4.6)	16 (8.0)	1.2 (0.9,1.5)	
<b>Keeping livestock</b>						<0.001*
No	2,253 (46.9)	167(21.2)	80 (40.2)	2006 (52.5)	<b>ref</b>	
Yes	2,553 (53.1)	619 (78.8)	119 (59.8)	1,815 (47.5)	3.2 (2.8,3.8)	
<b>Have close contact with animals</b>						<0.001*
No	495 (10.3)	451 (11.8)	32 (4.1)	12 (6.0)	<b>ref</b>	
Yes	4,311 (89.7)	3,370 (88.2)	754 (95.9)	187 (94.0)	2.8 (2.1,3.9)	
<b>Slaughtering sick animal(s)</b>						0.081
No	241 (80.6)	150 (76.9)	69 (88.5)	22 (84.6)	<b>ref</b>	
Yes	58 (19.4)	45 (23.1)	9 (11.5)	4 (15.4)	0.5 (0.2,0.9)	
<b>Drink raw milk</b>						0.021*
No	4,600 (95.7)	3,644 (95.4)	759 (96.6)	197 (99.0)	<b>ref</b>	
Yes	206 (4.3)	177 (4.6)	27 (3.4)	2 (1.0)	0.6 (0.4,0.9)	
<b>Mosquito prevention</b>						<0.001*
No	2,224 (46.3)	1,799 (47.1)	372 (47.3)	53 (26.6)	<b>ref</b>	
Yes	2,582 (53.7)	2,022 (52.9)	414 (52.7)	146 (73.4)	1.8 (0.7,0.9)	
<b>Presence of swamp/quarry/irrigation scheme near residence</b>						<0.001
No	2,393 (49.8)	2,118 (55.4)	224 (28.5)	51 (25.6)	<b>ref</b>	
Yes	2,413 (50.2)	1,703 (44.6)	562 (71.5)	148 (74.4)	3.4 (2.9,3.9)	

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

## 425 References

- 426 [1] M. Pepin, M. Bouloy, B. H. Bird, A. Kemp, and J. Paweska, "Rift Valley fever virus (*Bunyaviridae: Phlebovirus*): an update on pathogenesis, molecular epidemiology,  
427 vectors, diagnostics and prevention," *Vet. Res.*, vol. 41, no. 6, p. 61, Nov. 2010, doi:  
428 10.1051/vetres/2010033.  
429
- 430 [2] P. M. Nguku *et al.*, "An investigation of a major outbreak of Rift Valley fever in Kenya:  
431 2006-2007," *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, vol. 83, no. 2 Suppl, pp. 5–13, Aug. 2010, doi:  
432 10.4269/ajtmh.2010.09-0288.
- 433 [3] B. H. Bird and S. T. Nichol, "Breaking the chain: Rift Valley fever virus control via  
434 livestock vaccination," *Current Opinion in Virology*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 315–323, Jun.  
435 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.coviro.2012.02.017.
- 436 [4] A. S. Anyangu *et al.*, "Risk factors for severe Rift Valley fever infection in Kenya, 2007,"  
437 *Am J Trop Med Hyg*, vol. 83, no. 2 Suppl, pp. 14–21, Aug. 2010, doi:  
438 10.4269/ajtmh.2010.09-0293.
- 439 [5] M. O. Nanyingi *et al.*, "A systematic review of Rift Valley Fever epidemiology 1931-  
440 2014," *Infect Ecol Epidemiol*, vol. 5, p. 28024, 2015, doi: 10.3402/iee.v5.28024.
- 441 [6] L. Nyakarahuka *et al.*, "Ten outbreaks of rift valley fever in Uganda 2016-2018:  
442 epidemiological and laboratory findings," *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*,  
443 vol. 79, p. 4, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2018.11.029.
- 444 [7] L. Nyakarahuka *et al.*, "Detection of Sporadic Outbreaks of Rift Valley Fever in Uganda  
445 through the National Viral Hemorrhagic Fever Surveillance System, 2017–2020," *The  
446 American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, vol. 108, no. 5, pp. 995–1002,  
447 May 2023, doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.22-0410.
- 448 [8] G. M. Tshilenge, M. L. K. Mulumba, G. Misinzo, R. Noad, and W. G. Dundon, "Rift  
449 Valley fever virus in small ruminants in the Democratic Republic of the Congo,"  
450 *Onderstepoort j. vet. res.*, vol. 86, no. 1, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.4102/ojvr.v86i1.1737.
- 451 [9] G. M. Tshilenge *et al.*, "Seroprevalence of Rift Valley fever virus in cattle in the  
452 Democratic Republic of the Congo," *Trop Anim Health Prod*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 537–  
453 543, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11250-018-1721-5.
- 454 [10] K. M. Mbanzulu *et al.*, "Mosquito-borne viruses circulating in Kinshasa, Democratic  
455 Republic of the Congo," *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, vol. 57, pp. 32–37,  
456 Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2017.01.016.
- 457 [11] F. Wanyoike and K. M. Rich, "An Assessment of the Regional and National Socio-  
458 Economic Impacts of the 2007 Rift Valley Fever Outbreak in Kenya," *The American  
459 Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, vol. 83, no. 2\_Suppl, pp. 52–57, Aug. 2010,  
460 doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2010.09-0291.
- 461 [12] A. Launiala, "How much can a KAP survey tell us about people's knowledge, attitudes  
462 and practices? Some observations from medical anthropology research on malaria in  
463 pregnancy in Malawi," *Anthropology Matters*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2009.
- 464 [13] T. Chiuya, E. M. Fevre, S. Junglen, and C. Borgemeister, "Understanding knowledge,  
465 attitude and perception of Rift Valley fever in Baringo South, Kenya: A cross-sectional  
466 study," *PLOS Glob Public Health*, vol. 3, no. 9, p. e0002195, Sep. 2023, doi:  
467 10.1371/journal.pgph.0002195.
- 468 [14] S. Situma *et al.*, "Widening geographic range of Rift Valley fever disease clusters  
469 associated with climate change in East Africa," *BMJ Glob Health*, vol. 9, no. 6, p.  
470 e014737, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2023-014737.
- 471 [15] Z. Kabami *et al.*, "Notes from the Field: Rift Valley Fever Outbreak — Mbarara  
472 District, Western Uganda, January–March 2023," *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.*, vol.  
473 72, no. 23, pp. 639–640, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7223a6.
- 474 [16] C. E. Sanderson, F. Jori, N. Moolla, J. T. Paweska, N. Oumer, and K. A. Alexander,  
475 "Silent Circulation of Rift Valley Fever in Humans, Botswana, 2013–2014," *Emerg.  
476 Infect. Dis.*, vol. 26, no. 10, pp. 2453–2456, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.3201/eid2610.191837.



- 477 [17] L. Nyakarahuka *et al.*, “Prevalence and risk factors of Rift Valley fever in humans and  
478 animals from Kabale district in Southwestern Uganda, 2016,” *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, vol.  
479 12, no. 5, p. e0006412, May 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006412.
- 480 [18] P. A. Harris *et al.*, “The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of  
481 software platform partners,” *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, vol. 95, p. 103208, Jul.  
482 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208.
- 483 [19] S. Situma *et al.*, “Serological Evidence of Cryptic Rift Valley Fever Virus Transmission  
484 among Humans and Livestock in Central Highlands of Kenya,” Oct. 08, 2024, *Public  
485 Health and Healthcare*. doi: 10.20944/preprints202410.0587.v1.
- 486 [20] R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation  
487 for Statistical Computing,. (2021). Vienna, Austria. [Online]. Available: [https://www.R-  
488 project.org](https://www.R-project.org)
- 489 [21] H. Kainga *et al.*, “Assessment of Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices towards Rift  
490 Valley Fever among Livestock Farmers in Selected Districts of Malawi,” *TropicalMed*,  
491 vol. 7, no. 8, p. 167, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.3390/tropicalmed7080167.
- 492 [22] A. De St. Maurice *et al.*, “Rift Valley Fever: A survey of knowledge, attitudes, and  
493 practice of slaughterhouse workers and community members in Kabale District,  
494 Uganda,” *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. e0006175, Mar. 2018, doi:  
495 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006175.
- 496 [23] L. Nyakarahuka *et al.*, “Knowledge and attitude towards Ebola and Marburg virus  
497 diseases in Uganda using quantitative and participatory epidemiology techniques,”  
498 *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, vol. 11, no. 9, p. e0005907, Sep. 2017, doi:  
499 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005907.
- 500 [24] A. R. Issae, A. A. S. Katakweba, R. P. Kicheleri, A. A. Chengula, and C. J. Kasanga,  
501 “Knowledge, attitudes and practices on rift valley fever among pastoral and  
502 agropastoral communities of Ngorongoro in the rift valley ecosystem, Tanzania,  
503 conducted in 2021/2022,” *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, vol. 17, no. 8, p. e0011560, Aug. 2023,  
504 doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0011560.
- 505 [25] A. M. Gillespie *et al.*, “Social Mobilization and Community Engagement Central to the  
506 Ebola Response in West Africa: Lessons for Future Public Health Emergencies,” *Glob  
507 Health Sci Pract*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 626–646, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-16-  
508 00226.
- 509 [26] F. M. Asad Khan *et al.*, “The concomitant viral epidemics of Rift Valley fever and  
510 COVID-19: A lethal combination for Kenya,” *Trop Doct*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 6–8, Jan.  
511 2022, doi: 10.1177/00494755211055247.
- 512 [27] M. Komugisha *et al.*, “Outbreak of Rift Valley Fever among herdsmen linked to contact  
513 with body fluids of infected animals in Nakaseke District, Central Uganda, June–July,  
514 2023,” 2023.
- 515 [28] J. P. Lacaux, Y. M. Tourre, C. Vignolles, J. A. Ndione, and M. Lafaye, “Classification of  
516 ponds from high-spatial resolution remote sensing: Application to Rift Valley Fever  
517 epidemics in Senegal,” *Remote Sensing of Environment*, vol. 106, no. 1, pp. 66–74,  
518 Jan. 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2006.07.012.
- 519 [29] H. Affognon *et al.*, “Ethnic groups’ knowledge, attitude and practices and Rift Valley  
520 fever exposure in Isiolo County of Kenya,” *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, vol. 11, no. 3, p.  
521 e0005405, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005405.
- 522 [30] T. R. Frieden, “A Framework for Public Health Action: The Health Impact Pyramid,” *Am  
523 J Public Health*, vol. 100, no. 4, pp. 590–595, Apr. 2010, doi:  
524 10.2105/AJPH.2009.185652.  
525