

1 Title: “I don’t feel safe sitting in my own yard”: Chicago resident experiences with urban rats
2 during a COVID-19 stay-at-home order

3

4 Authors: Maureen H. Murray^{1,2}, Kaylee A. Byers^{3,4}, Jacqueline Buckley^{1,2}, Seth B. Magle¹,
5 Dorothy Maffei⁵, Preeya Waite⁶, and Danielle German⁷

6

7 Affiliations:

8 ¹Urban Wildlife Institute, Dept. of Conservation and Science, Lincoln Park Zoo, Chicago, IL,
9 USA

10 ²Davee Center for Epidemiology, Dept. of Conservation and Science, Lincoln Park Zoo,
11 Chicago, IL, USA

12 ³Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British
13 Columbia, Canada

14 ⁴Canadian Wildlife Health Cooperative, Animal Health Centre, Abbotsford, BC, Canada

15 ⁵School of Public Health, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA

16 ⁶Center for Community Health Equity, DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois, USA

17 ⁷Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD,
18 USA

19

20 Corresponding author:

21 Name: Maureen H. Murray

22 Email: maureenmurray@lpzoo.org

23 Address: 2001 N Clark St., Chicago IL, 60614

24 Abstract

25

26 Background: Encounters with rats in urban areas increase risk of human exposure to rat-
27 associated zoonotic pathogens and act as a stressor associated with psychological distress. The
28 frequency and nature of human-rat encounters may be altered by social distancing policies to
29 mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, restaurant closures may reduce food availability
30 for rats and promote rat activity in nearby residential areas, thus increasing public health risks
31 during a period of public health crisis. In this study, we aimed to identify factors associated with
32 increased perceived exposure to rats during a stay-at-home order, describe residents' encounters
33 with rats relevant to their health and well-being, and identify factors associated with increased
34 use of rodent control.

35

36 Methods: Urban residents in Chicago, a large city with growing concerns about rats and health
37 disparities, completed an online questionnaire including fixed response and open-ended
38 questions during the spring 2020 stay-at-home order. Analyses included ordinal multivariate
39 regression, spatial analysis, and thematic analysis for open-ended responses.

40

41 Results: Overall, 21% of respondents (n=835) reported an increase in rat sightings around their
42 homes during the stay-at-home order and increased rat sightings was positively associated with
43 proximity to restaurants, low-rise apartment buildings, and rat feces in the home ($p \leq 0.01$). Many
44 respondents described feeling unsafe using their patio or yard, and afraid of rats entering their
45 home or spreading disease. Greater engagement with rodent control was associated with property
46 ownership, information about rat control, and lower incomes ($p \leq 0.01$).

47

48 Conclusions: More frequent rat encounters may be an unanticipated public health concern during
49 periods of social distancing, especially in restaurant-dense areas or in low-rise apartment
50 buildings. Rat presence may also limit residents' ability to enjoy nearby outdoor spaces, which
51 otherwise might buffer stress experienced during a stay-at-home order. Proactive rat control may
52 be needed to mitigate rat-associated health risks during future stay-at-home orders.

53

54 Keywords

55

56 Urban rat, COVID-19 pandemic, Urban health, Social science, Qualitative research, Spatial
57 analysis, Zoonotic disease

58

59 Background

60

61 Urban rats create public health risks in cities around the world. Their adaptability to a
62 range of environments has allowed them to thrive in close association with people. This tendency
63 toward close contact with people is concerning for public health because rats can carry many
64 zoonotic pathogens associated with illness in people such as *Leptospira interrogans*, *Escherichia*
65 *coli*, and *Clostridium difficile* [1]. Rats can also act as a mental health stressor [2] and cause
66 billions of dollars in property damage [3]. Identifying the drivers of rat encounters in residential
67 areas may help mitigate health concerns. For example, rats typically aggregate in city blocks
68 where food sources such as garbage are abundant [4, 5]. Changes in the availability of these

69 resources for rats in residential areas may therefore alter local rat abundance and rat-associated
70 health risks.

71

72 Local environmental changes can impact rat abundance and distributions, and these
73 changes can be influenced, in turn, by global phenomena. In spring 2020, millions of people
74 around the world were required to stay at home to mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting in
75 altered activity in and around businesses, food establishments, public spaces, and the home.
76 Urban residents in multiple countries reported increased rat sightings during this period,
77 prompting media articles and public health recommendations from the Center for Disease
78 Control [6, 7]. These increases in rat sightings were hypothesized to be the result of restaurant
79 closures and subsequent changes in the distribution of garbage as rats search for new food
80 sources [7]. Indeed, an early analysis found that rat complaints increased in New York City
81 during social distancing restrictions near closed food establishments [8]. Although these results
82 are preliminary, this pattern underscores the potential for surveys to document changes in
83 resident experiences with rats that are not captured in complaint data. For example, residents
84 living near restaurant-dense areas may be more likely to experience increased contact with rats or
85 their excreta. In addition to changes in rat activity, residents may also observe rats because they
86 are spending more time in and around their residence. Regardless of cause, understanding
87 whether residents experienced more frequent or severe encounters with rats during the COVID-
88 19 pandemic will help mitigate additional and unanticipated public health risks associated with
89 rats.

90

91 The impacts of rats on residents will also be determined by the context of these
92 interactions. Resident experiences with rats while staying at home may vary depending on local
93 environmental and social factors. Previous studies have demonstrated that rat abundance and rat-
94 associated health risks vary significantly between neighborhoods [5, 9] and is typically higher in
95 low-income areas [10, 11], likely because of building conditions and resources available to
96 control rats. Residents' encounters with rats might also differ based on their housing conditions;
97 property owners may face monetary burdens from controlling rats while some renters may have
98 negligent landlords. Some residents may also be disproportionately impacted by rat infestations,
99 for example if they have young children, pets, or rarely leave the house. Identifying which
100 communities are most vulnerable to rat infestations will help prioritize proactive rodent control
101 policies and education campaigns to mitigate health risks from rats.

102

103 To understand how social distancing policies changed resident encounters with rats, we
104 evaluated how a stay-at-home order influenced three aspects of resident vulnerability to rats:
105 exposure to rats, impacts of rats on human health and well-being, and adaptive capacity to
106 mitigate these interactions [12]. We assessed rat exposure as the frequency of rat encounters and
107 changes to these encounters as compared to before the stay-at-home order; impacts of rats as the
108 frequency and change in rat encounters relevant to human health or well-being; and adaptive
109 capacity by identifying factors associated with engagement with rodent control. We did so by
110 surveying residents in Chicago, a large city with increasing problems with rats [5] and disparities
111 in public health outcomes between neighborhoods [13]. Based on anecdotal reports, we predicted
112 that residents living in proximity to more restaurants and especially in lower-income areas would
113 be more likely to experience an increase in rat encounters. We also predicted that engagement

114 with rodent control would be positively associated with increased rat sightings, motivation (i.e.
115 concern about rats), and capacity (i.e. information and income). Understanding resident
116 experiences with rats during the stay-at-home order will help further understand the impacts of
117 rat infestations on human health and well-being as well as anticipate community health issues as
118 cities re-open or restrict activities to control the current pandemic.

119

120 Methods

121

122 A cross-sectional study design was used to collect information from Chicago residents
123 about their experiences with rats during the stay-at-home order. The survey was formatted to
124 collect responses through SurveyMonkey, an online survey service to ensure rapid distribution of
125 surveys, which would have been impossible using paper surveys. The survey was available
126 online between April 27 and June 6, 2020 corresponding with Chicago's stay-at-home order,
127 which was in effect from March 21 to June 3, 2020. During the stay-at-home order, all residents
128 were requested to stay at home except for essential needs and restaurants could not provide dine-
129 in service [14].

130

131 To obtain responses from all Chicago neighborhoods, we distributed the link to our
132 online survey via email to all 50 Aldermanic offices (i.e. elected officials who represent city
133 wards) and at least one community organization in all 77 community areas. Prior to distributing
134 the survey, a list of potential questions was pilot tested (n = 21) and refined to improve
135 comprehension. The survey was available and advertised in English and Spanish. Survey
136 respondents were deemed eligible if they were over the age of 18 and had lived in their current

137 residence for at least six months. To increase the accuracy of responses, survey questions were
138 preceded by an introduction that distinguished the appearance and sign (e.g. droppings, burrows)
139 of rats relative to mice. All survey participants anonymously provided written informed consent
140 via checkboxes prior to taking the survey. The Lincoln Park Zoo Institutional Review Board
141 approved our informed consent protocol and deemed this study exempt from the requirements of
142 45 CFR 46.

143

144 The survey questionnaire (Supplementary file 1) was designed to follow the methods of
145 German and Latkin [2]. The survey questions aimed to describe any changes in residents'
146 exposure to rats (i.e., frequency and context of rat encounters), the impacts of rats on their health
147 or well-being (i.e., zoonotic exposure risk and mental health impacts); and their adaptive
148 capacity to addressing rats (i.e., changes in behaviors including use of rodent control). Within
149 each topic, we asked respondents to report the *frequency* of an event in the past month from
150 “never” to “daily or almost daily” and we asked about any *change* relative to a month prior to
151 taking the survey. Respondents also had the opportunity to describe their feelings and
152 experiences associated with rats in their own words (see below).

153

154 We hypothesized that resident experiences with rats would be mediated by several
155 demographic and environmental factors. To understand these relationships, we asked
156 respondents to self-report their age group, gender, children in the household (yes/no), type of
157 housing, whether they were renters or property owners, time spent outside the house per week,
158 their neighborhood, and their closest major intersection. For analysis, we grouped housing types
159 into single-family homes, low-rise multi-unit buildings (<10 units), and high-rise multi-unit

160 buildings (≥ 10 units; [15, 16]). We also included the median household income of the
161 respondent's census tract [15] if they provided their closest major intersection.

162

163 Exposure

164

165 To determine whether residents experienced more frequent rat encounters during the stay
166 at home order (i.e. exposure), we asked respondents to report the frequency and change in rat
167 sightings at two geographic levels: in/around their home; and on their city block. Because rat
168 abundance is known to increase during the spring [5, 8], and because our survey coincided with
169 this time period, we also asked about their change in rat sightings in spring 2020 relative to
170 previous years.

171

172 To test the hypothesis that rat activity would increase in areas near restaurants during the
173 stay-at-home order, we undertook a spatial analysis. To do this, we compared respondents'
174 reported change in rat sightings with the number of restaurants within 500m of their closest
175 major intersection. We chose a buffer size of 500m because rats have small home ranges on the
176 order of tens to hundreds of square meters [17] and the closest major intersection may be several
177 blocks away from the respondent's residence. We accessed the location of all food vendors in
178 Chicago using food inspections data from the Chicago Department of Public Health's Food
179 Protection Program [18]. We treated the count of restaurants within 500m as a continuous
180 variable. However, the count of restaurants was right skewed (median = 51, mean = 64, range =
181 1 - 425) and so we removed outliers and log-transformed the values prior to analysis.

182

183 We also accessed municipal rat complaint data to complement survey responses about
184 any increase in rat infestations. The city of Chicago records public complaints about rats made
185 via 311 calls and online. In response to complaints, city managers will distribute rodenticide bait
186 in the complainant's alley. Rat complaint data can be a useful way to measure the timing or
187 locations of rat infestations [5, 8, 19]. Although rat complaints are not a direct measure of rat
188 populations, the biases associated with complaints (e.g. knowledge of the 311 system) may differ
189 from sampling bias in survey research (e.g. internet access) and therefore similar trends in these
190 complementary data sources may support survey results. We accessed rat complaints made to the
191 city between January 1 and June 6, 2020 through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request
192 to the City of Chicago Department of Streets and Sanitation. We then calculated the change in
193 311 rat complaints made in each census tract in March 2020 relative to May 2020 as these were
194 the time periods relevant to our survey. All spatial analyses were performed in QGIS 2.18.14
195 [20].

196

197 Impacts of rats

198

199 To understand the impacts of rats on public health risks, we asked respondents to report
200 the frequency and change in rat encounters that may lead to the transmission of zoonotic
201 pathogens such as touching rat feces or being bitten by a rat. We also asked respondents to
202 describe how they felt about their interactions, including their concerns about these encounters.

203

204 Adaptive Capacity

205

206 To assess adaptive capacity, we asked residents about changes in their behaviors during
207 the stay-at-home orders that were specifically meant to minimize contact with rats. We also
208 included questions about resident engagement with rodent control as a measure of adaptive
209 capacity. To test whether an increase in rat sightings during the stay-at-home order was
210 associated with increased engagement with rodent control, respondents were asked about the
211 frequency and change in their use of rodent control such as reporting rat complaints to the city
212 and/or calling a pest professional. We hypothesized that engagement with rodent control is
213 mediated by motivation and ability. We thus asked if respondents were more concerned about
214 rats now than they were a month ago and if they had enough information to control rats on a 5-
215 point Likert scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”.

216

217 Thematic analysis

218

219 We analyzed respondents’ open-ended responses to the question “If you currently have
220 rat problems or had them in the past, how did that make you feel?” using a “thematic
221 framework” [21, 22]. A preliminary coding framework was developed by MM, JB, PW, and DM
222 for thematic analysis of the responses. Some codes (i.e. emotions associated with rats) were
223 determined a priori based on the survey question. Many other codes emerged organically based
224 on respondents’ tendency to discuss certain topics (e.g. how rats impact their day to day life).
225 The survey responses were coded manually using the program Dedoose [23] and all responses
226 were coded by at least two reviewers. The thematic framework was revised once all responses
227 were coded. Themes were developed based on the objective of the question (i.e. describe

228 respondents' feelings about rats) and by identifying concepts that were mentioned by multiple
229 respondents in relation to the study objectives.

230

231 Statistical analysis

232

233 For quantitative analysis of survey questions, we used generalized linear models to
234 identify variables significantly associated with exposure to rats (i.e. change in rat sightings),
235 impacts of rats (i.e. change in contact with rats or rat feces), and adaptive capacity (i.e.
236 engagement with rodent control). For all of these three outcomes, the response variables were
237 rating scales with the categories “more often”, “about the same”, and “less often” relative to a
238 month prior. Because the response variables of interest were ordered categories, we used ordinal
239 regression in R using the package MASS [24, 25] and the reference category for all three
240 outcomes was “more often”. We included the demographic and socioeconomic variables listed
241 above such as housing type and income in all models. We added additional predictor variables to
242 the models based on the factors we hypothesized would be associated with a change in rat
243 sightings (i.e. number of restaurants within 500m), change in contact with rats or rat feces (i.e.
244 change in rat sightings), and engagement with rodent control (i.e. change in rat sightings,
245 concern about rats, information about rats). All continuous variables were centered and scaled
246 prior to analysis.

247


248 Results

249

250 Survey Participant Characteristics

251
252 The online survey was shared electronically by nine community organizations and by the
253 aldermanic offices in 29 of Chicago’s 50 wards. In total, we received 835 at least partially
254 completed surveys from eligible respondents but none in Spanish. Of the 672 respondents who
255 provided demographic data, 67% (N = 453) identified as female, 31% as male (N = 205), 1% as
256 non-binary (N = 5), and 1% preferred not to say (N = 9). Because a small proportion of
257 respondents self-identified as non-binary, we were unable to include their responses when
258 including gender as a covariate in generalized linear models. All age groups were represented
259 although there were fewer respondents in the 18-24 category (3.5%) relative to other categories
260 (13% - 19%, Table S1). Relative to Chicago’s population, respondents were disproportionately
261 more likely to self-identify as female (51% vs 67%, respectively) and property owners (45% vs
262 66%), but there was no significant bias in age class (Table S1, see Supplementary file 2). Most
263 respondents indicated that they had heard of the survey from their Alderman/city council
264 member (47%), from a community organization (17%) or from social media (17%).

265
266 Of the eligible respondents, 740 provided their neighborhood and 627 provided their
267 closest major intersection. We received responses from 106 neighborhoods, mostly in the North
268 Side (Figure 1). We received more responses from community areas with higher incomes and
269 with more 311 rat complaints during the stay-at-home period ($\beta_{\text{Income}} = 8.36 \mp 2.39 \text{ SE}$, $t = 3.49$,
270 $p = 0.001$; $\beta_{\text{Complaints}} = 8.61 \mp 2.31 \text{ SE}$, $t = 3.73$, $p = 4.82 \times 10^{-4}$; model adjusted $R^2 = 0.43$,
271 $F(2,50) = 20.63$, $p = 2.93 \times 10^{-7}$). Based on census tract data, the average median household
272 income for respondents who provided their closest major intersection was $\$82,888 \mp 34,182$
273 (range: $\$16,953 - \$168,352$).




274

275 Figure 1: Map of Chicago showing community area boundaries and the locations of survey
276 respondents. Community areas are shaded based on the number of respondents who self-reported
277 their neighborhood of residence (n = 740). Red circles indicate the closest major intersection
278 reported by respondents (n = 627). The locations of respondent intersections were offset by a
279 random distance within a 500m buffer to maintain respondent privacy.

280

281 We received 485 responses to the open-ended question “If you currently have rat
282 problems or had them in the past, how does that make you feel?” These respondents were more
283 likely to report seeing rats at least once in the past month but otherwise did not differ
284 significantly from the other respondents (Data not shown). Based on a thematic analysis of these
285 responses, four themes emerged: Context of rat encounters, Emotional responses to Rats;
286 Impacts of rats; and Accountability and responsibility for rodent control (Figure 2). We will
287 discuss these themes as they relate to our study objectives below.



288

289 Figure 2: Thematic structure describing resident experiences with rats during the stay-at-home
290 order. Yellow and blue squares represent major themes identified in open-ended survey
291 responses using thematic analysis. Red squares represent experiences unique to the stay-at-home
292 order period.

293

294 Exposure to rats: “there is a bigger issue now”

295

296 Of eligible respondents, 21% observed more rats in or around their home and 23%
297 observed more rats on their block during the stay-at-home order (Table 1). Conversely, half as
298 many respondents observed fewer rats around their home (11%) or on their block (10%) during

299 the stay-at-home order (Table 1). Respondents were more likely to observe an increase in rats on
300 their block if they lived near more restaurants ($p = 0.001$), spent more time outside ($p = 0.001$),
301 and lived in a small multi-unit building ($p = 0.003$) (Table 2, Figure 3). Respondents who
302 observed an increase in rats were also more likely to report more rats in 2020 relative to previous
303 years ($p < 0.001$; Table 2). Respondents were also more likely to observe greater numbers of rats
304 in or around their homes if they lived in a small multi-unit building (Table S2). We found no
305 significant correlation between an increase in rat sightings from survey responses and increased
306 311 complaints in the same census tract (Table 2 and Table S2).

307 Table 1: Frequency of rat sightings and encounters during March - June 2020 stay-at-home order in Chicago, Illinois, USA. Residents
 308 were asked to recall the frequency of experiences during the past month and compare their current experiences with a month ago.

	Frequency during quarantine				Change during quarantine			
	Never	Rarely (Less than weekly)	Frequently (Weekly)	Daily or almost daily	Does not occur	Less often	About the same	More often
Rats in home	253 (30%)	260 (31%)	219 (26%)	109 (13%)	173 (21%)	8 (11%)	400 (48%)	173 (21%)
Rats on block	186 (22%)	243 (29%)	263 (31%)	145 (17%)	130 (16%)	84 (10%)	423 (51%)	195 (23%)
Saw chewed objects	498 (69%)	139 (19%)	58 (8%)	24 (3%)	266 (37%)	95 (13%)	271 (38%)	90 (13%)
Rat feces in home	453 (63%)	154 (21%)	80 (11%)	31 (4%)	264 (37%)	98 (14%)	261 (36%)	98 (14%)
Touched rat feces	661 (91%)	52 (7%)	16 (2%)	1 (0.1%)	480 (67%)	83 (12%)	144 (20%)	13 (2%)
Touched a rat (alive or dead)	650 (89%)	70 (10%)	9 (1%)	0	504 (70%)	91 (13%)	118 (17%)	7 (1%)
Bitten by rat	725 (99%)	3 (0.4%)	1 (0.1%)	0	529 (74%)	80 (11%)	108 (15%)	2 (0.3%)

309

310 Table 2: Ordinal regression output for variables hypothesized to be associated with a change in
311 rat sightings on respondents' block of residence during quarantine. The response categories were
312 "more rats", "about the same", "fewer rats", and "I see no rats here" and the reference category
313 was "more rats".

Variable	β	Std. Error	t value	p value
Restaurants within 500m (log)	0.34	0.10	3.26	1.10 x 10 ⁻³
Gender (Male)	-0.02	0.20	-0.08	0.93
Age (Linear)	0.44	0.43	1.02	0.31
Age (Quadratic)	-0.92	0.36	-2.54	0.01
Age (Cubic)	0.17	0.28	0.60	0.55
Age (^4)	-0.19	0.23	-0.82	0.41
Age (^5)	-0.11	0.19	-0.57	0.57
Rats sightings 2020 vs previous years (Linear)	2.81	0.52	5.43	5.50 x 10 ⁻⁸
Rats sightings 2020 vs previous years (Quadratic)	0.92	0.37	2.48	0.01
Children in home (Yes)	0.09	0.23	0.41	0.68
Time spent outside per week	0.78	0.24	3.21	1.31 x 10 ⁻³

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

(Linear)

Time spent outside per week	0.25	0.20	1.23	0.22
-----------------------------	------	------	------	------

(Quadratic)

Time spent outside per week	0.25	0.16	1.57	0.12
-----------------------------	------	------	------	------


(Cubic)

Rent or own (Renter)	-0.03	0.26	-0.10	0.92
----------------------	-------	------	-------	------

Housing (large multi-unit)	-0.50	0.29	-1.75	0.08
----------------------------	-------	------	-------	------

Housing (small multi-unit)	0.64	0.22	2.92	3.46 x 10 ⁻³
----------------------------	------	------	------	-------------------------

Median household income	0.06	0.09	0.69	0.49
-------------------------	------	------	------	------



315

316 Figure 3: Relationships between the change in rat sightings during the stay-at-home order in
317 Chicago and proximity to restaurants (a) or housing type (b) based on ordinal regression of
318 survey responses. Lines show the probability of a survey respondent reporting more rats (red
319 solid line), fewer rats (blue dashed line), about the same number of rats (black dotted line) or no
320 rats (gray dotted line) relative to a month prior. The count of restaurants was log-transformed for
321 analysis due to right skewness and back-transformed for ease of interpretation. Shaded bands (a)
322 or error bars (b) show 95% confidence intervals.

323 In their open-ended responses, several residents mentioned that they see more rats now
324 that restaurants have closed. Most surmised that there was less garbage available to rats
325 following restaurant closures, which caused rats to move into residential areas.

326

327 *“as a landlord, It’s disgusting to have rats on our property despite our efforts to keep*
328 *everything clean. The restaurants we share an alley with are mediocre at best in keeping trash*
329 *off the ground. Now with less to no food in the dumpsters, the rats are coming & burrowing in*
330 *our yard”*

331

332 Several respondents also mentioned that rats appeared to be less afraid of people during
333 the stay-at-home order. These respondents described rats being more visible and active during
334 the day, potentially because rats were searching for new food sources after restaurant closures.

335

336 *“Rats are a normal part of city life and usually keep to themselves and the alleyways, but*
337 *since restaurant closings I’ve noticed them getting “bolder”, often finding them crossing yards*
338 *and porches in daylight and walking very close. I suppose because with the lack of restaurant*
339 *garbage their food sources have disappeared?”*

340

341 Impacts of rats: “Unsafe in my own home”

342

343 Several respondents reported interactions with rats of public health concern. In the month
344 prior to taking the survey, 11% of respondents had touched a rat, 10% touched rat feces, and four
345 respondents (0.5%) were bitten by a rat at least once (Table 1). Although over 70% of our

346 respondents resided in the North Side of Chicago, three respondents that reported being bitten by
347 a rat lived in less-affluent South Side neighborhoods, representing 5.0% of all South Side
348 respondents. Respondents who observed an increase in rats in their home were also more likely
349 to observe increased rat feces in their home ($p < 0.01$; Table 3; Figure S1).

350

351 Table 3: Ordinal regression output for variables hypothesized to be associated with a change in
352 rat feces in respondents' homes during quarantine.

Variable	β	Std. Error	t value	p value
Change in rat sightings at home (Linear)	1.70	0.21	8.02	1.03×10^{-15}
Change in rat sightings at home (Quadratic)	-0.20	0.19	-1.01	0.31
Change in rat sightings at home (Cubic)	0.23	0.18	1.23	0.22
Gender (Male)	0.23	0.18	1.28	0.20
Children in home (Yes)	0.02	0.22	0.09	0.93
Age (Linear)	0.02	0.38	0.06	0.95
Age (Quadratic)	0.03	0.33	0.10	0.92
Age (Cubic)	0.08	0.26	0.31	0.76

Age (^4)	-8.88 x 10 ⁻⁴	0.21	-4.06 x 10 ⁻³	1.00
Age (^5)	-0.17	0.19	-0.90	0.37
Renter	-0.50	0.25	-1.97	0.05
Housing (large multi-unit)	-0.24	0.27	-0.90	0.37
Housing (small multi-unit)	0.32	0.20	1.61	0.11
Median household income	0.03	0.09	0.32	0.75

353

354

355 Most respondents described feeling concerned/worried (21% of respondents), afraid
356 (18%), unsanitary (17%), disgusted (14%) or frustrated (14%) in the context of rat encounters.
357 Many respondents described feeling unsanitary, dirty, or unclean because of rats living in their
358 home. Of respondents who expressed feeling frustrated, most were frustrated with their
359 neighbors or other community members for actions they believe attracted rats or were frustrated
360 at the difficulty of eliminating rats (see below).

361

362 *“A home violation. It feels disgusting. I'm concerned for my kids and my home. I'm*
363 *scared they'll come on to us when we sleep.”*

364

365 Many respondents mentioned being concerned for their family's health or safety because
366 of the risk of disease transmission or aggression from rats. Specifically, many respondents

367 mentioned being concerned about their children playing in areas with rats or rat feces or about
368 their pets being exposed to diseases from rats or rat poison.

369

370 *“I have a nice home, and seeing rats in and around it brings me so much anxiety, it's*
371 *hard to put into words. It makes me feel dirty and scared. I am afraid my cats, my kids, or I will*
372 *be bitten and hurt, or that they will bring disease to my home.”*

373

374 Residents who reported observing more rats during the stay-at-home order also described
375 feeling frustrated about rats or worried about rats entering their home more frequently than other
376 respondents. These respondents were also the only group who mentioned feeling unsafe because
377 of rats or being concerned or afraid about the risk of disease from rats.

378

379 *“It makes me feel unsafe from disease.” “I feel scared that my family can get sick.”*

380

381 Another emergent theme in the open-ended responses was changes in resident behavior to
382 avoid encountering rats. Many respondents mentioned feeling uncomfortable using their outdoor
383 spaces such as patios or yards because they were afraid of encountering rats or disgusted by the
384 presence of rat droppings. Several respondents emphasized their discomfort with recreating
385 outdoors after dark when rats are most commonly active.

386

387 *“I fear going out at night as I often encounter rats running through the yard and in the*
388 *street. I am unable to use my back patio after dark.”*

389

390 When describing this discomfort, respondents often mentioned feeling unsafe or
391 unwelcome on their own property. These feelings were often shared in association with
392 perceptions that parties responsible for pest control were being neglectful.

393

394 *“Rats make me feel like I'm not welcome in my own backyard even though it's my yard.*
395 *It's very frustrating when building neglect and slum lords ignore their properties and rats take*
396 *over under garages and buildings. It makes me feel unsafe for my family as we see rats daily in*
397 *our backyard.”*

398

399 *“every evening a rat runs across our backyard and sometimes in our gangway. I don't*
400 *feel safe sitting in my own yard. we have children and it feels unsafe and unclean for them even*
401 *though we maintain cleanliness in/out of our house. they are scary and i'm afraid they may*
402 *become aggressive if hungry.”*

403

404 Several residents highlighted that this discomfort with using private outdoor spaces
405 because of rats felt especially limiting or frustrating during the stay-at-home order because they
406 had few options to safely leave their home or recreate outdoors.

407

408 *“[I feel] Limited as I don't enjoy being in my yard. My quality of life is greatly affected”*

409

410 Adaptive capacity to control rats: “I can't do this by myself”

411

412 Respondents were more likely to report using more rodent control during the stay-at-
413 home order if they observed increased rat sightings in their home ($p < 0.001$), if they were more
414 concerned about rats than they were previously ($p < 0.001$), if they were property owners ($p <$
415 0.001), if they had enough information about rats ($p = 0.03$), and if they had lower incomes ($p =$
416 0.01 ; Table 4). Of respondents who reported observing rats daily, 42% never called 311 and of
417 respondents who reported observing rats weekly, 59% never called 311. Respondents were
418 significantly more likely to call 311 at least once in the past month if they observed an increase
419 in rats in their home ($\beta = 1.77 \pm 0.44$, $p < 0.01$), if they were more concerned about rats than
420 they were previously ($\beta = 1.85 \pm 0.40$, $p < 0.01$), if they strongly agreed that they had enough
421 information to control rats ($\beta = 1.27 \pm 0.37$, $p < 0.01$) and if they were property owners rather
422 than renters ($\beta = -1.14 \pm 0.40$, $p < 0.01$; Table S3). These same variables were significantly
423 associated with calling a pest professional at least once in the past month (Table S4).

424

425 Table 4: Ordinal regression output for variables hypothesized to be associated with a change in
426 engagement with rodent control during the quarantine period.

Variable	β	Std. Error	t value	p value
Change in rat sightings at home (Linear)	1.43	0.25	5.63	1.05×10^{-4}
Change in rat sightings at home (Quadratic)	0.04	0.23	0.18	0.86
Change in rat sightings at home (Cubic)	0.29	0.21	1.40	0.16

Change in concern about rats (Linear)	1.24	0.27	4.52	2.05 x 10 ⁻³
Change in concern about rats (Quadratic)	0.15	0.23	0.63	0.53
Change in concern about rats (Cubic)	-0.07	0.22	-0.32	0.75
Change in concern about rats (^4)	0.06	0.19	0.29	0.77
Information about rats (Linear)	0.61	0.32	1.87	0.06
Information about rats (Quadratic)	0.63	0.29	2.18	0.03
Information about rats (Cubic)	0.18	0.22	0.84	0.40
Information about rats (^4)	-0.12	0.18	-0.67	0.50
Gender (Male)	-0.23	0.20	-1.13	0.26
Children (Yes)	0.16	0.23	0.71	0.48
Age (Linear)	-0.05	0.45	-0.11	0.91
Age (Quadratic)	-0.49	0.39	-1.27	0.21
Age (Cubic)	-0.22	0.31	-0.70	0.48
Age (^4)	0.34	0.25	1.37	0.17
Age (^5)	0.03	0.20	0.14	0.89

Renter	-1.10	0.28	-3.88	1.06 x 10 ⁻⁴
Housing (large multi-unit)	-0.03	0.21	1.14	0.75
Housing (small multi-unit)	0.24	0.09	-2.39	4.42
Median household income	-0.23	0.09	-2.49	0.01

427

428 A common theme that emerged from respondent descriptions was concerns about who is
429 responsible for rat problems and accountable for rodent control. Many respondents expressed
430 that their neighbors attracted rats, often by improperly managing garbage in alleys, or were not
431 active enough in controlling their rat problems. Many respondents also expressed that the city
432 government was ultimately responsible for rodent control and could be more active in their
433 neighborhood.

434

435 *“Note that since the pandemic the neighborhood is getting trashed. People are not*
436 *cleaning after their dogs like they used to n are throwing garbage on sidewalks n lawns. Is this*
437 *part of their rebellion against being told what to do ie stay inside, wear masks, don’t*
438 *congregate? Because in this area all of that is blatantly ignored. So I feel frustrated that these*
439 *new habits encourage rats.”*

440

441 Several others pointed out that they feel alone in dealing with rats and that rats require a
442 community approach for effective rodent control. Many respondents emphasized that they take
443 multiple measures to control rats but they still see rats on their property because of rat burrows or
444 food sources on their neighbor’s property.

445

446 *“I worry about the health and safety of my family but I can’t solely solve this issue as the*
447 *rats burrows are not in my yard but they are simply using my yard as a highway between. This*
448 *is a neighborhood problem that requires everyone including the city to be involved to solve.”*

449

450 Indeed, many respondents mentioned how difficult it is to eradicate rats from their
451 property. Many described spending money on multiple control methods that did not always
452 succeed in reducing rat populations. In these cases, many expressed hopelessness that rats can be
453 eradicated.

454

455 *“The rats in Chicago seem to be smarter than any pest control measures. I’ve tried snap*
456 *and glue traps, poison, and city services. I’ve cleaned regularly, made repairs and attempted to*
457 *seal access points. Evidence of rats still returns.”*

458

459 One resident also mentioned that they were unable to manage rat harborage because they
460 were taking care of others during the COVID-19 pandemic, leading to increased rat problems
461 during the stay-at-home order.

462

463 *“Each spring we do a major clean up. I was a bit delayed this year due to COVID/ Stay*
464 *at home (had to take care of others). My neighbor started seeing multiple rats in my front yard.*
465 *Exterminator came out. Confirmed 4 nests. We are choosing to try to take care of by ourselves.*
466 *1st step: cleared out all vines, ivy, plants. Discovered 4 HUGE dead rats in addition to the*
467 *nests.”*

468

469 Discussion

470

471 In this study, we evaluated whether a stay-at-home order increased resident vulnerability

472 to rat infestations. We found that residents living in proximity to restaurant-dense areas or in

473 small apartment buildings were more likely to report an increase in rat sightings. Residents

474 expressed feeling frustrated with neighbors, restaurants, and restaurant closures for attracting

475 rats. We also found several types of public health risks from rats during the stay-at-home order,

476 including increased exposure to rat feces in the home and feeling unsafe using outdoor spaces.


477 Residents who observed more rats during the stay-at-home order did increase their use of rodent

478 control, however this was more likely for residents with adequate information about rats and

479 lower incomes. Our results suggest that some urban communities may be particularly vulnerable

480 to rat infestations during this stressful and challenging time (Figure 4).

481



482

483 Figure 4: Conceptual framework and summary of main factors found via quantitative and
484 qualitative analysis of survey responses to affect resident exposure to rats (red), impacts of rats
485 on human health or well-being (blue), and adaptive capacity to mitigate rats through engagement
486 with rodent control (green). Text in italics highlights areas for future research.

487

488 Although only a subset of respondents observed rats more frequently during the stay-at-
489 home order, increased rat problems appear to be predictable based on their location and type of
490 residence. Respondents living near restaurant-dense areas were more likely to report an increase
491 in rats because of shifts in garbage availability, supporting trends in rat complaints in other cities
492 [8]. With restaurant closures, garbage would have been less plentiful in commercial dumpsters
493 and, simultaneously, food garbage was likely more abundant in residential areas because
494 residents were eating at home more often. Residents in small apartment buildings were also more
495 likely to report increased rat sightings. Although the mechanism driving this pattern is less clear,
496 these residents share walls and garbage facilities with their neighbors who may vary in their
497 fastidiousness with respect to rats. To prevent rat infestations in shared apartment buildings in
498 restaurant-dense neighborhoods, municipalities could prioritize these areas for proactive rodent
499 control including monitoring, rat abatement, and replacing damaged garbage containers [4].
500 Residents should also be especially vigilant about properly containing garbage and reporting rat
501 sightings to managers. Indeed, many survey respondents emphasized the need for all community
502 members to be actively involved in rat mitigation. Public education campaigns emphasizing rats
503 as a community issue may help promote proactive rat management.

504

505 We also found unequal health risks from rats during the stay-at-home order. Respondents
506 who reported increased rat sightings were also more likely to report increased rat feces in the
507 home. Residents in small apartment buildings in restaurant-dense areas may thus be especially at
508 risk for rat-associated zoonotic exposure. Many respondents also reported exposure to rat urine.
509 For example, one respondent stated that “odor from rat urine” made their home office
510 uninhabitable as a result of past rat problems. For many Chicago residents, home offices became
511 primary work locations during the stay-at-home order. Home environments that contain rat feces
512 or urine can expose residents to a variety of zoonotic pathogens such as *Leptospira interrogans*,
513 Seoul hantavirus, and infectious organisms such as *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* spp. [9, 26].

514

515 Perhaps more concerning, we found that rat bites were mainly reported from Chicago’s
516 South Side neighborhoods. One respondent who reported a rat bite described themselves as
517 “Petrified” and another sought medical attention because of this contact with rats. Although only
518 four respondents reported rat bites, we received disproportionately fewer responses from the
519 South Side, highlighting the need for more information about resident experiences with rats from
520 all Chicago areas. This region of the city is notorious for lower incomes and poorer economic
521 prospects [27], and 93% of South Side residents are Black or African American [28]. These
522 results thus contribute to a growing awareness that multiple aspects of the pandemic have
523 disproportionately impacted Chicago’s Black communities [29].

524

525 In addition to public health risks from potential zoonotic exposure, rat infestations during
526 the stay-at-home order may negatively impact resident well-being by restricting their activities.
527 For many Chicago residents, the stay-at-home order caused dramatic changes to their daily

528 routine and use of their home. Staying at home can have negative impacts for resident mental
529 health, such as increased depressive symptoms, symptoms of Generalized Anxiety Disorder, and
530 acute stress [30]. While staying at home, household features such as access to a private yard or
531 patio become more important as a determinant of health and well-being [31]. For example,
532 access to outdoor spaces may help to mitigate the negative impacts of staying at home on
533 residents' mental health by providing safe sociable spaces [32]. Many respondents described
534 feeling uncomfortable or unsafe using outdoor spaces out of fear that they would encounter rats
535 or come in contact with rat droppings. For those residents who are negatively impacted by
536 staying at home and experiencing rat problems during the stay-at-home order, the relief that
537 private outdoor spaces can offer may be reduced. Controlling rat populations may therefore
538 mitigate physical and mental health risks for residents during this challenging time.

539

540 Although residents with increased rat problems were more likely to increase their use of
541 rodent control, knowledge and income appear to be important mediating factors. The city of
542 Chicago receives tens of thousands of rat complaints per year [5]. However, most survey
543 respondents did not report complaints about the rats they saw during the stay-at-home order,
544 potentially because they are not aware of the risks from rats, aware of the 311 rat complaint
545 program, or are not aware that the city will abate rats in their alley for free. The high proportion
546 of respondents who did not report rat complaints might also explain the lack of correlation
547 between our survey results and trends in 311 rat complaints. Beyond the need for information
548 about rats, residents might not engage with municipal rodent control if they do not believe the
549 city will act in response to their rat complaints. Surprisingly, increased use of rodent control was
550 associated with lower incomes, even while controlling for the frequency of rat sightings.

551 Residents in lower income neighborhoods may be more likely to take on the responsibility and
552 cost of rodent control themselves rather than rely on neighbors or the city. In Baltimore, low-
553 income residents in perceived problem rat areas had less confidence that their neighbors or the
554 city would address rat infestations [2]. Regardless of cause, rat control could impose a monetary
555 burden for some communities during a period of record high unemployment [33] and economic
556 disruption [31]. Public education programs and greater understanding of resident attitudes toward
557 rodent control is therefore needed to increase participation with free municipal services.

558

559 Our results suggest avenues for future research to understand the impacts of rat
560 infestations on resident health and well-being. Of note, our sample only included residents with
561 internet access and residents with rat issues may have been more motivated to participate in the
562 study. We received a disproportionately high amount of responses from the North Side of
563 Chicago, potentially because of the aforementioned factors. Future surveys that are mailed to
564 randomly sampled households may provide more robust estimates of rat infestations across the
565 entire city. Importantly, with our survey, it was difficult to determine whether respondents
566 observed a true increase in rat abundance or a perceived increase because residents were
567 spending more time at home. Residents who spent more time outside in their neighborhood were
568 more likely to report increased rat sightings in or around their home (Table S3), suggesting that
569 sightings were likely not only driven by time spent indoors. Future studies that link survey
570 responses with local rat abundance could tease apart actual and perceived risks from rats in urban
571 neighborhoods. Such studies could also document health outcomes associated with rats, which
572 we were unable to examine due to other health concerns during the pandemic.

573

574 Conclusions

575

576 Our results suggest that more frequent rat encounters may be an unanticipated public
577 health concern during periods of social distancing to mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic. Some
578 urban communities may be more vulnerable to rat infestations based on their location, housing,
579 and income. For residents in small apartment buildings in restaurant-dense areas, proactive
580 support may be needed in the form of rat abatement or information about rats. Targeted support
581 may help minimize rat-associated risks such as zoonotic pathogen exposure or restricted use of
582 outdoor spaces while staying at home. Such measures will help protect public health in cities
583 struggling with rat infestations and the COVID-19 pandemic around the world.

584

585 Declarations

586

587 Ethics approval and consent to participate

588 This research involving human subjects was performed in accordance with the Declaration of
589 Helsinki. The Lincoln Park Zoo Institutional Review Board (reference number IRB00009278)
590 approved our informed consent protocol and deemed this study exempt from the requirements of
591 45 CFR 46 as per 45 CFR 46.104(d)(2) of U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
592 regulations.

593

594 Availability of data and materials

595 A summarized version of the datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available
596 from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

597

598 Competing interests

599 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

600

601 Funding

602 This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No.

603 1923882. The funding body played no role in the design of the study or the collection, analysis,

604 and interpretation of data or in writing the manuscript

605

606 Author' contributions

607 MHM, KB, SBM, and DG designed the study. MHM led the quantitative analysis with assistance

608 from all authors. MHM, KB, JB, DM, and PW contributed to the thematic analysis. MHM wrote

609 the manuscript with assistance from all authors.

610

611 Acknowledgments

612 We wish to thank the survey participants for sharing their experiences and the city officials and

613 community organizations who shared our survey. We also thank Lydia Hopper, Lisa Hyatt,

614 Elizabeth Lehrer, Cria Kay, Mason Fidino, and Kim Fake for their help with survey refinement

615 and the volunteers who piloted our survey. Icons used in Figure 4 are from the Noun Project and

616 created by Adrien Coquet, iconosphere, Maxim Kulikov, Alice Design, Vectors Point, Daryl

617 Vandemont, Guilherme Furtado, and Pavel Pavlov.

618

619 References

620

621 1. Himsworth CG, Parsons KL, Jardine C, Patrick DM. Rats, cities, people, and pathogens: A
622 systematic review and narrative synthesis of literature regarding the ecology of rat-associated
623 zoonoses in urban centers. *Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis.* 2013;13:349–59.

624 2. German D, Latkin CA. Exposure to urban rats as a community stressor among low-income
625 urban residents. *J Community Psychol.* 2016;44:249–62.

626 3. Pimentel D. Environmental and economic costs of vertebrate species invasions into the United
627 States. *Manag Vertebr Invasive Species Proc an Int Symp.* 2007;:1–8.

628 4. Singleton GR, Leirs H, Hinds LA, Zhang Z. Ecologically-based management of rodent pests –
629 re-evaluating our approach to an old problem. In: *Ecologically-based Management of Rodent*
630 *Pests.* Canberra, Australia: Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR);
631 1999. p. 17–29.

632 5. Murray MH, Fyffe R, Fidino M, Byers KA, Ríos MJ, Mulligan MP, et al. Public complaints
633 reflect rat relative abundance across diverse urban neighborhoods. *Front Ecol Evol.* 2018;6:189.

634 6. BBC News. Coronavirus: Why more rats are being spotted during quarantine. 2020.
635 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-52177587>. Accessed 7 Apr 2020.

636 7. CDC. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Rodent Control. Centers for Disease Control
637 and Prevention. 2020. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/rodents.html>. Accessed
638 21 May 2020.

639 8. Parsons MH, Kiyokawa Y, Richardson JL, Stryjek R, Byers KA, Himsworth CG, et al. Rats
640 and the COVID-19 pandemic: Early data on the global emergence of rats in response to social
641 distancing. *medRxiv.* 2020.

642 9. Murray MH, Fidino M, Fyffe R, Byers KA, Pettengill JB, Sondgeroth KS, et al. City

- 643 sanitation and socioeconomics predict rat zoonotic infection across diverse neighbourhoods.
644 Zoonoses Public Health. 2020;:1–11.
- 645 10. Ayral F, Artois J, Zilber AL, Widén F, Pounder KC, Aubert D, et al. The relationship
646 between socioeconomic indices and potentially zoonotic pathogens carried by wild Norway rats:
647 A survey in Rhône, France (2010–2012). *Epidemiol Infect.* 2015;143:586–99.
- 648 11. Rael RC, Peterson AC, Ghersi BM, Childs J, Blum MJ. Disturbance, reassembly, and disease
649 risk in socioecological systems. *Ecohealth.* 2016;13:450–5.
- 650 12. Turner BL, Kasperson RE, Matsone PA, McCarthy JJ, Corell RW, Christensene L, et al. A
651 framework for vulnerability analysis in sustainability science. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*
652 2003;100:8074–9.
- 653 13. Hunt B, Whitman S. *Black: White Health Disparities in the United States and Chicago: 1990-*
654 *2010. J Racial Ethn Heal Disparities.* 2015;2:93–100.
- 655 14. Pritzker J. Executive Order 2020-10: Executive order in response to COVID-19 (COVID-19
656 Executive Order no. 8). Government of Illinois. 2020.
657 <https://www2.illinois.gov/Pages/Executive-Orders/ExecutiveOrder2020-10.aspx>. Accessed 20
658 Mar 2020.
- 659 15. U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey, 2018 American Community Survey 1-
660 Year Estimates. 2020. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>. Accessed 15 Jun 2020.
- 661 16. Brenner BL, Markowitz S, Rivera M, Romero H, Weeks M, Sanchez E, et al. Integrated pest
662 management in an urban community: A successful partnership for prevention. *Environ Health*
663 *Perspect.* 2003;111:1649–53.
- 664 17. Byers K, Lee MJ, Patrick DM, Himsworth CG. Rats about town: A systematic review of rat
665 movement in urban ecosystems. *Front Ecol Evol.* 2019;7:1–22.

- 666 18. Chicago Department of Public Health. Restaurant and Food Service Inspection Reports.
667 Healthy Chicago. 2020.
668 https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/cdph/provdrs/healthy_restaurants/svcs/restaurant_food_in
669 [pection.html](https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/cdph/provdrs/healthy_restaurants/svcs/restaurant_food_in). Accessed 31 Jan 2020.
- 670 19. Walsh MG. Rat sightings in New York City are associated with neighborhood
671 sociodemographics, housing characteristics, and proximity to open public space. *PeerJ*.
672 2014;2:e533. doi:10.7717/peerj.533.
- 673 20. QGIS Development Team. QGIS Geographic Information System. Open Source Geospatial
674 Foundation Project. 2020. <http://qgis.org>.
- 675 21. Nowell LS, Norris JM, White DE, Moules NJ. Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the
676 trustworthiness criteria. *Int J Qual Methods*. 2017;16:1–13.
- 677 22. Byers KA, Cox SM, Lam R, Himsworth CG. “They’re always there”: Resident experiences
678 of living with rats in a disadvantaged urban neighbourhood. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19:1–13.
- 679 23. Dedoose Development Team. Dedoose Version 8.0.35, web application for managing,
680 analyzing, and presenting qualitative and mixed method research data. 2018. www.dedoose.com.
- 681 24. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development for R v.1.1.453. 2016.
682 <http://www.rstudio.com/>.
- 683 25. Venables W, Ripley B. *Modern applied statistics with S*. Fourth. New York: Springer; 2002.
- 684 26. Himsworth CG, Zabek E, Desruisseau A, Parmley EJ, Reid-Smith R, Jardine CM, et al.
685 Prevalence and characteristics of *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* spp. in the feces of wild urban
686 Norway and black rats (*Rattus norvegicus* and *Rattus rattus*) from an inner-city neighborhood of
687 Vancouver, Canada. *J Wildl Dis*. 2015;51:589–600.
- 688 27. Theodos B, Hangen E, Meixell B, Rajasekaran P. Neighborhood disparities in investment

- 689 flows in Chicago. 2019.
- 690 [https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/100261/neighborhood_disparities_in_invest](https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/100261/neighborhood_disparities_in_investment_flows_in_chicago_1.pdf)
- 691 [ment_flows_in_chicago_1.pdf](https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/100261/neighborhood_disparities_in_investment_flows_in_chicago_1.pdf).
- 692 28. U.S. Census Bureau. Estimates of resident population change and rankings: July 1, 2017 to
- 693 July 1, 2018 – United States – combined statistical area. American FactFinder. 2018.
- 694 https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=PEP_2014_PE
- 695 [PANNCHG.US41PRandprodType=table](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=PEP_2014_PANNCHG.US41PRandprodType=table). Accessed 2 Jun 2020.
- 696 29. Kim SJ, Bostwick W. Social vulnerability and racial inequality in COVID-19 deaths in
- 697 Chicago. *Heal Educ Behav*. 2020;47:509–13.
- 698 30. Marroquín B, Vine V, Morgan R. Mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic: Effects of
- 699 stay-at-home policies, social distancing behavior, and social resources. *Psychiatry Res J*.
- 700 2020;293:113419.
- 701 31. Mikolai J, Keenan K, Kulu H. Intersecting household level health and socio-economic
- 702 vulnerabilities and the COVID-19 crisis: An analysis from the UK. *SSM - Popul Heal*.
- 703 2020;12:100628. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2020.100628.
- 704 32. Mehta V. The new proxemics: COVID-19, social distancing, and sociable space. *J Urban*
- 705 *Des*. 2020;:1–6. doi:10.1080/13574809.2020.1785283.
- 706 33. IDES. Illinois unemployment rate rises to 16.4% amid COVID-19 Pandemic. 2020.
- 707
- 708 Supplementary Files
- 709
- 710 Supplementary File 1: Survey questionnaire developed for this study.
- 711 Supplementary File 2: Supplemental tables containing model outputs (Tables S1, S2, S3, S4) and

712 a figure showing the relationship between the change in rat sightings and sightings of rat feces in
713 the home (Figure S1).