

1 **Title**

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

4 **Subtitle**

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

6 **Authors**

7 Godwin Deku (GD)<sup>1,2,3,5</sup> [deku.godwin@student.usm.my](mailto:deku.godwin@student.usm.my)

8 Emmanuel Younge (EY)<sup>1</sup> [youngeemma@gmail.com](mailto:youngeemma@gmail.com)

9 Stephen L. Doggett (SLD)<sup>4</sup> [Stephen.Doggett@health.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Stephen.Doggett@health.nsw.gov.au)

10 Rofela Combey (RC)<sup>5</sup> [rcombey@ucc.edu.gh](mailto:rcombey@ucc.edu.gh)

11 Isaac Kwame Badu (IKB)<sup>6</sup> [ibadu@ed.ac.uk](mailto:ibadu@ed.ac.uk)

12 Mercy Amo Paintsil (MAP)<sup>7</sup> [mpaintsil21sw@sph.uhas.edu.gh](mailto:mpaintsil21sw@sph.uhas.edu.gh)

13 Smile Kwabena Ametsi (SKA)<sup>1,2</sup> [smiledoe2019@gmail.com](mailto:smiledoe2019@gmail.com)

14 Angela Ama Wills (AAW)<sup>8</sup> [willsangela21@gmail.com](mailto:willsangela21@gmail.com)

15 Rabiatu Bonnoua Bonney (RBB)<sup>8</sup> [rbonney001@st.ug.edu.gh](mailto:rbonney001@st.ug.edu.gh)

16 Kwabena Owusu Amoah (KOA)<sup>1,2</sup> [owusuowusu22@gmail.com](mailto:owusuowusu22@gmail.com)

17 **Affiliations**

18 <sup>1</sup>Department of Environmental Health, Accra School of Hygiene, Ministry of Sanitation and  
19 Water Resources, Ghana<sup>1</sup>

20 <sup>2</sup>Ministry of Health, Ghana

21 <sup>3</sup>Centre for Chemical Biology, University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

22 <sup>4</sup>Department of Medical Entomology, Westmead Hospital, Sydney, Australia

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

25 <sup>6</sup>Global Change Research Institute, School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Scotland,  
26 UK

27 <sup>7</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ghana

28 <sup>8</sup>Department of Psychology, College of Humanities, University of Ghana, Ghana

29

### 30 **Correspondent Authors**

31 \*Email: [deku.godwin@student.usm.my](mailto:deku.godwin@student.usm.my) (G.D)

32 Orcid Id: 0000-0001-6917-6256

33

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

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

36

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

38 Orcid Id: 0000-0003-4645-4588

39

## 40 **Abstract**

### 41 **Introduction**

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

## 46 **Method/Findings**

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

## 59 **Conclusion**

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

## 66 **Author Summary**

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

## 81 **Introduction**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 173 **Materials and Methods**

### 174 **Ethical Clearance**

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



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

## 183 **Study area**

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

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

## 200 **Study design and data collection instrument**

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

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

## 210 **Data collection**

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

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

228 The questionnaire was divided into five sections. The first section collected data on socio-  
229 demographic characteristics of the study respondents. Data such as region of the respondent,  
230 gender, ethnicity, age, education, profession, monthly income, and marital status were recorded.

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

## 244 **Data processing and statistical analysis**

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

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

## 263 **Results**

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

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

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

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

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

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

283

## 284 **Rat meat consumption**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

310

311 Table 3. Sociodemographic variables and rat meat consumption

312

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



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

313

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

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

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

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

349  
 350 Table 4. Multivariable logistics regression analysis of sociodemographic predictors and rat meat  
 351 consumption in the participants  
 352

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

353

### 354 Perception of disease risks associated with rats

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

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

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

377

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

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

378

379

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

#### 381 **associated with rats**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

406

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

409

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

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

410

411

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

415

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

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

432

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

436

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

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



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

452

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

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

454

455

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

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

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

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

469

## 470 **Discussion**

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

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

492 perception of risks about rat meat consumption and rat infestation in urban environments were  
493 generally low among the participants allowing us to reject our hypothesis that urban dwellers in  
494 Ghana have high risks perceptions pertaining to peridomestic rats. We surmised that this low  
495 perception may have contributed to the limited efforts made by the public to control rats.

496 Our literature search revealed a publication scarcity on the consumption rate of rats in various  
497 country settings and regions. Previous research primarily focused on either rodent or bush meat  
498 consumption in general, therefore our findings were discussed in that regard. In our study,  
499 approximately 65% consumed rodents. This finding aligns with recent studies in Ghana indicating  
500 that 67% of Ghanaians [28] prefer bush meat, including rodents, due to the flavor and taste.  
501 However, the rate of rodent consumption was higher in Guinea, West Africa, where a study showed  
502 that 91.5% of the population considers rodents as an important protein source [24] and also that  
503 they are common and easy to obtain at mere/no cost implication. In the present research, we found  
504 that approximately 35% of rodent meat consumers also consumed rat meat, and 26% will consume  
505 commensal rat in their neighbourhood when available. These findings closely coincide with a  
506 related study in Nigeria, which found 33.5% and 31.1% of the study respondents interviewed from  
507 urban and peri-urban neighborhood respectively consume urban rodents [23].

508 Preferences for consuming wild meats in Ghana and across Africa are influenced by various  
509 sociodemographic factors [57,62,63]. In this study, we identified gender, education, sex, age,  
510 religion, ethnicity, region, income, and profession as independently associated with rat meat  
511 consumption. Rat meat consumption correlated with religious beliefs with higher consumption  
512 rates in Christians than Muslims aligning with the report by [28] which could be attributed to their  
513 religious beliefs. Additionally, cultural beliefs among different ethnic communities contribute to  
514 varying levels of bush rat meat consumption. Particularly, high rat meat consumption was observed

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

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

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

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

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



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

## 619 **Conclusion**

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

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

## 635 **Acknowledgement**

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

## 641 **Reference**

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

651

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

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

654

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

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

657

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

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

660

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

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

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

664

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

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

667

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

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

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

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

672

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

676

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

680

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

684

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

688

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

691

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

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

- 736 27. Teye M, Fuseini A, Odoi FN. Consumer acceptance, Carcass and sensory characteristics of  
737 meats of farmed and wild cane rats (*Thryonomys swinderianus*). Sci Afr. 2020; 8:e00461.  
738 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2020.e00461>  
739
- 740 28. Bannor RK. Bushmeat in Ghana: Consumer profiles may point the way to conservation. The  
741 Conservation. 2021.  
742
- 743 29. Jones KE, Patel NG, Levy MA, Storeygard A, Balk D, Gittleman JL, Daszak P. Global trends  
744 in emerging infectious diseases. Nature 2008; 451(7181):990-993.  
745 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06536>  
746
- 747 30. Strand TM, Lundkvist Å. Rat-borne diseases at the horizon. A systematic review on infectious  
748 agents carried by rats in Europe 1995–2016. Infect Ecol Epidemiol. 2019; 9(1):1553461.  
749 <https://doi.org/10.1080/20008686.2018.1553461>  
750
- 751 31. Jahan NA, Lindsey LL, Larsen PA. The role of peridomestic rodents as reservoirs for  
752 zoonotic foodborne pathogens. Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2021; 21(3):133-48.  
753 <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2020.2640>  
754

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



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

796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816

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

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

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

46. Didelot X, Whittles LK, Hall I. Model-based analysis of an outbreak of bubonic plague in Cairo in 1801. *J R Soc. Interface*. 2017; 14(131):20170160. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2017.0160>

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

817 48. Dominguez JE, Rosario L, Juliana S, Redondo LM, Chacana PA, Regino C, et al. Rats as  
818 sources of multidrug-resistant Enterobacteriaceae in animal production environments. *Zoonoses*  
819 and Public Health. 2023; 70(7):627-35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.13071>  
820

821 49. Sonola VS, Misinzo G, Matee MI. Occurrence of multidrug-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*  
822 among humans, rodents, chickens, and household soils in Karatu, Northern Tanzania. *Int. J.*  
823 *Environ. Res. Public Health*. 2021;18(16):8496. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168496>  
824

825 50. Furness LE, Campbell A, Zhang L, Gaze WH, McDonald RA. Wild small mammals as  
826 sentinels for the environmental transmission of antimicrobial resistance. *Environ. Res.* 2017;  
827 154:28-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2016.12.014>  
828

829 51. Le Huy H, Koizumi N, Ung TT, Le TT, Nguyen HL, Hoang PV, Nguyen CN, et al. Antibiotic-  
830 resistant *Escherichia coli* isolated from urban rodents in Hanoi, Vietnam. *J Vet Med Sc.* 2020;  
831 82(5):653-660. <https://doi.org/10.1292/jvms.19-0697>  
832

833 52. Byers KA, Lee MJ, Patrick DM, Himsworth CG. Rats about town: A systematic review of rat  
834 movement in urban ecosystems. *Front Ecol Evol.* 2019; 7:13.  
835 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00013>  
836

837 53. Brunton CF, Macdonald DW, Buckle AP. Behavioural resistance towards poison baits in  
838 brown rats, *Rattus norvegicus*. *Appl Anim Behav Sci*. 1993; 38(2):159-74.  
839 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591\(93\)90063-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591(93)90063-U)  
840

841 54. Krijger IM, Strating M, van Gent-Pelzer M, Van Der Lee TA, Burt SA, Schroeten FH, et al.  
842 Large-scale identification of rodenticide resistance in *Rattus norvegicus* and *Mus musculus* in the  
843 Netherlands based on *Vkorc1* codon 139 mutations. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2023; 79(3):989-995.  
844 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.7261>  
845

846 55. Foya YR, Mgeni CP, Kadigi RM, Kimaro MH, Hassan SN. The knowledge about the potential  
847 health risks of illegal bushmeat activities among local communities adjacent to Western Nyerere  
848 National Park, Tanzania. *Open Journal of Ecology* 2023; 13(1):22-36.  
849 <https://doi.org/10.4236/oje.2023.131003>  
850

851 56. Suu-Ire R, Obodai E, Bel-Nono SO, Ampofo WK, Mazet JA, Goldstein T, et al. Surveillance  
852 for potentially zoonotic viruses in rodent and bat populations and behavioral risk in an agricultural  
853 settlement in Ghana. *One health outlook*. 2022; 4(1):6. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s42522-022-00061-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s42522-022-00061-2)  
854 [2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s42522-022-00061-2)  
855

856 57. Kamins AO, Restif O, Ntiamo-Baidu Y, Suu-Ire R, Hayman DT, Cunningham AA, et al.  
857 Uncovering the fruit bat bushmeat commodity chain and the true extent of fruit bat hunting in  
858 Ghana, West Africa. *Biolog Conserv*. 2011; 144(12):3000-8.  
859 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2011.09.003>

860

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

864

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

867

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

872

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

877

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

881

882 63. Willcox AS, Nambu DM. Wildlife hunting practices and bushmeat dynamics of the Banyangi  
883 and Mbo people of Southwestern Cameroon. *Biolog. Conserv.* 2007; 134(2):251-61.  
884 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.08.016>

885

886 64. Suwannarong K, Chapman RS, Lantican C, Michaelides T, Zimicki S. Hunting, food  
887 preparation, and consumption of rodents in Lao PDR. *PLoS One.* 2015; 10(7):e0133150.  
888 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0133150>

889

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

892

893 66. Van Vliet N, Nebesse C, Nasi R. Bushmeat consumption among rural and urban children  
894 from Province Orientale, Democratic Republic of Congo. *Oryx.* 2015; 49(1):165-74.  
895 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605313000549>

896

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

900

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

903

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

907

908 70. Louisiana Department of Health, Hantavirus infections. 2017.  
909 [www.infectiousdisease.dhh.louisiana.gov](http://www.infectiousdisease.dhh.louisiana.gov)

910

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

915

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

920

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

924

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

927







