Novel Community-Based Rabies Surveillance (CBRS) In Urban Lilongwe City, Malawi

Precious Innocent Mastala[¶1,2*], Melaku Tefera[¶1†], Edson Chiweta[¶2], Madeline Nyamwanza[¶2], Thoko Kapalamula [¶1*]

[1]*Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Lilongwe, Malawi*
[2]*Lilongwe Society for the Protection and Care of Animals, Lilongwe, Malawi*

*Corresponding Authors

Precious Innocent Mastala

Email: preciousmastala@gmail.com

Thoko Flav Kapalamula

Email: tkapalamula@luanar.ac.mw

[¶]All authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Introduction: Rabies is a neglected tropical disease that is endemic to Malawi, killing almost 500 people every year. Domestic dogs are implicated as the main reservoir for rabies. However, there is limited capacity to detect canine rabies in the country, particularly in urban areas where there are high dog densities. The Lilongwe Society for the Protection and Care of Animals designed and implemented a canine community-based rabies surveillance (CBRS) in Lilongwe city between January and June 2020.

Objectives: This study assessed the effectiveness of the CBRS program in canine rabies detection compared to the traditional passive routine surveillance data of the years between 2015 and 2019. Furthermore, the study determined rabies Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP) issuance trends in emergent cases.

Methods: Suspected rabies cases were recorded and followed. The dogs that were found alive were quarantined for 10 days for observation. Brain samples were collected post-mortem for direct-fluorescent antibody testing for antigen detection.

Results: There were 610 suspected cases, and only 217 (39.2%) were followable. Out of these, 150 (62.8%) were followed. A total of 9 dogs (6%) tested positive, and there were 11 (7.3%) probable cases. This represents a 4.97-fold increase in rabies cases detected compared to the pre-surveillance period, with a resultant of 3.33 cases/month from 0.67 cases/month. The program also helped to initiate PEP treatment in exposed people. There were 141 bite victims and 136 (96.5%) reported for PEP. Out of these, 89 (65.4%) were from healthy bites and 33 (24.4%) from suspect cases indicating a 63.97% to 88.24% rate of irrelevant PEP issuance.

Conclusion: The CBRS program established relevance in increasing canine rabies detection and subsequent prevention of related human infections. It also established a high rate of PEP issuance following healthy bites. Therefore, we recommend enhanced multi-sectoral collaborative efforts aimed at increasing rabies detection and optimizing PEP usage.

Keywords: *Community-based rabies surveillance, Lilongwe, Malawi, One Health, Post-Exposure Prophylaxis, Rabies*

One Health Impact Statement

This novel implementation research features a One Health approach, bringing together various stakeholders from the public and private sectors, as well as the community, in the effort to eradicate rabies. This collaboration provides synergy towards accelerating the identification of rabid animals in the community and effectively guides people to take the necessary precautions including prompt Post-Exposure Prophylaxis in cases of exposure, ultimately promoting health at the human-animal interface.

1.0. Introduction

Rabies is a viral zoonotic encephalitis infection of the central nervous system of homeothermic animals, including humans, that usually ends in the death of the host once clinical symptoms appear[1]–[3]. The virus is usually transmitted to humans primarily by bites, scratches, or another contact with saliva (Health Protection Agency, 2013).

In Malawi, the disease is a neglected, endemic and notifiable disease that causes an estimated 500 human deaths[4], [5]. About 99% of these human rabies cases are mostly attributed to dogs bites [2], [3]. However, rabies can easily be prevented and controlled by increasing public awareness, vaccinating 70–80% of the dog population and prompt rabies PEP [3], [6]. Thus, controlling dog rabies substantially reduces human exposure to the virus by prevention at source of most human deaths from this cause [2].

To achieve the global and country goal of eliminating canine rabies-related human deaths by 2030, robust, effective and coordinated surveillance of the disease is crucial in comprehending the disease burden and control efforts impact [2], [3], [7], [8]. Despite this need, Malawi currently lacks a nationwide instituted rabies surveillance program, relying instead on local initiatives under the auspices of non-governmental organizations such as the Lilongwe Society for the Protection and Care of Animals (LSPCA) and Mission Rabies which are in a few districts [9]. The country is unable to implement a strong surveillance system because of the high cost involved. As a result, it mostly relies on passive reporting systems, a common practice in low and middle-income countries [2], [7], [8]. However, these systems have a slow response time for rabies diagnosis and are prone to misdiagnosis, making it difficult to efficiently allocate limited resources like animal vaccines and PEP and effectively implement control measures through public awareness campaigns [7].

The inadequate reporting of the disease, caused by a lack of diagnostic facilities and difficulties with the reporting system, leads to frequent misdiagnosis and subsequent underestimation of the actual burden of the disease [2], [4]. To address this issue to some extent, there is a nationwide One Health approach to addressing the disease which involves coordination between state animal health and public health departments. This coordination ensures that potential human-animal exposures are reported to the veterinary department for advice and follow-up of the suspected case where possible. Depending on the case, the veterinarian recommends PEP treatment for the victim.

Employing the community-based rabies surveillance (CBRS), has been successful in increasing animal rabies and reflecting the true burden of the diseases in several countries including Haiti and Kenya [7], [8]. This approach presents opportunities in improving collaboration across sectors and the community and rapid identification and response to rabies cases [10]. To improve canine rabies detection in Malawi, a similar program was designed and implemented under the

LSPCA. This paper details the process of developing and implementing the program; quantifying its impact on canine rabies cases detection (by comparing the CBRS cases to the pre-surveillance period (2015–2019) cases) and assessing the rabies Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP) issuance trends.

2.0. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Area

The study was conducted in urban Lilongwe city (Figure *1*). Lilongwe is the capital and most populated city of Malawi. Located at latitude -13.96692 and longitude 33.78725, it sits at an altitude of 1,050 m (3,440 ft) above the sea level. The city is located in the central region of Malawi and as of 2018, it had a total population of 989,318 people, residing in 230,265 households [11]. The urban area is divided into 58 areas that include residential, commercial, and industrial areas.



Figure 1: The study area: Lilongwe City with its designated areas of residence. The numbers show the specific area names.

2.2. CBRS Design and Implementing Taskforce

The program was executed by a diverse coalition of stakeholders, including the Lilongwe Society for the Protection and Care of Animals (LSPCA) (Lead), the Lilongwe District Animal Health and Livestock Development Office (DAHLDO), the Lilongwe District Health Office (DHO), the Lilongwe City Council (LCC), and the Central Veterinary Laboratory (CVL).

The taskforce comprised of four rabies project officers (RPOS) with a background in para-veterinary medicine, a veterinarian from the LSPCA, and personnel from the CVL, DHO, LCC, DAHLDO, and Community Rabies Action Groups (RAGs). The RAGs brought together a range

of influential stakeholders, including community leaders, community police, human and animal health surveillance officers, church leaders, school managers, and market vendors' association chairpersons. The DAHLDO reported cases of suspected human-animal exposures, the DHO reported cases of human exposures seeking post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) at the hospital; the LCC also assisted in reporting cases of road killed dogs; and CVL conducted the rabies testing.

2.2.1. Implementation, Case Management Procedures and Analysis

Data collection for the program was carried out between January and June 2020. In preparation for the program's implementation, the Rabies Project Officers (RPOs) received rabies PEP followed by training on the principles of rabies and its prevention in both animals and humans, and in animal rabies surveillance and bite investigation in December 2019.

To facilitate the reporting and management of suspected rabies cases, a toll-free number (172) was established under Telecommunications Malawi (TNM), and the program was widely publicized in the communities through various channels, including radio, television, newspapers, flyers, and other printed materials.

Based on 2018 data on dog bites from the DAHLD and rabies PEP treatments from the DHO, nine areas including were identified as hotspots for human exposure to rabies. These areas were strategically selected for the deployment of RPOs. The RPOs conducted regular patrols while offering pet (dog and cat) vaccination services in these areas to identify any suspected cases of rabies in animals. Additionally, the RPOs followed up on reported cases of exposure from the DAHLD and DHO, both by phone and through physical visits to the reported locations, regardless of whether the locations were within the designated hotspots.

The follow-up efforts were done to locate the infected animal and all cases were diagnosed and defined of their rabies status based on the case definition in the box (

Table *1*) as in Haiti [8].

Table 1: Animal Rabies Surveillance Program Case Definitions

Animal Rabies Surveillance Program Case Definitions

Confirmed Rabies Cases

- Diagnostic confirmation of rabies virus by Direct Fluorescent Antibody Test (dFAT)

Probable Rabies Cases

- Animals that were not tested for rabies and
- Animals that died during the observation
- Animals that did not pass observation (escaped animals, not found by further investigation)
- Animals that developed one or more clinical signs and died after being bitten by a suspect/probable/confirmed rabid animal

Suspect Rabies Cases

- Animals reported to animal rabies Project Officers that could not be assessed or

- Animals that had less than 2 signs of rabies and test results were inconclusive
- Animals that died after being hit on the road

Non-cases

- Animals that are healthy after the 14-day observation period or
- Animals that test negative by dFAT

In accordance with the initial case definition outlined in Table 1, any animal that does not display obvious clinical symptoms of rabies was placed under home quarantine for a minimum of 10 days. During this time, the animal was monitored for any changes that may indicate the presence of rabies. If at any point during the quarantine period or subsequent investigation, the animal exhibited clinical symptoms, it was humanely captured and transported to the LSPCA Clinic for euthanasia following the protocols recommended by the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) [12]. Then a brain sample was collected, properly packages and tagged with a unique identifier, and transported to the CVL for rabies testing using the direct Fluorescent Antibody Test (dFAT).

The laboratory results were disseminated to stakeholders through a WhatsApp forum, a telephone call to related bite victims, and through the health facility, or in-person communication if telephone communication was not feasible. If the test results were positive for rabies, the bite victim was encouraged to either initiate or continue PEP treatment. If the test results were positive for rabies, the bite victim was encouraged to either initiate or continue PEP treatment.

To evaluate the program against the pre-surveillance period, diagnostic test data for rabies from the CVL from 2015 to 2020 was collected.

Analysis of the data was conducted in SPSS Version 23, R, and Microsoft Excel.



Figure 2: The CBRS Case Reporting and Investigation structure infographic

3.0. Results

During the surveillance period, a total of 610 cases were reported, out of which 239 (39.2%) were considered followable. Further, 150 of these followable cases (24.6% of the total cases and 62.8% of the followable cases) were followed up on (.

Figure 4: Outcomes of the animal investigations conducted

). The 150 cases that were followed were further classified into 9 positive cases (6%), 11 probable cases (7.3%), 33 suspect cases (22%), and 97 non-cases (64.6%). This implies that the program contributed to 20 positive and probable cases, which is 13.6% of the total cases.

The majority of animals involved in human bites were dogs, with only 2 cat bite cases reported. One confirmed donkey case was detected through the surveillance, but it was not included in the study as it was outside the area of study (**Error! Reference source not found.**).



Figure 3: Figure shows the number of cases that were reported during the study period versus the cases that were followable and actually followed. It also splits the followed cases into the actual case definitions. Not that NA represents a category of cases that were not followed.

Figure 4: Outcomes of the animal investigations conducted



Table 2: Animals followed during the investigations

Species	**Case Review**			
	Non-Cases	**Confirmed**	**Probable**	**Suspect**
Dog	96(64.9%)	9 (6.1%)	10(6.8%)	33(22.3%)
Cat	1 (50%)	0(0%)	1(50%)	0(0%)
Total **(n (%))**	97 (64.7)	9(6%)	11(7.3%)	33(22%)

The most common signs of the infection among all defined cases as shown in Table 3, were, unusual aggression and biting, with exception of Paresis/paralysis (Odds Ratio (OR)=.039-.148 and .045-.159), hypersalivation (OR=2.994-71.4 and 3.46-66.667), restlessness (OR=2.188-29.411 and 1.656-45.454) and anorexia (OR=2.105-62.5 and 236-22.727) which were common among confirmed and probable cases respectively. Lethargy (OR=6.758-29.4) and hydrophobia (OR=6.757-25.64) were among the confirmed cases only.

Table 3: Odds ratios of the clinical signs observed in suspected animals by case status during the investigations

Observed Signs	Case Review						
	Non-Cases (n (%)) #	**Confirmed (n (%))**	**ODDS RATIOS (OR)**	**Probable (n (%))**	**ODDS RATIOS (OR)**	**Suspect (n (%))**	**ODDS RATIOS (OR)**
Paresis/ paralysis	0 (0%)	1(11.1%)	.076(.039-.148)	2(18.2%)	.085(.045-.159)	0 (0%)	§
aggression	11(11.6 %)	4(44.4%)	6.25(1.457-27.027)	5(45.5%)	6.536(1.701-25)	1(3%)	.244(.03-1.969)
Abnormal vocalisation	5(5.3%)	2(22.2%)	5.263(.86-32.258)	2(18.2%)	4.082(0.691-24.39)	0 (0%)	1.359(1.224-1.508)
Biting	94(98.9 %)	6(66.7%)	.064(.011-.386)	9(81.8%)	0.134(.021-.975)	33(100%)	.74(.668-.82)
Hypersalivation	5(5.3%)	4(44.4%)	14.706(2.994-71.4)	5(45.5%)	15.385(3.46-66.667)	0 (0%)	1.358(1.224-1.508)
Lethargy	0 (0%)	1(11.1%)	13.158(6.758-29.4)	0 (0%)	§	0 (0%)	§
Restlessness	4(4.2%)	1(11.1%)	2.9(2.188-29.411)	3(27.3%)	8.696(1.656-45.454)	0 (0%)	1.355(1.221-1.504)
Anorexia	4(4.2%)	3(33.3%)	11.628(2.105-62.5)	1(9.1%)	2.326(.236-22.727)	0 (0%)	1.355(1.221-1.504)
Hydrophobia	0 (0%)	1(11.1%)	13.158(6.757-25.64)	0 (0%)	§	0 (0%)	§

#Non-cases category was used as a reference for comparison
§ No statistics were computed because the designated sign was a constant.

3.1. Spatial Distribution of Rabies

In Figure 5, confirmed and probable cases were detected from Area 25, Area 18, Area 22, Area 9, Area 22, Area 23, Area 24, Area 36, Area 39, Area 49, Area 50, Area 56, and Area 57.



Figure 5: The spatial distribution of rabies cases during the study period

3.1. Rabies Testing at CVL During the CBRS Study Period and Pre-Surveillance Period

Prior to the CBRS period, years 2015-2019, there were a total of 87 samples submitted for testing from the area, and 40 were confirmed positive (Figure 6). This averages 8 cases per year and 0.67 cases per month. Whilst in the CBRS implementation year, 2020, between January and June, there were a total of 22 suspected case samples tested and 13 cases were from active surveillance and 10 (45.5%) of the tested positive.



Figure 6: Comparison of rabies dFAT tests for cases between the pre-surveillance and surveillance period at Central Veterinary Laboratory

3.2. Human Bites and Corresponding PEP Issuance

There were 141 bite victims. Out of these, 91 (64.54%) were from healthy bites; 8 (5.67%) from confirmed cases; 9 (6.38%) from probable cases; and 33 (23.4%) from suspect cases. Out of these in the different exposure categories, 136 (96.45%) of the bite victims reported rabies PEP. Out of the 136, 87 (63.97%) from the non-cases, 7 (5.15%) from confirmed cases (1 person was reluctant to go for PEP after communication of lab results and advice due to religious convictions), 9 (6.62%) from probable cases, and 44 (32.35%) from suspect cases. This indicates between 63.97% to 88.24% of PEP issuance following healthy bites.

4.0. Discussion

The absence of reliable surveillance data in low-resource settings like Malawi makes it challenging to effectively monitor and comprehend the disease burden and implement appropriate control and prevention measures. The CBRS program, using the case definitions established by Odds Ratios as stated by the Haiti Animal Rabies Surveillance Program (HARSP), identified 20 confirmed and probable cases within the study period [8]. This indicates an average of 3.33 cases per month, compared to the pre-surveillance period's average of 0.67 cases per month, representing a 5-fold increase in cases. This highlights the significance of surveillance in detecting rabies cases efficiently, as in HARSP which found that the surveillance program resulted in a 10-fold increase in the detection of rabies in animals within the first two years [8]. Furthermore, the surveillance program facilitated prompt initiation of PEP treatment for exposed individuals thereby reducing the chances of loss of human lives from the exposures.

The present study observed a significant reduction in the number of followed cases compared to the reported cases, with only 150 (24.6%) out of 610 reported cases being followed. This was because of a number of factors, including the delayed reporting of cases from the DHO and DALHDO departments and the absence of adequate contact information for victims and dog owners in most of the reported data from DALHD. Additionally, some members of the community were not aware of the surveillance program, leading to their distrust of phone-based investigations into the cases, which they perceived as potential scams. The lack of prompt investigation and reporting systems for clinical and public health purposes, as highlighted by [7], [8], [13], often results in insufficient incentives for conducting rabies surveillance. Inadequate and inconsistent data can lead to an underestimation of the true burden of rabies and hinder advocacy efforts aimed at controlling and eliminating the disease [14], resulting in a lack of awareness, reduced funding, and poor community engagement in rabies prevention.

The highest rabies cases were recorded during the study period in Areas 25, Area 18, and Area 22, according to the spatial distribution. One of the most important data for comprehending the population's burden is animal populations' sizes, demographics, and ownership patterns. However, in this study adjustments to comprehend the true significance of the observations are prevented by the lack of statistics or studies on dog populations. The majority of nations around the world lack such data on pet populations [19]. It is crucial to have thorough knowledge of zoonoses, infectious diseases, and risk factors associated with their spatial and temporal distribution in the pet population [19], [20].

The results of the study indicate that the majority of individuals seeking rabies post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) had not been exposed to positive or probable cases of rabies, with only 14.18% of the population identified as having been exposed. The study also revealed that religious beliefs can impact the prompt initiation of PEP treatment, potentially putting individuals at risk for death from rabies. The existing One Health platform for rabies in Malawi

assigns the responsibility of determining PEP administration for human victims of animal bites to state (para-)veterinarians. However, the observed irregularity in PEP issuance to mostly healthy bite victims raises concerns regarding the decision-making of veterinary practitioners and calls for further investigation into the factors influencing their decisions. It is important to note that in regions such as Malawi, where rabies is endemic in dogs and wildlife, the World Health Organization recommends prompt initiation of PEP unless sufficient laboratory surveillance and data demonstrate that the species in question is not a rabies vector [15]–[17]. PEP administration may be discontinued if the animal is vaccinated and, after 10 days of observation, remains healthy or is humanely killed and declared rabies-free by a WHO-recommended laboratory test [17].

Given the scarcity of resources, PEP must be used more effectively for those who have been exposed. To reduce inappropriate PEP administration, it is recommended to increase vaccination rates for pet (owned) animals [18]. Furthermore, with advanced training of the staff and adhering to WHO recommendations, this could be accomplished. There is a need to teach the communities about responsible dog ownership including the need for vaccination and understanding animal behaviour to reduce and prevent animal-bite cases. To ensure that the exposed individuals and the anti-rabies dispensary are promptly informed to stop the PEP if the involved animal is deemed healthy, it is important to establish good coordination between the involved parties, including the diagnosing laboratory, the veterinary team, the DHO, and the community/patient.

5.0. Limitation

Due to COVID-19-related public health restrictions, the surveillance team's activities were heavily affected and as such some cases could have gone unreported.

6.0. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study indicates the significance of community-based rabies surveillance in detecting canine rabies cases and the potential of reducing the disease burden. The CBRS program increased the detection of cases 5-fold compared to the pre-surveillance period and helped in assisting the exposed individuals to initiate PEP treatment. However, the study also highlighted some major challenges in the implementation of the program, including inadequate surveillance data like contact information for bite victims and dog owners, and a lack of awareness and trust in the program among some members of the community. Additionally, a high rate of 88.24% PEP issuance following healthy bites has been established. To overcome these challenges and improve rabies surveillance efforts, it is crucial to enhance data collection and reporting by establishing prompt investigation and reporting systems, fostering close collaboration between all involved parties to prevent unnecessary PEP administration, and gathering data on pet populations to gain a deeper understanding of their demographics and ownership patterns.

7.0. Funding statement

This research was generously supported by the Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (LUANAR), the Lilongwe Society for the Protection and Care of Animals, and the Martyn Edelsten (of The University of Edinburgh) Research and Internship Grant Fund.

8.0. Conflict of interest declaration

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

9.0. Ethics statement confirming that all relevant guidelines were followed.

Ethical Approval for research was provided by Animal Health Committee reference number DAHLD/AHC/12/2019/1. All extracted data was anonymized and did not have any personal identifiers. Only authorized persons had access to the data which was held in password-protected computers.

10. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Kondwani Chiumya, Julia Pascarella, Dr. Maike Müller, Dr. Tinotenda Razemba and the entire Lilongwe Society for the Protection and Care of Animals (LSPCA) team for their expertise and assistance throughout all aspects of this study.

11. References

[1] P. J. Quinn, B. K. Markey, F. C. Leonard, P. Hartigan, S. Fanning, and E. S. FitzPatrick, *Veterinary Microbiology and Microbial Disease*, 2nd ed. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2011. Accessed: Feb. 07, 2023. [Online]. Available: http://public.ebookcentral.proquest.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=819153

[2] World Health Organization, *WHO Expert Consultation on Rabies: second report*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2013. Accessed: Feb. 07, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/85346

[3] K. Hampson *et al.*, "Estimating the Global Burden of Endemic Canine Rabies," *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.*, vol. 9, no. 4, p. e0003709, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003709.

[4] M. Mallewa *et al.*, "Rabies Encephalitis in Malaria-Endemic Area, Malawi, Africa," *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 136–139, Jan. 2007, doi: 10.3201/eid1301.060810.

[5] World Health Organization, "Rabies in Malawi: A mother's first-hand account," 2015. https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/rabies-in-malawi-a-mother-s-first-hand-account (accessed Jan. 16, 2020).

[6] World Health Organization, F. and A. O. of the U. Nations, and W. O. for A. Health, "Zero by 30: the global strategic plan to end human deaths from dog-mediated rabies by 2030: United Against Rabies Collaboration: first annual progress report: global strategic plan to end human deaths from dog-mediated rabies by 2030," World Health Organization,

WHO/CDS/NTD/NZD/2019.04, 2019. Accessed: Feb. 07, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/328053

[7] P. M. Kitala, J. J. McDermott, M. N. Kyule, and J. M. Gathuma, “Community-based active surveillance for rabies in Machakos District, Kenya,” *Prev. Vet. Med.*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 73–85, Mar. 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0167-5877(99)00114-2.

[8] R. M. Wallace *et al.*, “Establishment of a Canine Rabies Burden in Haiti through the Implementation of a Novel Surveillance Program,” *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.*, vol. 9, no. 11, p. e0004245, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004245.

[9] World Health Organization, “Joint external evaluation of IHR core capacities of the Republic of Malawi: mission report: 11-15 February 2019,” World Health Organization, WHO/WHE/CPI/2019.58, 2019. Accessed: Feb. 07, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/325321

[10] G. Global Alliance for Rabies Control, “Community-Based Rabies Surveillance,” *Global Alliance for Rabies Control*. https://rabiesalliance.org/tools/surveillance-tools/cbrs (accessed Feb. 07, 2023).

[11] National Statistical Office, “2018 Malawi Population and Housing Census Main Report,” 2019. https://malawi.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/2018%20Malawi%20Population%20and%20Housing%20Census%20Main%20Report%20%281%29.pdf (accessed Feb. 08, 2023).

[12] World Society for the Protection of Animals, *Methods for the euthanasia of dogs and cats: comparison and recommendations*. 2010. Accessed: Feb. 09, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://caninerabiesblueprint.org/IMG/pdf/Link72_Euthanasia_WSPA.pdf

[13] T. Lembo *et al.*, “The Feasibility of Canine Rabies Elimination in Africa: Dispelling Doubts with Data,” *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. e626, Feb. 2010, doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000626.

[14] T. P. Scott, A. Coetzer, A. S. Fahrion, and L. H. Nel, “Addressing the Disconnect between the Estimated, Reported, and True Rabies Data: The Development of a Regional African Rabies Bulletin,” *Front. Vet. Sci.*, vol. 4, 2017, Accessed: Feb. 07, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fvets.2017.00018

[15] J. N. Ngugi, A. K. Maza, O. J. Omolo, and M. Obonyo, “Epidemiology and surveillance of human animal-bite injuries and rabies post-exposure prophylaxis, in selected counties in Kenya, 2011–2016,” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 996, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-5888-5.

[16] M. Obonyo *et al.*, “Suspected Rabies in Humans and Animals, Laikipia County, Kenya,” *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*, vol. 22, no. 3, p. 551, Mar. 2016, doi: 10.3201/eid2203.151118.

[17] World Health Organization, “WHO Guide for Rabies Pre and Post Exposure Prophylaxis in Humans,” 2014. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/india/health-topic-pdf/pep-prophylaxis-guideline-15-12-2014.pdf?sfvrsn=8619bec3_2 (accessed Feb. 07, 2023).

[18] D. A. Moore, W. M. Sischo, A. Hunter, and T. Miles, “Animal bite epidemiology and surveillance for rabies postexposure prophylaxis,” *J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc.*, vol. 217, no. 2, pp. 190–194, Jul. 2000, doi: 10.2460/javma.2000.217.190.

[19] A. Carvelli, P. Scaramozzino, F. Iacoponi, R. Condoleo, and U. Della Marta, “Size, demography, ownership profiles, and identification rate of the owned dog population in central Italy,” *PLOS ONE*, vol. 15, no. 10, p. e0240551, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0240551.

[20] M. Day *et al.*, “Surveillance of Zoonotic Infectious Disease Transmitted by Small Companion Animals,” *Emerg. Infect. Dis. J.*, vol. 18, no. 12, 2012, doi: 10.3201/eid1812.120664.