

1 **Assessment of risk factors associated with and practices of cattle farmers in Kirehe**
2 **District Rwanda with respect to vector-borne and zoonotic pathogens**

3

4 M. Fausta Dutuze⁺¹, Analise Espino⁺², Rebecca C. Christofferson^{3*}

5

6 ¹ Rwanda Institute for Conservation Agriculture, Kigali, Rwanda

7 ² George Washington University, Milken School of Public Health, Washington DC, USA

8 ³ School of Veterinary Medicine, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA

9

10

11 ⁺Denotes co-first authorship

12 *Corresponding author: rcarri1@lsu.edu, +1-225-578-9864

13

14 **Keywords:** Vector-borne disease; Biosafety; malaria; Rwanda; One Health

15

16 Word counts:

17 Abstract: 250

18 Text: 3189

19

20 Number of Tables: 4

21 Number of Figures: 3

22

23 Supplemental Information: SupplementalInformation_RC

24

25 **Abstract (250 words)**

26 Rural Rwandan communities face challenges to the health of humans and animals. The
27 topography and climate of the Kirehe District of Rwanda put farmers there at high risk for
28 mosquito-borne diseases. Farmers from 92 Rwandan farms were surveyed about farm
29 practices, as well as animal and human health histories between December 2017 to February
30 2018. Further, human, animal, and environmental factors were investigated to determine
31 whether there is a pattern in risk for abortion occurrence in cattle and/or history of malarial
32 disease in the human populations. Iterative, complimentary logistic regression models were
33 employed to determine whether there was an association between surveyed variables and
34 spontaneous cattle abortion, a known symptom of and risk factor for Rift Valley Fever virus and
35 other mosquito-borne/ zoonotic pathogens in the region. These factors were then used to
36 investigate association with a reported history of malaria. Of the 92 farms in our study, 82 were
37 family farms and 10 were commercial farms. On average, 88% of the farms had cattle and 30%
38 of farms had experienced a cattle abortion in the past two years. There was no discernable
39 pattern in significance in the risk factors for history of abortion in cattle. This One Health
40 approach sought to investigate human, animal, and environmental factors surrounding the
41 transmission of zoonotic, mosquito-borne viruses. From our study into the practices of the
42 farmers with respect to biosafety and self-protection against disease, we identify potential
43 sources of risk that could be targeted for enhance education and protection on these farms.

44

45

46

47

48

49

50 Introduction

51 Vector-borne diseases account for 17% of all infectious diseases and 700,000 deaths
52 annually [1, 2]. Rift Valley fever virus (RVFV) is a mosquito-borne viral zoonosis, a disease
53 naturally transmissible between animals and people [3]. This virus was first isolated in 1931 in
54 Kenya's Great Rift Valley region when there were 4,700 lamb deaths in four weeks [3]. In 2000,
55 70 years after RVFV's isolation, the first outbreak outside of Africa was reported and RVFV has
56 since become a global priority disease [4]. Heavy rainfall usually precedes RVFV outbreaks, as
57 it is spread by the *Aedes* and *Culex* mosquitoes [4]. While RVFV in humans is usually mild, a
58 few cases progress to a severe form of the disease [4, 5]. It is estimated that up to 2% of RVFV
59 human cases result in ocular disease, <1% result in meningoencephalitis, and <1% develop
60 hemorrhagic fever [4, 5]. Overall, the human cases fatality rate is <1%, with the majority of
61 fatalities occurring in patients who developed hemorrhagic fever [4, 5]. However, the mortality
62 rate of RVFV in all animals is much higher, with the mortality rate of sheep and lambs together
63 at 20-70% and that of young lambs alone as high as 70-100% [4, 5]. Furthermore, the rate of
64 spontaneous abortion in pregnant sheep and cattle with RVFV is 80-100% [4, 5].

65 Given that RVFV significantly affects cattle and is listed as a priority pathogen by the
66 World Health Organization, understanding the eco-epidemiological factors that describe the One
67 Health landscape of these communities is essential for assessing risk [6, 7]. Part of that
68 understanding includes the landscape of RVFV clinical presentation, including abortions, to
69 clarify the true burden of RVFV and identify potential alternative etiologies.

70 The Republic of Rwanda is in the Great Rift Valley of Central Africa and is known as “the
71 land of a thousand hills,” contributing to its temperature and humidity variability. As of 2021,
72 Rwanda is ranked second highest in population density with one of the smallest African
73 countries by area but with a population of 13.46 million [8-10]. The UN World Population
74 Prospects data from 2022 shows that the Rwandan population has increased by nearly 2.5%
75 yearly since 2004 [11]. While an increase in urbanization has worked in tandem with this

76 increase in population, the country still has an 80% rural population [10]. Rural communities are
77 known to have poorer health outcomes due to inequalities in access to healthcare and health
78 coverage. This medical inequality has been associated with lower poverty and educational
79 status [12]. The EICV5 Main Indicators Report shows that 53% of workers identify as
80 independent farmers, a category with a 34% working poverty rate [13].

81 Rwanda is divided into five provinces—Northern, Southern, Western, Eastern, and
82 Kigali—which can be further subdivided into sectors, cells, and villages. The Eastern Province is
83 a prime location for mosquitos, given the low altitudes, precipitation, and proximity to lakes and
84 plantations. A study in 2011 on the most prevalent mosquito species in this area found four
85 species—*Culex* spp., *Aedes* spp., *Coquillettidia* spp., and *Anopheles* spp.—that are known to
86 be primary and secondary vectors of Rift Valley Fever virus and malaria [14]. A study completed
87 in the western region of Uganda, which has a similar landscape to the Eastern Province of
88 Rwanda, found a 10.4% overall RVFV seroprevalence [15]. Of all the livestock, cattle had nearly
89 double RVFV seroprevalence compared to other livestock (20.5%); sheep and goats followed
90 with 6.8% and 3.6% seroprevalences, respectively [15].

91 Our study was conducted in the Eastern Province. According to the Fifth Integrated
92 Living Conditions Survey (EICV5) Poverty Profile Report, in 2016, 37.4% of the population in the
93 Eastern Province lived in poverty, and 15.3% lived in extreme poverty [16]. Rwanda's Fourth
94 Integrated Household Living Conditions Survey from 2013-2014 showed that nearly 70% of
95 Rwandans in the working population are employed in agriculture, and in the Eastern Province of
96 Rwanda, 67% of households raise livestock [17]. Nationally, there has been an increase of three
97 percentage points in the percentage of households raising cattle from 2010-2013 [17].

98 Rural Rwandan families are the target demographic for this program, as families without
99 cattle are associated with a lower socioeconomic class [18, 19]. The Eastern Province has the
100 highest participation of Girinka at a rate of 10% [17]. Between 2006 and 2017, the program
101 distributed nearly 300,000 cattle and helped over one million individuals [20]. The Girinka report

102 from 2014 highlighted high citizen satisfaction in the following roles of the program: fighting
103 malnutrition (97%), fighting poverty (96%), and promoting social cohesion (95%) [20]. A
104 controlled cohort study in Rwanda's Nyabihu and Ruhango districts found that the Girinka
105 program was strongly associated with reduced stunting in children [21]. Another study in the
106 Bugesera district in 2013 found that the Girinka program was essential in increasing food
107 security and eliminating child malnutrition [22]. Beyond its health benefits, Girinka has
108 successfully increased agricultural production and, ultimately, increased the social class of the
109 beneficiaries [21, 22]. Kim *et al.* found that over 90% of beneficiaries used their manure and
110 attributed their increased crop yields to better soil fertility [23]. Manure is known to help crop
111 production and is associated with increased food security [24]. Overall, the Girinka program has
112 been perceived by citizens as successful and has been associated with alleviating health and
113 financial hardship.

114 However, Rwanda experienced its largest RVFV outbreak in 2018 following unusually
115 extreme rainfall [14]. This outbreak also affected other regions of eastern Africa, such as Kenya,
116 Uganda, and Tanzania, before ending in July 2018 [14]. During this outbreak, many livestock
117 deaths and abortions were reported [14]. While other etiologies were identified, many cases of
118 cattle abortion and all cases of cattle hemorrhagic fever were confirmed to be PCR-positive for
119 RVFV. Proximity to cattle is a risk factor for exposure to RVFV, yet the attitudes and practices of
120 Rwandan farmers for basic knowledge of biosafety/biosecurity practices for this and associated
121 pathogens remain understudied.

122 One Health encourages a holistic approach to determinants of health in the framework of
123 the interaction of environmental, animal, and human health. The WHO describes One Health as
124 involving “public health, veterinary, and environmental sectors [7].” The One Health approach is
125 particularly relevant for food and water safety, nutrition, and controlling zoonoses. These
126 diseases, such as flu, rabies, and Rift Valley fever, can spread between animals and humans[2,
127 25]. Further, systems thinking promotes thinking beyond the target question to determine if

128 other elements in the interconnected system could be exploited or pursued to find holistic
129 solutions to health issues.

130

131 **Methodology**

132 In-person surveys were administered between December 2017 and February 2018 in
133 the Kirehe District, Eastern Province (*Iburasirazuba*) of Rwanda, with the appropriate ethics
134 approvals from the University of Rwanda, College of Medicine and Health Sciences (No.
135 377/CMHS IRB/2017). The enumerators conducted the in-person questionnaires in
136 Kinyarwanda and then translated them into English for data analysis. The survey instrument can
137 be found in **Supplemental Information S2**. A cluster-based method for data sampling was
138 utilized, resulting in a total of 92 farms. The farm data was collected from the following sectors in
139 the Kirehe district: Gahara (11), Kigarama (10), Kirehe (9), Mahama (7), Mpanga (10), Nasho
140 (9), Nyamugari(19), & Nyarubuye (17) (**Figure 1**). Measurements were taken and recorded by
141 study personnel to judge distance to points of interest. Study personnel also directly observed
142 water collection and collection device types. Altitude, temperature, and humidity were measured
143 using a handheld GPS with Altimeter and Compass ([Garmin Ltd.](#))

144 Variable Classification: We classified the following variables as environmental variables:
145 farm type; altitude; temperature; humidity; garbage disposal; presence and distance to bush,
146 swamp, and/or banana plants; and study personnel observed water retention in exposed
147 containers. (Note: all farms had experienced rain within three days of site visits.) The following
148 were classified as animal variables: number and source of cattle; history of cattle on the farm;
149 presence of other animal species and housing; isolation of new cattle; and zero grazing
150 practices. The following were classified as human variables: distance to human housing of
151 cattle, bed net usage, history of malaria, and source and storage of water habits.

152 Univariate analysis was completed to examine whether there were differences in farm
153 humidity, temperature, and altitude across Kirehe sectors. Logistic regression models were
154 employed to examine any association between a history of spontaneous abortion in cattle on
155 the farm with the variables of interest for each One Health vertex a) environmental factors, b)
156 animal health, and c) human. Variables determined significant in each vertex were then put into
157 a single model to interrogate associations with both abortion history in cattle and malaria history
158 in humans. RStudio version 2023.06.1 was used for all analyses.

159 **Results**

160 *Sectors of Eastern Province, Rwanda.*

161 There were some differences in the environmental characteristics across sectors in the
162 Kirehe District. The average altitude of all sites included was 1462.6 meters above sea level.
163 Using Kruskal-Wallis, it was determined that altitude was significantly different across sectors (p
164 <0.0001). Subsequent pairwise comparisons (Wilcoxon rank sum test) show where differences
165 lie (**Table 1**). The altitude means, minimums, and maximums by sector are in **Figure S1A**.

166

Table 1. Mean altitude (in meters) of each sector and range. *Indicates significance at the $\alpha=0.05$ based on pairwise comparisons of altitude by sector using Wilcoxon rank sum test with Bonferroni p-value adjustment method.

	Gahara (1511 m)	Kigarama (1676 m)	Kirehe (1319 m)	Mahama (1362 m)	Mpanga (1322 m)	Nasho (1345 m)	Nyamugari (1371 m)
Kigarama	0.0023*	---	---	---	---	---	---
Kirehe	0.2754	0.0041*	---	---	---	---	---
Mahama	0.0068*	0.0086*	1.000	---	---	---	---
Mpanga	0.0023*	0.0031*	1.000	0.0560	---	---	---
Nasho	0.0031*	0.0041*	1.000	0.0182*	0.0368*	---	---
Nyamugari	0.0002*	0.0004*	1.000	1.000	0.0022*	0.0385*	---
Nyarubuye (1671 m)	0.0003*	0.2828	0.001*	0.0031*	0.0005*	0.0001*	<.0001*

168 The overall average temperature was 24°C across all sites, but again, the temperature
169 was significantly different among sectors ($p < 0.0001$) and subsequently determined pairwise
170 differences (**Table 2**). The temperature means, minimums, and maximums by sector are in
171 **Figure S1B**.
172

Table 2. Table of pairwise comparisons of temperature by sector using Wilcoxon rank sum test with Bonferroni p-value adjustment method. *Indicates significance at the $\alpha=0.05$.

	Gahara	Kigarama	Kirehe	Mahama	Mpanga	Nasho	Nyamugari
Kigarama	0.0304*	---	---	---	---	---	---
Kirehe	0.6897	1.000	---	---	---	---	---
Mahama	0.0114*	0.1516	0.1158	---	---	---	---
Mpanga	1.000	0.0049*	0.8426	0.0177*	---	---	---
Nasho	0.2927	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.0598	---	---
Nyamugari	0.0058*	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.0010*	0.9879	---
Nyarubuye	0.0019*	1.000	0.5017	1.000	0.00010*	0.8426	1.000

174 The average humidity of the farms was 64%, and again, we found a significant
175 difference among sectors ($p < 0.0001$). **Table 3** shows the pairwise comparison of humidity
176 across sectors. **Figure S1C** shows the humidity minimum, maximum, and averages by sector.
177

Table 3. Table of pairwise comparisons of humidity by sector using Wilcoxon rank sum test with Bonferroni p-value adjustment method. *Indicates significance at the $\alpha=0.05$.

	Gahara	Kigarama	Kirehe	Mahama	Mpanga	Nasho	Nyamugari
Kigarama	1.0000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Kirehe	0.0047*	0.005*	---	---	---	---	---
Mahama	1.0000	1.0000	0.0193*	---	---	---	---
Mpanga	0.2188	0.0834	1.0000	0.1358	---	---	---
Nasho	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.9276	---	---
Nyamugari	0.3661	0.5088	0.0145*	0.6490	0.0046*	0.4777	---
Nyarubuye	0.1473	0.1169	0.0218*	0.4777	0.0064*	1.0000	1.000

179 Across all sectors, temperature was highly predictive of humidity (%) with a slope of -
180 3.26 and an Adjusted R^2 of 0.6167 ($p < 0.0001$, **Figure 2**). Altitude was only moderately
181 associated with temperature and humidity with slopes -0.003382 and 0.020863, and adjusted R^2
182 of 0.04628 and 0.1077, respectively (**Supplemental Figure S2**).

183

184 *Farm Demographics*

185 A total of 92 farms were surveyed. The majority (90%) of the farms in our study were
186 family farms ($n = 82$, 89.13%), and only ten were commercial farms (10.87%). Most farms had
187 cows (90% and 87.8% of commercial and family farms, respectively), and many had small
188 ruminants, namely, sheep or goats (40% and 62.41% of commercial and family farms,
189 respectively). Few farms had poultry, only 13.4% of family farms (**Table 4**). Of those farms with
190 cattle, 77.78% ($n=7$) of commercial and 34.15% of family farms had non-indigenous cattle
191 breeds, while 44.44% of commercial and 47.56% of the family had local breeds. Interestingly,
192 only 3 (3.66%) family farms reported a mix of exotic and local cattle breeds.

193 Most farms (56 and 7 of family and commercial, respectively) practiced species
194 separation with respect to housing, while the remaining had either no separation or no housing
195 (**Table 4**). Zero grazing was practiced by 59.76% of family farms and 40% of commercial farms.
196 Of those family farms with cattle, 30.56% ($n = 22$) indicated the government had been the
197 source of the animal. The remaining farms received their cattle from family, dowry, neighbors, of
198 the market. Of the commercial farms with cattle, 4 indicated the source was the government,
199 with the remaining coming from the market ($n = 4$) or family ($n = 2$). Most cattle were bred using
200 natural insemination, though some artificial insemination was practiced, with public veterinary
201 officers exclusively identified as the source of semen. For natural insemination across both farm
202 types, most ($n = 75$) males were sourced from neighbors.

203

Table 4: Farm Demographics. Numbers refer to the number of respondent farms that indicated “yes” to the question.

	Family (n=82)	Commercial (n=10)
Animal Makeup		
Cows	72	9
Small ruminants	4	52
Poultry	0	11
Animal Housing		
Species pen separation	56	7
Shared pens	21	1
No housing	5	2
Animal Practices		
Zero Grazing	49	4
Cattle from Government	22	4
Artificial Insemination (AI)	7	5
Natural Insemination (NI)	68	4
Both AI and NI	6	1
Biosecurity		
Foot Bath	0	0
Isolation of new animals	0	0
Mosquito Control Practices – Human	81	5
Mosquito Control Practices – Animal	2	3
Abortive Tissue Disposal With Disinfectant	0	0

206 On average, family farms had approximately three cattle, while commercial farms had
207 approximately 26 cattle. Commercial farms reported an average of 20 exotic cattle less than one
208 on average exotic for family farms. Commercial farms reported an average of 5 indigenous
209 breeds of cattle per farm, while family farms reported approximately 2 indigenous cattle per farm
210 on average (**Supplemental Table S1**).

211 All commercial and most (70.73%) of family farms reported being near the bush, with a
212 median distance measured of 16 meters (IQR: 7-43.8m) for commercial and 7.5 meters (IQR:
213 3.75-50 meters) for family farms (**Supplemental Figure S3**). The distance to the bush was not
214 significantly different between farm types ($p = 0.4844$). Half of the commercial farms reported
215 being near swamps, while 36.59% of family farms reported being near swamps. However, the
216 distance (in meters) to the nearest swamp was measured for all but three farms (**Supplemental**
217 **Figure S4**).

218 The commercial farms were closer to the swamps, with an average distance of 625
219 meters, while family farms were an average of 1,301 meters from the swamps. Both commercial
220 and family farms were relatively near to banana trees, including, in some instances, banana
221 growing operations, with an average distance of 85 and 51 meters, respectively. Family and
222 commercial farms were generally close in proximity, with a median distance of 150 meters (IQR
223 90-300 meters, **Supplemental Figure S5**).

224 Of the farms that responded ($n = 89$), 42.7% ($n = 38$) had piped water, 43.8% ($n = 39$)
225 primarily got water from a well, while 11.2% ($n = 10$) primarily used swamp water. The
226 remaining five farms used a combination of rain, swamp, and/or well water. Of those that used
227 well water, almost all reported storing water daily in external containers ($n = 38/39$), while 26/28,
228 with primarily piped-in water, reported storing water only occasionally.

229 Out of all farms that reported storing water ($n = 85$), most water was covered (**Figure 3**),
230 but still 48.7% (37/76) of family farms and 88.9% (8/9) of commercial farms did report having at

231 least some of the water containers as uncovered. The most used container was JerryCans (n =
232 15, 15, and 5 for those that stored water daily, occasionally, and regularly, respectively).

233 **Supplemental Table S2** shows all water storage container reporting. At the time of the
234 survey, study personnel noted the presence of water-retaining elements in 45.7% (42/50) of
235 visited farms, 32 (39.02%) of family farms, and 10 (100%) of commercial farms (**Supplemental**
236 **Figure S6**).

237 No farms indicated that there was a use of foot bath, regardless of whether family or
238 commercial entity. Further, no farms indicated that new animals were isolated upon acquisition
239 (though 2 commercial and 10 family farms did not provide any information for this question).
240 Five commercial farms (50%) practiced mosquito control within the buildings where humans
241 resided, while 81 of the 82 family farms (98.78%) reported the use of mosquito control inside
242 human dwellings. (Of note: the other six farms provided no information for this question, so it is
243 impossible to determine whether there was no control activity.) When asked about mosquito
244 control specifically for animals, most farms indicated there was none (80% of commercial and
245 96.34% of family farms) (**Table 4**).

246 Twenty-seven (20 family and 7 commercial) farms reported a history of abortion in their
247 cattle; 24.4% and 70%, respectively. Only 1 of each farm type reported having repetitive
248 abortions on their farms, while 6 farms (4 commercial and 2 family) did not have record keeping
249 to answer. Of those that reported a history of abortion in cattle, 14 family farms reported that
250 one event had occurred in the last two years, 4 family farms reported two events in the last two
251 years, and 1 family farm reported 3 events in the last two years. Two commercial farms reported
252 2 events within the last two years, one farm reported 3 events, 1 reported 4 events, 1 reported 6
253 events, and 1 reported 9 events all within the last two years.

254 A total of 26 farms (19 family and 7 commercial) reported how abortive waste was
255 disposed of. The most common abortion tissue disposal method was burying without
256 disinfectant (68.4% and 71.4% for family farms and commercial, respectively). Five family farms

257 (26.3%) reported giving abortive tissue to dogs, and one (5.26%) put tissue in normal trash. Two
258 (28.6%) commercial farms gave the abortive tissue to dogs, and no commercial farms disposed
259 in normal trash.

260 Most farms indicated using bednets; 66 (92.96%) of family farms but only 3 (30%) of
261 commercial farms, though this discrepancy is likely due to the nature of family versus
262 commercial farms and whether personnel sleep at commercial farms. Of those who reported
263 using bed nets, 100% reported using bednets every day. Responders were asked about the
264 history of malaria cases on the farm, and 43 (46.7%) reported no malaria cases since the
265 implementation of bed net use and/or mosquito spraying, while the remaining reported a history
266 of malaria on the farm (**Supplemental Figure S7**). Finally, all but one farm reported disposal of
267 garbage in a large hole, which would eventually be subjected to burning ('fumier').

268

269 *Environmental Factors as Predictors of Reported Abortion History in Cattle*

270 Ninety farms had a response for whether there was a history of abortion in cattle.
271 Univariate logistic regression was performed with the dependent binary response of abortion
272 history (Yes = 1, No = 0). Altitude, temperature, nor humidity were significantly associated with
273 abortion history ($p = 0.393, 0.709, 0.221$, respectively). The presence of nearby bushes,
274 swamps, or bananas was also not indicative of a history of abortion ($p = 0.5335, 0.1332, 0.149$,
275 respectively). Observed elements retaining water by study personnel were also not associated
276 with a history of abortion ($p = 0.2147$). Cattle source was not significantly associated with
277 abortion history (**Supplemental Tables S3**). Sectors were also not significantly associated with
278 abortion history (**Supplemental Table S4**). Farm type was significantly associated with
279 abortion history ($p = 0.00493$) with family farms were significantly less likely to have reported
280 abortion history (OR = 0.94).

281

282 *Animal Health Factors as Predictors of Reported Abortion History in Cattle*

283 There was no association between the presence or absence of exotic cattle breeds and
284 abortion history ($p = 0.5579$), the presence or absence of small ruminants ($p = 0.56965$), or the
285 presence of chickens ($p = 0.13924$). Species separation in housing practices was not
286 associated with abortion history ($p = 0.8826$). Zero grazing practices were not associated with
287 abortion history ($p = 0.2875$). Isolation practices for new animals were also not associated with
288 abortion history in cattle ($p = 0.3698$), nor were years since the introduction of cattle ($p =$
289 0.109146). Further, spearman's rank correlation revealed that there was no obvious correlation
290 between the number of reported abortion events within the last two years and the total number
291 of cattle on the farm ($\rho = 0.319$, $p = 0.1197$).

292

293 *Human Health Factors as Predictors of Reported Abortion History in Cattle*

294 Distance to human housing from cattle housing was not associated with abortion history
295 ($p = 0.201$), nor was bed net use ($p = 0.6826$), nor a history of malaria ($p = 0.7821$). The water
296 source was not associated with the abortion report, nor was whether water was stored
297 **(Supplemental Tables S5-S6)**. The type of storage container (Jerricans vs. other) was not
298 associated with a history of abortion ($p=0.2989$), nor was coverage of water being stored
299 **(Supplemental Table S7)**.

300

301 *Associations with the History of Malaria in Households associated with Farms*

302 *Environmental Factors as Predictors of Reported Malaria History in Humans*

303 All 92 farms responded with a history of malaria in humans associated with the farm.
304 Univariate logistic regression was performed with the dependent binary response of malaria
305 history (Yes = 1, No = 0). Sectors were significantly associated with malaria history, with
306 Mpanga differing from the reference group of Gahara. Additionally, when Mpanga was coded as
307 the reference, Kirehe and Nasho were also significantly different from Mpanga. However, when

308 we looked at whether villages (within sectors) were associated with malaria history, there was
309 no effect (**Supplemental Table S8**). Farm type was not significantly associated with malaria
310 history ($p = 0.0912$). Altitude, temperature, nor humidity were significantly associated with
311 malaria history ($p = 0.767, 0.914, 0.912$, respectively). The presence of nearby bush or swamp
312 was also not indicative of a history of malaria ($p = 0.0757, 0.559$, respectively). The presence of
313 bananas near was significantly associated with malaria history ($p = 0.026$, OR: 3.04) but the
314 distance to banana trees or plantations was not significant ($p = 0.209$). Observed elements
315 retaining water by study personnel were also associated with a history of malaria ($p = 0.0195$,
316 OR: 2.76). The type of container that was observed retaining water was not significant
317 (**Supplemental Table S9**).

318

319 *Animal Health Factors as Predictors of Reported Malaria History in Humans*

320 There was no association between the presence or absence of exotic cattle breeds and
321 malaria history ($p = 0.890$), the presence or absence of small ruminants ($p = 0.941$), or the
322 presence of chickens ($p = 0.180$). Species separation in housing practices was not associated
323 with malaria history ($p = 0.253$). Zero grazing practices of cattle were not associated with
324 malaria history ($p = 0.604$).

325

326 *Human Health Factors as Predictors of Reported Malaria History in Humans*

327 Distance to human housing from cattle housing was not associated with malaria history
328 ($p=0.634$). Water source was not associated with malaria reporting, nor was whether water was
329 stored (**Supplemental Tables S10-S11**). The type of storage container (Jerricans vs. other)
330 was not associated with the history of abortion ($p = 0.362$), nor was coverage of water being
331 stored (**Supplemental Table S12**). Unsurprisingly, the use of bed nets was significantly
332 associated with reported history of malaria ($p = 0.00541$), with those who reported the use of
333 bed nets significantly less likely to report a history of malaria (OR: 0.1099). Additionally,

334 reporting the use of bed nets every day was also associated with a decrease in the likelihood of
335 reporting malaria history ($p = 0.0074$, OR: 0.1183).

336 Stepwise logistic regression was employed using all significant variables from the
337 univariate analyses and the best model was based on the smallest AIC value over all
338 observations where there were no missing values ($n = 84$). The final model included the
339 presence of banana trees (y/n), observed elements retaining water (y/n), and the use of bed
340 nets (y/n) (AIC = 106.67). However, the only variable that remained significant was bed net use
341 (yes vs. no, $p = 0.0281$, OR: 0.1641294).

342

343 Discussion

344 Animal and environmental health are intimately related to global health. Many leading
345 health organizations have adopted The One Health outlook, including the WHO, FAO, WOA, and
346 CDC [7, 26, 27]. While not having a uniform definition amongst institutions, One Health is
347 best described as using an integrated and multi-disciplinary approach to investigate and
348 optimize the health of humans, animals, and the environment, and emerged as a popular
349 framework in 2004 in response to the emergence of SARS-1 [28, 29]. This outbreak highlighted
350 the need for a collaborative process that understood that humans, animals, and the environment
351 are closely linked [25, 28, 29]. A One Health approach is particularly beneficial when studying
352 zoonoses and vector-borne pathogens.

353 In 2021, it was estimated that there were more than 10,000 livestock farms and 430,000
354 cattle in the Eastern Province of Rwanda [30]. This indicates that cattle and humans are in
355 regular contact. Further, water storage and water accumulation in the environment is a known
356 risk factor for mosquito vector breeding [31, 32]. Because Rwanda experiences regular RVFV
357 outbreaks - its largest in 2018, and because RVFV is a zoonoses in addition to an animal
358 disease of veterinary and economic significance, we focused on the most overt clinical outcome
359 of this virus as an indicator of recognizable risk [14]. These data looked at animal, human, and

360 environmental health factors to determine whether any of these factors could be associated with
361 the risk of zoonotic and/or human mosquito-borne disease. There was no discernable pattern in
362 the significance of risk factors for the history of abortion in cattle associated with these farms
363 from any of the three One Health sectors. However, we were able to identify some potential
364 sources of risk that could be targeted for enhanced education and protection on these farms.

365 First, mosquito control in the form of source reduction and pesticide use was also
366 problematic. Research shows that cattle can play a positive or negative role in attracting
367 mosquitoes to humans. In cases where cattle live near human sleeping quarters, an increased
368 attraction can be seen, known as zoo-potential, and cattle treated with insecticides are
369 associated with a decrease in malaria vectors when used with other vector control approaches
370 [33-35]. Only five farms reported practicing animal mosquito control, and only two identified the
371 product specifically. Two commercial farms reported the use of Norotraz, which is currently only
372 indicated for use by the Rwanda FDA to control ticks [36]. Whether or not this pesticide is
373 efficacious for mosquitoes remains to be widely investigated. The remaining three family farms
374 practiced bush removal as mosquito control. Bushes, especially those with large leaves, can
375 often function as a stagnant water source for mosquito breeding grounds, providing a cover for
376 mosquitoes after breeding [37, 38]. Our study found no significant correlation between the
377 presence and/or distance to the bush and history of either malaria in humans or abortion in
378 cattle. However, a study on integrated malaria management in neighboring Kenya found that
379 removing bushes did reduce the vector population in the home [37]. This study did note a
380 significant relationship between the reported history of malaria and the presence of bananas
381 near the home. The variability in significance and type of surrounding environment may indicate
382 the need for more targeted research on the efficacy of responsible environmental habitat
383 reduction for the control of mosquito vectors.

384 Second, water storage can be a risk factor for breeding and the presence of mosquito
385 vectors. It is recommended that stagnant water be covered and replaced at least every four

386 days [39]. On average, half of the farms surveyed stored water in their containers daily; though
387 this was not a significant factor, and we do not know the frequency of water turnover in these
388 containers. This study did find a statistically significant association between study personnel
389 observed water accumulation in containers and/or trash in the environment near the home and
390 a history of reported malaria. Bed net use was high in this population, indicating a high level of
391 knowledge regarding the adult mosquito and its risk for transmitting the parasite to the
392 household [40-42]. However, overall, there is an indication that perhaps the juvenile stage of
393 mosquitoes remains unclear to farmers and that there is likely an opportunity for education
394 regarding the mosquito life cycle and the benefits of source reduction for breeding [32]. **Error!**

395 **Reference source not found.**

396 Third, the use of biosafety tools, such as footbaths to prevent environmental
397 contamination and the spread of pathogens, was universally lacking in this population, which
398 indicates unawareness of the potential for the spread of this and other cattle-borne viruses and
399 other health conditions in cattle [43-46]. Footbaths can also protect human health, as having a
400 footbath present reduced infection odds by nearly 4-fold [47]. While there was not a significant
401 relationship between abortion history in cattle and tissue disposal methods, we did observe and
402 record risky disposal behaviors. The most common method of tissue disposal in farms with an
403 abortion history was burying without disinfectant, followed by feeding to dogs, and one farm
404 disposed of the tissue in normal trash. Abortive tissue must be disposed of with consideration
405 for the biohazard it represents through any number of methods. Incineration is an effective
406 method for reducing disease transmission but requires specific conditions and likely specialized
407 equipment. Burial is considered the easiest and cheapest option though it invites the potential
408 for ground contamination or disease transmission if not done properly, especially if spore-
409 forming bacteria like *Bacillus anthracis* circulate in the region [48]. Further, Rift Valley Fever and
410 other bunyaviruses have been shown to be environmentally stable, which increases the risk of
411 environmental or fomite-mediated transmissions [49-51]. Personal protective equipment, such

412 as gloves and masks, and other preventative measures should be taken when handling abortive
413 tissue.

414 Our study is not without limitations. As a cross-sectional study of attitudes and practices,
415 it is difficult to determine historical effectors of transmission and risk. Further, this survey was
416 conducted before the COVID-19 global pandemic, which, at best, resulted in an increase in
417 public awareness of infection control. A follow-up study would be necessary to determine
418 whether there have been any changes in the use of PPE or infection control methods on farms,
419 given the recency of the pandemic. Another limitation of our study appears in the relatively
420 limited sample size of commercial farms, which may have affected our ability to make
421 comparisons, with only ten commercial farms relative to eighty-two family farms. However, our
422 data does provide a helpful building block to begin assessing the social and environmental
423 determinants of One Health assessments on Rwandan farms.

424

425 **Conclusion**

426 Considering our findings, policymakers and health officials should focus on promoting
427 personal protective equipment (PPE) and preventative measures on livestock farms.

428 Emphasizing the importance of safe abortive tissue disposal, proper mosquito control, and
429 preventive practices like foot baths for cattle can significantly improve animal health and
430 mitigate disease risks. Addressing these issues can positively affect livestock farms,
431 safeguarding animal welfare and farmers' livelihoods. The WHO continually speaks of the
432 importance of education on vector-borne diseases and promoting behavior change [52]. This
433 study showcases the health of rural Rwandan farms and highlights areas of improvement for
434 animal and human health.

435

436 **Table and Figure Legends:**

437

438 **Table 1.** Mean altitude (in meters) of each sector and range. *Indicates significance at the
439 $\alpha=0.05$ based on pairwise comparisons of altitude by sector using Wilcoxon rank sum test with
440 Bonferroni p-value adjustment method.

441 **Table 2.** Table of pairwise comparisons of temperature by sector using Wilcoxon rank sum test
442 with Bonferroni p-value adjustment method. *Indicates significance at the $\alpha=0.05$.

443 **Table 3.** Table of pairwise comparisons of humidity by sector using Wilcoxon rank sum test with
444 Bonferroni p-value adjustment method. *Indicates significance at the $\alpha=0.05$.

445 **Table 4: Farm Demographics.** Numbers refer to the number of respondent farms that indicated
446 “yes” to the question.

447 **Figure 1:** *Rwanda (inset) with the Kirehe District highlighted and the sampled sectors color*
448 *coded.*

449 **Figure 2:** Linear association between temperature and humidity was statistically significantly
450 ($p<0.0001$).

451 **Figure 3:** *The frequency of whether water was stored (x-axis) and whether that water was kept*
452 *covered (colored bars).*

453

454

455 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank Jean Claude Tumushime, Evodie Uwimbabazi,
456 Elisee Ndizeye, Grace Mukasine, Jean Bosco Noheri, Jean de Dieu Ayabagabo, and
457 Christopher Mores for their assistance and guidance. As always, thank you to Autumn for her
458 unwavering attitude and to Julie, Alex, Isabella, Alexandra, and Liliana Espino for their support.

459 **Financial Support:** This research is based on a work supported by the 1) United States Agency
460 for International Development, as part of the Feed the Future initiative, under the CGIAR Fund,
461 award number BFS- G-11-00002, and the predecessor fund the Food Security and Crisis
462 Mitigation II grant, award number EEM-G-00-04-00013; and 2) USDA National Institute of Food
463 and Agriculture, project #LAV3748, accession #1015690.

464 **Disclaimer:** The contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily
465 represent the official views of the USDA or NIFA.

466 **Disclosure of COI:** We report no conflicts of interest.

467

468 **Authors' addresses:**

469 M. Fausta Dutuze, PhD

470 Rwanda Institute for Conservation and Agriculture

471 Kigale, Rwanda

472 mfdutuze@rica.rw

473

474 Analisa Espino, MPH

475 George Washington University

476 Washington, DC, USA

477 analisa.esp@gmail.com

478

479 Rebecca Carriere Christofferson, PhD, MApSt

480 Department of Pathobiological Sciences

481 LSU School of Veterinary Medicine

482 Baton Rouge, LA, USA

483 Rcarri1@lsu.edu

484

485

486

487 References

- 488 1. *Vector-Borne Diseases*. 2020 March 2 2020 [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from:
489 [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/vector-borne-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/vector-borne-diseases#:~:text=It%20causes%20an%20estimated%20219,infection%20transmitted%20by%20Aedes%20mosquitoes)
490 [diseases#:~:text=It%20causes%20an%20estimated%20219,infection%20transmitted%2](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/vector-borne-diseases#:~:text=It%20causes%20an%20estimated%20219,infection%20transmitted%20by%20Aedes%20mosquitoes)
491 [0by%20Aedes%20mosquitoes](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/vector-borne-diseases#:~:text=It%20causes%20an%20estimated%20219,infection%20transmitted%20by%20Aedes%20mosquitoes).
- 492 2. Faburay, B., *The case for a 'one health' approach to combating vector-borne diseases*.
493 *Infection ecology & epidemiology*, 2015. **5**(1): p. 28132.
- 494 3. *Zoonoses*. 2020 July 29 [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from:
495 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/zoonoses>.
- 496 4. *Rift Valley fever*. 2018 February 19 [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from:
497 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/rift-valley-fever>.
- 498 5. *Rift Valley fever*. 2023 [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from:
499 <https://www.woah.org/en/disease/rift-valley-fever/>.
- 500 6. *Prioritizing diseases for research and development in emergency contexts*. [cited 2023
501 August 15]; Available from: [https://www.who.int/activities/prioritizing-diseases-for-](https://www.who.int/activities/prioritizing-diseases-for-research-and-development-in-emergency-contexts)
502 [research-and-development-in-emergency-contexts](https://www.who.int/activities/prioritizing-diseases-for-research-and-development-in-emergency-contexts).
- 503 7. *One Health*. 2017 September 17 [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from:
504 <https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/one-health>.
- 505 8. Lemarchand, R. and D. Clay. *Rwanda*. 2024 February 7 [cited 2023 August 15];
506 Available from: <https://www.britannica.com/place/Rwanda>.
- 507 9. Kamer, L. *Population density in Africa as of 2021, by country*. 2022 August 1 [cited 2023
508 August 15]; Available from: [https://www.statista.com/statistics/1218003/population-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1218003/population-density-in-africa-by-country/)
509 [density-in-africa-by-country/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1218003/population-density-in-africa-by-country/).
- 510 10. *Rwanda population total*. [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from:
511 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=RW>.
- 512 11. *World Population Prospects 2022*, D.o.E.a.S.A. United Nations, Population Division,
513 Editor.
- 514 12. Liu, K., S. Subramanian, and C. Lu, *Assessing national and subnational inequalities in*
515 *medical care utilization and financial risk protection in Rwanda*. *International journal for*
516 *equity in health*, 2019. **18**(1): p. 1-10.
- 517 13. *EICV5 Main Indicators Report: The Fifth Integrated Household Living Conditions Survey*
518 *2016/17*, N.I.o.S. Rwanda, Editor. 2018.



- 519 14. Dutuze, M.F., et al., *Identification of bunyamwera and possible other orthobunyavirus*
520 *infections and disease in cattle during a rift valley fever outbreak in Rwanda in 2018*. The
521 American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene, 2020. **103**(1): p. 183.
- 522 15. Budasha, N.H., et al., *Rift Valley fever seroprevalence and abortion frequency among*
523 *livestock of Kisoro district, South Western Uganda (2016): a prerequisite for zoonotic*
524 *infection*. BMC veterinary research, 2018. **14**(1): p. 1-7.
- 525 16. *EICV5 Rwanda Poverty Profile Report: The Fifth Integrated Household Living Conditions*
526 *Survey 2016/17*, N.I.o.S. Rwanda, Editor. 2018.
- 527 17. *EICV4 Main Indicators Report: The Fourth Integrated Household Living Conditions*
528 *Survey 2013/14*, N.I.o.S. Rwanda, Editor. 2015.
- 529 18. Petherick, A. *Rwanda's One Cow per Poor Family Program Turns Ten Years Old*. 2016
530 [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from: [https://www.milkgenomics.org/?splash=rwandas-](https://www.milkgenomics.org/?splash=rwandas-one-cow-per-poor-family-program-turns-ten-years-old#:~:text=A%20decade%20ago%2C%20the%20Rwandan,with%20which%20to%20fer-tilize%20crops)
531 [one-cow-per-poor-family-program-turns-ten-years-](https://www.milkgenomics.org/?splash=rwandas-one-cow-per-poor-family-program-turns-ten-years-old#:~:text=A%20decade%20ago%2C%20the%20Rwandan,with%20which%20to%20fer-tilize%20crops)
532 [old#:~:text=A%20decade%20ago%2C%20the%20Rwandan,with%20which%20to%20fer-](https://www.milkgenomics.org/?splash=rwandas-one-cow-per-poor-family-program-turns-ten-years-old#:~:text=A%20decade%20ago%2C%20the%20Rwandan,with%20which%20to%20fer-tilize%20crops)
533 [tilize%20crops](https://www.milkgenomics.org/?splash=rwandas-one-cow-per-poor-family-program-turns-ten-years-old#:~:text=A%20decade%20ago%2C%20the%20Rwandan,with%20which%20to%20fer-tilize%20crops).
- 534 19. Mudingu, J. *Girinka Programme transforms livelihoods, reconciles communities*. 2016
535 August 22 [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from:
536 [https://www.newtimes.co.rw/article/132862/Advertorial/girinka-programme-transforms-](https://www.newtimes.co.rw/article/132862/Advertorial/girinka-programme-transforms-livelihoods-reconciles-communities)
537 [livelihoods-reconciles-communities](https://www.newtimes.co.rw/article/132862/Advertorial/girinka-programme-transforms-livelihoods-reconciles-communities).
- 538 20. *Assessing Girinka Programme (2006-2016): Citizen perspectives*, R.G. Board, Editor.
539 2018.
- 540 21. Flax, V., et al., *Rwandan government livestock asset transfer program ("Girinka") is*
541 *associated with improved child nutrition*, F.t.F.I.L.f.L. Systems, Editor. 2019.
- 542 22. Kayigema, V., *An assessment of the Girinka (one cow per poor family) program and*
543 *poverty alleviation in Rwanda: a case study of Bugesera District*, in *School of*
544 *Agricultural, Earth, and Environmental Sciences*. 2013, University of Kwazulu-Natal.
- 545 23. Kim, S.K., et al., *Soil Fertility and Manure Management—Lessons from the Knowledge,*
546 *Attitudes, and Practices of Girinka Farmers in the District of Ngoma, Rwanda*.
547 *Agroecology and sustainable food systems*, 2013. **37**(6): p. 631-658.
- 548 24. Koelsch, R. *Does Manure Benefit Crop Productivity? Environment?* 2018 April 10 [cited
549 2023 August 15]; Available from: [https://water.unl.edu/article/animal-manure-](https://water.unl.edu/article/animal-manure-management/does-manure-benefit-crop-yield-nitrogen-loss-or-soil-carbon)
550 [management/does-manure-benefit-crop-yield-nitrogen-loss-or-soil-carbon](https://water.unl.edu/article/animal-manure-management/does-manure-benefit-crop-yield-nitrogen-loss-or-soil-carbon).
- 551 25. Mackenzie, J.S. and M. Jeggo, *The One Health approach—Why is it so important?* Trop
552 Med Infect Dis, 2019. **4**(2): p. 88.
- 553 26. *One Health*. [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from: [https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-](https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/global-initiatives/one-health/)
554 [do/global-initiatives/one-health/](https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/global-initiatives/one-health/).
- 555 27. *One Health*. 2024 January 22 [cited 2023 August 15].
- 556 28. Adisasmitho, W.B., et al., *One Health: A new definition for a sustainable and healthy*
557 *future*. PLoS Pathogens, 2022. **18**(6): p. e1010537.
- 558 29. Destoumieux-Garzón, D., et al., *The one health concept: 10 years old and a long road*
559 *ahead*. Frontiers in veterinary science, 2018. **5**: p. 14.
- 560 30. Nsabimana, J.d.D. *Why Eastern Province urgently needs zero grazing for livestock*.
561 2021 June 21 [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from:
562 [https://www.newtimes.co.rw/article/186963/News/why-eastern-province-urgently-needs-](https://www.newtimes.co.rw/article/186963/News/why-eastern-province-urgently-needs-zero-grazing-for-livestock)
563 [zero-grazing-for-livestock](https://www.newtimes.co.rw/article/186963/News/why-eastern-province-urgently-needs-zero-grazing-for-livestock).
- 564 31. Shenton, F.C., et al., *Research agenda for preventing mosquito-transmitted diseases*
565 *through improving the built environment in sub-Saharan Africa*. Cities & Health, 2022.
566 **6**(1): p. 72-80.
- 567 32. Forsyth, J.E., et al., *Source reduction with a purpose: Mosquito ecology and community*
568 *perspectives offer insights for improving household mosquito management in coastal*
569 *Kenya*. PLoS neglected tropical diseases, 2020. **14**(5): p. e0008239.

- 570 33. Donnelly, B., et al., *A systematic, realist review of zooprophylaxis for malaria control*.
571 *Malaria journal*, 2015. **14**(1): p. 1-16.
- 572 34. Iwashita, H., et al., *Push by a net, pull by a cow: can zooprophylaxis enhance the impact*
573 *of insecticide treated bed nets on malaria control?* *Parasites & Vectors*, 2014. **7**(1): p. 1-
574 15.
- 575 35. Kawaguchi, I., A. Sasaki, and M. Mogi, *Combining zooprophylaxis and insecticide*
576 *spraying: a malaria-control strategy limiting the development of insecticide resistance in*
577 *vector mosquitoes*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological*
578 *Sciences*, 2004. **271**(1536): p. 301-309.
- 579 36. *Rwanda FDA Authorized Veterinary Medicinal Product List*. Rwanda Food & Drug
580 Authority.
- 581 37. Okech, B.A., et al., *Use of integrated malaria management reduces malaria in Kenya*.
582 *PLoS One*, 2008. **3**(12): p. e4050.
- 583 38. Oladepo, O., et al., *Malaria knowledge and agricultural practices that promote mosquito*
584 *breeding in two rural farming communities in Oyo State, Nigeria*. *Malaria journal*, 2010.
585 **9**: p. 1-9.
- 586 39. Lawler, S.P. and G.C. Lanzaro. Regents of the University of California, Division of
587 Agricultural and Natural Resources.
- 588 40. Agosto, F.B., et al., *The impact of bed-net use on malaria prevalence*. *Journal of*
589 *theoretical biology*, 2013. **320**: p. 58-65.
- 590 41. Mutuku, F.M., et al., *Impact of insecticide-treated bed nets on malaria transmission*
591 *indices on the south coast of Kenya*. *Malaria journal*, 2011. **10**(1): p. 1-14.
- 592 42. Monroe, A., et al., *Improving malaria control by understanding human behaviour*. *Bulletin*
593 *of the World Health Organization*, 2021. **99**(11): p. 837.
- 594 43. Reiter, T. and J. Bewley. *Prevention of Hoof Disorders Using Footbaths*. [cited 2023
595 August 15]; Available from: <https://afs.ca.uky.edu/dairy/prevention-hoof-disorders-using-footbaths#:~:text=The%20purpose%20of%20a%20footbath,prevention%20of%20hairy%20heel%20warts>.
- 596 44. Jacobs, C., et al., *Effect of footbath protocols for prevention and treatment of digital*
597 *dermatitis in dairy cattle: a systematic review and network meta-analysis*. *Preventive*
598 *veterinary medicine*, 2019. **164**: p. 56-71.
- 601 45. Gomez, A. *Strategies to prevent and control infectious claw lesions*. 2015 July 17 [cited
602 2023 August 15]; Available from: <https://www.agproud.com/articles/22915-strategies-to-prevent-and-control-infectious-claw-lesions>.
- 603 46. *Foot Health*. [cited 2023 August 15]; Available from: <https://www.vet.cornell.edu/animal-health-diagnostic-center/programs/nyschap/modules-documents/foot-health>.
- 604 47. Firestone, S.M., et al., *A case-control study of risk factors for equine influenza spread*
605 *onto horse premises during the 2007 epidemic in Australia*. *Preventive Veterinary*
606 *Medicine*, 2011. **100**(1): p. 53-63.
- 609 48. Romero-Alvarez, D., et al., *Potential distributions of Bacillus anthracis and Bacillus*
610 *cereus biovar anthracis causing anthrax in Africa*. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*,
611 2020. **14**(3): p. e0008131.
- 612 49. Pepin, M., et al., *Rift Valley fever virus (Bunyaviridae: Phlebovirus): an update on*
613 *pathogenesis, molecular epidemiology, vectors, diagnostics and prevention*. *Veterinary*
614 *research*, 2010. **41**(6).
- 615 50. Odendaal, L., et al., *Ovine fetal and placental lesions and cellular tropism in natural Rift*
616 *Valley fever virus infections*. *Veterinary Pathology*, 2020. **57**(6): p. 791-806.
- 617 51. Odendaal, L., A.S. Davis, and E.H. Venter, *Insights into the pathogenesis of viral*
618 *haemorrhagic fever based on virus tropism and tissue lesions of natural Rift Valley fever*.
619 *Viruses*, 2021. **13**(4): p. 709.

- 620 52. Danasekaran, R., et al., *Small bite, big threat: the burden of vector-borne diseases*.
621 Iranian Journal of Public Health, 2014. **43**(7): p. 1014.
622


Kirehe District of Rwanda

Republic of Rwanda



Sector:

- Gahara
- Gatore
- Kigarama
- Kigina
- Kirehe
- Mahama
- Mpanga
- Musaza
- Mushikiri
- Nasho
- Nyamugari
- Nyarubuye



Sector

- Gahara
- Kigarama
- Kirehe
- Mahama
- Mpanga
- Nasho
- Nyamugari
- Nyarubuye

