

1 Rats and the COVID-19 pandemic: Early data on the global emergence of rats in
2 response to social distancing

3
4 Michael H. Parsons¹, Yasushi Kiyokawa², Jonathan L. Richardson³, Rafal Stryjek⁴, Kaylee A.
5 Byers^{5,6}, Chelsea G. Himsworth^{6,7}, Robert M. Corrigan⁸, Michael A Deutsch⁹, Masato Ootaki²,
6 Tsutomu Tanikawa¹⁰, Faith E. Parsons^{11,12}, Jason Munshi-South¹³

7
8 ¹Department of Biological Sciences, Fordham University, Bronx, NY, USA

9 ²Laboratory of Veterinary Ethology, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

10 ³Department of Biology, University of Richmond, Richmond, VA, USA

11 ⁴Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

12 ⁵Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

13 ⁶Canadian Wildlife Health Cooperative, The Animal Health Centre, British Columbia, Canada

14 ⁷British Columbia Ministry of Agriculture, Abbotsford, Canada

15 ⁸RMC Pest Management Consulting, Briarcliff Manor, New York, USA

16 ⁹Medical and Applied Entomology, Arrow Exterminating Company, Inc. Lynbrook, NY, USA

17 ¹⁰Tokyo Pest Control Association, Tokyo, Japan

18 ¹¹CareSet Systems, Houston, TX, USA

19 ¹²Center for Behavioral and Cardiovascular Health, Columbia University, New York, New York,
20 USA

21 ¹³Department of Biological Sciences and the Louis Calder Center—Biological Field Station,
22 Fordham University, Armonk, NY, USA

23

24 **Abstract**

25 Following widespread closures of food-related businesses due to efforts to curtail the spread of
26 SARS-CoV-2, public health authorities reported increased sightings of rats in close vicinity of
27 people. Because rats vector a number of pathogens transmissible to people, changes in their
28 behavior has consequences for human health risks. To determine the extent of how stay-at-home
29 measures influenced patterns of rat sightings we: 1) examined the number of rat-related public
30 service requests before and during the period of lockdown in New York City (NYC) and Tokyo,
31 Japan; 2) examined reports made in proximity to closed food service establishments in NYC; and
32 3) surveyed pest control companies in the United States, Canada, Japan, and Poland. During the
33 month following lockdown, the overall number of reports decreased by 30% in NYC, while
34 increasing 24% in Tokyo. However, new hotspots of 311 calls were observed in proximity of
35 closed food service establishments in NYC; and there was a consistent positive association
36 between kernel density estimates of food service establishments and location of 311 calls ($r =$
37 0.33 to 0.45). Similarly, more reports were observed in the restaurant-dense eastern side of
38 Tokyo. Changes in clientele for pest control companies varied geographically, with 37% of pest-
39 management companies surveyed in North America reporting 50-100% of their post-lockdown
40 rat-related requests coming from new clients. In Warsaw, where there are no clusters of
41 restaurants in densely-populated areas, there were no changes. In Tokyo, there were no changes
42 in clients. We conclude that changes in public service calls are region-specific and localized,
43 with increases in rat sightings more likely near restaurant-dense regions. Pest control companies
44 surveyed in North America either lost much of their business or shifted clientele from old to new
45 locations. We discuss possible mitigation measures including ramping up pest control during re-
46 opening of food-related establishments and the need for citywide rodent surveillance and disease
47 monitoring.

48

49 **Keywords:** COVID-19, disease ecology, global commensal rodents, pandemic, public health,
50 rodent emergence, rodent surveillance, urban hygiene

51

52 **Introduction**

53 Urban rats (*Rattus spp.*) are global commensal organisms that depend on humans for food and
54 harborage. Thus, shifts in human behavior, such as occurs following natural catastrophe or
55 pandemics, will have pronounced effects on nearby rat populations. This effect has been
56 hypothesized after social distancing and business closures were broadly enacted in Spring 2020
57 to limit the spread of SARS-CoV-2. Shortly thereafter, local governments and public health
58 authorities around the world began reporting that closures of restaurants and food-related venues
59 have coincided with reports of mass sightings of rats¹⁻³. These sightings include reports of
60 aggressive behaviors during daylight hours and in close proximity to people^{4,5} with some rats
61 consuming conspecifics (e.g. muricide or cannibalism;⁶. Given the heightened state of anxiety
62 among people affected by the social distancing mandates^{7,8}, these sightings could also be a
63 reflection of human sensitivity toward rats as indicators of poor sanitation and disease^{9,10}.
64 Further, due to the increased use of social media during the pandemic^{11,12} and the rate at which
65 ‘panic’ spreads as a social contagion globally¹³, predisposition or cognitive bias could lead to
66 increased reports. These reports, while broadly circulated in the popular media, have yet to be
67 reviewed or confirmed through research or surveillance.

68 The potential mass movements of rats into new areas may negatively impact human
69 society^{14,15}. Rats are known to transmit many types of disease^{14,16,17} and are associated with
70 billions of dollars in losses of food annually^{18,19}. They are commonly thought to have killed more
71 humans than all wars combined^{20,21}, and these fearful perceptions have caused an intense fear of
72 rats in many cities²². The mere presence of rats is enough to cause harm to mental well-being,
73 particularly in low socio-economic status areas^{10,23}. But despite these harmful consequences,
74 there are no validated methods to quantify rat movements irrespective of human reports²⁴⁻²⁶.
75 Further, there are no routine disease surveillance programs to detect changes in pathogens that
76 rats may be transmitting¹⁴. Thus, cities are limited to the reporting of rat sightings to determine
77 spatial risks of rodent-borne disease and where abatement programs should be concentrated^{27,28}.

78 While cities need new mechanisms to monitor rat populations, it is important to
79 understand the relationship between human behavior and rat activity. Changes in the activity of
80 either species may have profound implications for the other^{22,23,27}. In temperate regions where
81 seasonal changes are prominent, rats and humans concurrently increase activity during Spring
82 and Summer, which results in predictable increases in rat sightings. For instance, reports of rat

83 complaints in Chicago over a ten-year period, 2008-2018, demonstrated a particularly strong rise
84 from winter to spring, then peaks each summer and decreases again from fall to winter²⁹. These
85 seasonal fluctuations in complaints can be explained by both decreased activity of rats as they
86 retreat deep within their burrows in colder months^{30,31} and the reduction in human outdoor
87 activity in winter^{32,33}. Human reporting of rat sightings can also be impacted by contextual bias
88 and cognitive bias³⁴. For instance, rats observed in new environments are more likely to be
89 noticed and reported than rats in areas where they have previously been established. Further, a
90 single rat sighting in a public area might generate more complaints compared to those in less
91 visible, or private, areas¹⁵. Lastly, the bandwagon effect³⁵ is a type of predisposition that causes
92 people who have knowledge of a widely-communicated event such as the global media reports
93 on rats, to have an increased awareness of rats, and thus, be more likely to report them.

94 Because humans have undergone profound changes resulting from social distancing and
95 isolation and because commensal rat populations are commensal with humans, rat populations
96 are almost certainly affected, however the nuances of these impacts remain unknown. Our
97 intentions for this paper are to provide data to help us understand to what extent changes in
98 human reporting behavior and/or wild rat ecology were responsible for the widely-reported
99 phenomenon. In colder climates, such as found in New York City, we sought to identify
100 observable shifts in public service reports (e.g., 311 calls) independent of seasonal effects²⁹.
101 Calls to 311 are free to report. Calls reported to pest management companies³⁶ on the other hand,
102 convey an added sense of urgency as they carry a monetary expense. Due to detailed, publicly
103 available data for the city, we were also able to examine food availability for rats in the form of
104 restaurants and food carts. In Tokyo we utilized public calls to the Tokyo Pest Control
105 Association (TPCA) which are used as a first step prior to hiring an exterminator, along with
106 cost-carrying reports made directly to private pest control companies. Neither Poland nor Canada
107 have immediately accessible public service reports, but national pest management associations
108 exist in each country, which we used to distribute surveys.

109 **Methods**

110 We analyzed public service requests (311 calls) from NYC Open Data
111 (<https://opendata.cityofnewyork.us/>) on May 3, 2020 for the observation period beginning
112 January 1, 2014 and ending April 30, 2020, inclusive of the lockdown phase which began on
113 March 23, 2020. New York City was considered an appropriate region for analysis due to its

114 high human population density, and robust, regularly-updated and easily accessible reporting
115 data. Reports are made when people file a complaint through the city's 311 via phone, website or
116 smartphone app. The selected interval was chosen because it allows a before-and-after treatment
117 analysis to be considered alongside annual seasonal changes. Rodent-related 311 calls are
118 classified into 5 categories: signs of rodents, conditions attracting rodents, rat sighting, mouse
119 sighting, and rodent bites. For this paper, we limited our analysis to the "rat sighting" category.

120 In Tokyo, the Japanese Government requested self-isolation on Feb. 16 and then declared
121 a state of emergency on Apr. 7. Therefore, we analyzed the number of phone calls to the TPCA
122 from January through April from 2015 through 2020, which was provided by the TPCA. The
123 TPCA is a non-profit public corporation established by the Ministry of Health & Welfare of the
124 Japanese Government. As a public interest incorporated association, they provide services and
125 referrals to the general public and also have access to 105 pest-management companies.
126 Complaints to the TPCA and subsequent consultation are free of charge, other than cost of a
127 local call. The TPCA introduces its members to pest control operations when necessary.
128 However, people are still responsible to decide whether or not they will contract with a pest-
129 management companies.

130 Pest control interventions offer a means to determine prevalence of rats³⁶. Thus, we also
131 created an industry survey with the help of industry professionals (Appendix A). The survey
132 covered at least a 30-day period from lockdown to post-lockdown for each nation. Three primary
133 questions were posed: 1) whether there had been changes in overall rat-related calls from
134 customers; 2) what approximate proportion of post-lockdown customers were new customers
135 (which may account for customers in new residences not previously infested); and 3) whether the
136 number of new customers for rat jobs was different from the number of new customers during
137 the same period the previous year. Respondents were not required to disclose personally
138 identifiable information. The survey was distributed through pest control channels (CPCA)
139 throughout Canada on May 5, 2020 and throughout the United States via Pest Control Magazine
140 ⁴ as well as via social media through Twitter and LinkedIn. The survey was translated in
141 Japanese and distributed to the 105 TPCA member pest-management companies on May 11,
142 2020. Because Japan has a large number of roof rats, the survey additionally asked about the
143 proportion of roof rats, brown rats, and house mice being reported. The survey was also

144 translated in Polish for dissemination via pest management channels, but due to the low numbers
145 of roof rats in Poland, there was no request for the species of rat being reported.

146 **Statistics**

147 Phone calls

148 We used one-way ANOVA to identify overall differences in average daily rat sightings per
149 month across all years in the observation period, and Tukey’s HSD test for pairwise comparison
150 between months. We then used two-way ANOVA to test the association between the daily
151 number of rat sightings in the months of March and April during the previous 6 years without
152 social distancing, 2014 to 2019, and during the social distancing phase in year 2020. We used
153 Tukey’s HSD test to conduct pairwise comparisons between the periods without social
154 distancing and the period with social distancing for the month of March, and similarly for the
155 month of April.

156 The Tokyo metropolitan area includes 23 wards, 26 cities, 3 towns, and 1 village. Among
157 them, the “accommodation, eating, and drinking services” (79.9% in 2016, based on Tokyo
158 Metropolitan Government website) and population (69.2% in 2020, based on Tokyo
159 Metropolitan Government website) were heavily biased toward the eastern 23 wards area (**Fig.**
160 **2**). Therefore, we focused on the data in 23 wards. From 2018 to 2020, the number of calls in the
161 target month was compared with the average of previous 3 years in the same month. When the
162 number of calls in 2020 was increased or decreased by more than 2 standard deviation as
163 compared to the previous 3 years, the number was classified as “increased” or “decreased”,
164 respectively. The differences in the number of wards showing “increased”, “decreased,” and “no
165 change” among 2018, 2019, and 2020 were analyzed by Fisher’s exact test.

166 Spatial analysis

167 To investigate changes in the spatial distribution of rats in NYC over the study period, we
168 mapped 311 rat calls in GIS and applied hot spot analysis. Both ArcMap 10.6 and QGIS 3.10
169 were used for these analyses. We first divided 311 calls for NYC by month and year and
170 imported these as separate data layers in GIS. We generated a time series of 311 rat calls in
171 QGIS by creating a heatmap and working within the Time Manager plugin. We then conducted
172 an optimized hot spot analysis in ArcMap using the Mapping Clusters toolbox. This analysis
173 evaluates areas with more or less point occurrences than expected at random, and applies a Getis-
174 Ord G_i^* statistic to assess significant deviations from a random distribution. We used the NYC

175 borough outline as the bounding polygon for this analysis, and a fishnet pattern was used to
176 generate sampling polygons across the study area, as recommended for this tool. Lastly, we
177 created kernel density raster layers of both the food service establishments (using NYC Open
178 Data on inspections) and rat 311 calls by month, and used the Band Collection Statistics toolbox
179 to calculate correlation coefficients between each raster dataset.

180 Survey

181 Descriptive statistics were used to report survey findings. In Tokyo, a two-way repeated
182 ANOVA was used to analyze the proportion of rodents. Planned comparisons were conducted
183 using paired t test to clarify the changes caused by a state of emergency and Tukey HSD test to
184 clarify the predominant species before and after a state of emergency.

185 **Results**

186 311 calls

187 In New York City, one-way ANOVA showed a significant difference in daily rat sightings
188 among the 12 months throughout the observation period ($F=106.5$; $P<0.001$). Tukey's HSD tests
189 indicated that, from 2014 to 2018, there are five groups of months with similar number of rat
190 sightings that appear to follow a seasonal trend. Specifically, the lowest number of daily rat
191 sightings were lowest in the winter burrowing periods (December and January) while the highest
192 were in summer (July through August). April sightings were significantly different from all the
193 other months, while March and November were similar (**Fig 1A**).

194 Two-way ANOVA showed a significant association between the average number of rat
195 sightings for the months of March and April during the years without social distancing (2014 to
196 2019) compared to the current year (2020) where social distancing was enforced (**Fig 1B**,
197 $F_1=35.4$; $P<0.001$). For the month of March, the early part of the COVID-19 lockdown period
198 where social distancing was enforced, there was no significant difference in the average number
199 of sightings during the social distancing phase ($\bar{x} = 24.9$; $SD=4.4$) as compared to March in the
200 prior 6 years when there was no social distancing ($\bar{x} = 35.6$; $SD=13.6$; $P=0.1$). However, for the
201 month of April, the first full month of isolation orders in NYC, the number of rat sightings
202 during the social distancing period ($\bar{x} = 31.7$; $SD=8.7$) was significantly lower compared to
203 April in the prior 6 years without social distancing ($\bar{x} = 45.0$; $SD=14.8$; $P<0.0001$). Although
204 the number of rat sightings in April 2020 was significantly lower compared to the same month in

205 prior years, the figure shows an increasing trend in the reported rat sightings from March to April
206 2020 (consistent with the trend shown in **Fig. 1A**) however, the difference is not statistically
207 significant ($P=0.560$).

208 Spatial relationship with food service establishments

209 There was a positive correlation between the kernel density estimates of food service
210 establishments and location of 311 calls in all of the months assessed (Fig. 4; **Supplemental**
211 **Table 1**). However, the spatial association between food service establishments and rat 311
212 locations did increase between the pre- and post-lockdown periods (r of 0.35–0.36 in
213 January/February 2020 compared to 0.44–0.45 in March/April 2020). Additionally, the Getis-
214 Ord analysis identified hotspots of 311 complaints within NYC, which changed only modestly
215 before and after the COVID lockdown period (**Fig. 4**). The correlation analysis also showed a
216 high correlation among 311 calls throughout the 3 years ($r = 0.83$ to 0.95), which indicates that
217 the locations of the rodent complaints are generally consistent across the years and months
218 analyzed. There were no detectable hotspots in areas away from clusters of food service
219 establishments (**Supplemental Fig. 1**).

220 Calls to TPCA (Tokyo)

221 Within the 23 wards of interest in Tokyo, the total number of calls from January through April.
222 were 224 (2015), 296 (2016), 293 (2017), 299 (2018), 314 (2019), and 365 (2020) which ranged
223 from 47.3% to 54.2% of calls in the Tokyo Metropolis. In the 23 wards, the total number of
224 phone calls was increased in Jan. and Apr. 2020, but not changed in February and March. The
225 patterns of changes in Tokyo were shown in **Fig 2**. In January, 5 of 6 changes (4 increased and 1
226 decreased), 2 of 4 changes (2 increased), and 1 of 4 changes (1 decreased) occurred in the 23
227 wards in 2018, 2019, and 2020, respectively. Fisher's exact test revealed that the changes in
228 Tokyo ($P = 0.55$) and in 23 wards ($P = 0.16$) were not different among three years. In February,
229 5 of 5 changes (3 increased and 2 decreased), 5 of 7 changes (5 increased), and 6 of 10 changes
230 (5 increased and 1 decreased) occurred in the 23 wards in 2018, 2019, and 2020, respectively.
231 Fisher's exact test revealed that the changes in Tokyo ($P = 0.23$) and in 23 wards ($P = 0.72$) were
232 not different among three years. In March, 3 of 5 changes (2 increased and 1 decreased), 2 of 4
233 changes (2 decreased), and 4 of 7 changes (4 increased) occurred in the 23 wards in 2018, 2019,
234 and 2020, respectively. Fisher's exact test revealed that the changes in Tokyo ($P = 0.08$), but not
235 in 23 wards ($P = 0.16$), were significantly different among three years. In April, no change

236 occurred in 2018. While 1 of 2 changes occurred in the 23 wards in 2019, 5 of 7 changes
237 occurred in 2020 (5 increased). Fisher's exact test revealed that the changes in Tokyo ($P < 0.05$)
238 and in 23 wards ($P < 0.05$) were different among three years.

239 Survey Data

240 There were 50 respondents from North America, 26 from Poland, 85 from Tokyo, and one each
241 from Argentina, India, and Malaysia. Of the 50 respondents in North America, one responded
242 "*prefer not to answer*" to the first question on whether there has been changes in number of rat-
243 related calls from customers, 3 to the second question on whether the majority of post-lockdown
244 customers were new customers, and 5 to the third question on whether the number of new
245 customers for rat jobs was different to the number of new customers during the same period the
246 previous year. The responses from Argentina, India and Malaysia were excluded from the
247 analysis, and responses of "*prefer not to answer*" were excluded on a per question basis. Data
248 from pest management companies from the US and Canada were combined as there was a
249 similar pattern in responses. The 50 respondents were from 47 cities across North America.
250 Given the number of cities represented, compared to the total number of respondents, we assume
251 that we received one response per pest management company.

252 Of 85 respondents in Tokyo, 82 responses were included as all questions were answered
253 clearly. The 82 respondents covered 29 of 53 areas of Tokyo and all 23 wards. We focused on
254 the 75 respondents from the 23 wards, because these wards, along with Tokyo, function as a
255 single urban entity with respect to public services such as rat complaints. The number of
256 questions answered ranged from 1 to 9 in each area. All respondents from Poland answered all
257 three questions and were all included in the analysis.

258 Volume of rat-related calls or jobs.

259 More than half of the respondents in North America (55%, **Fig. 3A**) indicated that they received
260 an increase in the volume of rat-related calls or jobs, while only 9% of responses from the 23
261 wards reported an increase. In Tokyo, the majority of the responses from the 23 wards (61%)
262 indicated that there was no change in the volume of calls. And in Poland, the distribution was
263 very similar between those who experienced an increase, a decrease and no change in the overall
264 volume of rat-related calls or jobs.

265 Relative volume of rat-related calls or jobs from new clients.

266 More than half of the respondents from North America (**Fig. 3B**, 53%) reported that they have
267 more calls from new clients for rat-related jobs as compared to the previous year. This is in
268 contrast with the responses from Poland (8%) and Tokyo (7%) where the majority of the
269 responses indicated that the relative volume was the same as compared to the same time in the
270 previous year (54% and 71%, respectively).

271 Proportion of rat-related jobs from new clients.

272 When asked how many of the rat-related calls or jobs were from new clients, 13% of respondents
273 in North America indicated that all of their rat-related jobs were for new clients, while none of
274 the respondents from Tokyo or Poland selected this response (**Fig. 3C**). More than half of the
275 respondents in Poland (54%) answered that none of their rat-related jobs were from new clients,
276 while only 21% in Tokyo and 13% in North America selected the same answer. Most of the
277 respondents from Tokyo (60%) indicated that the proportion of rat-related jobs from new clients
278 were very low, 1% to 25%, while the same response was obtained from one-third of the
279 respondents from both Poland (35%) and North America (32%).

280 Among the 24 respondents in North America who experienced an increase in rat-related
281 calls or jobs, 21 (88%) indicated that they have acquired more new clients for rat-related jobs
282 compared to the same time last year, while the remaining 3 (12%) responded that the relative
283 volume is about the same.

284 Proportion of rodents in Tokyo

285 Before declaration of a state of emergency, the proportion of brown rats, roof rats, and house
286 mice in Tokyo 23 wards was $20.5 \pm 1.7\%$, $78.9 \pm 1.8\%$, and $0.7 \pm 0.3\%$, respectively. The
287 proportion changed to $21.6 \pm 2.0\%$, $77.8 \pm 2.1\%$, $0.7 \pm 0.3\%$, respectively, after the
288 declaration. The proportion was significantly affected by the type of rodents ($F(2,225) = 748$, P
289 < 0.01), but not by the declaration of a state of emergency ($F(1,225) = 0$, $P = 1$). Interaction of
290 these two factors was not significant ($F(2,225)=1.32$, $P = 0.27$).

291 A planned comparison by paired t test did not find significant changes by the declaration
292 of a state of emergency (brown rats: $t(75) = 0.94$, $P = 0.35$; roof rats: $t(75) = -0.94$, $P = 0.35$;
293 house mice: impossible to assess because the majority was 0). A planned comparison by Tukey's
294 HSD test revealed that the proportion of roof rats was significantly higher than those of brown
295 rats ($P < 0.01$) and house mouse ($P < 0.01$) both before and after a declaration of a state of

296 emergency. The proportion of brown rats was higher than those of house mouse both before and
297 after a declaration of a state of emergency ($P < 0.01$).

298 **Discussion**

299 There are currently no validated measures to identify rat behaviors or movements in the city
300 despite their importance to human health risks. However, two key pieces of evidence suggest that
301 changes in human reporting behavior have to some extent been precipitated by changes in rat
302 movements. First, we have found a surprisingly high association between the location of rodent
303 complaints and food service establishments and; secondly, we provide evidence that these ‘hot
304 spots’ of rat sightings have shifted during the pandemic. Had these changes in rat reports been a
305 result of human cognitive bias³⁴ and/or hypervigilance due to ‘the bandwagon effect’³⁵, then
306 changes would have likely been unrelated to food businesses and more geographically uniform.
307 Instead, changes in public service calls and requests for pest control were region-specific and
308 localized, with increases in rat sightings in New York City (NYC) and Tokyo more likely to be
309 reported within, or near, restaurant-dense regions. In Warsaw, where there are no clusters of
310 restaurants within densely-populated areas, there were no changes.

311 The fact that calls decreased in NYC was unanticipated because institutions that reported
312 rat sightings¹⁻³ implied there were many more sightings than usual. The decrease in sightings was
313 further surprising because the period of lockdown coincided with the spring season when rat
314 sightings typically increase as rats emerge from underground burrows²⁹. Yet, the post-pandemic
315 reports moved in the opposite direction from the previous 6 years, with a 30% decrease in
316 volume of 311 calls in NYC. Conversely, in Tokyo, we were surprised that while calls actually
317 did increase by 23% as compared to 5 previous years, there were no differences between surveys
318 administered before and after the lockdown period. However, within North America, the shift in
319 clientele was striking. More than one-third of pest management companies surveyed reported 50-
320 100% of their post-lockdown jobs were from new clients, while six companies reported that
321 100% of their client-base had changed from old to new clients. Within the pest management
322 industry, such pronounced changes in rat populations following catastrophes are expected^{37,38}.

323 Some possible explanations for the geographic variability in outcomes relate to
324 differences in rat control, human social behavior and the ecological differences between the
325 primary species of rats being reported. In NYC, the lockdown was accompanied by the
326 widespread adoption of social distancing practice. The highest concentrations of sightings

327 typically occur near subway lines and recreational public spaces³⁹. However, in April 2020, the
328 majority of residents were at home social distancing and many had left the city (e.g., counter-
329 urbanization³⁷). Additionally, due to the abrupt reduction in available food, many rat populations
330 had temporarily decreased due to stress and competition. Another possible explanation is that
331 people who found an infestation near their residences may have contacted pest control directly
332 rather than reporting to 311. This finding makes sense because prior to restaurant closures a
333 single rat might be seen by hundreds of patrons and reported. During business closures the
334 opposite might be expected to occur, where many rats in a single residence might elicit only a
335 single call—likely to pest control for immediate response and not 311.

336 In Tokyo, it was surprising that the increased phone calls to TPCA were not reflected in
337 increased business for pest-management companies. This might be because the two species of
338 rats present in Tokyo were affected differently by the lockdown as roof rats were responsible for
339 78% of complaints registered in the surveys, while Norway rats made up only 20%. In addition
340 to being adapted for warmer climates, roof rats are more difficult to spot; they are smaller,
341 arboreal, make nests inside of ceilings or roofs, and migrate shorter distances. Pest control in
342 Tokyo is also mandatory in large buildings and thus roof rats are most likely found inside smaller
343 buildings such as restaurants and bars. Because restaurants and bars remained open for ‘take-
344 away’ meals, roof rats could continue to feed on food stocks, grease vats, and oil stains. Calls
345 regarding this species would have not been impacted greatly by the lockdown.

346 In contrast, the eastern side of Tokyo, where calls increased, is composed of the downtown
347 area where restaurants are more concentrated. In this area, large amounts of garbage are placed
348 street-side at midnight where Norway rats can consume garbage *ad libitum* until collected the
349 following morning. Thus, it is highly probable that roaming by Norway rats increased the overall
350 number of phone calls to TPCA, but was not perceived as important enough to hire a private pest
351 control specialist. We should also note that in Tokyo most pest-management companies contract
352 with restaurants and bars in one-year installments. The businesses that utilize these contracts for
353 the majority of their clientele would not be expected to be affected much by the declaration.
354 Specifically, if the number of one-year contracts had been much larger than new contracts, then
355 surveys of pest control companies would have failed to reveal the changes caused by the
356 declaration. In any case, we found that pest-management companies were not impacted as
357 prominently as NYC. Poland does not have a public service request system; however, they do

358 enforce mandatory pest control with fines for offenders with rats on their properties. Given that
359 they do not have clusters of restaurant-dense areas in heavily-populated areas, it is reasonable that
360 there were no changes in pest control needs before or after lockdown.

361 If large numbers of rats are migrating in some areas or regions—as appears to be
362 supported by our findings—then certain characteristics of immigrant rat populations may
363 change⁴⁰. For instance, if formerly insular rat populations⁴¹ come into increased contact with one
364 another due to migration, then mating opportunities could occur between colonies that do not
365 typically interbreed. Additionally, if large numbers of rats concurrently migrate, then a greater
366 variety of individual genotypes within populations would have moved significant distances while
367 under intense selective pressure⁴⁰. It is reasonable then to assume there is some influence on the
368 genetic profile of future urban rat populations^{42,43}. While stressed rat populations may initially
369 decrease due to loss of food and increased competition and muricide, rats breed rapidly, and
370 should rapidly re-establish population equilibrium⁴⁴. Impacts on human populations are less
371 clear.

372 Rodents are considered unlikely candidates to be infected with or transmit SARS-CoV-
373 2⁴⁵. Only two rodent species, the atypical 5 kg giant bamboo rat (*Rhizomys sinensis*)⁴⁶, and the
374 golden Syrian hamster (*Mesocricetus auratus*)⁴⁷ have been associated with the COVID-19 virus.
375 However, stressed or wounded rodents are less likely to groom and keep their fur clean, and thus
376 present a greater hazard to mechanically transmit contagious diseases without being infected
377 themselves^{48,49}. Additionally, in the case where rodents transmit pathogens that affect the
378 immune system, such as Lyme disease, then those affected could be at increased risk of a
379 weakened immune response to other pathogens^{50,51}. These increased risks to human health
380 support the urgent need for more robust data on rats in cities so that we can adequately track
381 these changes and make informed decisions moving forward regarding management.

382 **Conclusions**

383 Reports of increased sightings of urban rats near food service establishments suggest that
384 lockdown procedures have resulted in increased rat movement, which could, in turn, alter the
385 distribution of rats throughout the city. Because rats carry a number of pathogens that are
386 transmissible to people, these changes may have potential negative impacts for humans.
387 However, it is difficult to determine the extent to which social-distancing measures have
388 impacted rat biology due to a general lack of systematic data collected on rat presence and

389 abundance. To overcome these limitations, we combined 311 data, geographic data, and survey
390 data to infer whether rat sightings have increased in relation to stay-at-home measures put in
391 place during the COVID-19 pandemic. We demonstrate that following lock-down measures in
392 NYC, that rat complaints decrease as compared to previous years. Further we show that changes
393 in calls to pest control companies in North America, Japan, and Poland vary. Interestingly and
394 importantly, we have demonstrated that that in North America there is a striking increase in the
395 number of calls from new clientele, suggesting that stay-at-home measures have resulted in
396 noticeable changes in rat presence.

397 Natural disasters typically result in temporary decreases in rat populations followed
398 shortly by an uptick in populations^{37,38}. Residents near food service establishments should
399 therefore be prepared for local increases in rat populations during the late spring and early
400 summer. Properties closest to restaurants should pay special attention to exclusion techniques
401 and pest control to ward off the increased risks. General mitigation measures include public
402 education regarding urban hygiene and widespread, systemic changes in how we manage our
403 garbage⁵². We recommend that all commensal species⁵³ be tested for their ability to harbor or
404 transmit the virus, especially until a vaccine is developed. These assays could be particularly
405 useful because rats frequent sewers where they come into contact with human wastes which were
406 recently shown to contain heavy loads of the COVID-19^{54,55}. Given the impact of rats on public
407 health, and the challenges of exploiting human reports to learn about rats, there is a clear need
408 for more consistent, rigorous, and standardized rat monitoring and disease-monitoring on a
409 global scale.

410

411 **Acknowledgements**

412 We thank the Cornell University Extension Service (Matt Frye), Canadian Pest Management
413 Association (Amy Cannon), Pest Control Technology (Brad Harbison), and National Pest
414 Association Fairfax, Virginia (Jim Fredericks) for support and internal distribution of surveys.
415 Prof. Stanislaw Ignatowicz helped distribute surveys in Poland.

416

417

418 Funding Statement

419 This work was entirely self-funded by the authors.

420

421

422 References

- 423 1. BBC. Coronavirus: Why more rats are being spotted during quarantine.
424 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-52177587> (accessed June 6, 2020 2020).
- 425 2. BPCA. Latest Pest Control News, Features and Blog Articles from BPCA. 2020.
426 <https://bpca.org.uk/News-and-Blog/advice-for-pest-professionals-operating-during-covid-19->.
- 427 3. CDC. Rodent Control. In: (COVID-19). CDC.gov. June 15,2020.
- 428 4. Harbison B. PMPs re-strategize rodent control in response to COVID-19 pandemic. Pest Control
429 Technology. 2020 April 16, 2020.
- 430 5. Sieg L. As Japan fights coronavirus with shutdowns, rats emerge onto deserted streets. Reuters.
431 2020.
- 432 6. Elgar MA, Crespi BJ. Cannibalism: ecology and evolution among diverse taxa. 591.53 E53.
433 Turrialba, Costa Rica, 1992.
- 434 7. Rieger NS, Christianson JP. Vigilance in a time of social distancing. *Neuropsychopharmacology*
435 2020; PMID: 3230369: 1-2.
- 436 8. Venkatesh A, Edirappuli S. Social distancing in covid-19: what are the mental health
437 implications? *BMJ* 2020; 369 (m1379).
- 438 9. Strand TM, Löhmus M, Persson Vinnersten T, et al. Highly pathogenic *Leptospira* found in urban
439 brown rats (*Rattus norvegicus*) in the largest cities of Sweden. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases* 2015;
440 15(12): 779-81.
- 441 10. Byers KA, Cox SM, Lam R, Himsworth CG. "They're always there": resident experiences of living
442 with rats in a disadvantaged urban neighbourhood. *BMC Public Health* 2019; 19(1): 853.
- 443 11. Király O, Potenza MN, Stein DJ, et al. Preventing problematic internet use during the COVID-19
444 pandemic: Consensus guidance. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 2020: 152180.
- 445 12. Wiederhold BK. Social media use during social distancing. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social*
446 *Networking* 2020; 23(5).
- 447 13. Depoux A, Martin S, Karafillakis E, Preet R, Wilder-Smith A, Larson H. The pandemic of social
448 media panic travels faster than the COVID-19 outbreak. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 2020; Mar 3. [Epub
449 ahead of print].
- 450 14. Firth C, Bhat M, Firth MA, et al. Detection of zoonotic pathogens and characterization of novel
451 viruses carried by commensal *Rattus norvegicus* in New York City. *mBio* 2014; 5(5): e01933-14.
- 452 15. Childs J, Glass G, LeDuc J. Rodent sightings and contacts in an inner-city population of Baltimore,
453 Maryland, USA. *Bulletin of the Society of Vector Ecologists* 1991; 16(2): 245-55.
- 454 16. Himsworth CG, Parsons KL, Feng AY, Kerr T, Jardine CM, Patrick DM. A Mixed Methods Approach
455 to Exploring the Relationship between Norway Rat (*Rattus norvegicus*) Abundance and Features of the
456 Urban Environment in an Inner-City Neighborhood of Vancouver, Canada. 2014.
- 457 17. Frye M, Firth C, Bhat M, et al. Preliminary Survey of Ectoparasites and Associated Pathogens
458 from Norway Rats in New York City. *Journal of Medical Entomology* 2015: tjv014.
- 459 18. Stenseth NC, Leirs H, Skonhøft A, et al. Mice, rats, and people: the bio - economics of
460 agricultural rodent pests. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2003; 1(7): 367-75.
- 461 19. Pimentel D, Zuniga R, Morrison D. Update on the environmental and economic costs associated
462 with alien-invasive species in the United States. *Ecological Economics* 2005; 52(3): 273-88.


- 463 20. Zinsser H. Rats, lice and history. Boston, USA: Little Brown and Company; 1935.
- 464 21. Davis DE. The scarcity of rats and the Black Death: an ecological history. *The Journal of*
465 *Interdisciplinary History* 1986; **16**(3): 455-70.
- 466 22. Prokop P, Fančovičová J, Fedor P. Health is associated with antiparasite behavior and fear of
467 disease-relevant animals in humans. *Ecological Psychology* 2010; **22**(3): 222-37.
- 468 23. German D, Latkin CA. Exposure to urban rats as a community stressor among low - income
469 urban residents. *Journal of Community Psychology* 2016; **44**(2): 249-62.
- 470 24. Desvars-Larrive A, Baldi M, Walter T, Zink R, Walzer C. Brown rats (*Rattus norvegicus*) in urban
471 ecosystems: are the constraints related to fieldwork a limit to their study? *Urban Ecosystems* 2018;
472 **21**(5): 951-64.
- 473 25. Parsons MH, Sarno R, Deutsch M. Jump-starting urban rat research: Conspecific pheromones
474 recruit wild rats into a behavioral and pathogen-monitoring assay. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*
475 2015; **10.3389/fevo.2015.00146/full**.
- 476 26. Byers KA, Lee MJ, Donovan CM, Patrick DM, Himsworth CG. A novel method for affixing global
477 positioning system (GPS) tags to urban Norway rats (*Rattus norvegicus*): feasibility, health impacts and
478 potential for tracking movement. *Journal of Urban Ecology* 2017; **3**(1): jux010.
- 479 27. Himsworth CG, Feng AY, Parsons K, Kerr T, Patrick DM. Using experiential knowledge to
480 understand urban rat ecology: A survey of Canadian pest control professionals. *Urban Ecosystems* 2013;
481 **16**(2): 341-50.
- 482 28. Richardson JL, Burak MK, Hernandez C, et al. Using fine - scale spatial genetics of Norway rats to
483 improve control efforts and reduce leptospirosis risk in urban slum environments. *Evolutionary*
484 *Applications* 2017; **10**(4): 323-37.
- 485 29. Murray MH, Fyffe R, Fidino M, et al. Public Complaints Reflect Rat Relative Abundance Across
486 Diverse Urban Neighborhoods. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 2018; **6**: 189.
- 487 30. Schultz LA, Collier G, Johnson DF. Behavioral strategies in the cold: effects of feeding and nesting
488 costs. *Physiology & Behavior* 1999; **67**(1): 107-15.
- 489 31. Collier GH, Johnson DF, Naveira J, Cybulski KA. Ambient temperature and food costs: effects on
490 behavior patterns in rats. *American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative*
491 *Physiology* 1989; **257**(6): R1328-R34.
- 492 32. Feng AY, Himsworth CG. The secret life of the city rat: a review of the ecology of urban Norway
493 and black rats (*Rattus norvegicus* and *Rattus rattus*). *Urban Ecosystems* 2014; **17**(1): 149-62.
- 494 33. Himsworth CG, Parsons KL, Jardine C, Patrick DM. Rats, cities, people, and pathogens: a
495 systematic review and narrative synthesis of literature regarding the ecology of rat-associated zoonoses
496 in urban centers. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases* 2013; **13**(6): 349-59.
- 497 34. Kontokosta C, Hong B, Korsberg K. Equity in 311 reporting: Understanding socio-spatial
498 differentials in the propensity to complain. *arXiv Preprint:171002452* 2017.
- 499 35. Nadeau R, Cloutier E, Guay J-H. New evidence about the existence of a bandwagon effect in the
500 opinion formation process. *International Political Science Review* 1993; **14**(2): 203-13.
- 501 36. Strand TM, Pineda S, Backhans A, et al. Detection of *Leptospira* in Urban Swedish Rats: Pest
502 Control Interventions as a Promising Source of Rats Used for Surveillance. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic*
503 *Diseases* 2019; **19**(6): 414-20.
- 504 37. Peterson AC, Ghersi BM, Campanella R, Riegel C, Lewis JA, Blum MJ. Rodent assemblage
505 structure reflects socioecological mosaics of counter-urbanization across post-Hurricane Katrina New
506 Orleans. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 2020; **195**: 103710.
- 507 38. Shiels AB, Lombard CD, Shiels L, Hillis-Starr Z. Invasive rat establishment and changes in small
508 mammal populations on Caribbean Islands following two hurricanes. *Global Ecology and Conservation*
509 2020: e00986.

- 510 39. Walsh MG. Rat sightings in New York City are associated with neighborhood sociodemographics,
511 housing characteristics, and proximity to open public space. *PeerJ* 2014; **2**: e533.
- 512 40. Gardner - Santana L, Norris D, Fornadel C, Hinson E, Klein SL, Glass G. Commensal ecology,
513 urban landscapes, and their influence on the genetic characteristics of city - dwelling Norway rats
514 (*Rattus norvegicus*). *Molecular Ecology* 2009; **18**(13): 2766-78.
- 515 41. Combs M, Puckett EE, Richardson J, Mims D, Munshi - South J. Spatial population genomics of
516 the brown rat (*Rattus norvegicus*) in New York City. *Molecular Ecology* 2018; **27**(1): 83-98.
- 517 42. Harpak A, Garud N, Rosenberg NA, et al. Genetic Adaptation in New York City Rats. *BioRxiv* 2020.
- 518 43. Richardson JL, Silveira G, Soto Medrano I, et al. Significant genetic impacts accompany an urban
519 rat control campaign in Salvador, Brazil. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 2019; **7**: 115.
- 520 44. Emlen JT, Stokes AW, Winsor CP. The rate of recovery of decimated populations of brown rats in
521 nature. *Ecology* 1948; **29**(2): 133-45.
- 522 45. Liu Y, Hu G, Wang Y, et al. Functional and Genetic Analysis of Viral Receptor ACE2 Orthologs
523 Reveals a Broad Potential Host Range of SARS-CoV-2. *bioRxiv* 2020.
- 524 46. Sun Z, Thilakavathy K, Kumar SS, He G, Liu SV. Potential factors influencing repeated SARS
525 outbreaks in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2020; **17**(5):
526 1633.
- 527 47. Sia SF, Yan L-M, Chin AW, et al. Pathogenesis and transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in golden
528 hamsters. *Nature* 2020: 1-7.
- 529 48. Elbers AR, Stegeman A, Moser H, Ekker HM, Smak JA, Pluimers FH. The classical swine fever
530 epidemic 1997–1998 in the Netherlands: descriptive epidemiology. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 1999;
531 **42**(3-4): 157-84.
- 532 49. Battersby S. Rodents as carriers of disease. *Rodent pests and control, 2nd edn CAB International,*
533 *Wallingford* 2015: 81-100.
- 534 50. Brouwer MA, van de Schoor FR, Vrijmoeth HD, Netea MG, Joosten LA. A joint effort: The
535 interplay between the innate and the adaptive immune system in Lyme arthritis. *Immunological Reviews*
536 2020; **294**: 1.
- 537 51. Chaconas G, Castellanos M, Verhey TB. Changing of the guard: How the Lyme disease spirochete
538 subverts the host immune response. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 2020; **295**(2): 301-13.
- 539 52. Nagle R. Picking up: on the streets and behind the trucks with the sanitation workers of New
540 York City. New York, NY: Macmillan; 2013.
- 541 53. McNamara T, Richt JA, Glickman L. A Critical Needs Assessment for Research in Companion
542 Animals and Livestock Following the Pandemic of COVID-19 in Humans. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic*
543 *Diseases* 2020; **20**(6).
- 544 54. Mallapaty S. How sewage could reveal true scale of coronavirus outbreak. *Nature* 2020;
545 **580**(7802): 176-7.
- 546 55. Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 in
547 sewage. *MedRxiv* 2020.

548

549 **Figures**


550 **Figure 1.** Right, the association between number of reported rat sightings per day by month with reference to the social distancing
551 period of March and April 2014 to 2019 compared with the same two months during the social distancing period, year 2020. Left,
552 distribution of daily rat sightings per month during the observation period (January 2014 to April 20) using data from NYC Open
553 Data.
554



555
556

20)


557 **Figure 2.** New and old clients. Survey responses from 53 pest control companies in North America, 26 in Poland, and 75 in 23 wards
 558 of Tokyo, Japan. Top right, number of all rat-related calls/jobs from new clients. Top left, relative volume of overall rat-related
 559 calls/jobs before and after the lockdown period. Bottom, proportion of new client calls due to rat-related jobs.



560
 561
 562
 563


564 **Figure 3.** The changes in service calls to Tokyo Pest Control Association over period from
565 January through April from 2018 to 2020. The grey areas indicate the 23 wards.

566



567

568 **Figure 4.** Kernel density of food service establishments (top left) and results of optimized
569 hotspot analysis (Getis-Ord G_i^*) of 311 calls in New York City, USA (right and bottom).



570

571 **Supplemental Table 1.** Correlation matrix between the food service establishment (FSE) kernel density raster and monthly 311 calls
 572 kernel density raster in New York City, USA.

	FSE	Mar 2018	Apr 2018	Mar 2019	Apr 2019	Jan 2020	Feb 2020	Mar 2020	Apr 2020
FSE	1								
Mar 2018	0.40	1							
Apr 2018	0.33	0.95	1						
Mar 2019	0.42	0.88	0.89	1					
Apr 2019	0.44	0.90	0.92	0.93	1				
Jan 2020	0.36	0.90	0.92	0.91	0.92	1			
Feb 2020	0.35	0.83	0.87	0.88	0.91	0.91	1		
Mar 2020	0.44	0.88	0.91	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.90	1	
Apr 2020	0.45	0.84	0.89	0.90	0.90	0.91	0.89	0.95	1

573

574