DOI: 10.5829/idosi.ijbav.2023.09.14

Assessment of Community Knowledge, Attitude and Practice on Rabies in and Around Mendi Town, West Wollega, Oromia, Ethiopia

¹HundeWayuma, ²Alemitu Abera and ³JemalGemeda Utale

¹Menesibu District Livestock Resource office, Ethiopia ²Mendi town Veterinary Clinic, Ethiopia ³Lode-Hetosa District Agricultural office, Arsi Zone, Ethiopia

Abstract: Rabies is one of the oldest recognized infectious diseases which affect all mammals. The study was conducted in and around Mendi town, which is found in western Wollega zone of Oromia regional state, Ethiopia. Non observational study type consisting of purposive study was used and a cross-sectional quantitative study was conducted from January - March 2021 to assess the knowledge, attitude and practices on rabies and associated factors. A pre-tested structured questionnaire consisting of closed and open ended. The majority of the respondents in the study were males 247(64%), while the number of females was 137(36). About 290(76%) of the respondents were heard about rabies. 384 respondents majority of them 216(56%) responded humans and other domestic animals as the species affected by rabies. Regarding the preferred action taken for bitten human, traditional treatment was responded by 204(53%). Among 384 respondents only 30(7.8%) of them vaccinate their dogs. The present study revealed that the majority of the respondents were heard about rabies. However there is a big gap on KAP level related to transmission, clinical sign, vaccination of their dogs, Prevention methods after suspected animal bite, action taken in home after bitten by a suspected animals. Therefore, Community based education program with emphasis on transmission, clinical sign, vaccination of their dogs, Prevention methods after suspected animal bite, action taken in home after bitten by a suspected animals is very important.

Key words: Knowledge · Attitude · Practice · Rabies · Mendi · Menesibu

INTRODUCTION

Rabies is one of the oldest recognized infectious diseases which affect all mammals [1]. The etiologic agent of this disease is the rabies virus belonging to the genus Lyssa virus and family Rhabdoviridae [2]. Rabies is one of the most serious zoonotic diseases. Once the clinical signs develop, it is almost 100% fatal disease [3].

Rabies is the most widely recognized example of salivary transmission of viruses. Inoculation of infected saliva through the bite of a rabid animal appears to be the predominant mode of rabies viral entry although contamination of broken skin and mucous membrane such as mouth, nasal cavity or eyes by fresh saliva or neurological tissues may result in infection [4]. Worldwide, an estimated 29 million people receive postexposure prophylaxis (PEP) for rabies each year and more

than 59 000 people die of rabies, primarily due to poor rabies control measures [5-6].

Rabies is endemic in developing countries of Africa and Asia and most human deaths from the disease occur in these endemic countries. Africa, next to Asia, is the second continent most affected by rabies with an estimated 24,000 (44 %) of the 55,000 annual rabies deaths. Domestic dogs are considered to be the main sources (>90%) of human rabies in Africa and more than 88% of the exposure cases in Ethiopia were due to dog bites. The pooled estimate of rabies in Ethiopia was 32% (95% CI: 19-46%) [7].

Despite it is a fatal disease, rabies could be prevented by the timely application of appropriate prophylaxis [8]. The knowledge gap among the community should be assessed for subsequent intervention to increase awareness appropriately and to take other targeted interventions. An increase of knowledge about rabies and public awareness in general will first aid what kind of measures to take after dog bites. [9], suggested that an increased knowledge about dog behavior and how to avoid getting bitten by dogs are methods to prevent rabies in humans.

Although rabies is primarily a disease of dogs in Ethiopia including Mendi town and its surrounding villages of West Wollega zone, no adequate research has been done to address the knowledge gab about the disease through assessing the knowledge, attitude and practice of the community. Therefore, the main aim behind the present study is to address the existing knowledge, attitude and practice gaps in the study area through conducting in depth assessment thereof which eventually contribute for efficient and effective control of the disease.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Area: The study was conducted in and around Mendi town, which is found in western Wollega zone of Oromia regional state, Ethiopia. This area has a latitude and longitude of 9048'N and 3506'E respectively and an elevation of 1583 meters above sea level. It is the administrative center of ManasibuWoreda. Manasibu is bordered on the south by Jarso, on the South West by Begi on the North by the BenishangulGumuz Region and on the southwest by Nedjo. The town is approximately 596 km away from Addis Ababa to the west direction [10].

Study Population: The study population comprises people living in and around Mendi town. Roughly an estimated number of 4746 males and 4377 females inhabit in the town and its surroundings. The target population however entails the entire Manasibuworeda inhabitants containing an estimated number 86476 male and 82710 females.

Study Design and Methodology: The study was conducted from January - March 2021. Non observational study type consisting of purposive study was used. A questionnaire was administered to assess their knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) on rabies and associated factors. To this end, a structured questionnaire was developed.

Sample Size Determination: The sample size has been determined considering the worst case scenario where 50% of the population (P) is assumed to have gap in

knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP). In addition, 95% confidence level (CL), 5% desired precision were considered to calculate the sample size according to Thursfield, [11].

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2 Pexp 1 - Pexp}{d^2}$$

when: n=required sample size; Pexp= expected prevalence d= desired absolute precision. Hence, by using this formula, the sample size was calculated to be 384.

Data Collection: A pre-tested structured questionnaire consisting of closed and open ended questions was used for this study. The questionnaire consisted of resident profile (age, sex, education, religion) and question concerning knowledge, attitude and practice. The questions were read out to the respondents in their local language (Afan Oromo) by the interviewer and their answers were recorded in English.

Data Management and Analysis: After collection, the data was cleaned and checked for its completeness. Those incomplete and inconsistent were corrected when possible and removed otherwise. After a complete checkup, the data were coded and entered into Microsoft Excel and exported to SPSS version 20 statistical packages for Windows and analysis made. The frequency distribution of both dependent and independent variables was worked out by using descriptive statistical techniques (Frequencies and percentages). The association between independent variables and KAP scores on rabies was calculated using Pearson's Chi-square. Statistical significance was set at P<0.05.

RESULTS

A total of 384 community members were interviewed during the study period. Table 1 shows the profile of respondents from urban and peri-urban. The majority of the respondent's age groups were included in the range of (35 to 50 and 51-60). Regarding the educational status of the respondents, 94(24%) were cannot read and write, 98(26%) read.

About 290(76%) of the respondents have heard about rabies. Majority of the respondents 190(49%) described a virus as the cause of the disease and 108(28%) of the respondents responded that they do not know the causative agent. Among 384 respondents majority of them 216(56%) responded humans and other domestic animals as the species affected by rabies.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants in and around Mendi town (N = 384)

Socio-demographic variables	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
Residence			
Urban	216	56%	56%
Peri-urban	168	44%	100%
SEX			
Male	247	64%	64%
Female	137	36%	100%
AGE			
18-34	102	27%	27%
35-50	132	34%	61%
51-65	111	29%	90%
≥ 60	39	10%	100%
EDUCATION			
Cannot read and write	94	24%	24%
Read and write only	98	26%	50%
Primary school	96	25%	75%
Secondary school	66	17%	92%
Higher Education	30	8%	100%
OCCUPATION			
Health professionals	12	3%	3%
Veterinarian	14	4%	7%
Farmer	111	29%	36%
Merchant	33	9%	44%
Jobless	60	16%	60%
House wife	65	17%	77%
Other	89	23%	100%
RELIGIOUS			
Orthodox	110	29%	29%
Protestant	188	49%	78%
Muslim	52	14%	91%
Others	34	9%	100%

Most of the respondents 226(56%) replied bite and contact with open wound as transmission method. Dog bite has been replied only by 80(21%) respondents as a mechanism for disease transmission. Among 384 repondents135 (35%) replied that sudden change in behavior was the obvious clinical manifestation of rabies while 193(50%) were aware that rabies can be prevented by vaccine.

This study revealed that 244(63.5%) of respondents said that stray dogs are dangerous and 134(34.9) were willing to register their pets. 192(50) of respondents said killing prevents rabies.

As indicated in Table 3, 130(33.85) of respondents kill the animal after being rabid. Regarding the preferred action taken for bitten human, 204(53%) of participants preferred traditional treatment whereas, post exposure vaccination was preferred by 86(24%) of participants. Moreover, 68(7.8%) of respondents reported that they would wash the wound using soap and water. Among 384 respondents only 30(7.8%) of them vaccinate their dogs.

DISCUSSION

The present study revealed that the majority of the respondents (76%) were heard about rabies and this was in agreement with the reports of Matibag et al. [12], Ali et al. [13], Sumon et al. [14] and Reuben Christopher Rine et al. [15] which is 75.2%, 73%, 76.5% srilanka, Ethiopia, Bangladesh and Nigeria respectively. This finding is lower than the reports of 96.4% and 99.0% reported by Shumuye et al.[11] in Ethiopia and Moran et al. [16] in Guatemala respectively. However the present finding is higher than the reports of Mucheru et al. [17] in Kenya, Sambo et al. [18] in Tanzania with the reports of 49% and 27% respectively. These differences could be associated with awareness level of the community, educational status, information access.

Among the study participants, only 30% of the respondents vaccinated their dog once through their life time by the support of Wollegga University in urban area. This study is in line with the study conducted in Kenya

Table 2: knowledge of the study participants towards rabies in and around mendi town (N = 384)

Knowledge related variables	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
about rabies disease	Trequency	1 CICCIII	Cum. 1 creent
HEARD			
Yes	290	76%	76%
NO	94	24%	100%
RABIES CAUSE		2470	10070
Virus	190	49%	49%
Bacterium	63	16%	66%
Starvation and thirst	23	6%	72%
I don't know	108	28%	100%
SPECIES ARE AFFECTED BY RA		2070	10070
Dogs only	58	15%	15%
Human only	35	9%	24%
Dog and Human	75	20%	44%
Human and other domestic animals	216	56%	100%
TRANSMISSION	210	3070	10070
	80	21%	21%
Bite only Contact with saliva only	36	9%	30%
Bite and contact with open wound	226	59%	89%
Infected meat and others	42	11%	100%
SYMPTOMS	42	11/0	10070
Salivation only	128	33%	33%
Sudden change in behavior	135	35%	68%
Loss of appetite	61	16%	84%
Sudden death	60	16%	100%
VACCINE PREVENT	00	1070	10076
Yes	102	500/	500/
No No	193 191	50% 50%	50% 100%
	191	30%	100%
INFORMATION SOURCE	100	260/	260/
Health worker	100	26%	26%
Television	40	10%	36%
Radio Livestock officers	48	13%	49% 68%
zivestoen omeers	73	19%	100%
Others	123	32%	100%
VACCINE SOURCE			
General hospital	157	41%	41%
Private hospital/pharmacy	60	16%	57%
teaching/ specialized hospital	48	13%	69%
Livestock departments	119	31%	100%

(35%) reported by Mucheru *et al.* [17]. However this finding is much lower than with the study conducted in Indonesia (74%) and Sri Lanka (76%) reported by Matibag *et al.* [12] and Reta *et al.* [19] respectively. This may be attributed to anumber of factors that include availability of animal vaccines, the study times and good information sharing and lack of rabies control programs in this study area.

This study showed all respondents (100%) in peri urban area did not vaccinate their dogs. This is in agreement with Shumuye *et al.* [11] in north Gondar Ethiopia who noted that dog vaccination practice in

Table 3: Attitude and Practice of study participant in and around Mendi town (N=384)

STRAY DOG DANGEROUS Agree 244 63.54 0.6354 Disagree 140 36.46 1 RABIES IS PROBLEM 34.38 0.3438 Disagree 252 65.63 1 KILLING AS PREVENTION Agree 192 50 0.5 Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS 434.9 0.349 Disagree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 136 65.1 1 <t< th=""><th>Attitude and Practice related variables</th><th>Frequency</th><th>Percent</th><th>Cum. Percent</th></t<>	Attitude and Practice related variables	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
Disagree 140 36.46 1 RABIES IS PROBLEM Agree 132 34.38 0.3438 Disagree 252 65.63 1 KILLING AS PREVENTION Agree 192 50 0.5 Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use tradition		1 7		
Disagree 140 36.46 1 RABIES IS PROBLEM Agree 132 34.38 0.3438 Disagree 252 65.63 1 KILLING AS PREVENTION Agree 192 50 0.5 Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DUGG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer	Agree	244	63.54	0.6354
RABIES IS PROBLEM Agree 132 34.38 0.3438 Disagree 252 65.63 1 KILLING AS PREVENTION Agree 192 50 0.5 Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	· ·	140	36.46	1
Agree 132 34,38 0.3438 Disagree 252 65.63 1 KILLING AS PREVENTION Agree 192 50 0.5 Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 Visit				
Disagree 252 65.63 1 KILLING AS PREVENTION Agree 192 50 0.5 Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 1 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204		132	34.38	0.3438
KILLING AS PREVENTION Agree 192 50 0.5 Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS 34.9 0.349 Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG 7 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 1 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No <	· ·			
Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT 110 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 1 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID NIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PUR				
Disagree 192 50 1 REGISTER PETS Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT 110 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID NIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no	Agree	192	50	0.5
REGISTER PETS Agree 134 34.9 0.349 Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 1 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34	· ·			
Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 1 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84				
Disagree 250 65.1 1 OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 1 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE	Agree	134	34.9	0.349
OWN DOG Yes 134 34.9 0.349 No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 30 7.81 0.0781	· ·	250	65.1	1
No 250 65.1 1 MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 1 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 36 0.5156 Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading an	Yes	134	34.9	0.349
MANAGEMENT Indoor 19 4.95 0.0495 Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1	No	250	65.1	1
Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 30 7.81 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917	MANAGEMENT			
Free 116 30.21 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 30 7.81 0.5156 Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION <td></td> <td>19</td> <td>4.95</td> <td>0.0495</td>		19	4.95	0.0495
ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	Free	116		0.3516
ACTION ON ANIMALS BITTEN BY RABID DOG Killing 130 33.85 0.3385 No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	Has no dog	249	64.84	1
No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224		RABID DO	G	
No action 82 21.35 0.5521 Treatment 172 44.79 1 ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	Killing	130	33.85	0.3385
ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF HUMANS BY RABID ANIMAL Washing with soap and water use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	· ·	82	21.35	0.5521
Washing with soap and water 68 17.71 0.1771 use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	Treatment	172	44.79	1
use traditional healer 204 53.13 0.7083 Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	ACTION TAKEN AFTER BITE OF H	UMANS BY	RABID	ANIMAL
Visit health institution 86 22.4 0.9323 Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED VACCINATED VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 0.5156 0.5156 Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	Washing with soap and water	68	17.71	0.1771
Do nothing 26 6.77 1 VACCINATED VACCINATED VACCINATED VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	use traditional healer	204	53.13	0.7083
VACCINATED Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG 30 51.56 0.5156 Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	Visit health institution	86	22.4	0.9323
Yes 30 7.81 0.0781 No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	Do nothing	26	6.77	1
No 105 27.34 0.3516 Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	VACCINATED			
Has no dog 249 64.84 1 PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	Yes	30	7.81	0.0781
PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	No	105	27.34	0.3516
Guarding 198 51.56 0.5156 Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	Has no dog	249	64.84	1
Hunting 99 25.78 0.7734 Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	PURPOSE OF OWNING DOG			
Guading and Hunting 87 22.66 1 FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	Guarding	198	51.56	0.5156
FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFECTION Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	Hunting	99	25.78	0.7734
Yes 112 29.17 0.2917 No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	Guading and Hunting	87	22.66	1
No 272 70.83 1 BITTEN HISTORY 47 12.24 0.1224	FAMILY HISTORY OF RABIES INFI	ECTION		
BITTEN HISTORY Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	Yes	112	29.17	0.2917
Yes 47 12.24 0.1224	No	272	70.83	1
	BITTEN HISTORY			
No 337 87.76 1	Yes	47	12.24	0.1224
	No	337	87.76	1

peri-urban practice was generally very low and totally nonexistent in rural district. This is due to large dependency of the respondents in peri urban area on the traditional treatment using herbs, limitation of availability and high cost of vaccine.

The present finding indicate that Majority of the respondents 204(53.3%) used traditional treatment as the best option for dog bites. The respondents from peri urban areas were more likely to seek treatment from traditional healers than those from urban areas. This could be attributed to the low level of education and awareness of the respondents which is in consistent

with the report of Shumuye *et al.* [11], Sekhon *et al.* [20], Sudarshan *et al.* [21] and Rumana *et al.* [22]. These types of treatment seeking behavior may be the outcome of persisting many myths and false beliefs among respondents associated with dog bite management and lack of education regarding effective prevention of rabies. Furthermore financial constraint, insufficient vaccine and immunoglobin supply to the government hospitals, distance from the dog bite victim place of government hospitals may be responsible for the low vaccine coverage among dog bite victims in the study area.

In the current study, only 17.7% of respondents would wash the wound using soap and water as first aid for bitten humans bitten by rabid animals. This finding is much lower than the report of Yalemebrat *et al.* [23] in Debark District of Ethiopia and Shumuye *et al.* [11] in Gondar zuria with the report of 76.4%, 49.6% and 30.7% respectively. This difference could be associated with awareness level of the community. Washing of rabies infected wound with soap and water can increase survival by 50 % [23].

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion the present study revealed that the majority of the respondents were heard about rabies. However there is a big gap on KAP level related to transmissions, clinical sign, vaccination of their dogs, Prevention methods after suspected animal bite, action taken in home after bitten by a suspected animals. Residence, sex, age, education of respondents was the variables found to be significantly associated with KAP of respondents about rabies.

Based on the above conclusion the following recommendations are forwarded:

- Community based education program with emphasis on transmissions, clinical sign, vaccination of their dogs, prevention methods after suspected animal bite, action taken in home after bitten by a suspected animals.
- Public healthy sectors, veterinary sectors and other stake holders should work together to prevent and control the public health and economic impact of rabies
- The Government should work with information source like radio, TV, newspaper and others to provide adequate information for the livestock owners in order to prevent their animals from exposure.

REFERANCES

- Serebe, G. Sh., A.K. Tadesse, A.H. Yizengaw and M.S. Tamirat, 2014. Study On Community Knowledge, Attitude And Practice Of Rabies In And Nearby Gondar Town, North West Ethiopia. J. Public Health and Epidemiology, 6(12): 429-435.
- 2. Rupprecht, C.E., C.A. Hanlon and T. Hemachudha, 2002. Rabies re-examined. The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 2: 327-343.
- Admassu, P. and Y. Mekonnen, 2014. Rabies and Its Folk Drugs Remedies in Ethiopia: A Review. International Journal of Basic and Applied Virology, 3(2): 22-27.
- 4. Yimer, E., 2001. Rabies in Ethiopia. In: proceeding of six SEARG meeting, June 18-21, 2001, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Hurisa, B., B. Tegbaru, D. Nolke, A. Mengesha, G. Kebede, S. Kerga, A. Adhanom, A. Godana, D. Nigussie, B. Newayesilassie, G. Gebrewold, D. Bankoviskiy, A. Metlin and K. Urga, 2013. Safety and Immunogenicity of Ethiorab Rabies Vaccine. Journal of Vaccine Vaccin, 4(6): 1-5.
- Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD), 2010. Rabies Control Strategies. In: Department Of Animal Health, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, pp. 12-33.
- 7. Shire, B., Melke, M. and A. Ayalew, 2021. Prevalence of dog mediated rabies in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta analysis from 2010 to 2020. One Health Outlook, 3(16): 8.
- 8. Yibrah, M. and D. Damtie, 2015. Incidence of Human Rabies Exposure And Associated Factors At The Gondar Health Center, Ethiopia: A Three-Year Retrospective Study. Infectious Diseases of Poverty, 4(3): 1-5.
- Radostits, O.M., C.C. Gay and K.W. Hinchcliff, 2007. Veterinary Medicine: A Textbook of the Diseases of Cattle, Horses, Sheep, Pigs and Goats. 10th ed. Saunders; London, UK, 1384-1394. [Google Scholar]
- MekonnenMeshesha and Wale Tesfaye, 2017. International Journal of Advanced Research in Biological Sciences, DOI: 10.2219/ijarsbscoden: IJARQG(USA) volume 4, Issue 2.
- 11. Shumuye, G.S., A.T. Kassaw, A.Y. Haileluel and M.T. Sintayehu, 2014. Study on community knowledge, attitude and practice of rabies in and nearby Gondar town, North West Ethiopia. Journal of Public Health and Epidemiology, 6(12): 429-43.

- Matibag, G.C., K. Taro, V.R.K. Pallegoda, G.W. Thula, W.K. Anil, D. Anuruddhika, D. Niranjala, D.G. Panduka, O. Yoshihide, K. Koji and T. Hiko, 2007. Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Survey of Rabies in a Community in Sri Lanka. Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine, 12: 84-89.
- Ali, A., E. Yimer and D.A. Sifer, 2013. Study on knowledge, attitude and practice of rabies among residents in Addis Ababa. Ethiop. Ethiop. Vet. J. 2013; 17:19–35. doi: 10.4314/evj.v17i2.2. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- Sumon, G., C. Sukanta, H. Najmul, K.B. Rajub, S. Rana, S. Aung, M. Prue, B.H. Muhammad, C.D. Nitish and A. BeNazir, 2016. Awareness of rabies and response to dog bites in a Bangladesh community. Veterinary Medicine and Science, 3: 1-9.
- 15. Reuben Christopher Rine, Gyar Silas Dogara and MwantaDachung Pam, 2017. Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Rabies in and Around Lafia Metropolis, Nigeria 1Department of Science Laboratory Technology (Microbiology/Biology Unit), Nasarawa State Polytechnic, Lafia, Nigeria 2Environmental Health Department, College of Health Technology, Zawan, Nigeria.
- Moran, D., P. Juliao, D. Alvarez, K.A. Lindblade, J.A. Ellison, A.T. Gilbert, B. Petersen, C. Rupprechat and S. Recuence, 2015. Knowledge, attitudes and practices regarding rabies and exposure to bats in two rural communities in Guatemala. BMC Res. Notes. 8:955. doi: 10.1186/s13104-014-0955-1. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- 17. Mucheru, G.M., G.M. Kikuvi and S.A. Amwayi, 2013. Knowledge and practices towards rabies and determinants of dog rabies vaccination in households: a cross sectional study in an area with high dog bite incidents in Kakamega County, KenyaPan Afr Med J 2014; 19: 255. doi: 10.11604/pamj.2014.19.255.4745. eCollection 2014

- 18. Sambo M., T. Lembo, S. Cleaveland, H.M. Ferguson, L. Sikana, C.Simon, H. Urassa and K. Hampson, 2014. Knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) about rabies prevention and control: A community survey in Tanzania. PLoSNegl. Trop. Dis.;8:e3310. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003310. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar].
- Reta, T.D., G.K. Legesse and F.M. Abraham, 2015.
 Knowledge, attitudes and practices towards rabies: questionnaire survey in rural household heads of Gondar Zuria District, Ethiopia. BMC Res Notes, 8:400.
- Sekhon, A., A. Singh, P. Kaur and S. Gupta, 2002.
 Misconceptions and myths in the management of animal bite case. Indian Journal of Community Medicine, 22(3): 27-31.
- Sudarshan, M.K., S.N. Madhusudana, B.J. Mahendra, N.S. Rao, D.A. Narayana and S.A. Rahman, 2007. Assessing the burden of human rabies in India: results of a national multi-center epidemiological survey. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 11: 29-35.
- Rumana, R., A. Sayeed, A. Basher, Z. Islam, M. Rahman and M. Faiz, 2013. Perceptions and treatment seeking behavior fordog bites in rural Bangladesh. The Southeast Asian Journal of Tropical Medicine and Public Health, 44: 1-5.
- 23. Yalemebrat, N., T. Bekele and M. Melaku, 2016. Assessment of public knowledge, attitude and practices towards rabies in Debark Woreda, North Gondar, Ethiopia. J. Vet. Med. Anim. Health, 8: 183-192. [Google Scholar].