Supplementary Material

	Number	%			
Gender					
Male	20,476	91.0			
Female	1,485	6.6			
Prefer not to say	550	2.4			
Age					
18-24 years	559	2.5			
25 – 34 years	2,077	9.2			
35 – 44 years	3,170	14.1			
45 – 54 years	4,416	19.6			
55 – 64 years	5,760	25.6			
65 – 74 years	5,228	23.2			
≥75 years	1,301	5.8			
Education Level					
<12 th grade	423	1.9			
High school graduate or GED	3,316	14.7			
Some college or an associate degree	8,613	38.3			
Bachelor's degree	6,013	26.7			
Graduate degree	4,146	18.4			
Species Hunted					
Deer	18,420	81.8			
Game birds	10,384	46.1			
Turkey	10,318	45.8			
Squirrel	9,170	40.9			
Rabbit	8,602	38.2			
Waterfowl	6,533	29.0			
Wild boar	5,781	25.7			
Coyote	5,721	25.4			
Bear	2,914	12.9			
Elk	2,877	12.8			
Fox	1,183	5.3			
Sheep/Goat	257	1.1			

 Table S1. Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents (n=22,511).

	Mea	n±SD	Test	p-value	Effect
-	Rabbit	Non-rabbit	statistic	•	size (d) ^a
	hunter	hunter	(t)		
RHDV2 knowledge	0.51±0.23	0.45±0.24	-9.09	<0.001	-0.27
Concern about lagomorph deaths	3.88±0.83	3.88±0.82	-0.19	0.43	<0.01
Domestic rabbits	3.71±0.94	3.78±0.91	5.29	< 0.001	0.07
Wild lagomorphs	4.00 ± 0.95	3.94±0.93	-4.67	< 0.001	-0.06
Biodiversity from the disease-	3.93 ± 0.92	3.92 ± 0.90	-1.05	0.15	-0.02
related deaths of native					
lagomorphs					
RHDV2 risk to domestic rabbit	3.14±0.66	3.20±0.66	6.24	<0.001	0.09
trade					
Pet trade	3.12 ± 0.77	3.15 ± 0.78	2.93	< 0.01	0.04
Rabbit rescues/ animal shelters	3.16 ± 0.77	3.23 ± 7.55	6.57	< 0.001	0.09
Rabbit shows/ exhibitions	3.10 ± 0.80	3.14 ± 0.80	3.32	< 0.001	0.05
Rabbit meat market	3.10 ± 0.00 3.11 ± 0.81	3.22 ± 0.79	10.01	< 0.001	0.14
Sport of rabbit hunting	3.11 ± 0.01 3.25 ± 0.80	3.22 ± 0.79 3.28 ± 0.78	3 28	<0.001	0.14
Concern about the impact of	3.23 ± 0.80 3.63±0.70	3.20 ± 0.70 3.71±0.70	J.20 7 26	<0.001	0.05
Concern about the impact of PUDV2 on the domestic rebbit	3.03±0.79	3. /1±0./9	7.30	<0.001	0.10
trada					
Dat trada	2 12+0.08	2 55+0 05	0.72	<0.001	0.12
Pet trade	3.42 ± 0.98	3.33 ± 0.93	9.72	< 0.001	0.15
Rabbit rescues/ animal shelters	3.49±0.97	3.68±0.92	14.38	< 0.001	0.20
Rabbit shows/ exhibitions	3.43±0.98	3.57±0.94	10.90	< 0.001	0.15
Rabbit meat market	3.63 ± 0.94	3.72 ± 0.92	7.31	< 0.001	0.10
Sport of rabbit hunting	4.16 ± 0.89	4.00 ± 0.89	-12.64	< 0.001	-0.17
Importance of biosecurity	4.32±0.67	4.36±0.70	4.79	<0.001	0.07
Transporting rabbits (alive or	4.21±0.89	4.28 ± 0.88	5.61	< 0.001	0.08
dead) between states increases					
the chance of RHDV2 spreading					
Hunters must practice disease	4.33±0.74	4.36 ± 0.77	3.71	< 0.001	0.05
prevention measures to prevent					
RHDV2 spreading to areas					
without the disease					
Engaging in disease prevention	4.29±0.76	4.34 ± 0.77	5.28	< 0.001	0.07
measures is important in states					
with no RHDV2 cases					
Engaging in disease prevention	4.45 ± 0.71	4.47 ± 0.75	1.76	< 0.05	0.02
measures is important in states					
with confirmed RHDV2 cases					
Social trust	3 23+0 69	3 24+0 62	1 18	0.11	0.02
The knowledge to effectively	332 ± 0.09	3.3+0.83	0.05	0.48	<0.02
manage RHDV2	5.52 ± 0.72	5.55±0.05	0.05	0.40	<0.01
The resources to affectively	2 18+0 01	2 22+0 81	2 01	<0.01	0.04
manage PHDV2	5.10-0.71	J.22±0.01	2.71	~0.01	0.04
Sufficiently skilled meets to	2 24 0 20	2 22 1 0 91	1.02	0.15	0.01
offectively manage DUDV2	3.34±0.89	3.33±0.81	-1.02	0.13	-0.01
enectively manage KHDV2					

Table S2. Comparison of RHDV2 knowledge, risk perceptions, importance of biosecurity, social trust, engagement in biosecurity, and support for biosecurity actions between rabbit hunters and non-rabbit hunters.

Has been effective in managing	3.08±0.68	3.10±0.60	2.23	< 0.05	0.03
Willingness to engage in					
voluntary biosecurity actions					
Report suspicious rabbit deaths ^b	4.40 ± 0.94	4.38 ± 0.96	-2.34	< 0.05	< 0.001
Wear gloves when handling	3.90 ± 1.25	4.17±1.13	15.81	< 0.001	0.23
carcasses					
Bag remains, sanitize, and	4.00 ± 1.21	4.06 ± 1.18	3.49	< 0.001	0.05
dispose of bag					
Clean carcasses at home	3.58±1.42	3.61±1.35	1.27	0.10	0.02
Cook rabbits to 165°F ^b	4.64 ± 0.78	4.36±1.04	-19.60	< 0.001	0.02
Sanitize hunting tools ^b	4.43 ± 0.94	4.28±1.05	-8.89	< 0.001	< 0.01
Support for government-					
mandated biosecurity measures					
Relocate field trials	3.58 ± 0.95	3.70 ± 0.89	9.13	< 0.001	0.10
Restrict hunting in areas with	3.52±1.14	3.79±1.01	17.69	< 0.001	0.23
threatened/endangered rabbits					
Ban transport from RHDV2	3.69±1.06	3.85 ± 0.98	11.61	< 0.001	0.14
states					
Ban transport until vaccine	3.46±1.09	3.68 ± 1.00	14.66	< 0.001	0.18
produced					

^a Cohen's d effect size interpretation: small (d = 0.2), medium (d = 0.5), and large (d = 0.8). If the difference between two groups is less than 0.2 standard deviations, the difference is negligible, even if statistically significant. ^b These three variables were not normally distributed. We used Mann-Whitney U tests instead of independent t-tests to determine if there were differences between rabbit hunters and non-rabbit hunters, and the effect size we report is eta-squared (η^2). $\eta^2 = 0.01$ indicates a small effect; $\eta^2 = 0.06$ indicates a medium effect, and $\eta^2 = 0.14$ indicates a large effect.

	Number	Percent	Knowledge
			score ^a
Respondents knew that RHDV2 infects ^b			
Wild lagomorphs	4,437	95.7	1
Domestic rabbits	3,371	72.7	1
Respondents who correctly identified that RHDV2 had	1,641	35.4	1
been confirmed in their state ^c			
How likely is it that rabbits infected with RHDV2 show			
signs of the disease before they die?			
Very unlikely	98	2.1	1
Unlikely	419	9.0	1
Neither likely nor unlikely	285	6.2	0
Likely	1,318	28.4	0
Very likely	472	10.2	0
I don't know	2,042	44.1	0
To the best of your knowledge, who or what can spread			
RHDV2?			
Domestic rabbits	3,458	74.6	1
Wild lagomorphs	3,738	80.7	1
Other domestic animals (e.g., dogs)	782	16.9	1
People	748	16.1	1
Animals that eat rabbits	1,708	36.9	1
Insects	635	13.7	1
Other	66	1.4	0
I don't know	791	17.1	0
To the best of your knowledge, how does RHDV2			
spread?			
Contact with infected rabbits that are still alive	3,167	68.3	1
Contact with rabbits that have died from RHDV2	2,651	57.2	1
Contact with the meat/fur of infected rabbits	2,117	45.7	1
Contact with the urine, feces, and/or saliva of	2,616	58.6	1
infected rabbits			
Contact with items that infect rabbits have used (e.g.,	1,951	42.1	1
food forage, bedding)			
Other	37	0.8	0
I don't know	1,163	25.1	0

Table S3. Respondents' prior knowledge of rabbit hemorrhagic disease virus 2 (RHDV2). This table only includes responses from hunter who were aware of RHDV2 prior to taking the survey (n=4,634).

	Median	Stro	Strongly Disagree		Neithe	r agree	Agr	ee	Stro	ongly	Factor	Cronbach's	
		disag	gree ^a		n		sagree			ag	ree	loading	alpha
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Risk sensitivity pe	rtaining to la	agomorp	oh death	S									0.87
I am concerned that	t RHDV2 wil	l negativ	ely affect	ct/cause	a loss of	f:							
Domestic rabbits	Agree	786	3.5	711	3.2	6,068	27.0	10,590	47.0	4,356	19.4	0.76	
Wild lagomorphs	Agree	825	3.7	508	2.3	3,869	17.2	10,700	47.5	6,609	29.4	0.90	
Biodiversity from the disease-related	Agree	678	3.0	381	1.7	4,982	22.1	10,469	46.5	6,001	26.7	0.84	
deaths of native lagomorphs													
Sensitivity to the e	conomic imp	pacts of]	RHDV2										0.90
I am concerned abo	out the impact	t of RHD	V2 on th	ne									
Pet trade	Neither	852	3.8	1,600	7.1	8,904	39.6	7,703	34.2	3,452	15.3	0.90	
	agree nor disagree												
Rabbit rescues/	Agree	728	3.2	1,292	5.7	7,960	35.4	8,720	38.7	3,811	16.9	0.90	
animal shelters													
Rabbit shows/ exhibitions	Agree	837	3.7	1,551	6.9	8,700	38.6	7,923	35.2	3,500	15.5	0.92	
Rabbit meat market	Agree	575	2.6	1,143	5.1	7,395	32.9	9,005	40.0	4,393	19.5	0.82	
Sport of rabbit hunting	Agree	383	1.7	653	2.9	4,064	18.1	9,480	42.1	7,931	35.2	0.48	
	Median	N	o risk ^b		Low	risk	Mode	erate risk		High r	risk	Factor	Cronbach's
		No.	%	, D	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	loading	alpha
Susceptibility to th	ne economic	impacts	of RHD	V2									0.90
How much risk do	you think RH	DV2 pos	ses to the	e followi	ing activ	vities?							
Pet trade	Moderate	510	2.	3 3	3,939	17.5	10,079	44.8	7	,983	35.5	0.86	
Rabbit rescues/ animal shelters	Moderate	492	2.	2 3	3,230	14.3	9,960	44.2	8	,829	39.2	0.86	
Rabbit shows/	Moderate	590	2.	6 4	,238	18.8	9,524	42.3	8	,159	36.2	0.87	
Rabbit meat market	Moderate	591	2.	6 3	8,774	16.8	9,238	41.0	8	,908	39.6	0.79	

Table S4. Respondents' risk perceptions pertaining to rabbit hemorrhagic disease virus 2 (RHDV2; n=22,511).

Sport of rabbit	Moderate	602	2.7	3,022	13.4	8,594	38.2	10,293	45.7	0.59
hunting										

^a Strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, neither agree nor disagree=3, agree=4, strongly agree=5. ^b No risk=1, low risk=4, moderate risk=3, high risk=4

	Median	Strongly disagree ^a		Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
	-	No.	%	No.	%	No.	<u>%</u>	No.	%	No.	%	-	
Transporting rabbits (alive or dead) between states increases the chance of RHDV2 spreading	Agree	587	2.6	284	1.3	2,255	10.0	9,164	40.7	10,221	45.4	0.68	0.90
Hunters must practice disease prevention measures to prevent RHDV2 spreading to areas without the disease	Agree	301	1.3	145	0.6	1,634	7.3	9,719	43.2	10,712	47.6	0.91	
Engaging in disease prevention measures is important in states with no RHDV2 cases	Agree	287	1.3	208	0.9	1,861	8.3	9,767	43.4	10,388	46.1	0.89	
Engaging in disease prevention measures is important in states with confirmed RHDV2 cases	Strongly agree	276	1.2	87	0.4	1,345	6.0	8,033	35.7	12,770	56.7	0.87	

Table S5. Respondents' perceptions of the importance of biosecurity measures. Respondents indicated their level of agreement that measures should be taken to prevent the spread of rabbit hemorrhagic disease virus 2 (RHDV2; n=22,511).

^a Strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, neither agree nor disagree=3, agree=4, strongly agree=5.

	Median	Strongly disagree ^a		Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
	-	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	_	
Please indicate your agreemen	t or disagre	ement v	vith the	e followir	ng state	ements: Y	our stat	e govern	ment ha	as			0.83
The knowledge to effectively	Neither	763	3.4	1,342	6.0	12,559	55.8	5,511	24.5	2,336	10.4	0.78	
manage RHDV2	agree nor disagree												
The resources to effectively manage RHDV2	Neither agree nor disagree	823	3.7	2,068	9.2	13,094	58.2	4,773	21.2	1,753	7.8	0.78	
Sufficiently skilled people to effectively manage RHDV2	Neither agree nor disagree	595	2.6	1,651	7.3	11,840	52.6	6,466	28.7	1,959	8.7	0.75	
Has been effective in managing RHDV2	Neither agree nor disagree	543	2.4	1,233	5.5	17,052	75.7	2,967	13.2	716	3.2	0.67	

Table S6. Respondents' trust in their state government to mitigate rabbit hemorrhagic disease virus 2 (RHDV2; n=22,511).

^a Strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, neither agree nor disagree=3, agree=4, strongly agree=5.