Spatio-temporal clusters and patterns of spread of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika in Colombia

Laís Picinini Freitas[1,2], Mabel Carabali[1], Mengru Yuan[1], Gloria I. Jaramillo-Ramirez[3], Cesar Garcia Balaguera[3], Berta N. Restrepo[4], Kate Zinszer[1,2*]

[1] School of Public Health, University of Montreal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

[2] Centre de Recherche en Santé Publique, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

[3] Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia, Villavicencio, Colombia

[4] Instituto Colombiano de Medicina Tropical, Universidad CES, Medellín, Colombia

* Corresponding author

E-mail: kate.zinszer@umontreal.ca (KZ)

Abstract

Background

Colombia has one of the highest burdens of arboviruses in South America. The country was in a state of hyperendemicity between 2014 and 2016, with co-circulation of several *Aedes*-borne viruses, including a syndemic of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika in 2015.

Methodology/Principal Findings

We analyzed the cases of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika notified in Colombia from January 2014 to December 2018 by municipality and week. The trajectory and velocity of spread was studied using trend surface analysis, and spatio-temporal high-risk clusters for each disease in separate and for the three diseases simultaneously (multivariate) were identified using Kulldorff's scan statistics. During the study period, there were 66,628, 77,345 and 74,793 cases of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika, respectively, in Colombia. The spread patterns for chikungunya and Zika were similar, although Zika's spread was accelerated. Both chikungunya and Zika mainly spread from the regions on the Atlantic coast and the south-west to the rest of the country. We identified 21, 16, and 13 spatio-temporal clusters of dengue, chikungunya and Zika, respectively, and, from the multivariate analysis, 20 spatio-temporal clusters, among which 7 were simultaneous for the three diseases. For all disease-specific analyses and the multivariate analysis, the most-likely cluster was identified in the south-western region of Colombia, including the Valle del Cauca department.

Conclusions/Significance

The results further our understanding of emerging *Aedes*-borne diseases' trajectory in Colombia and provide useful information on the identified spatio-temporal disease-specific and multivariate clusters of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika, that can be used to target interventions. To our knowledge, this is the first time that the co-occurrence of all three diseases in Colombia was explored using multivariate scan statistics.

Introduction

Mosquito-borne diseases are thriving and expanding globally despite decades of large-scale control efforts [1]. *Aedes* mosquitoes are responsible for transmitting arboviral diseases such as dengue, chikungunya, and Zika. *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* are opportunist mosquitoes adapted to urban environments for which poor quality housing and sanitation management are key determinants for the sustained propagation of arboviral diseases [2,3]. Dengue virus (DENV) is endemic in more than 100 countries with estimates ranging from 105 to 390 million infections each year [4,5]. Similarly, chikungunya virus (CHIKV) has been identified in 112 different countries, has become endemic in several countries, and is prone to explosive epidemics in areas with no prior immunity [6,7] As with chikungunya, epidemics of dengue also occur, usually coinciding with increased *Aedes*' mosquito abundance (after a rainy season) in populations with no immunity to one of the four dengue virus types [8] The introduction of Zika into the Americas likely occurred in late 2014, on the heels of chikungunya emergence in 2013 [9,10]. Local transmission of Zika was confirmed in 86 countries, and although Zika's Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) is over, sporadic new cases continue to be detected, indicating the potential for Zika to become endemic in previously Zika-naïve, *Aedes*-endemic countries [11–13].

Historically, Colombia has been significantly burdened with dengue, chikungunya, and Zika infections, with the *Aedes* mosquito being widely distributed throughout the country at elevations below 2,000 meters [14,15]. The severity of outcomes of arboviral diseases range from asymptomatic infections, mild febrile illnesses, to severe infections that can be fatal and or produce chronic sequela, including persistent fatigue and myalgia, debilitating joint pain, and Guillain-Barré syndrome [10,16–18]. Zika virus (ZIKV) exposure in fetuses has been causally related to microcephaly in neonates and other congenital malformations [19]. A significant portion of infected individuals remain asymptomatic and lifelong immunity can be developed for each one of the four dengue serotypes and for CHIKV and ZIKV [20–22]. There is no current antiviral treatment for arboviruses and until

effective vaccines become broadly commercially available, vector control through environmental (e.g., habitat removal), chemical (e.g., larvicide), biological (e.g., larvae eating fish), or educational campaigns remains the primary prevention strategy in most endemic settings [2,3]. Epidemiological surveillance is central to the successful control and prevention of arboviral diseases, as it provides data to monitor trends and outbreaks and identifies areas for targeted risk communication, travel advisories, and entomological response.

It is reasonable to anticipate that dengue, chikungunya, and Zika epidemiology is temporally and spatially related, given that they are transmitted by the same *Aedes* species, can co-circulate within the same region, and the presence of symptomatic infections for one virus may depend on previous or concurrent infection with one of the other viruses [23–28]. Previous work examined the spatio-temporal dependencies from 2015 to 2016 between dengue and Zika for one Colombian city and department [26]. Two other studies applied scan statistics to identify space-time clusters of arboviral diseases in Colombia, one only for dengue and chikungunya [29], and the other considered only disease-specific clusters [30]. Therefore, there have not been cluster analyses examining the co-occurrence of all three arboviruses and describing the patterns of introduction including the speed and direction of the spread of chikungunya and Zika in Colombia. We address this knowledge gap, providing meaningful insight into the shared and unique patterns of spatiotemporal disease risk in Colombia. Our study aimed to identify at-risk municipalities and time periods for dengue, chikungunya, and Zika in Colombia through disease-specific and multivariate cluster analyses and through estimating the direction and speed of chikungunya and Zika introduction in Colombia.

Methods

This is an ecological study in which notified cases of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika from January 2014 to December 2018 for the entire country were extracted from the national surveillance

system. Our units of analysis were municipality for space and week for time. Two main different methods were applied: front wave velocity analysis and scan statistics.

Ethics statement

This study was approved by the Science and Health Research Ethics Committee (*Comité d'éthique de la recherche en sciences et en santé* - CERSES) of the University of Montreal, approval number CERSES-19-018-D. Informed consent was not required as only secondary data was used and the data were analyzed anonymously.

Study context and data

Colombia is located at the northern tip of South America with nearly 50.4 million inhabitants. The Andes mountains dominate its topography and there are 11 distinctive geographic and climatic conditions within the country. Colombia comprises 1,122 municipalities and 33 administrative states called departments that are economically diverse and range from urban to rural to natural landscapes. Dengue became a notifiable disease in Colombia in 1978 whereas chikungunya was first detected in Colombia in July 2014 and local transmission of Zika was confirmed in the country in October 2015 [31–34].

In Colombia, surveillance is the responsibility of each department's Secretariat of Health although there is a national surveillance program administered by the National Institute of Health of Colombia that receives weekly reports from all health facilities that provide services to suspect, probable, and confirmed cases of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika. The electronic platform, SIVIGILA (*Sistema Nacional de Vigilancia en Salud Pública,* http://portalsivigila.ins.gov.co/), provides publicly available aggregate data on chikungunya, dengue, and Zika cases at the municipal and departmental levels [35]. The aggregate data represent a mixture of probable and confirmed cases. In Colombia, laboratory confirmation for dengue and chikungunya is based upon a positive result from antigen, antibody, or virus detection and/or isolation. Confirmation of probable cases is based on clinical

diagnosis plus at least one serological positive immunoglobulin M test (IgM) or an epidemiological link to a confirmed case 14 days prior to symptom onset [31,36,37]. Population data was obtained from the National Administrative Department of Statistics of Colombia (DANE, https://www.dane.gov.co/).

Front Wave Velocity

A trend surface analysis was performed to estimate the front wave velocity for chikungunya and Zika, the two *Aedes*-diseases that emerged in Colombia during the study period. Dengue was not considered for this analysis as the disease was already endemic in the country. Trend surface analysis has been used to examine diffusion processes in two dimensions: time and space, using polynomial regression. A continuous surface is estimated with the order of the model capturing the general direction and speed of the emerging or front wave of an infectious disease [38–40].

For this analysis, we separately identified the first notification of a chikungunya and Zika case for each municipality and then used the centroids of the municipalities, calculated in meters using QGIS software [41]. The response variable was time in weeks from the first chikungunya or Zika case notified for each centroid (X and Y coordinates) in a given municipality. The continuous surface of time to notification was estimated by regressing it against the X and Y coordinates in meters. Parameters were estimated using least squares regression, and if a simple 2-D plane through the points is insufficient to model the data, high-order polynomials are often used to capture local scale trends [42]. The best-fit model was selected using Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the model with polynomial terms of order five provided the best fit for the registration date.

The rate of change was obtained by taking the partial derivatives with respect to X and Y, for the best-fit linear model, shown below as order five polynomial (1).

(1) $f(t|x,y) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 Y + \beta_3 X^2 + \beta_4 Y^2 + \beta_5 X^3 + \beta_6 Y^3 + \beta_7 X^4 + \beta_8 Y^4 + \beta_9 X^5 + \beta_{10} Y^5 + \beta_{11} XY$

(2) $\partial f(t|x,y) / \partial x = \beta_1 + 2\beta_3 X + 3\beta_5 X^2 + 4\beta_7 X^3 + 5\beta_9 X^4 + \beta_{11} Y$

(3) $\partial f(t|x,y) / \partial y = \beta_2 + 2\beta_4 Y + 3\beta_6 Y^2 + 4\beta_8 Y^3 + 5\beta_{10} Y^4 + \beta_{11} X$

Equations (2) and (3) provide expressions for a slope vector at a given location (X,Y). The vectors can be converted to express the magnitude and direction of rate of change (in days per km) by finding the inner product of the vector, where magnitude $||xy|| = \sqrt{(x^2 + y^2)}$ and the direction $\theta = tan^{-1}(y/x)$. The rate we were primarily interested in was velocity (in km per week), which was obtained by inverting the final magnitude of the slope.

Scan statistics

To identify spatio-temporal clusters we used Kulldorff's scan statistics [43]. We used a discrete Poisson model approach including the total number of cases per municipality offset by the population at-risk (municipal population). Cluster detection was performed to identify statistically significant space-time high-risk clusters of each disease separately and then performed for the three diseases simultaneously, using the multivariate scan analysis.

Kulldorff's scan statistics determine the presence of clusters using a cylinder that moves across space and time under predefined spatial and temporal scanning windows. The clusters are identified by observing a higher risk within the cylinder compared to the risk outside of the cluster. The relative risk (RR) is calculated as follows:

$$RR = \frac{\frac{c}{E[c]}}{\frac{(C-c)}{(C-E[c])}} \quad (4),$$

where where c and C are the number of observed cases in the cylinder and the total number of observed cases in the study area, respectively, and $E[c]$ is the expected number of cases inside the cylinder, calculated as:

$$E[c] = \frac{C}{P} \times p \quad (5),$$

being P the total population in the study area and p the population within the cluster [43].

Clusters were ordered based on the likelihood ratio; clusters with the higher maximum likelihoods were more-likely, i.e. with stronger evidence of fitting the definition of a cluster. The likelihood function for the Poisson model is proportional to:

$$\left(\frac{c}{E[c]}\right)^{c}\left(\frac{C-c}{C-E[c]}\right)^{C-c} I() \qquad (6),$$

where $I()$ is set to 1 when there are more cases than expected, and 0 otherwise. For the multivariate scan analysis, the likelihood ratio of the cluster is the sum of the likelihood ratio for each disease, calculated using equation 6 [43,44].

Each space-time cluster had its own start and end dates, which were used to calculate the duration in weeks of the cluster, the number of accumulated cases observed in this period, the population within the cluster, and its relative risk.

The spatial scanning window was based on the centroid of each municipality, with the maximum size set to 150 km of radius and 20% of the total population at risk. Colombia's population is highly concentrated in a few municipalities, with only 5 municipalities accounting for nearly 30% of the country's population. Considering only the maximum population at-risk would result in clusters with very different sizes, and therefore,we also considered the maximum radius of the cylinder. To define the values, we experimented with different combinations of maximum sizes for the radius and for the population at-risk. We chose the combination that resulted in clusters that were balanced in terms of number and size: not so large as to include very distinct areas and/or low-risk municipalities, nor too small as to be too numerous and include only one municipality. The temporal scanning window was set from 2 up to 26 weeks. Clusters were restricted to having at least 100 cumulative cases over the temporal scanning window. For each model, 999 Monte Carlo simulations were performed to assess the statistical significance of observed clusters and only the clusters with p-value less than 0.05 were reported.

All analyses were performed using R (v. 4.1.2) [45] and we applied SaTScan™ (v. 9.6, https://www.satscan.org/) [46] using the package rsatscan (v. 0.3.9200) [47]. Maps were depicted using ggplot2 (v. 3.3.5) [48] and colorspace (v. 2.0) [49] packages in R, or QGIS (v. 3.22.3) [41].

Results

During the study period, from January 2014 to December 2018, there were 366,628, 77,345 and 74,793 cases of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika, respectively, captured by the national surveillance system. Dengue cases occurred throughout this period and peaked in 2016, with notifications of chikungunya rapidly increasing in September 2014 and lasting for approximately a year followed by a smaller wave of cases in December 2015 to August 2016 (Fig 1). Zika notifications began increasing in October 2015, with a peak number of cases in February 2016, coinciding with a peak of dengue cases and the second wave of chikungunya. The Zika epidemic in Colombia lasted for approximately a year, following which sporadic cases were continually detected along with sporadic chikungunya cases. In 2017, there was a sharp reduction in the number of cases of the three diseases, by 84.1% compared to the previous year. Cases of dengue increased again in 2018, but chikungunya and Zika counts remained low.

Fig 1. Number of notified dengue, chikungunya, and Zika cases by week of first symptoms, Colombia, 2014-2018.

The first cases of chikungunya observed in the surveillance data, at epidemiological week 23/2014, were from the municipalities of Tuluá and Barranquilla, with Tuluá being a smaller city inland in the Valle del Cauca department and over 700 kilometers away from Barranquilla, the capital city of Atlántico department, on the Atlantic northern coast. After the initial notifications, chikungunya was detected in 774 other municipalities during the first wave of cases, which lasted 14

months, following a southern pattern of dispersal from Barranquilla and a radiating pattern of dispersal from Tuluá (Fig 2A). Since the first notification of chikungunya until December 2018, it was identified in 875 different municipalities in Colombia with an average speed of 27 km/week, ranging from 1 to 397 km/week.

Fig 2. Chikungunya (A) and Zika (B) spread across Colombia, 2014-2018. The angle of the arrowhead represents the direction of spread. Yellow arrowheads represent the first cases observed in the data.

The first cases of Zika observed from the surveillance data, at epidemiological week 32/2015, were from four municipalities from three different departments: San Andrés (from the islands of San Adrés and Providencia, which are off the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua), Cali (capital city of Valle del Cauca department), Cúcuta and El Zula (both from the Norte de Santander department, in the northern border with Venezuela). During the period of the Zika epidemic, it was detected in 747 municipalities following a southern pattern of dispersal from the northern Atlantic coast, a estern pattern towards the border of Venezuela and also a northern pattern in the western part of the country (Fig 2B). Since its initial introduction and until December 2018, it was identified in 768 different municipalities with an average speed of 79 km/week, ranging from 2 to 747 km/week.

We identified 21, 16 and 13 spatio-temporal clusters of dengue, chikungunya and Zika, respectively (Table 1). When we consider the median values for each disease, Zika case clusters included more municipalities, were shorter in duration, and had higher relative risks compared to chikungunya and dengue.

Table 1. Summary of the characteristics of the clusters for dengue, chikungunya and Zika cases, Colombia, 2014-2018.

	Dengue	Chikungunya	Zika
Nº of clusters	21	16	13
		Median (IQR)	
Nº of municipalities	5 (2 – 34)	23 (9 – 61)	25 (4 – 106)
Duration in weeks	25 (21 – 26)	19.5 (16 – 24.25)	14 (11 – 21)
Relative risk	5.80 (3.34 – 8.75)	12.73 (7.68 – 21.53)	21.43 (7.89 – 30.81)
Population inside the cluster	203,979 (68,778 – 1,234,977)	975,063 (117,505 – 2,018,560)	940,273 (140,082 – 3,375,936)
Nº of observed cases	639 (204 – 2976)	1207 (322 – 1962)	933 (348 – 4663)

IQR = Interquartile Range

The spatial distribution of the detected clusters was similar for all diseases (Fig 3A-C). The most likely clusters for each disease were identified in the same region, the Valle del Cauca department, including its capital Cali, and were also the largest clusters in terms of population (S1 Fig). In 2014, dengue and chikungunya clusters were detected, while in 2015 and 2016, clusters of the three diseases were detected (Fig 3D-F). In 2017, no clusters were detected and in 2018, only dengue clusters were identified. The first chikungunya cluster was detected in northern Colombia, on the Atlantic coast, while the Zika clusters were first identified in the islands of San Andrés and Providencia, followed by a cluster on the Atlantic coast (S2 Fig). Generally, dengue clusters lasted longer than chikungunya and Zika (Fig 3G-I) and had smaller relative risks (Fig 3J-L). Among the clusters, higher relative risks were observed for chikungunya and Zika, particularly in the South Western part (Pacific region) of Colombia (Fig 3J-L).

Fig 3. Space-time clusters ranked by likelihood ratio* (A-C), year of start date (D-F), duration

in weeks (G-H) and relative risk (J-L) for dengue (1st column), chikungunya (2nd column) and Zika (3rd column), Colombia, 2014-2018. * The first cluster is the most likely cluster.

From the multivariate analysis, 20 spatio-temporal clusters were identified. Among those, 7 were significant for the three diseases, 5 for dengue and chikungunya, 2 for dengue and Zika, with 4 clusters for dengue only and 2 for chikungunya only. The median number of municipalities forming a cluster was 14.50 (Interquartile range, IQR, 2.00 – 46.25). Clusters' median duration was of 16.50 weeks (IQR 14.50 – 25.25) and median population was of 305,307 inhabitants (IQR 5,127 – 8,580,330). The most likely cluster for the multivariate scan analysis was significant for dengue, chikungunya, and Zika (Fig 4A-B), and was also detected in the Valle del Cauca department. All clusters significant for all three diseases were detected in 2015 (Fig 4C). In general, these clusters lasted longer than other clusters (Fig 4D) and presented higher relative risks for Zika compared to dengue and chikungunya (Fig 4E-G).

Fig 4. Multivariate space-time clusters of dengue, chikungunya and Zika ranked by likelihood ratio* (A), diseases (B), year of start date (C), duration in weeks (D) and relative risk for each disease (E-G), Colombia, 2014-2018. * The first cluster is the most likely cluster.

Discussion

Colombia was in a state of hyperendemicity between 2014 and 2016, with co-circulation of several arboviruses, including a syndemic of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika in 2015. Under this scenario, we explored the introduction patterns of chikungunya and Zika, and identified disease-specific and multivariate space-time clusters. To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the co-occurrence of all three diseases in Colombia using multivariate cluster analysis. Our results

indicate that the northern Atlantic coast is likely the place of emergency of new *Aedes*-borne diseases in Colombia, while the south-western region concentrates higher disease burden.

Overall, the geographical pattern of spread within Colombia was very similar for both chikungunya and Zika, with general southern dispersion from the Atlantic coast, although Zika spread more quickly. Our trend surface analysis and cluster evaluation identified the northern Atlantic coast, Caribbean region, for early clusters of both chikungunya and Zika, and therefore a potential portal of entry of arboviruses in the country. This region has important cargo ports on the Atlantic coast through which a good proportion of the country's imports enter. Also, there are well-known tourist sites in the region, such as Cartagena, Santa Marta and San Andrés, and the proximity to the Venezuelan border. These conditions favor the introduction of new pathogens and, together with climatic and social conditions, facilitate their dispersion [34]. Zika's accelerated spread is consistent with findings from another study using a different methodology [50]. We also observed that, compared to chikungunya, Zika's clusters were quicker and had higher relative risks, indicating a more explosive epidemic. This is possibly a result of an increased demand of people seeking medical care as a consequence of being more concerned about Zika due to the association of the virus with congenital malformations and of neurological complications. Another possible explanation is of Zika virus being more transmissible than chikungunya, supported by evidence that *Ae. Aegypti* is more efficient for transmitting the Zika virus than the chikungunya virus, even if co-infected [51,52].

For the disease-specific analyses and the multivariate analysis, the most likely cluster was consistently identified in the south-western region of Colombia and also presented elevated duration in weeks and relative risk. Between 2013 and 2016, Valle del Cauca was the department (and located in the south-western region) most affected by arboviral diseases in Colombia, accounting for 24.2% of the total disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) of the country [53] and its capital city, Cali, contributed 13% of all arbovirus cases reported during the study period. Previous studies also

identified clusters of *Aedes*-borne diseases in the south-western region of Colombia [29,30]. This region presents a favorable environment and suitable climate for the *Aedes* mosquitoes and historically has had the highest concentration of dengue cases in the country [34,54]. Factors such as environmental, cultural (e.g. water storage inside the houses) and social and material deprivation, in addition to a high population mobility due to trade with bordering countries and other cities have favored the introduction and dissemination of arboviruses in this region [34,55–57].

In our study, three cities (Cali, Ibagué and Neiva) that were part of the most likely clusters for all three diseases separate and simultaneously accounted for almost 20% of all cases of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika in the country during the study period. Cali alone contributed 13% of all cases. Dengue, chikungunya, Zika and simultaneous clusters for the three diseases were also identified in western Colombia near the border with Ecuador, a region previously classified as high-risk for dengue [58]. This region comprises an area with a large proportion of rural population, with limited public, educational, and health services. There is also a very active armed conflict in the region, generated by drug trafficking, further exacerbating health vulnerabilities. Therefore, the important presence of arboviruses observed in this region can be explained by its social and health inequities, in addition to a favorable climate for the presence of the *Aedes* mosquito [34].

No clusters were identified in 2017, when a sharp decrease in the number of arboviral diseases reported compared to previous years was observed. This decrease is likely due to immunity development (i.e. decrease in the number of susceptible individuals to the circulating viruses), which is typical after large outbreaks [59]. In fact, we observed very small counts of chikungunya and Zika in 2017 and 2018, while dengue cases began increasing in 2018. Dengue has four circulating serotypes, and is expected to generate cyclic outbreaks every two to three years [60]. After our study period, Colombia was affected by another dengue epidemic in 2019, with numbers of cases exceeding those of 2016 [61].

The main limitations of this study are related to the quality and timeliness of the surveillance data. We used official case counts that are from a passive surveillance system, meaning our study population included only patients who sought health care. Underreporting is a known limitation when working with surveillance data and is also an important challenge with Colombia's surveillance system [62,63]. During a syndemic of arboviral diseases that share similar symptoms such as dengue, chikungunya, and Zika, misclassification likely occurred as only a small proportion of cases are laboratory confirmed (27.2%, 4.4% and 2.7% of cases of dengue, chikungunya, and Zika, respectively, in Colombia in 2017), although differential diagnosis algorithms are used [63–66]. Earlier introductions of chikungunya may not have been captured by the surveillance system. In the case of Zika, its introduction was expected after the Brazilian epidemic, however, given the mild and generic nature of symptoms and the high proportion of asymptomatic persons, some cases may not have been captured by the surveillance system, especially in non *Aedes*-endemic areas [20]. Sporadic geographically dispersed cases were recorded in various parts of Colombia, which increased the uncertainty associated with the front wave analysis. These cases, such as those in southeastern Colombia, increased uncertainty in direction and speed estimates, which are also related to edge effects. Edge effects occurred along the boundary of the study area, which in this study were constructed by using fewer data points and are therefore less stable. One limitation of scan statistics is that the method uses circular scans to detect clusters. This could result in low-risk municipalities being considered as part of a cluster if surrounded by high risk municipalities. We counterbalanced this by restricting the clusters' size and verifying the relative risk of the municipalities forming clusters (S3 Fig).

In this study, we applied two methods to examine the emergence and spatio-temporal clusters of *Aedes*-borne diseases in Colombia. The detection of simultaneous clusters using the multivariate scan statistics analysis highlights the key hotspots areas for dengue, chikungunya, and Zika, and that should be prioritized for interventions to reduce the burden of these diseases. Additionally, these areas

may also be at higher risk for other emerging *Aedes*-borne diseases. It is important that the surveillance in these locations is strengthened to be able to early detect the circulating viruses as well as unusual increase in the number of cases. Both methods are simple and provide helpful insight into the trajectory of arboviral diseases in Colombia region, which can be used to inform targeted interventions, such as enhanced surveillance activities and prevention activities. The methods have the potential to be also applied for other emerging infectious diseases or variants of concern for COVID-19.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the National Institute of Health of Colombia for making the diseases' surveillance data publicly available.

References

1. Lambrechts L, Scott TW, Gubler DJ. Consequences of the Expanding Global Distribution of *Aedes albopictus* for Dengue Virus Transmission. Halstead SB, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2010;4: e646. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0000646

2. Mulligan K, Dixon J, Joanna Sinn C-L, Elliott SJ. Is dengue a disease of poverty? A systematic review. Pathog Glob Health. 2015;109: 10–18. doi:10.1179/2047773214Y.0000000168

3. Tapia-Conyer R, Méndez-Galván JF, Gallardo-Rincón H. The growing burden of dengue in Latin America. J Clin Virol. 2009;46: S3–S6. doi:10.1016/S1386-6532(09)70286-0

4. WHO. Dengue and severe dengue. In: World Health Organization [Internet]. 2 Feb 2018 [cited 15 Jul 2018]. Available: http://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/dengue-and-severe-dengue

5. Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, et al. The global distribution and burden of dengue. Nature. 2013;496: 504–507. doi:10.1038/nature12060

6. CDC. Geographic Distribution | Chikungunya virus | CDC. 6 Nov 2020 [cited 1 Dec 2021]. Available: https://www.cdc.gov/chikungunya/geo/index.html

7. Yactayo S, Staples JE, Millot V, Cibrelus L, Ramon-Pardo P. Epidemiology of Chikungunya in the Americas. J Infect Dis. 2016;214: S441–S445. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiw390

8. Wearing HJ, Rohani P. Ecological and immunological determinants of dengue epidemics. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2006;103: 11802–11807. doi:10.1073/pnas.0602960103

9. Zanluca C, Melo VCA de, Mosimann ALP, Santos GIV dos, Santos CND dos, Luz K. First report of autochthonous transmission of Zika virus in Brazil. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz. 2015;110: 569–572.

10. Nasci RS. Movement of Chikungunya Virus into the Western Hemisphere. Emerg Infect Dis. 2014;20: 1394–1395. doi:10.3201/eid2008.140333

11. PAHO/WHO. Zika Cumulative Cases. In: Pan American Health Organization / World Health Organization [Internet]. 18 Aug 2016 [cited 1 Dec 2021]. Available: https://www3.paho.org/hq/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=12390:zika-cumulative-cases&Itemid=42090&lang=en

12. Lourenço J, Maia de Lima M, Faria NR, Walker A, Kraemer MU, Villabona-Arenas CJ, et al. Epidemiological and ecological determinants of Zika virus transmission in an urban setting. eLife. 2017;6: e29820. doi:10.7554/eLife.29820

13. Fajardo Á, Cristina J, Moreno P. Emergence and Spreading Potential of Zika Virus. Front Microbiol. 2016;7. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.01667

14. Cardona-Ospina JA, Villamil-Gómez WE, Jimenez-Canizales CE, Castañeda-Hernández DM, Rodríguez-Morales AJ. Estimating the burden of disease and the economic cost attributable to chikungunya, Colombia, 2014. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2015;109: 793–802. doi:10.1093/trstmh/trv094

15. Villar LA, Rojas DP, Besada-Lombana S, Sarti E. Epidemiological Trends of Dengue Disease in Colombia (2000-2011): A Systematic Review. Horstick O, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015;9: e0003499. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0003499

16. Burt FJ, Rolph MS, Rulli NE, Mahalingam S, Heise MT. Chikungunya: a re-emerging virus. The Lancet. 2012;379: 662–671. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60281-X

17. Fauci AS, Morens DM. Zika Virus in the Americas — Yet Another Arbovirus Threat. N Engl J Med. 2016;374: 601–604. doi:10.1056/NEJMp1600297

18. García G, González N, Pérez AB, Sierra B, Aguirre E, Rizo D, et al. Long-term persistence of clinical symptoms in dengue-infected persons and its association with immunological disorders. Int J Infect Dis. 2011;15: e38–e43. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2010.09.008

19. Petersen LR, Jamieson DJ, Powers AM, Honein MA. Zika Virus. Baden LR, editor. N Engl J Med. 2016;374: 1552–1563. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1602113

20. Basarab M, Bowman C, Aarons EJ, Cropley I. Zika virus. BMJ. 2016; i1049. doi:10.1136/bmj.i1049

21. Duffy MR, Chen T-H, Hancock WT, Powers AM, Kool JL, Lanciotti RS, et al. Zika Virus Outbreak on Yap Island, Federated States of Micronesia. N Engl J Med. 2009;360: 2536–2543. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0805715

22. Galatas B, Ly S, Duong V, Baisley K, Nguon K, Chan S, et al. Long-Lasting Immune Protection and Other Epidemiological Findings after Chikungunya Emergence in a Cambodian Rural Community, April 2012. Halstead SB, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2016;10: e0004281. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004281

23. Muñoz ÁG, Thomson MC, Stewart-Ibarra AM, Vecchi GA, Chourio X, Nájera P, et al. Could the Recent Zika Epidemic Have Been Predicted? Front Microbiol. 2017;8: 1291. doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.01291

24. Rossi G, Karki S, Smith RL, Brown WM, Ruiz MO. The spread of mosquito-borne viruses in modern times: A spatio-temporal analysis of dengue and chikungunya. Spat Spatio-Temporal Epidemiol. 2018;26: 113–125. doi:10.1016/j.sste.2018.06.002

25. Bisanzio D, Dzul-Manzanilla F, Gomez-Dantés H, Pavia-Ruz N, Hladish TJ, Lenhart A, et al. Spatio-temporal coherence of dengue, chikungunya and Zika outbreaks in Merida, Mexico. Vasilakis N, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2018;12: e0006298. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0006298

26. Martínez-Bello D, López-Quílez A, Torres Prieto A. Spatio-Temporal Modeling of Zika and Dengue Infections within Colombia. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2018;15: 1376. doi:10.3390/ijerph15071376

27. Vogels CBF, Rückert C, Cavany SM, Perkins TA, Ebel GD, Grubaugh ND. Arbovirus coinfection and co-transmission: A neglected public health concern? PLOS Biol. 2019;17: e3000130. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000130

28. Furuya-Kanamori L, Liang S, Milinovich G, Soares Magalhaes RJ, Clements ACA, Hu W, et al. Co-distribution and co-infection of chikungunya and dengue viruses. BMC Infect Dis. 2016;16: 84. doi:10.1186/s12879-016-1417-2

29. Desjardins MR, Whiteman A, Casas I, Delmelle E. Space-time clusters and co-occurrence of chikungunya and dengue fever in Colombia from 2015 to 2016. Acta Trop. 2018;185: 77–85. doi:10.1016/j.actatropica.2018.04.023

30. Triana-Vidal LE, Morales-García MA, Arango-Cárdenas MJ, Badiel-Ocampo M, Cuartas DE. Análisis de la distribución espacial y temporal de los virus del Dengue (2006-2017), Zika (2015-2017) y Chikungunya (2014-2017) en Colombia. Infectio. 2019;23: 352. doi:10.22354/in.v23i4.810

31. Zambrano P, Instituto Nacional de Salud, Colombia. Protocolo de vigilancia en salud pública – Dengue. 2017. Available: https://www.ins.gov.co/Noticias/Dengue/7.%20Dengue%20PROTOCOLO.pdf

32. Botero DS, Instituto Nacional de Salud, Colombia. Protocolo de vigilancia en salud pública – Chikungunya. 2017. Available: http://www.ssmcucuta.gov.co/observatorio/_lib/img/protocolos/pro_chikungunya.pdf.

33. Pérez NT. Protocolo de vigilancia en salud pública – Enfermedad por Virus Zika. 2017. Available: https://www.ins.gov.co/BibliotecaDigital/PRO-Zika.pdf

34. Padilla JC, Rojas DP, Sáenz Gómez R. Dengue en Colombia: epidemiología de la reemergencia

a la hiperendemia. 1st ed. Bogotá, D.C., Colombia; 2012.

35. Government of Colombia. Decreto Numero 3518 de 2006. Creacion y reglamentacion del Sistema de Vigilancia en Salud Publica- SIVIGILA., 3518/2006. 2006. Available: https://www.minsalud.gov.co/sites/rid/Lists/BibliotecaDigital/RIDE/DE/DIJ/Decreto-3518-de-2006.pdf

36. Restrepo BN, Beatty ME, Goez Y, Ramirez RE, Letson GW, Diaz FJ, et al. Frequency and Clinical Manifestations of Dengue in Urban Medellin, Colombia. J Trop Med. 2014;2014: 1–8. doi:10.1155/2014/872608

37. Leo Y-S, Chow A, Ooi E-E, Chaterji S, Allen JC. Evaluation of the NS1 Rapid Test and the WHO Dengue Classification Schemes for Use as Bedside Diagnosis of Acute Dengue Fever in Adults. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2011;84: 224–228. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2011.10-0316

38. Lucey BT, Russell CA, Smith D, Wilson ML, Long A, Waller LA, et al. Spatiotemporal Analysis of Epizootic Raccoon Rabies Propagation in Connecticut, 1991–1995. Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2002;2: 77–86. doi:10.1089/153036602321131878

39. Tutt-Guérette M-A, Yuan M, Szaroz D, McKinnon B, Kestens Y, Guillot C, et al. Modelling Spatiotemporal Patterns of Lyme Disease Emergence in Québec. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18: 9669. doi:10.3390/ijerph18189669

40. Zinszer K, Morrison K, Brownstein JS, Marinho F, Santos AF, Nsoesie EO. Reconstruction of Zika Virus Introduction in Brazil. Emerg Infect Dis. 2017;23: 91–94. doi:10.3201/eid2301.161274

41. QGIS Development Team. QGIS Geographic Information System. Open Source Geospatial Foundation Project; 2022. Available: https://qgis.org/en/site/

42. Pioz M, Guis H, Calavas D, Durand B, Abrial D, Ducrot C. Estimating front-wave velocity of infectious diseases: a simple, efficient method applied to bluetongue. Vet Res. 2011;42: 60. doi:10.1186/1297-9716-42-60

43. Kulldorff M. A spatial scan statistic. Commun Stat - Theory Methods. 1997;26: 1481–1496. doi:10.1080/03610929708831995

44. Kulldorff M, Mostashari F, Duczmal L, Katherine Yih W, Kleinman K, Platt R. Multivariate scan statistics for disease surveillance. Stat Med. 2007;26: 1824–1833. doi:10.1002/sim.2818

45. The R Foundation for Statistical Computing. R. The R Foundation; 2021. Available: https://www.r-project.org/

46. Kulldorff M. SaTScan. Available: https://www.satscan.org/

47. Kleinman K. rsatscan: Tools, Classes, and Methods for Interfacing with SaTScan Stand-Alone Software. 2015. Available: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rsatscan

48. Wickham H. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag. 2016. Available: https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org/

49. Zeileis A, Fisher JC, Hornik K, Ihaka R, McWhite CD, Murrell P, et al. **colorspace** : A Toolbox for Manipulating and Assessing Colors and Palettes. J Stat Softw. 2020;96. doi:10.18637/jss.v096.i01

50. Charniga K, Cucunubá ZM, Mercado M, Prieto F, Ospina M, Nouvellet P, et al. Spatial and temporal invasion dynamics of the 2014–2017 Zika and chikungunya epidemics in Colombia. Funk S, editor. PLOS Comput Biol. 2021;17: e1009174. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009174

51. Göertz GP, Vogels CBF, Geertsema C, Koenraadt CJM, Pijlman GP. Mosquito co-infection with Zika and chikungunya virus allows simultaneous transmission without affecting vector competence of *Aedes aegypti*. Rasgon JL, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2017;11: e0005654. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0005654

52. Chaves BA, Orfano AS, Nogueira PM, Rodrigues NB, Campolina TB, Nacif-Pimenta R, et al. Coinfection with Zika Virus (ZIKV) and Dengue Virus Results in Preferential ZIKV Transmission by Vector Bite to Vertebrate Host. J Infect Dis. 2018 [cited 24 Jun 2018]. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiy196

53. Mora-Salamanca AF, Porras-Ramírez A, De la Hoz Restrepo FP. Estimating the burden of arboviral diseases in Colombia between 2013 and 2016. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;97: 81–89. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.051

54. Lwande OW, Obanda V, Lindström A, Ahlm C, Evander M, Näslund J, et al. Globe-Trotting *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* : Risk Factors for Arbovirus Pandemics. Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2020;20: 71–81. doi:10.1089/vbz.2019.2486

55. Gutierrez-Barbosa H, Medina-Moreno S, Zapata JC, Chua JV. Dengue Infections in Colombia: Epidemiological Trends of a Hyperendemic Country. Trop Med Infect Dis. 2020;5: 156. doi:10.3390/tropicalmed5040156

56. Delmelle E, Hagenlocher M, Kienberger S, Casas I. A spatial model of socioeconomic and environmental determinants of dengue fever in Cali, Colombia. Acta Trop. 2016;164: 169–176. doi:10.1016/j.actatropica.2016.08.028

57. Desjardins MR, Eastin MD, Paul R, Casas I, Delmelle EM. Space–Time Conditional Autoregressive Modeling to Estimate Neighborhood-Level Risks for Dengue Fever in Cali, Colombia. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2020 [cited 23 Sep 2020]. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-0080

58. Lee J-S, Carabali M, Lim JK, Herrera VM, Park I-Y, Villar L, et al. Early warning signal for dengue outbreaks and identification of high risk areas for dengue fever in Colombia using climate and non-climate datasets. BMC Infect Dis. 2017;17: 480. doi:10.1186/s12879-017-2577-4

59. Netto EM, Moreira-Soto A, Pedroso C, Höser C, Funk S, Kucharski AJ, et al. High Zika Virus Seroprevalence in Salvador, Northeastern Brazil Limits the Potential for Further Outbreaks. Powers AM, Hughes JM, editors. mBio. 2017;8. doi:10.1128/mBio.01390-17

60. Instituto Nacional de Salud, Colombia. Boletín epidemiológico semanal. Semana epidemiológica 30. 21 al 27 de julio de 2019.pdf. 2019 [cited 25 Jan 2022]. Available: https://www.ins.gov.co/buscador-eventos/BoletinEpidemiologico/2019%20Bolet%C3%ADn%20epidemiol%C3%B3gico%20se

mana%2030.pdf

61. Reyes AJR, Ruge DG, Herrera LCP. Informe de evento Dengue, Colombia, 2019. In: Instituto Nacional de Salud, Colombia [Internet]. 2019 [cited 9 Mar 2022]. Available: https://www.ins.gov.co/buscador-eventos/Informesdeevento/DENGUE_2019.pdf

62. Romero-Vega L, Pacheco O, la Hoz-Restrepo F de, Díaz-Quijano FA. Evaluation of dengue fever reports during an epidemic, Colombia. Rev Saúde Pública. 2014;48: 899–905. doi:10.1590/S0034-8910.2014048005321

63. Carabali M, Jaramillo-Ramirez GI, Rivera VA, Mina Possu N-J, Restrepo BN, Zinszer K. Assessing the reporting of Dengue, Chikungunya and Zika to the National Surveillance System in Colombia from 2014–2017: A Capture-recapture analysis accounting for misclassification of arboviral diagnostics. Beechler BR, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021;15: e0009014. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009014

64. Reyes AJR. Informe de evento Enfermedad por virus Zika, Colombia, 2017. In: Instituto Nacional de Salud, Colombia [Internet]. 2018 [cited 9 Mar 2022]. Available: https://www.ins.gov.co/buscador-eventos/Informesdeevento/ZIKA%202017.pdf

65. Reyes AJR. Informe de evento Chikungunya, Colombia, 2017. In: Instituto Nacional de Salud, Colombia [Internet]. 2018 [cited 9 Mar 2022]. Available: https://www.ins.gov.co/buscador-eventos/Informesdeevento/CHIKUNGUNYA%202017.pdf

66. Romero SEG. Informe de evento Dengue, Colombia, 2017. In: Instituto Nacional de Salud, Colombia [Internet]. 2018 [cited 9 Mar 2022]. Available: https://www.ins.gov.co/buscador-eventos/Informesdeevento/DENGUE%202017.pdf

S1 Fig. Population inside clusters of dengue, chikungunya and Zika, Colombia, 2014-2018.

S2 Fig. Week of start date of dengue, chikungunya and Zika clusters, Colombia, 2014-2018.

S3 Fig. Relative risk for dengue, chikungunya and Zika by municipality inside a cluster, Colombia, 2014-2018.


4000
3000
2000
1000
0
Number of cases
Apr/2014
Oct/2014
Apr/2015
Oct/2015
Apr/2016
Oct/2016
Apr/2017
Oct/2017
Apr/2018
Oct/2018
Time
Dengue
Chikungunya
Zika

Fig 1


A
Delay in weeks
1 - 8
8 - 34
34 - 44
44 - 55
55 - 67
67 - 79
79 - 91
91 - 104
104 - 117
117 - 129
N
0
250
500 km
B
Delay in weeks
1 - 2
2 - 26
26 - 29
29 - 33
33 - 37
37 - 41

Fig 2


A
Dengue
B
Chikungunya
C
Zika
Cluster
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
NA
D
E
F
Start year
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
NA
G
H
I
Weeks
25
20
15
10
5
J
K
L
Relative Risk
[1.96,2.28)
[2.28,4.12)
[4.12,6.39)
[6.39,10.92)
[10.92,19.65)
[19.65,39.6)
[39.6,152.53]
NA
N
500 km

Fig 3


A
Cluster
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
NA
B
Diseases
Chikungunya
Dengue
Dengue and Chikungunya
Dengue and Zika
Dengue, Chikungunya and Zika
NA
C
Start year
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
NA
D
Weeks
25
20
15
10
E
Dengue
F
Chikungunya
G
Zika
Relative Risk
[1.02,2.25)
[2.25,5.59)
[5.59,13.37)
[13.37,27.1)
[27.1,51.18)
[51.18,137.63)
[137.63,201.33]
NA
N
500 km

Fig 4