# Disentangling seasonal introduction and establishment risk of dengue in Africa

**Authors**: Jenicca Poongavanan[1], José Lourenço[2,3], Joseph L.-H. Tsui[4], Vittoria Colizza[5,6], Yajna Ramphal[1], Cheryl Baxter[1], Moritz U.G. Kraemer[4,7], Marcel Dunaiski[8], Tulio de Oliveira[1,9], Houriiyah Tegally[1]

1 Centre for Epidemic Response and innovation (CERI), Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa

2 BioISI (Biosystems and Integrative Sciences Institute), University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal AND

3 Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Biomedical Research Center, Lisboa, Portugal

4 Department of Biology, University of Oxford, Oxford,UK

5 Sorbonne Université, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'Epidemiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP), Paris, France

6 Department of Biology, Georgetown University, Washington, District of Columbia, USA

7 Pandemic Sciences Institute, University of Oxford, UK

8 Computer Science Division, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa

9 KwaZulu-Natal Research Innovation and Sequencing Platform (KRISP), University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

Corresponding authors: Houriiyah Tegally (houriiyah@sun.ac.za) and Tulio de Oliveira (tulio@sun.ac.za)

Keywords: Arboviruses, Dengue, Introductions, Mobility, Africa, Risk Flow

# Abstract

Background: The dengue virus is a significant global public health concern that poses a threat to Africa. Particularly, African countries are at risk of viral introductions through air travel connectivity with areas of South America and Asia that experience frequent explosive outbreaks. Limited reporting and diagnostic capacity hinder a comprehensive assessment of continent-wide transmission dynamics and deployment of surveillance strategies in Africa.

Methods: The risk of dengue introduction into Africa from countries of high incidence was estimated based on origin-destination air travel flows and epidemic activity at origin. We produced a novel proxy for local dengue epidemic activity using a composite index of theoretical climate-driven transmission potential and population density, which we used, along with travel information in a risk flow model, to estimate the importation risks.

Findings: We find that countries in east Africa face higher risk of importation from Asia, whereas for west African countries, larger risk of importation is estimated from South America. Some countries with high risk of importation experience low local transmission potential which likely hampers the chances that importations lead to local establishment and transmission. Conversely, Mauritius, Uganda, Ivory Coast, Senegal, and Kenya are identified as countries susceptible to dengue introductions during periods of persistent transmission suitability.

Interpretation: Our work improves the data driven allocation of surveillance resources, in regions of Africa that are at high risk of dengue introductions and establishment. This will be critical in detecting and managing imported cases and can improve local response to dengue outbreaks.



Funding: Rockefeller Foundation, National Institute of Health, EDCTP3 and Horizon Europe Research and Innovation, World Bank Group, Medical Research Foundation, Wellcome Trust, Google.org, Oxford Martin School Pandemic Genomics programme, John Fell Fund

## Research in context

### Evidence before this study

Despite the significant global burden of dengue virus globally, Africa remains relatively understudied due to limited reporting and diagnostic capabilities. We searched PubMed for articles in English published on and before May 6, 2024, that included “Dengue OR dengue”, “Africa”, and "importation OR imported”. Few studies have investigated the introduction of dengue into African countries. Limited evidence includes phylogeographic studies describing a potential introduction of dengue from Brazil into Angola in 2013 and evidence of multiple historical introductions of dengue from Asia to Africa over several years. Before our study, none had employed a modelling framework to investigate the continental risks of importing dengue via viremic travellers into African countries from other regions of high dengue incidence.

### Added value of this study

This study provides a novel approach to assessing the risk of dengue importation into Africa, integrating temperature-dependent transmission potential and air travel data. By identifying high-risk regions and highlighting the complex interplay between travel patterns, population density, and ecological factors, our findings enhance the understanding of dengue dynamics in Africa. This information enables targeted allocation of surveillance resources, improving preparedness and response to potential dengue outbreaks in susceptible regions.

### Implications of all the available evidence

The integration of transmission potential as local epidemic activity and air travel data into a risk flow metric provides valuable insights into the risk of dengue importation into African airports from high-incidence countries. These findings have implications for tailored surveillance and prevention strategies in high-risk regions, facilitating early detection and management of potential dengue imported cases outbreaks in Africa.

# Introduction

Dengue is an arthropod-borne virus with four main serotypes and is a member of the genus *Flavivirus* in the family *Flaviviridae* (1,2). It is thought to cause between 5.2 million and 390 million infections around the world every year, mostly transmitted by *Aedes aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* mosquitoes (3,4). Approximately half of the global human population is estimated to currently live in areas that are environmentally suitable for dengue transmission (3,5,6). Dengue is now endemic in more than 100 countries, with reported outbreaks predominantly in Central America, South America, and Southeast Asia, and has recently established epidemic cycles in parts of Africa and North America (6–8).

Despite the widespread distribution of mosquito vectors in Africa (9) and favourable transmission conditions characterised by high temperatures and increased urbanisation (7,10,11), severe gaps exist in our understanding of the transmission intensities of the virus on the continent. Limited diagnostic capacity and reporting on dengue incidence make it difficult to assess the true burden of dengue in Africa (3,5). Similarity of symptoms with other febrile illnesses such as malaria also play a role in underdiagnosis (12,13). Consensus of evidence studies have reported that dengue transmission is endemic in 34 countries in the African region (14,15). It is therefore speculated that dengue is more widespread in Africa than previously thought. In 2023 alone, 16 countries in Africa reported large dengue outbreaks (16).

Risk assessment for dengue in Africa has to consider several mechanisms of transmission. Given frequent explosive dengue outbreaks in South America and Asia, African countries are, for instance, at risk of constant viral introductions through air travel connectivity. Once introduced, dengue can theoretically spread rapidly in large parts of Africa due to the presence of suitable vectors, appropriate environmental conditions and limited population immunity. Even in countries where dengue is thought to be endemic, the risk of importing dengue genetic variants either from high incidence South American or Asian countries can exacerbate the burden of disease or seed new explosive outbreaks.

The potential for dengue importation into Africa via viremic travellers is a function of transmission in the origin country and the volume of travellers from the origin country to the destination country of interest. It is well documented that increased international travel and trade have facilitated dengue's global spread and mixing of viral serotypes and genotypes

(10,6,22,23). The influence of human mobility on pathogen spread has previously been characterised for influenza (24,25), zika (26) and more recently, and very extensively, for SARS-CoV-2 (27,28). Human mobility also plays a key role in shaping individuals' interactions with disease-carrying vectors and consequently affecting pathogen transmission (29,30). Understanding the combination of factors driving dengue introduction and onward transmission is crucial for effective surveillance, prevention, and control in Africa in the absence of antiviral treatment, underdiagnosis, and widespread vaccine cover. This study aimed to identify African airports at high risk of receiving dengue infected passengers. In doing so, it identifies potential high risk areas and optimal periods (at a monthly scale) during which to conduct enhanced disease surveillance.

# Methods

## 2.1 Data

### 2.1.1 Air Travel

The air travel flow data used in this study was obtained from the International Air Transport Association (IATA). It comprises the number of origin-destination passenger tickets and accounts for any connections at intermediate airports for the year 2019. We opted for the year 2019 to reflect a recent customary year of travel preceding disruptions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The data comprises monthly passenger volumes from 14 high incidence countries (selection described further down) to 54 African countries, encompassing all commercial airports (n = 197) in both the source and destination regions.

### 2.1.2 Transmission Potential Estimate

We sourced spatio-temporal estimates of climate-based transmission potential of dengue (referred to as index P) developed and made accessible by estimates from Nakase et al. (2023; https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.21502614). The index used in this study quantifies the transmission capacity of a single adult female mosquito throughout its lifetime in a completely susceptible host population, incorporating factors such as infectious periods and oviposition. The metric was validated with regional dengue data from Brazil and Thailand. The index P metric utilises local temperature and humidity time series (spatial pixel resolution used was

0.25° × 0.25° (~28 km2) ) as primary inputs, which enables its application to any location with available climate data.

We post-processes the raw estimates to define *persistence suitability* as the time period where environmental conditions exceed a predetermined threshold deemed favourable for dengue transmission. An index P threshold of 1.0 was selected as it is directly comparable with the basic reproduction rate. A value of 1.0 means that within a population where the average number of adult female mosquitoes per host is 1.0, interpreted as a reproduction number of 1. Periods of persistence suitability are then defined as the months where transmission potential was > 1.0.

### 2.1.3 Population Density

Population density at a given location significantly influences dengue transmission due to its role in determining the availability of human hosts for the virus. To integrate population density into the risk metric, we extracted population densities of each district within countries from the Gridded population of the World, using administrative (level 1) boundary data from the GADM database (31). To calculate the population density of a province, we aggregated the population density values of grid cells intersecting the province boundary. This total population was then divided by the sum of the areas of these grid cells, providing a representation of the province's population density.

## 2.2 Transmission potential as a proxy for case counts

To address the challenge of obtaining dengue case data with sufficient spatial and temporal resolution, we explored the possibility of using transmission potential (index P) as a proxy. To assess the viability of replacing dengue case data with transmission potential, we conducted a preliminary correlation test between transmission potential and monthly dengue cases for countries in which we were able to obtain monthly dengue case data (see supplementary figure S1). Moreover, using transmission potential instead of case data would allow for a more fine scale understanding of dengue activity in a country, surpassing the resolution typically available at the national level.

For this study, we considered countries with large outbreaks of dengue in 2019 as flagged by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) (accessed on 10th May 2023;

https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/dengue). These were predominantly in Latin America and Asia. Monthly dengue case data from these countries were then extracted from public health organisations such as the Pan American Health Organisation (PAHO; www3.paho.org), from governmental health reports or bulletins and from statistical bureau websites (governmental reporting websites, WHO reports, etc). The inclusion criteria for countries of high dengue incidence used in this study was based on the availability of monthly case data in 2019 as it allowed for reliable testing of the transmission potential proxy. This resulted in a final selection of 14 countries of high dengue incidence in Latin America and Asia, namely: Brazil, Bolivia, Peru, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Malaysia, Columbia, Thailand, Nicaragua, India, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Singapore and Belize. We also extracted province-level case data where openly available. In the correlation coefficient computation we also incorporated data from two African countries, Burkina Faso and Mauritius, for which monthly data for the year 2019 were available.

We use the Spearman's Rank correlation coefficient to examine the relationship between transmission potential and monthly dengue case counts for 16 countries. Following the methodology used by Nakase et al., (2023), we computed correlation strengths between case counts and transmission potential with various month lags (month+0, month+1 and month +2). We find (see appendix figure S1) a significant positive correlation between transmission potential and dengue cases for most countries, with the highest association at a lag of one month (12 out of 16 countries). The strength of the association ranged from -0.204 to 0.954. For some countries (n = 3), we found a weak correlation which could be caused by several factors, such as: i) limited case data obscuring seasonal patterns, which results in poor alignment with the index, ii) the national-level index failing to accurately reflect the overall case distribution if cases are concentrated in specific regions.

While the transmission potential index serves as a valuable indicator of dengue risk in a given region, its standalone consideration is insufficient. Additional factors must be taken into account, including the presence and abundance of mosquito vectors, population density in the area, and various environmental factors that may influence the spatial distribution of vectors. In this study, we address one of these conditions by incorporating population density alongside the transmission potential index. We define a composite index ($t$):

$$t_i = Transmission\ Potential\ (state\ i) * Population\ Density\ (state\ i)$$

which captures the combined influence of the transmission potential and the population density at the district level, by multiplying both elements (see supplementary figure S2). With our chosen approach, we managed to overcome some data constraints especially in view of dengue case numbers, which might have otherwise impacted our results.

## 2.3 Risk Flow Metric

The importation risk to each airport (destination) in each African country was estimated as the probability of importing a case from each state (origin) within each country of high incidence, accounting for the origin–destination travel flows originated from such countries and for their different transmission potential from the originating states. For cross-country comparisons, we aggregated the resulting risk of introduction from each airport to the country level and for visualisation purposes we calculated the average risk across each airport over the 12-month period (January - December 2019).

The methodology was adapted from Gilbert et al. (2020) and is as follows:

Risk flow ($r_{i\alpha}$) from origin state $i$ to destination airport $\alpha$ is calculated by:

$$r_{i\alpha} = \frac{t_i n_i A_{i\alpha}}{\sum_j t_j n_j}$$

where $t_i$ is the combined transmission potential and population density of state $i$, $n_i$ is the travel flux from the origin state $i$, $A_{i\alpha}$ is the probability of a traveller flying from $i$ to $\alpha$, conditioned on travelling internationally from $i$ (by construction, $\Sigma_\alpha A_{i\alpha} = 1$). The denominator accounts for the transmission potential in various states and the potential risk associated with travellers from different origin states. It is constructed as the sum product of all transmission potentials and travel flows originating from each individual state (denoted by j). This normalisation process ensures that the impact of each state's transmission potential and travel flow is proportionally represented in relation to the collective risk from all origin states.

The total risk of case importation to destination $\alpha$ is then given by

$$R_\alpha = \sum_i r_{i\alpha}$$

This risk is normalised such that $\Sigma_\alpha R_\alpha = 1$.

To summarise and compare the overall introduction risks of dengue into African countries from high incidence countries in Asia and South America, we aggregated the risk originating from Asia and South America separately by summing it across all airports to the district level and then calculating the average value over all months. We then computed the proportions of risk coming from Asia and South America for each district. Additionally, in aggregating the risk for destination countries, we conducted a secondary computation of risk emphasising the locations characterised by persistence suitability (see section 2.1.2). This was done by excluding any estimate of risk that occurred outside of times of persistence suitability (i.e. index P < 1) in respective destination locations. In other words, we filter only for estimated risks that are most likely to lead to onward transmission and local outbreaks. We term this introduction suitability while we term the risk based on the non-filtered values the raw introduction risk.

# Results

**Dengue introduction risks from high incidence Asian and South American countries into Africa**

Several countries in Africa are estimated to have high transmission suitability for dengue and simultaneously high population density, indicating elevated potential for local transmission following viral introductions (Supplementary Figure S3). At the same time, certain countries on the continent are receiving variable, and sometimes high volumes of international passengers from various Asian and South American countries (Supplementary Figure S4). In 2019, over 504 million travellers entered the African continent from the 14 high-incidence countries. Of the total number of travellers, 39% originated from Southeast Asia, 34% from South Asia and 27% from South America (Supplementary Figure S4). The months with the highest travel volume entering the African continent from these places were November, December, and January.

The risk flow of dengue from countries with high incidence rates, from Asia and South America show that South Africa and Egypt were the countries at higher risk of dengue importation

followed by Kenya, Angola, Morocco, Seychelles and Mauritius (Figure 1). Egypt is exposed to significant risk primarily originating from Asia, specifically its biggest risk coming from Malaysia. Kenya, Mauritius, Tanzania, and Uganda exhibit an elevated risk of introduction from India. Risks from Singapore were also high, especially towards Mauritius, South Africa and Egypt. Risks from Vietnam are relatively low across the entire continent, with the most significant potential impact observed in South Africa and Angola. Additionally, Morocco and Nigeria are identified as regions with a considerable risk of disease introduction from Nicaragua.

The results reveal a general trend that countries in the southern and eastern African region are faced with higher risks of dengue importation from Asia, whereas central, western and a portion of northern African countries face higher risk of introduction from South America. South Africa is seen to receive large introduction risks from both origin regions. When considering the raw risks of introductions overlayed onto the local transmission suitability index across Africa, it becomes clear that high risk of introduction is not necessarily linked to high transmission suitability. For instance, the high risks of introduction into South Africa do not necessarily translate to transmission locally due to very low dengue transmission suitability. We explore this further in the following sections.




**Figure 1. Mean risk of dengue introduction into African countries in 2019 from 14 countries in Asia and Latin America**. The risk of dengue introduction into African countries from 14 origin countries in Asia and Latin America is represented by circles on the African

continent. The size of the circles represent the size of the risk averaged over the 12 months for each airport in Africa. The colour of the circles represents the country from which the risk is coming from and the fill colour of those countries are consistently matched. The fill colour of the African continent represents the index of transmission potential multiplied by population density to highlight the hotspots of high transmission at the destination.

**Spatiotemporal variation in risks of introduction and local transmission suitability**

In addition to quantifying the risk of dengue introductions from countries of high incidence from Asia and South America we evaluate the timing of these introductions and whether they arrive at periods of high local transmission suitability in Africa. We do so by mapping the monthly introduction risk to transmission potential at the airport level in Africa. Egypt is estimated to be at high risk of dengue introduction during the second half of the year from both Asia and South America (Figure 2). This temporal pattern aligns with a concurrent period of heightened transmission potential within the country, which could indicate a higher likelihood of viral introductions leading to onward transmission. In fact in 2023, Egypt experienced quite a big dengue outbreak around September to November (33), which coincides with peaks in risk and transmission potential. Angola and Ethiopia both are estimated to have a continuous risk of disease introduction from Asia throughout the year. However, in Angola, the transmission potential is predicted to decline during the months of July, August, and September. Mauritius is also estimated to be at high risk of introduction from Asia during the early part of the year, again coinciding with a period of high transmission potential. On the other hand, we observe high risks of dengue introduction into South Africa but, in general, the country exhibits a low transmission potential throughout the year, indicating these potential introductions as likely impasses for transmission. In Nigeria, the majority of the high risk of introduction from South America are estimated to occur during periods of lower local transmission suitability. The temporal analysis of estimated importation risks and local transmission potential reveal the optimal times to conduct increased surveillance, as the times when the risks of introduction and the potential for transmission are simultaneously high. Therefore, the temporal synchrony between estimated introduction risks and transmission suitability has important implications for which viral introductions are predicted to have the ability to contribute to local outbreak risks.




**Figure 2. Time-varying risk of introduction into selected African countries in 2019.** The blue and red lines represent the risk of importation from Asia and South America respectively and the dotted line represents the total risk of importation from both continents across the year. The risk of importation was aggregated at the national level by summing the individual risks from all airports within each African destination country. The blue bars represent the time-varying transmission potential index. Here, we demonstrate countries that had the most synchronicity between transmission potential and risk of introduction - see supplementary S5 for additional countries.

**Overall introduction suitability in Africa**

We then filtered for risk estimates that are most likely to lead to onward transmission: introduction suitability risk, that is, risks that occur during periods of persistence suitability. Figure 3A illustrates the aggregated raw risk of dengue introduction throughout the year 2019 across individual provinces or districts (administrative level 1) within each African country, and aggregated as originating either from Latin America or Asia. Conversely, Figure 3B presents the aggregated introduction suitability of dengue into Africa. Notably, in South Africa, where the transmission potential remains consistently below 1 throughout the year, the risk of dengue evolving into an outbreak from an introduction is negligible.

In our analysis, a noteworthy shift in risk proportionality emerged when focusing on introduction suitability compared to raw risk. For example, in the case of the Democratic

Republic of the Congo (DRC), initially, 73.83% of the total risk was attributed to Asian regions. However, when looking at periods of persistence suitability for the DRC, the risk distribution shifted and the proportion of risk attributed to Asia, rose to 98.19% relative to South America. This outcome underlines the importance of understanding not only the geographic origin of introduction risks but also the specific temporal and spatial context in which these risks are introduced.




**Figure 3: Overall proportional risk of importation into African countries before and after adjusting for period of persistence suitability (transmission potential greater than 1).** A) The proportion of risk from Asia and South America throughout the year for each district. The size of the pie charts are proportional to mean risk of importation across the year and the coloured pies represent the origin continent. We zoomed in on specific countries within the plot, namely: Ghana, Togo, Benin, Nigeria, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Egypt, Sudan, Ethiopia, and Kenya. B) The proportion of risk from Asia and South America across the year, for months with high persistence suitability. We zoomed in on specific countries within the plot, namely: Ghana, Togo, Benin, Nigeria and Egypt. C) Boxplot displaying risk across months and districts for each African country, colour-coded by their respective African region. D) Boxplot of risk across months and districts with high persistence suitability.

# Discussion

In this study, we investigated the temporal and spatial intersections of high risks of introduction and heightened transmission potential of dengue in African countries. The exploration of dengue introduction into Africa is imperative due to the potential implications for onward transmission. To this end, we constructed an importation suitability map to depict the spatial and temporal hotspots of dengue introduction and establishment into Africa from high incidence countries in Asia and Latin America.

We identified that the heterogeneity of the risk across Africa is dependent on the distribution of dengue activity across different provinces or states in the countries of high incidence and their connection to airports in Africa (see supplementary figure S6). Further, we found that seasonal variation plays a crucial role. For example, in India, major outbreaks tend to occur after the monsoon season and thus have a higher transmission potential during these seasons (For example, the main monsoon season spans from June to September) (34–36) and thus we also observe a higher risk of dengue importation from India to African countries following the monsoon season (see supplementary figure S6).

This research presents an alternative risk assessment by considering modelled dengue transmission potential (7) rather than reported incidence, compared to other studies using case incidence which might suffer from substantially underreporting (37–40). The correlation analyses revealed a robust association between transmission potential and dengue cases for countries where high resolution spatiotemporal case records were available, with a significant correlation observed at a one-month lag (see supplementary figure S1). Our findings are consistent with previous research, demonstrating that 96% of municipalities in Brazil and 95% of provinces in Thailand exhibited incidence dynamics with 0-3 months time delays with estimated transmission potential (7). Our correlation further supports the utility of using transmission potential as a proxy for local dengue circulation.

Increased international travel and trade have facilitated the global spread of dengue from endemic to non-endemic regions, by enabling the movement of infected individuals and mosquito vectors between regions (Gubler, 2011; Murray et al., 2013; Nakase et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2021). The risk flow results highlight the substantial risks of dengue introduction into certain parts of the African continent from Asia and South America through human

404 mobility. We show that the risk of importation to African countries is highly heterogeneous.
405 The results produced by our model suggest that major airports in South Africa, Egypt,
406 Morocco, Kenya, Seychelles and Mauritius, are potential hotspots for the importation of
407 dengue-infected travellers from high-incidence countries. However, the analysis also revealed
408 important geographical nuances: for example, the broader Southern and Eastern African
409 regions are confronted with elevated risks of dengue importation from Asia, while Central,
410 Western, and a segment of Northern African nations are more susceptible to introductions from
411 South America. This is consistent with a recent phylogeographic study which found that all
412 four dengue serotypes were introduced on multiple occasions to Africa, primarily from
413 southern or Southeast Asia since the 1940s (41). This highlights the significance of our study
414 in obtaining high-resolution and recent temporal and spatial trends for the vulnerability of
415 Africa to dengue introductions.
416
417 To translate the high risks of introduction into the notion of introduction suitability, that is
418 considering potential introductions that are only highly likely to cause onward transmission in
419 the destination countries, it was important to understand the specific temporal and spatial
420 patterns of the risk flow estimates. Angola and Mauritius were identified as being at high-risk
421 of suitable introductions, given that inferred introductions peaked during periods of heightened
422 transmission potential within those countries (Fig 2). When considering introductions that
423 happen during times of high persistence suitability, we notice high risk of introduction into
424 West and North Africa (Fig 3B).
425
426 Epidemiological and genomic surveillance are critical public health measures to mitigate
427 disease burden, and also to understand the spread and evolution of pathogens. For dengue,
428 molecular surveillance also allows public officials to monitor the circulating serotypes while
429 remaining vigilant for the emergence of novel strains or genotypes. At present, there is no
430 approved antiviral treatment for dengue and supportive care is the only option (17–19).
431 However, two dengue vaccines have shown great promise (Takeda and Butantan vaccines)
432 (20). Genomic surveillance can also provide critical information about viral transmission
433 landscape prior to upcoming dengue vaccine rollouts. To determine the optimal locations for
434 conducting genomic surveillance in Africa, it is also important to have a quantitative
435 understanding of the actual risk of a dengue virus epidemic at country level, particularly given
436 limited resources to implement surveillance programs. This study's findings point to the fact
437 that emphasis should be placed on targeted monitoring during periods when the likelihood of

risks escalating into an outbreak is higher, and within areas prone to introductions during time of persistence suitability.

This study should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, our analysis focuses on the risk of viral movement from high-incidence countries in South America and Asia to African countries, and does not model the potential movement of dengue between African nations, which would also have been dependent on road travel networks. This is an avenue for further exploration especially between highly connected neighbouring countries with known dengue circulation (for example, Burkina Faso and Senegal). Additionally, the measure of transmission potential used for the source locations does not account for specific control measures in place, potentially impacting the accuracy of the estimated dengue incidence. It also does not take into account the presence and abundance of mosquito vectors. Despite this limitation, the chosen transmission potential index P seems to produce realistic estimates for dengue incidence in source locations, considering variations in testing and reporting practices globally. Thirdly, while our findings are founded upon the current travel networks, it is imperative to acknowledge the dynamic nature of travel patterns. Given the expansive reach of air travel and the transformative impact observed during the COVID-19 pandemic, we must remain vigilant to the possibility of shifts in dengue introduction risks. This is particularly relevant as more areas are becoming suitable for transmission of dengue.

In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the complex dynamics of dengue importation risks into Africa. The incorporation of estimated transmission suitability for dengue and population density in risk assessments enhances the accuracy of predictions. The temporal and spatial analyses highlight specific regions and times that warrant intensified surveillance and public health interventions given the likelihood of potential introductions to lead to outbreaks. These findings contribute to a more nuanced understanding of global dengue dynamics, and importantly focus on informing further surveillance on the Africa continent.

# Data Availability Statement

Proprietary air travel data are commercially available from the International Air Transport Association (https://www.iata.org/) databases. Transmission potential (index P) estimates are available at https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.21502614. Risk estimates computed from this study can be found at:

https://github.com/CERI-KRISP/Dengue_Importation_Risk_Modelling.git

# Acknowledgements

CERI and KRISP are supported in part by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation (HTH 017), the National Institute of Health USA (U01 AI151698) for the United World Antivirus Research Network (UWARN), and the INFORM Africa project through IHVN (U54 TW012041), European Union supported by the Global Health EDCTP3 Joint Undertaking and its members, European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation Programme (101046041), the Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Umbrella Program (HEPR Program), managed by the World Bank Group (TF0B8412), the Medical Research Foundation (MRF-RG-ICCH-2022-100069), and the Wellcome Trust (228186/Z/23/Z). M.U.G.K. acknowledges funding from The Rockefeller Foundation, Google.org, the Oxford Martin School Pandemic Genomics programme, European Union's Horizon Europe programme projects MOOD (#874850) (also V.C.) and E4Warning (#101086640), the John Fell Fund, a Branco Weiss Fellowship and Wellcome Trust grants 225288/Z/22/Z, 226052/Z/22/Z & 228186/Z/23/Z, United Kingdom Research and Innovation (#APP8583) and the Medical Research Foundation (MRF-RG-ICCH-2022-100069.). The content and findings reported herein are the sole deduction, view and responsibility of the researcher/s and do not reflect the official position and sentiments of the funding agencies.

# Supplementary Figures

## Figure S1




Figure S1: Temporal correlation between monthly dengue cases from different origin countries to Transmission potential without and with 1 and 2 months lag.

# Figure S2




Fig S2: The figure shows the composite index of Transmission Potential multiplied by Population Density (t_i), used in this study. Here we only show for the 14 countries of high incidence and the African continent, i.e, only for the origin and destination countries used in this study.

# Figure S3




Fig S3: A) The map background uniformly represents the transmission potential of dengue (mean index P) across Africa, with the continent divided into five distinct regions. B) The population density across Africa and C) Transmission potential multiplied by population density for Africa. We also divide the African continent into 5 regions: Eastern (light blue) , Middle (Green), Northern (Purple), Southern (dark blue) and Western Africa (pink) which are outlined on the map.




Fig S4: This figure depicts the proportion of travel volumes from Asia, Southeast Asia, and South America to African countries over the course of one year.

# Figure S5


A
Transmission Potential
Risk from
Asia
South America
Total Risk
Chad
Gambia
Lesotho
Mali
Mozambique
Niger
Sao Tome and Principe
Somalia
Mean Index P
Risk of Importation
Date
Jan 2019
Apr 2019
Jul 2019
Oct 2019


B
Transmission Potential
Risk from
Asia
South America
Total Risk
Comoros
Libya
Swaziland
Mean Index P
Risk of Importation
Date
Jan 2019
Apr 2019
Jul 2019
Oct 2019


C
Transmission Potential
Risk from
Asia
South America
Total Risk
Benin
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Congo
Djibouti
Eritrea
Guinea Bissau
Liberia
Sierra Leone
Togo
Mean Index P
Risk of Importation
Jan 2019
Apr 2019
Jul 2019
Oct 2019
Date


D
Transmission Potential
Risk from
Asia
South America
Total Risk
Botswana
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Gabon
Guinea
Madagascar
Malawi
Mauritania
Zimbabwe
Mean Index P
Risk of Importation
Jan 2019
Apr 2019
Jul 2019
Oct 2019
Date




Fig S5: Time-varying risk of introduction into African countries in 2019 from Asia (blue line) and South America (red line) along with time-varying transmission potential index nationally. The combined risk is represented by the black dotted line. Panel A) Chad, Gambia, Lesotho, Mali, Mozambique, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia. B) Comoros, Libya, Swaziland. C) Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Sierra Leone. D) Botswana, DRC, Gabon, Guinea, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Zimbabwe. E) Algeria, Cameroon, Central African Republic, EquatorialGuinea, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Namibia, South Sudan, Sudan and Tunisia.

# Figure S6




Fig S6: Risk of Exportation from countries of high incidence (n=14) considered in this study overlaid across their respective transmission potential across the year.

# References


1. Gubler DJ. Dengue and dengue hemorrhagic fever. Clin Microbiol Rev. 1998;11(3):480–

592 96.
593 2. Paz-Bailey G, Adams LE, Deen J, Anderson KB, Katzelnick LC. Dengue. The Lancet.
594 2024 Feb 17;403(10427):667–82.
595 3. Brady OJ, Gething PW, Bhatt S, Messina JP, Brownstein JS, Hoen AG, et al. Refining the
596 global spatial limits of dengue virus transmission by evidence-based consensus. 2012;
597 4. Stanaway JD, Shepard DS, Undurraga EA, Halasa YA, Coffeng LE, Brady OJ, et al. The
598 global burden of dengue: an analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013.
599 Lancet Infect Dis. 2016;16(6):712–23.
600 5. Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, et al. The global
601 distribution and burden of dengue. Nature. 2013 Apr;496(7446):504–7.
602 6. Murray NEA, Quam MB, Wilder-Smith A. Epidemiology of dengue: past, present and future
603 prospects. Clin Epidemiol. 2013;299–309.
604 7. Nakase T, Giovanetti M, Obolski U, Lourenço J. Global transmission suitability maps for
605 dengue virus transmitted by Aedes aegypti from 1981 to 2019. Sci Data. 2023 May
606 12;10(1):275.
607 8. Yang X, Quam MBM, Zhang T, Sang S. Global burden for dengue and the evolving pattern
608 in the past 30 years. J Travel Med. 2021 Dec 1;28(8):taab146.
609 9. Kraemer MU, Sinka ME, Duda KA, Mylne AQ, Shearer FM, Barker CM, et al. The global
610 distribution of the arbovirus vectors Aedes aegypti and Ae. albopictus. elife.
611 2015;4:e08347.
612 10. Gubler DJ. Dengue, urbanization and globalization: the unholy trinity of the 21st century.
613 Trop Med Health. 2011;39(4SUPPLEMENT):S3–11.
614 11. Morin CW, Comrie AC, Ernst K. Climate and dengue transmission: evidence and
615 implications. Environ Health Perspect. 2013;121(11–12):1264–72.
616 12. Khan W, Zakai HA, Khan K, Kausar S, Aqeel S. Discriminating clinical and biological
617 features in malaria and dengue patients. J Arthropod-Borne Dis. 2018;12(2):108.
618 13. Nyenke CU, Nnokam BA, Esiere RK, Nwalozie R. Dengue Fever: Etiology, Diagnosis,
619 Prevention and Treatment. Asian J Res Infect Dis. 2023;14(1):26–33.
620 14. Bosire C, Mutuku F, Ndenga B, Nzaro M, Mwendwa K, LaBeaud AD. A narrative review
621 of dengue fever infection and epidemic activity in Kenya (2010 to 2020). PAMJ - One
622 Health [Internet]. 2023 Oct 16 [cited 2024 Mar 19];12(10). Available from: https://www.one-
623 health.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/12/10/full
624 15. Gainor EM, Harris E, LaBeaud AD. Uncovering the Burden of Dengue in Africa:
625 Considerations on Magnitude, Misdiagnosis, and Ancestry. Viruses. 2022 Feb;14(2):233.
626 16. WHO Afro Region. Weekly Epidemiological Record, 2023, vol.78. Wkly Epidemiol Rec.
627 2023;78(22):279–86.
628 17. Foucambert P, Esbrand FD, Zafar S, Panthangi V, Kurupp ARC, Raju A, et al. Efficacy of

Dengue Vaccines in the Prevention of Severe Dengue in Children: A Systematic Review. Cureus [Internet]. 2022 Sep 7 [cited 2023 Jun 2];14(9). Available from: https://www.cureus.com/articles/105177-efficacy-of-dengue-vaccines-in-the-prevention-of-severe-dengue-in-children-a-systematic-review

18. Lee TH, Lee LK, Lye DC, Leo YS. Current management of severe dengue infection. Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther. 2017 Jan 2;15(1):67–78.
19. Ross TM. Dengue Virus. Clin Lab Med. 2010 Mar 1;30(1):149–60.
20. Thomas SJ. Is new dengue vaccine efficacy data a relief or cause for concern? Npj Vaccines. 2023 Apr 15;8(1):1–6.
21. Pintado Silva J, Fernandez-Sesma A. Challenges on the development of a dengue vaccine: a comprehensive review of the state of the art. J Gen Virol. 2023;104(3):001831.
22. Wilder-Smith A, Gubler DJ, Weaver SC, Monath TP, Heymann DL, Scott TW. Epidemic arboviral diseases: priorities for research and public health. Lancet Infect Dis. 2017;17(3):e101–6.
23. Ryan SJ, Carlson CJ, Mordecai EA, Johnson LR. Global expansion and redistribution of Aedes-borne virus transmission risk with climate change. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019;13(3):e0007213.
24. Charu V, Zeger S, Gog J, Bjørnstad ON, Kissler S, Simonsen L, et al. Human mobility and the spatial transmission of influenza in the United States. PLoS Comput Biol. 2017;13(2):e1005382.
25. Merler S, Ajelli M. The role of population heterogeneity and human mobility in the spread of pandemic influenza. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. 2010;277(1681):557–65.
26. Bogoch II, Brady OJ, Kraemer MUG, German M, Creatore MI, Brent S, et al. Potential for Zika virus introduction and transmission in resource-limited countries in Africa and the Asia-Pacific region: a modelling study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2016 Nov 1;16(11):1237–45.
27. Kraemer MU, Hill V, Ruis C, Dellicour S, Bajaj S, McCrone JT, et al. Spatiotemporal invasion dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B. 1.1. 7 emergence. Science. 2021;373(6557):889–95.
28. Tegally H, Wilkinson E, Tsui JLH, Moir M, Martin D, Brito AF, et al. Dispersal patterns and influence of air travel during the global expansion of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern. Cell. 2023;186(15):3277–90.
29. Soriano-Paños D, Arias-Castro JH, Reyna-Lara A, Martínez HJ, Meloni S, Gómez-Gardeñes J. Vector-borne epidemics driven by human mobility. Phys Rev Res. 2020;2(1):013312.
30. Stoddard ST, Morrison AC, Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Paz Soldan V, Kochel TJ, Kitron U, et al. The role of human movement in the transmission of vector-borne pathogens. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2009 Jul 21;3(7):e481.

31. Global Administrative Areas. GADM Database. GADM Database Glob Adm Areas [Internet]. 2019; Available from: www.gadm.org.
32. Gilbert M, Pullano G, Pinotti F, Valdano E, Poletto C, Boëlle PY, et al. Preparedness and vulnerability of African countries against importations of COVID-19: a modelling study. The Lancet. 2020 Mar 14;395(10227):871–7.
33. Frank C, Lachmann R, Wilking H, Stark K. Increase in dengue fever in travellers returning from Egypt, Germany 2023. Eurosurveillance. 2024 Feb 1;29(5):2400042.
34. Barik P, Goswami P. Quantifying the Impact of Rainfall Categories on Dengue Occurrence: A Multi-Site Analysis in India. 2023;
35. Mutheneni SR, Morse AP, Caminade C, Upadhyayula SM. Dengue burden in India: recent trends and importance of climatic parameters. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2017 Aug;6(8):e70.
36. Shil P. Rainfall and dengue occurrences in India during 2010–2016. Biomed Res J. 2019;6(2):56.
37. Gardner LM, Fajardo D, Waller ST, Wang O, Sarkar S. A Predictive Spatial Model to Quantify the Risk of Air-Travel-Associated Dengue Importation into the United States and Europe. J Trop Med. 2012 Mar 14;2012:e103679.
38. Huang YM. Contributions to the mosquito fauna of Southeast Asia. XIV. The subgenus Stegomyia of Aedes in Southeast Asia I-The scutellaris group of species. 1972;
39. Semenza JC, Sudre B, Miniota J, Rossi M, Hu W, Kossowsky D, et al. International dispersal of dengue through air travel: importation risk for Europe. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014;8(12):e3278.
40. Tatem AJ, Rogers DJ, Hay SI. Global transport networks and infectious disease spread. Adv Parasitol. 2006;62:293–343.
41. Alfsnes K, Eldholm V, Gaunt MW, de Lamballerie X, Gould EA, Pettersson JHO. Tracing and tracking the emergence, epidemiology and dispersal of dengue virus to Africa during the 20th century. One Health. 2021;13:100337.
42. Schwartz E, Weld LH, Wilder-Smith A, von Sonnenburg F, Keystone JS, Kain KC, et al. Seasonality, Annual Trends, and Characteristics of Dengue among Ill Returned Travelers, 1997–2006. Emerg Infect Dis. 2008 Jul;14(7):1081–8.