Mobility and non-household environments: understanding dengue transmission patterns in urban contexts

Víctor Hugo Peña-García[1, *], Bryson A. Ndenga[2], Francis M. Mutuku[3], Donal Bisanzio[4], A. Desiree LaBeaud[5], Erin A. Mordecai[1]

[1] Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

[2] Kenya Medical Research Institute, Kisumu, Kenya

[3] Department of Environmental and Health Sciences, Technical University of Mombasa, Mombasa, Kenya

[4] RTI International, Washington, DC, USA

[5] School of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

[*] Corresponding author: Víctor Hugo Peña-García

email: victorhugopega@gmail.com

Abstract

Households (HH) have been traditionally described as the main environments where people are at risk of dengue and other arbovirus infections. Mounting entomological evidence suggests a larger role for environments other than HH. Recently, an agent-based model (ABM) estimated that over half of infections occur in non-household (NH) environments such as workplaces, markets, and recreational sites. However, the influence of human and vector mobility and urban spatial configurations on the effects of NH on dengue transmission remains understudied. To address this gap, we expanded an ABM calibrated with field data from Kenya to examine movement of people and vectors under different spatial configurations of buildings. We assessed the number of people traveling between HH and NH and the distances traveled, in three urban configurations: NH distributed randomly (scattered), concentrated in a single center, or clustered in multiple centers. Across simulations, the number of people moving was the most influential variable, with higher movement between HH and NH increasing case numbers. The number of cases was also higher when NH were scattered. Intriguingly, the distance people traveled from HH to NH had little effect on dengue burden but influenced the spatial clustering of cases. These findings underscore the role of NH as major spreaders of infections between HH and NH environments, and the importance of human movement in driving dengue dynamics.

Keywords

Dengue transmission, Agent-based model, Human mobility, Urban Configuration, Non-household environments, Spatial Structure

Introduction

Dengue is a vector-borne disease prevalent and on the rise in most of the tropical and subtropical regions around the globe with frequent number of cases being present in non-endemic areas like USA and Europe.[1, 2] The main vector, *Aedes aegypti,* is highly anthropophilic, found very close to human environments and impacting the public health of urban environments.[3, 4]

Historically, the main strategy to control the disease has been to reduce vector-human contact by reducing the size of mosquito populations. Conventional wisdom is that for effective control, these activities should be focused on households (HH) as the main environment where transmission is happening.[5, 6] However, some studies have suggested that locations other than households might have an important role because of a significant presence of mosquitoes,[7, 8, 9, 10] and infected vectors.[11] In a recent study, we used an agent-based model (ABM) to quantify the number of infections in different types of urban spaces and estimated that over half of infections are happening in non-household (NH) environments, where the main high-risk spaces are workplaces and markets/shops.[12]

These results have implications for dengue epidemiology since the high flux of people through NH suggests that these spaces can contribute to the spread of infections. In this way, the total number of infections can be affected by the distribution in space of NH and the movement of people between HH and NH. However, these intra-urban dynamics have never been described in the context of different roles among HH and different NH space types,[13, 14, 15, 16] though Massaro and colleagues used mobile phone data to get estimates for movement between workplaces.[17]

Building on a previous result showing the importance of NH for dengue transmission, we now evaluate how levels of human and vector mobility as well as different urban spatial configurations of NH affect dengue transmission. In particular, what role does spatial configuration of NH spaces play, along with the extent to which people and mosquitoes move between spaces, in determining dengue dynamics? To address this, we modified a previously published ABM[12] to make it spatially explicit by assigning coordinates that mimic different urban conformations and evaluated different scenarios of movement of people and vectors. We then assessed how these variables affect the burden of dengue and the spatial patterns to understand urban-level transmission dynamics.

Methods

Model overview

To achieve the aims of this study, we modified the ABM previously used to describe the importance of HH and NH in transmission.[12] The model was developed to quantify the relative contribution of five different types of NH (workplaces, markets or shops, recreational, religious, and schools) and HH to dengue burden. The model development and calibration were based on data from two Kenyan cities: Kisumu in the west and Ukunda on the coast.[12] Here, we focus on parameters calibrated to Kisumu, although additional results including dynamics from Ukunda are found in supplementary material.

The model represents the movement of people between HH and two different types of NH locations: daily-commuting locations where individuals attend daily and meet with the same individuals like schools and workplaces, and randomly assigned locations for which both the number and identity of people who visit them is randomly defined every day. The latter include locations like markets or shops, recreational and religious spaces. Movement between HH (categorized as “visit”) is also included in the model for which its frequency is daily determined with probability of 0.1. Based on vector surveys conducted over two years of fieldwork previously published,[18] NH and HH environments were assigned to have mosquito presence or absence based on observed prevalence of mosquitoes. Population dynamics of vectors were modeled at the building level, whereby the sub-population dynamics are determined based on building-level conditions like the presence of water containers and the total amount of water they can

hold, again informed by field vector surveillance data. These dynamics as well as infection dynamics of vectors are also determined by temperature by using functions previously described and widely used elsewhere.[19, 20, 21]

Initial baseline prevalence of dengue was set to 0.08%, estimated from previous studies reporting age-structured seroprevalence[22] with an incidence rate per year estimated as $IR = -\frac{1}{age}\ln(1 - prevalence)$. Transmission events happen in those locations where infected vectors contact susceptible humans or vice versa. Mosquitoes bite depending on both temperature-dependent biting rate and the probability of having a successful vector-human encounter, which depends on the amount of time that humans spend in the location (Details can be found in supplementary material). Infection status of mosquitoes can be either susceptible, exposed, or infected while humans can be either susceptible, exposed, infected, or recovered and (temporarily) immune. The time that mosquitoes spend as exposed depends on temperature (extrinsic incubation period) and is determined in the model by equations reported previously by Mordecai and colleagues.[19] Once infected, mosquitoes remain in this stage until death, which is evaluated daily following a temperature-dependent death rate. Humans remain susceptible until they are bit by infected mosquitoes and moved to latent stage where they remain for five days. Then, the individual is moved to the infectious stage which lasts seven days before moving to the recovered stage. Since the model does not explicitly represent dynamics of different serotypes, waning immune protection was based on Sabin's classic studies describing the loss of complete heterotypic protection after roughly three months[23, 24] to set a return to susceptible after 100 days on recovered

status. The number of infections in each location is recorded daily. Statistics about the total number of infections and locations are provided weekly. The model simulates transmission dynamics happening for 731 days (comprising temperature conditions between January 1st of 2020 until December 31st of 2021) and results are shown as a distribution of the number of infections over 200 simulations. The model and modifications described in this work were coded in Julia language (v1.10.0) and simulations were run on Sherlock computational cluster (Stanford Research Computing Center).

Spatial variables

The original model was not spatially explicit and hence the movement of individuals was assumed to be totally random. As such, the resultant infections arise from complete mixing of individuals among structures, which is not realistic and does not capture local, intra-urban spatial phenomena. To include mobility-associated variables and describe such local phenomena, we made the model spatially explicit. No real spatial coordinates were used so we could record the outcome when different urban conformations are tested by using the same set of spatial coordinates. In this way, we can assure that differences are due to the building designation as HH or NH and not by the specific set of spatial coordinates. Because the model considers synthetic populations of about 20,000 people, the total municipality areas were rescaled to fit the total number of structures of the virtual populations while considering similar densities. Spatial

coordinates were randomly generated to create a synthetic settlement and assigned to each structure of the population. With the aim to capture different real setting conformations, coordinate assignments were done based on either “Scattered” (randomly distributed), “Centered” (majority of NH concentrated in the center of the city in a single cluster), or “Clustered” (majority of NH concentrated in three clusters) configurations (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Spatial distribution of NH for three different urban conformations to be tested: scattered (NH randomly distributed in space), centered (majority of NH are clustered in the center), and clustered (majority of NH are grouped in three clusters).

NH are shown with colors while HH are displayed as light gray points. Religious and schools are represented in the first row, markets/shops and recreational in middle row and more frequent NH, workplaces, are represented in the lower row.

[ALT TEXT: Arrangement of plots showing the distribution of non-household (NH) environments in three patterns: scattered in the left column, centered in a single dense area in the middle column, and clustered into three major concentrations in the right column. The top row shows religious and school NH, the middle row shows markets and recreational NH, and the bottom row shows workplace NH.]

Movement of people

We included two movement-related variables: the distance from each household (HH) to the nearest non-household (NH) locations and the number of people moving. To control movement distances, we applied three treatments: (1) limiting attendance to the nearest NH locations (assigned as distance zero), (2) allowing attendance to NH locations at least 500 meters away, and (3) allowing attendance to NH locations at least 1000 meters away from each HH. These treatments were applied across the three different urban configurations. It is worth noting that no experiments involving humans were conducted, and the results presented in this work are limited to simulations performed using synthetic human populations.

In the clustered or centralized configurations, assigning the closest NH locations to HHs would primarily select NH sites at the periphery of each cluster, potentially leading to

biased representations. To address this, we generated a list of NH locations sorted by proximity for each HH and allocated the closest NHs based on the number of inhabitants in the HH. For example, if a HH had four inhabitants, the four closest NHs were assigned to it. This approach ensured a more representative distribution across all HHs.

The number of people visiting NH was simulated at three levels. First, we included the same levels previously described in the model, categorized as 100% mobility.[12] This treatment includes all students and workers attending their respective school and workplace, and random-attendance locations (religious, markets/shops, and recreational). Unfortunately, no data were available on the number of individuals visiting these types of locations. We anticipated significant variability due to the influence of several unmodeled factors. To account for this uncertainty, we relied on discussions with local residents to estimate a range of possible visitor numbers. We then applied a uniform distribution, with a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 70 individuals, to cover a broad spectrum of potential scenarios. The number of people visiting a given location is determined daily. We also evaluated the number of cases when decreasing the number of people moving to school and workplaces to 50% and remaining NH locations to a uniform distribution with parameters minimum = 5 and maximum = 35. Finally, we include a level of people movement of 20% for school and workplaces and uniform distribution with parameters minimum = 2 and maximum = 14 for random-attendance locations.

Movement of mosquitoes

In line with the inclusion of spatial variables and human movement, we included the movement of vectors. There were no data available to characterize the rate of movement of mosquitoes into new areas. As a result, we parameterized such movement by considering two variables—availability of both breeding and blood-feeding resources—to estimate a baseline migration probability for the number of mosquitoes moving from given locations.

The model includes a local density-dependent function that allows for the mosquito population to grow in a location-specific way, representing dynamics previously described for a fragmented environment.[25] The function is already described elsewhere[12] and depends on temperature (peaking at 29°C) and the density of immatures according to water availability, as follows:

$$f(D) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{bD-a}} d(T) \tag{1}$$

Where

$$d(T) = -0.166 + 0.08T - 0.0014T^2 \tag{2}$$

In this equation a and b are calibrated parameters, D is the larval density expressed as the ratio of the number of larvae to liters of water available for breeding in the structure, and $d(T)$ is the term describing the temperature-dependence of population growth (additional details in supplementary material).

By using this function, the growth of the mosquito sub-population (in a given building) depends on the amount of water resources available. In this way, when the mosquito population has grown so the water resources are depleted (reaching the carrying capacity), the mortality of immatures is higher and the probability for a given mosquito to migrate out of the building increases (details provided in supplementary material).

Additionally, we considered for migration the possibility that human blood availability is not satisfying the mosquito subpopulation needs in a given building. For this purpose, the number of females that fed in each day was estimated by considering the number of females biting (N_b) and the probability for those to have a successful feeding encounter with a human the same day ($P(bit)$). The latter is determined considering the number of inhabitants, the time they spend at home and the time a visitor spends in each location (details are provided in supplementary material). The final number of fed females (N_F) is estimated by

$$N_F \sim Bin\left(N_b, P(bit)\right) \tag{3}$$

Thus, when the difference between the number of mosquitoes trying to bite and the actual number of mosquitoes that are fed is large, the probability of migration increases.

Once a mosquito migrates, a new location is assigned by considering a dispersal kernel[26]. Following previous work[27], we used a lognormal function with the form

$$P_D = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{3}{2}} b d^2} e^{-\frac{\log(d/a)^2}{2b^2}} \tag{4}$$

Where d is distance and both a and b are parameters to be estimated. We fitted a function by assuming a mean dispersal distance of 105.69 meters, as estimated for *Aedes aegypti* by.[28]

Spatial autocorrelation

By taking advantage of spatial features introduced in the model, we performed a spatial autocorrelation analysis to evaluate the level of clustering of dengue cases recorded in each simulation as a function of urban configuration and human and mosquito mobility. To do this, the household location of each infection is recorded so a Global Moran's I index[29] could be estimated at the end of the simulated period. Global Moran's I ranges from -1 to +1 where -1 means totally dispersed location of cases while a value of 1 represents a spatial distribution that is totally clustered (total separation between locations with dengue cases and those without cases). In this sense, the null hypothesis of this analysis is that dengue cases are randomly distributed in municipalities, represented by Moran's I value of 0.[30] The analysis was done for every simulation by using 1,000 permutations for inference in each of them. Analyses were done using the package SpatialDependence.jl implemented in Julia language (v 1.10.0). Code is available in the GitHub repository (https://github.com/vhpenagarcia/ABM_dengue) and have been archived within the Zenodo repository (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14036270).

Results

Burden of dengue is strongly affected by number of people visiting NH

We quantified the total number of cases after two years of transmission. When we simulated the epidemic under different human movement regimes, it was evident that the number of cases decreased as the number of people moving from HH decreased. For 100% human movement, irrespective of the urban conformation, we estimated a median of 4,228 cases (IQR: 3,025 – 4,921), which decreased to a median of 764 (IQR: 349 – 1,626) and 154 (IQR: 108 – 232) cases for 50% and 20% human movement, respectively (Figure 2 and S1 Table) (all results are derived from the model calibrated for Kisumu, Kenya; see supplementary material for further results for Ukunda, Kenya).



Figure 2: Increasing the number of people moving from HH to NH significantly increases the burden of dengue under three NH spatial distribution scenarios. Three levels of human movement were assessed (20%, 50%, and 100%) on three urban conformations (scattered, centered, or clustered). Boxplots shows the distribution of the total number of infections for 200 runs of two-year simulation where median is the horizontal line, the filled box is the interquartile (IQR) range, the whiskers show the values above and under the IQR and no more than 1.5·IQR, and dots are representing values beyond this range.

[ALT TEXT: Box plot showing that the number of cases increases as the percentage of people moving from HH locations rises. Small variations are also observed among urban

275 configurations—slightly higher for scattered, followed by centered and clustered—but
276 differences by movement percentage are more pronounced.]

277

278 Additionally, the scenario where NH locations are spatially randomly distributed
279 produced more cases, though at all movement levels the interquartile ranges for
280 different spatial configurations overlapped (Figure 2). At 100% movement, scattered
281 conformation yielded a median of 4,672 (IQR: 3,956 – 5,227) while the centered and
282 clustered scenarios produced, respectively, medians of 4,432 (IQR: 3,587 – 5,027) and
283 3,178 (IQR: 1,785 – 4,179) (S2 Table).

284 When we compared HH and NH environments, the number of infections is slightly
285 higher in HH at lower levels of movement and hence lower transmission. However, at
286 higher levels of movement, the number of infections in NH are higher than HH. In this
287 way, at 100% movement, irrespective of urban conformation, NH produced 67% of the
288 cases, but this proportion decreased to 58.8% and to 42.3% at 50% and 20% of human
289 movement, respectively (Figure 3 and S1 Table).

290 It is worth noting that different levels of mosquito movement were found to influence
291 transmission. Specifically, transmission decreases at higher levels of movement due to
292 migration-mediated mortality (see supplementary results and discussion).

293



Figure 3: Number of infections are higher in NH than HH at high levels of human movement but becomes more even when levels of transmission are low due to lower movement. Three levels of human movement were assessed (20%, 50%, and 100%) on three urban conformations (scattered, centered, or clustered). Boxplots show the distribution of total number of infections for 200 runs of two-year simulation where median is the horizontal line, the filled box is the interquartile (IQR) range, the whiskers show the values above and under the IQR and no more than 1.5·IQR, and dots represent values beyond this range. The y-axis is represented in Log_{10} scale.

[ALT TEXT: Box plot comparing HH and NH environments as the percentage of people moving from HH increases. For 20% and 50% movement, case numbers are similar in both environments, while at 100% movement, cases are higher in NH environments.]

Distance from HH to NH makes little difference in dengue burden but defines level of spatial structure

Varying the distance between HH and NH had only slight impacts on the total number of infections, with a slight increase in the number of cases with distance when NH are clustered (Figure 4 and S3 Table). Besides these slight changes, differences among urban conformations are still evident (Figure 4).



Figure 4: Different distance regimes people travel from HH to NH results in slight differences in cases and larger differences among configurations. Distance 0 means people only visit the closest NH location from HH. On the three urban configuration scenarios, three levels of distance from HH to NH were assessed (the closest [categorized as 0], at least 500 meters, and at least 1000 meters). Boxplots are showing the total number of infections after two-year simulation for 200 runs.

[ALT TEXT: Box plot showing no significant differences in case numbers among the three urban configurations across the three distance categories—closest, 500 meters, and 1000 meters—from household (HH) locations. A slight tendency toward more homogeneous case numbers is observed as distance increases.]

Intrigued by the apparent lower importance of human movement distance in transmission, we wanted to explore further by assessing the spatial structure of cases. Given that the number of people moving affects the number of cases, we evaluated the spatial structuring when distance traveled is considered as well. In general, we found that irrespective of urban conformation, when people move short distances the level of spatial structure is higher, as expected (Figure 5). Similarly, the spatial structuring levels are also modified by the number of people moving, where lower levels of movement decrease Moran's I, thereby making cases more dispersed (Figure S6).



Figure 5: Spatial structuring decreases with increased distance of movement. Distribution of Moran's I values for 200 simulations for each of the three distance regimes is shown. Values that are both significantly (α = 0.05) and non-significantly different from zero are displayed by color. Three levels of distance from HH to NH were assessed (the closest [categorized as 0], at least 500 meters, and at least 1000 meters) on three urban conformations (scattered, centered, or clustered).

[ALT TEXT: Box plot showing that Moran's I values shift toward a higher range as the distance of people moving from HH locations increases. The category representing zero distance—people moving to the closest NH location—shows the highest Moran's I values.]

Discussion

Despite recent results of this model showing an important role of NH environments for dengue transmission and control, where over half of infections occur in NH environments, it remained unknown how non-random mixing and mobility of humans and vectors affected dengue dynamics.[12] By extending the ABM to consider spatially-explicit urban conformations and movement levels, we showed that human movement is a primary driver of dengue dynamics, irrespective of urban spatial configuration. Further, qualitatively similar, outcomes generated by simulating conditions from the

355 coastal Kenyan city of Ukunda supports these results and can be found in
356 supplementary material.

357 Among urban conformations, when NH spaces are scattered throughout the city it
358 allows for closer connections to HH and therefore increased transmission. In this way,
359 NH spaces serve as spreaders of infection since they are highly visited locations, which
360 increases the chances of having a successful feeding encounter between humans and
361 infected vectors. Once an individual is infected, the chances of infecting mosquitoes
362 inside the household and in turn having another household inhabitant infected
363 increases, generating local household chains of transmission.

364 For this reason, a lower number of individuals visiting NH locations tends to reduce the
365 burden of dengue (Figure 2). In this sense, when the number of people visiting NH
366 decreases, the number of infections happening in these spaces also decreases until
367 becoming roughly even with the number of infections in HH. These results are
368 supported by previous reports showing that when COVID-19 pandemic lockdowns
369 forced people to stay at home most of the time, the number of dengue cases was
370 significantly reduced.[16, 31, 32] The idea of human movement guiding different levels of
371 transmission is not new and has been explored previously, especially by Stoddard and
372 colleagues (2009), who focused their study on the movement of individuals between
373 houses only.[13] However, here we highlight how human mobility interacts with NH spaces
374 as drivers of transmission, which then disseminates within households. As a result, when
375 control is focused on households, it prevents the spread of disease to the remaining

376 household inhabitants but leaves broader foci of transmission active as long as NH
377 transmission is not under control.

378 Distance from HH to NH was not as important as overall levels of human movement for
379 dengue burden (Figure 4). This supports our previous result by suggesting that it is not
380 how far people are traveling but the destination and total amount of movement. This is in
381 line with previous work where a large, longitudinal study in Iquitos, Peru showed that
382 human infection risk is mainly driven by individuals visiting locations with presence of
383 infected vectors, irrespective of the distance.[14] It is important to note that our model
384 does not account for movement times, which increase with distance (but note that even
385 our largest range of movement, >1000m, is still very localized within a city's limits).
386 These NH spaces have been previously described to have mosquitoes[33] and hence
387 represent some degree of risk for transmission when people are nearby. Unfortunately,
388 we do not have data about the time people spend in NH locations. We think that the
389 number of infections happening while people are moving through NH locations is likely
390 to be negligible, but this merits further work.

391 The distance that people travel to NH does, however, affect the urban spatial dynamics
392 of transmission. By increasing people's traveling distances we are also increasing the
393 mixing of individuals. Distance traveled affects the level of clustering of cases, which is a
394 measure of the level of spatial dependence of cases and hence of how cases are
395 unevenly distributed in space (Figure 5).[30] The clustering of cases considering the major
396 role in transmission of NH is something that has not been explored before and deserves
397 further exploration to understand its implication for disease control program design.

Although urban spatial configuration had subtle effects on the number and spatial structure of dengue infections, human movement between HH and NH had a much larger impact, with an 82% decline in cases as the number of people moving decreased from 100% to 50%. Together, these results reflect the importance of NH and human mobility between NH and HH spaces in dengue epidemiology. This underscores the importance of vector control in NH spaces, which is not currently implemented in many dengue endemic regions. Finally, though people's travel distance did not have a large impact on the number of cases, it is important for shaping spatial patterns, which can have implications for control activities and for local herd immunity.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge Dr. Jason R. Andrews for the valuable input in this work. We would also acknowledge the fieldwork teams (in Kisumu: Joel Mbakaya, Samwel Ndire and Charles Adipo; in Ukunda: Said Lipi Malumbo, Paul S. Mutuku, Charles M. Ng'ang'a) who collected the data that made this work possible. We also acknowledge NIH for funding through project R01 AI102918 (ADL).

Financial Support

This research was funded by NIH through the grant R01AI102918 (PI LaBeaud). In addition, V.H.P.G. is supported by grants R01AI102918 and R35GM133439; E.A.M. is supported by NIH grants R35GM133439, R01AI102918, and R01AI168097, and NSF

419 grant DEB-2011147 (with Fogarty International Center); A.D.L. is supported by grants
420 R01AI102918, R01AI149614, R01AI155959, D43TW011547.

421

422 Competing interests

423 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

424

425

426 Authors' Information:

427 VHPG: Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA.
428 victorhugopega@gmail.com

429 BAN: Kenya Medical Research Institute, Kisumu, Kenya, bndenga@yahoo.com

430 FMM: Department of Environmental and Health Sciences, Technical University of
431 Mombasa, Mombasa, Kenya, fmutuku73@gmail.com

432 DB: RTI International, Washington, DC, USA, dbisanzio@rti.org

433 ADL: School of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA,
434 dlabeaud@stanford.edu

435 EAM: Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA,
436 emordeca@stanford.edu

437

References

1. Guzman MG, Harris E, 2015. Dengue. Lancet 385: 453-65.

2. Guzman MG, Gubler DJ, Izquierdo A, Martinez E, Halstead SB, 2016. Dengue infection. Nat Rev Dis Primers 2: 16055.

3. Scott TW, Amerasinghe PH, Morrison AC, Lorenz LH, Clark GG, Strickman D, Kittayapong P, Edman JD, 2000. Longitudinal studies of *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) in Thailand and Puerto Rico: blood feeding frequency. J Med Entomol 37: 89-101.

4. Scott TW, Chow E, Strickman D, Kittayapong P, Wirtz RA, Lorenz LH, Edman JD, 1993. Blood-feeding patterns of *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) collected in a rural Thai village. J Med Entomol 30: 922-7.

5. Montenegro-Quiñonez CA, Louis VR, Horstick O, Velayudhan R, Dambach P, Runge-Ranzinger S, 2023. Interventions against Aedes/dengue at the household level: a systematic review and meta-analysis. EBioMedicine 93: 104660.

6. World Health Organization., 2009. Dengue guidelines for diagnosis, treatment, prevention and control : new edition. Geneva: World Health Organization.

7. Huang CH, Lin CY, Yang CY, Chan TC, Chiang PH, Chen YH, 2021. Relationship between the Incidence of Dengue Virus Transmission in Traditional Market and Climatic Conditions in Kaohsiung City. Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol 2021: 9916642.

8. Suwanbamrung C, Promsupa S, Doungsin T, Tongjan S, 2013. Risk factors related to dengue infections in primary school students: exploring students' basic knowledge of dengue and examining the larval indices in southern Thailand. J Infect Public Health 6: 347-57.

9. Barrera R, Acevedo V, Amador M, 2021. Role of Abandoned and Vacant Houses on *Aedes aegypti* Productivity. Am J Trop Med Hyg 104: 145-150.

10. Kampango A, Furu P, Sarath DL, Haji KA, Konradsen F, Schiøler KL, Alifrangis M, Saleh F, Weldon CW, 2021. Risk factors for occurrence and abundance of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes bromeliae* at hotel compounds in Zanzibar. Parasit Vectors 14: 544.

11. Pérez-Pérez J, Peña-García VH, Calle-Tobón A, Quimbayo-Forero M, Rojo R, Henao E, Shragai T, Rúa-Uribe G, 2021. Entomovirological Surveillance in Schools: Are They a Source for Arboviral Diseases Transmission? Int J Environ Res Public Health 18.

12. Peña-García VH, LaBeaud AD, Ndenga BA, Mutuku FM, Bisanzio D, Andrews JR, Mordecai EA, 2025. Non-household environments make a major contribution to dengue transmission: implications for vector control. R Soc Open Sci 12: 241919.

13. Stoddard ST, Morrison AC, Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Paz Soldan V, Kochel TJ, Kitron U, Elder JP, Scott TW, 2009. The role of human movement in the transmission of vector-borne pathogens. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 3: e481.

14. Stoddard ST, Forshey BM, Morrison AC, Paz-Soldan VA, Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Astete H, Reiner RC, Vilcarromero S, Elder JP, Halsey ES, Kochel TJ, Kitron U, Scott TW, 2013. House-to-house human movement drives dengue virus transmission. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110: 994-9.

15. Wesolowski A, Qureshi T, Boni MF, Sundsøy PR, Johansson MA, Rasheed SB, Engø-Monsen K, Buckee CO, 2015. Impact of human mobility on the emergence of dengue epidemics in Pakistan. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 112: 11887-92.

16. Liyanage P, Rocklöv J, Tissera HA, 2021. The impact of COVID-19 lockdown on dengue transmission in Sri Lanka; A natural experiment for understanding the influence of human mobility. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 15: e0009420.

17. Massaro E, Kondor D, Ratti C, 2019. Assessing the interplay between human mobility and mosquito borne diseases in urban environments. Sci Rep 9: 16911.

18. Peña-García VH, Mutuku FM, Ndenga BA, Mbakaya JO, Ndire SO, Agola GA, Mutuku PS, Malumbo SL, Ng'ang'a CM, Andrews JR, Mordecai EA, LaBeaud AD, 2023. The Importance of Including Non-Household Environments in Dengue Vector Control Activities. Viruses 15.

19. Mordecai EA, Cohen JM, Evans MV, Gudapati P, Johnson LR, Lippi CA, Miazgowicz K, Murdock CC, Rohr JR, Ryan SJ, Savage V, Shocket MS, Stewart Ibarra A, Thomas MB, Weikel DP, 2017. Detecting the impact of temperature on transmission of Zika, dengue, and chikungunya using mechanistic models. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 11: e0005568.

20. Huber JH, Childs ML, Caldwell JM, Mordecai EA, 2018. Seasonal temperature variation influences climate suitability for dengue, chikungunya, and Zika transmission. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 12: e0006451.

21. Caldwell JM, LaBeaud AD, Lambin EF, Stewart-Ibarra AM, Ndenga BA, Mutuku FM, Krystosik AR, Ayala EB, Anyamba A, Borbor-Cordova MJ, Damoah R, Grossi-Soyster EN, Heras FH, Ngugi HN, Ryan SJ, Shah MM, Sippy R, Mordecai EA, 2021. Climate

503 predicts geographic and temporal variation in mosquito-borne disease dynamics on two
504 continents. Nat Commun 12: 1233.

505 22. Inziani M, Adungo F, Awando J, Kihoro R, Inoue S, Morita K, Obimbo E, Onyango F,
506 Mwau M, 2020. Seroprevalence of yellow fever, dengue, West Nile and chikungunya
507 viruses in children in Teso South Sub-County, Western Kenya. Int J Infect Dis 91: 104-
508 110.

509 23. Sabin AB, 1950. The dengue group of viruses and its family relationships. Bacteriol Rev
510 14: 225-32.

511 24. Sabin AB, 1952. Research on dengue during World War II. Am J Trop Med Hyg 1: 30-
512 50.

513 25. McCormack CP, Ghani AC, Ferguson NM, 2019. Fine-scale modelling finds that
514 breeding site fragmentation can reduce mosquito population persistence. Commun Biol
515 2: 273.

516 26. Nathan R, Klein E, Robledo-Arnuncio JJ, Revilla E, 2012. Dispersal kernels: review.
517 Clobert J, Baguette M, Benton TG, Bullock JM, eds. Dispersal Ecology and Evolution:
518 Oxford University Press, 0.

519 27. Marcantonio M, Reyes T, Barker CM, 2019. Quantifying *Aedes aegypti* dispersal in
520 space and time: a modeling approach. Ecosphere 10: e02977.

521 28. Moore TC, Brown HE, 2022. Estimating *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) Flight
522 Distance: Meta-Data Analysis. J Med Entomol 59: 1164-1170.

523 29. Moran PAP, 1948. The Interpretation of Statistical Maps. Journal of the Royal Statistical
524 Society: Series B (Methodological) 10: 243-251.

525 30. Pfeiffer DU, Robinson TP, Stevenson M, Stevens KB, Rogers DJ, Clements ACA, 2008.
526 Spatial clustering of disease and global estimates of spatial clustering. Spatial Analysis
527 in Epidemiology: Oxford University Press, 0.

528 31. Wilder-Smith A, 2021. Dengue during the COVID-19 pandemic. J Travel Med 28.

529 32. Sasmono RT, Santoso MS, 2022. Movement dynamics: reduced dengue cases during
530 the COVID-19 pandemic. Lancet Infect Dis 22: 570-571.

531 33. Ngugi HN, Mutuku FM, Ndenga BA, Musunzaji PS, Mbakaya JO, Aswani P, Irungu LW,
532 Mukoko D, Vulule J, Kitron U, LaBeaud AD, 2017. Characterization and productivity
533 profiles of Aedes aegypti (L.) breeding habitats across rural and urban landscapes in
534 western and coastal Kenya. Parasit Vectors 10: 331.

535


Scattered
Centered
Clustered
Workplace
Market
Religious
Recreational
School


Cases
6000
4000
2000
0
20
50
100
Percentage of people moving from HH
urban
scattered
centered
clustered


Cases
1000
100
10
20
50
100
Percentage of people moving from HH
Household
Non_Household


Cases
6000
4000
2000
0
0
500
1000
Distance from Households
urban
scattered
centered
clustered


0
500
1000
count
Moran's I
0.00
0.04
0.08
0.12
p < 0.05
p ≥ 0.05