Climate Change and Malaria: A Call for Robust Analytics

David L Smith[1,◕,*], Daniel J Laydon[2,◕], Kaustubh Chakradeo[3], Mark P Khurana[3], Jaffer Okiring[4] David A Duchene[3,◕], Samir Bhatt[2,3,◕]

1 Department of Health Metrics Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
2 MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK
3 Section of Epidemiology, Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

◕These authors contributed equally to this work
*smitdave@uw.edu

Abstract

Mosquito ecology and malaria parasite development in mosquitoes display marked sensitivity to weather, in particular to temperature and precipitation. Therefore, climate change is expected to profoundly affect malaria epidemiology in its transmission, spatiotemporal distribution and consequent disease burden. However, malaria transmission is also complicated by other factors (e.g. urbanisation, economics, genetics, drug resistance) which together constitute a highly complex, dynamical system, where the influence of any single factor is highly uncertain.

In this study, we therefore aim to re-evaluate the evidence underlying the widespread belief that climate change will increase worldwide malaria transmission. We firstly review the different types of studies that have contributed to this evidence-base: i) studies that project changes in transmission due to inferred relationships between environmental and mosquito entomology; ii) studies that focus on either mechanistic transmission or time series models to estimate the effects of malaria control strategies on prevalence, and iii) regression-based studies that look for associations between environmental variables and malaria prevalence. We then employ a simple statistical model to show that environmental variables alone do not account for the observed spatiotemporal variation in malaria prevalence.

Our review raises several concerns about the robustness of the analyses used for advocacy around climate change and malaria. We find that, while climate change's effect on malaria is highly plausible, empirical evidence is much less certain. Future research on climate change and malaria must become integrated into malaria control programs, and understood in context as one factor among many affecting malaria. Our work outlines gaps in modelling that we believe are priorities for future research.

Introduction

Malaria epidemiology, transmission, ecology and control are complex. The distribution of malaria, and its transmission intensity and seasonality have been shaped by a range of factors: climate [1, 2], mosquito ecology and biogeography [3], malaria control [4], economic development [5], human genetics [6, 7], and history [8]. Since the start of the 20th century, the incidence of malaria has declined, albeit unevenly, over time [9, 10]. The geographical range of malaria has substantially contracted in recent times, and prevalence has dropped in places where it remains endemic [1]. While malaria has declined due to economic development and improved control strategies (e.g. elimination programs, improved healthcare, medical interventions), other factors push in the opposite direction. Malaria incidence has seen large changes caused by: drug resistance; changes in first-line therapies; healthcare system strengthening and degradation; economic development; efforts to scale up intervention coverage; resurgent outbreaks associated with the evolution of insecticide resistance; and pauses in malaria control [11–13]. These changes are often abetted further by weather or land use changes. Therefore, how this multitude of factors come together to drive malaria incidence is far from straightforward.

Despite advances in control, overall malaria remains a major cause of death and disease today, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. Since malaria parasites are transmitted by mosquitoes, and mosquito ecology and behavior are affected by the environment, the interactions between weather, mosquito ecology, climate change, and malaria transmission have been of longstanding interest [14]. Here, we review and evaluate the evidence that has shaped science and advocacy concerning climate change and malaria, with a focus on the broad sources of uncertainty underlying this evidence. We explain why statistical studies tend to find that environmental variables alone do not explain the total variation in malaria prevalence over space and time. Environmental variables primarily define a population at risk rather than actual current transmission intensity. Taken together, we explain how the influence of climate change on future malaria transmission is far less certain than previously stated.

We consider three kinds of studies that have examined the relationship between climate change and malaria. First, we consider studies of potential malaria transmission, which project changes in malaria transmission based on the link between environmental variables and mosquito behavior or ecology. In such studies, effects on malaria transmission have been modelled using a formula for the basic reproductive number, R_0, or vector capacity [15, 16] or using a mathematical model of malaria transmission dynamics. Further, the data used to make projections under various climate change scenarios are based on observations of mosquitoes raised under controlled conditions in a laboratory, in a semi-field environment, or in carefully controlled settings.

Second, we consider long-term time series studies, which focus on either mechanistic transmission or time series models to estimate the effects of malaria control strategies on prevalence. In some cases, these associations have been used as the basis for projections forward in time.

Third, we consider regression-based studies that look for associations between environmental variables and malaria prevalence. These studies have generally relied on large data sets curated by the Malaria Atlas Project [4].

While all three types of analysis are valuable, they also suffer from limitations that render them incomplete. For example, a major limitation of any study of malaria and temperature over time is the lack of any covariates describing treatment failure associated with anti-malarial drug resistance. The evolution of anti-malarial drug resistance in Africa in the 1990s is a well-documented phenomenon [17] that has proven difficult to measure in terms of overall efficacy. In this piece, we describe how these limitations dramatically weaken the evidence

supporting a dominant link between climate change and malaria in Africa. Critically, highlighting the risks of increased malaria due to climate change can be misleading, with downstream consequences being important, but also multifaceted and nuanced.

Malaria is now a heavily managed disease, and if climate change is relevant for management, then methods to attribute the effects of climate change, apart from all the other factors changing malaria, must be considered for future strategies. In this piece we sum up how rather than rising temperatures, it is overall weather changes that most influence vector density, and that pose a challenge to malaria control programs. Furthermore, malaria transmission has a changing baseline that varies with malaria control. Despite this complex interplay of factors, the task of coping with climate change ultimately falls on malaria control programs. Therefore funding is needed to help develop surveillance, information systems, early warning systems, and capacity for effective outbreak responses. Regardless of the impact that climate change may have on malaria, it should not distract from the central task of reducing malaria burden, such that research on climate change and malaria should serve those goals [18]. Future research on climate change and malaria must become integrated into malaria control programs and understood in context as one factor among many affecting malaria.

Potential Transmission

Many studies of climate change and malaria are based on basic theory for malaria transmission dynamics and control. These include simulation studies that use mathematical models of transmission, and analyses of potential transmission based on Macdonald's formula for the basic reproductive number for malaria, R_0, which describes the number of human malaria cases per human malaria case [15, 16, 19, 20]; or on a formula for vectorial capacity, which was derived from the formula for R_0 shortly thereafter [21]. Macdonald's formula was first developed in the 1950s in a set of papers that synthesized the first few decades of work in malaria epidemiology and medical entomology [15, 22–29]. A central question addressed by this mathematical model was the critical density of mosquitoes required to sustain transmission. Macdonald used the formula to understand endemic malaria, and he used the formula to weigh the relative importance of various parameters describing transmission [15]. The formula would serve as a threshold criterion in simple models of transmission: transmission would be sustained if $R_0 > 1$. Therefore, to eliminate malaria, mosquito population density would have to be reduced by factor that exceeds R_0. In Macdonald's papers, the formula was derived from standard metrics (e.g., the human biting rate, sporozoite rate, and thus the entomological inoculation rate [EIR], to malaria prevalence and incidence) that had been developed to measure transmission. Macdonald's analysis reframed the question of mosquito-borne transmission around a few specific parameters, and drew attention to the important role played by mosquito survival [24].

To develop theory for vector control, Garrett-Jones isolated the purely entomological parameters in the formula for R_0 and called the new formula "vectorial capacity" (VC, see Box 1) [21]. The formula, separated from the rest of the formula for R_0, computes transmission potential as if humans were perfectly infectious, avoiding the difficult issue of human infectiousness. In doing so, Garrett-Jones ignored differences among vector species in their ability to host the parasites (now referred to as "vector competence"). VC describes a daily reproductive number, the number of infective bites that would eventually arise from all mosquitoes that would blood-feed on a single, perfectly infectious human on a single day [21]. Macdonald had originally derived the formula

for R_0 from mathematical formulas for the sporozoite rate, the human biting rate, and their product the daily entomological inoculation rate (dEIR) – the number of infective bites received per person per day [15, 30]. The concepts and mathematical formulas suggested a basis for estimating VC from dEIR: the two main differences are the net infectiousness of humans (which could be extended to include vector competence), and mosquito superinfection [16, 31].

In mathematical models, the concepts of EIR and VC (or some version of the equations from which they were derived) play a key role in understanding transmission intensity. The consequences of transmission are then explored in models that couple mosquito ecology, mosquito infection dynamics, and models of human malaria epidemiology, including infection and immunity. These mathematical models have evolved substantially since Macdonald. Mathematical models of malaria gain credibility through rigorous testing, and while the Ross-Macdonald model remains useful as a way of understanding the basic process of transmission, early attempts to use it during field trials exposed its limitations [32]. After Macdonald, mathematical models were extended to look at immunity [33, 34], treatment with antimalarial drugs and chemoprotection [35], heterogeneous transmission [36–38], mosquito ecology [34] and dozens of other issues. Models for malaria infection and immunity have grown in complexity, and they have become embedded in comprehensive individual-based simulation models [39, 40]. Mathematical models have been used to guide malaria policies, including integrated malaria control.

Some of the first publications on climate change and malaria employed computer simulation models based on either simple extensions of the Ross-Macdonald model, or based on the vectorial capacity formula [20, 41–44]. In the following, we examine the use of these models and concepts to study climate and malaria.

Climate and Vectorial Capacity

The formula for vectorial capacity can be understood as a concise quantitative summary of the potential for malaria transmission (Fig 1, Box 1). Parameters in the formula mosquito blood feeding on humans, survival, and ecology. Parasite transmission occurs during mosquito blood feeding, and a mosquito must take at least one blood meal to get infected, and then one or more bites to transmit parasites between humans: parasites consumed in human blood during a blood meal infect a mosquito; the parasites develop and mature; and later, human malaria parasites are transmitted from mosquitoes to humans in the bite via saliva. After rewriting the formula for vectorial capacity, this interpretation is clear: upon emerging, one human blood meal is required to infect a mosquito, and after surviving long enough for the parasites to mature, one (or more) additional bites could infect humans (Box 1). We can think of vectorial capacity as having two parts – one for adult behaviors and demography, and another for mosquito population dynamics. Mosquito population dynamics are affected by the same adult behaviors as transmission – blood feeding and demography – since adult mosquitoes provision eggs after blood feeding. All these factors affect the number of times mosquitoes will bite or blood-feed on a human during its lifespan. The formula makes simple assumptions that can help to contextualize mosquito behaviors and ecology and study their effects on transmission. Our discussion will break VC into two parts: the capacity of an adult mosquito to transmit, starting after emergence:

$$A = \frac{f^2 q^2}{g^2} e^{-gn}$$



Fig 1. A diagram of 1) vectorial capacity as a summary of transmission potential (see Box #1) involving two parts: the emergence rate of mosquitoes, per human (λ); and the capacity of each individual mosquito to transmit parasites ($f^2q^2e^{-gn}/g^2$.) 2) Some of the likely effects of weather; and 3) a ranking of parameters by the number of ways they affect transmission. The box around mosquito aquatic ecology ($\mathcal{L}$), including egg laying by adults and emergence, indicates an important source of variability in malaria transmission that is also affected by weather in ways that often depend on the local context.

and processes affecting mosquito population dynamics through a population dynamic feedback involving egg laying. Egg laying can also be understood through the capacity of an individual adult mosquito to lay eggs, which we assume is proportional to the total number of blood meals taken ($\gamma \propto f/g$). All the factors affecting mosquito population dynamics are reduced to a simple formula

$$M = \lambda \left(\gamma \left(\frac{f}{g} \right) \right)$$

This formula is deliberately vague because, unlike the formula for adults, it is not clear that it is possible to write down any formula that would work across all settings. This relationship is a great source of uncertainty.

Potential Transmission by Adults

Many studies have examined the role of climate on malaria by computing an effect size, a quantitative measure of the increase in the potential for malaria transmission. If a given parameter is related to temperature over time, $T(t)$. Then we could write down $R_0(T(t))$, and compute an effect size Z. Alternatively, many studies have modified models for malaria transmission dynamics to simulate forcing by temperature (or other variables). For example, if mosquito survival is a function of temperature, $g(T(t))$, then a change in temperature would result in

a change in R_0 by a factor Z_g, given by

$$Z_g = \frac{e^{-g(T(t))}}{g(T(t))^2} \times \frac{g(T(0))^2}{e^{-g(T(0))}}$$

We call Z_g the effect size on potential transmission associated with temperature-driven changes in mosquito survival. Using the formula for vectorial capacity, it is possible to compute additional changes in potential transmission associated with feeding rates, or the extrinsic incubation period (EIP, i.e. the mean time taken for malaria parasites to undergo development within the mosquito before they are infectious to humans), $n(T(t))$. The total effect size on potential transmission by adult mosquitoes would be a product of changes in each one of the bionomic parameters. Ideally, a total effect size would consider the effects of all changes caused by any relevant environmental variables. An advantage of these studies is that it is easy to communicate the results: an effect size of 1.5 can be reported as a 50% projected increase in potential transmission.

The estimated effects of environmental variables on parameters are based on field studies or controlled experiments that have measured the effect of changes in bionomic parameters on adult mosquito behavior or demography, and parasite development rates while in the mosquito [45]. Temperature and humidity have been consistently identified as factors affecting malaria transmission by adult mosquito populations. By the time Macdonald wrote his synthesis in 1952, dozens of studies had already measured the EIP for malaria parasites in relation to temperature [24, 46]. More recent data have looked in closer detail at the relationship between the EIP and temperature in *An. gambiae* and in *An. stephensi* [47]. Lab studies have examined effects of temperature and humidity on lab reared mosquitoes [48].

It is also useful to consider temperature through its interaction with humidity, and in particular relative humidity [48]. Relative humidity describes how much moisture the air holds relative to its maximum. The hotter the temperature, the more humidity the air can hold. There are strong associations between relative humidity and malaria transmission and relative humidity also affects parasite and pathogen development within mosquitoes. Furthermore, relative humidity affects thermal performance curves of both mosquitoes and pathogens, leading to complex variation in the thermal optimum, limits, and operative range.

Despite disagreements on specific details, the studies agree on a set of core messages [49]: mosquito daily survival and blood feeding rates, and the EIP all reach an optimum somewhere between 25 and 30 degrees. The optimum depends largely on relative humidity. Unlike temperature, mosquito survival and blood feeding rates tend to increase consistently with relative humidity.

Since climate would mainly affect transmission by mosquitoes (rather than the behavior of humans or human infections), the information in Ross-Macdonald simulation models is, in essence, all conveyed by the formula for vectorial capacity. The effects on potential survival propagate measures of change through formulas derived from vectorial capacity. However, these formulas typically overlook alterations in describing vectorial capacity, or, depending on which factors are neglected, consider only partial versions of it, in order to assess changes in potential transmission. The question that these studies addressed was how environmental variables would affect vectorial capacity [50].

Climate and Mosquito Populations

The effect of rainfall on malaria transmission is a major concern for understanding malaria transmission, with potentially important feedbacks to weather and its effects on adult mosquito ecology. Since rainfall creates standing water that serves as mosquito habitat, rainfall can create new habitats and an opportunity for mosquito populations to grow exponentially. The effects of changing rainfall patterns may be large, but they are also highly unpredictable. Short term rainfall itself is unpredictable, and longer term climate projections for rainfall are also highly uncertain. Further, the effects of rainfall are locally idiosyncratic, mediated by hydrology, terrestrial ecology, and many other factors. This context dependence means that, in effect, the relationship between rainfall and transmission may be specific to each locality. Within a locality, rainfall can drive different patterns for each one of the local vector species populations.

The degree to which rainfall affects malaria transmission dynamics is related to the all the factors that regulate mosquito populations, including the availability and quality of mosquito habitats. Mosquito habitats could include any concavity that could be filled by rainfall or subterranean water flows to become habitats for immature mosquitoes. However, it is not necessarily the case that more rain will lead to more habitat and subsequently more mosquitoes. First, the effects of rainfall are mediated by hydrology. Second, the effects of rainfall are affected by the temporal distribution, *i.e.*, the times between successive rainfall events and their magnitude. Third, the aquatic mosquito populations are affected by a large number of biotic interactions, including competition with other mosquitoes for resources. The effects of climate change are thus likely to be highly context dependent and localized in both time and space. In contrast to temperature, which varies smoothly between nearby locations, rainfall is also likely to have high spatial variation with differing magnitudes, even in nearby localities [51].

The relationship between rainfall and malaria transmission may not be monotonic, *i.e.*, more rainfall does not always equate to more malaria. Increased egg laying in a crowded habitat could increase crowding, delay development, and lower the number of adults emerging, for example. While rainfall can increase the number and size of breeding sites, an excess of rainfall can wash out breeding sites [52]. The non-monotonicity of this relationship is further compounded by the observation that rainfall is a nonequilibrium relaxation process, in contrast to temperature.

Rainfall itself is highly unpredictable. Nonequilibrium processes like rainfall are scale free and best described by simple power laws that characterize the density and occurrence of rain events as well as drought periods. The consequence of this dynamic is that rainfall events can be of enormous size in a very short period, followed by a prolonged drought, exhibiting complex and often unpredictable fluctuations over time. In this context, the average amount of rainfall in a period is a misleading indicator of the true dynamics. Earthquakes are another example of a nonequilibrium relaxation process [53]. In the context of climate change, warmer oceans increase evaporation. When moisture-laden air moves over land or converges into a storm system, it intensifies precipitation. Rainfall is therefore expected to increase with climate change, but because precipitation dynamics are scale free (power-law distributed), increased rainfall is expected to result in a larger incidence of both floods and droughts - each of which will have a reductive effect on malaria transmission. Furthermore, at a macroscopic scale, rainfall affects the availability of resources that mosquitoes need in order to complete their life cycle, making predictions based on climate change even more challenging.

Sensitivity, Variability, and Uncertainty

An important question is how much we should be concerned with climate change and malaria through its effects on adult mosquitoes, through mosquito ecology, or through both. One approach to this has been mathematical – to examine the sensitivity or elasticity to parameters [54]. While many studies have emphasized the importance of adult mosquito survival and blood feeding, a cursory examination of the data suggests that most of the variability in malaria transmission intensity is related to mosquito ecology [55]. The primary data come from studies that have estimated the EIR. Notably, the EIR is computed as the product of two metrics: the human biting rate (HR), and the sporozoite rate (SR). The annual EIR ranges from very close to zero up to more than a thousand bites by infectious mosquitoes, per person, per year [56]. Most of the variability in the aEIR is attributed to differences in the HBR, not the SR.

The mathematical approach, one that emphasizes sensitivity to parameters, had suggested that transmission should scale only linearly with adult mosquito population density, but this ignores the fact that mosquito ecology is itself a highly non-linear system. A single adult female mosquito could produce thousands of offspring over a few days, leading to highly explosive bouts of malaria transmission.

Complexity, Scaling, and Malaria Metrics

To understand the effects of any change in potential transmission, some soft of mathematical construct is needed to understand how malaria in humans responds to changes in malaria transmission intensity. These models emphasize non-linearities and complexities in the relationship between exposure to the bites of infectious mosquitoes, the metrics used to measure parasite infections in populations, and malaria. What would it mean if potential malaria transmission doubled?

Rigorous studies have used models to compare patterns observed in studies of malaria, particularly those that have measured malaria in two or more ways at the same place and time. The relationship between the EIR and the average PR is strongly non-linear [57, 58]; the PR varies by age, sex, season, travel, and drug taking. While the EIR has been used as a measure of exposure, the association with the estimated force of infection (FoI), malaria incidence is also strongly non-linear and it also varies by age [59, 60]. Malaria immunity develops with age and exposure, and disease is concentrated in young children. Changing transmission intensity is expected to shift the burden to older ages, but the expected overall changes in burden are not simple linear responses to changing mosquito densities or to overall transmission intensity.

An important consequence of these non-linearities is that despite the mathematical possibility of doing so, there is enormous uncertainty about the how a change in one parameter or metric would lead to changes in another. To put it another way, there is no reason to believe that doubling the VC / EIR would lead to a doubling in mortality, or that a second doubling in VC / EIR would have the same effect as the first. These non-linearities also make it difficult to make credible projections about the changing burden of malaria even if there were complete certainty around expected changes in transmission.

Thresholds and Smoothness

Models and Macdonald's threshold condition have focused some attention on concernsthat a change in potential transmission would bring about a qualitative change in malaria transmission. While Macdonald's formula for R_0

was meant to describe a threshold condition for the establishment of endemic transmission, the predicted effect of crossing a threshold required for local transmission are substantially dulled by malaria connectivity. Malaria transmission can be sustained by malaria importation in mobile human populations. In realistic models with spatial dynamics, threshold conditions are modified by heterogeneity, and transmission is dispersed widely by movement of humans and mosquitoes [61]. In most places where $R_0 < 1$, the presence of malaria is sustained by malaria importation, so crossing a threshold would not lead to a qualitative change.

Three important factors modifying threshold conditions are: the heterogeneous spatial distribution of mosquitoes; the heterogeneous spatial distribution of humans; and the heterogeneous temporal distribution of mosquito transmission potential. Consider a simple conceptual model for a time-varying reproduction number $R_0(t)$ that is piecewise constant (i.e. a step function), where seasonal endemic transmission is characterised by periods where $R_0(t) > 1$, and other periods where $R_0(t) \leq 1$. However, empirical malaria data is highly heterogeneous [55], and estimates of reproduction numbers exhibit roughness in their functional form over time [62] and space [63].

Mosquito populations and malaria transmission are highly heterogeneous on landscapes, and parasite populations are connected by movement of infected humans and mosquitoes [61]. So while Macdonald's formula $R_0 > 1$ is an important threshold concept for local malaria transmission in an isolated population, it is best regarded as an informative pseudo-threshold condition [61]. This is modified by heterogeneity since it will persist through malaria importation and onwards transmission in chains that habitually fade out [64–67].

On islands, the non-linearity associated with variability in transmission potential around a threshold is dulled substantially in places with malaria importation [63]. In other settings, malaria is found in places that could not sustain transmission [68] if they were disconnected from surrounding populations. Because of these source-sink dynamics, too much attention has focused on the possibility that changes in potential transmission would cross some particular threshold. The high temporal variation in $R_0(t)$ suggests that the factors that contribute to $R_0(t)$ are themselves highly heterogeneous. As noted above, climate change is expected to yield extreme events that increase variation in $R_0(t)$. However this is likely to be highly unpredictable and the effects could both increase and lower $R_0(t)$. Therefore a simple relationship between climate change and the incidence of malaria is unlikely.

Predictions

An important question is how much global warming is likely to change malaria in sub-Saharan Africa, which carries most of the burden of malaria. Despite uncertainty about the shape of $R_0(T)$, the effects of global warming on malaria in Africa are likely to be small, at least given that temperatures in Africa are already high enough to maximise spread. Indeed, the temperatures across much of sub-Saharan Africa are near the optimum, where a change in temperature (T) has very little effect on potential transmission, insofar as we are able to make rational guesses based on such extrapolations. In fact, a large fraction of Africa is above the optimum, such that an increase in temperature would see potential declines in malaria transmission by adult mosquitoes.

Most studies of potential transmission have come to similar conclusions about climate and malaria, particularly in Africa where the burden of malaria is greatest. First, since large fractions of Africa are already at or near optimal temperatures required for transmission, global warming is likely to reduce transmission in large areas that are above the optimum; cause almost no change in areas that are near the optimum; and increase transmission in areas Second, the predicted effect sizes on potential transmission are small compared with the natural variability

in malaria transmission. Third, the predicted effect sizes of climate on potential transmission are much smaller than the potential reductions in transmission that can be achieved through vector control. Fourth, the greatest changes in malaria transmission are likely to come through changes in rainfall.

Malaria Time Series

The second kind of study of malaria and climate change is a small set of studies of time series describing malaria and environmental variables. Such studies are rare because there are few places in the world that have reliable long-term data sets describing malaria. Among the African study sites that have time series longer than ten years, many of them have documented long-term declines. Among these are studies centered around long-term research sites: Dielmo, Senegal; The Gamia; Kilifi, Kenya; and Kisumu, Kenya; Macha, Zambia; Kalifabougou, Mali. One other source of long-term malaria incidence or malaria prevalence data is from medical centers at tea plantations describing malaria and temperature in Kericho, Kenya.

A limitation of these studies is that while it is comparatively easy to get time series of climate data in some form, it is almost impossible to get other variables affecting malaria. In particular, malaria transmission in Africa was dramatically affected by the evolution of chloroquine resistance from 1987, when it was first introduced, for the next 20-30 years until first-line treatment for malaria and cultural practice shifted. While there is now a marker for chloroquine resistance, data describing the prevalence of that marker in malaria parasites either does not exist or has not been considered in time series analyses.

Regression

A common approach to climate change and malaria has come through regression analyses [1, 4, 69, 70]. Using detailed satellite imagery from a range of different satellites, it is possible to collect data on temperature, vegetation, precipitation etc. and crucially, to match these variables to the location and time of the observations, which we denote y. Let the resulting basis matrix of covariates be given by X. A model-based statistical approach is the current state-of-the-art when modelling this type of data, and represents a suitable data generating process [**?**]. Loosely, a statistical model can be expressed using the following linear equation

$$y \sim \beta X^T + Z(x, y, t) \tag{1}$$

where β is a vector of coefficients and Z is a zero mean Gaussian process with a space-time covariance function that denotes the residuals.

Intuitively, this model attempts to explain *Pf*PR (*Plasmodium falciparum* parasite rate) as a function of a set of environmental covariates (X), which could include rainfall or vegetation from satellite imagery. A question of interest is how much of the data can be explained as a linear function of the environment? If the predictive power of this linear function is high, then an argument can be made that a simple relationship between temperature and rainfall and malaria prevalence exists. The Z term attempts to explain any residual pattern that cannot be explained by the covariates but is structured and not simply random noise. Z does not tell us what causes this unobserved structure; it could be a wide range of factors, including nutrition, culture, mosquito ecology and

dispersal, or human mobility and travel. We fit this model using Approximate Bayesian inference (the Laplace approximation [71]) such that the resultant model is parsimonious.

For a simple illustration, we consider two major climate factors: temperature suitability and average rainfall. Temperature suitability [72, 73] is a dynamic biological mathematical model that incorporates temperature dependency in the malaria transmission cycle, and then uses satellite data on temperature to estimate a suitability index. Rainfall is measured using CHIRPS (Climate Hazards Group InfraRed Precipitation with Station data), which estimates the average rainfall in a month from rain gauge and satellite observations. It is possible to match temperature suitability index to the month and year of malaria observations, and to match rainfall to the month (averaged over years) to account for minor aspects of seasonality.

Outliers such as heatwaves, droughts and floods will not be adequately captured using these data, but major variations in the spatial and temporal distribution of the environment factors relevant to the mosquito will be captured. Using the large Malaria Atlas Project dataset on malaria parasite rate surveys, where each data point is a sample of the number of parasite positive individuals out of the total, it is possible to match temperature suitability to the specific latitude, longitude, rainfall, month and year (2001-2022) to the specific latitude, longitude, month, with the years averaged due to data paucity. To facilitate consistency, the data on parasite rates are adjusted for age [74] and diagnostic time [75].

Malaria parasite rate data are proportions, thus bounded between zero to one. To simplify regression, we transformed these data via the empirical logit into a Gaussian scale. We call these observations y. Consider three simple models, explaining parasite rate observations by (i) a constant model $y_{x,y,t} \sim I$, (ii) a linear model with temperature suitability and rainfall $y \sim I + \beta^T X_{x,y,t}$, where $X_{x,y,t}$ is the temperature suitability index and rainfall at the matched locations and times of the malaria parasite rate observations, and (iii) $y \sim I + \beta^T X_{x,y,t} + Z(x, y, t)$, where again Z is a space-time random field that captures structure in the data. We evaluate model performance by computing the mean absolute percentage error and the correlation on the original untransformed parasite rate scale.

The mean absolute error of simply fitting a constant intercept to the data is 17% with a correlation of zero. The model with temperature suitability does explain variation with a mean absolute error of 16.5% and a correlation of 0.2. The Gaussian process model with temperature suitability yields a mean absolute error of 9% and a correlation of 0.8. This difference is substantial, and while this example is simplistic, it reveals that the overwhelming bulk of the spatial distribution of malaria and its change in time over the past 2 decades is negligibly explained by temperature and its biological effect on the mosquito. Figure 2 shows the predictions for the linear and Gaussian process model along side the raw data. We see that the model with just temperature suitability and rainfall is unable to capture the large variations in parasite rate, and creates predictions within a narrow band (Figure 2 top right) and the fine grained spatial variation only predicts a limited variation in $PfPr$ (Figure 2 bottom left). In contrast, the Gaussian process (Figure 2 bottom right) is an excellent fit to the data, both in terms of spatial pattern but also in predicting the full range of variation in $PfPr$. These results reinforce that while climate plays a pivotal role in defining the population at risk, simple relationships are not the primary driver in the dynamic changes of infection.



Fig 2. (top left) $PfPr$ malaria parasite rate from the Malaria Atlas Project Database. (top right) Linear model with temperature and rainfall with the colour scale ranging from 0-1 (bottom left) Linear model with temperature and rainfall with a restricted colour scale to show variation (bottom right) Gaussian process process with linear mean function of temperature and rainfall

Critical gaps in modelling

While substantial efforts have been made to model malaria dynamics over time, it is also critical to discuss other critical variables that can confound modelling efforts. While many of these factors are easy to list, such as demography, economics, politics and logistics, any analysis including these is hampered by a lack of consistent health records and surveillance systems.

Obtaining data on socio-economic factors, climate, and local environmental conditions can become difficult because of landscape and topography of any given region. Human mobility patterns, land use changes, migration effects as well exposure to malaria vectors are usually used as in malaria modelling; however, data for all these can prove difficult to acquire. For example, if there is ongoing military conflict in a particular region, population numbers can change drastically in a short period of time, and this needs to be modelled. However, acquiring exact estimates is almost impossible, and only approximations can be made. Even in periods of relative stability, if there is limited infrastructure present in a region, population numbers will still be difficult to extrapolate. For example, the last census in the Democratic Republic of Congo was held in 1984. So, official numbers are not available over the last 40 years. Methods for estimating census data are used to a great extent and will continue to improve and contribute greatly in this field in the coming years.

Malaria Seasonality

Climate has been one determinant of the seasonal patterns of malaria transmission. Recent satellite data show large-scale changes in the geographical patterns of seasons [76]. Multiple studies have highlighted the impact and association of seasonality in driving waves of malaria transmission. These studies demonstrate that ordinary fluctuations in temperature set the seasonal pattern, along with rainfall, and are likely to be disrupted by climate change. This disruption is not expected to be geographically homogeneous, with some regions benefiting over others. One seasonal factor that may be overlooked is human-related seasonality, which is not expected to change as abruptly as environmental factors. Human-related seasonality includes seasonal labor migrations, cultural events and gatherings, and seasonal travel (both business and recreational), which play a substantial role in propagating waves of malaria transmission, particularly in lower transmission and elimination settings.

As malaria control programs study the relationship between environmental variables and malaria, to improve the accuracy of vector control or develop early warning systems, most of the variance in the data that is availabledescribes seasonal variation in malaria, especially over short time scales.

Drug resistance

The evolution of drug resistance is a critical factor influencing malaria transmission and prevalence. The low cost, high demand, and widespread use or antimalarial drugs have in combination led to strong selection on the parasite for drug resistant strains. Meanwhile, drug resistance is possible with relatively modest molecular change. One example is the small amount of change needed of about four amino acids, in a single gene called the P. falciparum chloroquine resistance transporter, that confer resistance to chloroquine-based antimalarial drugs [77].

Importantly for modeling malaria prevalence, it is the severe selective constrains that control strategies place on the pathogen that dominate the emergence of drug resistance. Perhaps surprisingly to non-geneticists, strains that are drug resistant are actually inferior in their natural environment, given that they involve relatively rare combinations of molecular changes [78]. This inferiority of drug resistant strains means that reduced use of antimalarial drugs leads to the quick loss of drug resistance. Since drug resistance is such a crucial factor in driving malaria prevalence, strategies that limit the use of antimalarial drugs to symptomatic cases will maximise their efficacy [79]. The misuse of low-cost antimalarial drugs will conversely increase the risk that drug resistance emerges, and on the contrary the development of new types of drugs can dramatically drop prevalence in the medium term. The major impact of drug development and resistance on prevalence has been evident for both chloroquine in the second half of the 20th century and artemisinin-based combination therapies in the last two decades [80].

There is a hypothetical link between drug development, resistance, and climate change, where the climate mediates the logistics and accessibility for drug administration. Yet ultimately, it is drug distribution and resistance that dominates prevalence, as opposed to climate directly [81]. Alternatively, novel climatic conditions might tend to disproportionately benefit the emergence of drug resistant strains, although the biological mechanism of this has not been described. Extensive genetic surveillance is likely to shed light onto the immunological and environmental conditions that benefit drug resistant strains, and climate could be involved in this mix of factors. More immediately, genomic surveillance can play an important role for optimising drug administration, by helping

map the emergence and spread of drug resistant strains [79].

Conclusion

Our work raises several concerns about the robustness of the analyses used for advocacy around climate change and malaria. Accuracy, weak evidence, and complexity have been challenges for studies of global warming and malaria, because effect sizes of temperature are easily mimed or masked by other environmental factors, vector control, anti-malarial drug use, healthcare systems, land use changes, economic development, and evolution of drug and insecticide resistance. Given the complexity of malaria epidemiology and transmission, concerns about global warming and climate change must be evaluated in context, as part of multi-factorial studies that provide accurate assessments of causation and estimates of effect sizes. Decades after concerns were first raised about the effects of climate and malaria, there is still a need to reset priorities. The questions to be addressed today are: how much should research on climate change and malaria be prioritized, and to what end? What is the marginal value of learning more about climate and malaria?

First, our analysis suggests that the risks posed by climate change on malaria incidence have been overstated [1]. While there are compelling analyses demonstrating that temperature affects several aspects of transmission, a focus on sensitivity to parameters has diverted attention away from effect sizes. If, instead, effect sizes are computed by propagating the expected changes in temperature, they are much smaller compared the observed variability in transmission intensity across Africa.

Empirical data also emphasize the importance of interactions between temperature and humidity, and not merely temperature alone. Analyses of the long-term longitudinal studies from Africa have not so far found an effect of temperature on malaria. The two regression studies that have examined global warming and malaria were flawed as they ignored the evolution of chloroquine resistance in sub-Saharan Africa during the 1990s. The basis for making projections about likely changes in mortality is therefore not sound. The robustness of the conclusion that climate change will increase malaria transmission is challenged by the dramatic differences between the projections given differing scenarios, as well as the vastly different effect sizes reported between studies. While there are good reasons to expect small increases in transmission overall, the changes attributable to climate change are highly spatially heterogeneous, with malaria likely to increase in some locations and decline in others.

The evidence suggests that studies of climate change and malaria must be understood through its effects on mosquito ecology in context. While climate has clearly played a role in shaping the current distribution of malaria, the effects of climate on transmission are locally idiosyncratic, highly dynamical and therefore difficult to predict.

Box 1: Vectorial Capacity

Macdonald's formula for R_0 was based the product of formulas for the sporozoite rate and the the human biting rate [15, 30], which is now called the EIR. A formula for vectorial capacity includes three parameters describing adult mosquitoes: the blood feeding rate (f); the human fraction, or the number of human blood meals among all blood meals (q); and daily survival (g). Together, these terms describe the expected number of human bloodmeals a mosquito would take over its lifetime ($S = fq/g$). A single parameter describes parasites in mosquitoes, called the extrinsic incubation period (EIP, n days), defined as the number of days required for malaria parasites to develop. To transmit, a mosquito must also survive through the EIP (with probability $P = e^{-gn}$). The formula for VC includes one parameter describing mosquito ecology: the emergence rate of mosquitoes from aquatic habitats, per human (λ). These parameters are combined into a formula for vectorial capacity that contextualizes transmission.

$$V = \lambda \frac{f^2 q^2}{g^2} e^{-gn} = \lambda S^2 P$$

The formula on the right hand side tells the story of parasite transmission by mosquitoes: after emerging (λ), a mosquito must blood feed on a human to become infected (S), then survive through the EIP (with probability P); and then bite other humans to transmit (S). This is equivalent to Macdonald's formula, after a change in notation [55].

The formula has been used to understand parameters that could have the greatest influence on transmission. The longer a mosquito survives, the more human bites it will give, and the more likely it will survive through the EIP, so survival affects transmission in three ways. Blood feeding rates and the human fraction affect VC in two ways; the EIP and the density of mosquitoes once [30]. Since mosquitoes turn blood into eggs, and since egg laying affects mosquito ecology, it might make sense to count one more effect of mosquito survival and blood feeding rates [82].



Fig 3. The mosquito life cycle includes immature aquatic stages and a volant adult. Female mosquitoes lay eggs in water bodies. Eggs hatch within a few days to months. Larvae live in water and develop into pupae in as few as 5 days. Pupae continue to live in water and develop into flying mosquito adults that leave the water in 2-3 days. Adult mosquitoes, are meanwhile flying in search of resources, including vertebrate hosts to blood feed, sugar sources for sugar, and aquatic habitats to lay eggs.

Box 2: Mosquito Ecology

Mosquitoes have seven distinct life stages: eggs, four larval instars, pupae, and adults (Figure 3). Adults lay eggs in aquatic habitats. After hatching and developing in water through pupation, adults emerge as adults that mate and sugar feed. Female mosquitoes (but not males) also blood feed; the protein and nutrients in blood are used to make eggs. It is the cycle of blood feeding, egg laying, and sugar feeding by adult females that is of greatest interest sets the stage for mosquito ecology and malaria parasite transmission. Mosquitoes, like most insects, are poikilothermic – their internal temperature depends on the surrounding environment. Mosquito activities and many of the resources they require to complete their life cycle are also affected by weather and climate, including vertebrate animals for blood, sugar, vegetation and resting habitats, and aquatic habitats.

Acknowledgments

DJL acknowledges funding from the Wellcome Trust for the Vaccine Impact Modelling Consortium (VIMC) Climate Change Research Programme (grant ID: 226727_Z_22_Z). DJL, SB acknowledge funding from the MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis (reference MR/X020258/1), funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC). This UK funded award is carried out in the frame of the Global Health EDCTP3 Joint Undertaking. SB is funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Health Protection Research Unit in Modelling and Health Economics, a partnership between the UK Health Security Agency, Imperial College London and LSHTM (grant code NIHR200908). Disclaimer: 'The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR, UK Health Security Agency or the Department of Health and Social Care.'. DAD acknowledges support from the Novo Nordisk Foundation via the Emerging Data Science Investigator award (NNF23OC0084647). SB acknowledges support from the Novo Nordisk Foundation via The Novo Nordisk Young Investigator Award (NNF20OC0059309), which also funds KC. SB acknowledges the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF160) through the chair grant which also supports MPK. SB acknowledges support from The Eric and Wendy Schmidt Fund For Strategic Innovation via the Schmidt Polymath Award (G-22-63345).

References

1. Gething PW, Smith DL, Patil AP, Tatem AJ, Snow RW, Hay SI. Climate change and the global malaria recession. Nature. 2010;465(7296):342–345. doi:10.1038/nature09098.

2. Reiter P. Climate change and mosquito-borne disease. Environmental Health Perspectives. 2001;109(suppl 1):141–161. doi:10.1289/ehp.01109s1141.

3. Kiszewski A, Mellinger A, Spielman A, Malaney P, Sachs SE, Sachs J. A global index representing the stability of malaria transmission. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2004;70(5):486–498.

4. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of malaria control on *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa between 2000 and 2015. Nature. 2015;526(7572):207–211. doi:10.1038/nature15535.

5. Tusting LS, Gething PW, Gibson HS, Greenwood B, Knudsen J, Lindsay SW, et al. Housing and child health in sub-Saharan Africa: A cross-sectional analysis. PLoS Med. 2020;17(3):e1003055. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003055.

6. Hedrick PW. Population genetics of malaria resistance in humans. Heredity. 2011;107(4):283–304. doi:10.1038/hdy.2011.16.

7. Kariuki SN, Williams TN. Human genetics and malaria resistance. Human Genetics. 2020;139(6):801–811. doi:10.1007/s00439-020-02142-6.

8. Mertens JE. A History of Malaria and Conflict. Parasitology Research. 2024;123(3):165. doi:10.1007/s00436-024-08167-4.

9. Leal Filho W, May J, May M, Nagy GJ. Climate change and malaria: some recent trends of malaria incidence rates and average annual temperature in selected sub-Saharan African countries from 2000 to 2018. Malaria Journal. 2023;22(1):248. doi:10.1186/s12936-023-04682-4.

10. Weiss DJ, Lucas TCD, Nguyen M, Nandi AK, Bisanzio D, Battle KE, et al. Mapping the global prevalence, incidence, and mortality of Plasmodium falciparum, 2000–17: a spatial and temporal modelling study. The Lancet. 2019;394(10195):322–331. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31097-9.

11. Cohen JM, Smith DL, Cotter C, Ward A, Yamey G, Sabot OJ, et al. Malaria resurgence: a systematic review and assessment of its causes. Malar J. 2012;11:122. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-11-122.

12. Namuganga JF, Epstein A, Nankabirwa JI, Mpimbaza A, Kiggundu M, Sserwanga A, et al. The impact of stopping and starting indoor residual spraying on malaria burden in Uganda. Nat Commun. 2021;12(1):2635. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-22896-5.

13. Epstein A, Maiteki-Sebuguzi C, Namuganga JF, Nankabirwa JI, Gonahasa S, Opigo J, et al. Resurgence of malaria in Uganda despite sustained indoor residual spraying and repeated long lasting insecticidal net distributions. PLOS Global Public Health. 2022;2(9):e0000676. doi:10.1371/journal.pgph.0000676.

14. Organization WH. Potential health effects of climatic change: report of a WHO task group. World Health Organization; 1990.

15. Macdonald G. The analysis of equilibrium in malaria. Trop Dis Bull. 1952;49(9):813–829.

16. Smith DL, McKenzie FE, Snow RW, Hay SI. Revisiting the basic reproductive number for malaria and its implications for malaria control. PLoS Biol. 2007;5(3):e42. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0050042.

17. Sidhu ABS, Verdier-Pinard D, Fidock DA. Chloroquine Resistance in ¡i¿Plasmodium falciparum¡/i¿ Malaria Parasites Conferred by ¡i¿pfcrt¡/i¿ Mutations. Science. 2002;298(5591):210–213. doi:10.1126/science.1074045.

18. Feachem RGA, Chen I, Akbari O, Bertozzi-Villa A, Bhatt S, Binka F, et al. Malaria eradication within a generation: ambitious, achievable, and necessary. Lancet. 2019;394(10203):1056–1112. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31139-0.

19. Smith DL, Battle KE, Hay SI, Barker CM, Scott TW, McKenzie FE. Ross, Macdonald, and a theory for the dynamics and control of mosquito-transmitted pathogens. PLoS Pathog. 2012;8(4):e1002588. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1002588.

20. Shapiro LL, Whitehead SA, Thomas MB. Quantifying the effects of temperature on mosquito and parasite traits that determine the transmission potential of human malaria. PLoS biology. 2017;15(10):e2003489.

21. Garrett-Jones C. Prognosis for interruption of malaria transmission through assessment of the mosquito's vectorial capacity. Nature. 1964;204:1173–1175. doi:10.1038/2041173a0.

22. Macdonald G. The analysis of malaria parasite rates in infants. Tropical diseases bulletin. 1950;47(10):915–938.

23. Macdonald G. Community aspects of immunity to malaria. British medical bulletin. 1951;8(1):33–36.

24. Macdonald G. The analysis of the sporozoite rate. Trop Dis Bull. 1952;49(6):569–586.

25. Macdonald G. The analysis of malaria epidemics. Trop Dis Bull. 1953;50(10):871–889.

26. Macdonald G. The measurement of malaria transmission. Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine. 1955;48(4):295–302.

27. Macdonald G. A new approach to the epidemiology of malaria. Indian J Malariol. 1955;9(4):261–270.

28. Macdonald G. Epidemiological basis of malaria control. Bull World Health Organ. 1956;15(3-5):613–626.

29. Macdonald G. Theory of the eradication of malaria. Bull World Health Organ. 1956;15(3-5):369–387.

30. Smith DL, McKenzie FE. Statics and dynamics of malaria infection in Anopheles mosquitoes. Malaria Journal. 2004;3:13. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-3-13.

31. Gething PW, Elyazar IRF, Moyes CL, Smith DL, Battle KE, Guerra CA, et al. A long neglected world malaria map: *Plasmodium vivax* endemicity in 2010. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012;6(9):e1814. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001814.

32. Nájera JA. A critical review of the field application of a mathematical model of malaria eradication. Bull World Health Organ. 1974;50(5):449–457.

33. Dietz K, Molineaux L, Thomas A. A malaria model tested in the African savannah. Bull World Health Organ. 1974;50(3-4):347–357.

34. Aron JL, May RM. The population dynamics of malaria. In: Anderson RM, editor. The Population Dynamics of Infectious Diseases: Theory and Applications. Boston, MA: Springer US; 1982. p. 139–179. Available from: `https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2901-3_5`.

35. Dietz K. Models for parasitic disease control. Bull Int Stat Inst. 1975;46(1):531–544.

36. Dietz K. Models for vector-borne parasitic diseases. In: Barigozzi C, Levin SA, editors. Vito Volterra Symposium on Mathematical Models in biology. Berlin: Springer-Verlag; 1980. p. 264–277.

37. Dye C, Hasibeder G. Population dynamics of mosquito-borne disease: effects of flies which bite some people more frequently than others. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 1986;80(1):69–77. doi:10.1016/0035-9203(86)90199-9.

38. Dietz K, Hadeler KP. Epidemiological models for sexually transmitted diseases. J Math Biol. 1988;26(1):1–25.

39. Reiner RC Jr, Perkins TA, Barker CM, Niu T, Chaves LF, Ellis AM, et al. A systematic review of mathematical models of mosquito-borne pathogen transmission: 1970-2010. J R Soc Interface. 2013;10(81):20120921.

40. Smith NR, Trauer JM, Gambhir M, Richards JS, Maude RJ, Keith JM, et al. Agent-based models of malaria transmission: A systematic review. Malar J. 2018;17(1):299. doi:10.1186/s12936-018-2442-y.

41. Haile DG. Computer simulation of the effects of changes in weather patterns on vector-borne disease transmission. Washington, DC, US Environmental Protection Agency. 1989;.

42. Martens WJ, Niessen LW, Rotmans J, Jetten TH, McMichael AJ. Potential impact of global climate change on malaria risk. Environ Health Perspect. 1995;103(5):458–464. doi:10.1289/ehp.95103458.

43. Martens WJM. Climate change and malaria: exploring the risks. Med War. 1995;11(4):202–213.

44. Lindsay SW, Birley M. Climate change and malaria transmission. Ann Trop Med Parasitol. 1996;90(6):573–588. doi:10.1080/00034983.1996.11813087.

45. Detinova TS, Bertram DS. Age-grouping methods in Diptera of medical importance, with special reference to some vectors of malaria. World Health Organization; 1962.

46. Ohm JR, Baldini F, Barreaux P, Lefevre T, Lynch PA, Suh E, et al. Rethinking the extrinsic incubation period of malaria parasites. Parasit Vectors. 2018;11(1):178. doi:10.1186/s13071-018-2761-4.

47. Waite JL, Suh E, Lynch PA, Thomas MB. Exploring the lower thermal limits for development of the human malaria parasite, Plasmodium falciparum. Biol Lett. 2019;15(6):20190275. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2019.0275.

48. Bayoh MN. Studies on the development and survival of *Anopheles gambiae* sensu stricto at various temperatures and relative humidities [Doctoral]. Durham University; 2001. Available from: `http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/4952/`.

49. Mordecai EA, Paaijmans KP, Johnson LR, Balzer C, Ben-Horin T, de Moor E, et al. Optimal temperature for malaria transmission is dramatically lower than previously predicted. Ecol Lett. 2012;16(1):22–30. doi:10.1111/ele.12015.

50. Mordecai EA, Caldwell JM, Grossman MK, Lippi CA, Johnson LR, Neira M, et al. Thermal biology of mosquito-borne disease. Ecol Lett. 2019;22(10):1690–1708. doi:10.1111/ele.13335.

51. Jensen NE, Pedersen L. Spatial variability of rainfall: Variations within a single radar pixel. Atmospheric Research. 2005;77(1):269–277. doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2004.10.029.

52. Parham PE, Waldock J, Christophides GK, Hemming D, Agusto F, Evans KJ, et al. Climate, environmental and socio-economic change: weighing up the balance in vector-borne disease transmission. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2015;370(1665):20130551–20130551. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0551.

53. Peters O, Hertlein C, Christensen K. A Complexity View of Rainfall. Physical Review Letters. 2001;88(1):018701. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.018701.

54. Brady OJ, Johansson MA, Guerra CA, Bhatt S, Golding N, Pigott DM, et al. Modelling adult *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* survival at different temperatures in laboratory and field settings. Parasit Vectors. 2013;6:351. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-6-351.

55. Smith DL, Musiime AK, Maxwell K, Lindsay SW, Kiware S. A New Test of a Theory about Old Mosquitoes. Trends Parasitol. 2021;37(3):185–194. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2020.10.011.

56. Hay SI, Rogers DJ, Toomer JF, Snow RW. Annual *Plasmodium falciparum* entomological inoculation rates (EIR) across Africa: Literature survey, internet access and review. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2000;94(2):113–127. doi:10.1016/s0035-9203(00)90246-3.

57. Hay SI, Guerra CA, Tatem AJ, Atkinson PM, Snow RW. Urbanization, malaria transmission and disease burden in Africa. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2005;3(1):81–90. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1069.

58. Smith DL, Dushoff J, Snow RW, Hay SI. The entomological inoculation rate and *Plasmodium falciparum* infection in African children. Nature. 2005;438(7067):492–495. doi:10.1038/nature04024.

59. Smith DL, Drakeley CJ, Chiyaka C, Hay SI. A quantitative analysis of transmission efficiency versus intensity for malaria. Nature Communications. 2010;1(8):108. doi:10.1038/ncomms1107.

60. Tusting LS, Bousema T, Smith DL, Drakeley C. Measuring changes in *Plasmodium falciparum* transmission: precision, accuracy and costs of metrics. Adv Parasitol. 2014;84:151–208. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-800099-1.00003-X.

61. Wu SL, Henry JM, Citron DT, Ssebuliba DM, Nsumba JN, C HMS, et al. Spatial dynamics of malaria transmission. PLOS Computational Biology. 2023;19(6):e1010684. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1010684.

62. Routledge I, Chevéz JER, Cucunubá ZM, Rodriguez MG, Guinovart C, Gustafson KB, et al. Estimating spatiotemporally varying malaria reproduction numbers in a near elimination setting. Nat Commun. 2018;9(1):2476. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04577-y.

63. Guerra CA, Kang SY, Citron DT, Hergott DEB, Perry M, Smith J, et al. Human mobility patterns and malaria importation on Bioko Island. Nature Communications. 2019;10(1):2332. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-10339-1.

64. Cohen JM, Moonen B, Snow RW, Smith DL. How absolute is zero? An evaluation of historical and current definitions of malaria elimination. Malar J. 2010;9:213. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-9-213.

65. Silal SP, Little F, Barnes KI, White LJ. Hitting a Moving Target: A Model for Malaria Elimination in the Presence of Population Movement. PLoS One. 2015;10(12):e0144990. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0144990.

66. Griffin JT. Is a reproduction number of one a threshold for Plasmodium falciparum malaria elimination? Malar J. 2016;15(1):389. doi:10.1186/s12936-016-1437-9.

67. Reiner RC, Le Menach A, Kunene S, Ntshalintshali N, Hsiang MS, Perkins TA, et al. Mapping residual transmission for malaria elimination. Elife. 2015;4:e09520. doi:10.7554/eLife.09520.

68. Fornace KM, Topazian HM, Routledge I, Asyraf S, Jelip J, Lindblade KA, et al. No evidence of sustained nonzoonotic Plasmodium knowlesi transmission in Malaysia from modelling malaria case data. Nature Communications. 2023;14(1):2945. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-38476-8.

69. Gething PW, Patil AP, Smith DL, Guerra CA, Elyazar IRF, Johnston GL, et al. A new world malaria map: *Plasmodium falciparum* endemicity in 2010. Malar J. 2011;10(1):378. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-10-378.

70. Bhatt S, Cameron E, Flaxman SR, Weiss DJ, Smith DL, Gething PW. Improved prediction accuracy for disease risk mapping using Gaussian process stacked generalization. J R Soc Interface. 2017;14(134):20170520. doi:10.1098/rsif.2017.0520.

71. Rue H, Martino S, Chopin N. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol. 2009;71(2):319–392. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00700.x.

72. Weiss DJ, Bhatt S, Mappin B, Van Boeckel TP, Smith DL, Hay SI, et al. Air temperature suitability for *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria transmission in Africa 2000-2012: a high-resolution spatiotemporal prediction. Malar J. 2014;13:171. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-13-171.

73. Gething PW, Van Boeckel TP, Smith DL, Guerra CA, Patil AP, Snow RW, et al. Modelling the global constraints of temperature on transmission of *Plasmodium falciparum* and *P. vivax*. Parasit Vectors. 2011;4:92. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-4-92.

74. Smith DL, Guerra CA, Snow RW, Hay SI. Standardizing estimates of the *Plasmodium falciparum* parasite rate. Malar J. 2007;6:131. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-6-131.

75. Mappin B, Cameron E, Dalrymple U, Weiss DJ, Bisanzio D, Bhatt S, et al. Standardizing *Plasmodium falciparum* infection prevalence measured via microscopy versus rapid diagnostic test. Malar J. 2015;14(1):460. doi:10.1186/s12936-015-0984-9.

76. Santer BD, Po-Chedley S, Zelinka MD, Cvijanovic I, Bonfils C, Durack PJ, et al. Human influence on the seasonal cycle of tropospheric temperature. Science. 2018;361(6399):eaas8806. doi:10.1126/science.aas8806.

77. Wicht KJ, Mok S, Fidock DA. Molecular Mechanisms of Drug Resistance in Plasmodium falciparum Malaria. Annual Review of Microbiology. 2020;74(Volume 74, 2020):431–454. doi:10.1146/annurev-micro-020518-115546.

78. Rosenthal PJ. The interplay between drug resistance and fitness in malaria parasites. Mol Microbiol. 2013;89(6):1025–1038. doi:10.1111/mmi.12349.

79. White NJ. Does antimalarial mass drug administration increase or decrease the risk of resistance? The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2017;17(1):e15–e20. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(16)30269-9.

80. Menard D, Dondorp A. Antimalarial Drug Resistance: A Threat to Malaria Elimination. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Medicine. 2017;7(7):a025619. doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a025619.

81. Snow RW, Kibuchi E, Karuri SW, Sang G, Gitonga CW, Mwandawiro C, et al. Changing Malaria Prevalence on the Kenyan Coast since 1974: Climate, Drugs and Vector Control. PLoS One. 2015;10(6):e0128792–14. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0128792.

82. Brady OJ, Godfray HCJ, Tatem AJ, Gething PW, Cohen JM, McKenzie FE, et al. Adult vector control, mosquito ecology and malaria transmission. International Health. 2015;7(2):121–129. doi:10.1093/inthealth/ihv010.