Mapping the bird reservoir potential for West Nile virus in Europe and its relationship with disease occurrence in humans

Jonathan Bastard [1,2], Raphaëlle Métras [2], Benoit Durand *[1]

[1] EPIMIM, Laboratoire de Santé Animale, ANSES, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire d'Alfort, 94700 Maisons-Alfort, France

[2] Sorbonne Université, INSERM, IPLESP, Paris, France

* Corresponding author: benoit.durand@anses.fr

Abstract

Background. West Nile virus (WNV) is a zoonotic mosquito-borne *Flavivirus*, with bird populations reservoirs. Although often asymptomatic, infection in humans can cause febrile symptoms and more rarely, severe neurological symptoms that may lead to death. Mapping WNV bird reservoir is important towards understanding the distribution of WNV cases in humans.

Aim. Our objective was to generate a WNV Reservoir Index (RI), quantifying the bird reservoir potential across Europe, and validate the RI using human cases notifications.

Methods. We first used a bird traits-based model to estimate WNV seroprevalence in 150 European passerine bird species. This allowed us to build a map of the WNV bird RI across Europe. To validate this metric, we investigated its association with WNV human cases notified at the NUTS administrative region scale, using a Besag-York-Mollie spatial model in a Bayesian framework.

Results. We first identified eco-ethological characteristics associated with higher WNV seroprevalence in wild birds. Second, we mapped the RI that showed a strong spatial heterogeneity across Europe, with overall high RI values (i.e. a high reservoir potential for WNV) in Central and Eastern Europe, despite variations at small geographical scale. At the NUTS level, the RI was positively associated with the number of years with notified WNV human cases between 2016 and 2023.

Conclusions. We provide a map quantifying the suitability for WNV to circulate in the bird reservoir. This allows to target surveillance efforts in areas at risk for WNV zoonotic infections in the future.

Key words: West Nile, vector-borne, spatial, model, reservoir, serology, antibodies, Europe.

Introduction

The occurrence of arboviral diseases in humans either results from a human only well-established epidemiological cycle (such as dengue or chikungunya), zoonotic transmissions from an animal reservoir source (such as West Nile or tick-borne encephalitis), or a combination of both (such as yellow fever [1]). In the zoonotic case, the risk of infection to humans may result from a combination of (i) the level of infection in the animal reservoir that represents a zoonotic *potential*, thereafter named the structural risk, and (ii) environmental (e.g. high mosquito abundance following rains) or anthropic (e.g. individual protective measures against mosquitoes) circumstances that favor subsequent zoonotic transmission events to humans, thereafter named the conjectural risk [2]. The structural risk, which depends on the distribution of reservoir host species, is typically expected to change on the longer term than the conjectural risk.

West Nile virus (WNV) is a mosquito-borne *Flavivirus* with bird populations as reservoirs [3]. It can also infect humans and horses, considered as "dead-end" hosts because they do not transmit further the virus to biting mosquitoes. However, human-to-human transmission remains possible through the donation of blood or organs from an infected donor [4]. Although asymptomatic in about 80% of infections in humans, WNV can cause febrile symptoms and, in rare cases, severe neurological symptoms that may lead to death [3]. For these reasons, mapping West Nile disease (WND) risk, despite its possible silent circulation, is important to strengthen surveillance and preparedness in affected areas.

Previous studies investigated spatial drivers of WND occurrence at the scale of Europe, North America or Africa. Environmental factors associated with WNV infection reports included temperature, humidity, land type, vegetation cover and density of poultry, among others [5–12].

However, the associations for some environmental variables showed contradictory results depending on the study (e.g. regarding vegetation cover) or the season measured within the same study (e.g. temperature in winter *versus* in summer [7]). This may reflect that most studies did not discriminate the effects of environment on the reservoir host community (associated to the structural risk) *versus* on the abundance of bridge vectors (also associated to the conjectural risk), leading to conflicting statistical associations. For instance, local temperature patterns may affect both the suitability for key reservoir bird species and the dynamics of *Culex* during the mosquito season, which both ultimately influence human WND occurrence. Instead, separating these components of human infection risk, as [2,10], brings a mechanistic rationale justified by the ecology of such a zoonotic pathogen. This allows (i) to better understand WNV epidemiological system, and (ii) to adapt monitoring and control strategies focusing on long-term (e.g. implementing a surveillance scheme) or short-term (e.g. timely increasing awareness of the public or practitioners) measures.

Moreover, these studies generally used a cases-to-reservoir approach, relying on reports of WNV infection in humans, animals or vectors (i.e. positive results only) to fit spatial models and derive environmental drivers. They may therefore be subject to reporting or sampling bias, with potential WNV infections occurring in some areas without being observed. Instead, here, we adopted a reservoir-to-cases approach following [2]: we first quantified the structural reservoir potential for the virus across Europe using recent data on bird host spatial distribution and WNV seroprevalence, producing a WNV Reservoir Index (RI), and then validated this measure against long-term trends of WND occurrence in humans in the last decade.

Our WNV Reservoir Index (RI) showed spatial heterogeneity across Europe and was associated to the notifications of WND cases over eight years.

Materials and Methods

Review of serological surveys in birds

We reviewed the literature to find WNV serological data on European bird species (step A in Figure 1). First, we retrieved articles included in a previous literature review published in 2017 [2]. Second, on March 6th 2024, we searched the following terms on PubMed: "(West Nile [title]) AND (bird* [title/abstract] OR avian [title/abstract]) AND (sero* [title/abstract]) AND ("2016/01/01" [Date - Publication]: "3000" [Date - Publication]) NOT (Review[Publication Type])". Inclusion criteria were: articles written in English or French, samples in European birds weighting less than 50g (see list of the 150 species in Supplementary Data 1), information available on the number of both negative and positive samples, confirmation of positive samples by virus neutralization tests. We focused on birds weighting less than 50g because they tend to have shorter lifespans (a few years) than larger birds [13,14], and thus a higher proportion of susceptible individuals (due to population renewal) for any given force of infection and virus-induced mortality. This leads to expect (i) a substantial role of smaller birds in WNV epidemiological cycle [2,15–17], and (ii) that the seroprevalence in these bird species allows to better assess the force of infection applying to them [18].



Figure 1. *Diagram of the methodology to map West Nile Virus (WNV) Reservoir Index (RI) and validate it against WNV human cases data. The white boxes represent the steps of the analyses presented in this paper, whilst grey boxes show input information used from published studies. We first performed a literature review of WNV seroprevalence surveys in European bird species (step A). Using this seroprevalence data and previously published species traits information* [2]*, we predicted WNV seroprevalence in 150 bird species using a mixed-effect logistic regression with 1,000 bootstrap replicates (step B). We then combined each of the 1,000 bootstrap results to published distribution maps for the 150 bird species* [19] *to compute 1,000 maps of the RI in Europe at a 0.25 km² resolution (step C). For each pixel, we calculated the mean (averaged over 1,000 replicates) and Coefficient of Variation of the RI, and aggregated them at the NUTS administrative level (step D). We finally used the mean RI as predictor in a spatial model predicting the number of years with notified WNV human cases between 2016 and 2023 (step E).*

Predictions of seroprevalence in birds

Using the values of seroprevalence found in the literature for some bird species, we aimed at inferring seroprevalence estimates for 150 European bird species weighting less than 50g (step B in Figure 1). We fitted a mixed-effects logistic model where the outcome was the serological status (negative or positive) of individuals sampled in the studies (hereafter named Model 1). Predictors included as fixed effects were life history traits determined for each of the 150 bird species by expert opinion and literature search, as described in a previously published study [2] (Supplementary Data 1), namely the migratory status (yes/no), body mass, nest height (ground, intermediate or above 4 meters), use of suburban or urban habitats (yes/no), nocturnal gregariousness (yes/no), exposure of nestlings (altricial/precocial) and breeding sociality (yes/no). Study identification numbers were included as random effect to account for the variability of sampling years and locations in the literature. Confidence intervals for the seroprevalence predicted in bird species were generated by bootstrapping using 1,000 replicates.

Spatial distribution of the West Nile Reservoir Index

To obtain the spatial distribution of West Nile reservoir potential, we then combined the seroprevalence predictions in the 150 bird species to published maps of their spatial distribution [19] (step C in Figure 1). Briefly, Lumbierres et al. produced presence/absence habitat maps at 0.01 km² resolution by subtracting areas deemed unsuitable for the species (based on their land cover and elevation preferences) from their global range maps. Instead, we worked at the 0.25 km² resolution for computational efficiency purposes. In each 0.25 km² pixel *k*, the Reservoir Index (RI) was defined as:

$$RI_k = \sum_{j=1}^{150} S_j . P_{kj}$$

Where S_j was WNV seroprevalence predicted in species *j* by Model 1, and P_{kj} was the proportion of 0.01 km² pixels encompassed in pixel *k* for which species *j* was found present by [19]. We generated 1,000 RI maps from the 1,000 bootstrap replicates, in each of which RI values were standardized between 0 and 1. We subsequently produced maps of the mean and coefficient of variation values of the RI.

Prediction of West Nile disease occurrence in Europe

We then assessed the relationship between RI and a time-aggregated outcome representing WN human disease risk in the European Union (steps D and E in Figure 1), namely the number of years with human cases notified at the NUTS administrative region level between 2016 and 2023 (Model 2). The case report data was obtained from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control [20]. We performed analyses at the NUTS3 level, excepted in countries where the average surface area of NUTS2 regions was closer to the European average NUTS3 surface area. This was the case for Belgium, Germany, Malta and Netherlands, where cases reported at the NUTS3 level were aggregated at the NUTS2 level.

We assumed a binomial distribution for Model 2, with 8 trials corresponding to a maximum of 8 years with WND cases in the data. The mean RI used as fixed effect was averaged over all pixels of each NUTS region. We also included the log-scaled population density, obtained from Eurostat [21], as a fixed effect in Model 2. We added a country random effect to account for variations in surveillance exhaustiveness and other national socioeconomic or cultural factors affecting the occurrence and notification of human cases. In addition, since some countries contained only one NUTS region, we combined those with neighboring countries regarding the country effect, to avoid convergence issues at the model fitting stage. Malta was combined with Italy, Luxembourg with Belgium and Cyprus with Greece. We also accounted for spatial autocorrelation of WND occurrence in NUTS regions using a Besag-York-Mollie (BYM) model, which combines spatially structured and unstructured effects. We fitted the models with the R-INLA package [22].

We performed a 5-fold cross-validation of the model, where the sampling of folds was stratified by country and number of years with cases in the NUTS region. In each case, we assessed the goodness of fit to both the training and testing datasets by computing the R^2 and by visualizing the Probability Integral Transform (PIT) histograms. For computation of the latter, we implemented a non-randomized method for count data described by [23,24]. When the consistency between observations and model predictions is good, the PIT histogram follows a uniform distribution. We included all the data in the final model and assessed its stability by checking that coefficients' posterior estimates were then similar to estimates from the training data only.

Sensitivity analysis

We first evaluated the sensitivity of our results to the predictor applied in Model 2. We either removed the "mean RI" fixed effect, or replaced it by (i) the species richness, i.e. a variant of the Reservoir Index not considering variability in seroprevalence values across bird species, or (ii) the proportion of bootstrap replicates for which each pixel fell in the 50% highest pixel values, hereafter named P50. We computed the Deviance Information Criterion (DIC) for these substitute models and compared them to the main analysis. Second, we fitted an alternative model, named Model 2bis, considering as outcome the cumulated number of notified human cases between 2016 and 2023, with a negative binomial distribution. The predictor was either the mean RI, the species richness or the P50 defined above. In Model 2bis, the log-scaled population density was included as an offset. We checked the goodness of fit for these alternatives as described above.

Results

Review of serological surveys in birds

Twenty-nine studies corresponded to inclusion criteria (see diagram flow and references in Supplementary Figure S1), reporting 11,989 sera samples in 73 bird species. The highest number of samples was in *Passer domesticus* and *Hirundo rustica* (n=5,999 and 1,335 samples respectively). Globally, 1.6% (192/11989) of published sample results were positive, although the proportion depended on the species as detailed in Supplementary Data 2.

Predictions of WNV seroprevalence in birds

Using published serological results and data on life history traits, we predicted WNV seroprevalence in European birds weighting less than 50g. Among 150 bird species, point predictions ranged between 0.48% (for *Riparia riparia*) and 9.67% (for *Phylloscopus borealis*), although with a large variability of bootstrap confidence interval sizes (Supplementary Figure S2).

WNV seroprevalence was found to be higher in altricial species than in precocial species (odds-ratio (OR) at 2.15 with a 95% confidence interval of [1.38; 3.35]), and lower for species showing nocturnal gregariousness (OR = 0.61, 95% CI [0.38; 0.97]). Species nesting on the ground were found more WNV seropositive (OR = 2.1, 95%CI [1.18; 3.74]) than species nesting above ground (Table 1). On the contrary, no significant effect was found for the migratory status, body mass (under 50g), use of urban or suburban habitat and breeding sociality (Table 1).

Table 1. *Odds-ratios or coefficients of the mixed-effects logistic model predicting seroprevalence in bird species (Model 1).*

Variable	Odds-ratio or coefficient [95% confidence interval]	*p*-value
Intercept	**0.02 [0.01; 0.05]**	**<0.001**
Migratory status		
No	Reference	-
Yes	0.84 [0.44; 1.62]	0.605
Body mass [a]	1.19 [0.88; 1.59]	0.255
Nest height		
Above ground and <4 meters	Reference	-
On the ground	**2.1 [1.18; 3.74]**	**0.011**
>4 meters	0.61 [0.32; 1.17]	0.136
Use of urban/suburban habitat		
No	Reference	-
Yes	1.65 [0.84; 3.24]	0.147
Nocturnal gregariousness		
No	Reference	-
Yes	**0.61 [0.38; 0.97]**	**0.039**
Exposure of nestlings		
Precocial	Reference	-
Altricial	**2.15 [1.38; 3.35]**	**<0.001**
Breeding sociality		
No	Reference	-
Yes	0.63 [0.3; 1.33]	0.226

[a] *Body mass was a scaled quantitative variable.*

Relationship between the RI and West Nile disease occurrence in Europe

Figure 2 depicts the spatial distribution of West Nile RI computed in Europe and around the Mediterranean basin. Mean RI values across pixels ranged between 0 and 0.98, with a median of 0.45. Areas with higher values (closer to 1) may be interpreted as showing more potential (or likelihood) for WNV circulation in the reservoir. While varying at small geographical scale, the reservoir potential was overall higher on the Central and Eastern parts than the Western and Northern parts of the continent. Highest uncertainty was found in the northernmost parts of Europe and South to the Atlas Mountains (Figure 2).



Figure 2. *Maps showing West Nile Reservoir Index (RI) mean (panel A) and coefficient of variation (panel B) across 1,000 bootstrap replicates, at the 0.25 km² resolution. Areas with no value are shown in white.*

We then assessed the association between the RI and WND human cases notified at the NUTS administrative region scale (Model 2). During cross-validation, Model 2 predictions provided satisfying consistency with both training (pooled R^2 value of 0.98) and testing data (pooled R^2 value of 0.73), as shown in Supplementary Table S1 and in PIT histograms (Supplementary Figure S3). The goodness of fit of the final model was also satisfying, as suggested by the R^2 value of 0.98 and by the PIT histogram (Supplementary Figure S4). Deviance residuals of the model are shown in Supplementary Figure S5. Model 2 correctly predicted spatial clusters of notified cases in Northern Italy, Northern Greece, Hungary, Romania and Eastern Germany (Figure 3).

At the NUTS level, the mean RI was positively associated with the number of years with notified WND cases (Table 2). Coefficient estimates were similar across cross-validation folds (Supplementary Table S1).



Figure 3. *Model 2 maps showing the observed (panel A) and predicted (panel B) number of years with notified WNV human cases in NUTS European administrative regions, between 2016 and 2023. We performed analyses at the NUTS3 level, or NUTS2 level for Belgium, Germany, Malta and Netherlands.*

Table 2. *Results of Model 2, which predicts the number of years with notified WNV human cases in NUTS European administrative regions between 2016 and 2023. Coefficient values are presented with their 95% posterior interval.*

Variable	Coefficient posterior median [95% credible interval]
Intercept	-24.7 [-29.3 ; -20.6]
Mean RI	9.96 [7.80 ; 12.19]
log(population density)	1.06 [0.80 ; 1.33]

Sensitivity analysis

In Model 2, changing the predictor from the RI to the species richness or P50 led to higher DIC values than the baseline analysis (Supplementary Table S2), hence could not be considered as improving the model. Similar to Model 2, the alternative Model 2bis exhibited a positive association between the RI and the cumulated number of notified WND cases between 2016 and 2023 at the NUTS level, and predictors other than the RI did not show a better fit to the data (Supplementary Table S3). Moreover, risk areas predicted by Model 2bis seemed globally consistent with observations and Model 2 predictions (Supplementary Figure S6). However, cross-validation was not conclusive for Model 2bis, with PIT histograms suggesting disparities between observed and predicted distributions (Supplementary Figure S7). Although this sign of a poor goodness of fit was not found when the full dataset was used (R^2 of 0.87 and PIT histogram displayed in Supplementary Figure S4), this calls for caution when interpreting Model 2bis results.

Discussion

In this study, we built a map of the bird reservoir potential for West Nile virus (WNV), the Reservoir Index (RI), across Europe, quantifying the spatial distribution of the virus' structural risk. This metric was positively associated to the occurrence of notified West Nile human cases at the NUTS administrative level.

Our results were partly in line with previously published risk maps of WNV in Europe, built using reported WNV human cases. Indeed, we found overall higher RI values east than west of the continent, similarly to [7–9,11]. However, we identified areas that were discordant with some of the previous works, such as Poland and Baltic countries for instance [7,8]. These discrepancies may first be explained by a circulation of WNV in wild birds that does not translate into zoonotic infections due to a low human exposure related to local landscape [25], anthropic (population distribution, mosquito avoidance behaviors, etc.) or vector-associated (abundance and/or capacity of WNV bridge vectors, host selection patterns, etc.) factors [26,27]. Second, WNV human infections might be occurring but with a lower reporting fraction. Third, since we had the objective to only map the structural (bird reservoir) component of WNV infection risk, some areas might show high potential for wild bird communities to sustain a diffusion of WNV, although local vector population dynamics do not favor an active enzootic circulation yet, but may in the future. Interestingly, WNV infections in birds of prey have been reported for the first time in 2024 in Latvia and Estonia [28,29], countries which globally display high RI values but with no notified WNV human case as of February 2025 [20].

The RI we computed may be used to strengthen WNV (active or passive) surveillance or sampling efforts in geographical areas that we estimated favorable to the virus' enzootic circulation, despite the absence of case notification. Such initiatives may target the animal (e.g. wild birds, horses or zoo animals), human (e.g. serosurveys, or sensitization of the general public or practitioners to WNV suggestive symptoms) and vector (e.g. viral testing of *Culex* mosquito pools) compartments, possibly as part of an integrated scheme [30–32].

Moreover, we compared the RI, a time-aggregated measure of the structural risk, to a time-aggregated West Nile disease outcome in humans. This is justified by the fact that the spatial distribution of bird populations, while affected by the environmental crisis [33], is expected to change at the scale of several years or decades. The next step will be to also account for shorter term (e.g. monthly) variations of environmental variables and of the vector population, i.e. to quantify the conjectural risk, to capture the mechanisms driving WNV outbreaks at fine time scale in suitable areas [34]. To do so, we could implement a One Health analysis framework by combining bird, equine and human cases notification data, as [10]. The mixture of both the RI and vector mapping would lead to a more accurate prediction of WNV infections at a finer spatio-temporal scale, in a silent circulation epidemiological context. This would also allow to assess the impact of shifts in vector populations related to climate change scenarios [35].

Previous studies investigated traits factors associated with higher WNV seroprevalence in bird species. First, as already described [2,36], we confirmed that altricial birds tended to be more WNV seropositive than precocial birds, potentially due to lower feather coverage and higher exposure to mosquito bites in altricial chicks [37]. The latter mechanism may also explain the association we found for bird species nesting on the ground, as compared to nesting above ground [2]. Second, we showed a protective effect of bird gregariousness, similarly as a previous study [38]. This might be due to an encounter-dilution effect, a hypothesis which postulates that a higher number of host individuals in the group reduces the probability for each of them to be bitten by mosquito vectors and to be subsequently exposed to the virus [39]. Third, we did not identify a significant effect of migratory compared to non-migratory species, consistently with a study led in Senegal [38] but unlike other studies in Spain [40,41]. This point would need further investigations, since some bird migratory routes encompass West Africa and Europe, and were shown to favor WNV (re)introductions in both directions [42]. In the future, mechanistic models

accounting for migratory and resident bird dynamics may help to explain the patterns observed in viral and serological data collected in bird communities.

To conclude, we computed a spatially heterogeneous metric quantifying WNV reservoir potential in Europe, which proved to be associated with WNV human case notification. It may be used to strengthen surveillance efforts in identified risk areas and, together with environmental and mosquito data, to better predict WNV outbreaks across Europe.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a DIM1Health postdoctoral fellowship awarded by the Conseil Régional d'Ile-de-France.

Authors contributions

JB performed the literature review, retrieved and curated the data, carried out the formal model analysis and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. JB, RM and BD designed the study, interpreted the results, reviewed and edited the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

None to declare.

Bibliography

1. Gaythorpe KAM, Jean K, Cibrelus L, Garske T. Quantifying model evidence for yellow fever transmission routes in Africa. PLOS Comput Biol. 2019 Sep 23;15(9):e1007355.

2. Durand B, Tran A, Balança G, Chevalier V. Geographic variations of the bird-borne structural risk of West Nile virus circulation in Europe. PLOS ONE. 2017 Oct 12;12(10):e0185962.

3. Campbell GL, Marfin AA, Lanciotti RS, Gubler DJ. West Nile virus. Lancet Infect Dis. 2002 Sep 1;2(9):519–29.

4. Čabanová V, Kerlik J, Kirschner P, Rosochová J, Klempa B, Sláviková M, et al. Co-Circulation of West Nile, Usutu, and Tick-Borne Encephalitis Viruses in the Same Area: A Great Challenge for Diagnostic and Blood and Organ Safety. Viruses. 2023 Jan 27;15(2):366.

5. Ozdenerol E, Taff GN, Akkus C. Exploring the Spatio-Temporal Dynamics of Reservoir Hosts, Vectors, and Human Hosts of West Nile Virus: A Review of the Recent Literature. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2013 Nov;10(11):5399–432.

6. Dellicour S, Lequime S, Vrancken B, Gill MS, Bastide P, Gangavarapu K, et al. Epidemiological hypothesis testing using a phylogeographic and phylodynamic framework. Nat Commun. 2020 Nov 6;11(1):5620.

7. Erazo D, Grant L, Ghisbain G, Marini G, Colón-González FJ, Wint W, et al. Contribution of climate change to the spatial expansion of West Nile virus in Europe. Nat Commun. 2024 Feb 8;15(1):1196.

8. Farooq Z, Sjödin H, Semenza JC, Tozan Y, Sewe MO, Wallin J, et al. European projections of West Nile virus transmission under climate change scenarios. One Health. 2023 Jun 1;16:100509.

9. García-Carrasco JM, Muñoz AR, Olivero J, Segura M, Real R. Predicting the spatio-temporal spread of West Nile virus in Europe. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021 Jan 7;15(1):e0009022.

10. García-Carrasco JM, Muñoz AR, Olivero J, Segura M, Real R. Mapping the Risk for West Nile Virus Transmission, Africa. Emerg Infect Dis. 2022 Apr;28(4):777.

11. Tran A, Sudre B, Paz S, Rossi M, Desbrosse A, Chevalier V, et al. Environmental predictors of West Nile fever risk in Europe. Int J Health Geogr. 2014 Jul 1;13(1):26.

12. Chuang TW, Wimberly MC. Remote Sensing of Climatic Anomalies and West Nile Virus Incidence in the Northern Great Plains of the United States. PLOS ONE. 2012 Oct 5;7(10):e46882.

13. Che-Castaldo JP, Byrne A, Perišin K, Faust LJ. Sex-specific median life expectancies from ex situ populations for 330 animal species. Sci Data. 2019 Feb 19;6(1):190019.

14. Tobias JA, Sheard C, Pigot AL, Devenish AJM, Yang J, Sayol F, et al. AVONET: morphological, ecological and geographical data for all birds. Ecol Lett. 2022;25(3):581–97.

15. Hamer GL, Kitron UD, Goldberg TL, Brawn JD, Loss SR, Ruiz MO, et al. Host Selection by Culex pipiens Mosquitoes and West Nile Virus Amplification. 2009 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Oct 1]; Available from: https://www.ajtmh.org/view/journals/tpmd/80/2/article-p268.xml

16. Hamer GL, Chaves LF, Anderson TK, Kitron UD, Brawn JD, Ruiz MO, et al. Fine-Scale Variation in Vector Host Use and Force of Infection Drive Localized Patterns of West Nile Virus Transmission. PLOS ONE. 2011 Aug 19;6(8):e23767.

17. Kent R, Juliusson L, Weissmann M, Evans S, Komar N. Seasonal Blood-Feeding Behavior of Culex tarsalis (Diptera: Culicidae) in Weld County, Colorado, 2007. J Med Entomol. 2009 Mar 1;46(2):380–90.

18. Gamble A, Garnier R, Chambert T, Gimenez O, Boulinier T. Next-generation serology: integrating cross-sectional and capture–recapture approaches to infer disease dynamics. Ecology. 2020;101(2):e02923.

19. Lumbierres M, Dahal PR, Soria CD, Di Marco M, Butchart SHM, Donald PF, et al. Area of Habitat maps for the world's terrestrial birds and mammals. Sci Data. 2022 Dec 3;9(1):749.

20. ECDC. Surveillance and updates for West Nile virus infection [Internet]. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. 2024 [cited 2025 Jan 31]. Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/infectious-disease-topics/west-nile-virus-infection/surveillance-and-updates-west-nile-virus

21. Eurostat. Population on 1 January by age group, sex and NUTS 3 region [Internet]. European Statistical Office. 2025 [cited 2025 Feb 14]. Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/product/page/DEMO_R_PJANGRP3

22. Gómez-Rubio V. Bayesian inference with INLA [Internet]. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2020. Available from: http://becarioprecario.bitbucket.io/inla-gitbook/index.html

23. Czado C, Gneiting T, Held L. Predictive Model Assessment for Count Data. Biometrics. 2009;65(4):1254–61.

24. Liboschik T, Fokianos K, Fried R. tscount: An R Package for Analysis of Count Time Series Following Generalized Linear Models. J Stat Softw. 2017 Nov 30;82:1–51.

25. Tavares Y, Day J, Giordano BV, Eastmond B, Burkett-Cadena N, Guralnick RP, et al. Regional variation in the landscape ecology of West Nile virus sentinel chicken seroconversion in Florida. PloS One. 2024;19(10):e0305510.

26. Poh KC, Chaves LF, Reyna-Nava M, Roberts CM, Fredregill C, Bueno R, et al. The influence of weather and weather variability on mosquito abundance and infection with West Nile virus in Harris County, Texas, USA. Sci Total Environ. 2019 Jul 20;675:260–72.

27. Marini G, Calzolari M, Angelini P, Bellini R, Bellini S, Bolzoni L, et al. A quantitative comparison of West Nile virus incidence from 2013 to 2018 in Emilia-Romagna, Italy. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2020 Jan 2;14(1):e0007953.

28. WOAH. Event report 6169 - Estonia, West Nile Fever [Internet]. World Organisation for Animal Health; 2025. Available from: https://wahis.woah.org/#/in-event/6169/dashboard

29. WOAH. Event report 5929 - Latvia, West Nile Fever [Internet]. World Organisation for Animal Health; 2024. Available from: https://wahis.woah.org/#/in-event/5929/dashboard

30. Petrović T, Blazquez AB, Lupulović D, Lazić G, Escribano-Romero E, Fabijan D, et al. Monitoring West Nile virus (WNV) infection in wild birds in Serbia during 2012: first isolation and characterisation of WNV strains from Serbia. Euro Surveill Bull Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull. 2013 Oct 31;18(44):20622.

31. Geffroy M, Pagès N, Chavernac D, Dereeper A, Aubert L, Herrmann-Storck C, et al. Shifting From Sectoral to Integrated Surveillance by Changing Collaborative Practices: Application to West Nile Virus Surveillance in a Small Island State of the Caribbean. Front Public Health [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2023 Dec 13];9. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2021.649190

32. Riles MT, Martin D, Mulla C, Summers E, Duke L, Clauson J, et al. West Nile Virus Surveillance in Sentinel Chickens and Mosquitoes in Panama City Beach, Florida, from 2014 To 2020. J Am Mosq Control Assoc. 2022 Aug 4;38(3):148–58.

33. Liang J, Peng Y, Zhu Z, Li X, Xing W, Li X, et al. Impacts of changing climate on the distribution of migratory birds in China: Habitat change and population centroid shift. Ecol Indic. 2021 Aug 1;127:107729.

34. Lourenço J, Thompson RN, Thézé J, Obolski U. Characterising West Nile virus epidemiology in Israel using a transmission suitability index. Eurosurveillance. 2020 Nov 19;25(46):1900629.

35. Bartlow AW, Manore C, Xu C, Kaufeld KA, Del Valle S, Ziemann A, et al. Forecasting Zoonotic Infectious Disease Response to Climate Change: Mosquito Vectors and a Changing Environment. Vet Sci. 2019 Jun;6(2):40.

36. Roche B, Morand S, Elguero E, Balenghien T, Guégan JF, Gaidet N. Does host receptivity or host exposure drives dynamics of infectious diseases? The case of West Nile Virus in wild birds. Infect Genet Evol. 2015 Jul 1;33:11–9.

37. Loss SR, Hamer GL, Goldberg TL, Ruiz MO, Kitron UD, Walker ED, et al. Nestling Passerines Are Not Important Hosts for Amplification of West Nile Virus in Chicago, Illinois. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2009 Feb;9(1):13–7.

38. Chevalier V, Reynaud P, Lefrançois T, Durand B, Baillon F, Balança G, et al. Predicting West Nile Virus Seroprevalence in Wild Birds in Senegal. Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2009 Dec;9(6):589–96.

39. Krebs BL, Anderson TK, Goldberg TL, Hamer GL, Kitron UD, Newman CM, et al. Host group formation decreases exposure to vector-borne disease: a field experiment in a 'hotspot' of West Nile virus transmission. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. 2014 Dec 7;281(1796):20141586.

40. Ferraguti M, Magallanes S, Mora-Rubio C, Bravo-Barriga D, Marzal A, Hernandez-Caballero I, et al. Implications of migratory and exotic birds and the mosquito community on West Nile virus transmission. Infect Dis. 2023;0(0):1–14.

41. López G, Jiménez-Clavero MA, Tejedor CG, Soriguer R, Figuerola J. Prevalence of West Nile virus neutralizing antibodies in Spain is related to the behavior of migratory birds. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis Larchmt N. 2008 Oct;8(5):615–21.

42. Mencattelli G, Ndione MHD, Silverj A, Diagne MM, Curini V, Teodori L, et al. Spatial and temporal dynamics of West Nile virus between Africa and Europe. Nat Commun. 2023 Oct 13;14(1):6440.