The association between climate change and Lyme disease incidence in Northern European countries by the Baltic and North Seas: An ecological time-series study

Mohammed AM Alhamadn[1,*]
[1]Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, USA
[*]Lead Contact; Correspondence: malhamadn@tulane.edu

ABSTRACT

Climate change is a complex problem that often disproportionately affects global health, including its influence on microbial ecosystems, which can lead to disease outbreaks such as Lyme disease (LD). However, the extent of climate variability and its influence on the spread of the most common vector-borne disease in countries that neighbor the Baltic Sea and North Sea have not been fully quantified. Therefore, this study focuses on an approach that measures the magnitude of the (LD) burden on the most at-risk European countries due to climate change. In this ecological study, the correlation between disease incidence over the years and climate change was tested using a Spearman correlation test, and the change in incidence of LD during the period 2000-2024 was assessed using Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), with a negative binomial distribution to handle overdispersion. The study found a strong positive relationship after adjusting for the tick lifecycle using lagged climate variables of two years to higher rates of LD in countries bordering the Baltic and North Seas. Most importantly, a unit increase in precipitation (mm/year), after adjusting for delayed effects, is associated with a higher disease rate (IRR Range= 1.15-1.24). Two years of delayed temperature effect is with a similar relationship (IRR range = 1.11-1.27). These findings suggest that the disproportionate climate change in the region influences the spread and burden of the disease in the north European temperate climate, even after controlling for delays. Compared to previous research, this study is concerned with the regional impact of climate change on microbial life and disease spillover, which causes public health problems. There is an urgent need for a collaborative and comprehensive program to include environmental, human, animal and vector data factors for future research to aid in disease control.

Keywords: climate change, lyme disease, microbial ecology, spillover, northern europe

INTRODUCTION

Climate change, the continued alteration in the average norms of temperature and other weather related variables, has been a core and complex burden on global health over the last few decades. Scientists have proven that there is a 1.25 °C increase in warming every 10 years [1–5,14]. However, these changes are not homogeneous across the globe; they are proportional, and each region has its own rate of change. New evidence states that Arctic warming has shown even faster odds of warming, up to four times, compared to warming in other places around the world [23].

Researchers have examined the connection between rapid Arctic warming, that is, Arctic amplification, and the Baltic Sea region, and they found a strong atmospheric connection between them [31]. According to the European Environmental Agency, the Arctic and Baltic sea are directly impacted by climate change, the ice cover hit its lowest points in recent years, and it increased annual precipitation and water temperature. Both the Arctic and Baltic sea ice are observed to be melting in a rapid manner that has not been seen before. Climate modeling has projected an imminent ice-free event by 2050, which is attributed to the impact of climate change on the areas, making the European region the most influenced by global warming [30]. Linear climate trends between 1982 and 2012 showed a strong correlation between changes in sea surface temperature in the North and Baltic Seas, emphasizing their interconnected behavior [39]. To further explore this, data from to 1980-2022 in Europe found that warming has uneven impact rates in all its regions [18]. Their study argued that the northern part of the EU is impacted the most by shifting climatic conditions, meaning that the shift from colder to warmer conditions is faster than in other areas of the EU, linking it to arctic amplification [20,23,29]. In addition, another study affirmed the findings in northeastern countries in Europe and in a wider scope, such as France, which experienced an extreme weather event in 2019 at 46.0 °C, confirming the wider impact of this occurrence [17].

This rapid disproportional change in climate factors per decade acts as a stressor and disturbs the equilibrium and interrelationship between environmental, human, and animal health [5–11]. Direct divergence in the influence of what was once normal to ecosystems leads to new ways for microbes to spread and find a new home or pathway for disease transmission [13,14,30]. A wide range of pathogens are influenced by this phenomenon, one of which is Lyme borreliosis [32].

Lyme disease (LD) is a zoonotic vector-borne disease transmitted from ticks to humans through a tick bite [1]. LD was first noticed in 1909 in Europe and then discovered in Lyme, Connecticut, in 1983. This discovery began with an outbreak that occurred in 12 communities and infected 43 people in 1975 [5]. Later, the bacterial causative agent (Borrelia burgdorferi) was isolated from a tick, formerly known as Ixodes dammini, now called blacklegged ticks [2]. There has been research on alternative methods of transmission; however, these claims have not been scientifically backed. Currently, LD does not have an approved vaccine for humans [6].

Several outbreaks have occurred over the years in Europe and the United States, causing an increase in global health threats. LD is considered the leading burden of all vector-borne diseases [3]. It causes a wide range of symptoms that start as mild symptoms,

such as fever, rash, and pain, and then progress to severe symptoms, such as inflammation of the joints, neurological, and heart conditions [4]. It is estimated that the annual prevalence of the disease in Europe is more than 200,000 cases each year, and about 476,000 reports in the USA per year [3,7]. The most common ticks that carry the disease are Ixodes scapularis and I. pacificus in the USA, and **I. ricinus** and I.persulcatus in the EU [3]. Animals have also been reported to become infected [8].

Ixodes ricinus, the most common tick in the EU, spends most of its life cycle outside of a host, and it takes approximately 2 years to complete its full biological form, where it can survive up to 6 years depending on weather conditions [3,8,11,12,15]. They rely on the active presence of water around them to survive, and their movement is completely influenced by temperature [10,26,27]. Moreover, ticks thrive in mixed forest settings with high humidity. Tick behavior (I. ricinus) in seeking hosts is associated with humidity and higher temperatures. Researchers have found that the northern (and western) areas of the EU are favorable living conditions for ticks, focusing on areas where the temperature is at a constant 6 °C and the relative humidity is higher (above 80%), which is a result of higher annual precipitation [13–16].

Adult ticks acquire the causative agent from infected animals during the nymph stage of their life cycle. When a tick is infected, the bacteria lives in the tick's gut dormant until activation, which occurs about 24 hours after biting and attachment to a host [11]. In other words, studies have shown that once an infected tick feeds on a blood meal, the bacterium travels to its salivary glands and remains inactive until it can pass from the tick to the host and cause infection [9–13]. Previous evidence suggests that while ticks' behaviour is influenced when carrying the bacterium [38], some different pathogens have a mechanism that improves their ability to infect hosts and makes transmission even more efficient [12]. An example of this is the production of Outer Surface Protein C (OspC), a bacterial protein that helps Borrelia spread from the tick to the vertebrate host during feeding [12]. An experimental study showed that this process could take less than 17 hours thanks to the protein expressed by the bacterium for it to move from the tick to a host [9], however, it was not backed up scientifically in human hosts.

The role of animals serves as an additional layer to this complex problem. Ticks utilize several animals to move and control the area where they are endemic [10–15]. Studies have found that ticks have a selective preference for the animal host they use as a reservoir. Ticks tend to feed on certain large mammals (e.g., deer) around the world. They are less likely to acquire infections from these hosts, but deer are associated with tick movement. In the EU, rodents (e.g., wood mouse and bank vole) serve as important hosts for smaller species. In addition, it was hypothesized that the disease can move quickly to a new area using birds, and that localized transmission occurs through mice or deer [8–11,15,29].

Factors related to tick ecology and disease events have been investigated for many years. Studies have found that there are cues that facilitate disease spillover and its spread through zoonotic cycles. These factors are related to tick population, host availability, location, and seasonality and climate variations [1,26,29]. However, research has overlooked the interconnection of all these factors as contributing to a higher risk of LD in northern EU regions. The presence of all these factors, especially for vulnerable countries in the north of the EU [17,18], makes the layer of complexities seen at a higher rate than their interaction elsewhere. It is important to model climate and disease incidence while accounting for tick biological terms; therefore, here, the corresponding author created lagged variables for delayed climate influence to account for the tick life cycle that can take two years to become in a questing behaviour [9,11], leading to an increased risk of disease across countries over time.

This study aimed to unpack this complex problem through a model that quantifies the relationship through measurable variables related to the disease, time trends, and environment, and its delayed effect on the increased rates of LD in the coastal regions of Europe. Several variables were collected to test 1) if the average change in climate variables over the years correlates with increased LD incidence rates, 2) determine if the delayed lagged variables (one and two years) to temperature and rainfall are associated with the higher disease risk, and 3) assess the disease dynamic impacting different countries LD incidence in the northern region of the EU from 2000 to 2024. In this early state of the hypothesis, the operationalization is to evaluate how interconnected variables are related to climate in northern countries associated with disease incidence while adjusting for biological factors. An ecological study with a time series design covering population-level data across time in the northern regions is needed. The outcome would provide a scientific basis for this hypothesis and guide additional research to better correlate climate variables with disease burden and to apply appropriate intervention programs to mitigate higher rates.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design and data collection

This paper is an ecological study that aims to test the association between climate-related factors and Lyme disease incidence from 2000 to 2024 in several countries in Northern Europe. The study included yearly data to understand the regional association at the macro level for the variables; therefore, all data used were aggregated. Nine European countries were included in this analysis, and these countries were considered based on 1) their utmost climate exposure, that is, their geographical location on the Baltic Sea or the North Sea, and 2) data on disease case count or rate availability for at least four years to perform lagged effects analysis.

Regarding the climate exposure parameters, all data extraction used an Application Programming Interface (API) based on 1) latitude and longitude, and 2) time in years. Meteorological exposure variables were obtained from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) Prediction of Worldwide Energy Resources (POWER) during the analysis to obtain the yearly average for temperature (T2M) and precipitation (PRECTOTCORR). NASA's POWER Project (retrieved May 10, 2025), dataset for POWER Daily 2.x.x, at https://power.larc.nasa.gov. The yearly average temperature (°C) and total precipitation (mm/year) were calculated by averaging daily values over the course of a calendar year, with precipitation totals adjusted for 365.25 days. Furthermore, to account for the biological plausibility of ticks becoming infectious, two lagged covariates were created for each climate index (T2M_lag_1_year and T2M_lag_2_year) for the average temperature and (Precep_lag_1_year and Precep_lag_2_year) for the average precipitation, totaling four additional mean climate elements. Similarly, the population size for each country was collected from the World Bank Statistics using the same extraction method and (wbstats) package. All these data were then merged into one large dataset during the analysis phase.

The outcome variable is the annual incidence of Lyme disease, which was obtained from Hopkins Lyme Tracker `https://www.hopkinslymetracker.org/explorer/`. Data availability for the disease is over the period of 2000-2024, no restriction of date has been placed

to this study, but there are three countries (the Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden) that have been dropped from the analysis due to missing disease data. Disease rates are presented as rates per 100,000 people in this study.

In the descriptive statistics table, **Figure 1,** shows 9 countries included in the study. The outcome variable is presented as the overall raw total number of cases per country. Climate metrics are presented as an average per year for temperature in °C (SD), and precipitation is averaged in mm/year (SD). The country's mean population shown is an average census for the population in which the country participates.

Climate and Disease Summary by Country

Temperature and Precipitation: Mean ± SD | Cases: Total | Population: Mean

Variable	Overall N = 181[1]	Belgium N = 11[1]	Estonia N = 25[1]	Finland N = 25[1]	France N = 15[1]	Germany N = 24[1]	Latvia N = 14[1]	Lithuania N = 17[1]	Norway N = 25[1]	Poland N = 25[1]
Total cases	1,241,554.0	20,820.0	41,354.0	40,793.0	598,452.0	184,463.0	7,059.0	40,595.0	8,696.0	299,322.0
Temperature (°C)	5.8 (3.9)	10.4 (0.7)	5.7 (0.9)	2.3 (0.8)	10.1 (0.9)	8.7 (0.9)	5.9 (0.9)	6.2 (0.7)	-1.6 (0.8)	9.1 (1.0)
Precipitation (mm/year)	854.3 (315.9)	778.9 (154.0)	710.2 (105.0)	825.2 (111.9)	775.2 (77.7)	721.8 (116.2)	810.3 (132.1)	745.6 (95.0)	1,561.6 (171.6)	606.8 (101.8)
Mean population	24,422,820.7	11,441,609.6	1,342,990.6	5,395,736.2	66,637,890.9	82,307,424.1	1,961,434.8	3,073,621.6	5,002,566.5	37,859,292.2

[1] Sum; Mean (SD); Mean

Data coverage years:
Belgium (2013-2023) | Estonia (2000-2024) | Finland (2000-2024) | France (2009-2023) | Germany (2001-2024) | Latvia (2010-2023) | Lithuania (2003-2019) | Norway (2000-2024) | Poland (2000-2024)

Figure 1: Descriptive summary table

Statistical analysis

This study involved a complex relationship between climate variables, disease incidence rates, and time. Here, a Spearman correlation test was used to assess the correlation strength of the variables of interest. Due to the biological aspect of ticks, two lag-year variables were added to assess the delayed correlation for one and two years to the frequency of LD incidence over time. Subsequently, General Linear Models (GLMs) were used to assess the association between climate metrics and increased case incidence, while accounting for covariates such as lagged variables, population, and year as offsets. After using Poisson Regression, the assumption was not met and was alternatively shifted to using Negative Binomial Models fit, to account for the observed overdispersion. Model selection was assessed using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) for model comparison, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for multicollinearity, and Pearson residuals for the goodness-of-fit test. These tests revealed that Model 4 is the best model of fit with VIF results below 3, (AIC) values ranging from 116 to 399, which are the smallest AIC values in all nine countries, and (1.8 dispersion) residual values centered around zero. The model variables and selection align with the biological traits of the vector that could become a threat. In the final model, 'Population' was included as an offset to account for demographic change over time, a better comparison unit to changing rates over the years and within the countries. The variable (year) was added as a covariate to control for time trend variation in reporting, intervention, and disease ecology change. Therefore, the sequential models tested are as follows:

Table 1: Model definitions, variables, and fit across countries

Model Name	Definition	Variables	Number of parameters (K)	Best fit for (n) of countries
Model1	Core environmental measures + population control	Temperature, precipitation, log(population)	4	_
Model2	Core + population control + one year lagged effect	Temperature, precipitation, temperature_lag_one, precipitation_lag_one, log(population)	6	_
Model3	Core + population control + one year lagged effect + covariate control	Temperature, precipitation, temperature_lag_one, precipitation_lag_one, log(population), year	7	_
Model4	Core + population control + two year lagged effect + covariate control	Temperature, precipitation, temperature_lag_two, precipitation_lag_two, log(population), year	7	9 out of 9*

* Model 4 best fit in all countries



Figure 2: Epidemiological curve showing LD rates over the years (2000–2024).

Figure 2 shows that the rate of Lyme disease has increased over the years in the EU, with the disease rate increasing up to 3-folds. The rates were the highest and consistently increased in countries near the Baltic Sea (Estonia and Lithuania) during the study period (2000-2024). The number of new LD cases also increased sharply in countries that are coastal to the north and west regions of Europe, such as Poland, Germany, Belgium, and France. The findings are consistent with two time trend studies by *Skufca*[33] in Germany and *Paradowska-Stankiewicz*[34] in Poland on this evidence.

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
Norway			
T2M_avg	1.11	0.92, 1.32	0.3
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	**0.040**
T2M_avg_lag1	1.18	0.98, 1.40	0.070
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.082
T2M_avg_lag2	1.15	0.96, 1.37	0.11
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.6
YEAR	1.04	1.03, 1.06	**<0.001**
Finland			
T2M_avg	1.12	0.97, 1.28	0.12
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.2
T2M_avg_lag1	1.15	1.02, 1.31	**0.033**
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.2
T2M_avg_lag2	1.13	0.98, 1.28	0.085
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.5
YEAR	1.04	1.04, 1.05	**<0.001**
Estonia			
T2M_avg	1.37	1.07, 1.74	**0.019**
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.4
T2M_avg_lag1	1.36	1.03, 1.76	**0.034**
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.2
T2M_avg_lag2	1.36	1.02, 1.80	**0.034**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.074
YEAR	1.10	1.08, 1.13	**<0.001**
Latvia			

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Figure 3: Univariable Analysis (First Page Shown). The complete table is available in the Appendix.

The univariable analysis in Figure 3 (Negative Binomial Regression) was consistent with the results of the Spearman Correlation Test when testing each relationship alone on the outcome. A 4-10% positive amplified relationship is observed in seven of the nine countries for year trends. The tests also revealed that Lyme disease (LD) incidence rates and environmental variables (current and lagged years) were positively associated in all countries. Unadjusted IRRs showed that one unit increase in the current year's average temperature in Estonia, Poland, and Germany was associated with an increase of 26-44% increase in LD incidence. An average unit rise in temperature in one year lagged, was associated with 15-42% of cases of LD in Finland, Estonia, Poland, Germany, and France. Additionally, one unit increase in the average temperature two years before, is estimated to be associated with a 21-36% increased in cases in Estonia, Lithuania, Germany, and France.

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
Norway			
T2M_avg	1.00	0.92, 1.09	>0.9
PRECTOT_avg	1.03	0.94, 1.13	0.6
T2M_avg_lag2	1.11	1.02, 1.21	**0.014**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	0.94	0.86, 1.03	0.2
YEAR	1.04	1.03, 1.05	**<0.001**
Finland			
T2M_avg	0.99	0.94, 1.04	0.6
PRECTOT_avg	1.01	0.96, 1.06	0.8
T2M_avg_lag2	1.01	0.96, 1.07	0.6
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.0	0.94, 1.05	0.9
YEAR	1.04	1.03, 1.05	**<0.001**
Estonia			
T2M_avg	1.14	0.95, 1.37	0.2
PRECTOT_avg	1.25	1.10, 1.43	**0.001**
T2M_avg_lag2	1.08	0.93, 1.26	0.3
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.24	1.05, 1.48	**0.010**
YEAR	1.12	1.09, 1.15	**<0.001**
Latvia			
T2M_avg	0.99	0.82, 1.18	0.9
PRECTOT_avg	1.01	0.87, 1.15	>0.9
T2M_avg_lag2	0.98	0.80, 1.22	0.9
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.03	0.89, 1.20	0.7
YEAR	0.94	0.89, 1.00	0.058

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Figure 4: Multivariable Analysis Using Negative Binomial General Linear Model (First Page Shown). The complete table is available in the Appendix.

After adjusting for covariates in Model 4, which was selected based on the best model fit, most countries showed an independent increase of **3-12%** in cases annually (Figure 4). Central to this discussion, the results indicate that lagged environmental variables of two years have a significant association with LD in six out of nine countries. For example, an average increase in one unit of pre-

cipitation that occurred two years prior was strongly associated with a higher disease incidence in Estonia (IRR= 1.24, 95% CI: 1.05-1.48), Lithuania (IRR = 1.15, 95% CI: 1.03-1.28), Belgium (IRR = 1.21, 95% CI: 1.17-1.26), and France (IRR= 1.22, 95% CI: 1.06-1.41), p=<0.05. In addition, a strong association was observed in three countries for the same duration of delay from the average temperature to disease incidence. Data showed that Norway (IRR=1.11, 95% CI: 1.02-1.21), Germany (IRR=1.13, 95% CI: 1.01-1.25), and France (IRR= 1.27, 95% CI: 1.05-1.53), p=<0.05, observed an increase in disease incidence when there was a change in average temperature. Furthermore, the change in average precipitation in the current year by one unit was significantly associated with the outcome only in Estonia (IRR= 1.25, 95% CI: 1.10-1.43, p=<0.05). However, no country showed an association between the change in the average temperature of the same year and the risk of disease after the final selection of the model and control of covariates.

The findings indicate an independent association between climate change variables and Lyme disease incidence in northern Europe. That is, when there is an average increase in environmental factors by one unit in countries bordering the two seas, it is expected to experience a higher rate of cases two years later, attributed to climate influence. The delayed precipitation effect was the most significant variable in the increase in the number of LD cases. Hence, Estonia has been the country most burdened by Lyme disease (LD) over the years due to climate change. These findings further support the initial hypothesis that climate change contributes to a higher number of LD events by affecting ecosystems unequally, leading to a higher risk of disease in several northwestern European countries, a region with a significant climate impact.

In addition, LD overall seems to have a progressive increase rate since 2000 in this region. Lyme disease exhibits a migration pattern of its high rates from one country to another, which is highly associated with climate variables. In figure 5, the map suggests that the incidence rate has shifted geographically from Scandinavian countries to the Baltic states and then to other neighboring countries, where higher numbers of cases were found. These findings align with the author's hypothesis that worsening climate conditions over time correlate with changing dynamics of the disease and its increasing spillovers in the northern EU region.



Figure 5: Overall Lyme Disease Rates from 2000 to 2024 in Europe. Data from Johns Hopkins Lyme Tracker (hopkinslymetracker.org)

DISCUSSION

This multicountry ecological study was conducted to explore the association between climate change in places near the Baltic Sea and the North Sea in Northern Europe and Lyme disease incidence from 2000 to 2024. Europe is known to experience microclimatic distortion, mostly in the north, and tremendous biodiversity differences, with a higher burden of Lyme disease over the years. The methodology of this study was used to quantify the risk of disease from the influence of climate on that region of Europe for the study period. To date, research integrating environmental units into human case risks has been lacking. While the majority of LD studies performed temporal year trends, in this analysis, more granular connections were considered in relation to data on environmental and population changes from 2000 to 2024. This analysis aids in understanding the higher incidence of LD in the EU. It is necessary to explore remote sensing data variables related to climate to study the rise in the disease rate in the northern region of the EU.

The hypothesis in this paper is to explore whether or not the coastal northern countries in the EU, which face changing climate factors the most, are unequally influenced by the burden of disease. This research highlighted that there is an association between climate change and increased LD risk in the included countries in Europe. The burden of the disease is uneven and depends on the region and variation in climate conditions. The disease has spread rapidly over the years, with higher rates attributed to the changing climate in countries bordering the Baltic Sea and its linked maritime climate. The study found that as Arctic amplification occurs, so does microbial amplification, and this pronounced ecosystem change is now being observed from the northern borders of coastal regions.



Figure 6: Mapping Disease Movement: Lyme Disease rates in Northwestern countries (2000–2024)

There is evidential of consistency between the statistical analysis of climate metrics and the biological plausibility related to Lyme disease vectors. Model four, which included two years of delayed variables to climate factors, was the best-fitting model in this analysis. This supports the idea that transmission dynamics are attributed to environmental changes when accounting for tick life cycles. As a result, changes in temperature or precipitation in an average year in the EU have an impact on disease incidence patterns two years later. Thus, the disease rate will change over time in countries that are considered to be at risk. Figure 6 shows the average estimated disease rates for two time interval 2000-2011, and 2012-2024. There is a clear increase in estimated rates in the North east portion of Europe, where higher rates are observed in countries closest to the Baltic Sea, making the effect of climate change on Arctic to regional waters like baltic sea and then the changing zoonotic disease ecosystems as a result in that region a strong argument. While accounting for the biological plausibility of the vector, the disease expansion is growing at a faster rate. Consequently, while investigating these remarks, the top countries with the highest disease incidence rates for the longest period were Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Finland, Germany, Norway, and France, as shown in Figure 2. This observation also calls for an intervention to address the regional epidemic burden.

The United States reported similar findings with respect to the link between climate and Lyme disease incidence [29]. For comparison, data rates from the USA were also analyzed through the same pipeline at the end of the study to contrast the risk rate differences of the disease. After controlling for covariates, the incidence rates and disease burden were significantly higher in Estonia (IRR = 20.3), Lithuania (IRR = 13.4), and several other countries than the disease rate in the United States during the study period (Figure 7).

Lyme disease is also endemic in other European countries in the central or southern regions. The scope of this study is to investigate the frontline states to the changing climate in a method that could quantify arctic amplification through disease incidence in the northwestern part of the EU. This study discussed the hypothesis and found a clear strong association between climate and disease incidence in countries near the two seas at a faster speed, suggesting with concurrent research that an environmental change to case surge could take up to 2 years, which might explain the fluctuation and delay of events based on regions. Estonia and Lithuania showed the strongest relationship between climate change variables and an increase in incidence over the years. With an estimation to be up to 20-folds as high as the USA when comparing disease rates. Hence, with disproportionate climate change, there are short and long effects, those effects are associated with how fast or slow the disease spreads.

Strength and Limitation

The strength of this study is the use of advanced statistical modeling to explore the association between climate and Lyme disease incidence in a time-series ecological study design. The statistical analysis assessed several models before fitting them to the data. A negative binomial general linear model was used to account for the overdispersion of the data. The results of the final model showed a positive association, accounting for covariates. Moreover, more meaningful results were obtained when exploring lagged variables (temperature and precipitation) with the incidence rate of the disease. Several countries were analyzed while accounting for the country's heterogeneity, elucidating the hypothesis that ongoing trends are affecting more areas in the region.

There are several possible biases due to the nature of the study design and data collection methods. Ecological studies are often prone to several epidemiological concerns. First, the study exposure and outcomes were measured at the population level from 2000 to 2024, not at the individual level. Thus, there is a possibility of ecological fallacy in this study; the interpretations for each country might not be applied to small regional or personal impacts. Individual-level data are needed to confirm these findings and address existing research gaps. Second, to account for temporal bias, the study included variables that account for the biological plausibility of the climate on the tick (one and two-year lagged). Additionally, to address differences in temporal trends between countries, a multivariable negative binomial regression model analysis was used while adjusting for time and population size.

Selection bias is a potential threat to the validity of this study. The threat may arise from which countries are excluded from the region or the number of years of data available for them. First, the analysis excluded three major countries originally intended to be included: the Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden. The original dataset lacked case incidence data for these countries. Additionally, not all countries contributed equally to the study (2000-2024). Some countries contributed more than others did. Collectively, these two issues could introduce a selection bias into the study.

Uncontrolled confounders can also bias the analysis if not adjusted for. The aim of this analysis was to assess the relationship using a parsimonious model while avoiding overfitting. The country's healthcare and socio-economic status, and the definition to diagnose and report LD confirmed cases are not alike and vary over time, both between and within countries. To address this, the best viable approach was to use data from a reputable source, the Johns Hopkins database, in which the data were extracted from each country's public health agency, and then using the variable (year) to account for year-to-year changes within countries. Nevertheless, this does not completely remove reporting and diagnostic bias that could come from individuals seeking care; thus, underestimating the true case numbers is still possible. Regrettably, there are no data to directly test the animal factors in the proposed models. And, geocoded data on tick populations, as well as their infection status, were not available too during the analysis. The absence of these variables indicates possible confounding factors in the study.

Research has linked climate change to an increase in the number of infectious diseases with zoonotic ability globally, including Lyme disease [35]. However, this study examined the correlation between changes in climate units in climate-sensitive regions and the high prevalence of cases in the Upper EU region. The dynamics of zoonotic disease transmission are shaped by changing ecosystems through the influence of climate change effects. To better understand this relationship, it was important to assess (LD) risks in an approach that considers how climate influences disease events. Finally, it remains unclear how microbes interact within their ecosystems and how animal factors contribute to higher tick densities and movement. The role of vegetation change and land use, genetics, and other variables in persistent Lyme disease counts are all possible factors but were not investigated here [10,12]. More research is needed to understand how tick density and infection rates are affected by intrinsic factors such as genetics and microbiome competence, extrinsic factors such as host availability and emerging hosts [20], and other climate variables that influence tick density and infectiousness.

Recommendation

Europe lacks a coordinated and standardized surveillance system, which has previously caused issues such as the misidentification of tick species [37,38]. Therefore, strong integrative collaboration is highly recommended for a better sampling and reporting system. This effort can be carried out using a One Health approach. Reporting data across all domains requires interdisciplinary teams, including those that deal with environmental and vector conditions (biologists), animal roles (veterinarians and animal health practitioners), and standard confirmed human infection (healthcare professionals). This is necessary not only for disease tracking but also to improve analytical accuracy and generalizability in understanding how climate change affects microbial ecology.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The corresponding author oversaw the entire study, from conceptualization to methodology, data analysis and writing.

AUTHOR COMPETING INTERESTS

The author has declared that he has no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

[1] Rosa PA. Microbiology of Borrelia burgdorferi. Semin Neurol. 1997;17(1):5-10.
[2] Burgdorfer W, Barbour AG, Hayes SF, Benach JL, Grunwaldt E, Davis JP. Lyme disease-a tick-borne spirochetosis? Science.

1982;216(4552):1317-9.
[3] Marques AR, Strle F, Wormser GP. Comparison of Lyme Disease in the United States and Europe. Emerg Infect Dis. 2021;27(8):2017-24.
[4] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Signs and Symptoms of Untreated Lyme Disease [Web Page]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2024 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/lyme/signs-symptoms/index.html.
[5] Steere AC, Snydman D, Murray P, Mensch J, Main AJ, Jr., Wallis RC, et al. Historical perspective of Lyme disease. Zentralbl Bakteriol Mikrobiol Hyg A. 1986;263(1-2):3-6.
[6] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. How Lyme Disease Spreads: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2024. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/lyme/causes/index.html.
[7] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Lyme Disease Surveillance and Data: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2025 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/lyme/data-research/facts-stats/index.html.
[8] Lindsø LK, Viljugrein H, Mysterud A. Temporal increase in ticks and pathogen prevalence in the small mammal part of the Lyme disease cycle in northern Europe. Ecosphere. 2024;15(11):e70063.
[9] Cook MJ. Lyme borreliosis: a review of data on transmission time after tick attachment. Int J Gen Med. 2015;8:1-8.
[10] Steere AC, Strle F, Wormser GP, Hu LT, Branda JA, Hovius JW, et al. Lyme borreliosis. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2016;2:16090.
[11] Skar GL, Blum MA, Simonsen KA. Lyme Disease. StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL)2025.
[12] Onder O, Humphrey PT, McOmber B, Korobova F, Francella N, Greenbaum DC, et al. OspC is potent plasminogen receptor on surface of Borrelia burgdorferi. J Biol Chem. 2012;287(20):16860-8.
[13] Kahl O, Gray JS. The biology of Ixodes ricinus with emphasis on its ecology. Ticks Tick Borne Dis. 2023;14(2):102114.
[14] Hauser G, Rais O, Moran Cadenas F, Gonseth Y, Bouzelboudjen M, Gern L. Influence of climatic factors on Ixodes ricinus nymph abundance and phenology over a long-term monthly observation in Switzerland (2000-2014). Parasit Vectors. 2018;11(1):289.
[15] Lindgren E, Jaenson TGT. Lyme borreliosis in Europe: influences of climate and climate change, epidemiology, ecology and adaptation measures. Copenhagen: World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe; 2006 2006.
[16] Porretta D, Mastrantonio V, Amendolia S, Gaiarsa S, Epis S, Genchi C, et al. Effects of global changes on the climatic niche of the tick Ixodes ricinus inferred by species distribution modelling. Parasit Vectors. 2013;6:271.
[17] Patterson M. North-West Europe Hottest Days Are Warming Twice as Fast as Mean Summer Days. Geophysical Research Letters. 2023;50(10):e2023GL102757.
[18] Rantanen M, Lee SH, Aalto J. Asymmetric warming rates between warm and cold weather regimes in Europe. Atmospheric Science Letters. 2023;24(10):e1178.
[19] de Souza WM, Weaver SC. Effects of climate change and human activities on vector-borne diseases. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2024;22(8):476-91.
[20] Pfenning-Butterworth A, Buckley LB, Drake JM, Farner JE, Farrell MJ, Gehman AM, et al. Interconnecting global threats: climate change, biodiversity loss, and infectious diseases. Lancet Planet Health. 2024;8(4):e270-e83.
[21] United Nations. What Is Climate Change? : United Nations; n.d. [Available from: https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/what-is-climate-change.
[22] National Aeronautics and Space Administration. What Is Climate Change? : National Aeronautics and Space Administration; n.d. [Available from: https://science.nasa.gov/climate-change/what-is-climate-change/.
[23] Rantanen M, Karpechko AY, Lipponen A, Nordling K, Hyvärinen O, Ruosteenoja K, et al. The Arctic has warmed nearly four times faster than the globe since 1979. Communications Earth & Environment. 2022;3(1):168.
[24] National Snow and Ice Data Center. Why does arctic weather and climate matter? : National Snow and Ice Data Center; n.d. [Available from: https://nsidc.org/learn/parts-cryosphere/arctic-weather-and-climate/why-arctic-weather-and-climate-matter.
[25] PIESMAN J, MATHER TN, DAMMIN GJ, TELFORD SR, III, LASTAVICA CC, SPIELMAN A. SEASONAL VARIATION OF TRANSMISSION RISK OF LYME DISEASE AND HUMAN BABESIOSIS. American Journal of Epidemiology. 1987;126(6):1187-9.
[26] Bourdin A, Dokhelar T, Bord S, van Halder I, Stemmelen A, Scherer-Lorenzen M, et al. Forests harbor more ticks than other habitats: A meta-analysis. Forest Ecology and Management. 2023;541:121081.
[27] Ehrmann S, Liira J, Gartner S, Hansen K, Brunet J, Cousins SAO, et al. Environmental drivers of Ixodes ricinus abundance in forest fragments of rural European landscapes. BMC Ecol. 2017;17(1):31.
[28] Levine MD, Steele RV. Climate change: What we know and what is to be done. WIREs Energy and Environment. 2021;10(1):e388.
[29] Couper LI, MacDonald AJ, Mordecai EA. Impact of prior and projected climate change on US Lyme disease incidence. Glob Chang Biol. 2021;27(4):738-54.
[30] European Environment Agency. Arctic and Baltic sea ice: European Environment Agency; 2025 [Available from: https://www.eea.europa.eu/en/analysis/indicators/arctic-and-baltic-sea-ice?activeAccordion=309c5ef9-de09-4759-bc02-802370dfa366.
[31] Jakobson E, Jakobson L. Atmospheric teleconnections between the Arctic and the Baltic Sea region as simulated by CESM1-LE. Earth Syst Dynam. 2024;15(1):155-65.
[32] Gibb R, Franklinos LHV, Redding DW, Jones KE. Ecosystem perspectives are needed to manage zoonotic risks in a changing climate. BMJ. 2020;371:m3389.
[33] Skufca J, Tran TMP, Brestrich G, Pilz A, Vyse A, Malerczyk C, et al. Incidence of Lyme Borreliosis in Germany: Exploring Observed Trends Over Time Using Public Surveillance Data, 2016-2020. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2023;23(4):237-46.
[34] Paradowska-Stankiewicz I, Zbrzezniak J, Skufca J, Nagarajan A, Ochocka P, Pilz A, et al. A Retrospective Database Study of Lyme Borreliosis Incidence in Poland from 2015 to 2019: A Public Health Concern. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2023;23(4):247-55.
[35] Leal Filho W, Ternova L, Parasnis SA, Kovaleva M, Nagy GJ. Climate Change and Zoonoses: A Review of Concepts, Definitions, and Bibliometrics. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(2).
[36] Benelli G. Pathogens Manipulating Tick Behavior-Through a Glass, Darkly. Pathogens. 2020;9(8).
[37] Nagarajan A, Skufca J, Vyse A, Pilz A, Begier E, Riera-Montes M, et al. The Landscape of Lyme Borreliosis Surveillance in Europe. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2023;23(4):142-55.
[38] Estrada-Pena A, D'Amico G, Palomar AM, Dupraz M, Fonville M, Heylen D, et al. A comparative test of ixodid tick identification by a network of European researchers. Ticks Tick Borne Dis. 2017;8(4):540-6.
[39] Høyer JL, Karagali I. Sea Surface Temperature Climate Data Record for the North Sea and Baltic Sea. Journal of Climate. 2016;29(7):2529-41.

APPENDIX

Supplementary Tables

Complete tables referenced in the main text.

Table A1: Complete Univariable Analysis

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
Norway			
T2M_avg	1.11	0.92, 1.32	0.3
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	**0.040**
T2M_avg_lag1	1.18	0.98, 1.40	0.070
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.082
T2M_avg_lag2	1.15	0.96, 1.37	0.11
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.6
YEAR	1.04	1.03, 1.06	**<0.001**
Finland			
T2M_avg	1.12	0.97, 1.28	0.12
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.2
T2M_avg_lag1	1.15	1.02, 1.31	**0.033**
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.2
T2M_avg_lag2	1.13	0.98, 1.28	0.085
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.5
YEAR	1.04	1.04, 1.05	**<0.001**
Estonia			
T2M_avg	1.37	1.07, 1.74	**0.019**
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.4
T2M_avg_lag1	1.36	1.03, 1.76	**0.034**
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.2
T2M_avg_lag2	1.36	1.02, 1.80	**0.034**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.074
YEAR	1.10	1.08, 1.13	**<0.001**
Latvia			

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Supplementary Tables

Complete tables referenced in the main text.

Table A1: Complete Univariable Analysis

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
T2M_avg	0.83	0.70, 1.0	0.051
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.8
T2M_avg_lag1	0.90	0.72, 1.12	0.3
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	>0.9
T2M_avg_lag2	0.83	0.72, 0.97	**0.017**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.14
YEAR	0.94	0.91, 0.96	**<0.001**
Lithuania			
T2M_avg	1.02	0.78, 1.31	>0.9
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.8
T2M_avg_lag1	1.23	0.95, 1.57	0.12
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.4
T2M_avg_lag2	1.32	1.04, 1.68	**0.025**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.15
YEAR	1.06	1.02, 1.09	**<0.001**
Poland			
T2M_avg	1.44	1.19, 1.73	**0.001**
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	>0.9
T2M_avg_lag1	1.42	1.12, 1.78	**0.007**
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.8
T2M_avg_lag2	1.27	0.94, 1.68	0.12
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.7
YEAR	1.09	1.08, 1.11	**<0.001**
Germany			
T2M_avg	1.26	1.09, 1.46	**0.002**

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Supplementary Tables

Complete tables referenced in the main text.

Table A1: Complete Univariable Analysis

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.6
T2M_avg_lag1	1.18	1.01, 1.38	0.051
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.5
T2M_avg_lag2	1.33	1.15, 1.54	**<0.001**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.12
YEAR	1.05	1.04, 1.07	**<0.001**
Belgium			
T2M_avg	1.11	0.91, 1.35	0.3
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.055
T2M_avg_lag1	1.02	0.82, 1.27	0.9
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	>0.9
T2M_avg_lag2	0.93	0.76, 1.13	0.4
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	**<0.001**
YEAR	1.03	0.99, 1.08	0.14
France			
T2M_avg	1.05	0.85, 1.29	0.6
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.3
T2M_avg_lag1	1.19	1.00, 1.41	**0.030**
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.2
T2M_avg_lag2	1.21	1.00, 1.46	**0.039**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.4
YEAR	1.05	1.00, 1.09	**0.020**

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Table A2: Complete Multivariable Analysis

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
Norway			
T2M_avg	1.00	0.92, 1.09	>0.9
PRECTOT_avg	1.03	0.94, 1.13	0.6
T2M_avg_lag2	1.11	1.02, 1.21	**0.014**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	0.94	0.86, 1.03	0.2
YEAR	1.04	1.03, 1.05	**<0.001**
Finland			
T2M_avg	0.99	0.94, 1.04	0.6
PRECTOT_avg	1.01	0.96, 1.06	0.8
T2M_avg_lag2	1.01	0.96, 1.07	0.6
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.0	0.94, 1.05	0.9
YEAR	1.04	1.03, 1.05	**<0.001**
Estonia			
T2M_avg	1.14	0.95, 1.37	0.2
PRECTOT_avg	1.25	1.10, 1.43	**0.001**
T2M_avg_lag2	1.08	0.93, 1.26	0.3
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.24	1.05, 1.48	**0.010**
YEAR	1.12	1.09, 1.15	**<0.001**
Latvia			
T2M_avg	0.99	0.82, 1.18	0.9
PRECTOT_avg	1.01	0.87, 1.15	>0.9
T2M_avg_lag2	0.98	0.80, 1.22	0.9
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.03	0.89, 1.20	0.7
YEAR	0.94	0.89, 1.00	0.058

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Table A2: Complete Multivariable Analysis

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
Lithuania			
T2M_avg	0.88	0.77, 1.01	0.052
PRECTOT_avg	1.01	0.91, 1.14	0.8
T2M_avg_lag2	1.12	1.0, 1.26	0.061
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.15	1.03, 1.28	**0.013**
YEAR	1.06	1.02, 1.09	**<0.001**
Poland			
T2M_avg	1.03	0.87, 1.21	0.7
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	0.88, 1.15	>0.9
T2M_avg_lag2	0.90	0.77, 1.04	0.14
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	0.91	0.80, 1.04	0.14
YEAR	1.10	1.07, 1.12	**<0.001**
Germany			
T2M_avg	1.04	0.93, 1.16	0.5
PRECTOT_avg	0.96	0.88, 1.05	0.3
T2M_avg_lag2	1.13	1.01, 1.25	**0.021**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.01	0.92, 1.11	0.8
YEAR	1.04	1.02, 1.06	**<0.001**
Belgium			
T2M_avg	0.99	0.94, 1.04	0.6
PRECTOT_avg	1.0	0.95, 1.04	0.8
T2M_avg_lag2	1.02	0.98, 1.07	0.3
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.21	1.17, 1.26	**<0.001**
YEAR	1.03	1.00, 1.05	**0.034**
France			

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Table A2: Complete Multivariable Analysis

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
T2M_avg	0.98	0.81, 1.17	0.8
PRECTOT_avg	1.05	0.90, 1.22	0.5
T2M_avg_lag2	1.27	1.05, 1.53	**0.010**
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.22	1.06, 1.41	**0.010**
YEAR	1.02	0.97, 1.07	0.5

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Characteristic	IRR	95% CI	p-value
T2M_avg	1.01	0.95, 1.07	0.7
PRECTOT_avg	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.7
T2M_avg_lag1	1.05	0.99, 1.12	0.10
T2M_avg_lag2	1.05	0.99, 1.11	0.12
PRECTOT_avg_lag1	1.00	1.00, 1.00	>0.9
PRECTOT_avg_lag2	1.00	1.00, 1.00	0.6
YEAR	1.05	1.04, 1.06	**<0.001**
country			
United States	—	—	
Belgium	1.29	0.96, 1.74	0.082
Estonia	20.3	10.5, 38.9	**<0.001**
Finland	7.63	2.91, 19.9	**<0.001**
France	5.63	4.24, 7.46	**<0.001**
Germany	1.21	0.83, 1.75	0.3
Latvia	3.34	1.74, 6.40	**<0.001**
Lithuania	13.4	7.41, 24.2	**<0.001**
Norway	2.33	0.63, 8.50	0.2
Poland	3.60	2.49, 5.19	**<0.001**

Abbreviations: CI = Confidence Interval, IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio

Figure 7: Estonia and Lithuania had about 20 times and 13 times the incidence of United States, respectively.