Spatial Dynamics of Australia's Syphilis Surge: Geographic Clustering, Service Accessibility, and the Dual Epidemic, 2011–2024

Hayden Farquhar MBBS MPHTM

February 2026

Independent researcher (no institutional affiliation)
hayden.farquhar@icloud.com
ORCID: 0009-0002-6226-440X

Keywords: syphilis; spatial epidemiology; Australia; sexual health services; congenital syphilis; COVID-19; geographic clustering

Abstract

Background: Australia is experiencing its worst syphilis epidemic in decades, driven by two distinct outbreaks — a heterosexual epidemic disproportionately affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in northern Australia, and a predominantly MSM-associated epidemic in urban centres. We examined the spatial dynamics of this dual epidemic, including geographic clustering, service accessibility associations, and COVID-19 impacts.

Methods: We analysed publicly available aggregate surveillance data (2013–2024). Spatial autocorrelation (Global/Local Moran's I, Getis-Ord Gi*), spatial regression (OLS, spatial lag, spatial error), and geographically weighted regression (GWR) were applied to 74–75 Victorian local government areas (LGAs). Congenital syphilis vulnerability was mapped at SA3 level using composite proxy scoring. COVID-19 impact was assessed using interrupted time series (ITS) analysis.

Results: National notifications rose 3.5-fold from 1,719 (2013) to 6,036 (2022). Strong spatial clustering was identified (Moran's I=0.560, p<0.001), with 11 high-high clusters in inner Melbourne. The spatial lag model identified distance to sexual health clinic (coefficient: −0.225, p=0.050) and Indigenous population proportion (coefficient: 0.210, p=0.045) as significant predictors. Eleven SA3 areas were classified as high

vulnerability for congenital syphilis, predominantly in remote northern Australia. Monthly NSW ITS found a non-significant 6% reduction in notifications during COVID restrictions (IRR=0.94, p=0.123). Comparing the COVID period (2020–2021) with pre-COVID means, remote area notifications increased 91% and female notifications increased 108% compared with 45% for males, reflecting the steep underlying epidemic trajectory.

Conclusions: Australia's syphilis epidemic exhibits distinct spatial patterns shaped by service accessibility and sociodemographic factors. The concentration of high-vulnerability areas in remote northern Australia highlights the need for targeted service expansion, point-of-care testing, and culturally appropriate outreach. The acceleration of heterosexual transmission signals increasing congenital syphilis risk requiring urgent antenatal screening strengthening.

Introduction

Australia is experiencing its most severe syphilis epidemic in decades.[1,2] Infectious syphilis notifications have increased more than threefold nationally, rising from 1,719 cases in 2013 to over 6,000 annually by 2022.[1] This resurgence follows decades of declining rates and near-elimination of congenital syphilis, representing a reversal of decades of progress.[3]

The current epidemic comprises two epidemiologically distinct outbreaks. The first, identified in Far North Queensland in 2011, is a heterosexual outbreak that has spread progressively across northern and central Australia, disproportionately affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.[4,5] In 2022, notification rates among Indigenous Australians in remote areas reached 273 per 100,000 — more than 35 times the non-Indigenous remote rate (7.8 per 100,000).[1] The second outbreak, centred in metropolitan areas, is driven predominantly by transmission among men who have sex with men (MSM) and has intensified since approximately 2015.[2]

The re-emergence of congenital syphilis is a critical consequence of these outbreaks. After near-elimination in Australia, congenital syphilis notifications have risen from one case in 2011 to 20 cases (with 10 deaths) in 2023.[3,6] The burden has been concentrated among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women in remote areas, with significant gaps in antenatal care.[3]

Despite the magnitude of this epidemic, limited research has examined its spatial dynamics using formal spatial statistical methods. Aung et al. described the spatial and temporal epidemiology of syphilis in Victoria

(2015–2018), documenting the generalisation of the epidemic from inner Melbourne to outer suburbs, but did not apply spatial autocorrelation statistics or regression modelling.[7] Schleihauf et al. used spatiotemporal scan statistics to detect STI clustering in New South Wales, reporting that over one-third of gonorrhoea, chlamydia, and syphilis cases fell within cluster areas.[8] Outside Australia, formal spatial methods have been applied to syphilis epidemiology, including spatial regression and GWR in British Columbia[9] and spatial autocorrelation analysis with spatial regression in China.[10,11] However, no Australian study has used these methods to examine associations between syphilis rates and service accessibility or sociodemographic predictors.

This study aims to: (1) describe the spatial and temporal distribution of infectious syphilis across Australian sub-state geographies; (2) identify significant spatial clusters and examine their associations with service accessibility and sociodemographic factors; (3) map areas at elevated vulnerability for congenital syphilis; and (4) assess the differential geographic impact of COVID-19 restrictions on syphilis transmission patterns. The study period (2011–2024) encompasses the full duration of the current epidemic from its identification in Far North Queensland, though specific analyses draw on different temporal windows depending on data availability (detailed in Methods).

Methods

Study design and data sources

This ecological study analysed publicly available aggregate surveillance data from multiple sources. No ethics approval was required as all data were aggregate, de-identified, and publicly accessible.

Notification data. National infectious syphilis notifications (2013–2022) were obtained from the Kirby Institute,[1] stratified by state/territory, sex, Indigenous status, and remoteness. Sub-state data were obtained from state health departments: Victorian (79 LGAs, 2019–2024); NSW (16 LHDs, 2000–2024); Queensland (16 HHS, 2012–2024);[4] and NT (7 health districts, 2024).[5] Congenital syphilis data were compiled from Hengel et al.,[3] the Kirby Institute,[1] the National Syphilis Surveillance Report (Q2 2025),[6] and state reports.

Demographic data. Population denominators, Indigenous population proportions (2021 Census), and remoteness classifications were sourced from the ABS.[14] Socioeconomic disadvantage used the IRSD at SA2 level.[15]

Service accessibility data. Sexual health clinic and Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation (ACCHO) locations were extracted from the National Health Services Directory (NHSD, accessed January 2025), via the AURIN open data portal.[16] Euclidean distance from each SA2 population-weighted centroid to the nearest sexual health clinic was the primary accessibility measure. Euclidean distance does not account for road networks, public transport, or telehealth, and is most imprecise in rural areas.[17] In regression models, this variable functions as a proxy for surveillance intensity and case ascertainment capacity rather than transmission risk. A total of 111 sexual health clinics and 583 Aboriginal health services were identified nationally.

Antenatal care data. First-trimester antenatal care attendance and adequate antenatal visit data by SA3 were obtained from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) National Perinatal Data Collection (2023).[18]

Geographic boundaries. SA2, SA3, and state/territory boundary files were obtained from the ABS Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS) 2021 edition.[14] All spatial data used the Geocentric Datum of Australia 2020 (GDA2020; EPSG:7844).

Spatial autocorrelation analysis

Victorian LGAs were selected as the primary spatial unit, as Victoria was the only jurisdiction providing notification counts at a geography fine enough for meaningful spatial analysis. Of 79 LGAs in the notification dataset, 75 were linked to the ABS LGA boundary file (ASGS 2021); four (Bayside, Colac-Otway, Kingston, Latrobe) could not be matched due to naming discrepancies between the Victorian notification system and ABS boundary file (e.g., parenthetical suffixes such as "Alpine (S)" vs "Alpine"). Regression modelling used 74 LGAs after excluding Queenscliffe, which lacked SA2-level covariate data. SA2-level covariates were aggregated to LGA level using population-weighted spatial joins, introducing a second layer of the modifiable areal unit problem. The mean annual notification rate per 100,000 (2019–2024) was the dependent variable.

Spatial weights used queen contiguity (mean 5.2 neighbours per LGA). Sensitivity to weight specification was assessed using k-nearest neighbours (k=4, k=6) and inverse-distance weights (Supplementary Table S2). Global spatial autocorrelation was assessed using Moran's I with 999 Monte Carlo permutations. Local clustering was identified using LISA[12] and Getis-Ord Gi*,[13] both with false discovery rate adjustment. Temporal stability was assessed annually for 2019–2024 (Supplementary Table S6). Queensland HHS areas

(n=15) were analysed separately. Throughout, spatial autocorrelation analyses used 75 LGAs; regression and GWR used 74.

Spatial regression modelling

Three regression models were compared: OLS, spatial lag (ρWy), and spatial error (λWu). The dependent variable was log(1+rate)-transformed mean annual rate, regressed on Indigenous population proportion, IRSD score, log-transformed distance to nearest sexual health clinic, and remoteness category. Model selection used Rao's score tests and AIC. Diagnostics included VIF, Shapiro-Wilk, Breusch-Pagan tests, and Moran's I on residuals (Supplementary Table S1). Geographically weighted regression (GWR) was fitted using an adaptive Gaussian kernel bandwidth optimised by cross-validation (adaptive quantile = 0.044; AICc = 156.9) to explore spatial non-stationarity, with 3 predictors (excluding remoteness to reduce local parameter burden). The small adaptive bandwidth means each local regression draws on few neighbours; local R^2 values near the upper range should be interpreted with caution. Sensitivity analysis using larger bandwidths (adaptive quantiles 0.10–0.20) confirmed stable coefficient directions (Supplementary Table S3).

Congenital syphilis vulnerability mapping

In the absence of SA3-level congenital syphilis case counts, a proxy vulnerability scoring approach was developed. Each SA3 was scored (0–4) based on four risk factors: Indigenous population proportion above the 75th percentile (≥1 point); first-trimester antenatal care attendance below the 25th percentile (≥1 point); Remote or Very Remote classification (≥1 point); and distance to nearest sexual health clinic above the 75th percentile (≥1 point). SA3 areas were classified as High vulnerability (score 3–4), Elevated vulnerability (score 2), Moderate vulnerability (score 1), or Lower vulnerability (score 0). Equal weighting was chosen because the relative contribution of each component to congenital syphilis risk is not empirically established at the area level in Australia; weighting any single factor (e.g., prioritising antenatal care gaps over remoteness) would introduce assumptions about causal pathways that the ecological data cannot support. The four components are correlated — Indigenous population proportion, remoteness, antenatal care gaps, and service distance co-occur in the same areas — meaning the score partly measures the same underlying construct of remote disadvantage repeatedly, which concentrates high scores in a small number of areas. Adult female syphilis notification rates were not included as a scoring component because they are subject to the same ascertainment bias documented in the regression analysis (areas with lower testing access under-detect cases)

and are not publicly available at SA3 level. Sensitivity of the classification to threshold choice was assessed by varying percentile cut-points (70th/30th, 80th/20th, 90th/10th; Supplementary Table S5).

COVID-19 impact analysis

An exploratory ITS analysis was performed at the national level (annual data, 2013–2022; 10 observations). Given the limited degrees of freedom, this national model is illustrative, with the NSW monthly analysis serving as the primary ITS estimate. A negative binomial model with log-transformed population offset was used (Supplementary Table S4):

$$\log(E[Y_t]) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{time} + \beta_2 \cdot \text{covid} + \beta_3 \cdot \text{time_since_covid} + \log(\text{population}_t)$$

where *covid* indicated the COVID restriction period (2020–2021). Sensitivity to functional form was assessed using a quadratic pre-COVID trend (Supplementary Table S4). Differential trajectories were examined by stratifying analyses by state/territory, remoteness, sex, and Indigenous status.

The primary ITS used monthly NSW notification data (2009–2025; n=204),[28] with negative binomial regression and Fourier harmonic seasonal adjustment (12- and 6-month cycles),[34] specifying COVID restrictions from March 2020 to December 2021 (Supplementary Table S7, Supplementary Figure S9).

Statistical software

All analyses were conducted in R version 4.5.0 using packages sf 1.0-19 (spatial data handling), tmap 4.1 (thematic mapping), spdep 1.3-8 (spatial autocorrelation), spatialreg 1.3-6 (spatial regression), spgwr 0.6-37 (geographically weighted regression), and tidyverse 2.0.0 (data manipulation).[19,20,21] Figures were produced using ggplot2 and tmap at 600 DPI resolution. Publication tables were formatted using the gt package.

Results

Descriptive epidemiology

National infectious syphilis notifications increased 3.5-fold from 1,719 in 2013 to 6,036 in 2022 (Table 1; Figure 1). The Northern Territory recorded the highest rate in 2022 (85.1 per 100,000), driven by an

Indigenous rate of 228.2 vs 7.2 per 100,000 non-Indigenous.[1] WA (30.3), VIC (25.4), and NSW (24.9) followed; ACT (7.8) and TAS (5.9) had the lowest rates.

Males comprised 82% of notifications in 2022 (n=4,943), reflecting the predominant MSM transmission pathway in urban settings (Supplementary Figure S1A).[1,2] However, female notifications showed a proportionally larger increase, rising from a pre-COVID mean of 482 per year (2013–2019) to 1,063 in 2022 — a 120.5% increase compared with 58.5% for males over the same period (Table 3).[1]

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people accounted for 971 notifications (16.1%) in 2022, a disproportionate burden given Indigenous Australians comprise 3.8% of the total population.[1,14] The disparity was most pronounced in remote areas, where Indigenous notification rates (273 per 100,000) were 35 times higher than non-Indigenous rates (7.8 per 100,000) (Supplementary Figure S1C).[1]

Sub-state analysis revealed marked heterogeneity: Queensland HHS-level rates ranged from below 10 to over 200 per 100,000 (Supplementary Figure S2),[4] and Victorian LGA rates from zero to over 50 per 100,000 in inner Melbourne.

Spatial clustering

Global Moran's I confirmed significant spatial autocorrelation (I=0.560, p<0.001, n=75), consistent across weight specifications (I=0.483–0.573, all p<0.001; Supplementary Table S2). LISA identified 11 high-high clusters, all in inner Melbourne (Figure 2A). Getis-Ord Gi* identified 10 hot spots at 99% confidence and one at 95%, concordant with LISA clusters (Figure 2B). Temporal analysis showed persistent clustering throughout 2019–2024 (Moran's I: 0.452–0.581; 7–12 high-high clusters annually; Supplementary Table S6).

Supplementary analysis of Queensland HHS areas (n=15) also demonstrated significant spatial autocorrelation (Global Moran's I=0.346, p=0.008), with hot spots concentrated in northern remote HHS areas (Torres and Cape, North West, Cairns and Hinterland), though the small number of spatial units limits statistical power for formal regression modelling.

Predictors of syphilis notification rates

OLS explained 43% of variance in LGA-level syphilis rates (Table 2), with satisfactory diagnostics (Supplementary Table S1). Distance to nearest sexual health clinic was the strongest OLS predictor (coefficient:

−0.360, p=0.008), with greater distance associated with lower reported rates — likely reflecting ascertainment rather than true incidence.

Significant spatial dependence in OLS residuals (Moran's I=0.282, p<0.001) supported spatial modelling. The spatial lag model provided the best fit (AIC=143.9 vs 155.3 OLS; Table 2), with ρ=0.490 (p<0.001). After accounting for spatial dependence, Indigenous population proportion was significant (coefficient: 0.210, p=0.045) — reflecting structural determinants overlapping geographically with Indigenous communities rather than inherent risk — while distance was marginally significant (coefficient: −0.225, p=0.050). The distance coefficient attenuated from −0.360 (OLS) to −0.225 (spatial lag), consistent with spatial econometric theory: when the lag term absorbs spatially structured variance previously attributed to predictors, coefficient magnitudes decrease. GWR confirmed the distance effect was locally significant (p<0.05) in 81% of LGAs (Supplementary Table S3). IRSD and remoteness were not independently significant.

GWR revealed substantial spatial non-stationarity (local R^2: 0.42–0.89; Supplementary Figures S3–S5). Distance effects were strongest in peri-urban areas; Indigenous proportion effects were strongest in northern Victoria.

Congenital syphilis vulnerability geography

National congenital syphilis notifications increased from one case in 2011 to a peak of 20 cases (with 10 deaths) in 2023, before declining to 9 notifications (3 deaths) in 2024 (Figure 3A).[3,6] The majority of cases occurred among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women in remote communities.[3]

Composite vulnerability mapping identified 11 SA3 areas as high vulnerability (score 3–4), 22 elevated (score 2), 110 moderate (score 1), and 197 lower (score 0) (Figure 3B). Four SA3 areas — Kimberley, East Pilbara, West Pilbara, and Gascoyne — were classified as high vulnerability under all threshold specifications (Supplementary Table S5). High-vulnerability areas were concentrated in the NT, Far North Queensland, and the Kimberley region of WA, characterised by mean Indigenous proportion of 32% and mean first-trimester antenatal attendance of 61%.

First-trimester antenatal care attendance was negatively correlated with Indigenous population proportion (Spearman ρ=−0.152, p=0.006), indicating that areas where screening is most needed have the lowest early antenatal engagement.[18]

COVID-19 impact

The national ITS (negative binomial; Supplementary Table S4) yielded a COVID IRR of 0.70 ($p<0.001$), corresponding to approximately 30% rate reduction relative to the counterfactual. Despite this rate attenuation, absolute counts continued to rise (Table 3: 5,554 during COVID vs 3,611 pre-COVID) because the epidemic was growing steeply. A quadratic specification yielded IRR=0.79 (21% reduction; AIC 130.9 vs 138.6), indicating the estimated impact is sensitive to the assumed functional form.

The NSW monthly ITS (n=204) yielded a smaller, non-significant COVID effect (IRR=0.94, 95% CI: 0.87–1.02, p=0.123; Supplementary Table S7). We consider this the more reliable estimate given its substantially greater degrees of freedom and seasonal adjustment. The discrepancy with the national annual estimate likely reflects overfitting in the 10-observation model.

Stratified descriptive comparisons revealed differential epidemic trajectories across population subgroups (Table 3; Figure 4B). These percentage increases reflect the steep underlying growth of the epidemic rather than effects of COVID-19 restrictions, which the ITS analysis suggests were modest at most:

By remoteness. Major cities experienced a 60% increase in mean annual notifications comparing pre-COVID (2013–2019) to the COVID period (2020–2021), while remote areas experienced a 91% increase, reflecting ongoing transmission in communities where urban lockdown measures had limited relevance (Table 3).[1]

By sex. Female notifications increased 108% between the pre-COVID and COVID periods, compared to 45% for males (Table 3).[1] This accelerating heterosexual transmission is particularly concerning for congenital syphilis risk.

By state. Western Australia experienced the largest rate-based increase (+169% during COVID), aligning with the Kimberley outbreak expansion into metropolitan Perth.[22] South Australia (+63%) and Queensland (+31%) also showed substantial increases. The Northern Territory was relatively stable (+13%).[1]

Sub-state analysis. Within Queensland, urban Southeast Queensland experienced a 56% increase during COVID while remote North Queensland experienced a 28% decrease — one of the few populations showing actual declines, potentially reflecting successful outbreak response in Indigenous communities or reduced population mobility during lockdowns.[4]

Discussion

This study applies spatial autocorrelation, spatial regression, and geographically weighted regression to Australia's ongoing syphilis epidemic at sub-state geographies, revealing distinct geographic clustering patterns, significant associations with service accessibility, and differential COVID-19 impacts that together inform targeted public health responses.

The dual epidemic in spatial perspective

The spatial clustering results confirm two geographically separated epidemic foci. Inner Melbourne LGAs formed a contiguous hot spot cluster (11 high-high LISA areas), consistent with MSM-predominant transmission in areas with established gay community precincts and high densities of sexual health services.[2,7] High notification rates in these areas partly reflect greater testing capacity. Aung et al. described the spatial generalisation of syphilis from inner Melbourne to outer suburbs (2015–2018);[7] our analysis extends this over a more recent period (2019–2024) and quantifies clustering formally: Global Moran's I of 0.560 confirms statistically significant spatial concentration rather than a population density artefact. In contrast, Queensland's hot spots in Torres and Cape, North West, and Cairns and Hinterland HHS areas reflect the heterosexual outbreak in remote Indigenous communities.[4]

The significant spatial autoregressive parameter (ρ=0.49) indicates that syphilis rates in any given LGA are substantially associated with rates in neighbouring areas. The spatial lag model is agnostic to mechanism: ρ captures spatial dependence regardless of whether it arises from diffusion, shared exposure, or confounding. In an ecological analysis, this dependence most likely reflects shared demographic profiles, common testing policies, and commuting patterns linking neighbouring LGAs to the same sexual health services — explanations more parsimonious than cross-boundary transmission, though the latter cannot be excluded. Regardless of mechanism, the finding suggests that interventions targeting individual LGAs in isolation may be insufficient, and that coordination across neighbouring jurisdictions — particularly for partner notification and service planning — warrants consideration.

Service accessibility and case detection

The inverse association between distance to sexual health clinics and reported notification rates likely reflects differential case ascertainment rather than true incidence variation — a pattern documented in STI surveillance internationally.[9,23] GWR results add nuance: distance effects were strongest in peri-urban

areas where service access varies, while western Victoria showed lower model fit (local R^2: 0.42), likely reflecting floor effects where many LGAs recorded zero cases.

This ascertainment bias has implications for vulnerability mapping: because greater distance is associated with lower notification rates (under-detection), the "High Vulnerability" classification in the most remote areas (Figure 3B) may underestimate true risk, as testing coverage is lowest where transmission risk is greatest.

These findings support expansion of sexual health testing into underserved areas. The 111 sexual health clinics identified are heavily concentrated in metropolitan areas.[16] ACCHOs (n=583) provide critical primary care access in remote areas but may lack specialised sexual health capacity or point-of-care testing — a gap addressed by the TTANGO trial, which demonstrated substantial delays between specimen collection and treatment in standard remote care.[29,30]

Congenital syphilis prevention geography

The composite vulnerability mapping identified 11 of 340 SA3 areas nationally as highest vulnerability for congenital syphilis — notably, only 11 of the 49 Remote/Very Remote SA3s scored highly, demonstrating that the score discriminates within remote areas rather than flagging all remote areas equally. The four components are strongly correlated and concentrate in the same areas, so high scores identify convergent disadvantage rather than independent risk factors. Although direct validation is not possible, the high-vulnerability SA3s correspond precisely to the regions where Hengel et al. reported congenital syphilis case concentration: Northern Territory, Far North Queensland, and the Kimberley–Pilbara region of Western Australia — the latter being the focus of an enhanced outbreak response from 2024.[3,22]

The negative correlation between Indigenous population proportion and first-trimester antenatal care attendance ($\rho=-0.152$, $p=0.006$) identifies a critical gap: areas where screening is most needed have the lowest early antenatal engagement. Hengel et al. reported that 43% of mothers of congenital syphilis cases received no antenatal care.[3] Addressing this requires place-based responses: outreach antenatal care, point-of-care syphilis testing at all maternal health contacts, and culturally appropriate models developed with ACCHOs, consistent with the WHO elimination strategy.[31]

COVID-19 impact on notification patterns

The differential COVID-19 impact analysis provides insights into epidemic dynamics. The paradoxical finding of increased notifications in remote areas during COVID restrictions (91% increase) may reflect several factors, possibly overlapping across communities and restriction phases: ongoing transmission in communities less affected by urban lockdown measures; reduced mobility limiting access to treatment, creating a backlog of untreated infections that were subsequently diagnosed; reverse migration of individuals returning to remote communities from urban centres during lockdowns; disruption of outreach testing when biosecurity zones restricted health team movement into remote Northern Territory communities;[5] or enhanced surveillance in outbreak-response areas.[2] The dramatic acceleration of female notifications (+108%) through the COVID period signals a genuine shift in the sex ratio — the female share of notifications grew from a pre-COVID mean of 12.2% to 18.1% during the COVID period — indicating increasing heterosexual transmission that amplifies congenital syphilis risk.

Taken together, the three analytical approaches suggest COVID restrictions produced at most a modest, transient slowing of notification growth — broadly consistent with international evidence[24,25] — while geographic stratification reveals that national averages conceal opposing trends: remote areas experienced a 91% increase while major cities saw 60%.

The persistence of the epidemic through COVID-19 disruptions — with national counts continuing to rise despite physical distancing measures — indicates that syphilis transmission networks are sufficiently entrenched that passive screening approaches alone are inadequate.[2] Active outreach testing, partner notification, and presumptive treatment — as demonstrated by the TTANGO point-of-care testing trial[29] — are likely necessary to interrupt transmission chains, particularly in the post-COVID period where notifications have exceeded pre-COVID trajectories.

Limitations

Several limitations should be noted. First, the ecological design precludes individual-level causal inference. Second, Victorian LGAs (n=75) are relatively coarse; SA2-level notification data would enable finer clustering detection but are not publicly available. Additionally, four LGAs (including the populous Kingston [~170,000 residents] and Bayside [~110,000]) were excluded due to naming discrepancies between state notification and ABS boundary systems, which may affect LISA cluster detection in southeast Melbourne. Third, notification data reflect diagnosed rather than true infections, with ascertainment bias favouring areas

with greater testing access. Fourth, the composite vulnerability score uses equally weighted proxy indicators rather than validated case data. The four components are strongly collinear, making independent weighting difficult to justify without individual-level data,[3] though the consistently high-vulnerability areas (Supplementary Table S5) are robust to threshold choice. Fifth, the national ITS uses only 10 annual observations, providing minimal degrees of freedom; the pre-COVID counterfactual is sensitive to assumed functional form (linear: IRR=0.70; quadratic: IRR=0.79). The NSW monthly analysis (n=204) partially addresses this, yielding a more modest COVID effect estimate (IRR=0.94). The ITS results should be interpreted as descriptive trend characterisation rather than strong causal inference.

The absence of publicly available SA2-level notification data is a significant constraint that limits the resolution of spatial analyses; nationally consistent small-area data would substantially strengthen future surveillance and spatial modelling.

Australia's syphilis resurgence mirrors trends in the United States[26] and Europe,[27] and while spatial methods have been applied to syphilis internationally,[9,10,11,32] no prior Australian study has applied LISA, spatial lag/error regression, or GWR to syphilis data. Australia's epidemic is distinctive in its pronounced Indigenous health dimension, requiring responses that address structural determinants including health service access and community-controlled service models.[3,5]

Conclusions

Australia's syphilis epidemic exhibits distinct spatial patterns shaped by dual outbreak dynamics, with urban MSM-associated clustering in inner Melbourne and heterosexual outbreak concentration in remote northern Australia. Service accessibility is a significant independent predictor of notification geography, and the convergence of high adult syphilis rates, limited antenatal care, remoteness, and service distance identifies priority areas for congenital syphilis prevention, though these vulnerability classifications require validation against case-level data.

We recommend: (1) expansion of point-of-care testing in high-vulnerability remote SA3 areas; (2) integration of syphilis screening into all antenatal contacts, with repeat testing at 28 weeks and delivery in high-prevalence areas;[33] (3) coordinated regional outbreak responses recognising spatial dependence in transmission patterns; (4) enhanced fine-scale surveillance data sharing; and (5) resourcing of culturally appropriate sexual health programmes in partnership with ACCHOs.

The acceleration of heterosexual transmission, particularly among women of reproductive age, represents the

most urgent dimension of Australia's syphilis surge. Without targeted geographic intervention, congenital syphilis cases and deaths will continue — an unacceptable outcome for a preventable condition.

References

1. Kirby Institute. HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmissible infections in Australia: Annual Surveillance Report 2024. Sydney: Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney; 2024.
2. McManus H, Watchirs Smith L, Kaldor J, et al. Trends in infectious syphilis in Australia: a comparison of pre- and post-COVID-19 pandemic notification rates. Sex Health. 2023;20(6):519-526.
3. Hengel B, Giele C, Daveson K, et al. Congenital syphilis in Australia: an analysis of national surveillance data from 2011 to 2021. Med J Aust. 2024;220(3):145-150.
4. Queensland Health. Syphilis in Queensland 2024: Surveillance Report. Brisbane: Queensland Government; 2024.
5. Northern Territory Department of Health. Surveillance Update: Sexually transmitted and blood-borne virus infections in the Northern Territory, Vol 25. Darwin: Centre for Disease Control; 2024.
6. Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care. National Syphilis Surveillance Report: Quarter 2, 2025. Canberra: National Centre for Disease Control; 2025.
7. Aung ET, Chen MY, Fairley CK, et al. Spatial and temporal epidemiology of infectious syphilis in Victoria, Australia, 2015-2018. Sex Transm Dis. 2021;48(12):e178-e182.
8. Schleihauf E, Watkins RE, Plant AJ. Heterogeneity in the spatial distribution of bacterial sexually transmitted infections. Sex Transm Infect. 2009;85(1):45-49.
9. Salway T, Gesink D, Lukac C, et al. Spatial-temporal epidemiology of the syphilis epidemic in relation to neighborhood-level structural factors in British Columbia, 2005-2016. Sex Transm Dis. 2019;46(9):571-578.
10. Tan NX, Messina JP, Yang LG, et al. A spatial analysis of county-level variation in syphilis and gonorrhea in Guangdong Province, China. PLoS One. 2011;6(5):e19648.
11. Tang S, Shi L, Chen W, et al. Spatiotemporal distribution and sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors associated with primary and secondary syphilis in Guangdong, China, 2005-2017. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021;15(8):e0009621.

12. Anselin L. Local indicators of spatial association — LISA. Geogr Anal. 1995;27(2):93-115.

13. Getis A, Ord JK. The analysis of spatial association by use of distance statistics. Geogr Anal. 1992;24(3):189-206.

14. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS) Edition 3, 2021. ABS cat. no. 1270.0.55.001. Canberra: ABS; 2021.

15. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA), 2021. ABS cat. no. 2033.0.55.001. Canberra: ABS; 2023.

16. Healthdirect Australia. National Health Services Directory. Accessed via the Australian Urban Research Infrastructure Network (AURIN) open data portal, January 2025.

17. Apparicio P, Abdelmajid M, Riva M, Shearmur R. Comparing alternative approaches to measuring the geographical accessibility of urban health services: distance types and aggregation-error issues. Int J Health Geogr. 2008;7:7.

18. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. National Perinatal Data Collection annual update 2023. Canberra: AIHW; 2024. (AIHW Cat. no. PER 101.)

19. Pebesma E. Simple features for R: standardized support for spatial vector data. R J. 2018;10(1):439-446.

20. Bivand RS, Wong DWS. Comparing implementations of global and local indicators of spatial association. TEST. 2018;27(3):716-748.

21. Tennekes M. tmap: thematic maps in R. J Stat Softw. 2018;84(6):1-39.

22. Western Australian Department of Health. Syphilis Outbreak Response Group Communique 2024–2025. Perth: Government of Western Australia; 2025.

23. Owusu-Edusei K, Gift TL, Leichliter JS, Romaguera RA. The spatial association between federally qualified health centers and county-level reported sexually transmitted infections: a spatial regression approach. Sex Transm Dis. 2018;45(2):81-86.

24. Sentís A, Prats-Uribe A, López-Corbeto E, et al. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on sexually transmitted infections surveillance data: incidence drop or artefact? BMC Public Health. 2021;21(1):1637.

25. Chow EPF, Hocking JS, Ong JJ, Phillips TR, Fairley CK. Sexually transmitted infection diagnoses and access to a sexual health service before and after the national lockdown for COVID-19 in Melbourne, Australia. Open Forum Infect Dis. 2020;8(1):ofaa536.

26. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Sexually Transmitted Infections Surveillance, 2022. Atlanta: US Department of Health and Human Services; 2024.

27. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Syphilis — Annual Epidemiological Report for 2022. Stockholm: ECDC; 2024. Available from: https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/syphilis-annual-epidemiological-report-2022

28. NSW Health. Notifiable Conditions Information Management System (NCIMS): Syphilis notifications by month of disease onset, 2009–2026. Sydney: NSW Ministry of Health; 2026. Available from: https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/Pages/data.aspx

29. Guy RJ, Ward J, Causer LM, et al. Molecular point-of-care testing for chlamydia and gonorrhoea in Indigenous Australians attending remote primary health services (TTANGO): a cluster-randomised, controlled, crossover trial. Lancet Infect Dis. 2018;18(10):1117-1126.

30. National Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation (NACCHO). Measuring the Gap in Health Expenditure: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. Report prepared by Equity Economics. Canberra: NACCHO; 2022.

31. World Health Organization. Global health sector strategies on, respectively, HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmitted infections for the period 2022–2030. Geneva: WHO; 2022.

32. Dalazen CE, De Souza AS, Ribeiro CJN, et al. Space-time risk cluster and time trends of congenital syphilis in Brazil: an ecological study. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2022;116(9):822-831.

33. Australian Government Department of Health. Clinical Practice Guidelines: Pregnancy Care. Canberra: Australian Government; 2020. (Recommendation: syphilis serology at first antenatal visit; repeat at 28 weeks and at delivery for women in high-prevalence areas or at increased risk.)

34. Bhaskaran K, Gasparrini A, Hajat S, Smeeth L, Armstrong B. Time series regression studies in environmental epidemiology. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42(4):1187-1195.

Tables

Table 1. Infectious syphilis notification rates per 100,000 population by state/territory and Indigenous status, 2022.

State/territory	Overall rate	Indigenous rate	Non-Indigenous rate	Rate ratio
NT	85.1	228.2	7.2	31.7
WA	30.3	293.0	17.7	16.6
VIC	25.4	56.1	25.0	2.2
NSW	24.9	45.8	24.1	1.9
QLD	21.6	101.6	17.4	5.8
SA	17.2	55.7	16.3	3.4
ACT	7.8	9.1	7.7	1.2
TAS	5.9	0.0	6.2	n/a

Source: Kirby Institute Annual Surveillance Report 2024.[1] Rates are crude notification rates per 100,000 estimated resident population. Rate ratio = Indigenous rate / non-Indigenous rate. TAS Indigenous rate of 0.0 may reflect small Indigenous population size (~30,000, ~5.5% of state population) and/or case suppression.

Table 2. Spatial regression models: predictors of log-transformed infectious syphilis notification rates, Victorian LGAs (n=74).

Variable	OLS	Spatial Lag	Spatial Error
Intercept	6.153 (2.560)*	3.630 (2.226)	4.245 (2.236)
% Indigenous population	0.175 (0.123)	0.210 (0.105)*	0.204 (0.105)
IRSD score	−0.002 (0.002)	−0.002 (0.002)	0.000 (0.002)
log(Distance to sexual health clinic, km)	−0.360 (0.131)**	−0.225 (0.115)*	−0.294 (0.142)*

Variable	OLS	Spatial Lag	Spatial Error
Inner Regional (ref: Major Cities)	−0.444 (0.305)	−0.331 (0.263)	−0.476 (0.313)
Outer Regional	−0.603 (0.424)	−0.493 (0.364)	−0.675 (0.426)
AIC	**155.3**	**143.9**	**145.0**
Log-likelihood	−70.6	−63.9	−64.5
Spatial parameter	—	ρ = 0.490	λ = 0.517
Spatial p-value	—	<0.001	<0.001

*Coefficients shown as estimate (SE). *p<0.05, **p<0.01. Bold AIC indicates preferred model. Dependent variable: log(1 + mean annual rate per 100,000), 2019–2024 (see Methods for transformation rationale). Remoteness category coefficients are not significant in any model specification (Outer Regional OLS: p=0.16; lag: p=0.18; error: p=0.12), reflecting limited statistical power with few LGAs in outer regional categories. Data sources: Victorian Department of Health, ABS Census 2021, NHSD 2025.[1,14,16]*

Table 3. COVID-19 impact on infectious syphilis notifications by population group.

Group	Pre-COVID mean	COVID mean	Post-COVID (2022)	COVID vs pre (%)	Post vs pre (%)
National	3,611	5,554	6,036	+53.8	+67.2
Major cities	2,648	4,245	4,666	+60.3	+76.2
Regional	524	658	728	+25.6	+38.9
Remote	260	497	447	+91.2	+71.9
Female	482	1,000	1,063	+107.5	+120.5
Male	3,118	4,532	4,943	+45.3	+58.5

Pre-COVID: 2013–2019 mean annual notifications. COVID: 2020–2021 mean. Post-COVID: 2022. Percentage changes are descriptive period comparisons of absolute notification counts, not derived from the ITS model (which estimates rate changes relative to a modelled counterfactual trajectory). Source: Kirby Institute.[1]

Figure legends



Figure 1. National infectious syphilis notifications, Australia, 2013–2022. (A) Total annual notifications.

(B) Notification rates per 100,000 population by state and territory. Source: Kirby Institute Annual Surveillance Report 2024.[1]



Figure 2. Spatial clustering of infectious syphilis rates across Victorian local government areas (n=75), mean annual rate 2019–2024. (A) Local Moran's I (LISA) cluster classification showing 11 statistically significant high-high clusters in inner Melbourne. (B) Getis-Ord Gi* hot spot analysis showing 10 hot spots at 99% confidence and one at 95% confidence. Source: Victorian Department of Health.



Figure 2B. Getis-Ord Gi hot spot analysis.*



Figure 3. Congenital syphilis in Australia. (A) National congenital syphilis notifications and deaths, 2011–2024. Bars represent notification counts; line represents deaths. (B) SA3-level congenital syphilis vulnerability classification based on composite proxy score incorporating Indigenous population proportion, first-trimester antenatal care attendance, remoteness, and distance to nearest sexual health clinic. High-vulnerability SA3 areas (score 3–4, labelled "High vulnerability") include Kimberley, East Pilbara, West Pilbara, and Gascoyne (WA); Daly-Tiwi-West Arnhem and East Arnhem (NT); and Cape York and Torres Strait (QLD). Sources: Hengel et al. 2024,[3] Kirby Institute,[1] National CDC Q2 2025.[6]



Figure 3B. SA3-level congenital syphilis vulnerability classification.



Figure 4. COVID-19 impact on infectious syphilis notifications. (A) Interrupted time series analysis at the national level, 2013–2022. Observed counts (bars), ITS model fit (blue line), and pre-COVID counterfactual trajectory (red dashed line). Shaded area indicates COVID-19 restriction period (2020–2021). (B) Notification trends by remoteness category showing differential COVID impact. Source: Kirby Institute.[1]

Supplementary material

See Supplementary Appendix for additional figures and analyses, including:

- **Supplementary Table S7.** NSW monthly ITS model comparison (Poisson vs negative binomial, simple vs full specification)
- **Supplementary Figure S9.** NSW monthly infectious syphilis interrupted time series (2009–2025, n=204 months), with seasonal adjustment and counterfactual trajectory
- **Supplementary Figure S10.** Seasonal patterns in NSW infectious syphilis notifications by pre-COVID, COVID, and post-COVID periods

---

Acknowledgements

I acknowledge the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional custodians of the lands on which this research was conducted. I recognise that the disproportionate burden of syphilis on Indigenous communities reflects the ongoing impacts of colonisation, structural disadvantage, and inequitable access to health services. This research aims to highlight these systemic factors and support community-controlled responses.

I gratefully acknowledge the following organisations for making the surveillance and demographic data used in this analysis publicly accessible:

- **Kirby Institute**, UNSW Sydney — national HIV, viral hepatitis and STI surveillance data, including the Annual Surveillance Report 2024 and interactive data tables by state, sex, Indigenous status, and remoteness
- **Queensland Health** — Hospital and Health Service–level syphilis surveillance reports (2019, 2022, 2024), including congenital syphilis data
- **Northern Territory Department of Health**, Centre for Disease Control — SHBBV surveillance updates (Vol 25, 2024) with health district–level data, and the Syphilis Outbreak Response IMT communique (2025)

- **Victorian Department of Health** — local government area–level infectious disease notification data (2019–2024)
- **New South Wales Health** — local health district–level notifiable conditions data (2000–2025) and monthly notification data by disease onset (2009–2026) from the Notifiable Conditions Information Management System (NCIMS)
- **Western Australian Department of Health** — Syphilis Outbreak Response Group communique (2024–2025)
- **Australian Bureau of Statistics** — Estimated Resident Population, Census of Population and Housing 2021 (Indigenous population, SEIFA), Remoteness Areas and ASGS boundary files
- **Australian Institute of Health and Welfare** — National Perinatal Data Collection annual update 2023, including SA3-level antenatal care indicators
- **Australian Urban Research Infrastructure Network (AURIN)** — access to the National Health Services Directory (NHSD) 2025 snapshot for sexual health clinic and Aboriginal health service locations, accessed under AURIN's open research data agreement
- **National Centre for Disease Control** — National Syphilis Surveillance Report Q2 2025, providing congenital syphilis data through 2025

I also acknowledge the work of Hengel et al. (2024), whose analysis of national congenital syphilis data (2011–2021) provided essential context for the congenital syphilis vulnerability mapping component of this study.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This research received no specific funding from any agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Use of artificial intelligence

AI tools (Claude, Anthropic) were used to assist with R code development, data processing pipeline construction, and manuscript drafting and revision. All analyses, scientific interpretations, and methodological decisions were made by the author. The author takes full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the work.

Data availability

All data used in this study are publicly available from the sources described in the Methods section. Analysis code and replication instructions are available at https://github.com/hayden-farquhar/Syphilis-spatial-analysis.