1 Redefining snakebite envenoming as a zoonosis: disease 2 incidence is driven by snake ecology, socioeconomics and 3 anthropogenic impacts

4 Authors

5 Gerardo Martín^{1, 2, 3*}, Joseph Erinjery^{4, 5}, Dileepa Ediriweera⁶, H. Janaka de Silva⁶, David G.
6 Lalloo⁷, Takuya Iwamura⁸ and Kris A. Murray^{1, 2, 9}

7 Affiliations

8 ¹MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Imperial College London, UK.

9 ²Grantham Institute - Climate Change and Environment, Imperial College London, UK

10 ³Departamento de Sistemas y Procesos Naturales, Escuela Nacional de Estudios
11 Superiores unidad Mérida, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Yucatán, México.

12 ⁴School of Zoology, Department of Life Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

13 ⁵Department of Zoology, Kannur University, Kannur, India.

14 ⁶Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya, Ragama, Sri Lanka

15 ⁷Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, UK

16 ⁸Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society, College of Forestry, Oregon State
17 University, Corvallis, USA

18 ⁹MRC Unit The Gambia at London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Atlantic
19 Boulevard, Fajara, The Gambia.

20 Abstract

21 Snakebite is the only WHO-listed, not infectious neglected tropical disease (NTD), although its
 22 eco-epidemiology is similar to that of zoonotic infections: envenoming occurs after a
 23 vertebrate host contacts a human. Accordingly, snakebite risk represents the interaction
 24 between snake and human factors, but their quantification has been limited by data
 25 availability. Models of infectious disease transmission are instrumental for the mitigation of
 26 NTDs and zoonoses. Here, we represented snake-human interactions with disease
 27 transmission models to approximate geospatial estimates of snakebite incidence in Sri Lanka,
 28 a global hotspot. Snakebites and envenomings are described by the product of snake and
 29 human abundance, mirroring directly transmitted zoonoses. We found that human-snake
 30 contact rates vary according to land cover (surrogate of occupation and socioeconomic
 31 status), the impacts of humans and climate on snake abundance, and by snake species. Our
 32 findings show that redefining snakebite as zoonosis provides a mechanistic eco-
 33 epidemiological basis to understand snakebites, and the possible implications of global
 34 environmental and demographic change for the burden of snakebite.

35 Introduction

36 Snakebite envenoming causes acute life-threatening disease with long lasting consequences
 37 for survivors [1]. By most recent estimates, up to 1.8 million people suffer from snakebite
 38 envenoming every year, of which 20,000 – 94, 000 die of the resulting illness [2]. Such a high
 39 burden is increasingly recognised as a global health crisis and, in combination with its relative
 40 neglect from a research perspective, has led to snakebite’s recent inclusion on the WHO list of
 41 class A neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) [3], a first for a non-infectious disease, and to the
 42 development of a global action plan to reduce its burden [4].

Mathematical modelling has been useful for identifying processes that affect the incidence of NTDs and managing them to reduce their burden [5,6]. For instance, modelling revealed that only treating confirmed cases of lymphatic filariasis while neglecting vector and alternative host populations facilitated low-level endemic persistence and the evolution of drug resistant parasites, which together hampered long-term mitigation (reviewed in [7]). Models have also been instrumental for testing and implementing interventions for rabies [8]. The spillover of rabies from its zoonotic mammalian host, mostly as a result of a bite from an infected canine, is a relatively simple transmission process that can be represented with epidemiological models.

Rabies, the above example, and snakebite envenoming have some striking similarities. That is, a pathogenic *agent* - venom - is transmitted to humans after a contact event with a vertebrate host. Despite this similarity, mathematical models of snakebite are scarce (but see [9]), limiting the extent to which mitigation strategies can be assessed prior to field implementation, for example. In contrast, pharmaceutical solutions still dominate mainstream snakebite mitigation and research agendas (e. g., Snakebites: making treatments safe, effective and accessible | Wellcome; [10]). The snakebite roadmap aims to reduce the number of snakebite deaths and disabilities by 50% by 2030 [11], and identifies novel methods and tools to better understand snakebite epidemiology as a priority to help achieve this goal. Improved epidemiological models for snakebite could fill a major current void in understanding snakebite, improving mitigation efforts and maximising the efficacy of post-bite treatment systems (e.g., directing antivenom supplies efficiently) [5,12].

Mechanistic representation of zoonotic spillover predicates that transmission depends on three major principles [13,14]: 1) reservoir and spillover hosts coinciding in time and space (e.g. [15]), 2) the disease prevalence and/or pathogen shedding in reservoir hosts depending on the contact route necessary (e.g. [16]), and 3) the spillover host developing disease when it

68 is infected. Risk mapping studies of snakebites indicate that there are analogous factors
 69 relating to these mechanisms for zoonotic spillover. First, models of snake distribution and
 70 abundance, and maps of human population density can be used to represent human-snake
 71 spatial [17,18] and temporal [19] alignment, which underlies human-snake contact. Second,
 72 the equivalent of pathogen prevalence (i.e., possessing venom) is 100% among venomous
 73 snakes, hence the likelihood of transmission (envenoming) is rather a function of how likely it
 74 is that venom is delivered during a bite (as opposed to dry bites), which varies considerably
 75 between venomous species [20]. And third, host susceptibility relates to the effect of venoms
 76 on the human body [21].

77 Exposure factors and post exposure vulnerabilities (e.g. occupational, cultural and
 78 socioeconomic) may mediate these steps to further influence outcomes and ultimately the
 79 overall burden in a population [22–24]. For instance, working in agriculture could increase
 80 spatio-temporal alignment; poverty could limit the use of protective clothing to influence the
 81 probability of envenoming given a bite; and cultural differences could influence healthcare
 82 seeking behaviour, which could determine the toll on the body during an envenoming event.
 83 Figure 1, following Plowright et al.’s [13] framework for zoonotic spillover, represents such a
 84 conceptual arrangement as a sieve that starts with snake diversity, distribution, abundance,
 85 behaviour, venom toxicity, and its overlap with humans and individual risk/susceptibility
 86 factors.

87 Whereas the majority of NTDs comprise transmission of a pathogenic microorganism (or a
 88 complex of microorganism species e.g., *Leishmania spp.*) from one or more reservoir and/or
 89 vector hosts to humans, the transmission dynamics of snakebite involve envenoming of
 90 humans (or other victim, such as livestock) from one or more venomous snake (‘reservoir’)
 91 species. In systems in which only one species dominates the snakebite burden, an
 92 appropriately simple single-species model has been shown to successfully predict the

geographical variability of snakebite incidence. For instance, Bravo-Vega et al. [9] modelled the frequency of encounter with *Bothrops asper* as a function of environmental suitability to predict snakebite incidence in Costa Rica. However, such models have not been applied in settings where multiple species bite and influence variability of snakebite envenoming incidence in space and in time. For example, the ‘big four’ species considerably shape the burden of snakebite envenoming in South Asia [25], while Goldstein et al. [26] show that burden dynamics can be complex over time due to the influence of multiple biting species and the environment on the behaviour of both humans and snakes.

In the present study, we sought to capitalise on recent snakebite research developments in incidence mapping [23], snake distributional ecology [18], and zoonotic spillover theory [13] to develop a novel mechanistic epidemiological framework representing the biological components of snakebite. Specifically, we explored the extent to which various types of models typically applied to directly transmitted infectious diseases explain the geography of snakebite and envenoming incidence estimates. We use the island nation of Sri Lanka, a snakebite hotspot, as a model system given that, as of the time of writing, it is the only high snakebite burden region for which high quality/high resolution country-wide data exist to formulate, test and compare models on snakebite and envenoming incidences. In addition to demonstrating successful risk mapping, we show that geographical patterns of incidence arise from dynamic environmental socio-ecological processes that include effects of climate, occupational risk factors, land use and its changes and direct human impacts on snake populations. Recasting snakebite as a zoonosis and formally applying conventional epidemiological models provides a novel way forward in understanding snake bite epidemiology, which in future studies will allow us to better anticipate risks and potentially help achieve ambitious mitigation targets [11] in a rapidly changing world.

Methods

118 We first identified a series of mathematical formulations for human-snake contacts to
 119 represent snakebite as a zoonotic disease transmission process. In conventional infectious
 120 disease transmission models, disease spread is considered to be frequency-, density-
 121 dependent or a mixture of both. When frequency-dependent, the per-capita rate at which
 122 susceptible individuals become infected depends on pathogen prevalence in the population.
 123 When density-dependent, transmission increases with infected host density. For snakebites,
 124 pathogen prevalence for a given reservoir is 100% (all individuals of a venomous species
 125 carry venom; Figure 1), and as such we discarded all frequency-dependent formulations. The
 126 remaining density-dependent contact formulations (Table 1) summarise different mixing
 127 dynamics between humans and snakes, resulting in functional relationships between snake
 128 abundance and snakebite incidence that range from linear to asymptotic to bell-shaped [27].
 129 To test the models' abilities to explain snakebites, we transformed them from continuous to
 130 discrete time, and estimated their parameters regressing the estimated snakebite and
 131 envenoming incidence rates from Ediriweera et al. [23] against each functional relationship.
 132 As Ediriweera et al. [23] estimates are spatially explicit we first fitted a model ignoring the
 133 spatial component, and then we fitted the same models with a conditional autoregressive
 134 random effect.

135 **Data**

136 Data used for fitting and testing models and estimating parameters were two published
 137 datasets (rasters) of the spatial distribution of snakebite and envenoming incidence rates,
 138 estimated with model-based geostatistics applied to a country-wide community survey of
 139 ~0.8% of the Sri Lankan population [23], under the assumption that these estimates
 140 represent the ground truth. The response variables for regressing the functional relationships
 141 were the number of snakebite and envenoming cases, respectively, found by multiplying the
 142 mapped incidence rates by human population density (described below). The independent

143 data used to explain incidence rates and which represent the causal snakebite factors (Figure
144 1) were:

145 **Distribution and abundance of reservoir hosts:** raster images of the abundance patterns of
146 the most medically relevant venomous snakes of Sri Lanka, estimated with point process
147 models as functions of the environment (climate, topography and land cover), and adjusted
148 for species' relative abundances [28].

149 **Distribution and abundance of spillover hosts:** raster image of human population density
150 raster layer from 2010 (closest point in time prior to the snakebite survey period of August
151 2012 – June 2013; [23]) obtained from the Gridded population of the world (GPW v4) hosted
152 by the Socioeconomic Data and Applications Center (SEDAC,
153 <https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu>).

154 **Spillover host exposure risk factors:** raster image of land cover representing the
155 predominant classes forest, degraded forest, agriculture, urban and tea (see 'Deriving land
156 cover data' below for source details). Land cover correlates well with socioeconomic status
157 and predominant occupation [29], which are the primary human-related risk factors [22] and
158 which in the model represent different risk categories via model parameters such as the
159 human-snake contact rate.

160 **Data formatting**

161 Prior to analysis we homogenised and synchronised the resolution of all data to a common
162 grid comprising 5×5 km pixels (25 km^2) projected to the datum of Sri Lanka (SLD99, EPSG
163 5235). Synchronising data allowed matching data points to regress the number of snakebite
164 and envenoming cases against human, snake and land cover data according to the model
165 tested. A 5×5 km grid was chosen to facilitate computation and retain a reasonable degree of
166 biological detail relevant to the study aims. Human population density and snake abundance
167 estimates were upscaled from their original 1 km resolution by aggregation, summing the

values of adjacent cells by a factor of 5 grid cells along longitude and latitude. Snakebite and envenoming incidence layers were resampled from their original $\sim 1.5 \times 3$ km to the target resolution using weighted bilinear interpolation. The land cover layer was upscaled from 30 m to 5 km by majority vote per pixel (land cover class was assigned to each grid cell based on the most common class among the ~ 27000 30 m grid cells contained in each 5×5 km pixel).

Deriving land cover data

The five categories considered for the analyses were derived using unsupervised isoclustering and visual interpretation of remotely sensed data for the year 2010 (Landsat surface reflectance, original Landsat optical bands and NDVI). The resulting 30 m land cover maps were validated using 600 randomly generated points across Sri Lanka, with which we estimated a classification accuracy of $>95\%$.

Functional relationships for human-snake contacts

The simplest formulation of human-snake contact is the mass action model, whereby the total number of possible different contacts is found by *No. Humans* $\times$ *No. Snakes*. This formulation is widely used for zoonotic transmission, and the simplest model relevant to snakebites is the *susceptible-bitten* model [30]. Here, the growth of bitten humans (H_b) per time unit (dH_b/dt) is proportional to the number of possible contacts between susceptible humans (H_s) snakes (S):

$$\frac{dH_s}{dt} = -\beta H_s S \quad 1.1)$$

$$\frac{dH_b}{dt} = \beta H_s S \quad 1.2)$$

where β is the human-snake contact rate. This model assumes that time is continuous, however snakebite incidence data has a resolution of one year, for which discrete-time models are more adequate. The continuous (left) and discrete-time (right) models for snakebite based on the SB model are:

$$\frac{dH_s}{dt} = -\beta H_s S \Rightarrow H_{t+1} = H_{s,t} - H_{s,t} \exp(-\beta S) \quad 1.3)$$

$$\frac{dH_b}{dt} = \beta H_s S \Rightarrow H_{b,t+1} = H_{b,t} + H_{s,t} (1 - \exp(-\beta S)) \quad 1.4)$$

The tested human-snake contact formulations are given in Table 1 in their original and discretised forms. We held no *a priori* reason to favour one model over another, so we explored all of their relative abilities to explain snakebite and envenoming incidence.

Model implementation and selection

Ediriweera et al., [23] report both snakebite and snakebite envenoming incidence nationally for Sri Lanka, which here we refer to as two measures of risk, Snakebite and Envenoming. The former represents all confirmed contacts with snakes with and without envenoming, and the latter are the contacts which resulted in envenoming illness. To model envenoming we used two approaches. First, we modelled snakebite as a contact process with the functional relationships and assumed that envenoming is a subset or secondary event, whose probability of occurring was another function of snake abundance. Second, we treated envenoming cases alone in the same way we treated snakebites (see below).

To estimate model parameters we regressed the number of snakebite or envenoming cases against the functional relationships (Table 1) using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling in JAGS [31]. Prior to implementation, the contact processes (Table 1, column 1) were transformed from their continuous-time form into discrete-time, representing the probability that there were any snakebites during the study period ($t, t + 1$). The discrete-time form of equation 1.4 to represent snakebite incidence is [32]:

$$H_{b,t+1} - H_{b,t} = H_{s,t} \times (1 - \exp(-\beta S_t)) \quad 2.1)$$

Therefore, the probability that there are any snakebites when during one year ($t, t + 1$) is:

$$P(t, t + 1) = \frac{H_{b,t+1} - H_{b,t}}{H_s} = 1 - \exp(-\beta S)$$

To summarise, after taking H_s from the right to the left hand side of the equations, snakebite or envenoming incidence is proportional to a function of snakes and/or humans, $F(H, S) = P(t, t + 1)$. More generally the number of snake-bitten people is:

$$H_b = H_s \times P(t, t + 1)$$

To select a more appropriate model in the MCMC sampling process we treated snakebite and envenoming cases as either Poisson:

$$H_b^* \sim \text{Poisson}(H_b)$$

or Negative Binomial, parameterised by P_N and dispersion parameter r :

$$r \sim \text{unif}(0, 50)$$

$$P_N = \frac{r}{r + H_b}$$

$$H_b^* \sim \text{NegBin}(P_N, r)$$

in order to use the best statistical distribution for the number of cases.

Human-snake contact rates

To estimate effects of the different snake species and human-related factors, the contact rate β was decomposed into different aspects. The first aspect included the estimation of one contact rate per snake species, such that S_t from equation 2.1, for instance is:

$$S_t = \sum B_s \times (A, E)_s \times S_s$$

the sum of the individual snake species abundances multiplied by their specific human-snake contact rates B_s , and species aggressiveness or envenoming-severity indices $((A, E)_s; [28])$.

Each index was included depending on whether the contact process analysed was snakebite (A_s) or envenoming ($A_s \times E_s$). This means that the absolute magnitude of contact rate for snakebite is $B_s \times A_s$ and for envenoming is $B_s \times A_s \times E_s$. Thus B_s represents other factors not

related to aggressive behaviour (A_s) or envenoming severity (E_s) that influence human-snake interactions and their outcomes.

The second component of the decomposed contact rates are a series of functions of human population density (number of people per grid cell) that attempt to adjust total snake abundance in relation to humans, since high human population density is a well known threatening process for biodiversity [33,34]. The functions of human population density were:

$$\beta(H) = \begin{cases} \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 H) \\ \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 H^2) \\ \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 H + \beta_2 H^2) \end{cases} \quad 2.2)$$

In this approach, if $\beta_{0,1,2}$ coefficients are drawn from a normal distribution in the MCMC sampling process it is possible to model the negative effect of humans on incidence, whilst retaining a positive relationship between the total number of cases and human population density since $\beta(H)$ will always be positive. To estimate human susceptibility in the models we categorised their parameters (β and 2.2) in five land cover classes.

To summarise, we estimated parameters and measured the ability to represent snakebite and envenoming of the models with and without the functions of human population density (2.2), with and without its parameters categorised by land cover, and estimating a global β with and without categorisation by land cover.

Model of envenoming probability

For the approach of treating envenoming as an event that follows a snakebite, we treated the number of envenoming cases as the subset of snakebites that result in envenoming. Therefore, the number of envenoming cases is:

$$H_{envenomed} = H_b \times P_{env}$$

257 where $H_{envenomed}$ is the number of envenoming cases and P_{env} is the probability that a snakebite
 258 results in envenoming, which we derived from an expert-collated index of species'
 259 envenoming severity (Table 2; [28]). To estimate P_{env} we treated the number of envenoming
 260 cases as Poisson or Negative binomial, but estimated the probability logistically using two
 261 model-formulas:

$$262 \quad \log\left(\frac{P_{env}}{1-P_{env}}\right) = \sum B_s \times E_s \times S'_s \quad 3.1)$$

$$263 \quad \log\left(\frac{P_{env}}{1-P_{env}}\right) = B_{LC} + \sum B_s \times E_s \times S'_s \quad 3.2)$$

264 where, in both equations, B_s is the statistical effect of snake species s , E_s is the index of
 265 envenoming severity (Table 2) and S'_s is snake species s after applying the correction of
 266 abundance in relation to humans ($\beta(H)$). In model formula 3.2, the term B_{LC} is a random
 267 intercept for land cover class. The criteria to select one formula over the other was
 268 minimisation of the deviance information criterion (DIC) and convergence [35].

269 **Model selection**

270 We first implemented all functional relationship models and ran short MCMC chains of 10-50
 271 K iterations to discard those with erratic sampling behaviour, poor chain mixing or
 272 consistently higher DIC than other functions. Once we obtained a more manageable subset of
 273 models we ran the full MCMC chains of up to 750,000 iterations and then checked for
 274 convergence with the Gelman diagnostic test [36]. With the latter we made sure that
 275 posteriors are unrelated to starting prior values (ratio of between and within chain variances
 276 should approach one). Finally, we analysed the spatial pattern and statistical distribution of
 277 the residuals by subtracting the median of posterior samples with snakebite and envenoming
 278 incidence data.

279 The criteria to select one functional relationship over another were: 1) ease of parameter
 280 estimation and convergence of MCMC chains; 2) adequate reproduction of the spatial pattern

of raw number of snakebites and envenomings and their annual incidence rates, by measuring the spatial association of the predictions with a modified T-test for spatially autocorrelated data [37]; 3) minimising the DIC; and 4) adequate representation of the statistical distribution of the snakebite and envenoming data using quantile-quantile plots.

Model with spatial effects

To fit the models with spatial effects we used the mean and standard deviation estimates of the non-spatial version as parameter priors for the main effects β_0 , β_1 , and B_S to ease convergence. Random effects for the above models were incorporated as a log-linear random intercept for the number of predicted cases:

$$\log H_b = \log(H \times F(H, S)) + \rho_i$$

This means that ρ was sampled from a conditional autoregressive normal distribution where each ρ_i is proportional to the average ρ_{-i} of its immediate neighbours in a queen-type neighbourhood. These final models were fitted with Nimble [38] instead of JAGS.

Results

The selected models reproduced well the magnitude and distribution of both snakebite and envenoming incidence rates observed in Ediriweera et al., [23]. National snakebite and envenoming incidence patterns were best predicted by first modelling snakebites with the functional relationship based on simple mass action (Table 1) and then estimating the probability that a snakebite results in envenoming using the land cover random-intercept model (equation 3.2).

Snakebites model

Of the contact formulations listed in Table 1, the simple mass action (βSH) and refuge effect on humans ($\beta S(H - S/q)$) were the best performing models, with the lowest deviance

304 information criterion (DIC; Table 1). The refuge effect model had lower DIC than the simple
 305 mass action (Table 1) and higher correlation with the snakebites and incidence data (refuge
 306 effect, $r = 0.67$, d.f. = 128, $P = 0$; simple mass action, $r = 0.61$; d.f. = 137; $P = 0$), suggesting at
 307 face value a better fit. We considered that the remaining formulated models were all
 308 unsuitable as we failed to obtain reliable parameter estimates due to lack of MCMC
 309 convergence.

310 To select one model over another as the better one, we also took into account the statistical
 311 distribution of predicted incidence rates. The statistical distribution of the incidence rates
 312 produced by the refuge effect model was very different to the original incidence rate
 313 distribution (Supplementary materials, Figure S1 and S2). Therefore, we chose the simple
 314 mass action model. The number of snakebites and incidence patterns produced by this model
 315 were qualitatively very similar and had a statistical distribution nearly identical to that of the
 316 data.

317 **Table 1.** Disease transmission terms tested representing functional relationships between snakes and humans and resulting in snakebite. Each term has been previously
318 applied in various settings for infectious disease studies so here we list only the earliest reference for each. DIC = deviance information criterion, pD = potential degrees of
319 freedom, H = humans, S = snakes, β = contact rate. Missing DIC values means that we could not obtain a converged model, so DIC values were not comparable with those
320 of converged models.

Tranmission term	Discrete time form $F(H, S, \theta)$	Name and description	Source	DIC, pD*
βHS	$1 - \exp(-\beta S)$	Simple mass action. $H \times S$ is the total number of possible contacts	[30]	17484, 20.02
$\beta H^p S^q$	$1 - \exp(-\beta H^p S^q)$	Power. Similar to mass action, but p and q take values 0, 1, and increase or decrease the number of contacts of S in relation to H and vice-versa.	[39]	---
$\beta H (S - H/q_h)$	$1 - \exp(-\beta (S/H - 1/q_h))$	Refuge effect on S. Parameter q represents the fraction of snakes exposed to humans depending on the number of humans present	[40]	---

$\beta S (H - S/q_s)$	$1 - \exp(-\beta S (1 - S/(q_s \cdot H)))$	Refuge effect on H. Parameter q represents the fraction of humans exposed to snakes depending on the number of snakes present	[40]	17062, 26.0
$\beta HS \cdot \left\{ \frac{\frac{S}{1-\varepsilon + \varepsilon S}}{H} \right. \left. \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon + \varepsilon H} \right\}$	$1 - \exp \left(-\beta S \cdot \left\{ \frac{\frac{S}{H-\varepsilon H + \varepsilon HS}}{1} \right. \left. \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon + \varepsilon H} \right\} \right)$	Separate asymptotic term on H or S , where $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$. When parameter $\varepsilon = 0$, the expression reduces to the simple mass action model, otherwise the effect of H or S becomes asymptotic.	[41]	---
$\beta HS \cdot \left\{ \frac{\frac{1}{c + S}}{1} \right. \left. \frac{1}{c + H} \right\}$	$1 - \exp \left(-\beta S \cdot \left\{ \frac{\frac{1}{cH + SH}}{1} \right. \left. \frac{1}{cH + H^2} \right\} \right)$	Asymptotic on H or S . Parameter c represents the number of S or H at which 50% of the contacts occur.	[41]	---

322 The spatial version of the simple mass action model converged with 1M iterations, and had an
 323 even higher correlation with Ediriweera et al. [23]'s estimates, $r = 0.87$ (d. f. = 81, $P = 0$) for
 324 incidence and $r = 0.97$ (d. f. = 29, $P = 0$) for the number of bites (Figure 2).

325 The decomposition of contact rates that worked best was estimating a contact rate for each
 326 snake species and correcting snake abundance in relation to human population density by
 327 land cover class and log-transforming human population density:

$$328 \quad \beta(H, L) = \exp(\beta_{0(l)} + \beta_{1(l)} \ln(H)^2) \quad 4.1)$$

329 All the parameters of the spatial and non-spatial simple mass action model converged (Table
 330 2) and did not exceed the very strict threshold of 1.05 of the Gelman test (very similar
 331 variances between and within chains; Supplementary materials, Table S1). The estimated
 332 effects of humans on snake abundance resulted in different responses of incidence rates to
 333 human population and snake abundance in each land cover class (Figure 3).

Table 2. Parameter estimates for the mass action models for snakebites. $\beta_{i,l}$ parameters are those of the function of human population density to adjust total snake abundance in relation to humans in each land cover class. r_l are the negative binomial dispersion parameter for each land cover class. B_s are the estimated contact rates for each snake species after adjusting the point intensities for relative abundances and weighting for aggressiveness behaviour. The star * indicates the parameters whose 95% credible intervals do not contain zero (only relevant to $\beta_{i,l}$). Rows with grey background show estimates for the spatial version of the model.

θ	Median (S. D.)							
	Agriculture		Degraded		Forest		Tea	
$\beta_{0,l}$	-12.9 (0.19)*		-12.84 (0.2)*		-13.18 (0.21)*		-11.91 (0.26)*	
	-12.9 (0.11)*		-12.87 (0.11)*		-13.11 (0.12)*		-11.84 (0.15)*	
$\beta_{1,l}$	-0.004 (0.001)*		-0.005 (0.001)*		-0.000 (0.002)		-0.017 (0.002)*	
	-0.004 (0.001)*		-0.006 (0.001)*		-0.001 (0.001)		-0.018 (0.001)*	
r_l	23,70 (2.95)		16.82 (1,13)		9.32 (1,16)		7,18 (0.69)	
	34.47 (2.33)		23.56 (0.91)		13.25 (0.93)		9.39 (0.56)	
B_s	<i>B. caeruleus</i>	<i>B. ceylonicus</i>	<i>D. russelli</i>	<i>E. carinatus</i>	<i>H. spp</i>	<i>N. naja</i>	<i>T. trig.</i>	
	3.48 (0.56)	5.30 (2.85)	1.17 (0.37)	2.99 (1.07)	0.036 (0.02)	8.48 (1.29)	0.17 (0.16)	
	4.34 (0.48)	5.58 (2.26)	1.72 (0.39)	2.81 (0.97)	0.047 (0.015)	3.51 (0.69)	0.14 (0.11)	

Model parameters

Parameters of the correction of snake abundance in relation to human population density ($\beta_{0,l}$ and $\beta_{1(l)}$, equation 4.1) were all significantly negative (Table 2), indicating that humans tend to decrease snake abundance in all land cover classes. Also, given significant differences between land cover classes, the effect of humans on snakes depends on predominant land cover class. The largest effect was estimated for *tea* and *urban* cover (snakes decrease faster with human population density), intermediate in *forest* and *degraded forest*, and smallest in *agriculture* (snakes decrease the least with human population density, Table 2).

Regarding individual species' contact rates, the Indian cobra (*Naja naja*) had the highest estimated rate, followed by the Ceylon krait (*Bungarus ceylonicus*) and the common krait (*B. caeruleus*). The lowest contact rate was estimated for the hump-nosed viper (*Hypnale spp*). These contact rates showed no relationship with species' relative abundances, indicating that factors not represented in the decomposed contact rates (i.e., frequency of venom injection, time of activity aligned with human activities) are critical but unobserved determinants of risk patterns. Note, that the estimated rates are not statements of how frequently humans encounter them. Estimated parameters should only be interpreted as indices of species' importance for snakebites relative to their abundance and that of humans where they occur. Also, these parameters are negatively correlated with those estimated to adjust abundance in relation to humans. Every order of magnitude of increase in the size of the B_s contact rates must be accompanied by an absolute decrease in log-scale of the value of $\beta_{0(l)}$ parameter of equation 4.1 (e.g. $B_s \times 10 \rightarrow \beta_{0(l)} - \ln(10)$, or $B_s \div 10 \rightarrow \beta_{0(l)} + \ln(10)$), allowing the interpretations above for the individual species. The magnitude of these parameters indicates the average number of snakes in logarithmic scale that are lost for every human, resulting in faster declines in *urban* land cover, and slowest in *agriculture* (Table 2). The effect of both humans and snakes on snakebite incidence in each land cover class is represented visually in Figure 3.

Envenoming model

The fact that the random-intercept envenoming model (equation 3.2) was the more adequate, indicated that land cover influenced the probability that a snakebite resulted in envenoming. The correlation between envenoming incidence predicted by the spatial model and the data was $r = 0.85$ (d. f. = 23, $P = 0$; Figure 4, right panel) and for the number of envenoming cases was $r = 0.93$ (d.f. = 9, $P = 0$; Figure 4, top left panel). Convergence statistics for the spatial model are given in Supplementary materials Table S2 and Figure S4.

The snake species that had the largest significantly positive fitted effect on the probability of envenoming was *Bungarus caeruleus*, indicating that this species explains most of the spatial heterogeneity of the probability that bites result in envenoming in Sri Lanka (Table 3). *D. russellii* and *N. naja* also had significant effects in the outcome of snakebites but were significantly negative, indicating that risk of envenoming after a bite decreased with their predicted abundances (we address this counter-intuitive result in the Discussion). The remaining species' effects were not significantly different from zero, indicating that their contributions towards envenoming cannot be distinguished from random (Table 3).

Table 3. Parameter estimates of the model for probability of envenoming. *Intercept* are the estimated effects of each land cover, and B_s are snake species' effects. The * symbol indicates that the 95% credible intervals of posterior samples do not contain zero. Rows with grey background show estimates for the spatial version of the model.

θ	Median (S. D.)									
	Agriculture		Degraded		Forest		Tea		Urban	
Int	0.255 (0.07)*		-0.394 (0.05)*		0.056 (0.07)		-0.72 (0.04)*		0.59 (0.17)*	
	-0.05 (0.04)		-0.33 (0.03) *		-0.23 (0.05)*		-0.48 (0.03) *		0.53 (0.11)*	
B_S	<i>B. caeruleus</i>	<i>B. ceylonicus</i>	<i>D. russelli</i>	<i>E. carinatus</i>	<i>H. spp</i>	<i>N. naja</i>	<i>T.trig.</i>			
	280.14 (13.99)*	-15.77 (32.12)	-97.34 (28.4)*	5.49 (31.91)	-24.546 (23.74)	-290.34 (29.84)*	-2.88 (31.80)			
	197.88 (13.41)*	-3.86 (31.68)	-165.129 (25.61)*	5.22 (31.98)	-34.24 (19.77)	-373.43 (27.66) *	-1.64 (31.59)			
r	18.59 (1.09)									
	49.69 (0.41)									

Land cover classes also had significant effects on the probability that snakebites resulted in

387 envenoming. *Agriculture*, had the largest significantly positive effect followed by *urban*.
 388 *Degraded forest* had the largest significantly negative effect, followed by *tea*. The only land
 389 cover class with a non-significant effect was *forest*, which suggested that envenoming after a
 390 snakebite is more likely to be a function of the biting snake than of the environmental or
 391 social context of snake-bitten people in *forest* environments (Table 3, and see discussion on
 392 the role of land cover).

393 Discussion

394 Mathematical models have been critical tools for understanding and controlling the
 395 transmission of zoonotic diseases, but despite many ecological and epidemiological
 396 similarities few such models exist for snakebite (e. g. [9]). Here, we mapped snakebite and
 397 envenoming incidence using a mathematical model that represents human-snake interactions
 398 and their outcomes, adapting a mass action model usually applied to the transmission of
 399 infectious diseases [30]. We treated venom as pathogenic agent transmitted between
 400 venomous snakes and susceptible humans, and tested various functional relationships
 401 describing the human-snake contact process and its outcomes. Incidence rates were
 402 successfully mapped by estimating contact rates between all medically relevant snakes of Sri
 403 Lanka and humans, and by accounting for human and snake factors known to be important
 404 determinants of snakebite and envenoming incidence. Human factors included social,
 405 economic and cultural by categorising parameters by land cover, which serves as a powerful
 406 socio-economic proxy [29]. Snake factors included biological characteristics of the different
 407 species, like aggressiveness and severity of the envenoming illness. Furthermore, parameters
 408 in the model are sensitive to climate, land cover and topography via their effects on snake
 409 population estimates [28]. As such, we have developed a generalisable epidemiological model
 410 for snakebite that could be transferrable (given local data) to other time frames to forecast.

Predicting spatial and temporal patterns (including future changes) of snakebite risk is possible with purely statistical methods or by focusing only on one or two components of snakebite risk (e.g., [18,42]). An advantage of our approach, however, is that it is process-based and generalisable, explicitly capturing the relevant snakebite processes (e.g., human-snake contact patterns, biological traits of venomous species) to predict epidemiologically meaningful measures of snakebite risk. Such an approach may be more transferrable (i.e., when forecasting burden in other regions) and better suited to forecasting impacts of global change (e.g., including climate change, land-use change and socio-economic development), where a number of complex and potentially interactive mechanisms could push burden in different directions. However, the success of such applications still depends on the availability of relevant data to parameterise the model.

In particular, snake occurrence records and behavioural trait data were the raw material upon which we built our model [28]. Hence developing, improving and applying similar frameworks in other regions requires reliable occurrence data in relation to human population density as well as improved ecological information on venomous snakes [28,43], both of which can be regarded as high priorities for future work [44].

To the best of our knowledge, the only previous study of a mathematical model for snakebite comparable to ours, is Bravo-Vega et al. [9]. We considerably extend their approach by decomposing contact rates to incorporate both human and snake factors. The first snake aspect of the decomposed contact rate β represents known (aggressiveness $-A_s-$ and envenoming $-E_s-$ indices) and unknown biological aspects (estimated statistically) of multiple species. The unknown estimated snake factors are likely related to the alignment of human-snake activity periods (Table 2 for snakebite model; [26]) and species' propensities to inject venom during a bite (Table 3 for envenoming model; [20,45]). Also, the estimated parameters summarise snake species' biologies and how these relate to human social, economic,

occupational and cultural aspects relevant for snakebite epidemiology. For instance, rice paddy farmers are more susceptible to Russel's viper bites (*Daboia russelii*) because rice is usually harvested barefoot in Sri Lanka [46,47]; common krait (*Bungarus caeruleus*) bites occur among the poorest of the poor while victims are asleep on the floor [46]; while *Hypnale spp.* envenoming victims are mostly women who are traditionally in charge of home garden maintenance where this species inhabits leaf litter [48]. These examples show how species' effects on snakebite are intertwined with human socioeconomic and cultural factors.

The second aspect of the decomposed contact rate was the adjustment of snake abundance as a function of land cover and human population density. Here, land cover may represent predominant occupation and socioeconomic status [29], both of which are known to be important snakebite risk factors [22]. Furthermore, we found that the probability that snakebites result in envenoming (Table 3) is also significantly influenced by land cover, especially in urban and agricultural areas. The latter is supported by empirical evidence, as agricultural workers are at greatest risk of snakebite envenoming [22,49]. Consequently, the estimated effects by land cover class summarise snake responses to humans, and effects of human factors such as agricultural occupation and economic status on snakebite and envenoming incidences.

In contrast with the conceptual and theoretical strengths of our approach, important questions arise to address in future work, for instance: 1) should models be developed with field data instead of estimates? 2) How does uncertainty and artefacts of incidence estimates affect selection and estimates of our model? 3) Why do highly medically-important species' decrease the probability that bites are envenoming? First question, we infer that a suitable model for field-collected data may be simpler than ours, for which snake abundance estimates in relation to humans should be more robust than currently available [28]. The second point is likely to affect uncertainty of our results, but we interpret the very high similarity between

461 results as an indication of robustness because most data were independent, apart from
 462 human population density, which we discussed above [23]. Finally the negative coefficients
 463 estimated for *D. russelii* and *N. naja* (Table 3) indicate that the probability that a bite results
 464 in envenoming decreases when these species are more abundant. Such a negative relationship
 465 is unexpected as both are considered among the primary cause of snakebites in Sri Lanka
 466 [50]. However, these contradictory estimates may result from the east vs west difference in
 467 envenoming incidence in Sri Lanka (Figure 4). Envenoming burden is much higher in eastern
 468 than western Sri Lanka, but both species are nearly equally abundant on either side [28].
 469 Hence their abundances cannot explain the east vs west spatial heterogeneity of
 470 envenomings, making estimation of their effects difficult with the methods used here.
 471 Alternatively, the estimated negative effects for these species could arise if the predicted
 472 abundances of *N. naja* and *D. russelii* actually serve as proxies for the abundances of non-
 473 envenoming species. Abundance surrogacy is relatively common among habitat generalists
 474 [51] and non-envenoming snakes are commonly involved in snakebite cases [52], resulting in
 475 decreasing risk with the abundance of those non-medically relevant species.

476 With careful consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of our approach, we encourage
 477 applying and testing our framework in data poor geographical areas for predicting risk in the
 478 absence of other data (e.g., national community survey data) or for testing mitigation
 479 interventions. Doing so, however, does require some baseline data as inputs. As mentioned
 480 above, the first requirement is a collection of geographical occurrence data of venomous
 481 snakes to estimate abundance patterns. Methods and concepts for the analysis of this kind of
 482 data in relation to the environment are well established and are described elsewhere (e. g.
 483 [53]), and here we used point process models (PPMs) for this purpose given important
 484 limitations noted for other common distribution modelling methods (e.g., Maxent) [28,54].
 485 Second is to include some key snake biological/behavioural characteristics for the
 486 decomposed contact rates. Relevant traits include aggressiveness, overlap of activity periods

487 with humans [26], venom toxicity to humans and propensity to inject venom after a bite [20].
 488 Lastly, socioeconomic and demographic data may also be used if associated risk factors are
 489 well known in the study region. Predictions obtained with the suggested approach will not
 490 necessarily represent incidence rates or another measure of burden, but are likely to be
 491 broadly correlated with them [28].

492 Achieving the burden reduction goals laid out in the snakebite roadmap (reducing burden by
 493 50% by 2050; [11]) is an exceptionally ambitious target, requiring advances to our basic
 494 understanding of snakebite epidemiology and its treatment. As for other zoonotic diseases,
 495 global changes are likely already influencing snakebite and envenoming dynamics, and
 496 efficient management will need to accommodate for such changes. However, unlike for many
 497 zoonoses, few tools currently exist for snakebite that both shed light on its mechanistic
 498 underpinnings and provide avenues for burden mapping and prediction under scenarios of
 499 global change or for testing interventions. Reframing snakebite as a zoonotic disease has
 500 considerably improved our understanding of its epidemiology: it is a dynamic process, its
 501 burden is the result of the effects of humans on the abundance of snakes and both affect the
 502 burden of snakebite envenoming. The ecological footprint of humans, via land use, represents
 503 key characteristics of local populations that are related to snakebite levels. All these factors,
 504 and the nature of snake models used, make our model a simple, yet effective tool to forecast
 505 the impacts of global environmental change on snakebite burden. Such exercises are
 506 necessary to develop relevant interventions for the present and into the future to solve the
 507 snakebite crisis.

508 **Acknowledgements**

509 We thank Dr. Peter J. Diggle and Dr. Christl Donnelly for feedback on late stages of the
 510 manuscript. This research was funded by the Medical Research Council grant number
 511 MP/P024513/1, obtained by KM, TI, DGL, HJdeS, and PJD.

512 **Conflict of interest**

513 Authors have no competing financial interests or of any other nature to disclose.

514 **Data availability**

515 Data and code are currently hosted in the repository

516 <https://github.com/gerardommc/Snakebite-zoonotic-transmission> and will be archived in

517 Zenodo upon publication.

518 **References**

- 519 1. Warrell DA. Snake bite. The Lancet. 2010;375: 77–88. doi:10.1016/S0140-
520 6736(09)61754-2
- 521 2. Kasturiratne A, Wickremasinghe AR, De Silva N, Gunawardena NK, Pathmeswaran A,
522 Premaratna R, et al. The global burden of snakebite: A literature analysis and modelling
523 based on regional estimates of envenoming and deaths. PLoS Medicine. 2008;5: 1591–
524 1604. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050218
- 525 3. World Health Organization. Neglected tropical diseases. In: Neglected tropical diseases
526 [Internet]. 2017. Available: https://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/diseases/en/
- 527 4. Minghui R, Malecela MN, Cooke E, Abela-Ridder B. WHO's Snakebite Envenoming
528 Strategy for prevention and control. The Lancet Global Health. 2019;7: e837–e838.
529 doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30225-6
- 530 5. Hollingsworth TD, Langley I, Nokes DJ, Macpherson EE, McGivern G, Adams ER, et al.
531 Infectious disease and health systems modelling for local decision making to control
532 neglected tropical diseases. BMC Proc. 2015;9: S6. doi:10.1186/1753-6561-9-S10-S6
- 533 6. Mahmoud A, Zerhouni E. Neglected Tropical Diseases: Moving Beyond Mass Drug
534 Treatment To Understanding The Science. Health Affairs. 2009;28: 1726–1733.
535 doi:10.1377/hlthaff.28.6.1726
- 536 7. Bockarie MJ, Pedersen EM, White GB, Michael E. Role of Vector Control in the Global
537 Program to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis. Annu Rev Entomol. 2009;54: 469–487.
538 doi:10.1146/annurev.ento.54.110807.090626
- 539 8. Cliquet F, Scott TP, Levy MZ, McDonald R. Zero human deaths from dog-mediated rabies
540 by 2030: perspectives from quantitative and mathematical modelling. Gates Open
541 Research. 3: 1–18. doi:<https://doi.org/10.12688/gatesopenres.13074.2>
- 542 9. Bravo-Vega CA, Cordovez JM, Renjifo-Ibáñez C, Santos-Vega M, Sasa M. Estimating
543 snakebite incidence from mathematical models: A test in Costa Rica. Bottazzi ME, editor.
544 PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019;13: e0007914. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007914

- 545 10. Wellcome Trust. Snakebites: making treatments safe, effective and accessible | Wellcome.
546 2019 [cited 1 Sep 2020]. Available: [https://wellcome.ac.uk/what-we-do/our-](https://wellcome.ac.uk/what-we-do/our-work/snakebites)
547 [work/snakebites](https://wellcome.ac.uk/what-we-do/our-work/snakebites)
- 548 11. World Health Organization. Snakebite envenoming: A strategy for prevention and
549 control. Geneva (Switzerland): World Health Organization; 2019 p. 70. Report No.: 1.
550 Available: <https://www.who.int/snakebites/resources/9789241515641/en/>
- 551 12. Babo Martins S, Bolon I, Chappuis F, Ray N, Alcoba G, Ochoa C, et al. Snakebite and its
552 impact in rural communities: The need for a One Health approach. de Silva J, editor. PLoS
553 Negl Trop Dis. 2019;13: e0007608. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007608
- 554 13. Plowright RK, Parrish CR, McCallum H, Hudson PJ, Ko AI, Graham AL, et al. Pathways to
555 zoonotic spillover. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2017;15: 502–510.
556 doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2017.45
- 557 14. Lloyd-Smith JO, George D, Pepin KM, Pitzer VE, Pulliam JRC, Dobson AP, et al. Epidemic
558 Dynamics at the Human-Animal Interface. Science. 2009;326: 1362–1367.
559 doi:10.1126/science.1177345
- 560 15. Plowright RK, Eby P, Hudson PJ, Smith I, Westcott D, Bryden W, et al. Ecological dynamics
561 of emerging bat virus spillover. Proceedings B. 2015;282.
- 562 16. Field HE, de Jong C, Melville D, Smith C, Smith I, Broos A, et al. Hendra virus infection
563 dynamics in Australian fruit bats. PloS one. 2011;6: e28678.
564 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0028678
- 565 17. Yañez-Arenas C, Peterson AT, Mokondoko P, Rojas-Soto O, Martínez-Meyer E. The use of
566 ecological niche modeling to infer potential risk areas of snakebite in the Mexican State
567 of Veracruz. PLoS ONE. 2014;9. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100957
- 568 18. Yañez-Arenas C, Townsend Peterson A, Rodríguez-Medina K, Barve N. Mapping current
569 and future potential snakebite risk in the new world. Climatic Change. 2016;134: 697–
570 711. doi:10.1007/s10584-015-1544-6
- 571 19. Chaves LF, Chuang T-W, Sasa M, María Gutiérrez J. Snakebites are associated with
572 poverty, weather fluctuations, and El Niño. Science. 2015;1: 7.
573 doi:10.1126/sciadv.1500249
- 574 20. Pucca MB, Knudsen C, S. Oliveira I, Rimbault C, A. Cerni F, Wen FH, et al. Current
575 Knowledge on Snake Dry Bites. Toxins. 2020;12: 668. doi:10.3390/toxins12110668
- 576 21. Gerardo CJ, Vissoci JRN, Evans CS, Simel DL, Lavonas EJ. Does This Patient Have a Severe
577 Snake Envenomation?: The Rational Clinical Examination Systematic Review. JAMA Surg.
578 2019;154: 346. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2018.5069
- 579 22. Harrison RA, Hargreaves A, Wagstaff SC, Faragher B, Lalloo DG. Snake envenoming: A
580 disease of poverty. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases. 2009;3.
581 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0000569
- 582 23. Ediriweera DS, Kasturiratne A, Pathmeswaran A, Gunawardena NK, Wijayawickrama BA,
583 Jayamanne SF, et al. Mapping the Risk of Snakebite in Sri Lanka - A National Survey with

- 584 Geospatial Analysis. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases. 2016;10: 1–14.
585 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004813
- 586 24. Molesworth AM, Harrison R, Theakston RDG, Laloo DG. Geographic information system
587 mapping of snakebite incidence in northern Ghana and Nigeria using environmental
588 indicators: A preliminary study. Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine
589 and Hygiene. 2003;97: 188–192. doi:10.1016/S0035-9203(03)90115-5
- 590 25. Laxme SRR, Khochare S, de Souza HF, Ahuja B, Suranse V, Martin G, et al. Beyond the ‘big
591 four’: Venom profiling of the medically important yet neglected Indian snakes reveals
592 disturbing antivenom deficiencies. Billiald P, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019;13:
593 e0007899. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007899
- 594 26. Goldstein E, Erinjery JJ, Martin G, Kasturiratne A, Ediriweera DS, de Silva HJ, et al.
595 Integrating human behavior and snake ecology with agent-based models to predict
596 snakebite in high risk landscapes. Habib AG, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021;15:
597 e0009047. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009047
- 598 27. McCallum H, Barlow N, Hone J. How should pathogen transmission be modelled? TRENDS
599 in Ecology and Evolution. 2001;16: 295–300.
- 600 28. Martín G, Erinjery JJ, Gumbs, Rikki, Somaweera, Ruchira, Ediriweera, Dileepa, Diggle,
601 Peter J., et al. Integrating snake distribution, abundance and expert-derived behavioural
602 traits predicts snakebite risk. Journal of Applied Ecology. In-Review.
- 603 29. Ganzeboom HBG, De Graaf PM, Treiman DJ. A standard international socio-economic
604 index of occupational status. Social Science Research. 1992;21: 1–56. doi:10.1016/0049-
605 089X(92)90017-B
- 606 30. Anderson RM, May RM. Infectious Diseases Of Humans. 1st ed. Oxford Science
607 Publications. New York: Oxford University Press; 1992.
- 608 31. Plummer M. JAGS: A program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs
609 sampling. 2003.
- 610 32. Keeling MJ, Rohani P. Modelling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals. 1st ed. New
611 Jersey: Princeton University Press; 2007.
- 612 33. Harcourt AH, Parks SA, Woodroffe R. Human density as an influence on species/area
613 relationships: double jeopardy for small African reserves? Biodiversity and Conservation.
614 2001;10: 1011–1026. doi:10.1023/A:1016680327755
- 615 34. Baillie JEM, Hilton-Taylor C, Stuart SN. A Global Species Assessment. International Union
616 for the Conservation of Nature; 2004 p. 217. Available:
617 [http://lib.riskreductionafrica.org/bitstream/handle/123456789/423/a%20global%20s](http://lib.riskreductionafrica.org/bitstream/handle/123456789/423/a%20global%20species%20assessment.%202004.pdf?sequence=1)
618 [pecies%20assessment.%202004.pdf?sequence=1](http://lib.riskreductionafrica.org/bitstream/handle/123456789/423/a%20global%20species%20assessment.%202004.pdf?sequence=1)
- 619 35. Spiegelhalter DJ, Best NG, Carlin BP, van der Linde A. Bayesian Measures of Model
620 Complexity and Fit. Journal of the Royal Society of Statistics. 2002;64: 583–639.
- 621 36. Brooks SP, Gelman A. General methods for monitoring convergence of iterative
622 simulations. Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics. 1998;7: 434–455.

- 623 37. Clifford P, Richardson S, Hemon D. Assessing the Significance of the Correlation between
624 Two Spatial Processes. *Biometrics*. 1989;45: 123–134. doi:10.2307/2532039
- 625 38. de Valpine P, Turek D, Paciorek CJ, Anderson-Bergman C, Temple Lang D, Bodik R.
626 Programming with models: writing statistical algorithms for general model structures
627 with NIMBLE. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*. 2017;26: 403–417.
628 doi:10.1080/10618600.2016.1172487
- 629 39. Severo NC. Generalizations of some stochastic epidemic models. *Mathematical*
630 *Biosciences*. 1969;4: 367–394.
- 631 40. Barlow ND. A Spatially Aggregated Disease / Host Model for Bovine Tb in New Zealand
632 Possum Populations. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. 1991;28: 777–793.
- 633 41. Diekmann O, Kretschmar M. Patterns in the effects of infectious diseases on population
634 growth. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*. 1991;29: 539–570.
- 635 42. Zacarias D, Loyola R. Climate change impacts on the distribution of venomous snakes and
636 snakebite risk in Mozambique. *Climatic Change*. 2019;152: 195–207.
637 doi:10.1007/s10584-018-2338-4
- 638 43. Longbottom J, Shearer FM, Devine M, Alcoba G, Chappuis F, Weiss DJ, et al. Vulnerability
639 to snakebite envenoming: a global mapping of hotspots. *The Lancet*. 2018;392: 673–684.
640 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31224-8
- 641 44. Murray KA, Martin G, Iwamura T. Focus on snake ecology to fight snakebite. *The Lancet*.
642 2020;395: e14. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)32510-3
- 643 45. Naik BS. “Dry bite” in venomous snakes: A review. *Toxicon*. 2017;133: 63–67.
644 doi:10.1016/j.toxicon.2017.04.015
- 645 46. Kularatne S. Common krait (*Bungarus caeruleus*) bite in Anuradhapura, Sri Lanka: a
646 prospective clinical study, 1996-98. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*. 2002;78: 276–280.
647 doi:10.1136/pmj.78.919.276
- 648 47. Silva A, Marikar F, Murugananthan A, Agampodi S. Awareness and perceptions on
649 prevention, first aid and treatment of snakebites among Sri Lankan farmers: a knowledge
650 practice mismatch? *J Occup Med Toxicol*. 2014;9: 20. doi:10.1186/1745-6673-9-20
- 651 48. Sawant NS, Jadhav TD, Shyama SK. Habitat suitability, threats and conservation strategies
652 of Hump-nosed Pit Viper *Hypnale hypnale* Merrem (Reptilia: Viperidae) found in
653 Western Ghats, Goa, India. *J Threat Taxa*. 2010;2: 1261–1267.
654 doi:10.11609/JoTT.o2490.1261-7
- 655 49. Pierini SV, Warrell DA, De Paulo A, Theakston RDG. High incidence of bites and stings by
656 snakes and other animals among rubber tappers and amazonian indians of the Juruá
657 Valley, Acre State, Brazil. *Toxicon*. 1996;34: 225–236. doi:10.1016/0041-
658 0101(95)00125-5
- 659 50. Kasturiratne A, Pathmeswaran A, Fonseka M, Lalloo D, Brooker S, de Silva H. ESTIMATES
660 OF DISEASE BURDEN DUE TO LAND-SNAKE BITE IN SRI LANKAN HOSPITALS.
661 *SOUTHEAST ASIAN J TROP MED PUBLIC HEALTH*. 2005;36: 8.

- 662 51. Cushman SA, McKELVEY KS, Noon BR, McGARIGAL K. Use of Abundance of One Species
663 as a Surrogate for Abundance of Others: Evaluating Species Surrogacy. *Conservation*
664 *Biology*. 2010;24: 830–840. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01396.x
- 665 52. Thalgaspitiya S, Isbister G, Ukuwela K, Sarathchandra C, Senanayake H, Lokunarangoda
666 N, et al. Bites by snakes of lesser medical importance in a cohort of snakebite patients
667 from rural Sri Lanka. *Toxicon*. 2020;187: 105–110. doi:10.1016/j.toxicon.2020.08.025
- 668 53. Renner IW, Elith J, Baddeley AJ, Fithian W, Hastie T, Phillips SJ, et al. Point process models
669 for presence-only analysis. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*. 2015;6: 366–379.
670 doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12352
- 671 54. Isaac NJB, Jarzyna MA, Keil P, Dambly LI, Boersch-Supan PH, Browning E, et al. Data
672 Integration for Large-Scale Models of Species Distributions. *Trends in Ecology &*
673 *Evolution*. 2020;35: 56–67. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2019.08.006

Figure 1

Snakebite incidence

Random effects

RMSE

Number of snakebites

Estimates residuals

Survey data residuals

Figure 2

Figure 3

Envenoming incidence

Random effects

RMSE

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.01.21264438>; this version posted October 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Number of envenomings

Estimates residuals

Survey data residuals

Figure 4