

1 **Estimation of Rift Valley fever virus spillover to humans during the Mayotte**  
2 **2018-2019 epidemic**

3 Raphaëlle Métras<sup>\*a,b,c</sup>, W John Edmunds<sup>d</sup>, Chouanibou Youssouffi<sup>e</sup>, Laure Dommergues<sup>f</sup>,  
4 Guillaume Fournié<sup>g</sup>, Anton Camacho<sup>d,h</sup>, Sebastian Funk<sup>d</sup>, Eric Cardinale<sup>b,i</sup>, Gilles Le Godais<sup>j</sup>,  
5 Sohibou Combo<sup>j</sup>, Laurent Filleul<sup>k</sup>, Hassani Youssouf<sup>†k</sup>, Marion Subiros<sup>†k</sup>

6 † these authors share last authorship

7 <sup>a</sup> Inserm, Sorbonne Université, Institut Pierre Louis d'Épidémiologie et de Santé Publique  
8 (IPLESP), 27 rue de Chaligny, 75012 Paris, France.

9 <sup>b</sup> CIRAD, UMR ASTRE, Campus International de Baillarguet, 34398 Montpellier, France

10 <sup>c</sup> ASTRE, Univ Montpellier (I-MUSE), CIRAD, INRA, 34398 Montpellier, France

11 <sup>d</sup> Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, Department of Infectious Disease  
12 Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street WC1E 7HT,  
13 London, United Kingdom

14 <sup>e</sup> GSD Mayotte-Coopérative Agricole des Eleveurs Mahorais, 97670 Coconi, Mayotte, France

15 <sup>f</sup> La Coopération Agricole, 43 rue Sedaine, F-75538 Paris, France

16 <sup>g</sup> Veterinary Epidemiology, Economics and Public Health group, Department of Pathobiology and  
17 Population Sciences, The Royal Veterinary College, Hatfield, United Kingdom

18 <sup>h</sup> Epicentre, 14-34 avenue Jean Jaurès, 75019 Paris, France

19 <sup>i</sup> CIRAD, UMR ASTRE, F-97490 Sainte Clotilde, La Réunion, France

20 <sup>j</sup> Direction de l'Alimentation, de l'Agriculture et de la Forêt de Mayotte, Mamoudzou, France

21 <sup>k</sup> Santé Publique France, Mamoudzou, Mayotte, France

22 \* Corresponding author: Raphaëlle Métras

23 Institut Pierre Louis d'Epidémiologie et de Santé Publique (iPLesp)

24 Team 1: Communicable diseases Surveillance and Modelling

25 UMR-S 1136 | Inserm, Sorbonne Université

26 27 rue de Chaligny 75012 Paris

27 Email: [raphaelle.metras@inserm.fr](mailto:raphaelle.metras@inserm.fr)

## 28 **Abstract**

29 Rift Valley fever (RVF) is an emerging, zoonotic, arboviral haemorrhagic fever threatening  
30 livestock and humans mainly in Africa. RVF is of global concern, having expanded its  
31 geographical range over the last decades. The impact of control measures on epidemic dynamics  
32 using empirical data has not been assessed. Here, we combined seroprevalence livestock and  
33 human RVF case data from the 2018-2019 epidemic in Mayotte, with a dynamic mathematical  
34 model. Using a Bayesian inference framework, we estimated viral transmission potential amongst  
35 livestock, and spillover from livestock to humans, through both direct contact and vector-mediated  
36 routes. Model simulations were used to assess the impact of vaccination on reducing the human  
37 epidemic size. Reactive vaccination immunising 20% of the livestock population reduced the  
38 number of human cases by 30%. To achieve a similar impact, delaying the vaccination by one  
39 month required using 50% more vaccine doses, and vaccinating only humans required 20 times  
40 as more as the number of doses for livestock. Finally, with 53.92% (95%CrI [44.76-61.29]) of  
41 livestock estimated to be immune at the end of the epidemic wave, viral re-emergence in the next  
42 rainy season (2019-2020) was unlikely. We present the first mathematical model for RVF fitted to  
43 real-world data to estimate virus transmission parameters, and able to inform potential control  
44 programmes. Human and animal health surveillance, and timely livestock vaccination appear to  
45 be key in reducing disease risk in humans. We furthermore demonstrate the value of a One  
46 Health quantitative approach to surveillance and control of zoonotic infectious diseases.

## 47 **Introduction**

48 Controlling zoonotic and vector-borne infections is complex, as it requires an accurate  
49 understanding of pathogen transmission within animal populations, and pathogen spillover to  
50 humans, whilst accounting for environmental factors affecting vector population dynamics (1,2).  
51 Rift Valley fever (RVF) is an emerging zoonotic arbovirolosis causing haemorrhagic fever. RVF is a  
52 threat for both animal and human health, mainly in Africa (3). Livestock (cattle, sheep and goats)  
53 are RVF virus amplifying hosts, acquiring infection through the bites of infectious mosquitoes  
54 (mainly *Aedes* spp. and *Culex* spp.) (4). Humans get infected by direct contact with infectious  
55 animal tissues (upon abortions or animal slaughter), although vector transmission may also play a  
56 role (4,5). Since 2015, RVF has been listed as a priority emerging disease by the WHO R&D  
57 Blueprint (6). A major concern is the expansion of its geographical range over recent decades  
58 (5,7). Current disease control options for reducing disease risk in humans heavily rely on  
59 controlling virus transmission in animal populations. The impact of disease control measures in  
60 livestock on reducing RVF risk in humans has not yet been assessed, and doing so requires  
61 estimating key transmission parameters between livestock, and from livestock to humans; using  
62 animal and human epidemiological data.

63 Mayotte, an island located in the South Western Indian Ocean region, reported a RVF epidemic  
64 in 2007-2008 (8). In a previous paper, we used longitudinal livestock seroprevalence data to  
65 model RVF virus emergence in the livestock population, and we estimated that the likelihood of  
66 re-emergence was very low in a closed ecosystem (i.e. without introduction of infectious animals).  
67 However, a few imported infectious animals could trigger another large epidemic, as the herd  
68 immunity declined due to livestock population turnover (9). In 2018, about ten years after the  
69 previous epidemic, RVF outbreaks were reported in several East African countries (e.g. Kenya,  
70 South Sudan, Uganda, Rwanda) (10,11). In Mayotte, between November 2018 and August 2019,  
71 a total of 143 human cases (RVF virus RT-PCR confirmed) were reported (Fig. 1A). The virus  
72 belongs to the Kenya-2 clade (12), which is closely related to the strains detected in recent  
73 outbreaks in Eastern Africa. The Veterinary Services of Mayotte, the regional health authorities  
74 (Agence de Santé Océan Indien) and the French Public Health Agency (Santé Publique France)  
75 did further epidemiological investigations to assess temporal patterns in occurrence of the  
76 infection in the animal population, and to identify possible routes of human exposure to RVF  
77 virus. These investigations generated a uniquely well documented RVF epidemic dataset,  
78 including RVF seroprevalence and incidence data in animal and humans.

79 We present these data and use them to extend and fit a mathematical model of RVF virus  
80 transmission in livestock (9), and explicitly account for viral spillover from livestock into the human  
81 population. We fit this model simultaneously to the infection patterns in livestock and human  
82 observed during the 2018-2019 epidemic, allowing for the first time, (i) to estimate the level of  
83 RVF virus transmission amongst livestock and spillover from livestock to humans by both direct  
84 contact and vector-mediated routes, (ii) to estimate the likelihood of another epidemic the  
85 following year, and (iii) to assess the impact of potential vaccination strategies in livestock and  
86 humans on reducing disease occurrence in humans.

## 87 **Results**

### 88 **The course of the epidemic in livestock and humans**

89 Between November 2018 and August 2019, 143 RVF human cases were reported. The epidemic  
90 peaked mid-February (February 11-17, 2019), with 18 weekly confirmed cases, six to seven  
91 weeks following the rainfall peak (Fig. 1A). About two-third of investigated cases reported a direct  
92 contact with livestock or its tissues (incl. milk consumption) (68%, n=86), whilst 32% (n= 41)  
93 reported no previous contact with animals (Fig 1A. cases in red and green, respectively).

94 Livestock sera (n=1,169) collected by the Veterinary Services between July 2018 and June 2019  
95 were tested against RVF IgG. To assess the timing of emergence of the virus in the livestock  
96 population, we plotted quarterly age-stratified RVF IgG prevalence, using only tested animals for  
97 which the date of birth was available (n=493). In July - September 2018, that is before the report  
98 of the first human case, most seropositive animals were in the oldest age groups (Fig. 1D),  
99 possibly indicating viral exposure during the previous re-emergence (9). The IgG seroprevalence  
100 increased in all age groups in January-March (Fig. 1E), and then in April-June 2019 (Fig. 1F),  
101 evidencing that the emergence of the virus in the livestock population, was coincident with the  
102 report of cases in humans.

103 Ongoing viral phylogenetic analyses on human derived-samples (12), and IgM positive livestock  
104 seized from informal trade between June and August 2018 (Table S1), suggest that the virus was  
105 likely introduced from Eastern Africa into Mayotte between June and August 2018, through the  
106 movements of infectious animals.

### 107 **Epidemic model**

108 We modelled virus transmission amongst livestock as a function of rainfall, therefore varying  
109 along the study period. RVF virus spillover from livestock to humans was modelled by both direct  
110 contact, assuming a time-invariant transmission rate, and vector-mediated transmission, defined  
111 as a function of rainfall (*see Methods*).

112 **Transmission parameters.** By fitting this model to the RVF datasets, the time-varying  
113 reproduction number in the livestock population was estimated to peak at  $R_s(t)=1.87$  (95%  
114 Credible Interval CrI [1.53-2.69]), in the second half of January (January 14-27, 2019) (Fig. S3),  
115 two weeks following the rainfall peak, and three to four weeks prior to the predicted epidemic  
116 peaks in livestock and humans (Fig. 2A). This corresponded to a transmission rate amongst  
117 livestock ( $\beta_{L-L}(t)$ ) at 8.92 per 100,000 livestock heads per day (95%CrI [1.09-7.77]). The  
118 spillover rate from livestock to humans by direct contact ( $\beta_{L-H}^C$ ) was estimated to 1.78 per 10  
119 million persons per day (95%CrI [1.29 – 2.61]) (Table S2), and the maximum values of the time-  
120 varying spillover transmission rate ( $\beta_{L-H}^V(t)$ ) was 1.33 per 10 million persons per day (95%CrI  
121 [2.25-8.46]).

122 **Model predictions.** Using the estimated parameters, the simulated number of human reported  
123 cases was 181 (95% CrI [138-233]), with two third resulting from direct contact (n=111, 95%CrI  
124 [80-149]) and one third from vector transmission (n=70, 95%CrI [44-102]) (Table 1), in agreement  
125 with the observed data (Fig. 1B-1C). The predicted age-stratified IgG seroprevalence in livestock  
126 between January and June 2019 were in good agreement with the observed data as well (Fig.  
127 1E-1F). The simulated incidence in livestock cases peaked mid-February (February, 11-17),

128 concomitantly with the peak in human vector-mediated transmission, whilst the number of human  
129 cases by direct contact reached its maximum values one week later (February, 18-24) (Fig. 2A).  
130 Finally, by the end of the epidemic wave, 18,460 (95%CrI [14,926-21,154]) animals were affected  
131 resulting in 53.92 % (95%CrI [44.76-61.29]) of the livestock population being immune (Fig. 2B  
132 and Table 1). The overall predicted number of human cases (both reported and not reported) was  
133 estimated to have reached 9,566 (95%CrI [7,793-11,772]), resulting in 3.73% (95%CrI [3.03-  
134 4.56]) of the human population being immune (Table 1).

135 In this setting, the likelihood of virus re-emergence the following rainy season (2019-2020) was  
136 less than 2.5% (Fig. 2A), with the time-varying effective reproductive number  $R_e(t)$  falling below  
137 unity following the epidemic peaks and remaining very close to or below unity over the second  
138 year of the simulations (Fig. 2C).

139 **Vaccination scenarios.** Probabilistic forecasts were also used to assess the impact of different  
140 livestock and humans vaccination strategies on the size of the epidemic in both animals and  
141 humans (Fig 3A-3D and Table 1). A reactive and mass vaccination campaign in livestock  
142 immediately after the report of the first human case (i.e. 6,000 doses in December 2018) allowed  
143 a reduction in the epidemic size by a third (median number of humans cases = 113 cases,  
144 median number of livestock cases = 11,447), while waiting one more month would have required  
145 50 % more vaccine doses to achieve a similar impact (9,000 doses in January 2019, median  
146 number of humans cases = 115, median number of livestock cases = 11,573). Finally, a  
147 vaccination programme targeting only humans would require immunising half of the population  
148 (128,250 doses in December 2018) to reduce similarly the number of human cases (median=115  
149 cases), whilst, of course, not impacting on the number of livestock cases.

## 150 **Discussion**

151 We present the first RVF epidemic dataset combining both livestock and human surveillance  
152 data, and use it to parameterise a mathematical model. We estimated, for the first time,  
153 transmission rates amongst livestock and spillover to humans using empirical epidemic data. This  
154 also allowed the quantitative assessment of the importance of timely livestock vaccination in  
155 reducing disease risk in humans during an epidemic, useful to inform potential control  
156 programmes, and illustrating the importance of One Health surveillance in the management of  
157 zoonotic diseases.

158 The IgM testing of illegally imported livestock suggested that the virus may have been introduced  
159 in Mayotte around June-August 2018, which is in agreement with the timing of RVF outbreaks on  
160 the East African mainland (11) and corresponds to the dry season in Mayotte. Viral transmission  
161 might have been maintained on the island at a low level in the dry season, or the virus might have  
162 been several times introduced, and the epidemic started only following the start of the rainy  
163 season (that is in October). The epidemic is likely to have therefore resulted from a recent viral  
164 re-introduction, rather than viral persistence over the last ten years, as concluded about the 2007-  
165 2008 epidemics, in a previous study (9).

166 The systematic testing by RT-PCR of humans showing dengue-like syndrome performed in  
167 Mayotte for the last ten years (since 2008), provides additional evidence that RVF had been  
168 absent from the Island for a decade, and that the presented epidemic curve accurately reflected  
169 its actual timing. During the epidemic, mitigation strategies such as vector control around houses  
170 of human cases (i.e. post-detection) and the diffusion of prevention messages on milk  
171 consumption and exposure to animals were communicated, from February 27<sup>th</sup> onwards (13), that  
172 is two weeks after the peak. Therefore, these measures are likely to have had a moderate impact  
173 on the epidemic size, whilst not affecting the time of the epidemic peak. In addition, the timing of  
174 the epidemic was corroborated by the observed changes in livestock seroprevalence, exhibiting a  
175 clear pattern of viral emergence. Most livestock sera (90%) were collected and tested as part of  
176 the regular annual surveillance campaign. As 10% of these samples were collected in areas  
177 reporting human cases, the proportion of seropositive animals may have been overestimated.  
178 However, most animal sampling was conducted from January 2019 onwards, when RVF virus

179 had already spread across the whole island. In addition, our model predicted that 53.92 %  
180 (95%CrI [44.76-61.29]), of the livestock population was immune at the end of the simulated  
181 epidemic wave (August 2019), which was in line with estimates from the previous emergence in  
182 2007-2008 (9).

183 Previous RVF models parameterised the transmission rate from livestock to humans by direct  
184 contact as an input parameter at 1.7 per 10 thousand persons per day (14-16). The  
185 epidemiological investigations conducted in this epidemic assessed whether human cases  
186 reported a direct contact with animals or their infectious tissues, and human cases without prior  
187 contact with such materials. This allowed for the first time estimating both RVF virus spillover to  
188 humans by direct contact and by vector transmission from epidemic data. These estimated  
189 transmission rates can be used as a benchmark for further modelling work. RVF human cases  
190 with or without previous contact with animals or animal products have been reported in other  
191 settings (17,18). Here, the reported fraction of cases without previous animal contact (32%) was  
192 three times higher than in South Africa (10%) (17). Several reasons may explain these  
193 differences. For example, this could result from a recall bias from people interviewed in Mayotte,  
194 or from the fact that in South Africa, people were tested following reports of RVF in animals (17).

195 Rainfall is a known driver for RVF virus transmission (19) and was used as a proxy for vector  
196 abundance. We assumed a 14-days lag between rainfall and its impact on vector abundance  
197 based on previous modelling studies on RVF vectors population dynamics (20,21). Temperature  
198 above 26°C may also promote RVF virus transmission (22-24). The temperatures of Mayotte  
199 varying annually between 25°C and 35°C (9), we assumed that in this specific setting,  
200 temperature would not be a major driver for viral transmission. In areas with cooler temperatures,  
201 such as South Africa (25), temperature may need to be taken into account (26). The highest  
202 estimated  $R_s(t)$  value was 1.87 (95%CrI [1.53-2.69]), yet in line with previous estimations of  $R_0$   
203 (14,27,28). The baseline model, with constant transmission parameters, had a similar DIC than  
204 the rainfall-dependent model, and showed  $R_0$  values within the same range. Whilst this may  
205 suggest a smaller influence of environmental factors on the RVF viral transmission dynamics  
206 during this epidemic, it may also suggest that upon the conditions met for emergence -(i) the  
207 presence of the virus, (ii) a susceptible livestock population and (iii) the presence of vectors - the  
208 epidemic fade-out likely resulted from a depletion of susceptible livestock. This was corroborated  
209 by the small likelihood of re-emergence in the following rainy season, with an effective  
210 reproductive number  $R_e(t)$  remaining close or below unity in the months following the end of the  
211 2018-2019 epidemic, due to the high proportion of immune animals.

212 A limitation of the model was that the reporting rate in humans was unknown, and defined based  
213 on data from the 2007-2008 epidemic (29). This relied on the assumption that both the 2007-2008  
214 and 2018-2019 epidemics affected the same number of people. Whilst there is no data available  
215 on human infection patterns to support this assumption, our previous work estimated a post-  
216 epidemic livestock seroprevalence (9) which was similar to our current estimates, supporting the  
217 assumption that both epidemic sizes may be comparable. Further data collection estimating  
218 human post-epidemic seroprevalence would allow an accurate estimation of this reporting rate.  
219 Finally, the livestock model was built with similar assumptions than in our previous paper (9). This  
220 included a latent (E) and an infectious (I) period of 7 days in livestock, accounting for the extrinsic  
221 incubation period in the vector (3-7 days), and the latent (1-6 days) and infectious stages (3-6  
222 days) in livestock (30-33), without explicitly modelling these processes. Although this may have  
223 slightly impacted on the predicted timing of the epidemic peak in humans, our model predictions  
224 were in agreement with the observations. In addition, this did not impact on the fitting with  
225 livestock data, as we fitted on the (R) compartment, aggregating data over three-month periods.  
226 We also assumed homogeneous mixing. Mayotte is a small island (374km<sup>2</sup>), the ecosystem  
227 shows limited spatial variations, livestock production systems are extensive with animals raised  
228 outdoor year round (9), compatible with the assumption that the livestock population was equally  
229 exposed to RVF mosquito vectors. Accounting for spatial heterogeneity, and testing for finer  
230 vaccination protocols would have required the use of epidemic data at a smaller spatio-temporal

231 resolution. Our model can however be expanded into a metapopulation structure, and parameters  
232 further refined, in ecosystems with epidemic data available at finer spatial and temporal scales.

233 The impact and cost-effectiveness of livestock vaccination has been assessed in specific RVF  
234 high-risk areas in Kenya using simulation modelling (32,33). Instead, our analysis allows  
235 predicting the impact of vaccination strategies on reducing the number of human and animal  
236 cases, through a model calibrated from epidemic data. Our findings provide evidence that  
237 reactive animal vaccination is the most effective control measure, preventing both human and  
238 livestock cases, and requiring a smaller number of vaccine doses. The characteristics of the  
239 vaccine used in the vaccination scenarios (highly immunogenic, single dose, and safe) were  
240 those targeted by WHO R&D Blueprint (34), and not the existing ones. In practice, currently  
241 available RVF vaccines have different immunogenic and safety characteristics, with some of them  
242 requiring boosters (35), and the choice of which vaccine to use on the field may vary upon the  
243 epidemiological context. In addition, during this epidemic, livestock were not vaccinated due the  
244 absence of a vaccine with a EU marketing authorisation (Mayotte is an EU outermost region)  
245 (36). However, we highlight the importance of the development of contingency planning,  
246 availability of emergency funds and a suitable vaccine.

247 In conclusion, we have presented a uniquely detailed investigation into an outbreak of an  
248 emerging arbovirus, combining animal and human data, with a mathematical model for RVF.  
249 Early detection and rapid vaccination are critical to RVF control at the early stage of the epidemic.  
250 Disease surveillance in animals, contingency planning, and the timely implementation of livestock  
251 vaccination, are key for reducing human disease risk. This work represents a collaboration  
252 between public health agency, animal health surveillance network, farmers' association, and  
253 researchers, initiated from the start of the epidemic, and conducted as a collaborative work as the  
254 epidemic unfolded. Delays in getting livestock data were inherent to climatic conditions (storms)  
255 and field work constraints in remote areas. Nevertheless, we addressed in practice the  
256 challenges of a quantitative One Health approach (37), and illustrated its value to surveillance and  
257 control of zoonotic emerging infectious diseases. Our model can be further expanded, refined and  
258 recalibrated for other ecosystems.

## 259 **Materials and Methods**

### 260 **RVF datasets**

261 **Human data.** Human incident case data were collected from patients showing dengue-like  
262 symptoms and consulting a GP, and who subsequently tested positive for RVF virus RT-PCR  
263 (38). Cases were interviewed using a structured questionnaire administered by Sante Publique  
264 France health epidemiologists (39). The number of incident cases was aggregated by week.

265 **Livestock data.** During the study period, livestock sera were sampled by field veterinarians  
266 according to two protocols: RVF targeted surveys around human cases and the regular annual  
267 surveillance campaign (SESAM) which is implemented since 2008 (8). The sera from the RVF  
268 targeted surveys were collected around human cases and were collected between January and  
269 March only. However, due to the rapidly increasing number of human cases and logistics  
270 constraints, the Veterinary Services instead requested field veterinarians to sample animals from  
271 the annual surveillance campaign only, depending on their regular field visits, therefore not  
272 depending on human cases. In total, between July 2018 and June 2019, a total of 1,169 livestock  
273 sera were collected (842 from the annual surveillance and 146 from human investigations), and  
274 tested against RVF IgG (ID Screen RVF Competition ELISA, IDVet, Grabels, France, Se=97 %,  
275 Sp=100 % (40)). Date of birth was available for 493 of these sampled animals (with 9% from RVF  
276 targeted surveys, Table S3). In order to follow the emergence of the virus in the livestock  
277 population over a year, we plotted quarterly age-stratified RVF IgG prevalence (Fig. 1D-1F).

278 **Origin of the virus.** To investigate the possible time window of virus introduction from imported  
279 infected animals, we collated serological data from illegally imported livestock seized by the

280 Veterinary Services between June and August 2018. These animals were tested RVF IgM by  
281 ELISA (indicative of recent infections) (Table S1).

## 282 **Epidemic model**

283 We modelled RVF epidemic from the start of the rainy season, the first week of October 2018  
284 (October, 1-7), one month prior to the report of the first human case, up to the first week of  
285 August 2019 (July, 29-August, 4). No more human cases were reported after this date.

286 **Transmission amongst livestock.** We adapted the previously developed SEIR model of RVF  
287 virus transmission amongst Mayotte livestock (9) to the current epidemiological context. For full  
288 details on the model structure and equations, see Metras *et al.* 2017 (9). We kept the previous  
289 underlying demographic livestock population age-structure (10 yearly age-groups) for fitting  
290 purpose, and we used a discrete-time deterministic framework, with a daily time step. In the  
291 previous model, the transmission parameter amongst livestock ( $\beta_{L-L}(t)$ ) and corresponding time-  
292 varying reproductive number ( $R_s(t)$ ) were assumed to be vector-borne and modelled as a function  
293 of monthly NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index) values, as a proxy for vector  
294 abundance. Here, instead of using monthly NDVI, we used rainfall data (41) at a daily time step,  
295 since the model time step and the human epidemic curve available for fitting had a smaller time  
296 resolution. We also included a lag of 14 days between rainfall and its impact on the vector  
297 abundance (21,22). To look at the temporal pattern of the viral transmission over time, we also  
298 calculated  $R_e(t)$ , the time-varying effective reproduction number, as the product of  $R_s(t)$  with the  
299 proportion of susceptible livestock at time  $t$  (**SI Methods**).

300 **Spillover into humans.** We added a module simulating RVF virus transmission from livestock  
301 into the human population. We assumed that susceptible humans ( $S_H$ ) became infected following  
302 exposure with infectious livestock by direct contact ( $E_H^C$ ) at a constant rate  $\beta_{L-H}^C$ , and by vector-  
303 mediated route ( $E_H^V$ ) at a time-varying rate  $\beta_{L-H}^V(t)$ , scaled on the rainfall-dependent within-  
304 livestock transmission ( $\beta_{L-L}(t)$ ). Infected individuals  $E_H^C$  and  $E_H^V$  successively moved to their  
305 respective infectious states ( $I_H^C$  and  $I_H^V$ ); after which they moved into the immune compartment ( $R_H$ )  
306 (Fig. S1), assuming they remained immune until the end of the study period. The model  
307 equations, transmission parameters and the formulation of the forces of infection from livestock  
308  $\lambda_{contact}(t)$  and vectors  $\lambda_{vector}(t)$  are presented in **SI Methods**.

309 **Parameterisation and model fitting.** Input parameters were those related to the natural history  
310 of infection and demographics in both livestock and human populations (Table S4). The  
311 proportion of immune animals at  $t_0$  was informed from the aggregated July-September 2018 IgG  
312 livestock seroprevalence campaign (Fig. 1D). The reporting fraction of human cases was set to  
313  $\rho=1.9\%$ , as a post-epidemic serological study in humans, conducted in 2011 in Mayotte,  
314 estimated that 3.5% (95%CI [2.6-4.8]) of the human population was RVF IgG-positive (30).  
315 Assuming a population size of 212,645 inhabitants in 2012 (42), this corresponded to an average  
316 of 7,442 persons being seropositive. Assuming that the sizes of the 2007-2008 and 2018-2019  
317 epidemics were similar, the detection of 143 cases in the 2018-2019 epidemics suggests a  
318 reporting fraction of 1.9% (95% CI [1.4-2.6]). Finally, input rainfall data were downloaded from the  
319 Meteofrance website, as cumulated rainfall over 10-day periods (41). Daily rainfall was calculated  
320 by dividing these values by ten over each 10-day period.

321 Five parameters were estimated by fitting the model to the human and livestock epidemic data  
322 (Table S3). Two parameters related to the rainfall-dependent transmission amongst livestock ( $A$   
323 and  $B$ ), two parameters estimated the spillover to humans, via contact with livestock ( $\beta_{L-H}^C$ ) and  
324 via vector (scaling factor  $X$ ), and the fifth parameter was the number of infectious livestock at  $t_0$   
325 ( $I_{livo}$ ). Parameter estimation was done by fitting simultaneously the (i) quarterly age-stratified  
326 simulated proportion of immune livestock ( $p_{a,q}$ ) to quarterly RVF IgG prevalence (Fig. 1E-1F); (ii)  
327 the simulated weekly number of reported incident cases in humans by direct contact (Fig. 1B) and  
328 (iii) the simulated weekly number of reported incident cases in humans by vector-mediated route

329 (Fig. 1C), to the observed weekly number of reported cases via both transmission routes. Values  
330 of those five parameters were sampled from their prior distribution  $\theta = \{A, B, \beta_{L-H}^C, X, I_{liv0}\}$   
331 using a Monte Carlo Markov Chain Metropolis-Hastings (MCMC-MH) algorithm, implemented in  
332 the fitR package (43). Finally, to assess the impact of rainfall over the course of the epidemic, we  
333 also fitted a baseline model for which all transmission parameters were constant over time (Table  
334 S5). Details on models equations, parameter estimation, model fitting, and model comparison are  
335 presented in **SI Methods**.

336 **Forecasting and vaccination scenarios.** We did probabilistic projections for seven scenarios  
337 (Table 1). For all scenarios, we simulated 2,500 stochastic trajectories by sampling randomly  
338 parameter values from the joint posterior distribution. Scenario 1 aimed at estimating the  
339 likelihood of virus re-emergence, without disease control intervention, in the following rainy  
340 season (in 2019-2020), in a closed ecosystem, using the same rainfall data as during the 2018-  
341 2019 rainy season. Scenarios 2-6 aimed at assessing the impact that different livestock  
342 vaccination strategies could have had on the number of human and livestock cases during the  
343 2018-2019 epidemic. We assumed the use of a single-dose highly immunogenic vaccine (90 %  
344 vaccine efficacy) (34,35), and a 14-days lag between vaccination and build-up of immunity.  
345 Figures of vaccination campaigns in Mayotte in 2017 (against blackleg, a livestock disease),  
346 showed that about 3,000 vaccine doses are routinely administered to livestock over a year by  
347 local veterinarians. Scenario 2 tested the impact of administrating all these 3,000 doses in one  
348 month, in December 2018, immediately after the report of the first human case (joint animal-  
349 human alert date for response), corresponding to the current vaccinating capacity in Mayotte in  
350 an emergency setting. Scenario 3 assumed an extra-vaccine supply and an emergency mass  
351 vaccination, allowing 6,000 doses to be administered in December 2018. We also assessed the  
352 impact of vaccinating livestock in January 2019, one month following the report of first human  
353 case, allowing extra time for organising the vaccination campaign : 3,000 doses (Scenario 4),  
354 6,000 doses (Scenario 5) and 9,000 doses (Scenario 6). Finally, to assess the impact of a  
355 reactive and mass vaccination only in humans, we simulated a 50% vaccination coverage of the  
356 human population in December 2018 (i.e. 128,250 doses) (Scenario 7). Vaccination equations  
357 and diagram are presented in **SI Methods** and Fig. S2.

### 358 **Acknowledgments**

359 The authors wish to thank the Agence de Santé océan Indien that has participated in collecting  
360 human cases data, the laboratory of Centre Hospitalier de Mayotte which has performed the  
361 virological analyses on human samples, the animal SESAM (Système d'Epidémiosurveillance  
362 Animale à Mayotte) surveillance system, the CoopADEM (Coopérative agricole des éleveurs  
363 mahorais), the Cirad-CYROI, the Veterinary Services, and the LVAD (Laboratoire Vétérinaire  
364 d'Analyses Départemental de Mayotte) for the data collection and the serological analyses on  
365 livestock samples. Finally, we thank Harold Noël from Santé publique France for facilitating  
366 human data access in the early stage of the epidemic.

### 367 **Author Contributions**

368 RM, WJE, LD, YH, MS conceptualized and designed the study. CY, LD, SC, YH, MS collated the  
369 data and did data management. RM, GF performed the analyses. RM, WJE, CY, LD, GF, AC, SF,  
370 GLG, CS, EC, LF, YH, MS interpreted and discussed the data and results. RM was responsible  
371 for drafting the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.



## 372 **References**

- 373 1. M E. J. Woolhouse, C. Dye, Preface. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser B.* **356**, 981– 982  
374 (2001).
- 375 2. B. A. Jones, D. Grace, R. Kock, S. Alonso, J. Rushton, M. Y. Said, D. McKeever, F. Mutua, J.  
376 Young, J. McDermott, D. U. Pfeiffer, Zoonosis emergence linked to agricultural intensification and  
377 environmental change. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110**, 8399-8404 (2013).
- 378 3. M. H. A. Clark, G. M. Warimwe, A. Di Nardo, N. A. Lyons, S. Gubbins, Systematic literature  
379 review of Rift Valley fever virus seroprevalence in livestock, wildlife and humans in Africa from  
380 1968 to 2016. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **12**, e0006627 (2018).
- 381 4. B. H. Bird, T. G. Ksiazek, S. T. Nichol, N. J. MacLachlan, Rift Valley fever virus. *J. Am. Vet.*  
382 *Med. Assoc.* **234**, 883–893 (2009).
- 383 5. M.O. Nanyingi, P. Munyua, S. G. Kiama, G. M. Muchemi, S. M. Thumbi, A. O. Bitek, B. Bett, R.  
384 M. Muriithi, M. K. Njenga, A systematic review of Rift Valley Fever epidemiology 1931-2014.  
385 *Infect. Ecol. Epidemiol.* **5** (2015).
- 386 6. World Health Organization. Epidemic and pandemic-prone diseases, List of Blueprint priority  
387 diseases. Available at [http://www.emro.who.int/fr/pandemic-epidemic-diseases/news/list-of-](http://www.emro.who.int/fr/pandemic-epidemic-diseases/news/list-of-blueprint-priority-diseases.html)  
388 [blueprint-priority-diseases.html](http://www.emro.who.int/fr/pandemic-epidemic-diseases/news/list-of-blueprint-priority-diseases.html) Accessed on 8 March 2020 (2018).
- 389 7. R. Hatchett, N. Lurie, Outbreak responses as an essential component of vaccine development.  
390 *Lancet. Infect. Dis.* **19**, e399-e403 (2019).
- 391 8. R. Métras, L. Cavalerie, L. Dommergues, P. Mérot P, W. J. Edmunds, M. J. Keeling, C. Cêtre-  
392 Sossah, E. Cardinale, The Epidemiology of Rift Valley Fever in Mayotte: Insights and  
393 Perspectives from 11 Years of Data. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **10**, e0004783 (2016).
- 394 9. R. Métras, G. Fournié, L. Dommergues, A. Camacho, L. Cavalerie, P. Mérot, M. J. Keeling, C.  
395 Cêtre-Sossah, E. Cardinale, W. J. Edmunds, Drivers for Rift Valley fever emergence in Mayotte:  
396 A Bayesian modelling approach. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **11**, e0005767 (2017).
- 397 10. ProMED. Rift Valley fever - Kenya (02): (Wajir). Published Date: 2018-06-09. Archive  
398 Number: 20180609.5847216. Accessed on 05 December 2019 (2018).
- 399 11. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. EMPRES-i. Global Animal Disease  
400 Information System. Available at : <http://empres-i.fao.org/eipws3g/> Accessed on 11 December  
401 2019.
- 402 12. A. Kwasiborski, L. Collet, V. Hourdel, M. Vandenbergert, C. Batejat, J. C. Manuguerra, J.  
403 Vanhomwegen, V. Caro. Molecular investigation of Rift Valley Fever outbreak in Mayotte, 2018.  
404 Available at: [https://programme.europa-organisation.com/slides/programme\\_ricai-2019/CO-](https://programme.europa-organisation.com/slides/programme_ricai-2019/CO-095.pdf)  
405 [095.pdf](https://programme.europa-organisation.com/slides/programme_ricai-2019/CO-095.pdf) , Accessed on 20 March 2020 (2019)
- 406 13. ProMED. Rift Valley fever - Mayotte (12): human, cattle. Published Date: 2019-05-28. Archive  
407 Number: 20190528.6489852. Accessed on 09 March 2020 (2019).
- 408 14. L. Xue, M. H. Scott, L. W. Cohnstaedt, C. Scoglio, A network-based meta-population  
409 approach to model Rift Valley fever epidemics. *J Theor. Biol.* **306**, 129–144 (2012).
- 410 15. S. C. Mpeshe, H. Haario, J. M. Tchuente, A Mathematical Model of Rift Valley Fever with  
411 Human Host. *Acta Biotheor.* **59**, 231 (2011).

- 412 16. J. Lugoye, J. Wairimu, C. B. Alphonse, M. Ronoh, Modeling Rift Valley fever with treatment  
413 and trapping control strategies. *Appl. Math.* **7**, 556-568 (2016).
- 414 17. B. N. Archer, J. Thomas, J. Weyer, A. Cengimbo, D. E. Landoh, C. Jacobs, S. Ntuli, M.  
415 Modise, M. Mathonsi, M. S. Mashishi, P. A. Leman, C. le Roux, P. J. van Vuren, A. Kemp, J. T.  
416 Paweska, L. Blumberg, Epidemiologic Investigations into Outbreaks of Rift Valley Fever in  
417 Humans, South Africa, 2008-2011. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **19**, 1918–1925 (2013).
- 418 18. T. R. Shoemaker, L. Nyakarahuka, S. Balinandi, J. Ojwang, A. Tumusiime, S. Mulei, J.  
419 Kyondo, B. Lubwama, M. Sekamatte, A. Namutebi, P. Tusiime, F. Monje, M. Mayanja, S.  
420 Ssendagire, M. Dahlke, S. Kyazze, M. Wetaka, I. Makumbi, J. Borchert, S. Zufan, K. Patel, S.  
421 Whitmer, S. Brown, W. G. Davis, J. D. Klena, S. T. Nichol, P. E. Rollin, J. Lutwama, First  
422 Laboratory-Confirmed Outbreak of Human and Animal Rift Valley Fever Virus in Uganda in 48  
423 Years. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **100**, 659–671 (2019).
- 424 19. R. Sang, J. Lutomiah, M. Said, A. Makio, H. Koka, E. Koskei, A. Nyunja, S. Owaka, D.  
425 Matoke-Muhia, S. Bukachi, J. Lindahl, D. Grace, B. Bett, Effects of Irrigation and Rainfall on the  
426 Population Dynamics of Rift Valley Fever and Other Arbovirus Mosquito Vectors in the Epidemic-  
427 Prone Tana River County, Kenya. *J. Med. Entomol.* **54**, 460–470 (2017).
- 428 20. C. Talla, D. Diallo, I. Dia, Y. Ba, J. A. Ndione, A. A. Sall, A. Morse, A. Diop, M. Diallo M,  
429 Statistical modeling of the abundance of vectors of West African Rift Valley fever in Barkedji,  
430 Senegal. *PLoS One.* **12**, e114047 (2014).
- 431 21. D. Diallo, C. Talla, Y. Ba, I. Dia, A. A. Sall AA, M. Diall, Temporal distribution and spatial  
432 pattern of abundance of the Rift Valley fever and West Nile fever vectors in Barkedji, Senegal. *J*  
433 *Vector Ecol.* **2**, 426-436 (2011).
- 434 22. M. J. Turell, C. A. Rossi, C. L. Bailey, Effect of extrinsic incubation temperature on the ability  
435 of *Aedes taeniorhynchus* and *Culex pipiens* to transmit Rift Valley fever virus. *Am. J. Trop. Med.*  
436 *Hyg.* **134**, 1211-1218 (1985).
- 437 23. J. F. Brubaker, M. J. Turell, Effect of environmental temperature on the susceptibility of *Culex*  
438 *pipiens* (Diptera: Culicidae) to Rift Valley fever virus. *J. Med. Entomol.* **35**, 918-921 (1998).
- 439 24. G. Lo Iacono, A. A. Cunningham, B. Bett, D. Grace, D. W. Redding, J. L. N. Wood,  
440 Environmental limits of Rift Valley fever revealed using ecoepidemiological mechanistic models.  
441 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115**, E7448-E7456 (2018).
- 442 25. R. Métras, M. Baguelin, W. J. Edmunds, P. N. Thompson, A. Kemp, D. U. Pfeiffer, L. M.  
443 Collins, R. G. White RG. Transmission potential of Rift Valley fever virus over the course of the  
444 2010 epidemic in South Africa. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **6**, 916-924 (2013).
- 445 26. H. J. Esser, R. Mögling, N. B. Cleton, H. van der Jeugd, H. Sprong, A. Stroo, M. P. G.  
446 Koopmans, W. F. de Boer, C. B. E. M. Reusken, Risk factors associated with sustained  
447 circulation of six zoonotic arboviruses: a systematic review for selection of surveillance sites in  
448 non-endemic areas. *Parasit. Vectors.* **12**, 265 (2019).
- 449 27. C. M. Barker, T. Niu, W. K. Reisen, D. M. Hartley, Data-Driven Modeling to Assess  
450 Receptivity for Rift Valley Fever Virus. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **7**, e2515 (2013).
- 451 28. M. L. Danzetta, R. Bruno, F. Sauro, F. Savini, P. Calistri P, Rift Valley fever transmission  
452 dynamics described by compartmental models. *Prev. Vet. Med.* **134**, 197–210 (2010).

- 453 29. T. Lernout, E. Cardinale, M. Jego, P. Desprès, L. Collet, B. Zumbo, E. Tillard, S. Girard, L.  
454 Filleul, Rift Valley Fever in Humans and Animals in Mayotte, an Endemic Situation? *PLoS ONE*.  
455 **8**, e74192 (2013).
- 456 30. Cavalerie L, Charron MVP, Ezanno P, Dommergues L, Zumbo B, Cardinale E. A Stochastic  
457 Model to Study Rift Valley Fever Persistence with Different Seasonal Patterns of Vector  
458 Abundance: New Insights on the Endemicity in the Tropical Island of Mayotte. *PLoS One*. **10**,  
459 e0130838 (2015).
- 460 31. Nicolas G, Chevalier V, Tantely LM, Fontenille D, Durand B. A Spatially Explicit  
461 Metapopulation Model and Cattle Trade Analysis Suggests Key Determinants for the Recurrent  
462 Circulation of Rift Valley Fever Virus in a Pilot Area of Madagascar Highlands. *PLoS Negl. Trop.*  
463 *Dis.* **8**, e3346 (2014).
- 464 32. Gachohi JM, Njenga MK, Kitala P, Bett B. Modelling Vaccination Strategies against Rift Valley  
465 Fever in Livestock in Kenya. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **10** doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005049 (2016).
- 466 33. T. Kimani, E. Schelling, B. Bett, M. Ngigi, T. Randolph, S. Fuhrmann, Public Health Benefits  
467 from Livestock Rift Valley Fever Control: A Simulation of Two Epidemics in Kenya. *EcoHealth*. **13**,  
468 729–742 (2016).
- 469 34. World Health Organization, R&D Blueprint, Target Product Profiles for Rift Valley Fever Virus  
470 Vaccines – version 3. Available at :  
471 [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/blue-print/call-for-comments/tpp-rift-valley-fever-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/blue-print/call-for-comments/tpp-rift-valley-fever-vaccines-draft3-0pc.pdf?sfvrsn=f2f3b314_2)  
472 [vaccines-draft3-0pc.pdf?sfvrsn=f2f3b314\\_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/blue-print/call-for-comments/tpp-rift-valley-fever-vaccines-draft3-0pc.pdf?sfvrsn=f2f3b314_2) Accessed 06 March 2020 (2019).
- 473 35. B. Dungu, B. A. Lubisi, T. Ikegami, Rift Valley fever vaccines : current and future needs. *Curr*  
474 *Opin Virol.* **29**, 8-15 (2018).
- 475 36. European Centre for Diseases Prevention and Control. Rift Valley fever outbreak in Mayotte,  
476 France. Rapid Risk assessment. Available at  
477 [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-Rift-Valley-fever-Mayotte-France-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-Rift-Valley-fever-Mayotte-France-March-2019.pdf)  
478 [March-2019.pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/RRA-Rift-Valley-fever-Mayotte-France-March-2019.pdf) Accessed 17 March 2020 (2019).
- 479 37. I. Scoones, K. Jones, G. Lo Iacono, D. W. Redding, A. Wilkinson, J. L. N. Wood, Integrative  
480 modelling for One Health: pattern, process and participation. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.*  
481 **372**, 20160164 (2017).
- 482 38. B. H. Bird, D. A. Bawiec, T. G. Ksiazek, T. R. Shoemaker, S. T. Nichol, Highly sensitive and  
483 broadly reactive quantitative reverse transcription-PCR assay for high-throughput detection of Rift  
484 Valley fever virus. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **45**, 3506–3513 (2007).
- 485 39. H. Youssouf, M. Subiros, G. Dennetiere, L. Collet, L. Dommergues, A. Pauvert A, P.  
486 Rabarison, C. Vauloup-Fellous, G. Le Godais, M. C. Jaffar-Bandjee, M. Jean, M. C. Paty, H.  
487 Noel, S. Oliver, L. Filleul, C. Larsen, Rift Valley fever outbreak, Mayotte, France, 2018–2019.  
488 *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* Apr [08 March 2020] (2020).
- 489 40. J. Kortekaas, J. Kant, R. Vloet, C. Cêtre-Sossah, P. Marianneau, S. Lacote, A. C. Banyard, C.  
490 Jeffries, M. Eiden, M. Groschup, S. Jäckel, E. Hevia, A. Brun, European ring trial to evaluate  
491 ELISAs for the diagnosis of infection with Rift Valley fever virus. *J. Virol. Methods.* **1**, 177-181  
492 (2013).
- 493 41. Meteofrance. Donnees decadaires agrometeorologiques. Available at :  
494 [https://donneespubliques.meteofrance.fr/?fond=produit&id\\_produit=113&id\\_rubrique=37](https://donneespubliques.meteofrance.fr/?fond=produit&id_produit=113&id_rubrique=37)  
495 Accessed on 23 September 2019 (2019).

496 43. Institut National de la statistique et des études économiques (Insee). Habitants à Mayotte.  
497 Available at: <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/3286558#documentation>, Accessed on 05  
498 October 2019 (2017).

499 43. A. Camacho, S. Funk, fitR: Tool box for fitting dynamic infectious disease models to time  
500 series. R package version 0.1.

#### 501 **Ethics statement**

502 The livestock data were collected under the under the Mayotte disease surveillance system  
503 (Système d'Epidémiologie Animale à Mayotte, SESAM) with the approval of the Direction  
504 of Agriculture, Food and Forestry (DAAF) of Mayotte. For human data, according to French law,  
505 only "research involving a human being" (research defined by article L. 1121-1 and article R.  
506 1121-1 of the Code de la santé publique) are compelled to receive the approval of ethics  
507 committee. This study was based on anonymous data collected from health professionals for  
508 public health purposes relating to the health surveillance mission entrusted to Santé publique  
509 France by the French Law (article L. 1413-1 code de la santé publique). Therefore, the study did  
510 not meet the criteria for qualifying a study "research involving a human being" and did not require  
511 the approval of an ethics committee. Furthermore, as the data were anonymous, it did not require  
512 an authorization of the French data protection authority (Commission Nationale informatique et  
513 libertés).

#### 514 **Role of the funding sources**


515 The funding sources have no role in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of  
516 data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the paper for publication.

#### 517 **Declaration of interests**


518 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

#### 519 **Funding sources**


520 RVF RT-PCR were conducted as part as the surveillance system on dengue-like syndrome since  
521 2008, funded by Agence de Santé océan Indien. The animal sampling and analyses were funded  
522 by EAFRD (European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development) and RITA (Réseau d'Innovation  
523 et de Transfert Agricole) Mayotte. WJE and AC were funded by the Department of Health and  
524 Social Care using UK Aid funding managed by the NIHR (VEEPED: PR-OD-1017-20007). The  
525 views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the  
526 Department of Health and Social Care. SF was funded by a Wellcome Senior Research  
527 Fellowship (210758/Z/18/Z).



528 **Figure 1AF. RVF epidemic data in humans and livestock, and model fit.** (A) Weekly number  
 529 of reported human cases and average daily rainfall pattern (solid blue line). Human cases  
 530 reporting direct contact with animals or their products are presented in red (86 cases), those  
 531 reporting no prior contact with animals or their products are in green (41 cases), and lost to  
 532 follow-up are in grey (16 cases). (B) Predicted median (red solid line) and 95%CrI (red envelope)  
 533 of the number of weekly reported human cases by direct contact, and weekly incident observed  
 534 cases by contact (red dots). (C) Predicted median (green solid line) and 95%CrI (green envelope)  
 535 of the number of weekly reported human cases by vector-mediated route, and weekly incident  
 536 observed cases with no prior contact with animals (green dots). (D) Quarterly age-stratified RVF  
 537 IgG seroprevalence in livestock for the trimesters July-September 2018 (N=173), (E) January-  
 538 March 2019 (N=252), and (F) April-June 2019 (N=67). In (D),(E),(F), the black dots and vertical  
 539 black lines represent the observed age-stratified average IgG seroprevalence and their 95%CI.  
 540 The model predicted values are showed by the median (solid blue line) and 95%CI (blue  
 541 envelopes).



542 **Figure 2AC. Model predictions over two rainy seasons (2018-2019 and 2019-2020):**  
543 **epidemic curves, proportion of susceptible and immune livestock, and time-varying**  
544 **effective reproduction ( $R_e(t)$ ) number. (A)** Predicted (reported and unreported) number of  
545 infectious livestock (blue) and humans by direct contact (red), and vector-mediated route (green).  
546 (B) Predicted median (solid lines) and 95.%CrI envelopes of the predicted proportion of  
547 Susceptible (green) and Immune (black) livestock over the course of the epidemic. (C) Values of  
548  $R_e(t) = R_{st}(t) * S(t)$  over the course of the epidemic. In all panels, the vertical blue and red vertical  
549 lines correspond to the predicted epidemic peaks in livestock and humans, respectively. The  
550 vertical black line corresponds to the end of the fitting period (August 2019).



551 **Figure 3AD. Figure 3AD. Impact of vaccination strategies on the epidemic size.** (A) Median  
 552 weekly number of predicted incident human cases, and corresponding (B) human epidemic size  
 553 (reported cases). (C) Median weekly number of predicted incident infected livestock, and  
 554 corresponding (D) total livestock epidemic size. In (A) and (C) the red solid line presents the  
 555 scenario with no intervention (Scenario 1); the black lines present vaccinations in December 2018  
 556 (black solid: 3,000 doses, dashed black: 6,000 doses) (Scenarios 2-3); the blue lines present the  
 557 vaccinations in January 2019 (blue solid: 3,000 doses, dashed blue: 6,000 doses; dotted blue:  
 558 9,000 doses) (Scenarios 4-6); the red line represent the human vaccination only (Scenario 7).

Scenarios	Epidemic size				Post-epidemic prevalence		
	Livestock total	Humans total	Humans reported	Reported contact	Reported vector	Livestock	Humans
1. No intervention	18,461 (14,926-21,153)	9,566 (7,793-11,772)	181 (138-233)	111 (79-149)	70 (44-102)	53.92 (44.76-61.29)	3.73 (3.03-4.56)
<b>Livestock vaccination</b>							
2. Dec 3,000	14,415 (11,154-17,237)	7,465 (5,980-9,381)	142 (106-186)	87 (61-119)	54 (34-80)	42.40 (34.21-50.33)	2.90 (2.33-3.65)
3. Dec 6,000	11,447 (8,863-14,046)	5,936 (4,683-7,674)	113 (83-151)	69 (46-97)	43 (26-67)	34.17 (27.66-41.15)	2.31 (1.82-2.99)
4. Jan, 3000	15,311 (12,237-17,985)	7,867 (6,302-9,956)	149 (112-197)	91 (63-126)	58 (35-84)	44.72 (36.85-51.72)	3.06 (2.45-3.88)
5. Jan, 6000	13,229 (10,545-15,693)	6,872 (5,470-8,752)	131 (96-175)	80 (55-112)	51 (32-77)	38.87 (32.21-45.44)	2.68 (2.13-3.41)
6. Jan, 9000	11,573 (9,296-13,784)	6,014 (4,665-7,992)	115 (83-158)	90 (47-101)	44 (27-68)	34.27 (28.52-39.86)	2.34 (1.82-3.12)
<b>Human vaccination</b>							
7. Dec, 50 %	18,436 (14,987-21,099)	6,032 (4,708-7,942)	115 (82-157)	70 (46-102)	44 (26-67)	53.79 (45.05-61.20)	2.35 (1.83-3.10)