

It's risky to wander in September: modelling the epidemic potential of Rift Valley fever in a Sahelian setting

Hélène Cecilia^{a,b,c*}, Raphaëlle Métras^d, Assane Gueye Fall^e,

Modou Moustapha Lo^e, Renaud Lancelot^{b,c}, Pauline Ezanno^a

February 17, 2020

^a INRAE, Oniris, BIOEPAR, 44300 Nantes, France

^b UMR ASTRE, CIRAD, Montpellier, France

^c ASTRE, Montpellier University, CIRAD, INRAE, Montpellier, France

^d Inserm, Sorbonne Université, Institut Pierre Louis d'Epidemiologie et de Sante Publique (IPLESP), F-75012 Paris, France

^e Institut Sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles/Laboratoire National de l'Elevage et de Recherches Vétérinaires BP 2057 Dakar-Hann, Sénégal

* Corresponding author : helene.cecilia@oniris-nantes.fr ; helene.cecilia3@gmail.com

E-mails: raphaelle.metras@inserm.fr, agueyefall@yahoo.fr, moustaphalo@yahoo.fr, renaud.lancelot@cirad.fr, pauline.ezanno@inrae.fr

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Highlights

- September is a period of high Rift Valley fever epidemic potential in northern Senegal regardless of the year, but exact locations where epidemics might start change between rainy seasons.
- Decreased vector densities during the rainy season did not highly reduce the epidemic potential of at-risk locations.
- High levels of immunity in cattle populations reduce more Rift Valley fever virus transmission than a high immunity in small ruminants in our study area. This aspect should be investigated further for targeted vaccination campaigns.
- Precise estimates of vector feeding preferences and the temperature-dependent length of their gonotrophic cycle are key to ensure a good detection of at-risk pixels.

Keywords Rift Valley fever virus; basic reproduction number; mathematical modelling; vector-borne disease; risk map

Abstract

1
2 Estimating the epidemic potential of vector-borne diseases, along with the relative contribution
3 of underlying mechanisms, is crucial for animal and human health worldwide. In West African Sahel,
4 several outbreaks of Rift Valley fever (RVF) have occurred over the last decades, but uncertainty
5 remains about the conditions necessary to trigger these outbreaks. We use the basic reproduction
6 number (R_0) as a measure of RVF epidemic potential in Northern Senegal, and map its value in
7 two distinct ecosystems, namely the Ferlo and the Senegal river delta and valley. We consider three
8 consecutive rainy seasons (July-November 2014, 2015 and 2016) and account for several vector and
9 animal species. Namely, we parametrize our model with estimates of *Aedes vexans arabiensis*, *Culex*
10 *poicilipes*, *Culex tritaeniorhynchus*, cattle, sheep and goats abundances. The impact of RVF virus
11 introduction is assessed every week, in 4367 pixels of 3,5km². The results of our analysis indicate that
12 September was the month with highest epidemic potential in each study area, while at-risk locations
13 varied between seasons. We show that decreased vector densities do not highly reduce R_0 and that
14 cattle immunity has a greater impact on reducing transmission than small ruminants immunity. The
15 host preferences of vectors and the temperature-dependent time interval between their blood meals
16 are crucial parameters needing further biological investigations.
17

18 Introduction

19 Vector-borne diseases (VBDs) represent a growing threat to animal and human health worldwide. They
20 account for 17% of all infectious diseases, affecting more than one billion people each year (WHO, 2014).
21 Their presence in livestock can dramatically impact food production locally and hamper exportations
22 (Davies and Martin, 2003). This burden mostly affects low-income countries and their socio-economic
23 development (WHO, 2014). In addition, climate change along with increased people and animal mobility
24 create opportunities for vectors and their pathogens to establish in new areas, as was the case for West
25 Nile virus in the United States (Calisher, 2000). Developping efficient countermeasures against VBDs
26 requires a good understanding of their transmission dynamics. This remains a major challenge consider-
27 ing the complexity of the biological system formed by pathogens, hosts, vectors and their relation to the
28 environment (Parham et al., 2015).

29

30 Rift Valley fever virus (RVFV, Bunyaviridae : *Phlebovirus*) is a zoonotic and vector-borne pathogen,
31 present throughout Africa, in the Arabian Peninsula and in the South West Indian Ocean islands.
32 Mosquitoes of the *Aedes* and *Culex* genus are the main vectors (Chevalier et al., 2010), some of which
33 are suspected to transmit the virus transovarially (Linthicum et al., 1985). They transmit it to a variety
34 of domestic host species, including cattle, goats, sheeps and camels, causing storms of abortions and a
35 high mortality in young animals (Pepin et al., 2010). Human infection can occur through mucous mem-
36 brane exposure or inhalation of viral particles (Davies and Martin, 2003). Most cases are limited to mild
37 ‘flu-like’ symptoms (Laughlin et al., 1979), but severe forms of the disease can be fatal. The case fatality
38 rate is usually below 1% (Madani et al., 2003) but tends to increase in recent outbreaks (Chevalier et al.,
39 2010). Spillover into human population mainly concerns people working in close contact with animals
40 such as pastoralists, butchers or veterinarians (Anyangu et al., 2010; Linthicum et al., 2016), but can
41 be a concern for the general population, e.g. in a context of massive slaughters during religious festivals
42 (EMPRES, 2003; Lancelot et al., 2019). Vector-to-human transmission is possible but does not seem to
43 be the major route of infection (Gerdes, 2004). Animal-to-animal transmission by direct contact seems
44 possible but is not yet confirmed (Chevalier et al., 2010). Since 2015, RVF is part of the R&D Blueprint
45 programme of the World Health Organization (Mehand et al., 2018).

46

47 Models are a powerful tool to explore pathogen transmission dynamics, and several approaches have
48 already been used to answer questions about RVF virus emergence and spread (Métras et al., 2011;
49 Danzetta et al., 2016). Statistical models evidenced an association between El Niño events and RVF
50 occurrence in the Horn of Africa for the 2007 epidemic in Kenya (Anyamba et al., 2009), as well as the
51 link between rainfall patterns and population dynamics of RVF vectors (Mondet et al., 2005). Network
52 models highlighted factors influencing host mobility in regions affected by RVF (Apolloni et al., 2018;
53 Kim et al., 2018; Belkhiria et al., 2019). The use of remote-sensing and geographic information systems

54 (GIS) enabled the identification of landscape properties associated with RVF virus transmission (Tourre
55 et al., 2009; Tran et al., 2016). However, prior to studying the transmission dynamics of a pathogen
56 at large time- and spatial- scale, it is critical to understand the local impact of its introduction and in
57 particular, its potential to trigger the onset of an epidemic.

58
59 The use of compartmental models together with the next generation matrix provides a way to estimate
60 the basic reproduction number R_0 and gain a deeper understanding of the underlying processes contribut-
61 ing to the epidemic potential (Hartemink et al., 2008). R_0 represents the average number of secondary
62 cases produced by one infected individual introduced in an entirely susceptible population over the course
63 of its infectious period. Several theoretical mechanistic models have been proposed to formulate R_0 for
64 RVF (Gaff et al., 2007; Niu et al., 2012; Xue and Scoglio, 2013; Pedro et al., 2016), without being applied
65 to real areas. However, R_0 is context-specific and studies mapping R_0 in space using data on hosts
66 and vectors were done only for RVF-free regions, such as the Netherlands (Fischer et al., 2013) or the
67 United States (Barker et al., 2013). In regions with regular RVF outbreaks, such as the West African
68 Sahel, modelling R_0 could explain what locally drives the rapid increase in RVF incidence and creates
69 amplification hotspots.

70
71 Senegal and Mauritania have experienced several outbreaks since 1987. Most cases were reported in the
72 Sahel region, more specifically in Northern Senegal and Southern Mauritania (Caminade et al., 2014; Sow
73 et al., 2016). This region encompassing semi-arid to arid climate bridges the gap between the Sahara
74 desert and the tropical rainforests of equatorial Africa. In Northern Senegal, RVF outbreaks have mainly
75 been reported in two distinct ecosystems, along the Senegal river and in the Ferlo region. The hypotheses
76 underlying RVF epidemic potential are assumed to differ between these two study areas. Indeed, along
77 the Senegal River, water, vectors (mainly *Culex*) and hosts are in contact year round due to the develop-
78 ment of irrigated agriculture (Bruckmann, 2018). In contrast, the Ferlo is much dryer. When the rainy
79 season starts in July, temporary ponds are flooded and *Aedes* eggs, layed at the edges of ponds the year
80 before, hatch and induce a rapid and massive emergence of adult mosquitoes (Ndione et al., 2008). In the
81 meantime, vegetation grows and creates the suitable conditions for nomadic herds to stop during their
82 transhumance pathway (Adriansen, 2008). Therefore, the presence at the same place of mosquitoes and
83 livestock, which could both introduce the virus, create opportunities for RVF outbreaks.

84
85 Previous studies mapping RVF risk in West African Sahel overlapped climate anomalies and host den-
86 sities, but without linking mechanistically the underlying processes to the disease outcome (Caminade
87 et al., 2011, 2014). At very local scales, in particular around the village of Barkedji in the Ferlo region of
88 Senegal, different approaches such as remote-sensing (Lacaux et al., 2007; Ndione et al., 2009) or statisti-
89 cal models (Bicout and Sabatier, 2004; Vignolles et al., 2009; Talla et al., 2016) were used. These studies
90 focused on the link between landscape features (typically ponds, Soti et al., 2013; Bop et al., 2014) and

91 vector abundance. Therefore, there is still a need for an indicator integrating all the major mechanisms
92 suspected to play a role in RVF epidemic potential.

93

94 The aim of the present paper is to map the epidemic potential of RVF virus in a Sahelian setting during
95 the rainy season, comparing two different study areas, namely the Senegal river delta and valley, and
96 the Ferlo. For this, we give an expression of R_0 in a multi-species (2 hosts and 2 vectors) context,
97 accounting for vector feeding preferences. We identify parameters varying in time and space as well as
98 relevant data sources to map contact zones between hosts and vectors. Then, we map the local epidemic
99 potential for three consecutive rainy seasons for weekly dates of virus introduction. We identify locations
100 and introduction times with higher epidemic potential. We assess the role of vector densities and herd
101 immunity to reduce R_0 . Eventually, we test the robustness of our results through a sensitivity analysis.

102 **Material and methods**

103 We built a compartmental, mechanistic model of RVF virus (RVFV) transmission with 2 host and 2 vector
104 populations (Figure 1, Eq. S.1-S.3). We only included mechanisms accurately occurring at the onset of a
105 potential epidemic, locally, upon the introduction of the virus, either by a host or a vector. The model
106 was used to obtain the next-generation matrix. We derived the expression of the basic reproduction
107 number R_0 by using the method by van den Driessche and Watmough 2002. The value of R_0 was
108 computed for all pixels (of resolution 3.5 km²) containing both hosts and vectors, and for weekly dates of
109 virus introduction spanning three rainy seasons (July to November) of 2014, 2015, and 2016. Dates and
110 location of RVFV introduction were assumed independent from each other. In addition, host infectious
111 period is rather short (around a week) and temperatures did not strongly vary in our study area (Figure
112 S.2) over the course of a vector lifetime (around a month). Thus, parameters were kept constant within
113 each R_0 computation (i.e. each date and location of introduction) for the whole duration of secondary
114 case generation, but were updated at each new computation.

115 **Model structure and assumptions**

116 Vectors were modelled using susceptible (S_i), latently infected (E_i), and infectious (I_i) health states,
117 $i \in \{1, 4\}$. In the Ferlo, vector species considered were *Aedes vexans arabiensis* (subscript 1) and *Culex*
118 *poicilipes* (subscript 4). In the Senegal river delta and valley (SRDV), vector species considered were
119 *Culex tritaeniorhynchus* (subscript 1) and *C. poicilipes* (subscript 4). This was based on previous ento-
120 mological studies conducted in both areas (Diallo et al., 2011; Fall et al., 2011; Biteye et al., 2018). *Ae.*
121 *v. arabiensis* and *C. poicilipes* are confirmed vectors of RVFV in Senegal (Fontenille et al., 1998; Diallo
122 et al., 2000; Ndiaye et al., 2016). *C. tritaeniorhynchus* is highly abundant and was identified as a RVFV
123 vector in the 2000 outbreak in Saudi Arabia (Jupp et al., 2002). In the model, vectors were assumed
124 to become infected either after biting infectious cattle or small ruminants, but could not transmit the

125 virus transovarially. Whilst limited evidence of vertical transmission of RVFV in mosquitoes is available
 126 (Linthicum et al., 1985), we assumed that this mechanism would be related to interannually patterns,
 127 rather than epidemic potential during a given rainy season (Lumley et al., 2017).

128




Figure 1: A - Study area, northern Senegal. Pixels highlighted correspond to locations with hosts and vectors at least once in the 3 rainy seasons, the colour indicating the region and thus the vector species they contain. Ferlo (pink), n = 1702, Senegal river delta and valley (SRDV, blue), n = 2665. B - Flow diagram of the RVFV mechanistic model used to obtain the next-generation matrix and derive the analytical formula of the basic reproduction number R_0 . Formulas give the force of infection in host populations (from vectors) f_{ji} (light grey) and in vector populations (from hosts) f_{ij} (dark grey).

129 Host populations contained susceptible (S_j), latently infected (E_j), infectious (I_j), and recovered (with
 130 immunity, R_j) individuals, $j \in \{2,3\}$. They were stratified into cattle (subscript 2) and small ruminants
 131 (i.e. goats and sheeps, subscript 3). Livestock could only be infected by the bites of infectious vectors.

132 Animal-to-animal transmission by direct contact was here considered marginal compared to vector trans-
133 mission, playing a minor role at the onset of a potential epidemic. Even though it might explain observed
134 endemic patterns observed in unfavourable areas for mosquitoes (Nicolas et al., 2014), this transmission
135 route has yet to be documented.

136

137 Mosquito biting rate, mortality and extrinsic incubation period (defined as the time between infection
138 through a blood meal and virus presence in the salivary glands, Tjaden et al., 2013) were assumed
139 to be temperature-dependent for all vector species. In addition, we assumed that a proportion c_i of
140 mosquito populations i could have double, partial, blood meals (Table 1, Supplementary Information 1.2).
141 Transmission was modelled as reservoir frequency-dependent (Figure 1, Eq. S.1), as defined by Wonham
142 et al. (2006). This means that an individual vector was considered to have a constant contact rate (biting
143 rate + feeding preferences) with livestock populations regardless of surrounding vector densities, whereas
144 an individual host had a contact rate with vectors dependent on the vector-to-host ratio in the area
145 (Gubbins et al., 2008). This type of transmission function can induce unrealistically high R_0 values
146 when livestock densities are too low or vector densities are too high (Wonham et al., 2006). Therefore,
147 for each introduction date, we removed pixels with vector-to-host ratio $(N_1 + N_4)/(N_2 + N_3) > 1000$.
148 The force of infection included the relative preference of vectors for both livestock populations (π_{ij} , Table
149 1) combined with relative abundance of hosts to compute the proportion of blood meals taken on each
150 host population (parameter ϕ_{ij} , Table 1). Parameter values and references are in Table 1, Supplementary
151 information 1.2.

152 **Input data**

153 A schematic representation of the inclusion of data into our modelling framework can be found in Figure
154 S.1.

155 **Spatio-temporal data on vector abundance**

156 The vector abundance in space and time was derived from the predictions of a mechanistic model of
157 mosquito population dynamics developed by Tran et al. (2019). This model provides the abundance of
158 host-seeking female mosquitoes for the three vector species and the two regions of interest. Mosquito
159 abundance is driven by rainfall, temperature, location of waterbodies, and the surface dynamics of ponds
160 throughout the year. This model uses satellite-derived meteorological data and multispectral images
161 to assess the habitat suitability for vectors. Tropical Applications of Meteorology using SATellite data
162 (TAMSAT) daily rainfall estimates are used (<http://www.tamsat.org.uk/cgi-bin/data/index.cgi>), along
163 with the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) 10-daily minimum and max-
164 imum temperatures (<https://confluence.ecmwf.int>). Water bodies are detected using cloud-free Sentinel
165 2 scenes (level 1-C, <https://earthexplorer.usgs.gov/>). Their filling dynamics is estimated with an existing

166 hydrologic model (Soti et al., 2010). The predictions of this model have been validated against entomo-
167 logical data collected in several sites in our study area (Biteye et al., 2018). We used weekly mosquito
168 abundance for three consecutive rainy seasons (July to November 2014, 2015 and 2016). Our spatial units
169 were hexagonal pixels of 1 km radius ($\simeq 3.5\text{km}^2$) as in Tran et al. (2019).

Definition		Value	Source
Vector populations		subscripts $i \in \{1, 4\}$ $i = 1$: <i>Ae. v. arabiensis</i> (Ferlo), <i>C. tritaeniorhynchus</i> (SRDV) $i = 4$: <i>C. poicilipes</i>	
N_i	number of host-seeking female mosquitoes		Tran et al. (2019)
a_i	biting rate	$\frac{1 + c_i}{g_i(T)}$	
c_i	proportion of double blood meals	17%	Ba et al. (2006)
$g_i(T)$	duration of gonotrophic cycle	$\frac{1}{(0.0173 \times (T - 9.6))}$	Madder et al. (1983)
$1/\epsilon_i$	extrinsic incubation period	$\frac{1}{(0.0071T - 0.1038)}$	Barker et al. (2013)
ϕ_{ij}	proportion of blood meals taken on host population j	$\frac{\pi_{ij}N_j}{\pi_{i2}N_2 + \pi_{i3}N_3}, j \in \{2, 3\}, \pi_{i2} + \pi_{i3} = 1$	
π_{ij}	relative preference for host population j	0.843 for $j = 2$, 0.157 for $j = 3$	Ba et al. (2006)
$1/d_i$	vector lifespan	$\frac{1}{(0.000148T^2 - 0.00667T + 0.1)}, i = 1, \text{ Ferlo}$ $\frac{1}{(0.000148T^2 - 0.00667T + 0.1) \times (1 - 0.016H)}, i = 1, \text{ SRDV}, i = 4$	Tran et al. (2019)
Host populations		subscripts $j \in \{2, 3\}$ $j = 2$: cattle, $j = 3$: small ruminants	
N_j	Number of hosts of population j		Gilbert et al. (2018)
p_j	proportion of immune individuals at disease-free equilibrium	0	
$1/\epsilon_j$	incubation period	2	Spickler (2015)
$1/\gamma_j$	infectious period	6	Bird et al. (2009)
$1/d_j$	Host natural lifespan	$8 \times 365, j = 2$ $2400, j = 3$	† Hammami et al. (2016)
μ_j	RVF-induced mortality rate in cattle	0.0176 for $j = 2$, 0.0312 for $j = 3$	Gaff et al. (2007)
Transmission		$i \in \{1, 4\}, j \in \{2, 3\}$	
α_{ij}	host-to-vector successful transmission probability	0.6	Cavalerie et al. (2015)
α_{ji}	vector-to-host successful transmission probability	0.4	
T	temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	$(T_{min} + T_{max})/2$	T_{min}, T_{max}
H	relative humidity (%)	$100 \cdot \frac{\exp(\frac{17.27(T_{min}-2)}{(T_{min}-2)+237.3})}{\exp(\frac{17.27T_{max}}{T_{max}+237.3})}$	from ECMWF

Table 1: Parameter values of the basic reproduction number R_0 derived from the mechanistic RVFV transmission model with two host and two vector populations. Durations are in days, rates in days $^{-1}$. †: to the best of our knowledge. ECMWF : European Center for Medium Range Weather Forecasts.

170 Spatial distribution of livestock

171 For livestock host densities, we used the Gridded Livestock of the World (GLW 3, Gilbert et al., 2018)
172 database, which provides subnational livestock distribution data for 2010, at a spatial resolution of
173 $0,083333^{\circ}$ (approximately 10km at the equator). We used the distributions of cattle and small ruminants

174 (goats and sheeps) based on Gilbert et al. (2018) dasymetric weighting, which disaggregates census data
 175 according to weights established by statistical models using high resolution spatial covariates (land use,
 176 climate, vegetation, topography, human presence). This dataset was downscaled to match Tran et al.
 177 (2019) model pixel size by homogeneously distributing animals in smaller space units. The GLW 3 dataset
 178 is an average snapshot and does not provide time series of animal densities.

179 Analytical expression of the basic reproduction number

180 R_0 was computed only for pixels in which both hosts and vectors were present. We considered the chosen
 181 spatial resolution large enough to neglect vector dispersal among pixels, in agreement with entomological
 182 studies conducted in the Ferlo and SRDV which show that vectors rarely disperse further than 1km from
 183 ponds (Ba et al., 2005; Diallo et al., 2011; Fall et al., 2013). In addition, quantitative information on
 184 seasonal variations in livestock abundance at large scale was not available. As a result, we considered
 185 that pixels were disconnected and that animal densities remained constant.

186

187 R_0 is the dominant eigenvalue of the next generation matrix of our model (Eq. 1-5). The details of
 188 its computation can be found in Supplementary Information 2. Compared to the expression derived by
 189 Turner et al. (2013) for bluetongue, we accounted for an incubation period, a natural mortality rate and
 190 a proportion of immune individuals at the disease-free equilibrium in livestock hosts. We also considered
 191 transmission probabilities (vector-to-host and host-to-vector) to be host-population specific and not only
 192 vector-population specific.

$$R_0 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left[(R_{11} + R_{44}) + \sqrt{(R_{11} + R_{44})^2 - 4(R_{11}R_{44} - R_{14}R_{41})} \right]} \quad (1)$$

$$R_{11} = \frac{\epsilon_1}{(d_1 + \epsilon_1)d_1} \times \left(\frac{\frac{N_1}{N_2} \epsilon_2 \alpha_{21} \alpha_{12} (\phi_{12} a_1)^2}{(d_2 + \epsilon_2)(d_2 + \gamma_2 + \mu_2)} (1 - p_2) + \frac{\frac{N_1}{N_3} \epsilon_3 \alpha_{31} \alpha_{13} (\phi_{13} a_1)^2}{(d_3 + \epsilon_3)(d_3 + \gamma_3 + \mu_3)} (1 - p_3) \right) \quad (2)$$

$$R_{44} = \frac{\epsilon_4}{(d_4 + \epsilon_4)d_4} \times \left(\frac{\frac{N_4}{N_2} \epsilon_2 \alpha_{24} \alpha_{42} (\phi_{42} a_4)^2}{(d_2 + \epsilon_2)(d_2 + \gamma_2 + \mu_2)} (1 - p_2) + \frac{\frac{N_4}{N_3} \epsilon_3 \alpha_{34} \alpha_{43} (\phi_{43} a_4)^2}{(d_3 + \epsilon_3)(d_3 + \gamma_3 + \mu_3)} (1 - p_3) \right) \quad (3)$$

$$R_{14} = \frac{\epsilon_4}{(d_4 + \epsilon_4)d_4} \times \left(\frac{\frac{N_1}{N_2} \epsilon_2 \alpha_{21} \alpha_{42} \phi_{12} \phi_{42} a_1 a_4}{(d_2 + \epsilon_2)(d_2 + \gamma_2 + \mu_2)} (1 - p_2) + \frac{\frac{N_1}{N_3} \epsilon_3 \alpha_{31} \alpha_{43} \phi_{13} \phi_{43} a_1 a_4}{(d_3 + \epsilon_3)(d_3 + \gamma_3 + \mu_3)} (1 - p_3) \right) \quad (4)$$

$$R_{41} = \frac{\epsilon_1}{(d_1 + \epsilon_1)d_1} \times \left(\frac{\frac{N_4}{N_2} \epsilon_2 \alpha_{24} \alpha_{12} \phi_{12} \phi_{42} a_1 a_4}{(d_2 + \epsilon_2)(d_2 + \gamma_2 + \mu_2)} (1 - p_2) + \frac{\frac{N_4}{N_3} \epsilon_3 \alpha_{34} \alpha_{13} \phi_{13} \phi_{43} a_1 a_4}{(d_3 + \epsilon_3)(d_3 + \gamma_3 + \mu_3)} (1 - p_3) \right) \quad (5)$$

193 Spatio-temporal pattern of R_0

194 First, we identified dates and locations of RVFV introduction with high epidemic potential. For each
 195 area under study, we looked at the introduction date inducing the highest number of pixels with $R_0 > 1$

196 each season. For clarity hereinafter, pxl_1 is the number of pixels with $R_0 > 1$ at a given introduction
197 date. For each season, we computed an R_0 threshold corresponding to the value of the third quartile,
198 independently of the study area and date of introduction within a given season, $Q_{3,year}$. We mapped
199 pixels for which $R_0 > Q_{3,year}$ at least once within the season ; we also recorded the number of times (i.e
200 weeks) it happened during the season. For two specific locations, namely Rosso in SRDV and Barkedji
201 in the Ferlo, we normalized R_0 values (dividing them by the maximum R_0 value of the season) and
202 compared seasonal patterns.

203

204 We then investigated the role of vector and host populations on the epidemic potential. In the Ferlo,
205 in 2015, we looked at temporal variations of the relative abundances of vector populations within pixels
206 with $R_0 > 1$. In Barkedji, we assessed how decreased vector densities would affect the value of R_0 for
207 three different dates of virus introduction. The first date we chose corresponded to the maximum pxl_1
208 in the Ferlo over the season. The other two dates both induced $R_0 > 1$ in Barkedji but exhibited dia-
209 metrically opposed vector composition, quantified with $\log_{10}(N_4/N_1)$. Similarly, we looked at the effect
210 of herd immunity, which could be acquired either through vaccination or previous exposure to RVF, on
211 the number of pixels with $R_0 > Q_{3,year}$, per study area and season.

212

213 Finally, we performed a variance-based global sensitivity analysis using a Fourier Amplitude Sensitivity
214 Testing (FAST, Saltelli et al., 2008). This method was used to quantify first order effects of parameters
215 but also interactions between parameters varying simultaneously, which is not possible with “one-at-a-
216 time” sensitivity analyses (Saltelli et al., 2019). Parameters varied within a 10% range using scaling
217 factors (reference value of 1). A given set (scenario) of scaling factors was applied to all R_0 computations
218 of a given study area and rainy season, to maintain the spatial heterogeneity as well as the relative
219 temporal dynamics of vector densities and temperature-dependent parameters. Temperature-dependent
220 function formulas were kept, and temperature was not varied. We sampled 10,000 values per parameter.
221 We tested whether introduction dates and locations with high epidemic potential were robust to these
222 parameter variations.

223 Results

224 Overall, there are 2.5 times more R_0 values computed in the Senegal river delta and valley (SRDV) than
225 in the Ferlo. Initially, input data provides 4419 independent pixels (1702 in the Ferlo, 2717 in SRDV)
226 containing both hosts and vectors at least once in the 63 introduction dates (21 weeks each season)
227 studied. Over the 236,430 possible R_0 computations, 3.7% are discarded because the local vector-to-host
228 ratio is too high (Table S.1-S.6). This mainly affects SRDV, where 52 pixels are entirely removed from
229 the study because their ratio never goes below the chosen threshold during the 3 rainy seasons. We end
230 up with a stable number of pixels where R_0 is computed per timestep in SRDV (min 2401, max 2657

231 over the three seasons), whereas this number largely varies within a season in the Ferlo, minimums being
 232 54, 7, and 5, and maximums 1673, 1702, and 1614, for 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively. In addition,
 233 the number of pixels with $R_0 > 1$ per introduction date (pxl_1) never goes below 1801 for any date of
 234 introduction in SRDV (always $>68\%$ of R_0 computations in this study area), and reaches its absolute
 235 maximum on 2016-09-12 ($n = 2504$). In the Ferlo, pxl_1 can go from 0 for introductions in November
 236 (2014-11-24, 2015-11-30 and 2016-11-28) to 1527 (93% of R_0 computations) on 2015-09-21.
 237




Figure 2: September is the month when RVF virus introduction could be the most damaging.
 A, C: R_0 distribution by introduction week for 3 consecutive rainy seasons, spatially aggregated by region (A : Ferlo, C: SRDV). R_0 values are computed independently for each introduction week, assuming constant parameters over the course of the secondary cases generation. Coloured lines show the temporal patterns of Barkedji (Ferlo) and Rosso (SRDV). Yellow bands highlight the introduction weeks inducing the highest number of pixels with $R_0 > 1$, for each rainy season. Ferlo : 2014-09-22, $n = 1313$, 2015-09-21, $n = 1527$, 2016-09-12, $n = 1023$. SRDV, 2014-08-11, $n = 2352$, 2015-09-14, $n = 2482$, 2016-09-12, $n = 2504$. In the box plots, the boundaries of the box indicate the 25th (bottom) and 75th (top) percentile. The line within the box marks the median. Whiskers above and below the box indicate the 10th and 90th percentiles. Points above and below the whiskers indicate outliers outside the 10th and 90th percentiles. B, D: Comparison of yearly R_0 pattern for Barkedji and Rosso. Values are normalized by the maximum of each rainy season.

238 In both study areas, each season, dates of introduction resulting in the highest pxl_1 happen most of the
 239 time (5/6) in September (Figure 2). Seasons 2015 and 2016 exhibit similar temporal patterns of R_0 , both
 240 at the regional level (Figure 2A,C) and in two particular locations (Figure 2B,D). However the observed
 241 trend in 2014 is different, with an earlier peak (in August) in both regions. In addition, a third peak is
 242 observed in SRDV in November 2014. The pixel closest to Rosso has its $R_0 > 1$ for every possible date of
 243 introduction over the three consecutive rainy seasons, which is not the case for the pixel closest to Barkedji.

244




Figure 3: **Zones of high RVF epidemic potential change between rainy seasons.** Map of northern Senegal showing pixels with $R_0 \geq Q_{3,year}$ (third quartile of R_0 values) at least once in the season. Pixels are coloured by percentage of season spent above the threshold (1 to 21 weeks). Orange points are important locations to ease figure reading. Lights grey pixels are other pixels where R_0 is computed during the season.

245 The map of areas with highest epidemic potential varies across the three rainy seasons of 2014, 2015 and
246 2016 (Figure 3). In the Ferlo, the south-west of Barkedji exhibits a high epidemic potential in 2014 but
247 not in 2015-2016. Conversely, the north-east of Barkedji exhibits a high epidemic potential in 2015-2016
248 but not in 2014. In SRDV, around Matam, there is a strong density of pixels with R_0 above the third

249 quartile of the season ($Q_{3,year}$) in 2015-2016 but less so in 2014. Overall, SRDV accounts for a larger
250 proportion of pixels with $R_0 > Q_{3,year}$ than the Ferlo, every season (at least three times more, Table
251 S.7). In addition, R_0 values above $Q_{3,year}$ appear less often per pixel in the Ferlo than in SRDV, every
252 season (Figure 3, pixels ranging from green to yellow, Table S.7).

253

254 The results of the sensitivity analysis show that in both study areas and for each season, dates and
255 locations of RVFV introduction resulting in high epidemic potential are robust to parameter variations.
256 Dates of introduction inducing the highest pxl_1 are similar between scenarios (Table S.8), as well as the
257 distribution of pixels with high R_0 values ($R_0 > Q_{3,year}$) and the number of times for which it happens
258 for those pixels (Figure S.8).

259

260 In the Ferlo, *Ae. v. arabiensis* tends to be the most abundant vector population within pixels with $R_0 > 1$
261 at the beginning of the rainy season, while *C. poicilipes* is the most abundant later in the season (Figure
262 4A, Figure S.4). Nonetheless, the vector composition shows a large variability between pixels for a same
263 date of introduction. For instance on October 12th 2015, minimum and maximum relative abundances
264 are $\log_{10}(N_4/N_1) = -3.74$ and $\log_{10}(N_4/N_1) = 4.44$ respectively (Figure 4A). In addition, when looking
265 at dates resulting in the highest pxl_1 , *Ae. v. arabiensis* is on average the most abundant in pixels with
266 $R_0 > 1$ in 2014 (2014-09-22, Figure S.4), while *C. poicilipes* is on average the most abundant in pixels
267 with $R_0 > 1$ in 2015 and 2016 (2015-09-21, 2016-09-12, Figure 4A, Figure S.4). In Barkedji, diametrically
268 opposed vector compositions can induce $R_0 > 1$, such as 2015-08-24 when $\log_{10}(N_4/N_1) = -1.08$ and
269 2015-10-12 when $\log_{10}(N_4/N_1) = 1.08$ (Figure 4A,B,D). In SRDV, *C. tritaeniorhynchus* is always the
270 most abundant species in every pixel with $R_0 > 1$, but the difference between the two populations is less
271 important than in the Ferlo (Figure S.4).

272

273 Decreased vector densities can hardly reduce R_0 values of at-risk pixels below 1 (Figure 4). In Barkedji,
274 this is observed regardless of RVFV introduction date and whichever species is the most abundant. In
275 addition, the vector composition is not an indicator of which population, if decreased, will more strongly
276 affect R_0 . Indeed, for RVFV introductions on August 24th 2015 and September 21st 2015, decreasing
277 the density of the most abundant vector population has the most important effect on R_0 value (Figure
278 4A,B,C). This is not observed on October 12th 2015, when *C. poicilipes* are more numerous than *Ae. v.*
279 *arabiensis* in Barkedji (Figure 4A, third red star), but decreasing the density of *Ae. v. arabiensis* has
280 the strongest impact on R_0 (Figure 4D).




Figure 4: Decreased vector densities do not highly reduce RVF epidemic potential in at-risk locations. Example of Ferlo 2015. A: Relative abundance of vector populations $\log_{10}(N_4/N_1)$ within pixels having $R_0 > 1$ over time. Light grey line indicates equal densities. For boxplots, see legend of Figure 2. Boxplots width is proportional to the number of pixels with $R_0 > 1$ (pxl_1 , min 4, max 1527). Colours inside box plots indicate the proportion of pixels with $R_0 > 1$ among those where R_0 is computed (min 7%, max 93%). Black line corresponds to the particular value of the ratio in Barkedji, for introduction weeks inducing $R_0 > 1$. Stars are positioned at introduction weeks 2015-08-24, 2015-09-21 and 2015-10-12. 2015-09-21 corresponds to the maximum pxl_1 in the Ferlo this season. The other two dates both induce $R_0 > 1$ in Barkedji but exhibit diametrically opposed vector composition. B-D: Variation of R_0 in Barkedji when decreasing vector densities, for 3 different weeks of introduction. Axes represent the proportion of initial vector density applied for the R_0 computation, the reference is at the top right corner (1, 1).

281 In both study areas, an increase in the proportion of immune cattle decreases the number of pixels with
 282 high R_0 values ($R_0 > Q_{3,year}$) more effectively than increasing the proportion of immune small ruminants
 283 (Figure 5B,C, Figure S.5). In most pixels ($4302/4367 = 98,5\%$), the number of small ruminants is higher
 284 than the number of cattle (Figure 5A). However, the difference in host populations sizes is smaller in
 285 SRDV than in the Ferlo. Indeed, there are on average 7.5 times more small ruminants than cattle in the
 286 Ferlo, and only twice more in SRDV. This is related to the presence of both very low cattle densities and
 287 very high small ruminant densities in the Ferlo, while the range of SRDV host distributions is narrower
 288 (Figure S.3). As a consequence, since cattle are in fewer numbers than small ruminants while being the
 289 preferred host of all vector species studied. (Table 1, Supplementary information 1.2) they are more likely
 290 to get bitten more than once. These bites, provided they result in successful transmission (first to the
 291 host, then to a vector), can strongly contribute to RVF epidemic potential.




Figure 5: **In both study areas, an increase in the proportion of immune cattle decreases the number of pixels with high R_0 values ($R_0 > Q_{3,year}$) more effectively than increasing the proportion of immune small ruminants** A - Map of relative densities of hosts $\log_{10}(N_3/N_2)$ within pixels of our study area. Blue pixels have more cattle than small ruminants, the biggest difference being $\log_{10}(N_3/N_2) = -0.08$. B-C - Variation of the number of pixels with $R_0 > Q_{3,2015}$ by study area (B : SRDV, C : Ferlo) when increasing host immunity. Axis represent proportion of immune hosts applied for the R_0 computation. The reference is the absence of herd immunity, (0, 0), in the bottom left corner.

292 Finally, in the Ferlo, every rainy season, the feeding preferences and the gonotrophic cycle duration of the
 293 most abundant vector species are the most influential parameters on the epidemic potential at the region
 294 scale (Figure 6, Figure S.6). In 2015, the first order effects of these parameters explain respectively 47%
 295 and 19% of the variance observed in pxl_1 , for the date of introduction inducing the highest pxl_1 (Table
 296 S.8). In SRDV, pxl_1 does not vary much in our sensitivity analysis (maximum 3% from the reference
 297 value in 2016, Figure S.7) for the dates of introduction inducing the highest pxl_1 , because pxl_1 quickly
 298 reaches the total number of pixels where R_0 is computed for the study area. It is nonetheless influenced
 299 by the same parameters than highlighted for the Ferlo (Figure S.7). Precisely, the more the feeding
 300 preference of the most abundant vector population is skewed towards cattle, and the more often these
 301 vectors have to take a new blood meal, the higher pxl_1 .




Figure 6: **The feeding preferences and the gonotrophic cycle duration of the most abundant vector species are the most influential parameters on the epidemic potential at the regional scale.** Example of Ferlo, 2015. Results of the FAST sensitivity analysis showing contribution of model parameters to the number of pixels with $R_0 > 1$, pxl_1 , for the introduction week inducing the highest pxl_1 of the rainy season. Sensitivity indices for principal effect in grey and for interactions in black. Definition and reference values of parameters can be found in Table 1. The introduction week inducing the highest pxl_1 during the 2015 rainy season is 09-21 for 299,999 scenari and 09-14 for one scenario (Table S.8). At these dates, *C. poicilipes* is the most abundant vector population in the Ferlo (Figure S.4)

Discussion

302

303 The results of our analyses show that an introduction of Rift Valley fever virus in September has the po-
 304 tential to trigger an epidemic almost everywhere in northern Senegal. Areas with high epidemic potential
 305 during most of the rainy season also exists, particularly in the Senegal river delta and valley, due to the
 306 continuous presence of water. In contrast, in the Ferlo region, the most at-risk ponds change between
 307 rainy seasons. These results are robust to parameter variations tested in our sensitivity analysis, following
 308 a global variance-based approach requested for models with nonlinearities and interactions (Saltelli et al.,
 309 2019).

310

311 We provide the first mapping of RVF epidemic potential in the West African Sahel using the basic repro-
 312 duction number. We achieve better spatial and temporal resolutions than previous studies in RVF-free
 313 regions (Barker et al., 2013; Fischer et al., 2013), which was made possible by the use of satellite Sen-
 314 tinel 2 images by Tran et al. (2019) along with ground truth validation data and a precise knowledge
 315 of temporary ponds filling dynamics. However, host densities, which do not stand out in our sensitivity
 316 analysis, may vary beyond the range presently allowed. Indeed, their temporal dynamics, mostly driven
 317 by animal mobility, is not incorporated into GLW 3 data, and might affect the population-specific contact
 318 rate with vectors and therefore R_0 values. Remote-sensing methods are considered a promising tool to
 319 measure human mobility (Bharti and Tatem, 2018), but we also need qualitative data on factors guiding
 320 decisions of nomadic herders in order to include animal mobility in a mechanistic way (Apolloni et al.,

321 2018; Belkhiria et al., 2019).

322

323 The mechanistic approach used in this paper is the best suited to describe the complexity of RVF epidemic
324 potential in our study region. Indeed, neither host nor vector densities alone are sufficient to predict the
325 local epidemic potential, contrary to what was implied by previous mappings and statistical studies (Bi-
326 cout and Sabatier, 2004; Caminade et al., 2011). Indeed, it is actually the process of blood feeding, during
327 which host and vector populations interact, which should accurately be described to achieve the most
328 reliable estimates of RVF epidemic potential. We account for the influence of temperature in our model,
329 which is known to strongly influence the risk of vector-borne diseases transmission (Mordecai et al., 2017;
330 Kamiya et al., 2020; Mordecai et al., 2019), but we do not simulate the consequences of global changes,
331 which is beyond the scope of this study. The adequate contact rate, an aggregated parameter used in
332 previous models (Gaff et al., 2007; Mpeshe et al., 2014), is decomposed here to assess the importance
333 of each of its components, as in Turner et al. 2013. Based on our sensitivity analysis, we recommend
334 that future biological investigations focus on the feeding preferences of vectors and the duration of their
335 gonotrophic cycle, in relation with temperature.

336

337 The inclusion of two host and two vector populations provides new insights on RVF epidemic potential,
338 and this structure should be kept for future models studying RVF in the region. We show that decreased
339 vector densities are not sufficient to limit the epidemic potential of RVF, regardless of the introduction
340 date considered. Indeed, vector abundances are not always a good predictor of RVF epidemic potential,
341 with high R_0 values sometimes driven by the least abundant vector population. Moreover, cattle con-
342 tribute strongly to RVF transmission and their immune status is likely to influence the epidemic potential
343 at the regional scale. Favoring vaccination of cattle over small ruminants is not what is usually done in
344 the field. Veterinary services, along with herders, tend to promote small ruminant vaccination as they are
345 more likely to die from the disease and thus need more protection (Sow et al., 2016). The importance of
346 small ruminant trade, particularly around the Tabaski festival, might also justify this approach (Lancelot
347 et al., 2019). Operational decisions regarding targeted vaccination campaigns should therefore consider
348 the potential benefits of cattle immunity at the population scale.

349

350 In the present study, we provide a better understanding of conditions which could trigger the onset of an
351 epidemic. However, this should be interpreted with caution, and should not be considered as an indicator
352 of epidemic size. Indeed, multiple introductions or sudden unfavourable conditions might lead to diseases
353 persisting with $R_0 < 1$ or dying out with $R_0 > 1$ (Li et al., 2011). In addition, our results could be used as
354 initial conditions for a stochastic mechanistic model of spatio-temporal transmission, which would include
355 processes underlying epidemic dynamic after RVFV introduction, such as animal mobility. Such a model
356 would benefit from an increased availability of epidemiological data for validation and parametrisation,
357 which are necessary to unravel the underlying mechanisms driving the spatio-temporal dynamics of RVF

358 in the West African Sahel.

Data and code accessibility

Input data and scripts are available online: <http://sourcesup.renater.fr/www/rvf-r0-senegal/>

Funding

This work was part of the FORESEE project funded by INRAE metaprogram GISA (Integrated Management of Animal Health). HC was funded by INRAE, Région Pays de la Loire, CIRAD.

Author contributions

HC: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **RM:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **AGF:** Resources, Writing - review & editing. **MML:** Resources, Writing - review & editing. **RL:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Supervision, Writing - review & editing. **PE:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing.

References

- Adriansen, H. K. Understanding pastoral mobility: the case of Senegalese Fulani. *The geographical journal*, 174(3):17, 2008.
- Anyamba, A., Chretien, J.-P., Small, J., Tucker, C. J., Formenty, P. B., Richardson, J. H., Britch, S. C., Schnabel, D. C., Erickson, R. L., and Linthicum, K. J. Prediction of a Rift Valley fever outbreak. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(3):955–959, 2009. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0806490106.
- Anyangu, A. S., Gould, L. H., Sharif, S. K., Nguku, P. M., Omolo, J. O., Mutonga, D., Rao, C. Y., Lederman, E. R., Schnabel, D., Paweska, J. T., Katz, M., Hightower, A., Njenga, M. K., Feikin, D. R., and Breiman, R. F. Risk factors for severe Rift Valley fever infection in Kenya, 2007. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 83(Suppl 2):14–21, 2010. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2010.09-0293.
- Apolloni, A., Nicolas, G., Coste, C., EL Mamy, A. B., Yahya, B., EL Arbi, A. S., Gueya, M. B., Baba, D., Gilbert, M., and Lancelot, R. Towards the description of livestock mobility in Sahelian Africa: some results from a survey in Mauritania. *PLoS ONE*, 13(1):e0191565, 2018. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0191565.

- Ba, Y., Diallo, D., Kebe, C. M. F., Dia, I., and Diallo, M. Aspects of bioecology of two Rift Valley fever virus vectors in Senegal (West Africa): *Aedes vexans* and *Culex poicilipes* (Diptera: Culicidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 42(5):12, 2005.
- Ba, Y., Diallo, D., Dia, I., and Diallo, M. Comportement trophique des vecteurs du virus de la fièvre de la vallée du Rift au Sénégal : implications dans l'épidémiologie de la maladie. *Bull Soc Pathol Exot*, 99(4):283–289, 2006.
- Barker, C. M., Niu, T., Reisen, W. K., and Hartley, D. M. Data-driven modeling to assess receptivity for Rift Valley fever virus. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 7(11):e2515, 2013. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002515.
- Belkhiria, J., Lo, M. M., Sow, F., Martínez-López, B., and Chevalier, V. Application of exponential random graph models to determine nomadic herders' movements in Senegal. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases*, 66:1642–1652, 2019. doi: 10.1111/tbed.13198.
- Bharti, N. and Tatem, A. J. Fluctuations in anthropogenic nighttime lights from satellite imagery for five cities in Niger and Nigeria. *Scientific Data*, 5:180256, 2018. doi: 10.1038/sdata.2018.256.
- Bicout, D. J. and Sabatier, P. Mapping Rift Valley fever vectors and prevalence using rainfall variations. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis.*, 4(1):33–42, 2004. doi: 10.1089/153036604773082979.
- Bird, B. H., Ksiazek, T. G., Nichol, S. T., and MacLachlan, N. J. Rift Valley fever virus. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 234(7):883–893, 2009.
- Biteye, B., Fall, A. G., Ciss, M., Seck, M. T., Apolloni, A., Fall, M., Tran, A., and Gimonneau, G. Ecological distribution and population dynamics of Rift Valley fever virus mosquito vectors (Diptera, Culicidae) in Senegal. *Parasit Vectors*, 11(1):27, 2018. doi: 10.1186/s13071-017-2591-9.
- Bop, M., Amadou, A., Seidou, O., Kébé, C. M. F., Ndione, J. A., Sambou, S., and Sanda, I. S. Modeling the hydrological dynamic of the breeding water bodies in Barkedji's zone. *Journal of Water Resource and Protection*, 06(08):741–755, 2014. doi: 10.4236/jwarp.2014.68071.
- Bruckmann, L. Crue et développement rural dans la vallée du Sénégal : entre marginalisation et résilience. *Belgeo*, 2, 2018. doi: 10.4000/belgeo.23158.
- Calisher, C. H. West Nile virus in the new world: appearance, persistence, and adaptation to a new econiche—an opportunity taken. *Viral Immunology*, 13(4):411–414, 2000. doi: 10.1089/vim.2000.13.411.
- Caminade, C., Ndione, J. A., Kebe, C. M. F., Jones, A. E., Danuor, S., Tay, S., Tourre, Y. M., Lacaux, J.-P., Vignolles, C., Duchemin, J. B., Jeanne, I., and Morse, A. P. Mapping Rift Valley fever and malaria risk over West Africa using climatic indicators. *Atmospheric Science Letters*, 12(1):96–103, 2011. doi: 10.1002/asl.296.

- Caminade, C., Ndione, J., Diallo, M., MacLeod, D., Faye, O., Ba, Y., Dia, I., and Morse, A. Rift Valley fever outbreaks in Mauritania and related environmental conditions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(1):903–918, 2014. doi: 10.3390/ijerph110100903.
- Cavalerie, L., Charron, M. V. P., Ezanno, P., Dommergues, L., Zumbo, B., and Cardinale, E. A stochastic model to study Rift Valley fever persistence with different seasonal patterns of vector abundance: new insights on the endemicity in the tropical island of Mayotte. *PLoS ONE*, 10(7):e0130838, 2015. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0130838.
- Chevalier, V., Pépin, M., Plée, L., and Lancelot, R. Rift Valley fever - a threat for Europe ? *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 19(8):705–708, 2010. doi: 10.1111/1469-0691.12163.
- Danzetta, M. L., Bruno, R., Sauro, F., Savini, L., and Calistri, P. Rift Valley fever transmission dynamics described by compartmental models. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 134:197–210, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2016.09.007.
- Davies, F. G. and Martin, V. Recognizing rift valley fever. *FAO Animal Health Manual*, 17, 2003.
- Diallo, D., Talla, C., Ba, Y., Dia, I., Sall, A. A., and Diallo, M. Temporal distribution and spatial pattern of abundance of the Rift Valley fever and West Nile fever vectors in Barkedji, Senegal. *Journal of Vector Ecology*, 36(2):426–436, 2011. doi: 10.1111/j.1948-7134.2011.00184.x.
- Diallo, M., Lochouarn, L., Ba, K., Sall, A. A., Mondo, M., Girault, L., and Mathiot, C. First isolation of the Rift Valley fever virus from *Culex poicilipes* (Diptera: Culicidae) in nature. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 62(6):702–704, 2000. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.2000.62.702.
- EMPRES. Early warning message: Rift valley fever in the gambia; tabaski is approaching, 2003. URL <http://www.fao.org/AG/AGAInfo/programmes/en/empres/earlywarning/ew14.html>. (Accessed 17 February 2020).
- Fall, A., Diaïté, A., Seck, M., Bouyer, J., Lefrançois, T., Vachiéry, N., Aprelon, R., Faye, O., Konaté, L., and Lancelot, R. West Nile virus transmission in sentinel chickens and potential mosquito vectors, Senegal River delta, 2008–2009. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10(10):4718–4727, 2013. doi: 10.3390/ijerph10104718.
- Fall, A. G., Diaïté, A., Lancelot, R., Tran, A., Soti, V., Etter, E., Konaté, L., Faye, O., and Bouyer, J. Feeding behaviour of potential vectors of West Nile virus in Senegal. *Parasites & Vectors*, 4(1):99, 2011. doi: 10.1186/1756-3305-4-99.
- Fischer, E. A., Boender, G.-J., Nodelijk, G., de Koeijer, A. A., and van Roermund, H. J. The transmission potential of Rift Valley fever virus among livestock in the Netherlands: a modelling study. *Veterinary Research*, 44(1):58, 2013. doi: 10.1186/1297-9716-44-58.

- Fontenille, D., Traore-Laminaza, M., Diallo, M., Thonnon, J., Digoutte, J. P., and Zeller, H. G. New vectors of Rift Valley fever in West Africa. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 4(2):289–293, 1998. doi: 10.3201/eid0402.980218.
- Gaff, H. D., Hartley, D. M., and Leahy, N. P. An epidemiological model of Rift Valley fever. *Electronic Journal of Differential Equations*, 2007(115):1–12, 2007.
- Gerdes, G. H. Rift valley fever. *Rev. sci. tech. Off. int. Epiz.*, 23(2):613–623, 2004.
- Gilbert, M., Nicolas, G., Cinardi, G., Van Boeckel, T. P., Vanwambeke, S. O., Wint, G. R. W., and Robinson, T. P. Global distribution data for cattle, buffaloes, horses, sheep, goats, pigs, chickens and ducks in 2010. *Scientific Data*, 5:180227, 2018. doi: 10.1038/sdata.2018.227.
- Gubbins, S., Carpenter, S., Baylis, M., Wood, J. L., and Mellor, P. S. Assessing the risk of bluetongue to UK livestock: uncertainty and sensitivity analyses of a temperature-dependent model for the basic reproduction number. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 5(20):363–371, 2008. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2007.1110.
- Hammami, P., Lancelot, R., and Lesnoff, M. Modelling the dynamics of post-vaccination immunity rate in a population of Sahelian sheep after a vaccination campaign against Peste des Petits Ruminants virus. *PLoS ONE*, 11(9):e0161769, 2016. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0161769.
- Hartemink, N. A., Randolph, S. E., Davis, S. A., and Heesterbeek, J. A. P. The basic reproduction number for complex disease systems: defining r_0 for tick-borne infections. *The American Naturalist*, 171(6):743–754, 2008. doi: 10.1086/587530.
- Jupp, P. G., Kemp, A., Grobbelaar, A., Leman, P., Burt, F. J., Alahmed, A. M., Mujalli, D. A., Khamees, M. A., and Swanepoel, R. The 2000 epidemic of Rift Valley fever in Saudi Arabia: mosquito vector studies. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*, 16(3):245–252, 2002. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2915.2002.00371.x.
- Kamiya, T., Greischar, M. A., Wadhawan, K., Gilbert, B., Paaijmans, K., and Mideo, N. Temperature-dependent variation in the extrinsic incubation period elevates the risk of vector-borne disease emergence. *Epidemics*, 30:100382, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.epidem.2019.100382.
- Kim, Y., Dommergues, L., M’sa, A. B., Mérot, P., Cardinale, E., Edmunds, J., Pfeiffer, D., Fournié, G., and Métras, R. Livestock trade network: potential for disease transmission and implications for risk-based surveillance on the island of Mayotte. *Scientific Reports*, 8:11550, 2018. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-29999-y.
- Lacaux, J., Tourre, Y., Vignolles, C., Ndione, J., and Lafaye, M. Classification of ponds from high-spatial resolution remote sensing: application to Rift Valley fever epidemics in Senegal. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 106(1):66–74, 2007. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2006.07.012.

- Lancelot, R., Cêtre-Sossah, C., Hassan, O. A., Yahya, B., Ould Elmamy, B., Fall, A. G., Lo, M. M., Apolloni, A., Arsevska, E., and Chevalier, V. Rift Valley fever: One Health at play? In Kardjadj, M., Diallo, A., and Lancelot, R., editors, *Transboundary Animal Diseases in Sahelian Africa and Connected Regions*, pages 121–148. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. ISBN 978-3-030-25384-4 978-3-030-25385-1. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-25385-1_8.
- Laughlin, L. W., Meegan, J. M., Strausbaugh, L. J., Morens, D. M., and Watten, R. H. Epidemic Rift Valley fever in Egypt: observations of the spectrum of human illness. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 73(6):630–633, 1979. doi: 10.1016/0035-9203(79)90006-3.
- Li, J., Blakeley, D., and Smith, R. J. The failure of R0. *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, 2011:17, 2011. doi: 10.1155/2011/527610.
- Linthicum, K. J., Davies, F. G., Kairo, A., and Bailey, C. L. Rift Valley fever virus (family Bunyaviridae, genus Phlebovirus). Isolations from Diptera collected during an inter-epizootic period in Kenya. *Journal of Hygiene*, 95(01):197–209, 1985. doi: 10.1017/S0022172400062434.
- Linthicum, K. J., Britch, S. C., and Anyamba, A. Rift Valley fever: an emerging mosquito-borne disease. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 61(1):395–415, 2016. doi: 10.1146/annurev-ento-010715-023819.
- Lumley, S., Horton, D. L., Hernandez-Triana, L. L. M., Johnson, N., Fooks, A. R., and Hewson, R. Rift Valley fever virus: strategies for maintenance, survival and vertical transmission in mosquitoes. *Journal of General Virology*, 98(5):875–887, 2017. doi: 10.1099/jgv.0.000765.
- Madani, T. A., Al-Mazrou, Y. Y., Al-Jeffri, M. H., Mishkhas, A. A., Al-Rabeah, A. M., Turkistani, A. M., Al-Sayed, M. O., Abodahish, A. A., Khan, A. S., Ksiazek, T. G., and Shobokshi, O. Rift Valley fever epidemic in Saudi Arabia: epidemiological, clinical, and laboratory characteristics. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 37(8):1084–1092, 2003. doi: 10.1086/378747.
- Madder, D., Surgeoner, G., and Helson, B. Number of generations, egg production, and developmental time of *Culex pipiens* and *Culex restuans* (Diptera: Culicidae) in Southern Ontario. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 20(3):275–287, 1983. doi: 10.1093/jmedent/20.3.275.
- Mehand, M. S., Al-Shorbaji, F., Millett, P., and Murgue, B. The WHO R&D Blueprint: 2018 review of emerging infectious diseases requiring urgent research and development efforts. *Antiviral Research*, 159:63–67, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.antiviral.2018.09.009.
- Mondet, B., Diaïté, A., Ndioune, J.-A., Fall, A. G., Chevalier, V., Lancelot, R., Ndiaye, M., and Ponçon, N. Rainfall patterns and population dynamics of *Aedes (Aedimorphus) vexans arabiensis*, Patton 1905 (Diptera: Culicidae), a potential vector of Rift Valley fever virus in Senegal. *Journal of Vector Ecology*, 30(1):5, 2005.

- Mordecai, E. A., Cohen, J. M., Evans, M. V., Gudapati, P., Johnson, L. R., Lippi, C. A., Miazgowicz, K., Murdock, C. C., Rohr, J. R., Ryan, S. J., Savage, V., Shocket, M. S., Ibarra, A. S., Thomas, M. B., and Weikel, D. P. Detecting the impact of temperature on transmission of Zika, dengue, and chikungunya using mechanistic models. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 11(4):e0005568, 2017.
- Mordecai, E. A., Caldwell, J. M., Grossman, M. K., Lippi, C. A., Johnson, L. R., Neira, M., Rohr, J. R., Ryan, S. J., Savage, V., Shocket, M. S., Sippy, R., Stewart Ibarra, A. M., Thomas, M. B., and Villena, O. Thermal biology of mosquito-borne disease. *Ecology Letters*, 2019. doi: 10.1111/ele.13335.
- Mpeshe, S. C., Luboobi, L. S., and Nkansah-Gyekye, Y. Modeling the impact of climate change on the dynamics of Rift Valley fever. *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, 2014:12, 2014. doi: 10.1155/2014/627586.
- Métrás, R., Collins, L. M., White, R. G., Alonso, S., Chevalier, V., Thuránira-McKeever, C., and Pfeiffer, D. U. Rift Valley Fever Epidemiology, Surveillance, and Control: What Have Models Contributed? *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*, 11(6):761–771, 2011. doi: 10.1089/vbz.2010.0200.
- Ndiaye, E. H., Fall, G., Gaye, A., Bob, N. S., Talla, C., Diagne, C. T., Diallo, D., Ba, Y., Dia, I., Kohl, A., Sall, A. A., and Diallo, M. Vector competence of *Aedes vexans* (Meigen), *Culex poicilipes* (Theobald) and *Cx. quinquefasciatus* Say from Senegal for West and East African lineages of Rift Valley fever virus. *Parasites & Vectors*, 9:94, 2016. doi: 10.1186/s13071-016-1383-y.
- Ndione, J.-A., Diop, M., Lacaux, J.-P., and Gaye, A. T. Variabilité intra-saisonnière de la pluviométrie et émergence de la fièvre de la vallée du Rift dans la vallée du fleuve Sénégal : nouvelles considérations. *Climatologie*, (5):83–97, 2008. doi: 10.4267/climatologie.794.
- Ndione, J.-A., Lacaux, J.-P., Tourre, Y., Vignolles, C., Fontanaz, D., and Lafaye, M. Mares temporaires et risques sanitaires au Ferlo: contribution de la télédétection pour l'étude de la fièvre de la vallée du Rift entre août 2003 et janvier 2004. *Sécheresse*, 20(1):153–160, 2009. doi: 10.1684/sec.2009.0170.
- Nicolas, G., Chevalier, V., Tantely, L. M., Fontenille, D., and Durand, B. A spatially explicit metapopulation model and cattle trade analysis suggests key determinants for the recurrent circulation of Rift Valley fever virus in a pilot area of Madagascar highlands. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 8(12): e3346, 2014. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003346.
- Niu, T., Gaff, H. D., Papelis, Y. E., and Hartley, D. M. An epidemiological model of Rift Valley fever with spatial dynamics. *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine*, 2012:12, 2012. doi: 10.1155/2012/138757.
- Parham, P. E., Waldock, J., Christophides, G. K., Hemming, D., Agosto, F., Evans, K. J., Fefferman, N., Gaff, H., Gumel, A., LaDeau, S., Lenhart, S., Mickens, R. E., Naumova, E. N., Ostfeld, R. S., Ready, P. D., Thomas, M. B., Velasco-Hernandez, J., and Michael, E. Climate, environmental and

- socio-economic change: weighing up the balance in vector-borne disease transmission. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 370:20130551, 2015. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2013.0551.
- Pedro, S. A., Abelman, S., and Tonnang, H. E. Z. Predicting Rift Valley fever inter-epidemic activities and outbreak patterns: insights from a stochastic host-vector model. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 10(12):e0005167, 2016. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005167.
- Pepin, M., Bouloy, M., Bird, B. H., Kemp, A., and Paweska, J. Rift Valley fever virus (*Bunyaviridae: Phlebovirus*): an update on pathogenesis, molecular epidemiology, vectors, diagnostics and prevention. *Veterinary Research*, 41(6):61, 2010. doi: 10.1051/vetres/2010033.
- Saltelli, A., Chan, R., and Scott, F. M. *Sensitivity analysis*. Wiley, 2008. ISBN 978-0-470-74382-9.
- Saltelli, A., Aleksankina, K., Becker, W., Fennell, P., Ferretti, F., Holst, N., Li, S., and Wu, Q. Why so many published sensitivity analyses are false: a systematic review of sensitivity analysis practices. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 114:29–39, 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.envsoft.2019.01.012.
- Soti, V., Puech, C., Lo Seen, D., Bertran, A., Vignolles, C., Mondet, B., Dessay, N., and Tran, A. The potential for remote sensing and hydrologic modelling to assess the spatio-temporal dynamics of ponds in the Ferlo Region (Senegal). *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 14(8):1449–1464, 2010. doi: 10.5194/hess-14-1449-2010.
- Soti, V., Chevalier, V., Maura, J., Bégué, A., Lelong, C., Lancelot, R., Thiongane, Y., and Tran, A. Identifying landscape features associated with Rift Valley fever virus transmission, Ferlo region, Senegal, using very high spatial resolution satellite imagery. *International Journal of Health Geographics*, 12:10, 2013. doi: 10.1186/1476-072X-12-10.
- Sow, A., Faye, O., Ba, Y., Diallo, D., Fall, G., Faye, O., Bob, N. S., Loucoubar, C., Richard, V., Dia, A. T., Diallo, M., Malvy, D., and Sall, A. A. Widespread Rift Valley fever emergence in Senegal in 2013–2014. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*, 2016. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofw149.
- Spickler, A. R. Rift Valley fever, 2015. URL http://www.cfsph.iastate.edu/Factsheets/pdfs/rift_valley_fever.pdf. (Accessed 17 February 2020).
- Talla, C., Diallo, D., Dia, I., Ba, Y., Ndione, J.-A., Morse, A. P., Diop, A., and Diallo, M. Modelling hotspots of the two dominant Rift Valley fever vectors (*Aedes vexans* and *Culex poicilipes*) in Barkédji, Sénégal. *Parasites & Vectors*, 9:111, 2016. doi: 10.1186/s13071-016-1399-3.
- Tjaden, N. B., Thomas, S. M., Fischer, D., and Beierkuhnlein, C. Extrinsic incubation period of Dengue: knowledge, backlog, and applications of temperature dependence. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 7(6):e2207, 2013. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002207.

- Tourre, Y. M., Lacaux, J.-P., Vignolles, C., and Lafaye, M. Climate impacts on environmental risks evaluated from space: a conceptual approach to the case of Rift Valley fever in Senegal. *Global Health Action*, 2(1):2053, 2009. doi: 10.3402/gha.v2i0.2053.
- Tran, A., Trevenec, C., Lutwama, J., Sserugga, J., Gély, M., Pittiglio, C., Pinto, J., and Chevalier, V. Development and assessment of a geographic knowledge-based model for mapping suitable areas for Rift Valley fever transmission in Eastern Africa. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 10(9):e0004999, 2016. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004999.
- Tran, A., Fall, A. G., Biteye, B., Ciss, M., Gimonneau, G., Castets, M., Seck, M. T., and Chevalier, V. Spatial modeling of mosquito vectors for Rift Valley fever virus in northern Senegal: integrating satellite-derived meteorological estimates in population dynamics models. *Remote Sensing*, 11:1024, 2019. doi: 10.3390/rs11091024.
- Turner, J., Bowers, R. G., and Baylis, M. Two-host, two-vector basic reproduction ratio (R_0) for Blue-tongue. *PLoS ONE*, 8(1):e53128, 2013. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0053128.
- Vignolles, C., Lacaux, J.-P., Tourre, Y. M., Bigeard, G., Ndione, J.-A., and Lafaye, M. Rift Valley fever in a zone potentially occupied by *Aedes vexans* in Senegal: dynamics and risk mapping. *Geospatial health*, 3(2):211–220, 2009. doi: 10.4081/gh.2009.221.
- Wonham, M. J., Lewis, M. A., Renclawowicz, J., and van den Driessche, P. Transmission assumptions generate conflicting predictions in host-vector disease models: a case study in West Nile virus. *Ecology Letters*, 9(6):706–725, 2006. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00912.x.
- World Health Organization (WHO). A global brief on vector-borne diseases, 2014. URL http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/111008/1/WHO_DCO_WH-D_2014.1_eng.pdf. (Accessed 17 February 2020).
- Xue, L. and Scoglio, C. The network level reproduction number for infectious diseases with both vertical and horizontal transmission. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 243(1):67–80, 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.mbs.2013.02.004.