

# **The economic burden of zoonotic *Plasmodium knowlesi* malaria on households in Sabah, Malaysia compared to malaria from human-only *Plasmodium* species.**

SHORT TITLE: Comparative economic burden of knowlesi, falciparum and vivax malaria

Patrick Abraham(1), Campbell McMullin(1), Timothy William(3), Giri S Rajahram(3, 4, 5), Jenarun Jelip(6), Roddy Teo(7), Chris Drakeley(8), Abdul Marsudi Manah (9), Nicholas M Anstey(2), Matthew J Grigg(2)†, Angela Devine (1,2)†

1. Melbourne Health Economics, Centre for Health Policy, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
2. Global and Tropical Health Division, Menzies School of Health Research, Charles Darwin University, Darwin, Northern Territory, Australia
3. Infectious Disease Society-Menzies School of Health Research, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia
4. Queen Elizabeth Hospital II, Ministry of Health Malaysia, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia
5. School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Monash University Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
6. Vector Borne Disease Sector, Ministry of Health Malaysia, Putrajaya, Malaysia
7. Public Health Research Section, Sabah State Department of Health, Ministry of Health Malaysia, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia
8. London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

9. Vector Borne Unit, Sabah State Department of Health, Ministry of Health Malaysia, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia

† These authors contributed equally.

#### Author contributions

PA was responsible for formal analysis, writing and editing manuscript.

CM was responsible for data curation and manuscript editing.

TW was responsible for conceptualization, resources and supervision.

GSR was responsible for resources and supervision.

RT, JJ, AMM and CD were responsible for public health data context and analysis.

NA was responsible for conceptualization, resources, supervision, and manuscript preparation.

MG was responsible for conceptualization, methodology, resources, manuscript preparation and supervision.

AD was responsible for conceptualization, supervision, methodology, and manuscript preparation.

1 **ABSTRACT (274/300 words)**

2 **Background:** The emergence of the zoonotic monkey parasite *Plasmodium knowlesi* as the  
3 dominant cause of malaria in Malaysia has disrupted current national WHO elimination goals.  
4 Malaysia has free universal access to malaria care; however, out-of-pocket costs are unknown.  
5 This study estimated household costs of illness attributable to malaria due to *P. knowlesi*  
6 against other non-zoonotic *Plasmodium* species infections in Sabah, Malaysia.

7 **Methodology/Principal Findings:** Household costs were estimated from patient-level surveys  
8 collected from four hospitals between 2013 and 2016. Direct costs including medical and  
9 associated travel costs, and indirect costs due to lost productivity were included. One hundred  
10 and fifty-two malaria cases were enrolled: *P. knowlesi* (n=108), *P. vivax* (n=22), *P. falciparum*  
11 (n=16), and *P. malariae* (n=6). Costs were inflated to 2022 Malaysian Ringgits and reported  
12 in United States dollars (US\$). Across all cases, the mean total costs were US\$138 (SD=108),  
13 with productivity losses accounting for 58% of costs (US\$80; SD=73). *P. vivax* had the highest  
14 mean total household cost at US\$210, followed by *P. knowlesi* (US\$127), *P. falciparum*  
15 (US\$126), and *P. malariae* (US\$105). Most patients (80%) experienced direct health costs  
16 above 10% of monthly income, with 58 (38%) patients experiencing health spending over 25%  
17 of monthly income, consistent with catastrophic health expenditure.

18 **Conclusions/Significance:** Despite Malaysia's free health-system care for malaria, patients  
19 and families face other related medical, travel, and indirect costs. Household out-of-pocket  
20 costs were driven by productivity losses; primarily attributed to infections in working-aged  
21 males in rural agricultural-based occupations. Costs for *P. knowlesi* were comparable to *P.*  
22 *falciparum* and lower than *P. vivax*. The higher *P. vivax* costs related to direct health facility  
23 costs for repeat monitoring visits given the liver-stage treatment required.

25 **AUTHOR SUMMARY (178/150-200 words)**

26 Knowlesi malaria is due to infection with a parasite transmitted by mosquitos from monkeys  
27 to humans. Most people who are infected work or live near the forest. It is now the major type  
28 of malaria affecting humans in Malaysia. The recent increase of knowlesi malaria cases in  
29 humans has impacted individuals, families, and health systems in Southeast Asia. Although the  
30 region has made substantial progress towards eliminating human-only malaria species,  
31 knowlesi malaria threatens elimination targets as traditional control measures do not address  
32 the parasite reservoir in monkeys. The economic burden of illness due to knowlesi malaria has  
33 not previously been estimated or subsequently compared with other malaria species. We  
34 collected data on the cost of illness to households in Sabah, Malaysia, to estimate their related  
35 total economic burden. Medical costs and time off work and usual activities were substantial  
36 in patients with the four species of malaria diagnosed during the time of this study. This  
37 research highlights the financial burden which households face when seeking care for malaria  
38 in Malaysia, despite the free treatment provided by the government.

39

40 **INTRODUCTION**

41 Malaria is a vector-borne disease caused by infection with parasitic protozoa of the  
42 *Plasmodium* genus, which continues to exert a high health burden and cost in endemic settings  
43 [1, 2]. Six *Plasmodium* species commonly cause malaria in humans: *P. falciparum*, *P. vivax*,  
44 *P. malariae*, *P. ovale walikeri*, *P. ovale curtisi* and *P. knowlesi* [3]. Since *P. falciparum* and *P.*  
45 *vivax* have historically caused the most significant health burden in humans, elimination efforts  
46 have primarily focused on these species [4]. Malaysia is now nearing elimination of non-  
47 zoonotic malaria with no indigenous cases of *P. falciparum* and *P. vivax* reported in the country  
48 for the last 5 years [1].

49 The emergence of zoonotic *P. knowlesi* transmission since 2004 threatens progress towards  
50 WHO malaria elimination goals for endemic countries in Southeast Asia. *P. knowlesi* is now  
51 the major cause of malaria in Malaysia, with public health notifications increasing to 3000-  
52 4000 cases per year in 2017 and remaining at this level currently [5-7]. *P. knowlesi* infection  
53 also carries a high risk of severe disease, estimated at 6-9% of symptomatic cases presenting  
54 to health facilities in East Malaysia, comparable with previous risk for falciparum malaria in  
55 sympatric areas [5, 8-10]. Human infections with *P. knowlesi* occur in areas inhabited by  
56 natural macaque hosts where it is transmitted to humans via *Anopheles Leucosphyrus* Group  
57 mosquito vectors [11]. Due to the lack of effectiveness of traditional malaria public health  
58 control methods for zoonotic transmission primarily at the forest-edge [12, 13], the need for  
59 inter-sectoral approaches has been recommended for *P. knowlesi* [14].

60 *P. knowlesi* malaria is most prevalent in males aged between 20 and 40 years in Malaysia, who  
61 are the most active reported demographic in formal employment [8, 15, 16]. Males within this  
62 age group are more susceptible to acquisition of zoonotic malaria due to working outside in  
63 rural areas in proximity to forest edges, related to agricultural activities such as farming,  
64 forestry, palm oil and rubber plantations [12, 13]. More than half of *P. knowlesi* cases nationally  
65 have been attributed to agriculture and plantation-based work activities, with considerable  
66 remaining cases linked to timber logging and forestry work [14].

67 The increase in the incidence of *P. knowlesi* [14] is primarily in the East Malaysia states of  
68 Sabah and Sarawak on the island of Borneo [17]. Sabah, the nation's third most populous state,  
69 consists predominantly of rural agricultural areas with tropical rainforest and large areas of  
70 mountainous terrain, which combined with large-scale deforestation primarily for oil-palm  
71 plantations and rural population growth have created an environment suitable for zoonotic  
72 malaria transmission [16, 18-20]. In 2017 Sabah accounted for 45% of all reported malaria

73 cases in Malaysia, with an almost five times greater annual case-incidence than the national  
74 average [19].

75 Malaria carries a significant financial burden to both health systems and the individuals,  
76 families, and communities experiencing the disease.[2] Malaysia has free universal access to  
77 malaria screening, testing, and treatment through public health facilities [21, 22]. However, to  
78 our knowledge, the out-of-pocket costs to households for related travel, medicines and  
79 healthcare visits have not been previously estimated. High out-of-pocket payments required for  
80 healthcare services can potentially cause adverse consequences for patients and their families,  
81 often disproportionately affecting low-income households [23].

82 This study used a household perspective to measure and value out-of-pocket costs and  
83 productivity losses for a single malaria episode as part of a survey collected at health facilities  
84 in Sabah, Malaysia between 2013 and 2016, a period during which malaria was caused by both  
85 zoonotic and non-zoonotic *Plasmodium* species.

86

## 87 **METHODS**

### 88 **Ethics**

89 The study was approved by relevant institutional review boards in Malaysia, including the  
90 Medical Research Ethics Committee of the Ministry of Health, Malaysia (NMRR-12-537-  
91 12568) and the Human Research Ethics Committee of Menzies School of Health Research,  
92 Australia (HREC-2012-1814). All adult participants provided written informed consent, with  
93 parental/guardian written informed consent gained for participants less than 18 years of age.

## 94 **Study design and participants**

95 The cost surveys were collected alongside a larger epidemiological study conducted in Sabah,  
96 Malaysia, between February 2013 and September 2016 [12]. In line with national guidelines in  
97 Malaysia, all microscopically confirmed malaria cases required mandatory hospitalization for  
98 clinical management, including antimalarial drug treatment until at least two sequential  
99 microscopy slides are negative for malaria. A subset of patients presented initially to primary  
100 clinics prior to referral to the appropriate district or tertiary level hospital for admission. A  
101 retrospective, cross-sectional cost survey was conducted across three district hospitals: Kudat,  
102 Kota Marudu, and Pitas, and one tertiary referral hospital in Kota Kinabalu. A pre-tested,  
103 structured, closed-ended questionnaire [24] was directly administered by trained research  
104 nurses to malaria patients or caregivers at around 14 to 28 days after hospital admission to  
105 estimate the costs of a single malaria episode. Participants were included based upon an initial  
106 microscopic diagnosis of malaria, with final *Plasmodium* species determined by the laboratory  
107 PCR result.

108 A subset of patients were recorded as having severe malaria as classified by WHO research  
109 criteria [25]. These criteria included one or more of the following: impaired consciousness,  
110 acidosis, hypoglycemia, severe malarial anemia, acute kidney injury, jaundice, respiratory  
111 distress, significant bleeding, shock, or hyperparasitemia (defined as a parasite count  
112  $>100,000/\mu\text{L}$ ) [26].

## 113 **Data collection and valuation of productivity losses**

114 Household out-of-pocket costs were reported in Malaysian Ringgits. The out-of-pocket costs  
115 incurred by a household from a single malaria case was estimated using an ingredients-based  
116 approach. Total household costs were presented as aggregate costs of direct, indirect, and other  
117 costs for a single episode of malaria. Other costs included any additional expenses that patients  
118 incurred during their illness. Patients were not asked about the source of these costs.

119 Direct costs include all out-of-pocket expenses a patient incurred for diagnosis, hospital stays,  
120 clinic visits for follow-up monitoring, medical treatments, inpatient food or drink, over-the-  
121 counter medication, and transport while seeking medical care. Direct costs were used to  
122 determine catastrophic health expenditure, determined as direct, out-of-pocket expenditures  
123 while seeking treatment exceeding 10% and 25% of total monthly household income [27]. Two  
124 alternate sources of monthly income [28, 29] were also used as separate thresholds to calculate  
125 catastrophic health expenditure, to estimate the sensitivity of these results.

126 Indirect costs for patients were expressed as lost productivity, reported in the survey as “days  
127 unable to work (or decreased work) or go to school” due to the malaria episode. Indirect costs  
128 were measured using a human capital approach [30]. Reduced work hours due to illness was  
129 the sum of survey respondents absent time from work prior to presenting to hospital, the  
130 number of days hospitalized, and the number of recovery days after hospital discharge when  
131 patients were unable to work. For children who were below the minimum age of employment  
132 (16 years), only the productivity losses for caregivers were included. The value of a day of lost  
133 wages was self-reported in the survey, and for adults who reported lost time but did not disclose  
134 income (34% of adults), the mean wage of the recorded income from all others was used.

135 Indirect costs for caregivers were the number of days when additional care was needed for the  
136 patient and/or if the patient required someone else to care for their dependents. Caregiver costs  
137 were estimated using a proxy good approach [31]. We valued caregiver days lost as equivalent  
138 to 50% of the average reported lost daily wage for patients. Since 66% (63/96) of patients in  
139 this dataset who reported being looked after by someone were also unable to look after their  
140 own dependents, the reduced wage estimate has been used to avoid double counting. This  
141 conservative approach minimizes the potential overestimation of caregiving as it is likely the  
142 same caregiver could be used for the patient and their dependents.



## 143 **Data Analysis**

144 Patient data analysis was performed using STATA statical software, version 16 (StataCorp LP,  
145 College Station, TX, USA). Costs were inflated [32] before conversion to 2022 US dollars  
146 (US\$), equating to an approximate conversion of 4.4 MYR to 1 USD\$ [33]. The mean and  
147 standard deviations (SD) were calculated, and uncertainty for household costs was handled by  
148 performing a univariate sensitivity analysis of key parameters. Mann-Whitney tests were used  
149 to identify statistically significant differences in costs between groups with two outcomes, such  
150 as sex, and severe and non-severe malaria. A Kruskal-Wallis test was used to identify  
151 differences in household costs between individuals with malaria grouped by the four  
152 *Plasmodium* species [34]. Additionally, a generalized linear model (GLM) was used to model  
153 the marginal effect on total cost of severe malaria, sex, anemia status, human-only malaria  
154 status and age (while holding all other variables constant) using a gamma-distributed dependent  
155 variable with a log link, as appropriate for this data [35].

156 For the evaluation of lost productivity, five scenario analyses were performed. In Scenario 1,  
157 productivity loss costs were limited to those patients who self-reported lost wage earnings. In  
158 Scenario 2, local wage estimates derived from a government-validated source (Malaysian  
159 Household Income Survey [28]) was used for all adults. For Scenario 3 we applied the local  
160 wage estimate to all participants (including children). For Scenarios 4 and 5, the lost wage was  
161 taken from a modelled regression analysis of the household income survey controlling for  
162 rurality and ethnicity (Malaysian Household inequities survey [29]) and applied to adults only  
163 and then to all participants, respectively.

## 164 RESULTS

### 165 Socio-demographic characteristics of study participants

166 Data were collected for 152 participants presenting with a confirmed episode of malaria. The  
 167 mean length of time from enrolment to performing the interview was 31 days. Characteristics  
 168 of the study participants are presented in Table 1. The mean age was 32 years old (SD = 18),  
 169 and 75% (114/152) were male. The majority of patients were diagnosed with *P. knowlesi*  
 170 infections (71%, 108/152). Seven (5%) patients met the WHO research criteria for severe  
 171 malaria; all were due to *P. knowlesi* infection. Most patients (73%, 110/151) had at least mild  
 172 anemia (WHO age/sex criteria [36]) during their malaria episode, though the anemia status was  
 173 not known for one patient. No patients died during this study.

174 **Table 1: Demographic and disease characteristics of study population (n = 152).**

	n	%
<b>Sex (male)</b>	114	75%
<b>Age, mean (SD)</b>	31.8 (18.1)	
<b>Working age (16-65 years)</b>	110	72%
<b>Age Distribution</b>		
<5 years	4	3%
5-15 years	30	20%
16-35 years	64	42%
36-50 years	26	17%
50-65 years	20	13%
>65 years	8	5%
<b>Employment Status</b>		
Employed	77	51%
Unemployed	8	5%
Housewife	7	5%
Unknown	18	12%
Student	38	25%
Child younger than school age (5 years)	4	3%
<b>Species of malaria</b>		
<i>P. knowlesi</i>	108	71%
<i>P. vivax</i>	22	14%
<i>P. falciparum</i>	16	11%
<i>P. malariae</i>	6	4%
<b>Severe malaria</b>	7	5%
<b>Anemia Status (N=151)*</b>		

Anemic	110	73%
Non-Anemic	41	27%
<b>District of Residence</b>		
Pitas	53	37%
Kota Marudu	41	28%
Kudat	32	23%
Penampang	8	6%
Kota Kinabalu	4	3%
Papar	3	2%
Ranau	3	2%
Other	1	0.7%
<b>Site of hospital admission</b>		
Kota Marudu	46	30%
Kudat	32	21%
Pitas	49	32%
Kota Kinabalu	25	17%

175 SD = standard deviation

176 \* Hemoglobin data needed to calculate anemia were missing from one patient.

177

178 The mean monthly income for all working-age adults who reported income (N=80) was  
179 US\$156 (SD = 122).

## 180 **Time Losses due to malaria illness**

181 Overall, the average number of days participants were unable to complete their usual activities  
182 due to illness was 9.2 (SD = 6.5) (Table 2). *P. vivax* (10.8 days) and *P. falciparum* (10.3 days)  
183 had a higher number of days affected by illness compared to *P. knowlesi* (8.7 days) and *P.*  
184 *malariae* (8.4 days). The average number of days lost to illness increased to 13.9 (SD = 15.6)  
185 for severe *P. knowlesi* cases, comparatively higher than non-severe *P. knowlesi* cases at 8.3  
186 days (SD = 6.5,  $p = 0.141$ ) and all non-zoonotic malaria (*P. falciparum*, *P. vivax* and *P.*  
187 *malariae*) cases at 10.4 days (SD = 5.80,  $p = 0.477$ ).

188 Patients reported an average length of stay in hospital of 4.1 days (SD=1.5; range 1-10 days).

189 The length of hospitalization for severe knowlesi malaria cases (mean = 5.8 days, SD = 1.4)  
190 was higher than for non-severe malaria cases due to any species (mean = 4.0 days, SD = 1.4,  
191  $p=0.004$ ). Three patients (2%) were admitted within hospital to a high dependency clinical unit

192 for a mean of 3.3 days; however, of these only a single patient was subsequently categorized  
193 as severe malaria using research criteria.

194 Eighty-eight patients (58%) reported being unable to fulfill their role as primary caregiver for  
195 their household for a mean of 3.9 days during their illness, indicating additional care was  
196 needed for their dependents. In addition, 97 patients (64%) reported that another household  
197 member supported them for a mean of 4.8 days after leaving hospital. The mean amount of  
198 time spent by patients travelling was 1.2 days to seek treatment before plus 1.6 days after  
199 leaving the hospital to attend follow-up clinic visits (Supplementary Table 1). Travel days were  
200 not included in the total days impacted by the household, as this would duplicate the time spent  
201 away from usual activities. Distance from health facility was not collected within the survey.

202 **Table 2: Mean (standard deviation) number of days away from usual activity per patient and their household due to an episode of**  
 203 **malaria (N=152).** All severe cases in the study were due to *Plasmodium knowlesi*.

	<i>P. falciparum</i> (n=16)	<i>P. vivax</i> (n=22)	<i>P. malariae</i> (n=6)	Non-severe <i>P. knowlesi</i> (n=101)	Severe <i>P. knowlesi</i> (n=7)	Total*
<b>Time away from usual activity</b>						
Days away from usual activity pre-hospital <sup>1</sup>	2.3 (3.1)	2.9 (3.6)	1.67 (3.20)	1.6 (2.2)	3.7 (7.7)	2.0 (3.0)
Duration of hospital stay	4.4 (1.0)	4.9 (1.3)	3.66 (0.82)	3.9 (1.4)	5.6 (1.4)	4.1 (1.4)
Days away from usual activity post-hospital <sup>1</sup>	3.6 (5.9)	3.1 (3.6)	3.17 (3.19)	2.8 (5.9)	4.6 (7.5)	3.0 (5.6)
<b>Total days patient unable to do usual activities</b>	<b>10.3 (6.7)</b>	<b>11.0 (5.5)</b>	<b>8.5 (4.50)</b>	<b>8.3 (6.5)</b>	<b>13.9 (15.6)</b>	<b>9.2 (7.0)</b>
<b>Time required for caregiving</b>						
Caregiving received	2.9 (3.0)	5.3 (10.5)	2.3 (2.0)	2.5 (2.2)	5.6 (7.2)	3.1 (4.8)
Alternative caregiving required <sup>2</sup>	1.8 (1.9)	3.1 (3.7)	2.1 (1.8)	2.3 (2.0)	4.1 (3.1)	2.5 (2.4)
<b>Total days of caregiving</b>	<b>4.8 (3.7)</b>	<b>8.4 (11.5)</b>	<b>4.4 (2.7)</b>	<b>4.9 (3.2)</b>	<b>9.7 (9.1)</b>	<b>5.6 (5.7)</b>
<b>Total days impacted (patient/household)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>15.1 (8.7)</b>	<b>19.3 (12.5)</b>	<b>12.9 (5.6)</b>	<b>13.2 (7.2)</b>	<b>23.6 (16.9)</b>	<b>14.8 (9.2)</b>

205 <sup>1</sup> Days away from usual activity was expressed in the survey as “days unable to work (or reduced work) or unable to attend school”.

206 <sup>2</sup> Alternative caregiving was expressed in the survey as “did anyone else have to look after your dependents?”

207 <sup>3</sup> Total days impacted is the sum of total days unable to work and total days caregiving.

208 **Household costs of malaria**

209 The mean total household cost per malaria episode was US\$137.96 (SD=108.05) with a median  
 210 of \$101.57 (IQR=\$74.75, \$161.71) (Table 3). Of this total cost, 41% comprised direct  
 211 household costs equating to US\$56.96 (SD=69.96) per person. The majority of direct costs  
 212 were related to the hospital admission, although it is unclear whether these costs included direct  
 213 admission costs or cost associated food and other supplies needed during an admission. Indirect  
 214 household costs were the most significant contributor to the total cost burden (58%), with a  
 215 mean total amount of US\$80.15 (SD=73.62) for each household. When using self-reported  
 216 wages (with mean wage imputed for adults who reported time off usual activities but not their  
 217 income), the mean patient time cost was estimated to be US\$56.65 (SD=62.11). The total  
 218 caregiver time costs (including patients being looked after themselves and when alternative  
 219 caregiving was needed to look after the patient’s dependents) were estimated to be US\$23.50  
 220 (SD=30.01) for each malaria case. Only 3% (4/152) patients reported having “other costs”  
 221 which were unspecified in the survey. These were <1% of the total costs, all were *P. knowlesi*  
 222 cases, and three of these were reported by female patients.

223 **Table 3: Total mean and median household costs for a single malaria episode in 2022 USD**  
 224 **(n=152).**

	Mean	Standard deviation	Percent of total cost	Median	Interquartile range
Hospital admission	27.96	43.45	20%	13.36	5.38 - 37.71
Clinic visit	15.00	25.80	11%	8.08	5.34 - 13.47
Medicine	2.80	12.06	2%	0.00	0.00 - 0.97
Travel to clinic and hospital	11.20	18.81	8%	5.38	0.00 - 13.47
<b>Total direct costs</b>	<b>56.96</b>	<b>69.96</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>34.07</b>	<b>21.61 - 58.86</b>
Patient time	56.65	62.11	41%	38.85	14.96 - 69.92
Caregiver time	23.50	30.01	17%	18.81	7.76 - 28.14
<b>Total indirect costs</b>	<b>80.15</b>	<b>73.62</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>58.71</b>	<b>32.08 - 101.00</b>
<b>Total other costs<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>6.26</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00 - 0.00</b>
<b>Total costs</b>	<b>137.96</b>	<b>108.05</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>101.57</b>	<b>74.75 - 161.71</b>

225 <sup>1</sup> Other costs were unspecified in the questionnaire; no details about the nature of these costs  
 226 were provided by the participants.

227 All costs are inflated to year 2022 equivalent United States dollar amounts. Results are  
 228 presented in Malaysian Ringgits in Supplementary Table 2.  
 229

### 230 **Costs of malaria by population subgroup**

231 Male participants reported a greater average cost of illness with US\$141.90 compared to  
 232 US\$126.13 for females; however, this difference was statistically insignificant (Table 4). Cost  
 233 differences between sexes were primarily attributed to reported wage differences, with 65%  
 234 (25/38) of females not reporting their wage losses. This group predominantly consisted of  
 235 females identifying as houseworkers with no formal paid employment (13/38) or students  
 236 under 16 years (10/38). Despite higher overall cost for men, females had 45% higher direct  
 237 costs of US\$74.26 compared to US\$51.19 for men (p=0.018), attributed to higher hospital and  
 238 clinic costs (Supplementary Table 3). Costs were also compared between working-age males  
 239 (16-65 years old, which comprised 54% of the total participants) and the remainder of those  
 240 enrolled. The total cost for working-age males was higher than the remainder of the  
 241 participants, with a mean of US\$144.01 (SD=105.19) versus US\$110.22 (SD=92.38)  
 242 respectively (p=0.007; Supplementary Table 4). While direct costs were similar between  
 243 working-age males and the rest of the population, working-age males reported higher indirect  
 244 costs at US\$94.13, compared to US\$52.78 for others (p=0.000).

245 **Table 4. Total mean household costs and standard deviations (SD) for a malaria episode**  
 246 **by sex, species, and malaria severity in 2022 United States dollars (n=152).**

	N	Direct costs		Indirect costs		Other costs		Total		Total costs p-value*
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
<b>Sex</b>										0.330
Male	114	51.19	59.20	90.23	80.51	0.47	5.03	<b>141.90</b>	109.05	
Female	38	74.26	94.13	49.91	32.74	1.97	8.99	<b>126.13</b>	105.54	
<b>Malaria Species</b>										0.404
<i>P. knowlesi</i>	108	47.96	47.07	77.60	69.22	1.19	7.41	<b>126.75</b>	86.02	
<i>P. falciparum</i>	16	44.43	39.11	82.06	84.18	0.00	-	<b>126.49</b>	87.38	
<i>P. vivax</i>	22	115.55	135.26	94.82	93.22	0.00	-	<b>210.37</b>	183.76	
<i>P. malariae</i>	6	37.47	33.90	67.14	45.91	0.00	-	<b>104.61</b>	44.23	
<b>Malaria severity</b>										<b>0.006</b>
Non-severe	145	55.70	68.96	75.81	68.29	0.88	6.41	<b>132.39</b>	104.76	

Severe	7	83.12	95.34	170.14	120.83	0.00	-	<b>253.26</b>	118.93
--------	---	-------	-------	--------	--------	------	---	---------------	--------

247  
248 The seven severe malaria cases (all *P. knowlesi*) had 91% higher total costs than non-severe  
249 cases (US\$253.26 versus US\$132.39 respectively,  $p=0.006$ ) (Table 4), predominantly due to  
250 substantially higher indirect costs (US\$94.33 mean difference) for severe malaria ( $p=0.026$ ).  
251 *P. vivax* patients presented with the highest total costs at \$210.37 (SD=183.76; Table 4). In  
252 contrast to other malaria species, most of the *P. vivax* costs were direct costs (63%) where  
253 hospital admission and clinic out-of-pocket costs were double the direct costs of malaria due  
254 to other *Plasmodium* species (Table 4). *P. falciparum* and *P. knowlesi* had similar mean costs  
255 of US\$126.49 (SD=57.38) and US\$126.75 (SD=86.02), respectively. *P. malariae* episodes had  
256 the lowest total cost at \$104.61 (SD=44.23), consistent with common very low parasitemia and  
257 mild disease severity for this species [37]. Additional Mann-Whitney pairwise comparisons  
258 were performed between each *Plasmodium* species for direct, indirect, and total costs; no  
259 results were statistically significant.

## 260 **Multivariate analysis of malaria costs**

261 The GLM tested severe malaria, sex, anemia status, human-only malaria status and age against  
262 total costs. The GLM showed that when holding all other variables constant, severe malaria  
263 has an incremental marginal cost of US\$61.71 (95% CI= -\$20.99 - \$144.40) when compared  
264 to non-severe malaria (Table 5). Having a human-only type of malaria leads to an increase in  
265 marginal cost of \$53.08, and an increase in age by one year leads to an increase in marginal  
266 costs for each malaria episode of \$1.57, when controlling for other factors. This result is  
267 consistent with a *P. knowlesi* only GLM (Supplementary Table 5) where age was the only  
268 significant predictor with marginal cost of \$1.17 (95% confidence interval \$0.19 - \$2.15;  
269  $p=0.02$ ) while being male leads to an increase of \$19.79 compared to being a female (Table 5).  
270 Outputs of the GLM are presented in Supplementary Table 6.



271

272 **Table 5: Marginal costs, standard errors, and 95% confidence intervals of factors**  
 273 **associated with variability with total household costs from the Generalized Linear Model**  
 274 **that included all patients. All costs are in 2022 United States dollars.**

Total cost of malaria (n=151)	Marginal cost from base case (dy/dx)	Standard error	P-value	95% confidence interval
Sex (Male)	19.79	19.76	0.317	-18.95, 58.53
Age	1.57	0.56	0.005	0.47, 2.66
Severe malaria	61.71	42.19	0.144	-20.99, 144.40
Human-only malaria*	53.08	19.07	0.005	15.70, 90.46
Anemia	16.50	19.82	0.405	-22.35, 55.35

275 \* Includes falciparum, vivax, and malariae malaria.

276

## 277 Scenario Analysis

278 The wage used to estimate productivity losses greatly impacted the total cost per malaria  
 279 episode. Compared to the base case estimate of US\$137.96 per person, the cost per episode  
 280 decreased to US\$114.69 when wage loss estimates were only applied to adults who reported  
 281 their wages for Scenario 1 (Table 6). When using Sabah estimates from the Malaysia household  
 282 income survey (US\$236 per month) and applied to only adults [28], the total costs increased  
 283 by 19% to US\$163.90. When this wage was applied to the time loss of all patients, the total  
 284 cost increased to US\$188.76, an increase of 37% compared to the base case. Finally, when the  
 285 household inequities survey for Sabah was utilized (US\$411 per month) [29], the total cost  
 286 increased by 78% (US\$245.46) when applied to all adults and 104% (US\$281.81) when applied  
 287 to all patients. Figure 1 shows that females had higher total costs for scenarios where wage  
 288 estimates were applied evenly to the entire population.

289 **Table 6: Scenario analysis of mean and median indirect and total household costs for a**  
 290 **single malaria episode using varied wages to estimate productivity losses in 2022 United**  
 291 **States dollars (n=152).**

	Mean	SD	% of total cost	Median	Interquartile range
<b>Base case: Reported incomes with mean income applied to all adults who did not report income</b>					
Total Indirect Costs	80.15	73.62	56%	58.71	32.08 – 101.00
Total Costs	137.96	108.05		101.57	74.75 – 161.71


<b>Scenario 1: Only reported incomes considered</b>					
Total Indirect Costs	60.87	72.07	46%	31.08	20.05 – 69.81
Total Costs	114.69	106.21		78.85	49.71 – 138.02
<b>Scenario 2: MHIS wage only applied to adults</b>					
Total Indirect Costs	110.08	86.34	66%	97.60	54.69 – 142.21
Total Costs	163.90	118.41		137.28	87.90 – 195.47
<b>Scenario 3: MHIS wage applied to everyone</b>					
Total Indirect Costs	130.96	83.93	69%	109.39	83.93 – 153.14
Total Costs	188.76	118.61		155.39	118.24 – 212.68
<b>Scenario 4: HIS wage applied to adults</b>					
Total Indirect Costs	191.64	150.30	77%	169.92	95.22 – 247.57
Total Costs	245.46	175.73		212.63	129.49 – 298.40
<b>Scenario 5: HIS wage applied to everyone</b>					
Total Indirect Costs	227.98	146.12	80%	190.44	146.11 – 266.61
Total Costs	281.81	170.44		229.82	189.14 – 328.99

292 MHIS: Malaysia Household Income Survey [28]

293 HIS: Household Inequities Survey [29]

294

295 **Figure 1: Scenario analysis of methods for estimating the mean indirect costs and**  
 296 **associated impact on the total cost per malaria episode by sex in 2022 United States**  
 297 **dollars (n=152).**



298

299 The base case uses reported incomes with mean income applied to all adults who did not report income. Scenario  
 300 1 uses only reported incomes to value productivity losses. Scenario 2 applies the Malaysian Household Income  
 301 Survey wage [28] to adults only. Scenario 3 applies the Malaysian Household Income Survey wage [28] to all  
 302 patients including children. Scenario 4 applies the Household Inequities Survey wage [28] to adults only. Scenario  
 303 5 applies the Household Inequities Survey wage [28] to all patients including children.

304

### 305 **Catastrophic Health Expenditure**

306 When using the mean monthly self-reported income value of US\$168, direct health expenditure  
307 for a single malaria episode accounted for 27% of monthly income. Eighty percent (122/152)  
308 of patients reported direct health costs above 10% of monthly income, indicating catastrophic  
309 health expenditure. When using a higher defined threshold for catastrophic health expenditure  
310 of 25% of monthly income, the direct costs of a malaria episode reported by 38% (57/152) of  
311 patients in this survey remained at levels consistent with catastrophic health expenditure.

312 When using the Malaysia household income survey data as a higher baseline mean monthly  
313 income value of US\$236 [28], 62% (94/152) of patients reported health expenditure above 10%  
314 of monthly income. This percentage dropped to 24% (36/152) when applying the higher 25%  
315 monthly income defined threshold. If considering the mean monthly income from the  
316 household inequities survey of US\$411 [29], then 39% (59/152) and 12% (18/152) of patients  
317 experience catastrophic health expenditure at 10% and 25% monthly income thresholds,  
318 respectively.

319

## 320 **DISCUSSION**

321 Despite the provision of free health-facility-related costs of malaria care by the Ministry of  
322 Economy, Malaysia [38], patients in Sabah faced substantial personal financial barriers when  
323 accessing care with a mean cost of \$138 for each malaria episode. Malaysia has successfully  
324 controlled human-only malaria in recent years, with only small numbers of imported cases of  
325 *P. vivax* and *P. falciparum* now reported [1]. However, transmission of four major *Plasmodium*  
326 species were diagnosed during the period this study was conducted, with the majority being  
327 due to local zoonotic *P. knowlesi* infections. To our knowledge, this is the first study to present

328 and compare costs for more than two species of human-only malaria and the first to compare  
329 costs between zoonotic and non-zoonotic malarias. One of the major findings was that patients  
330 with *P. vivax* infections demonstrated a trend towards higher mean costs of US\$210, mainly  
331 due to direct medical costs for higher-intensity treatment monitoring [39, 40]. *P. knowlesi* had  
332 a mean total cost of US\$127, primarily comprised of productivity losses. As expected, severe  
333 malaria, exclusively due to *P. knowlesi* infection in this study, was associated with higher costs  
334 (US\$253) than non-severe disease (US\$132), consistent with the available literature for severe  
335 *P. falciparum* infections in African contexts [30, 41]. Females within this study had higher  
336 direct costs than men at \$74 as compared to \$51, respectively. While the source of this  
337 difference was not captured by our survey, the study team suggested that this may be explained  
338 by higher spending by females on hygiene products while in hospital. When using the mean  
339 reported monthly income from the study, 28% of patients experienced catastrophic health  
340 expenditure at a threshold of 25% of monthly income.

341 The higher cost associated with *P. vivax* infections compared to other *Plasmodium* species has  
342 a number of potential contributing factors related both to the patient and their care. *P. vivax*  
343 symptomatic infections predominantly occurred in a younger population demographic, with  
344 46% of vivax malaria participants under 15 years, meaning relatively lower productivity costs  
345 for the patients and higher costs for their caregiving. The younger age profile of vivax malaria  
346 patients may explain the higher direct out-of-pocket medical costs associated with the disease  
347 as parents and caregivers of these patients will likely travel, sleep, and eat in the ward alongside  
348 the child. Another factor which may contribute to higher costs is caregivers may be more likely  
349 to return their child for follow-up clinic services, and *P. vivax* requires a longer treatment  
350 duration of 14 days for the primaquine course, in contrast to other species that do not have  
351 dormant liver parasites to treat [21]. To our knowledge, no previous studies have shown the  
352 cost of *P. vivax* infections to be higher than *P. falciparum* infections.

353 Compared with infections due to non-zoonotic *Plasmodium* species, patients diagnosed with  
354 *P. knowlesi* were older and more likely to be male, reflecting the current understanding of  
355 transmission occurring among adult males engaged in agricultural activities [12, 42]. Overall,  
356 working-aged males (18-65 years), showed lower total direct medical costs than those of non-  
357 working age. This may be attributed to fewer visiting family members or to employers  
358 subsidizing out-of-pocket costs, such as large-scale plantation owners providing free transport.  
359 However, this population also experienced substantial productivity losses; thus, ongoing *P.*  
360 *knowlesi* transmission can substantially impact local economies, causing catastrophic spending  
361 for individuals and their families, or may prevent patients from seeking care. The higher  
362 comparative incidence of zoonotic *P. knowlesi* cases has been linked with recent deforestation  
363 and changes in agricultural land use and economic development [42], including in the Kudat  
364 district in northern Sabah, where most study participants resided [43]. Rapid changes in land  
365 use have created complex environments, including reduced forest cover and biodiversity [12,  
366 20], which have altered the interaction and parasite transmission dynamics between humans,  
367 mosquito vectors and macaque hosts [12]. *P. knowlesi* transmission is now demonstrated to  
368 occur in other locations in Southeast Asian locations [11]; without adequate control measures,  
369 the medical costs and indirect productivity losses will continue to place a substantial economic  
370 burden on patients and their families.

371 Factors found on multivariate analysis to remain independently associated with higher total  
372 costs were age and having malaria from human-only *Plasmodium* species (compared to *P.*  
373 *knowlesi* infection). Both male sex and severe malaria did not remain as independent predictors  
374 when controlling for these other features. Understanding the distance travelled by participants  
375 to access care and being able to control for this may have been useful in this model. However,  
376 these data were not collected within the survey. Without further data, it is challenging to  
377 speculate on other factors associated with higher total costs per malaria episode. However,

378 when controlling for malaria severity, malaria from human-only Plasmodium species  
379 (predominantly influenced by higher *P. vivax* related costs) was associated with higher total  
380 costs (Table 5), which may be reflective of the longer duration of illness with *P. vivax* and *P.*  
381 *falciparum* malaria compared with non-severe *P. knowlesi* malaria (Table 2).

382 Despite government health services being provided at no charge for malaria patients (e.g. usual  
383 hospital admission fee, routine antimalarial medicine costs, laboratory testing), out-of-pocket  
384 costs for households still have the potential to impact those experiencing socio-economic  
385 disadvantage disproportionately. Whilst this study did not directly capture socioeconomic  
386 disadvantage, understanding occupational status and district of residence may provide insight  
387 into subpopulations experiencing disadvantage. Irrespective of the method used to estimate  
388 wages and the health expenditure threshold chosen, a large proportion of malaria patients  
389 exceeded the catastrophic health expenditure threshold for mean direct out-of-pocket costs. It  
390 is conceivable that for many lower-income households, dealing with the impact of this type of  
391 health expenditure may necessitate either deferring initial or subsequent care. Alternatively,  
392 households may deplete savings, take funding for schooling, sell cash crops or animals or incur  
393 other forms of significant debt, collectively contributing to a possible long-term detrimental  
394 household debt-cycle [1]. Many of these factors may be further exacerbated if occurring in  
395 conjunction with a limited household savings buffer, including a lack of cash flow for those  
396 reliant on subsistence farming, for which selling assets such as land or changing agricultural  
397 practices to prioritize growing of higher risk cash crops may therefore further jeopardize future  
398 household earning potential or stability [27, 44]. Households with lower socio-economic status  
399 have been found to be at a higher risk of having malaria,[24] indicating the inequitable these  
400 households bear.

401 The scenario analyses showed significant variation in total costs when considering alternative  
402 methods to value time losses. The base case scenario imputed the mean self-reported income

403 for adults with no income-reported data. If only evaluating those with self-reported data on  
404 productivity losses (Scenario 1), the lower subsequent malaria cost estimates are likely to  
405 underestimate lost productivity for subsistence farmers and the informal workforce [45, 46].  
406 Since self-reported income may not be the most appropriate method, we also used alternative  
407 wage estimates to value these time losses, applying them primarily to all adults and then as a  
408 comparator to the whole population (including children). Using separate analyses based on the  
409 large robust Malaysian Household Income Survey [28], and health inequities reporting data  
410 [29] to provide alternative estimates of the average monthly wage to all adults, the total cost of  
411 illness increased by 19% and 78% respectively. Valuation of productivity losses is a highly  
412 discussed methodological issue [47], particularly considering income differences between male  
413 and female patients and caregivers [48]. By using standardized wage estimates, time losses  
414 from all patients are considered equal, and the total cost reflects an equity-driven estimate.

415 Notably, in Scenarios 3 and 5 (when the two alternative wage estimates were uniformly applied  
416 to all patients), the total costs were higher for females than males. Valuing children's time  
417 using a cost equal to adult wages, while not representative of formal economic output, gives  
418 greater insight into the economic cost of time losses due to malaria in children, given that  
419 malaria episodes have been shown to be detrimental to children's education [49-51]. In these  
420 scenarios, productivity losses account for 70% and 80% of total costs, respectively, compared  
421 to the base case where indirect costs accounted for 58% of total costs. The method by which  
422 time losses are valued can greatly alter the interpretation of the total household costs of malaria.  
423 Given the often overlooked value of the informal economy [52], scenarios which value all  
424 patients time losses equitably emphasize the true opportunity cost faced by patients and  
425 families during a malaria episode.

426 This study has several limitations. The self-reported costing data was collected 30 days after  
427 study enrolment; hence, potentially neglecting the long-term chronic health costs, especially

428 for the low numbers of *P. vivax* patients who are at risk of relapse infections [53]. Costs of  
429 other longer-term complications were not included due to feasibility limitations [8] and thus  
430 were outside the scope of the analysis; however, these costs may conceivably have a large  
431 effect on actual household costs. Additionally, recall bias and study setting may have  
432 influenced the actual costs and resources spent by a household related to a single malaria  
433 episode [54]. Females may also be underrepresented within the sample due to gender-related  
434 socio-cultural norms that influence female's treatment-seeking behavior [55]. Additionally, no  
435 questions were directly asked about total household income, thus if household have multiple  
436 income sources they have been missed in catastrophic health expenditure calculation. This  
437 study aimed to estimate costs to the households; therefore, costs to the healthcare provider were  
438 not included. The inclusion of healthcare provider costs would further increase the total cost  
439 per malaria episode. Future studies should aim to quantify costs from a societal perspective to  
440 provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the economic burden of malaria [56].

## 441 **CONCLUSION**

442 Given Malaysia's goal of malaria elimination, understanding the magnitude of household out-  
443 of-pocket costs and productivity losses is essential to inform policy and guide novel  
444 interventions. To our knowledge, this is the first study exploring household costs of malaria in  
445 Malaysia and the first to quantify the economic burden of *P. knowlesi* malaria episodes on  
446 households. This information is crucial to the East Malaysian states of Sabah and likely  
447 neighboring Sarawak, which collectively report the majority of *P. knowlesi* cases nationally  
448 and for which costs of *P. knowlesi* are poorly understood. Our research also highlights the  
449 opportunity cost of not developing novel public health interventions to control *P. knowlesi*  
450 transmission. Patients face a substantial financial burden for each episode of malaria, even  
451 when health-facility based clinical management is otherwise provided free of charge. These  
452 costs can disproportionately impact low socio-economic households that rely on subsistence



453 farming and agricultural-related income, with potentially catastrophic economic impacts if  
454 ignored.

455 Acknowledgements:

456 The authors thank the study participants, the IDSKKS malaria research team, and the Sabah State Health  
457 Department for assisting in the conduct of this study. We thank the Director General of Health Malaysia  
458 for permission to publish this manuscript.

459 *Financial support.* This work was supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council,  
460 Australia (Grant Numbers 1037304 and 1045156, a fellowship to NMA [1042072], The  
461 MONKEYBAR project (UK Environmental & Social Ecology of Human Infectious Diseases Initiative;  
462 Grant #G1100796), investigator grants to MJG [2017436], and AD [2025362] and the Australian  
463 Centre of Research Excellence in Malaria Elimination [1134989]; the National Institutes of Health,  
464 USA (R01AI160457-01); and Malaysian Ministry of Health (Grant Number BP00500/117/1002  
465 awarded to GSR). MJG and AD are supported by the Australian Centre for International Agricultural  
466 Research, and Indo-Pacific Centre for Health Security, DFAT, Australian Government (LS-2019-116).

467

## 468 REFERENCES

- 469 1. World Health Organization. World Malaria Report 2023: World Health Organization; 2023.
- 470 2. Andrade MV, Noronha K, Diniz BP, Guedes G, Carvalho LR, Silva VA, et al. The economic  
471 burden of malaria: a systematic review. *Malaria journal*. 2022;21(1):283.
- 472 3. Poespoprodjo JR, Douglas NM, Ansong D, Kho S, Anstey NM. Malaria. *Lancet*.  
473 2023;402(10419):2328-45. Epub 2023/11/05. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(23)01249-7. PubMed PMID:  
474 37924827.
- 475 4. Suwonkerd W, Ritthison W, Ngo CT, Tainchum K, Bangs MJ, Chareonviriyaphap T. Vector  
476 biology and malaria transmission in Southeast Asia. *Anopheles mosquitoes-New insights into  
477 malaria vectors: IntechOpen*; 2013.
- 478 5. Rajahram GS, Barber BE, William T, Grigg MJ, Menon J, Yeo TW, et al. Falling Plasmodium  
479 knowlesi malaria death rate among adults despite rising incidence, Sabah, Malaysia, 2010–2014.  
480 *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2016;22(1):41.
- 481 6. Mudin R, editor *Malaria: battling old disease with new strategies*. 5th Perak Health  
482 Conference; 2013.
- 483 7. Muhammad AB, Azman EN, Eddie NA, Azmi NI, Yee VCT, Idris ZM. The rise of Plasmodium  
484 knowlesi cases: implication to Malaysia's malaria-free status. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical  
485 Medicine*. 2022;15(8):337-8.
- 486 8. Grigg MJ, William T, Piera KA, Rajahram GS, Jelip J, Aziz A, et al. Plasmodium falciparum  
487 artemisinin resistance monitoring in Sabah, Malaysia: in vivo therapeutic efficacy and kelch13  
488 molecular marker surveillance. *Malaria journal*. 2018;17(1):1-8.
- 489 9. Daneshvar C, Davis TM, Cox-Singh J, Rafa'ee MZ, Zakaria SK, Divis PC, et al. Clinical and  
490 laboratory features of human Plasmodium knowlesi infection. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.  
491 2009;49(6):852-60.
- 492 10. Grigg MJ, William T, Barber BE, Rajahram GS, Menon J, Schimann E, et al. Age-related clinical  
493 spectrum of Plasmodium knowlesi malaria and predictors of severity. *Clinical infectious diseases*.  
494 2018;67(3):350-9.

- 495 11. Tobin RJ, Harrison LE, Tully MK, Lubis IN, Noviyanti R, Anstey NM, et al. Updating estimates  
496 of Plasmodium knowlesi malaria risk in response to changing land use patterns across Southeast  
497 Asia. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2024;18(1):e0011570.
- 498 12. Grigg MJ, Cox J, William T, Jelip J, Fornace KM, Brock PM, et al. Individual-level factors  
499 associated with the risk of acquiring human Plasmodium knowlesi malaria in Malaysia: a case-control  
500 study. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2017;1(3):e97-e104.
- 501 13. Fornace KM, Alexander N, Abidin TR, Brock PM, Chua TH, Vythilingam I, et al. Local human  
502 movement patterns and land use impact exposure to zoonotic malaria in Malaysian Borneo. *Elife*.  
503 2019;8:e47602.
- 504 14. Chin AZ, Maluda MCM, Jelip J, Jeffree MSB, Culleton R, Ahmed K. Malaria elimination in  
505 Malaysia and the rising threat of Plasmodium knowlesi. *Journal of physiological anthropology*.  
506 2020;39:1-9.
- 507 15. Cooper DJ, Rajahram GS, William T, Jelip J, Mohammad R, Benedict J, et al. Plasmodium  
508 knowlesi malaria in Sabah, Malaysia, 2015–2017: ongoing increase in incidence despite near-  
509 elimination of the human-only Plasmodium species. *Clinical infectious diseases*. 2020;70(3):361-7.
- 510 16. William T, Jelip J, Menon J, Anderios F, Mohammad R, Awang Mohammad TA, et al.  
511 Changing epidemiology of malaria in Sabah, Malaysia: increasing incidence of Plasmodium knowlesi.  
512 *Malaria journal*. 2014;13(1):1-11.
- 513 17. Jeffree SM, Ahmed K, Safian N, Hassan R, Mihat O, Lukman KA, et al. Falciparum malaria  
514 outbreak in Sabah linked to an immigrant rubber tapper. *The American journal of tropical medicine  
515 and hygiene*. 2018;98(1):45.
- 516 18. Ramdzan AR, Ismail A, Zanib ZM. Prevalence of malaria and its risk factors in Sabah,  
517 Malaysia. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020;91:68-72.
- 518 19. Hussin N, Lim YA-L, Goh PP, William T, Jelip J, Mudin RN. Updates on malaria incidence and  
519 profile in Malaysia from 2013 to 2017. *Malaria Journal*. 2020;19(1):1-14.
- 520 20. Brock PM, Fornace KM, Grigg MJ, Anstey NM, William T, Cox J, et al. Predictive analysis  
521 across spatial scales links zoonotic malaria to deforestation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*.  
522 2019;286(1894):20182351.
- 523 21. Ministry of Health Malaysia. Management Guidelines of Malaria in Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur:  
524 Ministry of Health Malaysia VBDSDCDoMoH; 2013.
- 525 22. Grigg MJ, William T, Menon J, Dhanaraj P, Barber BE, Wilkes CS, et al. Artesunate–  
526 mefloquine versus chloroquine for treatment of uncomplicated Plasmodium knowlesi malaria in  
527 Malaysia (ACT KNOW): an open-label, randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet infectious diseases*.  
528 2016;16(2):180-8.
- 529 23. Sirag A, Mohamed Nor N, editors. Out-of-pocket health expenditure and poverty: evidence  
530 from a dynamic panel threshold analysis. *Healthcare*; 2021: MDPI.
- 531 24. Karyana M, Devine A, Kenangalem E, Burdarm L, Poespoprodjo JR, Vemuri R, et al.  
532 Treatment-seeking behaviour and associated costs for malaria in Papua, Indonesia. *Malaria journal*.  
533 2016;15(1):1-12.
- 534 25. World Health Organization. Guidelines for the treatment of malaria: World Health  
535 Organization; 2015.
- 536 26. Severe Malaria. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2014;19(s1):7-131. doi:  
537 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.12313>.
- 538 27. Sayuti M, Sukeri S. Assessing progress towards Sustainable Development Goal 3.8. 2 and  
539 determinants of catastrophic health expenditures in Malaysia. *Plos one*. 2022;17(2):e0264422.
- 540 28. Department of Statistics M. Household Income Survey Putrajaya, Malaysia: Department of  
541 Statistics Malaysia; 2012 [cited 2022 July 15th 2022]. Available from:  
542 [https://www.dosm.gov.my/v1/index.php?r=column/cthemByCat&cat=120&bul\\_id=d1FLak9XZkISMIVqZkhoZUloZytYQT09&menu\\_id=amVoWU54UTI0a21NWmdhMjFMMWcyZz09](https://www.dosm.gov.my/v1/index.php?r=column/cthemByCat&cat=120&bul_id=d1FLak9XZkISMIVqZkhoZUloZytYQT09&menu_id=amVoWU54UTI0a21NWmdhMjFMMWcyZz09).
- 543  
544 29. Tey NP, Lai SL, Ng ST, Goh KL, Osman AF. Income inequality across states in Malaysia.  
545 *Planning Malaysia*. 2019;17.

- 546 30. Alonso S, Chaccour CJ, Elobolobo E, Nacima A, Candrinho B, Saifodine A, et al. The economic  
547 burden of malaria on households and the health system in a high transmission district of  
548 Mozambique. *Malaria journal*. 2019;18(1):1-10.
- 549 31. Koopmanschap MA, van Exel NJA, van den Berg B, Brouwer WB. An overview of methods  
550 and applications to value informal care in economic evaluations of healthcare. *Pharmacoeconomics*.  
551 2008;26:269-80.
- 552 32. GDP deflator [Internet]. 2023. Available from:  
553 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.DEFL.ZS>.
- 554 33. Official exchange rate (LCU per US\$, period average) [Internet]. 2023. Available from:  
555 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/PA.NUS.FCRF>.
- 556 34. Ostertagova E, Ostertag O, Kováč J. Methodology and application of the Kruskal-Wallis test.  
557 *Applied mechanics and materials*. 2014;611:115-20.
- 558 35. Johnson PE. GLM with a Gamma-distributed dependent variable. 2016.
- 559 36. World Health Organization. Haemoglobin concentrations for the diagnosis of anaemia and  
560 assessment of severity. Vitamin and Mineral Nutrition Information System 2011; 1–6. WHO  
561 Reference Number: WHO. World Health Organization Geneva. 2011.
- 562 37. Mueller I, Zimmerman PA, Reeder JC. Plasmodium malariae and Plasmodium ovale—the  
563 ‘bashful’ malaria parasites. *Trends in parasitology*. 2007;23(6):278-83.
- 564 38. Naserrudin NA, Culleton R, Hod R, Jeffree MS, Ahmed K, Hassan MR. Exploring the key  
565 anthropological drivers of and barriers to zoonotic malaria preventative behaviour in a community  
566 exposed to Plasmodium knowlesi infection in Malaysia: protocol for a qualitative study with a  
567 participatory research design. *BMJ open*. 2022;12(6):e060866.
- 568 39. World Health Organization. Guidelines for the treatment of malaria: World Health  
569 Organization; 2022.
- 570 40. Ministry of Health Malaysia. Malaria Treatment Guidelines. 2015.
- 571 41. Hailu A, Lindtjørn B, Deressa W, Gari T, Loha E, Robberstad B. Economic burden of malaria  
572 and predictors of cost variability to rural households in south-central Ethiopia. *PLoS One*.  
573 2017;12(10):e0185315.
- 574 42. Fornace KM, Abidin TR, Alexander N, Brock P, Grigg MJ, Murphy A, et al. Association  
575 between landscape factors and spatial patterns of Plasmodium knowlesi infections in Sabah,  
576 Malaysia. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2016;22(2):201.
- 577 43. Barber BE, William T, Dhararaj P, Anderios F, Grigg MJ, Yeo TW, et al. Epidemiology of  
578 Plasmodium knowlesi malaria in north-east Sabah, Malaysia: family clusters and wide age  
579 distribution. *Malaria journal*. 2012;11:1-8.
- 580 44. Nguyen HA, Ahmed S, Turner HC. Overview of the main methods used for estimating  
581 catastrophic health expenditure. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation*. 2023;21(1):50.
- 582 45. Lee J, Di Ruggiero E. How does informal employment affect health and health equity?  
583 Emerging gaps in research from a scoping review and modified e-Delphi survey. *International Journal*  
584 *for Equity in Health*. 2022;21(1):1-12.
- 585 46. Su TT, Sanon M, Flessa S. Assessment of indirect cost-of-illness in a subsistence farming  
586 society by using different valuation methods. *Health Policy*. 2007;83(2-3):353-62.
- 587 47. Zhang W, Bansback N, Anis AH. Measuring and valuing productivity loss due to poor health:  
588 A critical review. *Social science & medicine*. 2011;72(2):185-92.
- 589 48. Jones AS, Frick KD. Gender bias in economic evaluation methods: time costs and productivity  
590 loss. *Women's Health Issues*. 2008;18(1):1-3.
- 591 49. Burlando A. The disease environment, schooling, and development outcomes: evidence  
592 from Ethiopia. *The Journal of Development Studies*. 2015;51(12):1563-84.
- 593 50. Vitor-Silva S, Reyes-Lecca RC, Pinheiro TR, Lacerda MV. Malaria is associated with poor  
594 school performance in an endemic area of the Brazilian Amazon. *Malaria journal*. 2009;8:1-7.
- 595 51. Lucas AM. Malaria eradication and educational attainment: evidence from Paraguay and Sri  
596 Lanka. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*. 2010;2(2):46-71.

- 597 52. Lee J, Di Ruggiero E. How does informal employment affect health and health equity?  
598 Emerging gaps in research from a scoping review and modified e-Delphi survey. *International Journal*  
599 *for Equity in Health*. 2022;21(1):87.
- 600 53. Commons RJ, Simpson JA, Watson J, White NJ, Price RN. Estimating the proportion of  
601 *Plasmodium vivax* recurrences caused by relapse: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The*  
602 *American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*. 2020;103(3):1094.
- 603 54. Crossley TF, Winter JK. Asking households about expenditures: what have we learned?  
604 Improving the measurement of consumer expenditures: University of Chicago Press; 2014. p. 23-50.
- 605 55. Das S, Datta R, Beng TY, Kiromat M. Building a gender responsive framework for malaria  
606 elimination in Asia-Pacific. *The Lancet Regional Health–Western Pacific*. 2022;22.
- 607 56. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the*  
608 *economic evaluation of health care programmes*: Oxford university press; 2015.

609