

1 Mobility and non-household environments:
2 understanding dengue transmission patterns in
3 urban contexts

4

5 Víctor Hugo Peña-García^{1, †}, Bryson A. Ndenga², Francis M. Mutuku³, A. Desiree
6 LaBeaud⁴, Erin A. Mordecai¹

7

8 ¹ Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

9 ² Kenya Medical Research Institute, Kisumu, Kenya

10 ³ Department of Environmental and Health Sciences, Technical University of Mombasa,
11 Mombasa, Kenya

12 ⁴ School of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

13

14 [†] Corresponding author:

15 email: vhpena@stanford.edu

16

17

18 **Abstract**

19 Households (HH) have been traditionally described as the main environments where
20 people are at risk of dengue (and other arbovirus) infection. Mounting entomological
21 evidence has suggested a larger role of environments other than HH in transmission.
22 Recently, an agent-based model estimated that over half of infections occur in non-
23 household (NH) environments like workplaces, markets, and recreational sites.
24 However, the importance of human and vector mobility and the configurations of urban
25 spaces in mediating the effects of NH on dengue transmission remains understudied.
26 To improve our knowledge of the relevance of these spaces in transmission, we
27 expanded an agent-based model calibrated from field data in Kenya to examine
28 movement of people and vectors under different spatial configurations of buildings. In
29 this model, we assessed the number of people traveling between HH and NH, their
30 distance, and the number of mosquitoes migrating. Those were studied on three
31 different urban configurations, on which the NH are spatially distributed either randomly
32 (scattered), centered (in a single center), or clustered (in more than one cluster). Across
33 simulations, the number of people moving is a major influential variable where higher
34 levels of movement between HH and NH increases the number of cases. In addition,
35 the number of cases is higher when NH are scattered. These results highlight the
36 importance of NH in transmission as a major spreader of infections between households.
37 In addition, we found an inverse relationship between mosquito migration and
38 population size and hence transmission, which underscores the high cost of migration
39 for mosquitoes. Intriguingly, the distance that people travel from HH to NH seems to
40 have little effect on dengue burden; however, it affects the level of spatial clustering of

41 cases. The results of this work support the relevance of NH in transmission and its
42 interaction with human movement in driving dengue dynamics.

43

44 **Author summary**

45 Recent evidence describes a major role of non-household (NH) environments in dengue
46 transmission. This new knowledge implies that spatial distribution of these locations and
47 the movement of both vectors and humans among them has implications in dynamics of
48 transmission. However, these haven't been evaluated neither together nor considering a
49 differential role in transmission of urban environments. We modified a previously
50 informed agent-based model to include spatial variables by assessing three different
51 urban conformations, i.e. when NH are randomly distributed (scattered), centered, or
52 grouped in differed clusters (clustered). On these, we also evaluated the movement of
53 both vectors and people from households (HH) to NH (both distance and number of
54 individuals). Our findings, which includes a higher burden of dengue when NH are
55 scattered and at higher levels of human movement and low level of vector migration,
56 are aligned with the idea that infections are mainly happening in NH mediated by human
57 mobilization. Infected people reach the households where local subpopulation of vector
58 spread the virus to remaining inhabitants. This work highlights the role of NH and
59 human mobility in dengue transmission.

60

61 Introduction

62 Dengue is a vector-borne disease prevalent and on the rise in most of the tropical and
63 subtropical regions around the globe. The main vector, *Aedes aegypti*, is highly
64 anthropophilic, found very close to human environments and impacting the public health
65 of urban environments [1, 2].

66 Historically, the main strategy to control the disease has been to reduce vector-human
67 contact by reducing the size of mosquito populations. Conventional wisdom is that for
68 effective control, these activities should be focused on households (HH) as the main
69 environment where transmission is happening [3, 4]. However, some studies have
70 suggested that locations other than households might have an important role because
71 of a significant presence of mosquitoes [5-8], and infected vectors [9]. Recently, a study
72 using agent-based modeling to quantify the number of infections in different types of
73 urban spaces estimated that over half of infections are happening in non-household
74 (NH) environments, where the main high-risk spaces are workplaces and
75 markets/shops [10].

76 These results have implications for dengue epidemiology since the high influx of people
77 in NH suggests that these spaces can contribute to the spread of infections. In this way,
78 the total number of infections can be affected by the distribution in space of NH and the
79 movement of people between HH and NH. However, these intra-urban dynamics have
80 never been described in the context of different roles among HH and different NH space
81 types [11-14], though Massaro and colleagues used mobile phone data to get estimates
82 for movement between workplaces [15].

83 Building on a previous result showing the major importance of NH for dengue
84 transmission, we now evaluate how levels of human and vector mobility as well as
85 different urban spatial configurations of NH affect dengue transmission. In particular,
86 what role does spatial configuration of NH spaces play, along with the extent to which
87 people and mosquitoes move between spaces, in determining dengue dynamics? To
88 address this, we modified a previously reported agent-based model [10] to make it
89 spatially explicit by assigning coordinates that mimic different urban conformations and
90 evaluated different scenarios of movement of people and vectors. We then assessed
91 how these variables affect the burden of dengue and the spatial patterns to understand
92 urban-level transmission dynamics.

93

94 Methods

95 Model overview

96 To achieve the aims of this study, we modified the agent-based model previously used
97 to describe the importance of HH and NH in transmission [10]. The model was
98 developed to quantify the relative contribution of five different types of NH (workplaces,
99 markets or shops, recreational, religious, and schools) and HH to dengue burden. The
100 model development and calibration were based on data from the two Kenyan cities of
101 Kisumu and Ukunda [10]. This paper's results focus on parameters calibrated to Kisumu,
102 although additional results including dynamics from Ukunda are found in supporting
103 information.

104 The model represents the movement of people to daily-commuting locations like
105 schools and workplaces as well as other locations, for which both the number and
106 identity of people who visit them is randomly defined every day. The latter include
107 spaces like markets or shops, recreational and religious spaces. Movement between
108 HH is also included in the model. Based on vector surveys conducted over two years of
109 fieldwork previously published [16], NH and HH environments were assigned to have
110 mosquito presence or absence based on observed prevalence of mosquitoes.
111 Population dynamics of vectors were modeled at the building level, whereby the sub-
112 population dynamics are determined based on building-level conditions like the
113 presence of water containers and the total amount of water they can hold, again
114 informed by field vector surveillance data. These dynamics as well as infection
115 dynamics of vectors are also determined by temperature by using functions previously
116 described and widely used elsewhere [17-19].

117 Transmission events happen in those locations where infected vectors contact
118 susceptible humans or vice versa. Mosquitoes bite depending on both temperature-
119 dependent biting rate and the probability of having a successful vector-human
120 encounter, which depends on the amount of time that humans spend in the location.
121 Infection status of mosquitoes can be susceptible, exposed, or infected while humans
122 can be either susceptible, exposed, infected, or recovered and (temporarily) immune.
123 Since the model does not explicitly represent dynamics of different serotypes, recovered
124 humans go back to susceptible status after three months in recovered status. The
125 number of infections in each location is recorded daily. Statistics about the total number
126 of infections and locations are provided weekly. The model simulates transmission


127 dynamics happening for 731 days (comprising temperature conditions between January
128 1st of 2020 until December 31st of 2021) and results are shown as a distribution of the
129 number of infections over 200 simulations. The model and modifications described in
130 this work were coded in Julia language (v1.10.0) and simulations were run on Sherlock
131 computational cluster (Stanford Research Computing Center).

132

133 Spatial variables

134 To include mobility-associated variables, we made the model spatially explicit. No actual
135 spatial coordinates were used so we could record the outcome when different urban
136 conformations are tested by using the same set of spatial coordinates. In this way, we
137 can assure that differences are due to the building designation as HH or NH and not by
138 the specific spatial location. Because the model considers populations of about 20,000
139 people, the total municipality areas were rescaled to fit the total number of structures of
140 the virtual populations while considering similar densities. Spatial coordinates were
141 randomly generated and assigned to each structure of the population. Coordinates
142 assignments were done based on either “Scattered” (randomly distributed), “Centered”
143 (majority of NH concentrated in the center of the city in a single cluster), or “Clustered”
144 (majority of NH concentrated in three clusters) configurations (Fig 1), so no new
145 coordinates were created for each spatial distribution, but spatial assignments of
146 building types to locations differed among them.

147



148

149

Fig 1: Spatial distribution of NH for three different urban conformations to be

150

tested: scattered (NH randomly distributed in space), centered (majority of NH are

151

clustered in the center), and clustered (majority of NH are grouped in three clusters).

152

Only NH are shown while HH are interspersed among NH. Religious and schools are

153

represented in the first row, markets/shops and recreational in middle row and more

154

frequent NH, workplaces, are represented in the lower row.

155

156 Movement of people

157

We included two movement-related variables: distance from HH to NH locations, and

158

number of people moving. To control the distance of people moving, we limited the

159 attendance of people to (1) those NH locations that are the closest to their respective
160 HH (categorized as distance zero, 0), (2) those locations that are at least 500 meters
161 away from the respective HH, or (3) locations at least 1000 meters away from the HH.
162 The three treatments were applied to each of the three urban conformations. However,
163 on the clustered or centered conformations, the closest distance treatment would favor
164 NH locations at the periphery of the cluster. To avoid this, as many close NH were
165 assigned to each HH as inhabitants it had.

166 The number of people visiting NH was simulated at three levels. First, we included the
167 same levels previously described in the model, categorized as 100% mobility [10]. This
168 treatment includes all students and workers attending their respective school and
169 workplace, and random-attendance locations (religious, markets/shops, and
170 recreational) with number of people uniformly distributed with parameters minimum = 10
171 and maximum = 70. The number of people visiting a given location is determined daily.
172 We also decreased the number of people moving to school and workplaces to 50% and
173 remaining NH locations to a uniform distribution with parameters minimum = 5 and
174 maximum = 35. Finally, we include a level of people movement of 20% for school and
175 workplaces and uniform distribution with parameters minimum = 2 and maximum = 14
176 for random-attendance locations.

177

178 Movement of mosquitoes

179 We consider two variables to estimate a baseline migration probability for the number of
180 mosquitoes moving from given locations: availability of both breeding and blood-feeding
181 resources.

182 The model includes a local density-dependent function that allows for the mosquito
183 population to grow in a location-specific way, allowing it to represent dynamics
184 previously described for a fragmented environment [20]. By using this function, the
185 number of mosquitoes in each location grows according to availability of water
186 containers, the density of immature mosquitoes in those containers, and temperature
187 (peaking at 29°C), as follows:

$$f(D) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{0.09D - 0.55}} d(T) \#(1)$$

188 Where

$$d(T) = -0.166 + 0.08T - 0.0014T^2 \#(2)$$

189
190 In the equation, D is the larval density expressed as the ratio of the number of larvae to
191 liters of water available for breeding in the structure, and $d(T)$ is the term describing the
192 temperature-dependence of population growth. The equation allows the sub-population
193 to grow when larvae density is low by assuming they occupy all the water containers
194 inside or around the structure. As the mosquito sub-population grows, resource
195 availability in the water declines, slowing population growth. By considering Nm_t as the
196 mosquito subpopulation size at time t , when the ratio Nm_t/Nm_{t+1} approaches 1, breeding

197 site resources are reaching their carrying capacity and hence, the probability of a
198 mosquito migrating increases. Because there is a strong stochastic component in
199 estimating Nm_{t+1} , by running 20 simulations for every location every day, we estimated a
200 parameter M_P as the median of ratios Nm_t/Nm_{t+1} .

201 On the other hand, we also consider the probability that each female mosquito bites a
202 human within a given location. The rate of biting is temperature dependent (a),
203 according to previously published [17]. We coupled it into a binomial distribution to
204 define the number of biting mosquitoes as follows:

$$N_b \sim \text{Bin}(Nm_t, a) \#(3)$$

205 Where N_b is the number of females needing to bite on day t and Nm_t is the size of sub-
206 population mosquitoes that day. While most models assume that all females bite when
207 they need to, here we consider the possibility that mosquitoes cannot find blood meal
208 hosts in a given place and time as dependent on the human occupancy of a given
209 location. We assume that there is a probability for N_b mosquitoes to have a successful
210 biting human-mosquito encounter ($P(\text{bite})$) based on the size of N_b and the amount of
211 time that humans spend in the location, as follows:

$$P(\text{bite}) = 1 - e^{-\frac{\text{hours}}{24}Nh_t} \#(4)$$

212 Where Nh_t is the number of people attending a given location on day t for a structure-
213 specific number of hours. Finally, the actual number females that fed (N_F) in each day, is
214 estimated by

$$N_F \sim \text{Bin}(N_b, P(\text{bite})) \#(5)$$

215 In this sense, when the number of people on a given day is low and the number of
216 hours they spend in the location are few, the probability of a female mosquito
217 successfully biting is low. So, as the ratio N_F/N_b (later called M_F) approaches 0, the
218 probability of mosquitoes migrating increases. Again, for every location every day, 20
219 simulations were run to estimate a distribution of M_F .

220 Finally, we estimated the migration probability as the product $M_p \cdot (1 - M_F)$, which depends
221 on both larval density conditions via M_p and adult biting conditions via M_F . The resulting
222 probability was used in a binomial distribution to determine the number of migrating
223 mosquitoes each day. To evaluate the effect of different mosquito movement regimes
224 on the burden of dengue, we considered migration rates of 100% (as unmodified
225 product $M_p \cdot (1 - M_F)$), 50%, and 10%. The total number of cases was quantified after 200
226 simulations.

227 Once a mosquito migrates, a new location is assigned by considering a dispersal kernel
228 [21]. Following previous work [22], we used a lognormal function with the form

$$P_D = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} b d^2} e^{-\frac{\log(d/a)^2}{2b^2}} \quad \#(6)$$

229 Where d is distance and both a and b are parameters to be estimated. We fitted a
230 function by assuming a mean dispersal distance of 105.69 meters, as estimated for
231 *Aedes aegypti* by [23].

232

233 **Spatial autocorrelation**

234 By taking advantage of spatial features introduced in the model, we performed a spatial
235 autocorrelation analysis to evaluate the level of clustering of dengue cases recorded in
236 each simulation as a function of urban configuration and human and mosquito mobility.
237 To do this, the household location of each infection is recorded so a Global Moran's I
238 index could be estimated at the end of the simulated period. Global Moran's I ranges
239 from -1 to +1 where -1 means totally dispersed location of cases while a value of 1
240 represents a total spatially clustered distribution (total separation between locations with
241 dengue cases and those without cases). In this sense, the null hypothesis of this
242 analysis is that dengue cases are randomly distributed in municipalities, represented by
243 Moran's I value of 0 [24]. The analysis was done for every simulation by using 1,000
244 permutations for inference in each of them. Analyses were done using the package
245 SpatialDependence.jl implemented in Julia language (v 1.10.0).

246


247 Results

248 Burden of dengue is strongly affected by number of people
249 visiting NH

250 We quantified the total number of cases after two years of transmission. When we
251 simulated the epidemic under different human movement regimes, it was evident that
252 the number of cases decreased as the number of people moving from HH decreased.
253 For 100% human movement, irrespective of the urban conformation, we estimated for a
254 median of 4,228 cases (IQR: 3,025 – 4,921), which decreased to a median of 764 (IQR:

255 349 – 1,626) and 154 (IQR: 108 – 232) cases for 50% and 20% human movement,
256 respectively (Fig 2 and S1 Table) (all results are derived from the model calibrated for
257 Kisumu, Kenya; see supporting information for further results for the Kenyan city of
258 Ukunda).

259



260

261 **Fig 2: Increasing the number of people moving from HH to NH significantly**
262 **increases the burden of dengue under three NH spatial distribution scenarios.**

263 Three levels of human movement were assessed (20%, 50%, and 100%) on three
264 urban conformations (scattered, centered, or clustered). Boxplots shows the distribution
265 of the total number of infections for 200 runs of two-year simulation where median is the
266 horizontal line, the filled box is the interquartile (IQR) range, the whiskers show the


267 values above and under the IQR and no more than 1.5·IQR, and dots are representing
268 values beyond this range.

269

270 Additionally, the scenario where NH locations are spatially randomly distributed
271 produced more cases, though at all movement levels the interquartile ranges for
272 different spatial configurations overlapped (Fig 2). Thus, scattered conformation yielded
273 a median of 4,672 (IQR: 3,956 – 5,227) while the centered and clustered scenarios
274 produced, respectively, medians of 4,432 (IQR: 3,587 – 5,027) and 3,178 (IQR: 1,785 –
275 4,179) (S2 Table).

276 When we compared HH and NH environments, the number of infections is higher in NH
277 at higher levels of movement. However, at lower levels of movement and hence lower
278 transmission, the number of infections between HH and NH becomes roughly similar. In
279 this way, at 100% of movement irrespective of urban conformation, NH produced 67%
280 of the cases, but this proportion decreased to 58.8% and to 42.3% at 50% and 20% of
281 human movement, respectively (Fig 3 and S1 Table).

282



283

284 **Fig 3: Number of infections are higher in NH than HH at high levels of human**
285 **movement but becomes more even when levels of transmission are low due to**
286 **lower movement.** Three levels of human movement were assessed (20%, 50%, and
287 100%) on three urban conformations (scattered, centered, or clustered). Boxplots are
288 showing the distribution of total number of infections for 200 runs of two-year simulation
289 where median is the horizontal line, the filled box is the interquartile (IQR) range, the
290 whiskers show the values above and under the IQR and no more than 1.5·IQR, and
291 dots are representing values beyond this range.

292

293 Distance from HH to NH makes little difference in dengue burden

294 but defines level of spatial structure

295 Interestingly, when we evaluated the number of infections produced by different


296 distance regimes from HH to NH, only slight differences were evident among them.

297 These are mainly related to an increased number of cases when NH are clustered (Fig

298 4 and S3 Table). Besides these slight changes, differences among urban conformations

299 are still evident (Fig 4).

300



301


302 **Fig 4: Different distance regimes people travel from HH to NH results in slight**

303 **differences in cases.** Distance 0 means people only visit the closest NH location from

304 HH. On the three urban configuration scenarios, three levels of distance from HH to NH
305 were assessed (the closest [categorized as 0], at least 500 meters, and at least 1000
306 meters). Boxplots are showing the total number of infections after two-year simulation
307 for 200 runs.

308 Intrigued by the apparent lower importance of human movement distance in
309 transmission, we wanted to explore further by assessing the spatial structure of cases.
310 Given that the number of people moving affects the number of cases, we evaluated the
311 spatial structuring when distance traveled is considered as well. In general, we found
312 that irrespective of urban conformation, when people move short distances the level of
313 spatial structure is higher, as expected (Fig 5). Similarly, the spatial structuring levels
314 are also modified by the number of people moving, where lower levels of movement
315 decrease Moran's I , thereby making cases more dispersed (Fig S6).

316



317


318 **Fig 5: Distance that people travel from HH to NH locations defines the level of**
319 **spatial structuring of cases.** Distribution of Moran's I values for 200 simulations for
320 each of the three distance regimes is shown. Both significant ($\alpha = 0.05$) and non-
321 significant are displayed by color. Three levels of distance from HH to NH were
322 assessed (the closest [categorized as 0], at least 500 meters, and at least 1000 meters)
323 on three urban conformations (scattered, centered, or clustered).

324

325 Movement of mosquitoes is costly and reduces human dengue
326 burden

327 When we considered different regimes of mosquito movement, the model yielded a
328 lower number of cases when mosquito migration was higher. In this sense, the median
329 number of cases was 306 (IQR: 222 – 419) at 100% of mosquito movement and
330 increased to 1,090 (IQR: 533 – 1,714) and 4,670 (IQR: 4,005 – 5,229) when number of
331 mosquitoes was 50% and 10%, respectively (S4 Table). Still the proportion of infections
332 happening in HH compared to NH remained lower regardless of mosquito movement
333 (Fig 6). To better understand the mechanism by which mosquito movement was
334 reducing transmission, we studied the size of mosquito populations for each mosquito
335 movement regime, which resulted in smaller population sizes at higher movement rate
336 (Fig S9), indicating the importance of mosquito mortality during migration as a limit on
337 transmission.

338



339

340 **Fig 6: Number of cases decreases when levels of mosquito migration increase.**

341 Three levels of vector movement permissiveness were assessed (100%, 50%, and
342 20%). Human mobility was kept to 100% for all simulations, so differences are strictly
343 due to mosquito movement. Boxplots are showing the total number of infections after
344 two-year simulation for 200 runs.

345

346 Discussion

347 Recently, results of this model have described the important role of NH environments
348 for transmission, which is greater than previously recognized, accounting for over half of

349 infections and implying an important role of vector control in NH spaces [10]. Here, we
350 aimed to further understand how this differential role of NH environments interacts with
351 movement and spatial configurations of urban environments to drive dengue
352 transmission. We showed that human movement is a primary driver of dengue
353 dynamics, irrespective of urban spatial configuration, and that mosquito movement
354 tends to reduce transmission by increasing mosquito mortality. Further, qualitatively
355 similar, outcomes generated by simulating conditions from the Kenyan city of Ukunda
356 supports these results and can be found in supplemental material.

357 Among urban conformations, when NH spaces are scattered throughout the city it
358 allows for closer connections to HH and therefore increased transmission. In this way,
359 NH spaces serve as spreaders of infection since they are highly visited locations, which
360 increases the chances of having a successful feeding encounter between humans and
361 infected vectors. Once an individual is infected, the chances of infecting mosquitoes
362 inside the household and in turn having another household inhabitant infected increases,
363 generating local household chains of transmission.

364 For this reason, reducing the number of individuals visiting NH locations reduces the
365 burden of dengue (Fig 2). In this sense, when number of people visiting NH decreases,
366 the number of infections happening in these spaces is also decreased until becoming
367 roughly even with number of infections in HH. These results are supported by previous
368 reports that when COVID-19 pandemic lockdown forced people to stay at home most of
369 the time, the number of dengue cases was significantly reduced [14, 25, 26]. The idea
370 of human movement guiding different levels of transmission is not new and has been
371 explored previously, especially by Stoddard and colleagues (2009) who found that

372 human movement is even more important for transmission than vector abundance [11].
373 However, here we highlight how human mobility interacts with NH spaces as drivers of
374 transmission, which then disseminates within households. As a result, when control is
375 focused on households, it prevents the spread of disease to the remaining household
376 inhabitants. However, broader focuses of transmission remain active as long as NH
377 transmission is not under control.

378 Distance from HH to NH was not as important as overall levels of human movement for
379 dengue burden (Fig 4). The lack of influence of this variable supports our previous result
380 by suggesting that it is not how far people are traveling but the destination and total
381 amount of movement. This is in line with previous work where a large, longitudinal study
382 in Iquitos, Peru showed that human infection risk is mainly driven by individuals visiting
383 locations with presence of infected vectors, irrespective of the distance [12].

384 It is important to note that our model does not account for movement times, which
385 increase with distance. These spaces have been previously described to have
386 mosquitoes [27] and hence represent some degree of risk for transmission when people
387 are nearby. Unfortunately, we do not have data about the time people spend in those
388 locations. We think that the number of infections happening while people are moving
389 through these locations is likely to be negligible given the short duration of time people
390 spend there, but this merits further work.

391 The distance that people travel to NH should not, however, be neglected when
392 understanding urban spatial dynamics of transmission. The results of this model
393 indicate that distance traveled is important to determine the level of clustering of cases,
394 which is a measure of the level of spatial dependence of cases and hence of how cases

395 are unevenly distributed in space (Fig 5) [24]. The clustering of cases considering the
396 major role in transmission of NH is something that has not been explored before and
397 deserves further exploration to understand its implication for disease control program
398 design.

399 In this model we also included estimates of mosquito movement, where we found that
400 high levels of mosquito migration induce high mosquito mortality, thereby reducing
401 mosquito abundance and transmission (Fig 6). These results suggest that mosquito
402 migration is carried out at a high cost for the individual and population, which supports
403 the empirical observation that mosquitoes tend to stay in or close to the same location
404 where they are breeding. Though our model has different parameterization and purpose
405 from that previously reported by Reiner and colleagues, they also included both
406 movement of people and mosquitoes and found that the former is the real force shaping
407 dengue transmission as opposed to movement of mosquitoes, which diffuse it.
408 Interestingly, they found that their model output matches real observations when
409 mosquito movement is decreased and, under certain scenarios, when mosquito
410 movement equals to zero [28].

411 In our model, a migrant mosquito travels to another location, irrespective of the
412 suitability of that location (i.e., presence of water containers or established mosquito
413 population), with a distance-based probability. If the new location is suitable for breeding,
414 a new mosquito subpopulation is established, otherwise the migrant mosquito will die
415 before reproducing. A migrant mosquito may be more attracted to travel to a location
416 with water containers, as suggested by other studies [29], which is not included in the
417 model. However, it is not known how likely it is for a migrating mosquito to travel longer

418 distances in search of containers during migration if the closest location does not have
419 any. This type of dynamics has never been studied before. Another variable not
420 considered is the number of buildings, roads, and other urban features that might
421 impose some limits to mosquito dispersal like those described previously, where all *Ae.*
422 *aegypti* individuals were recaptured in the same block where they were released,
423 unable to cross roads [30].

424 Though there are several mark-release-recapture studies recording long travel
425 distances by *Ae. aegypti* [23], most of these studies are artificially releasing mosquitoes
426 where they are forced to travel looking for a place to settle. While these studies are
427 useful to evaluate the capacity of mosquitoes to fly in these conditions, they are not
428 indicative of the propensity for already settled mosquitoes to travel the distances
429 recorded in these studies.

430 According to results of this model, intra-urban dispersion of mosquitoes is not explained
431 by mosquito migration. A plausible explanation is that dispersion is actively driven by
432 human mobility. This would underscore the importance of human movement by
433 suggesting that it is mainly responsible for the burden and dispersal of dengue through
434 communities. Though the role of human mobility on intra-urban mosquito dispersion is
435 hard to measure, there are several studies explaining the importance of human
436 movement in dengue transmission at different space levels [11, 12, 28, 31-34].

437 Considering previous, novel results about the importance of NH environments in
438 dengue transmission, we aimed to describe the implications of them across different
439 urban spatial distributions and levels of human and mosquito movement, which has
440 never been studied before. According to our model, those municipalities with NH

441 locations clustered are slightly more protected from dengue spreading than those
442 municipalities with NH randomly distributed in space. However, the main variable
443 influencing dengue burden is the number of people moving between HH and NH.
444 Together, these results reflect the importance of NH and human mobility between NH
445 and HH spaces in dengue epidemiology. This underscores the importance of vector
446 control in NH spaces, which is not currently implemented in most places. Finally, though
447 people's travel distance did not have a large impact on the number of cases, it is
448 important for shaping spatial patterns, which can have implications for control activities
449 and for local herd immunity.

450

451 **Acknowledgements**

452 We would like to acknowledge Dr. Jason R. Andrews for the valuable input in this work.

453 We would also acknowledge the fieldwork teams (in Kisumu: Joel Mbakaya, Samwel

454 Ndire and Charles Adipo; in Ukunda: Said Lipi Malumbo, Paul S. Mutuku, Charles M.

455 Ng'ang'a) who collected the data which this work was possible with.

456

457

458 **References**

459

- 460 1. Scott TW, Amerasinghe PH, Morrison AC, Lorenz LH, Clark GG, Strickman D, et al.
461 Longitudinal studies of *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) in Thailand and Puerto Rico: blood
462 feeding frequency. *J Med Entomol.* 2000;37(1):89-101. PubMed PMID: 15218911.
- 463 2. Scott TW, Chow E, Strickman D, Kittayapong P, Wirtz RA, Lorenz LH, et al. Blood-
464 feeding patterns of *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) collected in a rural Thai village. *J Med*
465 *Entomol.* 1993;30(5):922-7. PubMed PMID: 8254642.
- 466 3. Montenegro-Quiñonez CA, Louis VR, Horstick O, Velayudhan R, Dambach P, Runge-
467 Ranzinger S. Interventions against *Aedes*/dengue at the household level: a systematic review
468 and meta-analysis. *EBioMedicine.* 2023;93:104660. Epub 20230621. doi:
469 10.1016/j.ebiom.2023.104660. PubMed PMID: 37352828; PubMed Central PMCID:
470 PMCPMC10333437.
- 471 4. World Health Organization. Dengue guidelines for diagnosis, treatment, prevention and
472 control : new edition. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2009. x, 147 p. p.
- 473 5. Huang CH, Lin CY, Yang CY, Chan TC, Chiang PH, Chen YH. Relationship between the
474 Incidence of Dengue Virus Transmission in Traditional Market and Climatic Conditions in
475 Kaohsiung City. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol.* 2021;2021:9916642. Epub 20210809. doi:
476 10.1155/2021/9916642. PubMed PMID: 34422144; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8371670.

- 477 6. Suwanbamrung C, Promsupa S, Doungsin T, Tongjan S. Risk factors related to dengue
478 infections in primary school students: exploring students' basic knowledge of dengue and
479 examining the larval indices in southern Thailand. *J Infect Public Health*. 2013;6(5):347-57.
480 Epub 20130621. doi: 10.1016/j.jiph.2013.04.006. PubMed PMID: 23999339.
- 481 7. Barrera R, Acevedo V, Amador M. Role of Abandoned and Vacant Houses on *Aedes*
482 *aegypti* Productivity. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2021;104(1):145-50. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0829.
483 PubMed PMID: 33021195; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7790113.
- 484 8. Kampango A, Furu P, Sarath DL, Haji KA, Konradsen F, Schiøler KL, et al. Risk factors
485 for occurrence and abundance of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes bromeliae* at hotel compounds in
486 Zanzibar. *Parasit Vectors*. 2021;14(1):544. Epub 20211022. doi: 10.1186/s13071-021-05005-9.
487 PubMed PMID: 34686195; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8539800.
- 488 9. Pérez-Pérez J, Peña-García VH, Calle-Tobón A, Quimbayo-Forero M, Rojo R, Henao E,
489 et al. Entomovirological Surveillance in Schools: Are They a Source for Arboviral Diseases
490 Transmission? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(11). Epub 20210606. doi:
491 10.3390/ijerph18116137. PubMed PMID: 34204166; PubMed Central PMCID:
492 PMCPMC8201003.
- 493 10. Peña-García VH, Desiree LaBeaud A, Ndenga BA, Mutuku FM, Bisanzio DA, Mordecai
494 EA, et al. Non-household environments make a major contribution to dengue transmission:
495 Implications for vector control. *medRxiv*. 2024. Epub 20240110. doi:
496 10.1101/2024.01.08.24301016. PubMed PMID: 38260355; PubMed Central PMCID:
497 PMCPMC10802645.

- 498 11. Stoddard ST, Morrison AC, Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Paz Soldan V, Kochel TJ, Kitron U,
499 et al. The role of human movement in the transmission of vector-borne pathogens. PLoS Negl
500 Trop Dis. 2009;3(7):e481. Epub 20090721. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000481. PubMed PMID:
501 19621090; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2710008.
- 502 12. Stoddard ST, Forshey BM, Morrison AC, Paz-Soldan VA, Vazquez-Prokopec GM,
503 Astete H, et al. House-to-house human movement drives dengue virus transmission. Proc Natl
504 Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(3):994-9. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1213349110. PubMed PMID: 23277539;
505 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3549073.
- 506 13. Wesolowski A, Qureshi T, Boni MF, Sundsøy PR, Johansson MA, Rasheed SB, et al.
507 Impact of human mobility on the emergence of dengue epidemics in Pakistan. Proc Natl Acad
508 Sci U S A. 2015;112(38):11887-92. Epub 20150908. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1504964112. PubMed
509 PMID: 26351662; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4586847.
- 510 14. Liyanage P, Rocklöv J, Tissera HA. The impact of COVID-19 lockdown on dengue
511 transmission in Sri Lanka; A natural experiment for understanding the influence of human
512 mobility. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021;15(6):e0009420. Epub 20210610. doi:
513 10.1371/journal.pntd.0009420. PubMed PMID: 34111117; PubMed Central PMCID:
514 PMCPMC8192006.
- 515 15. Massaro E, Kondor D, Ratti C. Assessing the interplay between human mobility and
516 mosquito borne diseases in urban environments. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):16911. Epub 20191115.
517 doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-53127-z. PubMed PMID: 31729435; PubMed Central PMCID:
518 PMCPMC6858332.

- 519 16. Peña-García VH, Mutuku FM, Ndenga BA, Mbakaya JO, Ndire SO, Agola GA, et al. The
520 Importance of Including Non-Household Environments in Dengue Vector Control Activities.
521 *Viruses*. 2023;15(7). Epub 20230714. doi: 10.3390/v15071550. PubMed PMID: 37515236;
522 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10384488.
- 523 17. Mordecai EA, Cohen JM, Evans MV, Gudapati P, Johnson LR, Lippi CA, et al. Detecting
524 the impact of temperature on transmission of Zika, dengue, and chikungunya using mechanistic
525 models. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2017;11(4):e0005568. Epub 2017/04/27. doi:
526 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005568. PubMed PMID: 28448507; PubMed Central PMCID:
527 PMCPMC5423694.
- 528 18. Huber JH, Childs ML, Caldwell JM, Mordecai EA. Seasonal temperature variation
529 influences climate suitability for dengue, chikungunya, and Zika transmission. *PLoS Negl Trop*
530 *Dis*. 2018;12(5):e0006451. Epub 20180510. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006451. PubMed PMID:
531 29746468; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5963813.
- 532 19. Caldwell JM, LaBeaud AD, Lambin EF, Stewart-Ibarra AM, Ndenga BA, Mutuku FM, et
533 al. Climate predicts geographic and temporal variation in mosquito-borne disease dynamics on
534 two continents. *Nat Commun*. 2021;12(1):1233. Epub 20210223. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-
535 21496-7. PubMed PMID: 33623008; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7902664.
- 536 20. McCormack CP, Ghani AC, Ferguson NM. Fine-scale modelling finds that breeding site
537 fragmentation can reduce mosquito population persistence. *Commun Biol*. 2019;2:273. Epub
538 20190725. doi: 10.1038/s42003-019-0525-0. PubMed PMID: 31372512; PubMed Central
539 PMCID: PMCPMC6658551.

- 540 21. Nathan R, Klein E, Robledo-Arnuncio JJ, Revilla E. Dispersal kernels: review. In: Clobert
541 J, Baguette M, Benton TG, Bullock JM, editors. Dispersal Ecology and Evolution: Oxford
542 University Press; 2012. p. 0.
- 543 22. Marcantonio M, Reyes T, Barker CM. Quantifying *Aedes aegypti* dispersal in space and
544 time: a modeling approach. Ecosphere. 2019;10(12):e02977. doi:
545 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2977>.
- 546 23. Moore TC, Brown HE. Estimating *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) Flight Distance:
547 Meta-Data Analysis. J Med Entomol. 2022;59(4):1164-70. doi: 10.1093/jme/tjac070. PubMed
548 PMID: 35640992.
- 549 24. Pfeiffer DU, Robinson TP, Stevenson M, Stevens KB, Rogers DJ, Clements ACA.
550 Spatial clustering of disease and global estimates of spatial clustering. Spatial Analysis in
551 Epidemiology: Oxford University Press; 2008. p. 0.
- 552 25. Wilder-Smith A. Dengue during the COVID-19 pandemic. J Travel Med. 2021;28(8). doi:
553 10.1093/jtm/taab183. PubMed PMID: 34850050; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8690170.
- 554 26. Sasmono RT, Santoso MS. Movement dynamics: reduced dengue cases during the
555 COVID-19 pandemic. Lancet Infect Dis. 2022;22(5):570-1. Epub 20220302. doi:
556 10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00062-7. PubMed PMID: 35247322; PubMed Central PMCID:
557 PMCPMC8890753.
- 558 27. Ngugi HN, Mutuku FM, Ndenga BA, Musunzaji PS, Mbakaya JO, Aswani P, et al.
559 Characterization and productivity profiles of *Aedes aegypti* (L.) breeding habitats across rural
560 and urban landscapes in western and coastal Kenya. Parasit Vectors. 2017;10(1):331. Epub

561 20170712. doi: 10.1186/s13071-017-2271-9. PubMed PMID: 28701194; PubMed Central
562 PMCID: PMCPMC5508769.

563 28. Reiner RC, Stoddard ST, Scott TW. Socially structured human movement shapes
564 dengue transmission despite the diffusive effect of mosquito dispersal. *Epidemics*. 2014;6:30-6.
565 Epub 20140108. doi: 10.1016/j.epidem.2013.12.003. PubMed PMID: 24593919; PubMed
566 Central PMCID: PMCPMC3971836.

567 29. Richter O, Nguyen A, Nguyen T. Application of reaction-diffusion equations for modeling
568 human and breeding site attraction movement behavior of *Aedes aegypti* mosquito. *Math Biosci*
569 *Eng*. 2022;19(12):12915-35. doi: 10.3934/mbe.2022603. PubMed PMID: 36654028.

570 30. Trewin BJ, Pagendam DE, Zalucki MP, Darbro JM, Devine GJ, Jansen CC, et al. Urban
571 Landscape Features Influence the Movement and Distribution of the Australian Container-
572 Inhabiting Mosquito Vectors *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) and *Aedes notoscriptus*
573 (Diptera: Culicidae). *J Med Entomol*. 2020;57(2):443-53. doi: 10.1093/jme/tjz187. PubMed
574 PMID: 31693154.

575 31. Phaijoo GR, Gurung DB. Modeling Impact of Temperature and Human Movement on the
576 Persistence of Dengue Disease. *Comput Math Methods Med*. 2017;2017:1747134. Epub
577 20170919. doi: 10.1155/2017/1747134. PubMed PMID: 29312458; PubMed Central PMCID:
578 PMCPMC5651158.

579 32. Tocto-Erazo MR, Olmos-Liceaga D, Montoya-Laos JA. Effect of daily human movement
580 on some characteristics of dengue dynamics. *Math Biosci*. 2021;332:108531. Epub 20210116.
581 doi: 10.1016/j.mbs.2020.108531. PubMed PMID: 33460675.

582 33. Ospina-Aguirre C, Soriano-Paños D, Olivar-Tost G, Galindo-González CC, Gómez-
583 Gardeñes J, Osorio G. Effects of human mobility on the spread of Dengue in the region of
584 Caldas, Colombia. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2023;17(11):e0011087. Epub 20231127. doi:
585 10.1371/journal.pntd.0011087. PubMed PMID: 38011274; PubMed Central PMCID:
586 PMCPMC10703399.










587 34. Bomfim R, Pei S, Shaman J, Yamana T, Makse HA, Andrade JS, et al. Predicting
588 dengue outbreaks at neighbourhood level using human mobility in urban areas. J R Soc
589 Interface. 2020;17(171):20200691. Epub 20201028. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2020.0691. PubMed
590 PMID: 33109025; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7653379.

591

Scattered

Centered

Clustered



● Workplace ● Market ● Religious ● Recreational ● School

