

# 1 Scoping review of Japanese encephalitis virus transmission

## 2 models

3 Troy A. Laidlow <sup>a b</sup>, Erin S. Johnston <sup>c</sup>, Ruth N. Zadoks <sup>a b</sup>, Michael Walsh <sup>b d</sup>, Mafalda Viana <sup>d</sup>,  
4 Kerrie E. Wiley <sup>b d</sup>, Balbir B. Singh <sup>e</sup>, Francesco Baldini <sup>c f</sup>, Himani Dhanze <sup>g</sup>, Cameron Webb  
5 <sup>b d h</sup>, Victoria J. Brookes <sup>a b</sup>

6 <sup>a</sup> Sydney School of Veterinary Science, Faculty of Science, The University of Sydney,  
7 Camperdown, NSW, Australia

8 <sup>b</sup> Sydney Infectious Diseases Institute, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of  
9 Sydney, Camperdown, NSW, Australia

10 <sup>c</sup> School of Biodiversity, One Health and Veterinary Medicine, University of Glasgow, Glasgow,  
11 United Kingdom

12 <sup>d</sup> Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney,  
13 Camperdown, NSW, Australia

14 <sup>e</sup> Guru Angad Dev Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, India

15 <sup>f</sup> Ifakara Health Institute, Environmental Health, and Ecological Sciences Department,  
16 Morogoro, United Republic of Tanzania

17 <sup>g</sup> Division of Veterinary Public Health, Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Bareilly,  
18 India

19 <sup>h</sup> Medical Entomology, NSW Health Pathology, Westmead, NSW, Australia

## 20 **Abstract**

21 Japanese encephalitis virus (JEV) causes approximately 100,000 clinical cases and 25,000 deaths  
22 annually worldwide, mainly in South-East Asia and the Western Pacific and mostly in children.  
23 JEV is transmitted from competent hosts to humans through the bite of mosquitoes, and the  
24 abiotic environment, such as seasonal rainfall, influences transmission. Transmission models  
25 have an important role in understanding disease dynamics and developing prevention and control  
26 strategies to limit the impact of infectious diseases. Our goal was to investigate how transmission  
27 models capture JEV infection dynamics and their role in predicting and controlling infection.  
28 This was achieved by identifying published JEV transmission models, describing their features,  
29 and identifying their limitations, to guide future modelling. A PRISMA-ScR guided scoping  
30 review of peer-reviewed JEV transmission models was conducted. Databases searched included  
31 PubMed, ProQuest, Scopus, Web of Science and Google Scholar. Of 881 full text papers  
32 available in English, 29 were eligible for data extraction. Publication year ranged from 1975 to  
33 2023. The median number of host populations represented in each model was 3 (range: 1–8;  
34 usually humans, mosquitoes and pigs). Most (72% [n=21]) models were deterministic, using  
35 ordinary differential equations to describe transmission. Ten models were applied (representing a  
36 real JEV transmission setting) and validated with field data, while the remaining 19 models were  
37 theoretical. In the applied models, data from only a small proportion of countries in South-East  
38 Asia and the Western Pacific were used. Limitations included gaps in knowledge of local JEV  
39 epidemiology, vector attributes and the impact of prevention and control strategies, along with a  
40 lack of model validation with field data. The lack and limitations of models highlight that further  
41 research to understand JEV epidemiology is needed and that there is opportunity to develop and

42 implement applied models to improve control strategies for at-risk populations of animals and  
43 humans.

44

## 45 **1. Introduction**

46 Japanese encephalitis (JE) is the leading form of human acute viral encephalitis in Asia and the  
47 Pacific, and it is estimated that more than 1.5 billion people live in areas suitable for endemic JE  
48 (Erlanger et al. 2009; Moore 2021). JE is caused by Japanese encephalitis virus (JEV), a zoonotic  
49 mosquito-borne orthoflavivirus. In reported human cases, estimated case fatality approaches 30%  
50 and of those who survive, an estimated 46% suffer permanent neurological sequelae (Cheng et  
51 al. 2022). Studies of the global burden of JE estimated 100,308 cases (95% CI: 61,720–157,522)  
52 and 25,125 deaths (95% CI: 14,550–46,031) in 2015 with most cases occurring in children aged  
53 0–14 years (incidence: 5.4 per 100,000) (Quan et al. 2020; Campbell et al. 2011). However, it is  
54 likely that reported case numbers are inaccurate due to inadequate data collection and diagnosis,  
55 or attributed incorrectly due to cross-reactivity of serological tests with other flaviviruses (Maeki  
56 et al. 2019).

57 It is generally accepted that JEV is transmitted from a wild reservoir host (such as ardeid birds,  
58 i.e., herons and bitterns) or an amplifying host (such as wild or domestic pigs) to humans through  
59 the bite of mainly *Culex* spp. mosquitoes (Van Den Hurk, Ritchie, and Mackenzie 2009; De  
60 Wispelaere, Desprès, and Choumet 2017; Faizah et al. 2020). An experimental study showed that  
61 vector-free transmission between pigs can occur via oronasal infection, however this is yet to be  
62 reported under field conditions (Ricklin et al. 2016). The epidemiology of JEV might differ  
63 between regions based on variation in the infection ecology, particularly the diversity, abundance  
64 and composition of animal (non-human mammals and birds) and vector communities, and the  
65 circulating JEV genotype. Chicks and ducklings develop viremia (Page et al. 2014) and JEV  
66 outbreaks have been strongly associated with chicken density (Walsh et al. 2022), but further

67 investigations are required to determine if poultry are competent hosts. Cattle, horses and dogs,  
68 like humans, have insufficient viremia to infect susceptible mosquitoes and are noncompetent  
69 hosts for JEV (Boyer et al. 2021; Yang et al. 2008). Mosquito host feeding preferences and  
70 changes in the ratio of competent hosts to noncompetent hosts – for example, in communities  
71 with livestock – can impact JEV transmission (Marini et al. 2017). Two epidemiological patterns  
72 of JEV have been described: endemic activity in tropical regions and epidemic activity in  
73 temperate and subtropical regions (Van Den Hurk, Ritchie, and Mackenzie 2009).

74 Disease transmission models are data driven mathematical approaches to understand the  
75 parameters responsible for the dynamics of pathogen transmission and to assess the strategic  
76 responses to disease risk (Becker et al. 2021). They can incorporate environmental, host and  
77 vector data to determine factors that influence the size and duration of outbreaks for vector-borne  
78 diseases such as dengue (Ogunlade et al. 2023) and malaria (Mandal, Sarkar, and Sinha 2011).  
79 These models have been valuable in the planning and evaluation of interventions, determining  
80 optimal prevention and control strategies, and predicting the expected course of disease events  
81 (Garnett et al. 2011). However, both model development and assessment can vary widely and,  
82 therefore, so can model accuracy and reliability. This can be due to epistemic uncertainty  
83 (imprecise knowledge of parameters), aleatoric uncertainty (due to randomness) (Penn et al.  
84 2023), or to existing beliefs that influence model assumptions and interpretation of results  
85 (Garnett et al. 2011), all of which can hinder the appropriate generation and use of model  
86 outputs, especially for decision making.

87 In this scoping review, we aimed to examine how disease transmission models capture the  
88 dynamics of JEV infection and their use in prediction, prevention, and control of JEV spread. To  
89 achieve this, we collated and described peer-reviewed information in which models of JEV

90 transmission in populations were developed or implemented. Models of JEV transmission were  
91 defined as those that made explicit hypotheses about the biological mechanisms that drive JEV  
92 infection dynamics in host and/or vector populations. We aimed to provide a baseline of current  
93 knowledge and knowledge gaps regarding JEV model development and parameterisation, host  
94 and vector population structures, and virus transmission between hosts. The findings of this  
95 review provide a foundation for the development of improved models of JEV transmission to  
96 support JE prevention and control.

## 97 **2. Method**

### 98 *2.1 Protocol*

99 This scoping review was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic  
100 reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines ([Tricco et](#)  
101 [al. 2018](#)). The objective was to collate and describe peer-reviewed information in which models  
102 of JEV transmission in populations were developed or used.

103 The review protocol comprised three levels: Level 1; screening on title and abstract; Level 2,  
104 screening on full record; Level 3 data extraction. The web-based review platform Sysrev  
105 ([Bozada et al. 2021](#)) was used for Levels 1 and 2 and a spreadsheet in Google Sheets ([Google](#)  
106 [2024](#)) was used for Level 3.

107 We use the term ‘record’ to describe any bibliography citation captured in the searches. We use  
108 the term ‘model’ to describe a disease transmission model that was either developed or  
109 implemented to describe or quantify the transmission of JEV in populations.

110 A total of 11 reviewers participated in the scoping review. Reviewers were selected based on  
111 their knowledge of JEV or disease transmission modelling and/or their experience in performing  
112 scoping reviews.

## 113 *2.2 Eligibility*

114 Records were eligible for inclusion if they were peer-reviewed literature, including peer-  
115 reviewed conference proceedings, for which the full text was available, published in English, in  
116 any year, and from any country, and contained primary research of interest in which a model of  
117 JEV transmission was developed or implemented. Models could range from representation of  
118 transmission in one host population to models that explicitly represented the spatio-temporal  
119 variability and heterogeneous contact structures in multiple populations.

120 Theses, dissertations, and pre-prints were excluded. Records which described JEV statistical  
121 models (for example, inferential models that aimed to identify and predict spatio-temporal  
122 occurrence based on risk factors or time-series models) were excluded.

## 123 *2.3 Information sources and search strategy*

124 The literature search was conducted in January 2023, using the following combination of search  
125 terms:

- 126 i. “Japanese encephalitis” OR JEV,
- 127 ii. AND: model,
- 128 iii. AND: spread OR transmission,
- 129 iv. time frame: all,
- 130 v. language: “English”.

131 Four electronic databases were searched: PubMed, ProQuest, Scopus, and Web of Science (All  
132 databases) to provide a comprehensive search across various disciplines. A literature search,  
133 using the same criteria, was conducted via the Google Scholar search engine, in which the first  
134 100 results were screened. All records were exported into the citation manager software Endnote,  
135 and duplicates were removed. Records were then uploaded to Sysrev for Level 1 screening.

#### 136 *2.4 Selection of relevant records – Level 1 and 2*

137 During Level 1 (screening on title and abstract), two reviewers assessed each record. To  
138 maximise the sensitivity of identification of relevant records, records progressed to Level 2 if  
139 either reviewer assessed that the record might be eligible.

140 An agreement test was conducted prior to screening at Level 2 (screening on the full record), in  
141 which five reviewers screened the same randomly selected 20 records. Conflicting opinion about  
142 inclusion or exclusion of records were discussed to achieve agreement between reviewers and to  
143 refine and improve the clarity of the questions at each level (Table S1).

144 During Level 2, two reviewers initially assessed each record. Records were only included for  
145 charting in Level 3 if there was agreement that the record met the eligibility criteria between at  
146 least 2 reviewers. Conflicts of opinion were resolved via discussion and if required, consultation  
147 with a third reviewer.

#### 148 *2.5 Data items and charting process – Level 3*

149 An agreement test was conducted prior to screening at Level 3, in which reviewers screened the  
150 same randomly selected five records. Conflicting opinion about inclusion or exclusion of records



151 were discussed to achieve consensus between reviewers and to refine and improve the clarity of  
152 data extraction at Level 3 (Table S1).

153 During Level 3, two reviewers initially extracted data from each record. Conflicting opinions  
154 about extracted data were discussed between each record's pair of reviewers and, if needed, a  
155 third reviewer to determine an agreement prior to synthesis of the extracted data.

156 Data items that were extracted included the year of publication, the type of modelling method  
157 and objective of the model (for example, to estimate the likely impact of available interventions),  
158 and if the model was applied (reflected a real JEV transmission setting), or theoretical. If the  
159 model had been applied using field data, the location of the data origin was also included.

160 Regions were defined using the World Health Organization regions. All information  
161 incorporated into each model was also recorded and comprised vector and host species, weather  
162 variables, control and prevention strategies, validation strategies, and sensitivity analyses.

163 Data that were extracted about vector and host species included the number and species of  
164 populations used in the model, the compartments used to describe the structure of each  
165 population (for example, susceptible-infected-recovered [SIR]), and the parameters used to  
166 describe change between compartments of a population and infection transmission within the  
167 model.

168 Weather data extracted included spatial, seasonal and temporal variations of rainfall,  
169 temperature, and humidity, and the impact of weather variability on JEV transmission.

170 Control and prevention strategy data included the type of strategy used and its impact on JEV  
171 transmission, and how the strategy was incorporated in the model (for example, a parameter used  
172 to decrease total vector abundance in the event of vector control).

## 173 *2.6 Identification of additional and missing records*


174 The titles of references in the bibliography of two records that were retained for data analysis in  
175 Level 3 were checked to identify any records missed by the search strategy. If records were  
176 potentially relevant to the study, they were included in the review process using the same  
177 methods as records identified in the initial search.

178 A weekly literature search alert was created using the same four electronic databases with the  
179 same combination of search terms to monitor new studies being published after the initial  
180 literature search was conducted. If newly published records identified by the search alert were  
181 potentially relevant to the study, they were included in the review process using the same  
182 methods as records identified in the initial search. The search alert ceased in April 2024.

## 183 **3. Results**

### 184 *3.1 Screening*

185 Our search identified 881 records. Following removal of 309 duplicates, 572 records remained  
186 for screening (Figure 1). During Level 1 screening, 458 records were excluded, leaving 114  
187 records for screening of full text (Level 2). Records were most commonly excluded because they  
188 were not relevant to JEV transmission modelling or were not primary literature. Overall, 29  
189 records were included for data charting and synthesis in Level 3 (Table S1).



190

191 Figure 1: Diagram of the flow of records through the levels of a scoping review of Japanese

192 encephalitis virus transmission models.

### 193 *3.2 Data charting*

194 All 29 records included in Level 3 described single models. Six records were published in peer-  
195 reviewed conference proceedings and the remainder were published in 22 peer-reviewed journals  
196 (Figure S1). Records were published from 1975 to 2023 (inclusive) (Figure S2).

197 Of the 29 models, 34% (n=10) were applied to real JEV transmission settings using data such as  
198 JE incidence and pig abundance and distribution. The most frequently represented region for  
199 these models was the Western Pacific (n=6) with models based in Cambodia, China, Philippines  
200 and Taiwan. Other locations included Bangladesh, French Overseas Département of Réunion,  
201 India, Japan, Thailand and United States of America (Figure S3).

### 202 *3.3 Aims of models*

203 Fifteen of the models aimed to draw general conclusions about JEV transmission dynamics, such  
204 as determining equilibrium points or reproductive numbers, and in some cases, conducting  
205 stability or sensitivity analyses related to these measures (Baniya and Keval 2021a, 2021c,  
206 2020b; De et al. 2016; Diallo et al. 2018; Dwivedi, Keval, and Baniya 2022; Ghassabzade and  
207 Bagherpoorfard 2021; Ghosh and Tapaswi 1999; Goswami 2022; Kalita and Devi 2020a, 2020b;  
208 Mukhopadhyay and Tapaswi 1994; Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay 2016; Tapaswi, Ghosh,  
209 and Mukhopadhyay 1995; Wada 1975). Eight models investigated the impact of various factors  
210 influencing host and vector species on the risk of JE in humans (Baniya and Keval 2020a, 2021b;  
211 Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022; Ladreyt et al. 2023; Naresh and Pandey 2009; Ndaïrou,  
212 Area, and Torres 2020; Sota and Mogi 1989; Zahid and Kribs 2021). Four models aimed to  
213 describe, understand and predict JE incidence (Riad et al. 2017b, 2017a, 2019; Zhao et al. 2018).

214 Lastly, two models aimed to describe the effects of interventions on human, animal-reservoir, or  
215 vector populations (Khan et al. 2014; Kharismawati and Fatmawati 2019).

### 216 *3.4 Model structures*

217 Twenty-two models were deterministic. Of these, 21 were implemented using continuous time,  
218 ordinary differential equations (Baniya and Keval 2021a, 2021c, 2020b, 2020a, 2021b; De et al.  
219 2016; Diallo et al. 2018; Dwivedi, Keval, and Baniya 2022; Ghosh and Tapaswi 1999; Goswami  
220 2022; Khan et al. 2014; Kharismawati and Fatmawati 2019; Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand  
221 2022; Ladreyt et al. 2023; Mukhopadhyay and Tapaswi 1994; Naresh and Pandey 2009;  
222 Ndaïrou, Area, and Torres 2020; Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay 2016; Sota and Mogi 1989;  
223 Tapaswi, Ghosh, and Mukhopadhyay 1995; Zahid and Kribs 2021) and one was implemented  
224 using discrete time, difference equations (Wada 1975). Four models were stochastic. Of these,  
225 two were implemented using continuous time, ordinary differential equations (Riad et al. 2017a;  
226 Zhao et al. 2018) and two were implemented using discrete time, difference equations (Riad et  
227 al. 2017b, 2019). The remaining three models were statistically converted models: two models  
228 were converted from deterministic to stochastic using geometric Brownian motion (Kalita and  
229 Devi 2020a, 2020b) and one converted a deterministic model implemented with ordinary  
230 differential equations to a deterministic fractional-order model (Ghassabzade and  
231 Bagherpoorfard 2021).

232 Two models simulated co-infection of the human population (JEV with either *Leptospira* spp. or  
233 dengue virus) (Dwivedi, Keval, and Baniya 2022; Zahid and Kribs 2021).

234 One model followed a single population of feral pigs across three spatial locations, representing  
235 each individual animal within a connected network (Riad et al. 2017a).

236 Models most commonly represented three populations — humans, vectors and an animal-  
237 reservoir (i.e., non-human mammal or bird) — but the number of populations in a model ranged  
238 from 1 to 8. A human population was represented in 24 models, a vector population in 21 models  
239 and at least one animal-reservoir population in 26 models.

### 240 3.4.1 Human population

241 Compartments used in models to reflect different human infection categories and the transition  
242 of the human population over time were Maternal (M), Vaccinated (V), Susceptible (S), Exposed  
243 (E), Infected (I), and Recovered (R) (Table S2 for description of compartments). Models  
244 described the natural history of JEV in humans using nine different model structures and the  
245 most common was SIRS (n=7) (Table 1).

246 Table 1: Number and types of model structures for human populations [*Maternal (M)*,  
247 *Vaccinated (V)*, *Susceptible (S)*, *Exposed (E)*, *Infected (I)*, and *Recovered (R)*].

Model structure	Citation
SIRS (n=7)	(Baniya and Keval 2021a; Ghosh and Tapaswi 1999; Goswami 2022; Kharismawati and Fatmawati 2019; Mukhopadhyay and Tapaswi 1994; Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay 2016; Tapaswi, Ghosh, and Mukhopadhyay 1995)
SIS (n=4)	(Ghassabzade and Bagherpoorfard 2021; Kalita and Devi 2020a; Naresh and Pandey 2009; Ndairou, Area, and Torres 2020)
VSIS (n=4)	(Baniya and Keval 2021c, 2020a, 2021b; Kalita and Devi 2020b)
SEIR (n=3)	(Ladreyt et al. 2023; Riad et al. 2017b, 2019)
VSIRS (n=2)	(Baniya and Keval 2020b; De et al. 2016)
I (n=1)	(Zhao et al. 2018)
MSEIR (n=1)	(Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022)
SIR (n=1)	(Zahid and Kribs 2021)
VSIR (n=1)	(Dwivedi, Keval, and Baniya 2022)

### 248 3.4.2 Vector population

249 Compartments used in models to reflect different vector infection categories and the transition of  
250 the vector population over time were Aquatic (A), Susceptible (S), Exposed (E), and Infected (I)  
251 (Table S2 for description of compartments). Mosquitoes were described as the main vector;  
252 however, details such as mosquito species and preferred habitat (e.g., water source and  
253 vegetation type) were not included in any models. Models described the natural history of JEV in  
254 vectors using four different model structures and the most common was SI (n=14) (Table 2).  
255 Table 2: Number and types of model structures for vector populations [*Aquatic (A)*, *Susceptible*  
256 *(S)* *Exposed (E)*, and *Infected (I)*].

Model structure	Citation
SI (n=14)	(Baniya and Keval 2021a, 2021c, 2020b, 2020a, 2021b; De et al. 2016; Dwivedi, Keval, and Baniya 2022; Goswami 2022; Kharismawati and Fatmawati 2019; Naresh and Pandey 2009; Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay 2016; Sota and Mogi 1989; Tapaswi, Ghosh, and Mukhopadhyay 1995; Zahid and Kribs 2021)
SEI (n=3)	(Diallo et al. 2018; Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022; Ladreyt et al. 2023)
ASI (n=2)	(Ghassabzade and Bagherpoorfard 2021; Ndaïrou, Area, and Torres 2020)
I (n=2)	(Kalita and Devi 2020a, 2020b)

### 257 3.4.3 Animal-Reservoir population

258 Most often, only one animal-reservoir population was described in models; however, the number  
259 of populations ranged up to six. Animals were also sometimes grouped as a “reservoir”  
260 representing a “pool of infection.” The most common group listed in models was pigs (n=19)  
261 followed by “reservoir” (n=7), cattle (n=2), chickens (n=2), dogs (n=2), ducks (n=2), “birds”  
262 (n=1) and “sows” (n=1).

263 Compartments used in models to reflect different animal-reservoir infection categories and the  
 264 transition of the animal-reservoir populations over time were Maternal (M), Vaccinated (V),  
 265 Susceptible (S), Exposed (E), Convalescent (C) and Recovered (R) (Table S2 for description of  
 266 compartments). Models described the natural history of JEV in animal-reservoir populations  
 267 using 13 different model structures and the most common was I (n=5) followed by SIRS (n=4)  
 268 (Table 3).

269 Table 3: Number and types of model structures for animal-reservoir populations [*Maternal (M)*,  
 270 *Vaccinated (V)*, *Susceptible (S)*, *Exposed (E)*, *Convalescent (C)* and *Recovered (R)*].


Model structure	Animal types	Citation
I (n=5)	Birds, pigs and reservoir	(Ghassabzade and Bagherpoorfard 2021; Goswami 2022; Kalita and Devi 2020a; Naresh and Pandey 2009; Ndaïrou, Area, and Torres 2020)
SIRS (n=4)	Reservoir	(Ghosh and Tapaswi 1999; Mukhopadhyay and Tapaswi 1994; Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay 2016; Tapaswi, Ghosh, and Mukhopadhyay 1995)
SI (n=3)	Pigs	(Baniya and Keval 2021a; Dwivedi, Keval, and Baniya 2022; Kharismawati and Fatmawati 2019)
SIR (n=3)	Pigs	(Sota and Mogi 1989; Wada 1975; Zahid and Kribs 2021)
SIS (n=3)	Pigs	(Baniya and Keval 2021c, 2020b, 2021b)
MSEIR (n=1)	Cattle, chickens, dogs, ducks, pigs and sows	(Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022)
MSIR (n=1)	Pigs	(Diallo et al. 2018)
MVSEIR (n=1)	Pigs	(Khan et al. 2014)
SEI (n=1)	Pigs	(Riad et al. 2017a)
SEICR (n=1)	Pigs	(Zhao et al. 2018)
SEIR (n=1)	Cattle, chickens, dogs, ducks and pigs	(Ladreyt et al. 2023)
VSI (n=1)	Pigs	(De et al. 2016)
V SIS (n=1)	Pigs	(Baniya and Keval 2020a)




271 *3.5 State duration parameters and basic reproduction number*

272 Descriptions of parameters and parameter values were clearly described in 21 models and the  
273 source of the data used to inform parameter values was clearly identified in 5 models. Units used  
274 for parameter values were not consistently identified. A total of 123 (human [n=23]; vector  
275 [n=45]; animal-reservoir [n=55]) unique parameters were identified over the 29 models. Of these  
276 parameters, 28% (n=34) were accompanied with sufficient information to extract units and  
277 values (human: 39% [n=9]; vector: 24% [n=11]; animal-reservoir: 25% [n=14]) (Figure 2;  
278 Tables S3, S4 and S5).


### Time to loss of maternal immunity




### Incubation period




### Infection duration




### Vector biting rate



### Bite transmission probability




### Lifespan



Models ○ 1 ● 2 ● 3 ● 4

280 Figure 2: Parameter ranges (dotted lines) estimated from parameter values detailed in models  
281 when source of data was clearly identified. The size of the point indicates the number of models  
282 with a shared parameter value.

283 Basic reproduction number values were clearly described in 6 of the applied models. The basic  
284 reproduction number could be further broken down into three transmission types, vector-borne  
285 transmission, pig-to-pig transmission (vector free transmission), and combined vector-borne and  
286 pig-to-pig transmission (Figure 3; Table S6). The basic reproduction number range for pig-to-pig  
287 transmission was  $<1$ . When transmission type included vector-borne transmission, the basic  
288 reproduction number was  $>1$  and up to 12, but more commonly between 1–3. One model  
289 investigated the impact of cattle on JEV transmission and estimated a basic reproduction number  
290 of 1.008 in the presence of cattle and 12.97 in the absence of cattle (Zahid and Kribs 2021).



291

292 Figure 3: Basic reproduction number ranges estimated from 6 models using three transmission  
293 types. The total number of models using each transmission type is separately indicated. [VB =  
294 *vector-borne transmission*; P-P = *pig-to-pig transmission*]

### 295 *3.6 Weather, location, and other factors*

296 Eleven models included one or more parameters influenced by changes in weather or location,  
297 which in turn influenced their outputs. However, the information pertaining to weather and  
298 location often lacked specificity, with parameters either ambiguously defined or inadequately  
299 detailed. For instance, terms like “environmental discharges” were used in the models to describe  
300 environmental factors that contributed to the growth of reservoir and vector populations. Such  
301 discharges included a range of sources, such as household waste, open sewage draining,  
302 discarded tyres, and poorly ventilated houses.

303 The vector population size was influenced in all 11 models that considered environmental  
304 factors. Five models included a “vector carrying capacity”, which represents the maximum  
305 vector population size sustainable in a given environment ([Baniya and Keval 2021c](#); [Goswami  
306 2022](#); [Naresh and Pandey 2009](#); [Ndairou, Area, and Torres 2020](#); [Tapaswi, Ghosh, and  
307 Mukhopadhyay 1995](#)). Weather variations influenced parameters in five models, leading to  
308 changes in vector population size ([Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022](#); [Panja, Mondal, and  
309 Chattopadhyay 2016](#); [Riad et al. 2017a](#); [Riad et al. 2019](#); [Zhao et al. 2018](#)). Human-induced  
310 “environmental discharges” influenced parameters in three models, resulting in changes to the  
311 vector population size ([Ghassabzade and Bagherpoorfard 2021](#); [Naresh and Pandey 2009](#);  
312 [Ndairou, Area, and Torres 2020](#)) whilst the parameters of one model allowed for the vector  
313 population size to vary by geographic location ([Riad et al. 2017a](#)).

314 Three models were influenced by human-induced “environmental discharges”, similar to those  
315 impacting the vector population, which consequently led to changes in the animal-reservoir  
316 population size ([Ghassabzade and Bagherpoorfard 2021](#); [Naresh and Pandey 2009](#); [Ndairou,](#)

317 [Area, and Torres 2020](#)). Furthermore, the parameters of one model varied based on the species  
318 and abundance of animals (birds), influenced by geographic location and time of year ([Riad et al.](#)  
319 [2017a](#)). One model quantified animal (pig) population size by the daily consumption of pigs  
320 ([Zhao et al. 2018](#)). The authors also linked the decrease in pig abundance to a decrease in pig  
321 rearing licenses.

### 322 *3.7 Prevention and control strategies*

323 Twenty of the 29 models included parameters on prevention and control strategies with 18  
324 models listing the influence of these parameters on model output. Seven models chose to apply  
325 prevention and control strategies through direct adjustment of the parameter that the strategy was  
326 anticipated to influence. Examples included reducing mosquito population size (insecticides),  
327 reducing bite and transmission rates (mosquito nets), reducing the size of the susceptible  
328 population (vaccinating the animal-reservoir or human populations), or reducing the growth of  
329 vector and animal-reservoir populations (by decreasing human induced “environmental  
330 discharges”) ([Dwivedi, Keval, and Baniya 2022](#); [Ghosh and Tapaswi 1999](#); [Mukhopadhyay and](#)  
331 [Tapaswi 1994](#); [Naresh and Pandey 2009](#); [Riad et al. 2017a](#); [Riad et al. 2019](#); [Wada 1975](#)).

332 In contrast, some authors explicitly modeled prevention and control strategies and included a  
333 specific parameter in the model to represent the strategy. Eleven models included parameters on  
334 the vaccination rate of susceptible humans or treatment rate of JEV infected humans ([Baniya and](#)  
335 [Keval 2021c, 2020b, 2020a, 2021b](#); [De et al. 2016](#); [Dwivedi, Keval, and Baniya 2022](#); [Goswami](#)  
336 [2022](#); [Kalita and Devi 2020b](#); [Kharismawati and Fatmawati 2019](#); [Mukhopadhyay and Tapaswi](#)  
337 [1994](#); [Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay 2016](#)), nine models included parameters on the  
338 vaccination rate of susceptible reservoir-animal populations or treatment of JEV infected

339 reservoir-animal populations (Baniya and Keval 2020b, 2020a; De et al. 2016; Goswami 2022;  
340 Khan et al. 2014; Kharismawati and Fatmawati 2019; Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay 2016;  
341 Wada 1975; Zhao et al. 2018), and four models included an insecticide control parameter which  
342 influenced the total mosquito population (De et al. 2016; Goswami 2022; Kharismawati and  
343 Fatmawati 2019; Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay 2016). Six models evaluated the  
344 effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of various prevention and control strategies to recommend  
345 best approaches (Baniya and Keval 2020a; De et al. 2016; Goswami 2022; Kharismawati and  
346 Fatmawati 2019; Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022; Panja, Mondal, and Chattopadhyay  
347 2016). Lastly, two models assessed the impact of changing the proportions of competent and  
348 non-competent hosts within a community (Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022; Zahid and  
349 Kribs 2021) and one explored the use of dogs as sentinel surveillance for JEV circulation  
350 (Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022).

### 351 *3.8 Identified limitations*

352 Limitations were identified in 11 models. Authors of six records noted that their models did not  
353 include real-life variation that might influence outputs, such as the seasonality, heterogeneity and  
354 spatial distributions of populations, and inclusion of various JEV transmission scenarios (Diallo  
355 et al. 2018; Sota and Mogi 1989; Wada 1975; Zahid and Kribs 2021, 2021; Zhao et al. 2018).  
356 The authors of four records noted that the numbers in the field data used to validate their model  
357 might have been under-reported (for example, pig population data) or over-reported (for  
358 example, the use of JEV case data) (Khan et al. 2014; Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022;  
359 Riad et al. 2017b, 2017a). Additionally, the authors of four models noted that there was limited  
360 information on contact structures between populations and there was limited host and vector  
361 attribute information, such as mosquito host feeding preferences, biting rates, and competency as

362 a JEV vector. Authors also noted that parameters were made to fit the geographic scale of the  
363 model and that parameters were based on collected field data when an endemic state existed.  
364 Therefore, model parameters might not be appropriate when models are scaled up to cover a  
365 larger geographic region or when annual variations in JEV transmission occur (Diallo et al.  
366 2018; Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022; Sota and Mogi 1989). The epidemiology was also  
367 uncertain, such as the unknown impact that host species other than those commonly modeled can  
368 have in contributing to or limiting the spread of JEV or JEV introduction into susceptible  
369 populations (Diallo et al. 2018; Khan et al. 2014; Sota and Mogi 1989).

### 370 *3.9 Sensitivity analyses*

371 Sensitivity analysis was clearly described in nine models. The method used varied between  
372 models (normalized forward sensitivity index [n=6], next generation method [n=2] and Morris  
373 method [n=1]). Not all parameters were included in sensitivity analyses and they were selected  
374 based on the objectives and research question. The median number of parameters assessed was 8  
375 (range: 1-51).

376 All nine models' sensitivity analyses assessed the influence of input parameters on the basic  
377 reproduction number (Baniya and Keval 2020b, 2021b; Diallo et al. 2018; Dwivedi, Keval, and  
378 Baniya 2022; Goswami 2022; Kalita and Devi 2020a, 2020b; Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand  
379 2022; Ladreyt et al. 2023). Most models assessed the impact of vector parameters on the basic  
380 reproduction number, finding that the vector biting rate, contact rate, death rate, population size,  
381 and probability of infection from a competent host were the most influential. Sensitivity analyses  
382 of two of these models quantified the influence of parameters and found that those related to the  
383 force of infection for vectors and hosts – specifically the vector biting rate, vector death rate, and

384 the number of vectors – contributed the most to the total variance in basic reproduction number  
385 (Diallo et al. 2018; Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand 2022).

386 One model assessed the influence of input parameters on the maximum number of infectious  
387 pigs (Diallo et al. 2018). It found that the the number of vectors, the recovery rate of infected  
388 pigs, the rate of loss of maternal immunity of piglets, and their interactions, contributed the most  
389 to the total variance in the maximum number of infectious pigs.

## 390 **4. Discussion**

391 Models varied widely in their structure, including combinations of vector, animal-reservoir and  
392 human populations, with differing compartmental structures selected to describe aspects of the  
393 natural history of JEV infection in those populations. While this variation sometimes aligned  
394 with specific modeling goals, such as Zahid and Kribs (2021), in which the focus was on  
395 understanding the impact of cattle on joint occurrence of JE and leptospirosis, it also likely  
396 reflects great uncertainty about JEV epidemiology.

397 In their review on the ecology of JEV, Mulvey et al. (2021) noted the detection of JEV in various  
398 domestic animals and wildlife beyond ardeid wading birds and pigs. While pigs are recognised  
399 as amplifying hosts, overlooking other potential competent hosts may lead to underestimating the  
400 true extent of JEV transmission (Le Flohic et al. 2013; Levesque et al. 2024). Notably, JEV  
401 transmission in animal hosts has been observed to continue despite the phasing out of pig  
402 farming in Singapore over 30 years ago (Yap et al. 2019). Additionally, JEV has been associated  
403 with chicken density (Walsh et al. 2022). These observations suggest that other competent hosts,  
404 such as chickens, can sustain JEV circulation in regions with low pig densities, highlighting the



405 potential importance of considering a broader range of hosts in understanding and controlling  
406 JEV transmission, especially in pig-free communities – this was reflected in few models in the  
407 current review, and non specifically investigated JEV circulation in species other than ardeid  
408 birds and pigs except Ladreyt et al. (2023) and Ladreyt, Chevalier, and Durand (2022).

409 Few of the modelling structures in the reviewed records allowed for simultaneous consideration  
410 of various factors influencing JEV spread, such as intrinsic incubation periods (for example in  
411 pigs) and extrinsic incubation periods (in vectors), while also enabling the assessment of  
412 different intervention strategies, like vaccination of pigs (Table 3). Despite the use of various  
413 compartmental structures and parameters, there was an absence of mosquito species-specific  
414 details in the vector populations in the models in the current review. Mosquito behaviour and  
415 ecological and host preferences vary between species known to transmit JEV (Zardini et al.  
416 2024). Together with host competence, this variation explains the potential importance of the  
417 composition of animal populations in JEV transmission models.

418 Field data can inform model structure and parameter values, but the current review showed that  
419 such data were used in only 34% of the models. Integrating field data can enhance the accuracy  
420 of important parameter estimates which can improve model predictions (Grassly and Fraser  
421 2008). Although this integration might overcome some epistemic uncertainty in model structure,  
422 epistemic uncertainty still existed with parameterisation because clarity regarding data sources  
423 and consistency in specifying units and time frames were limited. The identified discrepancies in  
424 parameter reporting led to challenges in model interpretation and comparison, highlighting the  
425 need for standardised reporting practices (Milwid et al. 2016; Garnett et al. 2011). Efforts to  
426 enhance transparency and consistency in parameterisation will be crucial for advancing the  
427 reliability and utility of JEV transmission models.

428 Six of the models based on field data described vector-borne basic reproduction numbers with  
429 wide variability which reflected differences in model structure and geographic origin of data, as  
430 well as factors like population density, seasonality, and vector mortality, that influence contact  
431 rates (Lord et al. 1996). Wide variability in basic reproduction numbers has also been observed  
432 in models of other diseases; for example, measles transmission, was represented with  $>20$   
433 different basic reproduction numbers, ranging from 5.4 to 18 (Guerra et al. 2017) and caution is  
434 warranted in interpreting these values beyond their region of calculation (Delamater et al. 2019).  
435 Although the reviewed models might not accurately reflect JEV transmission dynamics overall  
436 due to substantial differences in host and vector population structures across regions, calculating  
437 basic reproduction numbers in these models can help inform risk mitigation strategies. Changes  
438 in the basic reproduction number before and after interventions can indicate their effectiveness,  
439 even if the absolute predictions are not entirely accurate. For example, a significant reduction in  
440 basic reproduction number following an intervention suggests that the intervention is likely  
441 useful.

442 The authors of nine of the reviewed models conducted sensitivity analyses, mainly focusing on  
443 parameters influencing basic reproduction numbers. Notably, vector dynamics-related  
444 parameters like death rate, biting rate, and population size consistently emerged as significant  
445 influencers. Similar impacts have been observed in studies on diseases like African horse  
446 sickness (Lord et al. 1996) and malaria (Smith et al. 2007). Tennant and Recker (2018)  
447 highlighted the importance of obtaining field-relevant and species-dependent vector mortality  
448 rates for accurate modeling. However, most authors of reviewed models omitted sensitivity  
449 analysis, limiting readers' understanding of parameter influences and potentially compromising  
450 the utility and robustness of model outputs.

451 The findings from models implementing prevention and control strategies underscore the  
452 complexities inherent in planning interventions for JEV transmission. While strategies targeting  
453 human populations successfully reduced human JE cases, those aimed at animal-reservoir and  
454 vector populations, such as pig vaccination and mosquito control, interrupted the JEV  
455 transmission cycle more comprehensively. The interconnectivity of model populations  
456 underscores the necessity for integrated prevention and control approaches. However, a gap  
457 remains in employing finer parameters to evaluate specific JEV control strategies and their  
458 effectiveness. This approach has been successfully used in dengue transmission models to assess  
459 their own control strategies (Ogunlade et al. 2023). For instance, instead of solely introducing a  
460 parameter to reduce mosquito abundance and inferring potential strategies like using insecticide  
461 sprays, models could offer a more nuanced understanding to enhance the precision of  
462 intervention strategies. Dengue transmission models have investigated the impact of chemical,  
463 biological, and environmental control methods to reduce mosquito numbers, as well as the long-  
464 term advantages and disadvantages of each. However, it is noteworthy that while dengue  
465 transmission is driven by only a few mosquito species (such as *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes*  
466 *albopictus*) with highly specific habitat associations (Lambrechts, Scott, and Gubler 2010) JEV  
467 may have a greater number of mosquito species as potential vectors associated with a wider  
468 range of habitats (Van den Eynde et al. 2022).

469 The results of the 11 models that included the influence of environmental, weather, and  
470 geographic factors highlight the complex and multifaceted nature of JEV transmission.

471 According to the model outputs, vector carrying capacity, weather variations, human-induced  
472 environmental discharges, and geographic location significantly impact vector and animal-  
473 reservoir abundance. Geographic and temporal variations have also been incorporated in other

474 models to understand variations in mosquito-borne diseases (Caldwell et al. 2021), and human  
475 JE cases have been linked to changes in meteorological factors such as daily rainfall (Liu et al.  
476 2020). Models incorporating environmental drivers of JEV transmission, particularly climate  
477 features, might more accurately predict JE occurrence.

478 The limitations highlighted by the authors of the reviewed models re-iterated the challenges in  
479 JEV transmission modeling that are identified above. Several models overlooked factors such as  
480 seasonal and spatial impacts, population heterogeneity, and diverse JEV transmission scenarios.  
481 Authors also expressed concerns regarding the accuracy of field data used for model validation,  
482 citing instances of both under and overreporting of data, highlighting the need for reliable and  
483 more accurate data sources. Addressing these limitations is essential for refining model inputs  
484 and advancing future JEV transmission models.

## 485 **5. Conclusions**

486 Overall, this review provides insight into the literature on JEV transmission modelling, revealing  
487 both progress and challenges in understanding and mitigating the impact of JE occurrence.  
488 Despite the significant global burden of JE, it is notable that only a limited number of models  
489 have been developed to study the viral transmission dynamics, indicating a gap in our  
490 understanding of current prevention and control strategies, as well as preparedness for JEV  
491 emergence in new regions. Increased investment in JEV transmission modelling is essential to  
492 develop robust tools that can inform decision-making in JEV prevention and control to work  
493 towards reducing the global burden of JEV and safeguarding the health of populations at risk.

## 494 **Data availability**

495 All data supporting the findings of this review are included in the main article and the  
496 supplementary materials.

## 497 **Authors' contributions**

498 *Conceptualisation*: Victoria J. Brookes, Troy A. Laidlow; *Data curation*: Troy A. Laidlow;  
499 *Format analysis*: Troy A. Laidlow; *Funding acquisition*: Victoria J. Brookes, Troy A. Laidlow;  
500 *Investigation*: All authors; *Project administration*: Troy A. Laidlow; *Resources*: Troy A.  
501 Laidlow; *Supervision*: Victoria J. Brookes, Kerrie E. Wiley; Ruth N. Zadoks; *Validation*: All  
502 authors; *Visualisation*: Troy A. Laidlow; *Writing – original draft*: Troy A. Laidlow; *Writing –*  
503 *review & editing*: All authors.

## 504 **Funding statement**

505 This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP)  
506 Scholarship, Sydney Infectious Disease Institute, Ignition Grant, and internal funding from The  
507 University of Sydney and the University of Glasgow.

## 508 **Declaration of competing interest**

509 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal  
510 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## 511 **Acknowledgements**

512 We thank the librarians at The University of Sydney for their assistance with this study.

## 513 **Supplementary materials**

514 *Supplementary 1* includes Figure S1: Distribution of records published in conference  
515 proceedings and journals; Figure S2: Distribution of records published by year of publication  
516 Figure S3: Countries where Japanese encephalitis virus has been identified and countries from  
517 which field data were obtained to be used in Japanese encephalitis virus disease transmission  
518 models; Table S1: Forms used at each level of the scoping review; Table S2: Disease  
519 compartments and use within model structures; Table S3, S4, S5, S6: Model parameters and  
520 value ranges; and Table S6: Identified basic reproduction numbers.

521

## 522 **References**

- 523 Baniya, V., and R. Keval. 2020a. “Mathematical Modeling and Stability Analysis of Japanese  
524 Encephalitis.” *Advanced Science, Engineering and Medicine* 12 (1): 120–27.  
525 <https://doi.org/10.1166/ asem.2020.2528>.
- 526 ———. 2020b. “The Influence of Vaccination on the Control of JE with a Standard Incidence  
527 Rate of Mosquitoes, Pigs and Humans.” *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computing* 64 (1):  
528 519–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12190-020-01367-y>.
- 529 ———. 2021a. “A Comparative Series Solutions of Japanese Encephalitis Model Using  
530 Differential Transform Method and Variational Iteration Method.” *Heat Transfer* 50 (6): 5885–  
531 905. <https://doi.org/10.1002/htj.22154>.
- 532 ———. 2021b. “Sensitivity and Stability Analysis in the Transmission of Japanese Encephalitis  
533 with Logistic Growing Mosquito Population.” In *Mathematical Analysis and Computing*, edited  
534 by R. N. Mohapatra, S. Yuges, G. Kalpana, and C. Kalaivani, 55–69. Singapore: Springer  
535 Singapore.
- 536 ———. 2021c. “The Impact of Time Delay on the Transmission of Japanese Encephalitis Model  
537 Without Vaccination.” *Proyecciones (Antofagasta)* 40 (6): 1367–1410.  
538 <https://doi.org/10.22199/issn.0717-6279-4619>.
- 539 Becker, Alexander D, Kyra H Grantz, Sonia T Hegde, Sophie Bérubé, Derek A T Cummings,  
540 and Amy Wesolowski. 2021. “Development and Dissemination of Infectious Disease Dynamic  
541 Transmission Models During the COVID-19 Pandemic: What Can We Learn from Other

542 Pathogens and How Can We Move Forward?” *The Lancet Digital Health* 3 (1): e41–50.

543 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(20\)30268-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30268-5).

544 Boyer, Sébastien, Benoit Durand, Sony Yean, Cécile Brengues, Pierre-Olivier Maquart, Didier

545 Fontenille, and Véronique Chevalier. 2021. “Host-Feeding Preference and Diel Activity of

546 Mosquito Vectors of the Japanese Encephalitis Virus in Rural Cambodia.” *Pathogens* 10 (3):

547 376. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens10030376>.

548 Bozada, Thomas, James Borden, Jeffrey Workman, Mardo Del Cid, Jennifer Malinowski, and

549 Thomas Luechtefeld. 2021. “Sysrev: A FAIR Platform for Data Curation and Systematic

550 Evidence Review.” *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 4 (August).

551 <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2021.685298>.

552 Caldwell, Jamie M., A. Desiree LaBeaud, Eric F. Lambin, Anna M. Stewart-Ibarra, Bryson A.

553 Ndenga, Francis M. Mutuku, Amy R. Krystosik, et al. 2021. “Climate Predicts Geographic and

554 Temporal Variation in Mosquito-Borne Disease Dynamics on Two Continents.” *Nature*

555 *Communications* 12 (1): 1233. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21496-7>.

556 Campbell, Grant, Susan Hills, Marc Fischer, Julie Jacobson, Charles Hoke, Joachim Hombach,

557 Anthony Marfin, et al. 2011. “Estimated Global Incidence of Japanese Encephalitis:” *Bulletin of*

558 *the World Health Organization* 89 (10): 766–74. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.10.085233>.

559 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2023. “Geographic Distribution of Japanese

560 Encephalitis Virus | Japanese Encephalitis | CDC.” April 7, 2023.

561 <https://www.cdc.gov/japaneseencephalitis/maps/index.html>.



- 562 Cheng, Yuwei, Nhat Tran Minh, Quan Tran Minh, Shreya Khandelwal, and Hannah E. Clapham.  
563 2022. “Estimates of Japanese Encephalitis Mortality and Morbidity: A Systematic Review and  
564 Modeling Analysis.” *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 16 (5): e0010361.  
565 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0010361>.
- 566 De, A., K. Maity, S. Jana, and M. Maiti. 2016. “Application of Various Control Strategies to  
567 Japanese Encephalitic: A Mathematical Study with Human, Pig and Mosquito.” *Mathematical*  
568 *Biosciences* 282 (December):46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2016.09.015>.
- 569 De Wispelaere, MéliSSanne, Philippe Desprès, and Valérie Choumet. 2017. “European Aedes  
570 Albopictus and Culex Pipiens Are Competent Vectors for Japanese Encephalitis Virus.” Edited  
571 by Michael J Turell. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 11 (1): e0005294.  
572 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005294>.
- 573 Delamater, Paul L., Erica J. Street, Timothy F. Leslie, Y. Tony Yang, and Kathryn H. Jacobsen.  
574 2019. “Complexity of the Basic Reproduction Number.” *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 25 (1):  
575 1+. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2501.171901>.
- 576 Diallo, A. O. II., V. Chevalier, J. Cappelle, V. Duong, D. Fontenille, and R. Duboz. 2018. “How  
577 Much Does Direct Transmission Between Pigs Contribute to Japanese Encephalitis Virus  
578 Circulation? A Modelling Approach in Cambodia.” *PloS One* 13 (8).  
579 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201209>.
- 580 Dwivedi, A., R. Keval, and V. Baniya. 2022. “A Mathematical Study of Dynamical Model for  
581 Japanese Encephalitis-Dengue Co-Infection Using JE Vaccine.” *International Journal of*  
582 *Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Optimisation* 12 (4): 416–41.  
583 <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMMNO.2022.126564>.

- 584 Erlanger, Tobias E., Svenja Weiss, Jennifer Keiser, Jürg Utzinger, and Karin Wiedenmayer.  
585 2009. “Past, Present, and Future of Japanese Encephalitis.” *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 15 (1):  
586 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1501.080311>.
- 587 Faizah, Astri Nur, Daisuke Kobayashi, Michael Amoa-Bosompem, Yukiko Higa, Yoshio Tsuda,  
588 Kentaro Itokawa, Kozue Miura, Kazuhiro Hirayama, Kyoko Sawabe, and Haruhiko Isawa. 2020.  
589 “Evaluating the Competence of the Primary Vector, *Culex Tritaeniorhynchus*, and the Invasive  
590 Mosquito Species, *Aedes Japonicus Japonicus*, in Transmitting Three Japanese Encephalitis  
591 Virus Genotypes.” Edited by Felix Hol. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 14 (12).  
592 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008986>.
- 593 Garnett, Geoffrey P, Simon Cousens, Timothy B Hallett, Richard Steketee, and Neff Walker.  
594 2011. “Mathematical Models in the Evaluation of Health Programmes.” *The Lancet* 378 (9790):  
595 515–25. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(10\)61505-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61505-X).
- 596 Ghassabzade, F. A., and M. Bagherpoorfard. 2021. “Mathematical Analysis of a Novel Japanese  
597 Encephalitis Fractional Model.” In *2021 52nd Annual Iranian Mathematics Conference*, 21–23.  
598 <https://doi.org/10.1109/AIMC54250.2021.9657022>.
- 599 Ghosh, A. K., and P. K. Tapaswi. 1999. “Dynamics of Japanese Encephalitis—A Study in  
600 Mathematical Epidemiology.” *Mathematical Medicine and Biology: A Journal of the IMA* 16  
601 (1): 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1093/imammb/16.1.1>.
- 602 Google. 2024. “Google Sheets: Online Spreadsheet Editor | Google Workspace.” Google Sheets.  
603 2024. <https://workspace.google.com/products/sheets/>.

- 604 Goswami, N. 2022. “Sensitivity and Optimal Control Analysis of Japanese Encephalitis Disease:  
605 A Mathematical Model.” *Advances in Systems Science and Applications* 22 (April):148–66.  
606 <https://doi.org/10.25728/assa.2022.22.1.1180>.
- 607 Grassly, Nicholas C., and Christophe Fraser. 2008. “Mathematical Models of Infectious Disease  
608 Transmission.” *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 6 (6): NA.  
609 [https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A179279146/AONE?u=usyd&sid=bookmark-  
610 AONE&xid=bd467b51](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A179279146/AONE?u=usyd&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=bd467b51).
- 611 Guerra, Fiona M, Shelly Bolotin, Gillian Lim, Jane Heffernan, Shelley L Deeks, Ye Li, and  
612 Natasha S Crowcroft. 2017. “The Basic Reproduction Number ( $R_0$ ) of Measles: A Systematic  
613 Review.” *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 17 (12): e420–28. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-  
614 3099\(17\)30307-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30307-9).
- 615 Kalita, B., and A. Devi. 2020a. “Japanese Encephalitis from Two Outsources: A Mathematical  
616 Modeling.” *Journal of Critical Reviews* 7 (12): 309–15. <https://doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.12.58>.
- 617 ———. 2020b. “Mathematical Modelling of Impact of Vaccination in Controlling Japanese  
618 Encephalitis” 11 (3): 792–96.
- 619 Khan, S. U., H. Salje, A. Hannan, M. A. Islam, A. A. M. Bhuyan, Md Ariful Islam, M Ziaur  
620 Rahman, et al. 2014. “Dynamics of Japanese Encephalitis Virus Transmission Among Pigs in  
621 Northwest Bangladesh and the Potential Impact of Pig Vaccination.” *PLoS Neglected Tropical  
622 Diseases* 8 (9). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0003166>.

- 623 Kharismawati, H., and W. Fatmawati. 2019. “Optimal Control of a Mathematical Model for  
624 Japanese Encephalitis Transmission.” *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 1306 (1).  
625 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1306/1/012034>.
- 626 Ladreyt, H., V. Chevalier, and B. Durand. 2022. “Modelling Japanese Encephalitis Virus  
627 Transmission Dynamics and Human Exposure in a Cambodian Rural Multi-Host System.” *PLoS*  
628 *Neglected Tropical Diseases* 16 (7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0010572>.
- 629 Ladreyt, H., C. Garros, N. Habchi-Hanriot, M. Dupraz, T. Baldet, V. Chevalier, and B. Durand.  
630 2023. “Modelling the Potential Human Exposure to Japanese Encephalitis Virus (JEV) in Case  
631 of Introduction into Reunion Island.” *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases* 2023.  
632 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/3118640>.
- 633 Lambrechts, Louis, Thomas W Scott, and Duane J Gubler. 2010. “Consequences of the  
634 Expanding Global Distribution of *Aedes Albopictus* for Dengue Virus Transmission: E646.”  
635 *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 4 (5): e646. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0000646>.
- 636 Le Flohic, Guillaume, Vincent Porphyre, Philippe Barbazan, and Jean-Paul Gonzalez. 2013.  
637 “Review of Climate, Landscape, and Viral Genetics as Drivers of the Japanese Encephalitis  
638 Virus Ecology.” *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 7 (9): e2208.  
639 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0002208>.
- 640 Levesque, Zoë A., Michael Walsh, Cameron Webb, Ruth Zadoks, and Victoria J. Brookes. 2024.  
641 “A Scoping Review of Evidence of Naturally Occurring Japanese Encephalitis Infection in  
642 Vertebrate Animals Other Than Humans, Ardeid Birds and Pigs.” *bioRxiv*, January,  
643 2024.04.18.589998. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.18.589998>.

- 644 Liu, Zhidong, Yiwen Zhang, Michael Xiaoliang Tong, Ying Zhang, Jianjun Xiang, Qi Gao,  
645 Shuzi Wang, Shuyue Sun, Baofa Jiang, and Peng Bi. 2020. “Nonlinear and Threshold Effect of  
646 Meteorological Factors on Japanese Encephalitis Transmission in Southwestern China.” *The*  
647 *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 103 (6): 2442–49.  
648 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0040>.
- 649 Lord, C. C., M. E. J. Woolhouse, J. A. P. Heesterbeek, and P. S. Mellor. 1996. “Vector-Borne  
650 Diseases and the Basic Reproduction Number: A Case Study of African Horse Sickness.”  
651 *Medical and Veterinary Entomology* 10 (1): 19–28. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2915.1996.tb00077.x)  
652 [2915.1996.tb00077.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2915.1996.tb00077.x).
- 653 Maeki, Takahiro, Shigeru Tajima, Makiko Ikeda, Fumihiko Kato, Satoshi Taniguchi, Eri  
654 Nakayama, Tomohiko Takasaki, Chang-Kweng Lim, and Masayuki Saijo. 2019. “Analysis of  
655 Cross-Reactivity Between Flaviviruses with Sera of Patients with Japanese Encephalitis Showed  
656 the Importance of Neutralization Tests for the Diagnosis of Japanese Encephalitis.” *Journal of*  
657 *Infection and Chemotherapy* 25 (10): 786–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiac.2019.04.003>.
- 658 Mandal, Sandip, Ram Rup Sarkar, and Somdatta Sinha. 2011. “Mathematical Models of Malaria  
659 - a Review.” *Malaria Journal* 10 (July):202.  
660 [https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A265318343/AONE?u=usyd&sid=bookmark-](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A265318343/AONE?u=usyd&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=3708659f)  
661 [AONE&xid=3708659f](https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A265318343/AONE?u=usyd&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=3708659f).
- 662 Marini, Giovanni, Roberto Rosá, Andrea Pugliese, and Hans Heesterbeek. 2017. “Exploring  
663 Vector-Borne Infection Ecology in Multi-Host Communities: A Case Study of West Nile Virus.”  
664 *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 415 (February):58–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2016.12.009>.

- 665 Milwid, Rachael, Andreea Steriu, Julien Arino, Jane Heffernan, Ayaz Hyder, Dena Schanzer,  
666 Emma Gardner, et al. 2016. “Toward Standardizing a Lexicon of Infectious Disease Modeling  
667 Terms.” *Frontiers in Public Health* 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2016.00213>.
- 668 Moore, Sean M. 2021. “The Current Burden of Japanese Encephalitis and the Estimated Impacts  
669 of Vaccination: Combining Estimates of the Spatial Distribution and Transmission Intensity of a  
670 Zoonotic Pathogen.” *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 15 (10): e0009385.  
671 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0009385>.
- 672 Mukhopadhyay, B. B., and P. K. Tapaswi. 1994. “An SIRS Epidemic Model of Japanese  
673 Encephalitis.” *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences* 17 (2): 347–56.  
674 <https://doi.org/10.1155/S0161171294000487>.
- 675 Mulvey, Peter, Veasna Duong, Sebastien Boyer, Graham Burgess, David T. Williams, Philippe  
676 Dussart, and Paul F. Horwood. 2021. “The Ecology and Evolution of Japanese Encephalitis  
677 Virus.” *Pathogens (Basel, Switzerland)* 10 (12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens10121534>.
- 678 Naresh, R., and Surabhi Pandey. 2009. “Modelling and Analysis of the Spread of Japanese  
679 Encephalitis with Environmental Effects.” *Applications and Applied Mathematics: An  
680 International Journal* 4 (1): 155–75. <https://digitalcommons.pvamu.edu/aam/vol4/iss1/13>.
- 681 Ndaïrou, F., I. Area, and D. F. M. Torres. 2020. “Mathematical Modeling of Japanese  
682 Encephalitis Under Aquatic Environmental Effects.” *Mathematics* 8 (11).  
683 <https://doi.org/10.3390/math8111880>.

- 684 Ogunlade, Samson T, Michael T Meehan, Adeshina I Adekunle, and Emma S McBryde. 2023.  
685 “A Systematic Review of Mathematical Models of Dengue Transmission and Vector Control:  
686 2010–2020.” *Viruses* 15 (1): 254. <https://doi.org/10.3390/v15010254>.
- 687 Page, Michael J., Natalie B. Cleton, Richard A. Bowen, and Angela Bosco-Lauth. 2014. “Age-  
688 Related Susceptibility to Japanese Encephalitis Virus in Domestic Ducklings and Chicks.” *The*  
689 *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 90 (2): 242–46.  
690 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.13-0161>.
- 691 Panja, P., S. K. Mondal, and J. Chattopadhyay. 2016. “Stability and Bifurcation Analysis of  
692 Japanese Encephalitis Model with/Without Effects of Some Control Parameters.” *Computational*  
693 *& Applied Mathematics* 37 (2): 1330–51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40314-016-0400-2>.
- 694 Penn, Matthew J., Daniel J. Laydon, Joseph Penn, Charles Whittaker, Christian Morgenstern,  
695 Oliver Ratmann, Swapnil Mishra, Mikko S. Pakkanen, Christl A. Donnelly, and Samir Bhatt.  
696 2023. “Intrinsic Randomness in Epidemic Modelling Beyond Statistical Uncertainty.”  
697 *Communications Physics* 6 (1): 146. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-023-01265-2>.
- 698 Quan, Tran Minh, Tran Thi Nhu Thao, Nguyen Manh Duy, Tran Minh Nhat, and Hannah  
699 Clapham. 2020. “Estimates of the Global Burden of Japanese Encephalitis and the Impact of  
700 Vaccination from 2000-2015.” *eLife* 9 (May). <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.51027>.
- 701 Riad, M. H., C. M. Scoglio, L. W. Cohnstaedt, and D. S. McVey. 2019. “Short-Term Forecast  
702 and Dual State-Parameter Estimation for Japanese Encephalitis Transmission Using Ensemble  
703 Kalman Filter.” In *2019 American Control Conference*, 3444–49. Philadelphia, PA, USA: IEEE.  
704 <https://doi.org/10.23919/ACC.2019.8814893>.

- 705 Riad, M. H., C. M. Scoglio, D. S. McVey, and L. W. Cohnstaedt. 2017a. “An Individual-Level  
706 Network Model for a Hypothetical Outbreak of Japanese Encephalitis in the USA.” *Stochastic  
707 Environmental Research and Risk Assessment* 31 (2): 353–67. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-  
708 016-1353-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-016-1353-0).
- 709 ———. 2017b. “Estimation of Parameters and Basic Reproductive Ratio for Japanese  
710 Encephalitis Transmission in the Philippines Using a Sequential Monte Carlo Filter.” In *2017  
711 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications*, 668–73. Maui, HI, USA: IEEE.  
712 <https://doi.org/10.1109/CCTA.2017.8062539>.
- 713 Ricklin, Meret E., Obdulio García-Nicolás, Daniel Brechbühl, Sylvie Python, Beatrice Zumkehr,  
714 Antoine Nougairede, Remi N. Charrel, Horst Posthaus, Anna Oevermann, and Artur  
715 Summerfield. 2016. “Vector-Free Transmission and Persistence of Japanese Encephalitis Virus  
716 in Pigs.” *Nature Communications* 7 (1): 10832. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms10832>.
- 717 Smith, David L, F. Ellis McKenzie, Robert W Snow, and Simon I Hay. 2007. “Revisiting the  
718 Basic Reproductive Number for Malaria and Its Implications for Malaria Control.” *PLOS  
719 Biology* 5 (3): e42. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0050042>.
- 720 Sota, T., and M. Mogi. 1989. “Models for JE Transmission Dynamics with Vector Mosquito  
721 Dynamics.” In *Arbovirus Research in Australia Proceedings Fifth Symposium, August, 28:144–  
722 48*. Brisbane, Australia: EurekaMag. <https://eurekamag.com/research/002/162/002162760.php>.
- 723 Tapaswi, P. K., A. K. Ghosh, and B. B. Mukhopadhyay. 1995. “Transmission of Japanese  
724 Encephalitis in a 3-Population Model.” *Ecological Modelling* 83 (3): 295–309.  
725 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3800\(94\)00102-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3800(94)00102-X).



- 726 Tennant, Warren, and Mario Recker. 2018. “Robustness of the Reproductive Number Estimates  
727 in Vector-Borne Disease Systems.” *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 12 (12): e0006999.  
728 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006999>.
- 729 Tricco, Andrea C., Erin Lillie, Wasifa Zarin, Kelly K. O’Brien, Heather Colquhoun, Danielle  
730 Levac, David Moher, et al. 2018. “PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR):  
731 Checklist and Explanation.” *Annals of Internal Medicine* 169 (7): 467–73.  
732 <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>.
- 733 Van den Eynde, Claudia, Charlotte Sohler, Severine Matthijs, and Nick De Regge. 2022.  
734 “Japanese Encephalitis Virus Interaction with Mosquitoes: A Review of Vector Competence,  
735 Vector Capacity and Mosquito Immunity.” *Pathogens* 11 (3): 317.  
736 <https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens11030317>.
- 737 Van Den Hurk, Andrew F., Scott A. Ritchie, and John S. Mackenzie. 2009. “Ecology and  
738 Geographical Expansion of Japanese Encephalitis Virus.” *Annual Review of Entomology* 54 (1):  
739 17–35. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.54.110807.090510>.
- 740 Wada, Y. 1975. “Theoretical Considerations on the Epidemic of Japanese Encephalitis.”  
741 *Tropical Medicine* 17 (1): 171–99. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:59322088>.
- 742 Walsh, Michael G, Amrita Pattanaik, Navya Vyas, Deepak Saxena, Cameron Webb, Shailendra  
743 Sawleshwarkar, and Chiranjay Mukhopadhyay. 2022. “High-Risk Landscapes of Japanese  
744 Encephalitis Virus Outbreaks in India Converge on Wetlands, Rain-Fed Agriculture, Wild  
745 Ardeidae, and Domestic Pigs and Chickens.” *International Journal of Epidemiology* 51 (5):  
746 1408–18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyac050>.

- 747 Yang, Dong-Kun, Byoung-han Kim, Chang-Hee Kweon, Jin-Ju Nah, Hyun-Joo Kim, Kyung-  
748 Woo Lee, Young-Jin Yang, and Kyu-Whan Mun. 2008. “Serosurveillance for Japanese  
749 Encephalitis, Akabane, and Aino Viruses for Thoroughbred Horses in Korea.” *Journal of*  
750 *Veterinary Science* 9 (4): 381. <https://doi.org/10.4142/jvs.2008.9.4.381>.
- 751 Yap, Grace, Xiao Fang Lim, Sharon Chan, Choon Beng How, Mahathir Humaidi, Gladys Yeo,  
752 Diyar Mailepessov, et al. 2019. “Serological Evidence of Continued Japanese Encephalitis Virus  
753 Transmission in Singapore Nearly Three Decades After End of Pig Farming.” *Parasites &*  
754 *Vectors* 12 (1): 244. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-019-3501-0>.
- 755 Zahid, M. H., and C. M. Kribs. 2021. “Impact of Cattle on Joint Dynamics and Disease Burden  
756 of Japanese Encephalitis and Leptospirosis.” *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering* 18 (4):  
757 3046–72. <https://doi.org/10.3934/mbe.2021153>.
- 758 Zardini, Agnese, Francesco Menegale, Andrea Gobbi, Mattia Manica, Giorgio Guzzetta, Valeria  
759 d’Andrea, Valentina Marziano, et al. 2024. “Estimating the Potential Risk of Transmission of  
760 Arboviruses in the Americas and Europe: A Modelling Study.” *The Lancet Planetary Health* 8  
761 (1): e30–40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(23\)00252-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(23)00252-8).
- 762 Zhao, S., Y. Lou, A. P. Y. Chiu, and D. He. 2018. “Modelling the Skip-and-Resurgence of  
763 Japanese Encephalitis Epidemics in Hong Kong.” *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 454  
764 (October):1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2018.05.017>.