

1 **Environmental factors linked to reporting of active malaria foci in Thailand**

2 Preecha Prempree,^{1#} Donal Bisanzio,^{2#} Prayuth Sudathip,¹ Jerdsuda Kanjanasuwan,¹ Isabel Powell,²
3 Deyer Gopinath,³ Chalita Suttiwong,¹ Niparueradee Pinyajeerapat,⁴ Ate Poortinga,⁵ David Sintasath,⁴
4 Jui A. Shah^{2*}

5
6 **Affiliations:**

7 ¹ Division of Vector Borne Diseases, Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health,
8 Nonthaburi, Thailand

9 ² Inform Asia: USAID's Health Research Program, RTI International, Bangkok, Thailand

10 ³ World Health Organization, Nonthaburi, Thailand

11 ⁴ U.S. President's Malaria Initiative, United States Agency for International Development (USAID),
12 Regional Development Mission for Asia, Bangkok, Thailand

13 ⁵ The SERVIR-Mekong Project, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center, Bangkok, Thailand

14

15 #These authors provided equal contribution to this study

16 *Corresponding author: juishah@rti.org; Tel.: +66 (0)98 275 8210

17

18 **Abstract**

19 Background: Thailand has made substantial progress toward malaria elimination, with 46 of the
20 country's 77 provinces declared malaria free as part of the subnational verification program.

21 Nonetheless, these areas remain vulnerable to the reintroduction of malaria parasites and the
22 reestablishment of indigenous transmission. As such, prevention of reestablishment (POR) planning is
23 of increasing concern to ensure timely response to increasing cases. A thorough understanding of both
24 risk of parasite importation and receptivity for transmission is essential for successful POR planning.

25 Methods: Routine geolocated case- and foci-level epidemiological and case-level demographic data
26 were extracted from Thailand's national malaria information system for all active foci from October

27 2012 to September 2020. A spatial analysis examined environmental and climate factors associated

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 with remaining active foci. A logistic regression model collated surveillance data with remote sensing
29 data to investigate associations with the probability of having reported an indigenous case within the
30 previous year.

31 Results: Active foci are highly concentrated along international borders, particularly Thailand's
32 western border with Myanmar. Although there is heterogeneity in the habitats surrounding active foci,
33 land covered by tropical forest and plantation was significantly higher for active foci than other foci.
34 The regression results showed that tropical forest, plantations, forest disturbance, distance from
35 international borders, historical foci classification, percentage of males, and percentage of short-term
36 residents were associated with high probability to report indigenous cases.

37 Conclusion: These results confirm that Thailand's emphasis on border areas and forest-going
38 populations is well placed. The results suggest that environmental factors alone are not driving malaria
39 transmission in Thailand; rather, other factors, including demographics and behaviors, may also be
40 contributors. However, these factors are syndemic, so human activities in areas covered by tropical
41 forests and plantations may result in malaria importation and potentially, local transmission, in foci
42 that previously had been cleared. These factors should be addressed in POR planning.

43 **Keywords:** spatial analysis, environmental drivers, malaria elimination, disease modeling

44 **Background**

45 Malaria remains a major public health threat across the world, with over 241 million cases and
46 627,000 deaths in 2020 [1]. The Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS), an area of Southeast Asia
47 composed of Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR), Myanmar, Thailand, China's
48 Yunnan Province, and Vietnam, is now an area of low malaria incidence but high population
49 connectivity [2]. To accelerate progress in the region, GMS countries have jointly committed to
50 eliminating *Plasmodium falciparum* (*P. falciparum*) by 2025 and to eliminating all forms of human
51 malaria by 2030, following guidelines set in the World Health Organization's (WHO) Strategy for
52 Malaria Elimination in the Greater Mekong Subregion (2015-2030) [3].

53 Thailand also established ambitious, yet attainable, national goals to interrupt malaria transmission,
54 reduce active foci, and achieve nationwide malaria-free status by 2024 [4, 5]. The country's keystone
55 1-3-7 surveillance strategy, adapted from China, requires that all malaria cases be reported within 1
56 day of detection and investigated within 3 days, and that appropriate focus-level response is completed
57 within 7 days [6, 7]. Each case and focus are classified according to Thailand's detailed protocols, and
58 public health interventions are responsively tailored. Foci are categorized as active (A1), residual (A2),
59 cleared but receptive (B1), or cleared but not receptive (B2), as detailed in **Table 1** [5]. In the initial 5
60 years of the 1-3-7 strategy's implementation, malaria incidence decreased by 81%, from 14,954 cases
61 in fiscal year (FY) 2017 to 2,835 in FY2021, and nearly all annual targets are being met [6].
62 Additionally, 46 of the country's 77 provinces have now been declared malaria free as part of its
63 subnational verification program.

64 Despite this progress, challenges to malaria elimination persist, including adequately addressing
65 *Plasmodium vivax* (*P. vivax*) infections, heterogeneous epidemiology, and high population mobility [8,
66 9, 10]. In FY2013, 43.7% of malaria infections were due to *P. falciparum*, but by FY2020, the parasite
67 only accounted for 5.7% of all infections. *P. vivax* has become the predominant species, causing
68 91.6% of malaria infections in 2020 [11, 12]. *P. vivax* infections can stay latent for a long time, are
69 less likely to be symptomatic, and require a long 14-day treatment course of primaquine in Thailand as
70 radical cure to prevent relapse, thereby challenging malaria elimination. The spatial distribution of

71 malaria is highly heterogeneous across the country [13, 14]. Cases are clustered in difficult-to-reach
72 populations and areas, often among male workers who travel along Thailand's international borders
73 [15]. Thai nationals still comprise a majority of malaria cases (71.3% in FY 2020); however, there is a
74 disproportionately high malaria incidence among mobile and migrant communities [11]. As
75 indigenous transmission decreases in Thailand, imported parasites and clustered infections in mobile
76 populations have become an increasing concern. Imported cases can trigger local transmission in
77 susceptible areas [16, 17, 18]. Simultaneously, Thailand's subnational verification program has
78 expanded the number of malaria-free areas. Although this designation is hard earned, these areas
79 remain vulnerable to the importation of malaria parasites and the reestablishment of indigenous
80 transmission. Both international and domestic travel may increase susceptibility in malaria-free areas
81 or threaten progress toward Thailand's malaria elimination goal.

82 As such, Thailand's Division of Vector Borne Disease (DVBD) in the Ministry of Public Health
83 (MOPH) has accelerated its provincial-level prevention of reestablishment (POR) planning to ensure
84 timely response to increasing cases. The draft POR stratification incorporates both risk of parasite
85 importation and receptivity for transmission, building on Thailand's long-standing focus classification.
86 The classification considers the presence of both mosquito vectors and habitats conducive to vectors,
87 such as forests or mature rubber plantations, based on available entomological surveillance data. To
88 further progress toward malaria elimination, however, focused efforts must be made that draw upon all
89 available sources of information.

90 This study examined environmental, climate, and demographic factors associated with remaining
91 active foci in Thailand. A logistic regression model collated both routine case- and foci-level
92 surveillance data with remote sensing data to investigate associations of these factors with the
93 probability of having reported an indigenous case within the previous year. The results are intended to
94 contribute to understanding what factors are fueling current malaria transmission and potential future
95 reintroduction, thereby enhancing the current POR risk stratification strategy and increasing the
96 DVBD's ability to disrupt transmission.

97

98 **Methods**

99 *Malaria data*

100 Routine geolocated case- and foci-level epidemiological and case-level demographic data were
101 extracted from the national malaria information system (MIS). In Thailand, any focus that has
102 recorded an indigenous case in the previous one year is classified as A1 (based on an annual focus
103 classification cycle) and tracked as an “active focus” [5]. The analysis included all active foci in which
104 at least one parasitologically confirmed (by microscopy or rapid diagnostic test) case from public
105 health and non-governmental community facilities was reported over an 8-year period from October
106 2012 to September 2020, representing FY2013 to FY2020. Focus classifications were standardized
107 according to the classification criteria adopted after 2015 to ensure consistency in definitions and to
108 facilitate comparisons across the study period. Independent case-level variables for the regression
109 analysis were drawn from reported cases from FY2016 to FY2020 (to match the timeline of available
110 environmental data) with full demographics, travel history, and parasite species data. The study
111 utilized fiscal years (October to September) because Thailand’s malaria program and database are
112 based on fiscal year targets, and FY2020 was chosen as an endline to align with the availability of
113 environmental data.

114 *Land use data*

115 Environmental features around malaria foci were estimated using the Global Land Cover product with
116 Fine Classification System at 30 m (GLC_FCS30-2020) land cover classification map obtained from
117 Liu et al. (2020) [19]. The GLC_FCS30-2020 had a resolution of 30 m and higher granularity of land
118 cover classification compared to other land cover products. Using the land cover map, we calculated
119 the percentage of territory covered by crops, mixed forests, tropical forest, plantation, permanent and
120 seasonal water bodies, built areas, and grasslands in a 1-km radius around each malaria focus. These
121 categories are defined in detail elsewhere [20], but selected descriptions relevant to Thailand are listed
122 below:

- 123 ▪ *Cropland* includes herbaceous and shrubby crops such as cereals, oils seeds, vegetables, root
124 crops and forages but excludes tea, coffee, and rice.
- 125 ▪ *Plantation* includes perennial crops of >5 m such as rubber, palm oil, cashew, and coconut.
- 126 ▪ *Tropical forests* have >60% canopy cover from trees at least 5 m tall, and the dominant tree
127 species are evergreen broadleaf
- 128 ▪ *Mixed forests* have >60% canopy cover from trees at least 5 m tall; forest is considered mix
129 because no single forest type makes up >60% of the total tree cover.

130 The landcover calculation was performed using the open-source Geographic Information System
131 Geographic Resources Analysis Support System (GIS GRASS) [21].

132 *Rainfall data*

133 Global precipitation estimates were downloaded from the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre
134 (GPCC) V7 [22], which considers the largest number of contributing ground observations [23]. For
135 this study, GPCC V7 monthly precipitation data at 1-degree spatial resolution from 2016 to 2020 were
136 obtained from the Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD, <https://opendata.dwd.de/>) for all malaria foci.

137 *Forest disturbance data*

138 Because deforestation in Thailand has been associated with malaria transmission [16], we included
139 information about forest disturbance in the study analysis. Latest available raster data about forest
140 disturbance on a global scale from 2015 to 2019 were obtained from the Global Forest Change website
141 (<http://earthenginepartners.appspot.com/science-2013-global-forest>) [24]. The values reported in the
142 data create a disturbance index indicating the level of disturbance on a scale from zero (no
143 disturbance) to 17 (highest level of disturbance) at a 25-m resolution. We calculated the mean annual
144 disturbance index in a 1-km radius around each malaria focus.

145 *Statistical analysis*

146 Comparisons of percentage of territory covered by environmental features among the four foci classes
147 were performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test. A logistic regression model was built to investigate the

148 associations of environmental and demographic factors, with the probability of a focus to report an
149 indigenous malaria case and thus be classified as an active focus (A1). This project employed a
150 Structural Additive Regression (STAR) model [25]. This model's structure allows the inclusion of
151 both linear and non-linear predictor effects, increasing the model's flexibility. The STAR model can
152 also include a spatial spline factor to account for spatial autocorrelation of the data. The model's full
153 formula is below:

$$\begin{aligned} 154 \quad & \text{Classified as A1 active focus (0,1)} = \text{RAINFALL}_{\text{foci}} + \text{FOREST-Trop}_{\text{foci}} + \text{FOREST-Mix}_{\text{foci}} + \\ 155 \quad & \text{CROP}_{\text{foci}} + \text{BUILT}_{\text{foci}} + \text{PLANTATION}_{\text{foci}} + \text{SEAS WATER}_{\text{foci}} + \text{PERM WATER}_{\text{foci}} + \\ 156 \quad & \text{DISTURBANCE}_{\text{foci}} + \text{DIST BORDER}_{\text{foci}} + \text{AGE}_{\text{case}} + \text{MALE}_{\text{case}} + \text{SHORT-RESIDENT}_{\text{case}} + \\ 157 \quad & Pf\text{RATIO}_{\text{case}} + 1\text{-}3\text{-}7 \text{ ADHERENCE}_{\text{foci}} + \text{STATUS}_{\text{y-1}} + \text{STATUS}_{\text{y-5}} + \text{PROVINCE}_{\text{RND}} \\ 158 \quad & +\text{FOCI}_{\text{SPAT}} \end{aligned}$$

159 Where:

160 RAINFALL_{foci}: annual monthly mean rainfall

161 FOREST-Trop_{foci}: the percentage of land occupied by tropical forest

162 FOREST-Mix_{foci}: the percentage of land occupied by mixed forest

163 CROP_{foci}: the percentage of land occupied by crops

164 BUILT_{foci}: the percentage of land occupied by built area

165 PLANTATION_{foci}: the percentage of land occupied by plantation area

166 SEAS WATER_{foci}: the percentage of land occupied by seasonal water bodies

167 PERM WATER_{foci}: the percentage of land occupied by permanent water bodies

168 DISTURBANCE_{foci}: the level of forest disturbance

169 DIST BORDER_{foci}: the distance in kilometers from an international border

170 AGE_{case}: the median age of reported cases from FY2016 to FY2020

171 MALE_{case}: the percentage of males among reported cases from FY2016 to FY2020

172 SHORT-RESIDENT_{case}: the percentage of people among reported cases from FY2016 to FY2020 who
173 have lived in Thailand for less than 6 months

174 PfRATIO_{case}: the percentage of *P. falciparum* among reported cases from FY2016 to FY2020

175 1-3-7 ADHERENCE_{foci}: percentage of malaria cases in each focus managed without delays (i.e.,
176 adherence to 1-3-7 surveillance protocols in full and on time)

177 STATUS_{y-1}: focus status of the previous year

178 STATUS_{y-5}: the number of years with reported indigenous cases (i.e., A1 focus classification), up to 5
179 years

180 PROVINCE_{RND}: the focus' province, included as random effect

181 FOCI_{SPAT}: spatial random effect at the foci level represented by a geospatial spline

182 Variable selection was performed to identify those factors that have the highest prediction power. The
183 variable selection was based on comparing the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) of all tested
184 models [26]. Collinearity among the model variables was tested using the variance inflation factor
185 (VIF), which estimates variance inflation due to variable multicollinearity. A high VIF indicates low
186 reliability of a regression model due to strong correlation among its variables, and a VIF >2.5 indicates
187 a level of multicollinearity able to bias its results. The statistical analyses were performed using the R
188 language [27].

189 **Results**

190 *Changes over time in active foci*

191 The number of active foci for all malaria species in Thailand decreased by 77.7% over the study
192 period, from 1,915 to 427 foci. However, the decline demonstrated an inverse exponential trend, with
193 fewer active foci cleared each year. Between FY2013 and FY2014, the first year of the study, 374

194 active foci (A1) gained A2 status (19.5%). In contrast, between FY2019 and FY2020, at the study's
195 endline, only 45 active foci were reclassified to A2 (9.5%) (**Figure 1**).

196 Reported A1 and A2 foci were highly concentrated along international borders, particularly Thailand's
197 western border with Myanmar (**Figure 2**). Many active foci throughout Thailand gained A2 status
198 during the study period, most notably near the eastern border with Lao PDR (Sakhon Nakhon,
199 Mukdahan, and Ubon Ratchathani provinces) and the northeastern border with Myanmar (Chiang Mai
200 and Mae Hong Son provinces). However, persistent A1 foci (those that retained active foci status
201 consistently for 5 years, from FY2016–FY2020) were almost exclusively found immediately adjacent
202 to borders, showing increasing concentration from A2 to A1 to persistent A1 status (**Figure 2**).

203 During the study period, there was an 80.1% decrease in the number of A1 foci reporting a high
204 proportion of *P. falciparum* (80% or higher) among all cases (**Figure S1**). This trend is particularly
205 pronounced along the Cambodian border. It mirrors a national trend of very few foci by FY2020 with
206 greater than 20% of cases represented by *P. falciparum* infections.

207 *Assessment of environmental composition*

208 A1 foci identified during FY2020 are overlaid on the land cover map, showing that areas with high
209 density of A1 foci are characterized by high forest coverage and located along Thailand's international
210 borders (**Figure 3**). The land cover map also shows that a high fraction of central Thailand is dedicated
211 to cropland with no active foci (Figure 3).

212 The areas surrounding A1 foci at the borders with Myanmar (A, C), Cambodia (B), and Malaysia (D)
213 are magnified in **Figure 4**. There is heterogeneity in the habitats surrounding active foci. In Mae Hong
214 Son and Tak provinces in the northwest of Thailand (2A), active foci are surrounded by forest;
215 however, on the Myanmar side of the border, the environment is a mix of forest with plantation. In the
216 other hotspot areas, plantations are notable, and they are usually close to forests. Plantations are also
217 the dominant habitats surrounding A1 foci close to the border with Malaysia (D).

218 The mean percentages of territory covered by each environmental feature in a 1-km radius around the
219 foci are summarized in **Table 2**. A1 foci showed much higher proportional land cover of plantation,

220 tropical forest, mixed forest, and evergreen forest, in addition to greater forest disturbance.
221 Conversely, A1 foci showed lower proportional urban areas and rice fields. Comparing the
222 environment among the four foci classes showed that land covered by tropical forest and plantation are
223 significantly higher for A1 foci compared to A2, B1, and B2 foci (Kruskal-Wallis, $p < 0.05$).
224 The annual rainfall trend from FY2015 to FY2020 was very similar across the foci categories, with an
225 increase of rainfall from FY2017 to FY2018, followed by lower precipitation through the study's
226 endline (*Figure S2*).

227 *Results of statistical modelling*

228 The multicollinearity analysis indicated a VIF=1.34, showing that model's results were not affected by
229 multicollinearity. The model selection identified the best fit model as the one including the following
230 variables: FOREST-Trop_{foci}, PLANTATION_{foci}, DISTURBANCE_{foci}, DIST BORDER_{foci}, MALE_{case},
231 SHORT-RESIDENT_{case}, 1-3-7 ADHERENCE_{foci}, STATUS_{y-1}, and STATUS_{y-5} (Table 2). This result
232 showed that tropical forest, plantations, forest disturbance, distance from international borders, and
233 historical foci classification are associated with the probability to report indigenous cases, in addition
234 to sex and nationality (*Table 3*). The probability of a focus to be classified as A1 significantly
235 increases when the focus' environment is mostly composed of tropical forest or plantation, with high
236 forest disturbance. The model also showed that the odds of finding indigenous cases increased for
237 those foci closer to international borders (with Myanmar, Cambodia, and Lao PDR) and that have been
238 reported as A1 during the previous years. A1 classification was also linked to a high fraction of
239 reported cases among males and among short-term resident populations.

240 **Discussion**

241 The study confirms that Thailand's remaining active foci are clustered along international borders,
242 with a particularly high density along the western border with Myanmar and a high association with
243 tropical forest, plantation, and forest disturbance. These results support the DVBD's longstanding
244 programmatic focus on border areas and forest-going populations.

245 Heterogeneous land cover may partially explain these patterns and may contribute to geographically
246 varied success of malaria elimination interventions. The environment of the Thailand-Myanmar
247 border, which includes mountainous regions, forests, and wet-rice fields, is less urbanized than many
248 of Thailand's low-lying regions [10]. These forested areas provide ideal habitats for *Anopheles*
249 mosquitoes, and access may be more difficult for public health teams to reach for crucial interventions
250 like reactive case detection [28], thereby increasing likelihood of delayed response and onward
251 transmission. By contrast, urbanized or agriculturally developed areas provide a less ideal vector
252 habitat and are more easily accessible [29, 30]. Substantial prior research from malaria-endemic
253 countries suggests that decreased risks of infection are correlated with urbanization [31, 32].

254 Other environmental factors, including distance from seasonal or permanent bodies of water and
255 rainfall, have previously been shown to impact malaria transmission [33], but were not significant
256 predictors in our model. Temporal variations (wet vs. dry season), rather than geographic differences,
257 in rainfall distribution may be responsible for these results.

258 However, the study also showed a substantial, yet slowing, decrease in the number of active malaria
259 foci in Thailand since FY2013. These results are consistent with the 2021 World Malaria Report,
260 which found that global progress against malaria had reached a plateau before the start of the ongoing
261 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic [34]. However, these slowing rates indicate that
262 additional or revised surveillance efforts, coupled with other new interventions, will be necessary to
263 meet the elimination goals.

264 Thailand's routine surveillance data show that active foci with significantly lower adherence to 1-3-7
265 protocols are in border areas with these environmental factors, but which also experience additional
266 challenges [11]. These challenges include waning drug efficacy, migration linked with regional
267 sociopolitics, and civil unrest. To continue to accelerate to elimination, Thailand may need to further
268 refine the 1-3-7 approach to address persisting challenges in adherence, perhaps enhancing protocols
269 to better suit these specific micro-contexts, although developing such protocols would require
270 additional resources. The DVBD may also need to consider more aggressive strategies such as targeted
271 chemoprevention, a revised active case detection program to target emerging high-risk populations,

272 enhanced follow-up schemes or new treatments like tafenoquine for the radical cure of *P. vivax*,
273 support for improved data recording and use, and involvement of other actors such as the private
274 sector and military to improve reach of malaria interventions.

275 The results also indicated that demographic factors, such as percentage of males and short-term
276 resident cases, increase the probability of a focus to report a local case. Successfully eliminating
277 malaria will largely depend on targeting specific population groups to ensure high coverage of
278 essential interventions. In Thailand, men between 15 and 44 years of age are more likely to work and
279 sleep overnight in forests; they also comprise 65.9% of malaria infections [35]. Thailand is the
280 principal recipient country of cross-border workers in the GMS [36], and population movement is
281 influenced by social and economic crises including COVID-19 and the 2021 political crisis in
282 Myanmar. These communities often live in hard-to-reach areas and may face more barriers to
283 accessing malaria care than longer-term residents of Thailand [37]. The DVBD will need to find safe
284 and flexible ways to meet their goal of providing effective and complete malaria treatment to all
285 patients in Thailand. Continuing to focus on specific areas with substantial transboundary travel and
286 migration could reduce local transmission.

287 Environmental characteristics overlap to affect vector reproduction, exposure risk, and access to
288 malaria health services, thereby linking environmental and social patterns [10]. For example, a highly
289 forested area may provide outdoor work opportunities, in turn increasing exposure to exophagic
290 mosquitoes [9, 15, 37]. The results of this analysis suggest that environmental factors alone are not
291 driving malaria transmission in Thailand but rather a combination of syndemic factors. Human
292 activities in areas covered by tropical forests and plantations may result in malaria importation and in
293 turn, local transmission.

294 These results, which highlight areas at high risk of reporting indigenous cases, are already being used
295 in the DVBD's risk planning to prevent reestablishment in malaria-free areas. As active foci continue
296 to be eliminated, the DVBD will need to remain vigilant against the return of active foci in susceptible
297 areas. As documented in Sudathip (2021), movement between A1 and A2 status is frequent, which
298 may be unsurprising due to Thailand's sensitive foci classification criteria: having just one indigenous

299 case reverts a focus from A2 to A1 status [5]. The DVBD plans to develop an automated stratification
300 that will maximize use of Thailand's existing environmental, climate, and demographic data with
301 minimal statistical input. This stratification will be programmed into an open-source software that
302 enables interactive maps, so that district malaria officers across Thailand will be able to review their
303 jurisdiction's results and corresponding planning and response actions. The DVBD itself will manage
304 data sources and anticipated update cycles, maintenance of current data in the software, and analysis
305 and use from the resulting maps and tables. There may also be something to learn from provinces or
306 foci where malaria has been reintroduced, some of which are not on international borders. The
307 stratification will employ a non-modeling method to categorize subdistricts into malaria transmission
308 strata, with corresponding POR interventions for each stratum. The DVBD will also issue guidance by
309 stratum for response teams to use a reference for what POR actions need to be maintained and what
310 actions would be taken in the case of an unexpected case or outbreak.

311 **Conclusion**

312 This analysis suggests that environmental factors alone are not driving malaria transmission in
313 Thailand; rather, other factors, including demographics and behaviors, may be contributors. However,
314 these factors are syndemic, so human activities in areas covered by tropical forests and plantations
315 may result in malaria importation that could lead to local transmission. The environmental and
316 demographic determinants of malaria transmission identified in this study support greater
317 understanding of the vulnerability and receptivity bases of POR planning. The DVBD will continue to
318 tailor its surveillance and response to protect high-risk populations and environments and to prevent
319 malaria reintroduction and/or reestablishment. Although these findings are specific to Thailand, this
320 study reveals a generalizable link between both environmental conditions and human activities with
321 malaria elimination. This type of analysis may help other countries adapt their malaria elimination and
322 POR programming to promote consistent progress.

323 **List of abbreviations**

324	COVID-19	coronavirus disease 2019
325	DVBD	Division of Vector Borne Diseases
326	FY	fiscal year
327	GMS	Greater Mekong Subregion
328	Lao PDR	Lao People's Democratic Republic
329	MIS	Malaria Information System
330	MOPH	Ministry of Public Health
331	NMES	National Malaria Elimination Strategy
332	PMI	President's Malaria Initiative
333	POR	prevention of reestablishment
334	USAID	United States Agency for International Development
335	WHO	World Health Organization

336

337 **Declarations**

338 ***Ethics approval and consent to participate***

339 Not applicable.

340 ***Consent for publication***

341 Not applicable.

342 ***Availability of data and materials***

343 The visualizations supporting the conclusions of this article are available in the Malaria Online
344 repository, <http://malaria.ddc.moph.go.th/>.

345 ***Competing interests***

346 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

347 ***Funding***

348 This study was made possible by the generous support of the American people through the U.S.
349 President's Malaria Initiative (PMI) and United States Agency for International Development
350 (USAID), under the terms of Cooperative Agreement AID-486-LA-15-00002 for Inform Asia:
351 USAID's Health Research Program.

352 ***Authors' contributions***

353 PS, DB, and JAS conceptualized the manuscript. DB and AP organized and cleaned the data. DB
354 analyzed the spatial results and interpreted the results with support from JAS. IP led the writing of the
355 manuscript with support from DB and JAS. All authors, including PP, JK, DG, CS, NP, and DS,
356 provided input and review. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

357 ***Acknowledgments***

358 The authors recognize all local public health teams and partners who have contributed to the malaria
359 elimination program at the national and subnational levels under the leadership of Thailand's Division
360 of Vector Borne Diseases, Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health.

361 ***Authors' information***

362 The contents of this article are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views
363 of USAID, PMI, or the U.S. Government. DG is a staff member of the World Health Organization
364 (WHO) and is responsible for the views expressed in this publication, which do not necessarily reflect
365 the decisions or policies of the WHO.


366 **References**

- 367 1. World Health Organization (WHO). World Malaria Report 2021. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO;
368 2021.
- 369 2. The Mekong Malaria Elimination Programme. Accelerating Malaria Elimination in the Greater
370 Mekong. World Health Organization. [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WHO-UCN-GMP-MME-2022.01)
371 UCN-GMP-MME-2022.01. Accessed June 3, 2022.
- 372 3. World Health Organization (WHO). Strategy for Malaria Elimination in the Greater Mekong
373 Subregion (2015-2030).
- 374 4. Bureau of Vector Borne Diseases Department of Disease Control Thailand Ministry of Public
375 Health. Guide to Malaria Elimination For Thailand's Local Administrative Organizations. 2019.
- 376 5. Sudathip, P., Kitchakarn, S., Shah, J.A. et al. A foci cohort analysis to monitor successful and
377 persistent foci under Thailand's Malaria Elimination Strategy. *Malar J* 20, 118 (2021).
- 378 6. Lertpiriyasuwat, C., Sudathip, P., Kitchakarn, S. et al. Implementation and success factors from
379 Thailand's 1-3-7 surveillance strategy for malaria elimination. *Malar J* 20, 201 (2021).
- 380 7. Feng J, Liu J, Feng X, et al. Towards Malaria Elimination: Monitoring and Evaluation of the "1-3-
381 7" Approach at the China-Myanmar Border. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2016
- 382 8. Nguitragool W, Karl S, White M, et al. Highly heterogeneous residual malaria risk in western
383 Thailand. *Int J Parasitol.* 2019 May
- 384 9. Edwards, H.M., Sriwichai, P., Kirabittir, K. et al. Transmission risk beyond the village:
385 entomological and human factors contributing to residual malaria transmission in an area
386 approaching malaria elimination on the Thailand–Myanmar border. *Malar J* 18, 221 (2019).
- 387 10. Parker DM, Carrara VI, Pukrittayakamee S, et al. Malaria ecology along the Thailand-Myanmar
388 border. *Malar J.* 2015 Oct 5
- 389 11. Sudathip, P., Saejeng, A., Khantikul, N. et al. Progress and challenges of integrated drug efficacy
390 surveillance for uncomplicated malaria in Thailand. *Malar J* 20, 261 (2021).
- 391 12. Shah, JA. Learnings from Thailand in building strong surveillance for malaria elimination. *Nat*
392 *Commun.* 2022; 13

- 393 13. Kaehler, N., Adhikari, B., Cheah, P.Y., et al. Prospects and strategies for malaria elimination in
394 the Greater Mekong Sub-region: a qualitative study. *Malar J* 18, 203 (2019).
- 395 14. Saita S., Silawan T., Parker D.M., et al. Spatial Heterogeneity and Temporal Trends in Malaria on
396 the Thai-Myanmar Border (2012-2017): A Retrospective Observational Study. *Trop Med Infect*
397 *Dis.* 2019 Apr 12
- 398 15. Sudathip P, Naowarat S, Kitchakarn S, Gopinath D, Bisanzio D, Pinyajeerapat N, et al. Assessing
399 Thailand' s 1-3-7 surveillance strategy in accelerating malaria elimination. *Malar J.* 2022;;1-12.
- 400 16. Sanann, N., Peto, T.J., Tripura, R. et al. Forest work and its implications for malaria elimination: a
401 qualitative study. *Malar J* 18, 376 (2019).
- 402 17. Zhang, SS., Feng, J., Zhang, L. et al. Imported malaria cases in former endemic and non-malaria
403 endemic areas in China: are there differences in case profile and time to response? *Infect Dis*
404 *Poverty* 8, 61 (2019).
- 405 18. Win, A.Y.N., Maung, T.M., Wai, K.T., et al. Understanding malaria treatment-seeking preferences
406 within the public sector amongst mobile/migrant workers in a malaria elimination scenario: a
407 mixed-methods study. *Malar J* 16, 462 (2017).
- 408 19. Liu L, Zhang X, Chen X, Gao Y, Mi J. GLC_FCS30-2020: Global Land Cover with Fine
409 Classification System at 30m in 2020. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data.* 2020;13:2753-76.
- 410 20. Saah D, Tenneson K, Poortinga A, Nguyen Q, Chishtie F, Aung KS, et al. Primitives as building
411 blocks for constructing land cover maps. *Int J Appl Earth Obs Geoinf.* 2020;85:101979.
- 412 21. GRASS Development Team, 2017. Geographic Resources Analysis Support System (GRASS)
413 Software, Version 7.2. Open Source Geospatial Foundation. Electronic document.
414 <http://grass.osgeo.org>
- 415 22. National Center for Atmospheric Research Staff (Eds). Last modified 27 Feb 2020. "The Climate
416 Data Guide: GPCC: Global Precipitation Climatology Centre." Retrieved from
417 <https://climatedataguide.ucar.edu/climate-data/gpcc-global-precipitation-climatology-centre>.
- 418 23. Schneider U, Becker A, Finger P, Meyer-Christoffer A, Ziese M, Rudolf B. GPCC's new land
419 surface precipitation climatology based on quality-controlled in situ data and its role in quantifying
420 the global water cycle. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology.* 2014;115(1-2):15-40.


- 421 24. Hansen MC, Potapov PV, Moore R, Hancher M, Turubanova SA, Tyukavina A, et al. High-
422 resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. *Science*. 2013;342:850–3.
- 423 25. Umlauf N, Adler D, Kneib T, Lang S, Zeileis A. Structured additive regression models: An R
424 interface to BayesX. *Working Papers in Economics and Statistics*; 2012.
- 425 26. Burnham KP, Anderson DR. Multimodel inference: understanding AIC and BIC in model
426 selection. *Sociological methods & research*. 2004 Nov;33(2):261-304.
- 427 27. R Core Team (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
428 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 429 28. Perera R, Caldera A, Wickremasinghe AR. Reactive Case Detection (RACD) and foci
430 investigation strategies in malaria control and elimination: a review. *Malar J*. 2020;19.
- 431 29. Hay S.I., Guerra C.A., Tatem A.J., et al. Urbanization, malaria transmission and disease burden in
432 Africa. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2005.
- 433 30. Lindsay SW, Campbell H, Adiamah JH, Greenwood AM, Bangali JE, Greenwood BM. Malaria in
434 a peri-urban area of The Gambia. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol*. 1990 Dec;84
- 435 31. Gardiner C, Biggar RJ, Collins WE, Nkrumah FK. Malaria in urban and rural areas of southern
436 Ghana: A survey of parasitaemia, antibodies, and antimalarial practices. *Bull World Health Organ*.
437 1984;62:607–13.
- 438 32. Mathanga, D.P., Tembo, A.K., Mzilahowa, T. et al. Patterns and determinants of malaria risk in
439 urban and peri-urban areas of Blantyre, Malawi. *Malar J* 15, 590 (2016).
- 440 33. Wiwanitkit V. Correlation between rainfall and the prevalence of malaria in Thailand. *J Infect*.
441 2006 Mar;52
- 442 34. World Malaria Report 2021. World Health Organization. [https://www.who.int/teams/global-](https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2021)
443 [malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2021](https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2021). Accessed June 3, 2022
- 444 35. Jongdeepaisal M., Khonputsu P., Prasert O., et al. Forest malaria and prospects for anti-malarial
445 chemoprophylaxis among forest goers: findings from a qualitative study in Thailand. *Malar J*.
446 2022 Feb 14

- 447 36. Kheang S.T., Lin M.A., Lwin S., et al. Malaria Case Detection Among Mobile Populations and
448 Migrant Workers in Myanmar: Comparison of 3 Service Delivery Approaches [published
449 correction appears in *Glob Health Sci Pract.* 2018 Oct 4;6(3):612]. *Glob Health Sci Pract.* 2018
450 37. Kotepui M., Kotepui K.U. Impact of Weekly Climatic Variables on Weekly Malaria Incidence
451 throughout Thailand: A Country-Based Six-Year Retrospective Study. *J Environ Public Health.*
452 2018



454


455 **Figure 1. Number of reported active foci from FY2013 to FY2020**




456

457 **Figure 2. Spatial pattern of A1 and A2 foci and persistent A1 foci (as foci reported as active**
458 **throughout the time window FY2016 to FY2020)**

459



461 **Figure 3. Areas covered by forest, plantation, and cropland with A1 foci, FY2020**



462 **Figure 4. Areas covered by forest, plantation, and cropland around A1 foci in northwestern (A),**
 463 **eastern (B), central (C), and southern (D) Thailand**

464 **Table 1. Focus classification in Thailand**
 465

Focus classification	Pre-2016 definition	Current definition
A1	Perennial transmission village or hamlet where indigenous cases are reported at least 6 months out of the year	<i>Active focus</i> : Reported indigenous transmission in the current year
A2	Periodic transmission area village or hamlet where indigenous cases are reported fewer than 6 months out of the year	<i>Residual non-active focus</i> : No indigenous cases in the current year but with indigenous cases in the previous 3 years
B1	High-risk village or hamlet without transmission for a minimum of 3 years, but adult vectors or larvae are present or conditions are favorable for breeding	<i>Cleared focus but receptive</i> : No indigenous transmission in at least 3 years, but suitable environment for vector <i>Anopheles spp.</i> mosquitoes
B2	Low-risk village or hamlet without transmission for a minimum of 3 years, and no presence of adult vectors or larvae and unfavorable conditions for breeding	<i>Cleared focus but not receptive</i> : No indigenous transmission in at least 3 years, but unsuitable environment for vector <i>Anopheles spp.</i> mosquitoes

466

467 **Table 2. Environmental characteristics across foci classification** The table shows the mean (among
 468 all foci in each classification) percentage of land covered by each environmental feature.

Focus Classification in FY2020	Distance from Border (Mean)	Forest Loss Score (Mean)	Fraction Plantation (Mean)	Fraction Tropical Forest (Mean)	Fraction Mixed Forest (Mean)	Fraction Evergreen Forest (Mean)	Fraction Urban Area (Mean)	Fraction Rice Field (Mean)
A1	54.8 km	14.1	20.9%	10.8%	14.1%	1.53%	0.07%	0%
A2	77.85 km	9.8	18.09%	8.45%	13.36%	1.39%	0.19%	0%
B1	119.56 km	12.39	17.33%	7.22%	7.40%	2.30%	0.61%	0.32%
B2	188.69 km	12.54	6.70%	1.84%	0.89%	0.09%	1.00%	3.37%

469

470 **Table 3. Results of the logistic regression performed with the STAR model**


Variable	Type of variable	Odds ratio (95% CI)
STATUS _{y-1} (Ref: A1)	String	
A2		0.16 (0.09-0.28)**
B1		0.12 (0.05-0.25)**
B2		0.02 (0.01-0.28)*
STATUS _{y-5}	Discrete	1.20 (1.05-1.34)*
FOREST-Trop _{foci}	Discrete	1.02 (1.01-1.03)**
DISTURBANCE _{foci}	Discrete	1.16 (1.01-1.73)*
DIST BORDER _{foci}	Discrete	0.98 (0.97-0.99)*
MALE _{case}	Discrete	1.66 (1.23-1.87)*

SHORT-RESIDENT _{case}	Discrete	1.10 (1.03-1.16)**
--------------------------------	----------	--------------------

471 *p<0.05; **p<0.01

472 STATUS_{y-1}: focus status of the previous year; STATUS_{y-5}: the number of years with reported indigenous cases (i.e., A1 focus
 473 classification), up to 5 years; FOREST-Trop_{foci}: the percentage of land occupied by tropical forest; DISTURBANCE_{foci}: the
 474 level of forest disturbance; DIST BORDER_{foci}: the distance in kilometers from an international border; MALE_{case}: the
 475 percentage of males among reported cases from FY2016 to FY2020; SHORT-RESIDENT_{case}: the percentage of people
 476 among reported cases from FY2016 to FY2020 who have lived in Thailand for less than 6 months


477 **Appendix**



478

479 **Figure S1. Percentage of *Pf* cases among reported cases in A1 foci in FY2016 and FY2020**

480



481

482 **Figure S2. Median annual rainfall per foci classification, FY2015–FY2020**