Supplementary Information for Redding *et al.* **– Geographical drivers and climate-linked dynamics of Lassa fever in Nigeria**

Supplementary Figure 1: Lassa fever case time series from Nigeria Centre for Disease Control reporting regimes. Graphs summarise weekly surveillance data aggregated across all local government authorities (LGAs), from January 2012 to December 2019, and show the differences between two surveillance regimes. Bar plots show monthly total cases from the long-term Weekly Epidemiological Reports (W.E.R., top) and more recent Situation Reports (SitRep, bottom) regime, with bar heights representing the total LF cases from all epidemiological weeks starting during a given month, split into suspected (grey) and confirmed (black) cases. Weekly case accumulation curves per-surveillance regime, per-year show total reported cases (including both suspected and confirmed; top graphs) and confirmed only (bottom graphs). LF trends during the overlap period between the two regimes are similar (January 2017 to March 2018) but the SitRep data (based on the most current reporting regime and including post-hoc follow-ups to ensure accurate counts) more clearly show the very large increase in both suspected and confirmed case reports in 2018. The full time series used in analyses (Figure 1) includes W.E.R. data from 2012 to 2016, and SitRep data from 2017 to 2019.

Supplementary Figure 2: Annual spatiotemporal random effects from models of Lassa fever occurrence and incidence across Nigeria. Models of LF occurrence and incidence (2016-2019) included year-specific, spatially-structured (conditional autoregressive; *u*) and unstructured (*v*) random effects at LGA level (jointly specified as a Besag-York-Mollie model). These account for both spatial autocorrelation in environmental and reporting processes, and ongoing expansion of surveillance throughout the reporting period. Dark blue maps show the annual fitted LGA-level random effect (i.e. $u + v$; see Methods) for the full models with socio-environmental covariates, for occurrence (A; colour denotes log odds of occurrence) and incidence (B; colour denotes log incidence). Diverging colour maps show the difference in the fitted spatio-temporal effect between baseline (random effects only) and full models (with covariates), for occurrence (B) and incidence (D). More negative values (brown) indicate areas where including socio-environmental covariates has provided additional explanatory power (i.e. where random effects have reduced towards zero), and vice versa.

Supplementary Figure 3: Geographical cross-validation for spatial models of Lassa fever occurrence and incidence. The direction and magnitude of linear fixed effects and nonlinear climate effects in both occurrence (A-B) and incidence models (C-D) were robust to geographically-structured cross-validation (n=3096; i.e. 774 LGAs over 4 years). This involved in turn excluding all LGAs from each of 12 Lassa-endemic and non-endemic states, with point or line colour denoting the state that was excluded in each model iteration. Points and error bars show linear fixed effects (mean and 95% credible interval), and lines show fitted nonlinear effects of mean annual precipitation on either occurrence risk (odds ratio) or incidence (relative risk) (lines show posterior mean and transparent grey shading denotes 95% credible interval for each submodel). These results indicate that the findings were not overly influenced by data from any one locality.

Supplementary Figure 4: Fitted spatial models of Lassa fever occurrence and incidence for spatially-aggregated districts. To examine the effects of scale on inferences, we repeated all spatial modelling after aggregating LGAs into 130 composite districts, subject to the constraints of state boundaries, producing a more even area distribution (median 6826 km^2 , mean 6998 km^2 , range 1641 – 14677 km^2) (n=520, i.e. 130 districts over 4 years). The figure shows the same results as for Figure 3 (main text) at lower spatial resolution: geographical patterns of fitted occurrence (A) and incidence (B), linear fixed effects estimates (C; log odds scale for occurrence, and log scale for incidence; points and error bars denote posterior mean and 95% credible interval) and nonlinear fitted functions of total annual precipitation on occurrence (D) and incidence (E) (lines and shading denote posterior mean and 95% credible interval). All linear covariates were centred and scaled prior to model fitting, so fixed effects are comparable between covariates (i.e. each measure the effect of an increase of 1 standard deviation of the covariate on the response). Parameter estimates are provided in Supp. Table 2.

Supplementary Figure 5: Spatial projection of environmental suitability for Lassa fever occurrence and incidence across Nigeria. Maps show the contributions of climatic and socio-ecological fixed effects to the linear predictor for LF occurrence (top row; log odds scale) and incidence (bottom row; log scale). Projecting combined socioeconomic and environmental effects (left column) or environmental effects alone (climate and agriculture; right column) shows that the broad envelope of LF suitability covers much of Nigeria. However, the heterogeneous observed distribution and high-incidence hotspots in south Nigeria (Edo and Ondo states) are mainly explained by random effects (Supplementary Information Figures 2a and 2c).

Supplementary Figure 6: Seasonal and interannual climate and vegetation dynamics in Lassa-endemic regions of south and north Nigeria. Graphs show, for south (left column) and north (right column) Lassa-endemic areas, state-level weekly mean environmental (temperature, precipitation) and vegetation values across a 60-day window prior to reporting week (i.e. at time of transmission occurring). Separate lines show trends for separate states: Bauchi, Plateau and Taraba (north) and Edo, Ondo and Ebonyi (south). Temperature estimates are daily mean (Tmean; blue), minimum (Tmin) and maximum (Tmax), derived from Climate Prediction Centre interpolated air temperature layers from NOAA. Vegetation estimates are daily mean Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI), derived from 16-day interval EVI rasters from NASA. EVI values below a ~0.2 threshold (dotted line) indicate a lack of dense green vegetation. Precipitation estimates are daily mean rainfall, derived from daily rainfall layers from CHIRPS Africa. SPI3 shows Standardised Precipitation Index: values below 0 (dotted line) reflect drought conditions, and values above 0 reflect wetter conditions, relative to historical observed trends (1981-2020) for the same period of the year.

Supplementary Figure 7: Marginal effects of environment, seasonality and year on temporal Lassa fever incidence. Figures show the relative risk associated with climate and seasonality (A) and reporting and random effects (B) in south and northern states (represented in models by region-specific effects of year and season). Separate lines are exponentiated linear combinations of climate and random effects for each state, and reflect relative LF risk associated with these model components. The left column shows the combination of climatic covariates and seasonal effect (random walk of epidemiological week; see Methods), showing the expected interannual differences in LF risk associated with climate (A). The right column shows the combined effect of state-level, year and travel time to laboratory effects (i.e. random and observation-based) on relative risk, showing the rapid increase in surveillance effort associated with the 2017-19 period.

Supplementary Figure 8: Retrospective out-of-sample predictions for temporal models of Lassa fever incidence. Trend graphs show, for each state, the weekly observed confirmed LF cases (grey bars), and out-of-sample (OOS) predictions from the final climate-driven model. Red line shows the posterior median and shaded areas show the OOS 95% simulated posterior predictive interval (see Methods), calculated using 2500 samples drawn from the joint posterior. Across the entire surveillance period, the climate-driven model reduced predictive error relative to a baseline model (Table 1). Calibration was good overall although predictions were generally slightly overdispersed relative to observed cases, for both southern (90% of observations falling within 95% predictive interval; 79% falling within the 67% predictive interval) and northern states (97% of observations within 95% interval; 91% within 67% interval).

Supplementary Figure 9: Prospective predictions of Lassa fever case incidence for 2020. Graphs show, for each state, the comparison of observed weekly case counts in 2020 (grey bars) and predicted cases from baseline and climate-driven models. Lines show the posterior median predicted value for baseline (pink) and climate-driven (blue) models, and shaded area shows the 95% posterior predictive interval from the climate-driven model, both calculated using 2500 samples drawn from the joint posterior. Predictions hold all random effects at 2019 levels (i.e. assume the same effect of year). Both models substantially underpredict total cases observed (see Results), potentially because neither captures ongoing improvements in surveillance sensitivity.

 $-$ Baseline $-$ Climate

Supplementary Table 1: Clinical definitions used for diagnosis of suspected and

confirmed Lassa fever cases. Clinical definitions and criteria are listed in weekly Nigeria Centre for Disease Control Lassa fever Situation Reports¹.

Supplementary Table 2: Metrics of model fit for spatial Lassa fever occurrence and incidence models. Tables show the comparison of model information criteria (Deviance Information Criterion DIC and Watanabe-Akaike Information Criterion WAIC) between baseline random-effects only models, and models with socio-ecological and climate covariates (model results shown in Figure 3). Occurrence models were specified with a binomial likelihood (modelling annual presence-absence of Lassa fever) and incidence models were specified with a zero-inflated Poisson likelihood and an offset for log population (modelling annual incidence of Lassa fever).

Supplementary Table 3: Parameter estimates from the spatial models of Lassa fever occurrence and incidence. Tables show posterior marginal fixed effects parameter and hyperparameter estimates (median and 95% credible interval) from models of annual Lassa fever occurrence and incidence at LGA-level (occurrence n=774 LGAs over 4 years) and at aggregated district level (n=130 districts over 4 years). Occurrence was modelled using a binomial error distribution so estimates are on the log-odds scale, and incidence with zeroinflated Poisson (log link) so estimates are on the natural logarithmic scale. All fixed effect covariates were scaled (mean 0, sd 1) prior to model fitting so parameter estimates reflect the effect of a change in 1 scaled unit (standard deviation) of the covariate on the response variable (Methods).

Supplementary Table 4: Lassa-fever endemic states included in the temporal models.

The table shows the name and state of each spatially aggregated district included in temporal incidence models, the local government authorities (LGAs) within each district and the total number of confirmed cases detected across all years of surveillance. Cases from 2012-2016 are from the Weekly Epidemiological Reports regime, and from 2017-2019 are from the NCDC Situation Reports surveillance regime.

Supplementary Table 5: Data sources for all covariates included in analyses. The table includes the sources and rationale (hypothesis) for inclusion of covariates in spatial and spatiotemporal models of Lassa fever incidence across Nigeria. Modelling is described in full in Methods.

