

Risk factors associated with malaria infection along China-Myanmar border: a case-control study

Jian-Wei Xu (✉ xjw426@163.com)

Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases, Yunnan Provincial Centre of Malaria Research, Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases Innovative Team of Key Techniques for Vector Borne Disease Control and Prevention, Training Base of International Scientific Exchange and Education in Tropical Diseases for South and Southeast Asia

Dao-Wei Deng

Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases, Yunnan Provincial Centre of Malaria Research, Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases Innovative Team of Key Techniques for Vector Borne Disease Control and Prevention, Training Base of International Scientific Exchange and Education in Tropical Diseases for South and Southeast Asia

Chun Wei

Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases, Yunnan Provincial Centre of Malaria Research, Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases Innovative Team of Key Techniques for Vector Borne Disease Control and Prevention, Training Base of International Scientific Exchange and Education in Tropical Diseases for South and Southeast Asia

Xing-Wu Zhou

Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases, Yunnan Provincial Centre of Malaria Research, Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases Innovative Team of Key Techniques for Vector Borne Disease Control and Prevention, Training Base of International Scientific Exchange and Education in Tropical Diseases for South and Southeast Asia

Jian-Xiong Li

Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases, Yunnan Provincial Centre of Malaria Research, Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases Innovative Team of Key Techniques for Vector Borne Disease Control and Prevention, Training Base of International Scientific Exchange and Education in Tropical Diseases for South and Southeast Asia

Research Article

Keywords: Malaria, Risk factors, Cross-border collaboration, China, Myanmar, Greater Mekong Subregion

Posted Date: April 5th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1515344/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: The World Health Organization (WHO) has certificated China malaria free, but imported malaria is a continuous challenge in preventing reintroduction of malaria in the border area of China. Understanding risk factors of malaria along China-Myanmar border is benefit for preventing reintroduction of malaria in China and achieving the WHO's malaria elimination goal in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS).

Methods: This is a case-control study with one malaria case matched to two controls, in which cases were microscopy-confirmed malaria patients and controls were feverish people with microscopy-excluded malaria. A matched logistic regression analysis (LRA) was used to identify risk factors associated with malaria infection.

Results: From May 2016 through October 2017, the study recruited 223 malaria cases (152 in China and 71 in Myanmar) and 446 controls (304 in China and 142 in Myanmar). All the 152 cases recruited in China were imported malaria. Independent factors associated with malaria infection were overnight out of home in one month prior to attendance of health facilities (adjusted odd ratio [AOR] 13.37, 95% confidence interval [CI] 6.32-28.28, $P < 0.0001$), staying overnight in rural lowland and foothill (AOR 2.73, 95% CI 1.45-5.14, $P = 0.0019$), staying overnight at altitude $< 500\text{m}$ (AOR 5.66, 95% CI 3.01-10.71, $P < 0.0001$) and streamlets $\leq 100\text{m}$ (AOR 9.98, 95% CI 4.96-20.09, $P < 0.0001$) in the border areas of Myanmar; and people lacking of knowledge of malaria transmission (AOR 2.17, 95% CI 1.42-3.32, $P = 0.0004$).

Conclusions: Malaria transmission is highly focalized in lowland and foothill in the border areas of Myanmar. The risk factors associated with malaria infection are overnight staying out of home, at low altitude areas, proximity to streamlets and lack of knowledge of malaria transmission. To prevent reintroduction of malaria transmission in China and achieve the WHO's malaria elimination goal in the GMS Subregion, cross-border collaboration is continuously necessary, and health education is sorely needed for people in China to maintain their malaria knowledge and vigilance, and in Myanmar to improve their ability to apply personal protection.

Background

Malaria is an anopheline mosquito-borne parasitic disease and has closely been accompanied with human being from beginning human history [1]. However, malaria continuously remains one of main global public health threats. Due to service disruptions during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, there were an estimated 241 million malaria cases in 2020, increased from 227 million in 2019, and malaria deaths increased by 12% compared with 2019, to an estimated 627 thousand [2]. The goal of the World Health Organization (WHO) is to eliminate malaria in all countries of in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) by 2030 [3]. Cross-border malaria transmission keeps a regional impediment towards malaria elimination in the GMS [4]. China Yunnan is a unique province with malaria ecology and vector system similar to those of five other countries in the GMS. The investigation of risk factors of

border malaria can provide scientific evidences in planning malaria elimination in the GMS. After the national malaria programme and its partners dedicated efforts for seven decades, the WHO certified China malaria-free status on June 30, 2021 [5]. However, Yunnan Province in southwestern China shares 4060 km of border with Myanmar (1997 km), Laos (710 km) and Vietnam (1353 km). The interruption of malaria transmission in the north of Vietnam has been reported [6, 7]. A rapid progress, malaria control towards subnational elimination goals has also reported in the northern Laos [8]. Imported malaria threat from Vietnam and Lao PDR is therefore slight to China [9]. Malaria was also effectively controlled in most parts of the China-Myanmar border [10]. However, Yunnan borders Myanmar's five local ethnic special regions that are out of the central governmental management of Myanmar Union. Some parts of the special regions, such as Kachin Special Region II (KR2) and Kongkang Autonomous Regions, are currently in military conflicts. Health services of the Ethnic Health Organizations are too weak to be able to control malaria effectively in the border area of Myanmar. Malaria is still high endemic in some border areas of Myanmar. Movement of both the human population and anopheline mosquitoes infected with *Plasmodium spp.* can cause cross-border malaria transmission [11]. Knowing risk factors of malaria infection well along the China-Myanmar border area is helpful in preventing reintroduction of malaria transmission.

In malaria elimination setting, malaria is increasingly imported, caused by *Plasmodium vivax*, and clustered demographically in adult men with shared epidemiological risk factors [12]. In high endemic situation, risk factors can be investigated through representative cross sectional surveys. However, in the situation of low malaria transmission, the sectional survey is unlikely to adequately identify cases and risk factors because the sectional surveys are unlikely to adequately detect cases [13]. Case-control study is a well-established tool to investigate rare diseases and identify associated demographic, behavioral, and clinical risk factors, being particularly appropriate for rare diseases. As yet, this method has not been extensively used to the epidemiological study of malaria, which has mostly been investigated in high-endemic settings [14]. To further understand risk factors of malaria infection along the China-Myanmar border, a case-control study was conducted to investigate factors associated malaria infection in five prefectures of Yunnan Province in China and a hospital in the KR2 of Myanmar.

Methods

Study design and sample size

The study was a case-control design with one malaria case matched to two controls. The malaria cases were diagnosed by microscopy and the control were confirmed malaria free by microscopy too. They are febrile patients who attended the same health facility within a week. To mitigate the potential confounding of age, sex and health status, the controls were matched on the basis of age (± 5 years), gender and health status without complicated diseases. The intended sample size was calculated by using a 95% two-sided confidence level, 80% power, 20% of cases with exposure and 10% of controls with exposure in Epi Info 7.0 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, USA). The sample size calculated was at least a total of 158 cases and 316 controls.

Study site

In order to recruit enough number of malaria cases for this study, the study covered border areas of five prefectures, namely, Dehong, Baoshan, Lincang, Pu'er and Xishuangbanna in China and the KR2 based on the epidemiology of malaria [10–11, 14–26] (Fig. 1). The Laiza City and nearby areas in the KR2 of Myanmar is the hottest spot of malaria along the China-Myanmar border [11]. In China, more than 80% of malaria cases in Yunnan Province in recent five years were imported from the Laiza City and nearby areas. Yingjiang County of Dehong Prefecture neighbouring the Laiza City and nearby areas reported more than one third of Yunnan's imported malaria cases in recent five years [25, 26]. The subjects of this study were enrolled from 37 health facilities in China's five border prefectures and Myanmar's Laiza City Hospital (Fig. 1). Microscopy for malaria parasites is well performed in all these 38 health facilities. The study sites selected in China were former hyperendemic areas where are at a high risk of reestablishing malaria transmission due to the presently existing vectors.

Laboratory diagnosis and structure interview

Microscopy for malaria parasites is one of their normal test items in the selected health facilities. A finger or earlobe prick in febrile patients was performed to generate blood smears. The blood slides were stained with Giemsa for microscopy. The malaria cases were recruited from microscopy-confirmed malaria patients between May 2016 and October 2017, meanwhile, the feverish people with microscopy-excluded malaria were enrolled as controls after informed consent obtained. The blood slides were reread by an expert microscopist with the WHO malaria microscopy level one certificate for the secondary confirmation. A paper-based questionnaire was administered to the subjects in Mandarin in China's health facilities and in Kachin ethnical language in the Laiza City Hospital of Myanmar. The questionnaire has 36 questions, covering demographics, occupation, activities, travel, housing condition, local ecology, socio-economic status, behavior, malaria awareness and knowledge, and preventive measures. In the questionnaire, details of principal household components were recorded to construct a family wealth index (FWI) (Table 1) [27–30].

Table 1
Principal components for construction of the family wealth index (FWI)

FWI	Housing characteristics	Transportation tools	Family belongings
1 Most poor	Bamboo walls and sheet iron roofs	None	None or chickens
2 Mid low	Wood walls and sheet iron roofs	Bicycles	Pigs or goats
3 Middle	Brick walls, wood girders and terracotta roofs	Motorcycles	Cattle or horses
4 Mid high	Brick concrete walls and terracotta roofs	Tractors	TV sets or refrigerators
5 Least poor	Steel and concrete	Cars	Shops or elephants

Statistical analysis

Data were entered and cleaned in Excel 2007, and then were analyzed in Epi Info 7.2. The statistical associations were based on matched analyses. For the case and the control group, the frequency and its 95% confidence interval (CI) of each predictor variable were calculated, and then compared using a Fisher exact χ^2 test. A multivariate logistic regression analysis (LRA) was used to identify risk factors associated with malaria infection. In modeling strategy, the independent variables of univariate logistic analysis were items with values of $P < 0.10$ in the chi-squared Fisher's exact test between the cases and the controls. The independent variables were included in the multivariate LRA model if they had a value of $p < 0.25$ in the univariate LRA. Non-response answers were treated as missing value and therefore excluded from the analyses [14, 31]. The data of subjects recruited in China and Myanmar were analysed, respectively. And then the same methodology was used to analyse the data of the overall subjects. The risk factors of malaria infection were finally determined by across comparing the results from the three analyses (for subjects enrolled in China and Myanmar, and the combined).

Results

Subjects' characteristics

A total of 223 malaria cases and 446 matched controls were recruited to participate in the study. All 152 malaria cases enrolled in China were imported based on the China Information System for Disease Control and Prevention. A total of 304 matched controls were recruited in the same health facilities. Of the 152 cases, 141(92.7%) were *Plasmodium vivax* malaria and 10 (6.6%) *P. falciparum* and 1 (0.7%) mixed infection of *P. vivax* and *P. falciparum*; 120 (79.0%) cases were male; only 10(6.6%) cases were < 16 years old, 138 (90.8%) aged 16–59 years old and 4 (2.6%) aged > 60 years old (Additional file Table 1). A total of 71 cases and 142 matched controls were enrolled from the Laiza City Hospital in the KR2 of

Myanmar. Of the 71 cases, 69 (97.2%) were *Plasmodium vivax* malaria, 1(1.4%) *P. falciparum* and 1 (1.4%) mixed infection of *P. vivax* and *P. falciparum*; 46 (64.8%) cases were male; 17 (24.0%) cases were < 16 years old, 53(74.6%) aged 16–59 years old and 1 (1.4%) aged > 60 years old (Additional file Table 2). Among overall 669 research subjects, 489 (73.1%) were male and 180 (26.9%) female; and mean age was 30.6 years old (median: 29.0, range: 1–76). Most of the 223 cases were young male adults, and the 446 controls were matched by age and gender. Of the 223 confirmed malaria case patients, 210 (94.2%) cases were *Plasmodium vivax* malaria, 11(4.9%) *P. falciparum*, 2 (0.9%) mixed infection of *P. vivax* and *P. falciparum*; 163 (73.1%) cases were male; 27 (12.1%) cases were < 16 years old, 191 (85.7%) aged 16–59 years old and 5 (2.2%) aged > 60 years old (Additional file Table 3).

Risk factors of malaria cases enrolled in China

The malaria case group and the control group were similar in terms of demographics, proportions living in towns, residence proximity to forest, vector control measures, knowledge of malaria prevention, and engagement in trading, road- building and mining, sight-seeing and lumbering activities in one month prior to enrolling into the study ($P > 0.10$) (Additional file Table 2). The matched univariate and multivariate LRA identified five independent risk factors associated with malaria infection from subjects recruited in China. Two of the risk factors were overnight in Myanmar (adjusted odd ratio [AOR] 30.31, 95% confidence interval [CI] 15.42–59.58, $P < 0.0001$) and overnight out of home (AOR 69.71, 95%CI 8.59–261.47, $P < 0.0001$) in the one month prior to enrolling into the study. Three of the risk factors were staying overnight in rural lowland and foothill (AOR 3.05, 95%CI 1.59–5.84, $P = 0.0008$), staying overnight at altitude < 500m (AOR 4.59, 95%CI 2.35–8.97, $P < 0.0001$) and staying overnight nearby streamlets ($\leq 100\text{m}$) (AOR 8.08, 95%CI 2.23–29.25, $P = 0.0015$) for malaria cases in Myanmar in the one month prior to attendance of health facilities (Table 2).

Table 2
Risk factors associated malaria infection on the Yunnan border. China

Factors	OR (95%CI)	P value	AOR (95%CI)	P value
School education \leq 6 years	1.72(1.14–2.60)	0.0103	1.20 (0.55–2.61)	0.6476
Family wealth index < 3	2.56 (1.70–3.86)	< 0.0001	1.55 (0.70–3.45)	0.2798
Residence ecology in one month prior to attendance of health facilities				
Overnight in Myanmar	35.90(20.53–62.79)	< 0.0001	30.31 (15.42–59.58)	< 0.0001
Overnight out of home	129.89 (58.91–286.36)	< 0.0001	69.71 (8.59–261.47)	< 0.0001
Rural lowland and foothill	2.56 (1.69–3.87)	< 0.0001	3.05 (1.59–5.84)	0.0008
Altitude < 500m	7.59(4.89–11.77)	< 0.0001	4.59 (2.35–8.97)	< 0.0001
Water body \leq 100m	9.40 (4.61–19.17)	< 0.0001	1.22 (0.005–331.49)	0.9446
Streamlets \leq 100m	37.95 (15.94–90.37)	< 0.0001	8.08 (2.23–29.25)	0.0015
Proximity to shrub grass and forest	4.80 (3.14–7.35)	< 0.0001	1.53 (0.78–2.99)	0.2116
Wood and thatched houses or cottages	40.21(16.86–95.88)	< 0.0001	2.20 (0.47–10.40)	0.3201
No screened windows and doors	8.77 (4.29–17.96)	< 0.0001	5.80 (0.31–110.16)	0.2419
No measures against mosquito bite	1.05 (0.68–1.64)	0.8208	-	-
Use of untreated nets	0.9465 (0.63–1.41)	0.5489	-	-
Working as day laborers	1.3261 (0.44–31)	0.5656	-	-
Building houses, visiting relatives and friends	4.49 (2.47–8.16)	< 0.0001	1.79 (0.80–3.98)	0.1553
Don't know malaria symptoms	0.62 (0.40–0.97)	0.0347	0.62 (0.24–1.60)	0.3269

Note: OR, odd ratio; CI, confidence interval; AOR, adjusted odd ratio.

Factors	OR (95%CI)	P value	AOR (95%CI)	P value
Don't know malaria transmission	1.47 (0.95–2.27)	0.0829	1.69 (0.72–3.97)	0.2287
No consideration of prevention prior to entering endemic areas	2.63 (1.57–4.39)	0.0002	10.02 (0.99–101.30)	0.0509
Non co-decision	5.10 (2.44–10.65)	< 0.0001	1.36 (0.02–99.57)	0.8894
Availability of foreigners nearby home	2.36 (1.51–3.69)	0.0002	2.98 (0.32–27.74)	0.3375
Note: OR, odd ratio; CI, confidence interval; AOR, adjusted odd ratio.				

Risk factors of malaria cases enrolled in Myanmar

The case group and control group were similar in terms of demographics, FWI, nationality, country overnight in one month prior to enrolling into the study, proximity of vegetation, screens of windows and doors, types of bed nets used, knowledge of malaria prevention ($P > 0.10$) (Additional file Table 2). The matched univariate and multivariate LRA identified four independent risk factors associated with malaria infection from subjects enrolled in Myanmar, namely, staying overnight out of home in one month prior to attendance of health facilities (AOR 2.72, 95%CI 1.40–5.29, $P = 0.0033$), staying overnight in Laiza city (AOR 3.44, 95%CI 1.55–7.64, $P = 0.0023$), staying overnight at altitude $< 500\text{m}$ (AOR 2.81, 95%CI 1.21–6.51, $P = 0.0161$) and streamlets $\leq 100\text{m}$ (AOR 4.63, 95%CI 1.04–20.57, $P = 0.0441$) (Table 3). The Laiza city is located in a mountain valley with an altitude from 230 to 260m and nearby a river and a few of streamlets. Staying in the Laiza city and nearby areas is at a high risk of malaria infection.

Table 3
Risk factors associated malaria infection in Kachin Special region II, Myanmar

Factors	OR (95%CI)	P value	AOR (95%CI)	P value
Overnight out of home	3.37(1.82–6.3)	0.0001	2.72(1.40–5.29)	0.0033
Laiza city	2.95(1.54–5.62)	0.0011	3.44(1.55–7.64)	0.0023
Altitude < 500m	4.1300(1.96–8.71)	0.0002	2.81(1.21–6.51)	0.0161
Streamlets ≤ 100m	2.80(1.35–5.83)	0.0058	4.63(1.04–20.57)	0.0441
Wood, earth and thatched houses or cottages	0.33(0.17–0.64)	0.0009	0.65(0.30–1.41)	0.2753
Not using bed nets	0.36(0.13–0.98)	0.05	0.93(0.29–2.96)	0.8938
Don't know malaria transmission	1.81(0.94–3.45)	0.0744	1.44(0.61–3.46)	0.4082
Don't know nearby endemic areas	0.38(0.20–0.75)	0.0053	0.56(0.23–1.40)	0.2136
No consideration of prevention	0.53(0.30–0.94)	0.0429	0.97(0.49–2.65)	0.9944
Senior member decision	1.143(0.33–3.90)	0.8313	-	-
Note: OR, odd ratio; CI, confidence interval; AOR, adjusted odd ratio.				

Risk factors of overall malaria cases

Among overall combined subjects enrolled in China and Myanmar, the case malaria group and the control group were similar in terms of demographics, education, knowledge and awareness in malaria prevention ($P > 0.10$). The matched univariate and multivariate LRA identified six independent risk factors associated with malaria infection from the overall subjects enrolled in this study. Five of the risk factors were as same as identified from the subsample recruited in China, namely, staying overnight in Myanmar in one month prior to attendance of health facilities (AOR11.25, 95%CI 5.32–23.79, $P < 0.0001$), staying overnight out of home(AOR13.37, 95%CI 6.32–28.28, $P < 0.0019$), especially staying in rural lowland and foothill (AOR2.73, 95%CI 1.45–5.14, $P = 0.0441$), staying overnight at altitude < 500m (AOR5.66, 95%CI 3.01–10.71, $P < 0.0001$) and proximity (≤ 100 m) of streamlets(AOR9.98, 95%CI 4.96–20.09, $P < 0.0001$). Due to increased sample size, the variable of no knowledge of malaria transmission, namely, the malaria

cases lacking knowledge of mosquitoes transmitting malaria as compared to the controls, was identified as one of risk factors associated with malaria infection (AOR2.17, 95%CI 1.42–3.32, P = 0.0004).

Table 4
Risk factors associated malaria infection along China-Myanmar border

Factors	OR (95%CI)	P value	AOR (95%CI)	P value
Family wealth index < 3	0.60(0.33–1.06)	0.0856	0.43(0.15–1.26)	0.1237
Non-Chinese	5.57(2.37–13.08)	0.0001	3.01 (0.64–14.17)	0.1633
Residence ecology in one month prior to attendance of health facilities				
Overnight in Myanmar	20.75(10.86–39.65)	< 0.0001	11.25(5.32–23.79)	< 0.0001
Overnight out of home	18.02(10.77–30.16)	< 0.0001	13.37(6.32–28.28)	< 0.0001
Rural lowland and foothill	2.9485 (2.06–4.22)	< 0.0001	2.73(1.45–5.14)	0.0019
Altitude < 500m	12.05(6.89–21.09)	< 0.0001	5.66(3.01–10.71)	< 0.0001
Water body ≤ 100m	10.95(5.31–22.59)	< 0.0001	1.25 (0.08–18.34)	0.8737
Streamlets ≤ 100m	10.5250 (5.78–19.16)	< 0.0001	9.98 (4.96–20.09)	< 0.0001
Proximity to shrub grass and forest	4.24(2.74–6.56)	< 0.0001	2.70(0.69–10.65)	0.1549
Wood and thatched houses or cottages	4.67(3.22–6.77)	< 0.0001	0.53(0.20–1.38)	0.1928
No screened windows and doors	4.51 (2.56–7.94)	< 0.0001	1.39(0.26–7.49)	0.7023
No measures against mosquito bite	0.85 (0.55–1.30)	0.4481	-	-
Stable salary income	1.20 (0.74–1.91)	0.4658	-	-
Farming, building and visiting relatives and friends	3.07 (1.87–5.03)	< 0.0001	1.21 (0.51–2.83)	0.6657
Don't know malaria symptoms	0.53 (0.35–0.81)	0.0030	0.47(0.18–1.19)	0.1100
Don't know malaria transmission	1.69 (1.17–2.45)	0.0054	2.17 (1.42–3.32)	0.0004
Don't know nearby endemic areas	0.52 (0.34–0.79)	0.0019	0.64(0.26–1.56)	0.3210

Note: OR, odd ratio; CI, confidence interval; AOR, adjusted odd ratio.

Factors	OR (95%CI)	P value	AOR (95%CI)	P value
Senior member or husband decision	2.99 (1.76–5.08)	0.0001	1.10(0.44–2.74)	0.8347
Availability of foreigners nearby home	2.95 (1.93–4.50)	< 0.0001	1.12(0.46–2.75)	0.8048

Note: OR, odd ratio; CI, confidence interval; AOR, adjusted odd ratio.

Discussion

Risk factors of malaria infection

The low altitude leads to hot temperature and adequate precipitation and then abundant breeding sites of anopheline mosquitoes in the China-Myanmar border area. All results of former investigations documented that people in low altitude areas were at a high risk factor of malaria infection. A retrospective case-control study suggested that independent risk factors associated with malaria infection were overnight in the lowland, foothill and half-hill areas, and near anopheline mosquito breeding sites in the China-Myanmar border area. [14]. A cross-sectional study reported that independent risk factors for slide positivity were age, lower altitude, lack of knowledge about malaria transmission and symptoms, inaction against mosquito bites and delayed treatment-seeking in the Salween river valley of Shan Special Region II (SR2), northern Myanmar [16]. In this study, the comparison of the multivariate LRA results between the subjects recruited in China and Myanmar indicated that the risk factors associated with malaria infection were mainly overnight out of home in the one month prior to illness, staying in rural lowland and foothill, staying at altitude <500m and streamlets ≤100m in the border areas of Myanmar. For the subsample enrolled in China, the overnight in Myanmar was a part of overnight out of home. For the subsample enrolled in Myanmar, the Laiza city and nearby areas was altitude <500m and streamlets ≤100m, staying in the Laiza city and nearby areas was therefore at a high risk of malaria infection. The LRA result of the overall sample indicated that no knowledge of malaria transmission was a risk factor of malaria infection due to the increased sample size. The proportion of case-patients with knowledge of malaria transmission (67.3%) was lower than that of controls (77.6%) (P=0.0055). This indicates that health education on malaria should be necessary for people in both China and Myanmar. The public health in China should maintain people's malaria knowledge and vigilance, and remind people using personal protection against malaria infection when they are in the endemic areas of other countries. Cross-border workers should be educated on preventive measures for malaria through effective behavior change communication [25].

Malaria along China-Myanmar border and other parts in Southeast Asia

In most areas of the Southeast Asia, the year-round high rainfall and temperatures, and abundant malaria vectors lead to persistent and intense malaria transmission. Most parts of the GMS are low latitude and altitude, the year-round high temperatures and rainfall that are suitable for fertility of malaria vectors and

persistent malaria transmission [32]. Forests are traditionally considered as a major determinant of malaria risk in the GMS [33, 34]. In Vietnam a high proportion of malaria cases and deaths were reported in the central mountainous and forested areas [35]. In Myanmar, most of malaria cases were reported to occur in forest or forest fringe areas, and loggers and gem miners were at high risk of malaria [36, 37]. However, the China-Myanmar border areas with altitude from 200m to 5128m are mostly mountainous. The low altitude areas have high temperatures, more mosquito breeding sites and malaria vectors [14]. After malaria was effectively controlled along the China-Myanmar border [10], the major malaria hot spots are the Laiza and its nearby areas of the KR2 [18-19], the Salween river valley of the SR2 [15, 16] and the small golden triangle at China-Myanmar-Laos border in the Mekong River Valley [4, 11] in the northern Myanmar. All the three malaria hot spots are at low altitude. The two former investigations [14, 16] and this study did not identify malaria in association with forest in the northern Myanmar. This suggests that the heterogeneity and complexity of malaria should be recognized and considered in planning control and elimination programmes in the GMS [38].

Malaria epidemiological characteristics along China-Myanmar border

In eliminating settings, malaria cases are increasingly male, adult, clustered geographically, imported among migrant and other hard-to reach groups, and caused by *P. vivax* [12, 14]. All of 152 case-patients recruited in China were imported among migrant, and most of them were male, adult and *P. vivax* malaria. In the chi square test, the proportions of male and aged ≥ 16 year old case-patients recruited in China were significantly higher than the proportions of these case-patients recruited in Myanmar (male, $\chi^2=7.4081$, $P=0.0065$; age, $\chi^2=12.1295$, $P=0.0060$). However, the proportions of *P. vivax* between two subsamples were not significant ($\chi^2=1.0111$, $P=0.3146$). When the high percentage of *P. vivax* malaria indicated the success in control of *P. falciparum* malaria [10], it documents the difficulty in control of *P. vivax* malaria [18]. *P. vivax* malaria is one of challenges for malaria elimination in the GMS.

Implications

The WHO certification of malaria elimination requires applicant countries to provide evidence that 1) local malaria transmission has been fully interrupted, resulting in zero indigenous human malaria cases for at least the past three consecutive years (36 months), and 2) an adequate program for preventing reintroduction of malaria transmission is fully functional throughout the country [39, 40]. The last indigenous malaria case in China was reported from Yingjiang County in the Yunnan border area in April 2016 [41]. Malaria elimination in the Yunnan border area has strongly contributed to the remarkable achievement that the WHO certified China malaria-free status on June 30, 2021 [5, 11]. The results of this study helped public health decision-makers planning cost-effective strategies of malaria elimination gearing to the high risk location and populations [11]. However, the Yunnan border area is still challenged by reintroduction of malaria transmission. The threat of imported malaria from the border areas of Myanmar will continuously exist for a long time. With understanding the local risk factors of malaria infection, the “3+1” strategy for intensive surveillance, rapid response and border collaboration for malaria elimination was developed to reduce the threat of imported malaria for malaria elimination and

prevention of malaria transmission reintroduction in the Yunnan border area [11]. Reduced border collaboration of malaria had ever led to slightly resurgent malaria in some border areas of Myanmar since 2014 [11, 15, 18]. The Laiza and nearby areas of the KR2 with a population of approximately 30 thousand persons is one of the malaria hotspot areas along China-Myanmar border due to the risk factors presented in this paper and the weak health services [11]. The number of malaria cases increased from 518 in 2013 to 2,367 in 2016 in the Laiza and nearby areas. The strengthened collaborative interventions between China and Myanmar during 2017-2019 reduced the number of malaria cases to 274 in 2019 [11]. However, reduced collaborative interventions due to the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic led to malaria resurgence again. A total of 1,532 cases were reported in the Laiza and nearby areas of KR2 in 2021. This led to most of malaria cases in Yunnan were imported from the Laiza and nearby areas in 2021. The Yunnan borders Myanmar's five special regions that are out of the central governmental management of Myanmar Union. The military conflicts and the weak health services cannot effectively control malaria in the five special regions. In cross-border collaboration of malaria control, the risk factors presented in this paper can be considered to plan cost-effective strategies.

Limitations

This study has certain weaknesses, which might be the limitations of the case-control study itself too. 1) To mitigate the confounding effect, controls were matched with age, sex, healthy status and health facilities. The matching criteria make the study lose the chance to identify whether they are an independent risk or confounding factors of malaria infection. 2) Because the Laiza and nearby areas are the main malaria hot spot that exported most of malaria cases (>80%) detected in Yunnan Province, this study only recruited the subjects from the Laiza city hospital in Myanmar. Due to malaria scarceness, the subjects were enrolled from 37 health facilities in China. The large difference in the number of health facilities involved in this study between China and Myanmar is one of weakness. However, the case-patients recruited in China were imported from most parts of the border areas of Myanmar. This would not lead to selection bias. 3) Owing to a few of non-malaria febrile patients with overnight history in Myanmar, among the 304 controls recruited in China, 259 (85.2%) had no overnight history in Myanmar in the one month before attendance of health facilities. The high proportion of non-malaria febrile patients without overnight history in Myanmar might influence assessment of other potential risk factors. However, this can document that overnight in Myanmar is an obvious risk factor for Chinese people. 4) The subjects were only recruited in the health facilities. If some patients just bought anti-malarial drugs from the drug stores for malaria treatment and the self-medication worked, they might not seek diagnosis and treatment in the health facilities. This occasion might lead to exclusion of them from the study and selection bias. However, with reduction of malaria burden, anti-malarial drugs are disappearing from drug stores because of losing chance of making money. This leads to anti-malarial drugs mainly available in the public health facilities in China. The chance of the selection bias should be small. 5) Some participants declined to answer certain questions that they thought of as sensitive, this might cause responding bias. 6) To avoid recall bias, most of variables were defined to collect information in the one month prior to attendance of health facilities. This may miss to collect enough valuable information.

Conclusion

All malaria cases were infected in Myanmar. The Laiza and nearby areas are the dominant reservoirs of malaria parasites along China-Myanmar border. *P. vivax* is the dominant malaria parasites, and most malaria patients are male and adult. The independent risk factors of malaria infection were overnight out of home, staying in rural lowland and foothill, low altitude areas and nearby local vector breeding sites in the border areas of Myanmar; and subjects lacking knowledge of malaria transmission. To prevent reintroduction of malaria transmission in China and achieve the WHO malaria elimination goal in the GMS, cross-border collaboration is continuously necessary. Health education is sorely needed for people in China to maintain their malaria knowledge and vigilance, and in Myanmar to promote their ability to apply personal protection.

Abbreviations

AOR: Adjusted odds ratio; CI: Confidence interval; COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019; WHO: World Health Organization; GMS: Greater Mekong Subregion; KR2: Kachin Special Region II; FWI: Family wealth index; LRA: Logistic regression analysis; SR2: Shan Special Region II.

Declarations

Acknowledgements

We thank all participants for their contribution of time and patience in the study. We would like to thank Dr Liu Hui from Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases for her coordination of the investigation and Ms Li Huiqiong from Yunnan Simao Sanmu Group for the entry of the data. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the above-mentioned organizations and people.

Authors' contributions

JWX conceived the study idea, analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. JWX, DWD, CW, XWZ and JXL contributed towards the study design, data interpretation and rigorous manuscript review. All authors read, discussed and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81560543 and 81673113).

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The ethical approval of study (YIPDEA 201502) was granted by the Ethics Committee of the Yunnan Institute of Parasitic Diseases in China. The study was also approved by the Department of Health of the Kachin Independence Organization, Myanmar. The ethical approval documented a verbal consent procedure as sufficient because microscopy for malaria parasites is the golden standard for malaria diagnosis and one of normal test items in these health facilities, and the study was interviewed-based. According to the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki, the purpose and procedures of the study were explained and disclosed to the participants before obtaining their verbal informed consent. For the child participants, a statement that verbal informed consent was obtained from their parent or guardian. The questionnaire was administered following a verbal informed consent. Participation was entirely voluntary, and participants could pass on a question, take a break or withdraw their consent from the study without providing any explanation at any time. Their continued consent was assumed if they did not refuse to answer questions.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

References

1. Alonso, P.L., Tanner, M. Public health challenges and prospects for malaria control and elimination. *Nat. Med.* 2013; 19, 150–155.
2. WHO. World Malaria Report 2020. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2021. Accessed 3 Mar 2021.
3. WHO. Strategy for malaria elimination in the Greater Mekong Subregion: 2015– 2030. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2015. Accessed 27 Feb 2016.
4. Geng T, Malla P, Zhang Q, Xu S, Li C, Zhao Y, et al. Increasing trends of malaria in a border area of the Greater Mekong Subregion. *Malar J.* 2019; 18:309 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-019-2924-6>.
5. Cao J, Newby G, Cotter C, Hsiang M, Larson E, Tatarsky A, et al. Achieving malaria elimination in China 2021. *Lancet Public Health* 2021; 6: e871-872.
6. Morillon M, Baudon D, Dai B. Malaria in Vietnam in 1996: brief synthesis of epidemiological data. *Med Trop (Mars).* 1996; 56:197–200 (in French).
7. Thanh PV, Hong NV, Van NV, Malderen CV, Obsomer V, Urgell AR, et al. Epidemiology of forest malaria in Central Vietnam: the hidden parasite reservoir. *Malaria Journal.* 2015; 14:86.
8. Kounnavong S, Gopinath D, Hongvanthong B, Khamkong C, Sichanthongthip O. Malaria elimination in Lao PDR: the challenges associated with population mobility. *Infectious Diseases of Poverty.* 2017; 6:81.

9. Xu JW, Li JJ, Guo HP, Pu SW, Li SM, Wang RH, et al. Malaria from hyperendemicity to elimination in Hekou County on China–Vietnam border: an ecological study. *Malar J.* 2017; 16:66.
10. Xu JW, Li Y, Yang HL, Zhang J, Zhang ZX, Yang YM, et al. Malaria control along China-Myanmar Border during 2007–2013: an integrated impact evaluation. *Inf Dis Poverty.* 2016; 5:75.
11. Xu JW, Lee R, Lin ZR, Zhou YW, Shen HM, Zhou HN, et al. Intensive surveillance, rapid response and border collaboration for malaria elimination: China Yunnan’s “3 + 1” strategy. *Malar J* 2021;**20**, 396.
12. Cotter C, Sturrock HJ, Hsiang MS, Liu J, Phillips AA, Hwang J, et al. The changing epidemiology of malaria elimination: new strategies for new challenges. *Lancet.* 2013; 382: 900–916.
13. Hsiang MS, Hwang J, Kunene S. Surveillance for malaria elimination in Swaziland: a national cross-sectional study using pooled PCR and serology. *PLoS ONE.*, 2012; 7: e29550.
14. Xu JW, Liu H, Zhang Y, Guo XR, Wang JZ. Risk factors for border malaria in a malaria elimination setting: a retrospective case-control study in Yunnan, China. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2015; 92:546–515.
15. Liu H, Xu JW, Yang HL, Li Mei, Sun CD, Yin YJ, et al. Investigation and control of a *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria outbreak in Shan Special Region II of Myanmar along the China-Myanmar Border from June to December 2014. *Inf Dis Poverty.* 2016; 5:32.
16. Liu H, Xu JW, Xu QZ, Zeng YR. Retrospective analysis of risk factors of slide positivity among febrile patients in the Salween river valley of Shan Special Region II, northern Myanmar. *BMC Public Health.* 2018; 18:560.
17. Xu JW, Liu H. The challenges of malaria elimination in Yunnan Province, People’s Republic of China. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health.* 2012;43: 819–24.
18. Liu H, Xu JW, Bi Y. Malaria burden and treatment targets in Kachin Special Region II, Myanmar from 2008 to 2016: A retrospective analysis. *PLoS ONE.* 2018; 13(4): e0195032. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195032>.
19. Xu JW, Liu, H. The relationship of malaria between Chinese side and Myanmar’s five special regions along China–Myanmar border: a linear regression analysis. *Malar J.* 2016; **15**, 368. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-016-1413-4>.
20. Liu H, Xu JW, Guo, XR. *et al.* Coverage, use and maintenance of bed nets and related influence factors in Kachin Special Region II, northeastern Myanmar. *Malar J.* 2015; **14**: 212. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-015-0727-y>.
21. Liu H, Yang, Hl, Xu, JW *et al.* Artemisinin-naphthoquine combination versus chloroquine-primaquine to treat vivax malaria: an open-label randomized and non-inferiority trial in Yunnan Province, China. *Malar J.* 2013; **12**:409. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-12-409>.
22. Xu JW., Xu QZ., Liu H. *et al.* Malaria treatment-seeking behaviour and related factors of Wa ethnic minority in Myanmar: a cross-sectional study. *Malar J.* 2012; **11**: 417. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-11-417>.
23. Liu H., Yang HL, Tang, LH. *et al.* Monitoring *Plasmodium vivax* chloroquine sensitivity along China-Myanmar border of Yunnan Province, China during 2008–2013. *Malar J.* 2014; **13**:364. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-13-364>.

24. Liu, H., Yang, HL, Tang, LH. *et al.* In vivo monitoring of dihydroartemisinin- piperazine sensitivity in *Plasmodium falciparum* along the China-Myanmar border of Yunnan Province, China from 2007 to 2013. *Malar J.* 2015; **14**: 47. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-015-0584-8>.
25. Zhao X, Thanapongtharm W, Lawawirojwong S, Wei C, Tang Y, Zhou Y, Sun X, et al. Spatiotemporal trends of malaria in relation to economic development and cross-border movement along the China–Myanmar border in Yunnan Province. *Korean J Parasitol.* 2020; 58: 267–278.
26. Zhao X, Lawawirojwong S, Thanapongtharm W, Wei C, Tang Y, Zhou Y, Sun X, et al. Malaria risk map using spatial multi-criteria decision analysis along Yunnan Border during the pre-elimination period. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* 2020; 103:793–809.
27. Vyas S, Kumaranayake L. Constructing socio-economic status indices: how to use principal components analysis. *Health Policy Plan.* 2006; 21: 459–468.
28. Xu J-W, Liu H, Yaw B, Nbw HS. The health beliefs, dengue knowledge and control behaviors among internally displaced persons versus local residents in Kachin Special Region II, Myanmar. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2020; 14(6): e0008321. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008321>.
29. Xu JW, Liu H, Ai D, Yu Y, Yu B. The Shan people’s health beliefs, knowledge and perceptions of dengue in Eastern Shan Special Region IV, Myanmar. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2019; 13(6): e0007498. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0007498>.
30. Liu H, Xu JW, Ai Z, et al. Treatment seeking behavior and associated factors of suspected dengue fever among Shan people in eastern Shan special region IV, Myanmar: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Services Research.* 2020; 20:318. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-05163-z> PMID: 32299436.
31. Ward KA, Spokes PJ, McAnulty JM. Case–control study of risk factors hospitalization caused by pandemic (H1N1) 2009. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2011; 17: 1409–1416.
32. Prothero RM. Malaria, forests and people in Southeast Asia. *Singap J Trop Geogr.* 1999; 20: 76–85.
33. Roll Back Malaria Mekong. Mekong Malaria II: update of malaria, multi-resistance and economic development in the Mekong Region of Southeast Asia. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health.*, 2003; 34 (Suppl): 68–70.
34. Guerra CA, Snow RW, Hay SR. A global assessment of closed forests, deforestation and malaria risk. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 2006; 100:189–204.
35. Erhart A, Thang ND, Ky PV, Tinh TT, Overmeir CV, Speybroeck N, et al. Epidemiology of forest malaria in central Vietnam: a large scale cross-sectional survey. *Malar J.* 2005; 4: 58.
36. Delacollette C, Souza C, Christophe E, Thimasarn K, Abdur R, Bell D, et al. Malaria trends and challenges in the greater Mekong Subregion. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health.*, 2009; 40: 674–691.
37. Dunning J, Aung NKZ, Ward A. *et al.* Key factors associated with malaria infection among patients seeking care through the public sector in endemic townships of Ayeyarwady Region, Myanmar. *Malar J.* 2022; **21**:86. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-022-04088-8>

38. Cui L, Yan G, Sattabongkot J, Cao Y, Chen B, Chen X, et al. Malaria in the Greater Mekong Subregion: heterogeneity and complexity. *Acta Trop.* 2012; 121: 227–239.
39. WHO. Malaria elimination: a field manual for low and moderate endemic countries. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2014. Accessed 20 Feb 2015.
40. WHO. A framework for malaria elimination. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2017. Accessed 20 Feb 2021.
41. Zhao, X., Sun, X., Yang, H., Zhou, D., Yang, J., Guo, T., et al. A report of the last indigenous malaria case in Yunnan (in Chinese). *China Trop Med.* 2020; 20: 325–328.

Figures



Figure 1

Study site locations and number of subjects enrolled at each site.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Additionalfile.docx](#)