**West Nile Virus prediction in Chicago**

**Hanpu Yao**

**MUSA capstone**

**Professor: Jonathan Tannen**

Since the breakout of COVID-19, public health is drawing everybody’s attention. When people around the world are concerned about this never-ending pandemic, we might as well reflect on another public health crisis that broke out in 1999 and hopefully get some insights from disease control, even though they are different. In this article, I analyzed the previous trend of West Nile virus in Chicago and built a model to predict future possible presence of the virus.

**Introduction**

West Nile virus (WNV) is a single-stranded RNA virus that causes West Nile fever, that often breaks out in tropical and temperate regions. It primarily infects birds, but it also infects humans, horses, cats, skunks, squirrels, and domestic rabbits. It is most spread to people by the bite of an infected mosquito.

West Nile virus was first discovered in Uganda in 1937 and is transmitted by domestic mosquitoes.[[1]](#footnote-1) A major epidemic of West Nile virus spread in the population occurred in Israel in 1950. After the Romanian outbreak in the mid-1990s, there were subsequent small outbreaks in Morocco (1996), Tunisia (1997), Italy (1998), and Israel (1998). In particular, the 1998 outbreak in Israel that was fatal to geese and storks was the only flavivirus with the potential to be lethal to poultry.

In the hot summer of 1999 in New York City, several unusual phenomena are gradually being linked together. Crow deaths have begun in large numbers around the city; the eastern end of Long Island has begun to see an unusual outbreak of equine encephalitis; and the illness and death of Chilean flamingos and snowy owls at the Bronx Zoo. Then, encephalitis outbreak among people in Queens. The public health response to the outbreak cannot wait for the results of virus isolation verification, and the mayor of New York City has directed an aggressive, multi-faceted public health intervention in Queens. Mosquito repellent is dispensed, and trucks are sprayed with mosquito repellent at the US Open. But new cases have since emerged in Brooklyn, the Bronx and Manhattan. St. Louis encephalitis, which is common in the Americas, makes little connection between morbidity in humans and mortality in birds. Finally, CDC obtained tissue specimens of dead birds from the USDA NVSL, determined that the virus causing the dead birds was WNV (NY99), and ruled out the possibility of St. Louis encephalitis virus.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Since then, the virus has spread throughout the US, and it is now the leading cause of mosquito-borne disease in the continental United States.

The Chicago Department of Public Health maintains an environmental surveillance program to track the citywide trend of West Nile Virus (WNV). This program includes the collection of mosquitoes from specific traps located throughout the city; the identification and sorting of mosquitoes collected from these traps; and the testing of specific species of mosquitoes for WNV.

Diagram, map

Description automatically generated

Figure 1 All mosquito traps in Chicago city (2007-2021)

**Question**

How to predict the new presence of WNV in Chicago?

**Literature Review**

**Virology and epidemiology**

According to Murray (2011), the most important transmission factors may include: (i) competent mosquito vectors and susceptible hosts on which they depend, (ii) well-suited climatic conditions, and (iii) a reservoir population of flavivirus-naive birds to ensure efficient virus dispersal.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Besides, Moser (2015) demonstrated that mosquito saliva acts in a dose-dependent manner to enhance virus levels in the blood.[[4]](#footnote-4) Based on these researches, we can assume that most WNV infections in human is results from mosquitoes bites.

**Weather**

Paz’s (2015) study found the following: “As predictions show that the current trends are expected to continue, for better preparedness, any assessment of future transmission of WNV should take into consideration the impacts of climate change.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

The study show that climate is an important factor in assessing of transmission of WNV. And different aspects of weather patterns contribute to the presence of WNV in complicated ways.

For example, wind patterns are also relevant to virus spread by carrying mosquitoes with air flows.[[6]](#footnote-6) And in terms of precipitation, as its impact is more indirect in WNV transmission, the findings regarding North America are inconsistent especially when the analyses include different vectors.5

My paper builds on these studies about weather’s impact on virus transmission by wrangling different weather factors.

**Data sources:**

1. West Nile Virus (WNV) Mosquito Test Results[[7]](#footnote-7)

Time range: week 21, 2007 – week 39, 2021

This is the main dataset of this analysis. It is a list of information collected from every trap throughout Chicago. Each observation is a piece of data collected per trap per week. Specifically, there are following features:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Feature Name** | **Description** |
| season\_year | Year of collection |
| week | Week of the year |
| test\_id | Test ID |
| block | Address of the trap |
| trap | Trap ID |
| trap\_type | Trap type |
| test\_date | Test date of the sample |
| number\_of\_mosquitoes | Number of mosquitoes in a certain trap (test pool) |
| result | Pooled test results of a trap. This is the dependent variable of our analysis, which means whether WNV is presence in a certain trap in a certain week. |
| species | Species of mosquitoes in a certain trap (test pool) |
| latitude | Latitude of the trap |
| longitude | Longitude of the trap |
| location | Location of the trap |

Table 1 Data description of traps dataset

1. Weather dataset

Time range: Mar 1, 2007 – Dec 31, 2021

This dataset is provided by NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). It is the daily weather summary data of a station in Chicago midway airport (GHCND: USW00014819)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Code** | **Description** |
| Temperature | TMAX | Maximum temperature |
| TMIN | Minimum temperature |
| TOBS | Temperature at the time of observation |
| Precipitation | PRCP | Precipitation |
| Wind | AWND | Average wind speed |
| WDF2 | Direction of fastest 2-minute wind |
| WSF2 | Fastest 2-minute wind speed |
| Weather Type | WT01 | Fog, ice fog, or freezing fog (may include heavy fog) |
| WT02 | Heavy fog or heaving freezing fog (not always distinguished from fog) |
| WT03 | Thunder |
| WT04 | Ice pellets, sleet, snow pellets, or small hail |
| WT05 | Hail (may include small hail) |
| WT06 | Glaze or rime |
| WT08 | Smoke or haze |
| WT09 | Blowing or drifting snow |
| WT10 | Tornado, waterspout, or funnel cloud" |

Table 2 Data description of weather dataset

1. Locations of water bodies
2. Locations of forests
3. Location of parks
4. 311 request – sanitation violation

**My method**

The research process of my paper consists of following steps:

1. Data Wrangling: To put my features into a model, I synchronize all datasets into a single data frame, with columns of features and rows of one observation per trap per week.
2. Spatial lag features: Create a new spatial lag feature indicating the impact of blowing from nearby traps from previous week
3. Temporal lag features: Create new spatial lag features indicating the impact of positivity of previous 1 and 2 weeks

**Exploratory Analysis**

**Temporal trends**

The Figure 2 shows the monthly trends of number of mosquitoes in a trap in different years. Though in each year the available time ranges vary, the missing months are in cold weather in which I assume there is so few mosquitoes and WNV cases that it can be ignored.

There is an obvious trend that the number of mosquitoes peaks in July or August, which are the hottest months in a year. This is consistent with a common sense that mosquitoes are almost only active in warm weather. Noticeable, in 2007 the peak in August is relatively higher than other years.

**Chart, line chart

Description automatically generated**

Figure 2 Number of mosquitoes over month

Figure 3 shows the trend of positivity. This is highly similar with number of positivity pools, but with a greater rise in almost every August.

**Chart, line chart

Description automatically generated**

Figure 3 Number of positive pools over month

Figure 4 shows the overall situation of positive pools in different years. The blue line is positivity while orange is the 7-day moving average of it. Despite of the monthly pattern that I mention above, there is hardly a yearly trend: it begins with a peak in 2007, and decreases dramatically until the beginning of 2011; then the positivity also witnesses another peak in 2012 which is almost double the one in 2007, following by years without an obvious rising or falling trends. What’s more, in terms of the smoother moving average line, the peak in 2012 is a watershed after which the positivity maintains on a higher platform.

**Chart, histogram

Description automatically generated**

Figure 4 Overall positive pools by week of years

**Sampling bias**

However, do the charts above really represent the real situation in Chicago? In this chapter, I will demonstrate the sampling bias resulted from traps.

Firstly, the inconsistent number of traps in different years bring temporal bias. The mosquitoes are only the sample counted in traps, since it is unrealistic to know the population of all mosquitoes in the city. If there are some issues with traps, the data collection tool, the dataset would be problematic because of systematic error or bias.

Figure 5 shows the total number of traps of different years. The total number of traps is not consistent throughout the years and there are the most traps in 2007 which somehow explains the peak of mosquitoes’ number also in 2007 in Figure 2. Of course, if there are more traps, it is expected to capture more mosquitoes.

Chart, bar chart

Description automatically generated

Figure 5 Number of total traps

Second, different types of traps bring spatial bias. The number of traps is broken down into 4 different types in Figure 6: CDC, GRAVID, OVI and SENTINEL. While there is always relatively large number of GRAVID trap, SENTINEL traps are replacing CDC traps in recent years, and there is only one OVI trap in 2007.


****

Figure 6 Number of traps of different types

This pattern is also reflected in Figure 7, the number of positivity is related to trap types over years to a extent. And SENTINEL traps capture more positivity pools than GRAVID traps, even though there are much fewer SENTINEL traps. This indicates they are essentially different in their ability to capture mosquito samples.

**Chart

Description automatically generated**

Figure 7 Number of positive sample pools by trap types

Table 3 shows different type of traps’ performance in capturing mosquitoes and positivity samples. The tools data collection are clearly different that CDC traps might capture more mosquitoes and SENTINEL traps are more likely to capture more positive mosquitoes. This is a result of their mechanism of attracting mosquitoes.[[8]](#footnote-8)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Trap type** | **Total positivity** | **Total number of mosquitoes** | **Total observations** | **Positivity**  **/**  **Observations** | **Mosquitos**  **/**  **observations** |
| CDC | 79 | 35334 | 1256 | 0.062898 | 28.132166 |
| GRAVID | 2651 | 372014 | 31278 | 0.084756 | 11.893791 |
| OVI | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| SENTINEL | 48 | 6805 | 343 | 0.139942 | 19.83965 |

Table 3 Ability of different trap types

Finally, the location of traps is also a resource of selection bias. Whether the researcher in public health department sets a trap in a park or in the CBD would be very different. With different and uneven spatial features, selection bias from the trap locations is the most complicated.

**Feature engineering**

**Temporal feature**

The test results of each observation of 1- and 2-week lag are also two new features in the data frame.

**Spatial feature**

The first is the distance to spatial features. I collect some spatial features in Chicago city which are the geometries of forests, parks, water bodies and 311 requests of sanitation violation. To wrangle them into the dataset, I calculate the nearest distance from each trap to each type of these spatial features and create some features like “distance to forests”, “distance to water bodies” and so on. Lake Michigan is taken out from water bodies feature and it is wrangled into a separate feature because it is too huge compared to other water bodies.

The second is the spatial lag of traps, which is taking the nearby traps’ impact into consideration. Since mosquitoes are easily carried by wind blowing, I use wind as a factor to create spatial lag. I assume that wind direction and speed in one week before would impact the transmission of WNV. The function is as follow:

Here *i* is the ID of a trap, *j* is the week of the collection, and *n* is the number of traps last week and *k* is the ID of a trap in last week. This means I time the positivity (0 or 1), the number of mosquitoes, wind speed and azimuth decomposed to the direction between two traps, and all this data is from 1 week before.

After the feature engineering, Figure 8 is the final data set.

**Table

Description automatically generated**

Figure 8 final dataset information

**Prediction Models**

There is no much multicollinearity in the dataset according to Figure 9 correlation matrix.

**A picture containing chart

Description automatically generated**

Figure 9 correlation matrix

**Logistic regression**

After standardization of all predictors I run a logistic regression. The result is as followed.

Logit Regression Results

==============================================================================

Dep. Variable: result\_b No. Observations: 15868

Model: Logit Df Residuals: 15840

Method: MLE Df Model: 27

Date: Thu, 28 Apr 2022 Pseudo R-squ.: 0.2664

Time: 20:15:34 Log-Likelihood: -2595.1

converged: False LL-Null: -3537.7

Covariance Type: nonrobust LLR p-value: 0.000

=================================================================================================

coef std err z P>|z| [0.025 0.975]

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

season\_year 0.0308 0.012 2.522 0.012 0.007 0.055

week 0.0522 0.016 3.298 0.001 0.021 0.083

number\_of\_mosquitoes 0.0576 0.002 23.828 0.000 0.053 0.062

distance\_to\_water -3.1483 3.592 -0.876 0.381 -10.189 3.893

distance\_to\_michLake 6.2772 0.888 7.070 0.000 4.537 8.017

distance\_to\_parks -1.6588 3.049 -0.544 0.586 -7.634 4.317

distance\_to\_bad\_santination -5.705e-05 0.005 -0.011 0.991 -0.010 0.010

AWND -0.1377 0.035 -3.954 0.000 -0.206 -0.069

PRCP 0.1959 0.254 0.770 0.441 -0.303 0.694

tavg 0.0375 0.011 3.515 0.000 0.017 0.058

WDF2 0.0013 0.001 1.299 0.194 -0.001 0.003

WT01 -0.0701 0.042 -1.661 0.097 -0.153 0.013

WT02 -0.1393 0.191 -0.730 0.465 -0.513 0.235

WT03 0.0191 0.047 0.406 0.685 -0.073 0.111

WT05 0.3768 0.285 1.321 0.187 -0.182 0.936

WT08 -0.0247 0.045 -0.552 0.581 -0.112 0.063

WT10 -8.7232 183.961 -0.047 0.962 -369.279 351.833

result\_lag\_1 0.4503 0.109 4.146 0.000 0.237 0.663

result\_lag\_2 0.2297 0.120 1.917 0.055 -0.005 0.465

species\_CULEX ERRATICUS -85.8398 9861.920 -0.009 0.993 -1.94e+04 1.92e+04

species\_CULEX PIPIENS -71.8010 24.489 -2.932 0.003 -119.799 -23.803

species\_CULEX PIPIENS/RESTUANS -71.8812 24.513 -2.932 0.003 -119.925 -23.837

species\_CULEX RESTUANS -71.8389 24.512 -2.931 0.003 -119.881 -23.797

species\_CULEX SALINARIUS -154.0229 4.53e+17 -3.4e-16 1.000 -8.87e+17 8.87e+17

species\_CULEX TARSALIS -87.9549 3210.119 -0.027 0.978 -6379.673 6203.764

species\_CULEX TERRITANS -73.7517 24.517 -3.008 0.003 -121.804 -25.700

species\_UNSPECIFIED CULEX -96.7378 3.2e+05 -0.000 1.000 -6.26e+05 6.26e+05

wind\_lag\_log 0.8170 0.054 15.206 0.000 0.712 0.922

=================================================================================================

Table 4 Logistic regression result

The statistically significant features are week of the year, number of mosquitoes, distance to Lake Michigan, average wind speed, average temperature, temporal lag of 1 week, some certain species and spatial lag with wind.

**Machine learning models**

To prepare data to train machine learning models, I do a max-min standardization to the predictors. Also, since there are too few positive observations in the dataset and the positive and negative ration is only 0.06, I upsample the positive label in training set.

1. **Support vetor machine (SVM)**

After tuning the model, the best result is 0.705 accuracy, 0.744 sensitivity, 0.134 precision and 0.726 AUC (area under curve).

Chart, treemap chart

Description automatically generated

Figure 10 Confusion matrix of SVM model result

1. **Random forest**

The best result of random forest is 0.942 accuracy, 0.209 sensitivity, 0.514 precision and 0.598 AUC.

Chart, treemap chart

Description automatically generated

Figure 11 Confusion matrix of Random Forest model result

1. Comparison

In terms of overall accuracy, SVM model performs better than Random Forest model. However, my objective is to only predict the positive risk and I don’t focus on how accurate the prediction of negative pool is. The high accuracy is mainly contributed by the success in predicting negative pools.

In terms of sensitivity, SVM gets a better result of 0.744, which means that this model can find out 74.4% positive pools of the entire positive samples.

In terms of precision, Random Forest gets a better result of 0.514, which means that 51.4% of predicted positive traps are truly positive.

**Conclusion**

Although upsampling solves some problem from labels imbalance, the overall prediction quality is not satisfied. However, the trade-off between SVM and Random Forest models worth discussing.

My goal of this article is to train a model to predict WNV presence, so the further application of this model is my ‘user demand’. If this model is utilized by public health department to spray pesticide to places where the model predicts high risky, then the trade-off mainly depends on the effect of pesticide. If the pesticide is expensive, complicated, or harmful to other creatures, then the precision of where to spray it is the most important. In this case the Random Forest is more suitable because it won’t waste pesticide or cause side-effect from excessive spraying. Vice versa, if the WNV is a issue that need urgent action to control and fault tolerance is high, then the SVM model is a better choice because it can block as many of WNV transmission as possible.

**Reference**

“West Nile Virus: An Historical Overview” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3111838/>

1. “Exotic Virus Is Identified In 3 Deaths” <https://www.nytimes.com/1999/09/26/nyregion/exotic-virus-is-identified-in-3-deaths.html>
2. MURRAY, K., WALKER, C., & GOULD, E. (2011). The virology, epidemiology, and clinical impact of West Nile virus: A decade of advancements in research since its introduction into the Western Hemisphere. Epidemiology and Infection, 139(6), 807-817. doi:10.1017/S0950268811000185

Moser, Lindsey & Lim, Pei-Yin & Styer, Linda & Kramer, Laura & Bernard, Kristen. (2015). Parameters of Mosquito-Enhanced West Nile Virus Infection. Journal of virology. 90. 10.1128/JVI.02280-15.

1. Paz S. (2015). Climate change impacts on West Nile virus transmission in a global context. Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences, 370(1665), 20130561. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0561
2. Mackenzie JS, Gubler DJ, Petersen LR. 2004. Emerging flaviviruses: the spread and resurgence of Japanese encephalitis, West Nile and dengue viruses. Nat. Med. 10, S98–S109. (10.1038/nm1144)

<https://data.cityofchicago.org/Health-Human-Services/West-Nile-Virus-WNV-Mosquito-Test-Results/jqe8-8r6s>

1. GUIDE TO ADULT MOSQUITO SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT: FINDING THE RIGHT TRAPS FOR YOUR MOSQUITO CONTROL PROGRAM <https://www.clarke.com/blog/adult-mosquito-surveillance-equipment/>

1. “West Nile Virus: An Historical Overview” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3111838/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “Exotic Virus Is Identified In 3 Deaths” <https://www.nytimes.com/1999/09/26/nyregion/exotic-virus-is-identified-in-3-deaths.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 3 MURRAY, K., WALKER, C., & GOULD, E. (2011). The virology, epidemiology, and clinical impact of West Nile virus: A decade of advancements in research since its introduction into the Western Hemisphere. Epidemiology and Infection, 139(6), 807-817. doi:10.1017/S0950268811000185 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Moser, Lindsey & Lim, Pei-Yin & Styer, Linda & Kramer, Laura & Bernard, Kristen. (2015). Parameters of Mosquito-Enhanced West Nile Virus Infection. Journal of virology. 90. 10.1128/JVI.02280-15. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Paz S. (2015). Climate change impacts on West Nile virus transmission in a global context. Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences, 370(1665), 20130561. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0561 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Mackenzie JS, Gubler DJ, Petersen LR. 2004. Emerging flaviviruses: the spread and resurgence of Japanese encephalitis, West Nile and dengue viruses. Nat. Med. 10, S98–S109. (10.1038/nm1144)  [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <https://data.cityofchicago.org/Health-Human-Services/West-Nile-Virus-WNV-Mosquito-Test-Results/jqe8-8r6s> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <https://www.clarke.com/blog/adult-mosquito-surveillance-equipment/> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)