

1           **The ecology of Nipah virus in Bangladesh: a nexus of land use**  
2                           **change and opportunistic feeding behavior in bats**

3  
4   Clifton D. McKee<sup>1,\*</sup>, Ausraful Islam<sup>2</sup>, Stephen P. Luby<sup>3</sup>, Henrik Salje<sup>4</sup>, Peter J. Hudson<sup>5</sup>, Raina  
5   K. Plowright<sup>6</sup>, Emily S. Gurley<sup>1</sup>

6  
7   <sup>1</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore,  
8   MD 21205, USA

9   <sup>2</sup>Infectious Diseases Division, icddr,b, Dhaka 1212, Bangladesh

10   <sup>3</sup>Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine Division, Stanford University, Stanford, CA  
11   94305, USA

12   <sup>4</sup>Department of Genetics, Cambridge University, Cambridge CB2 3EJ, UK

13   <sup>5</sup>Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA  
14   16801, USA

15   <sup>6</sup>Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT  
16   59717, USA

17

18   \*To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: [clifton.mckee@gmail.com](mailto:clifton.mckee@gmail.com).

19

20 **Abstract**

21 Nipah virus is a bat-borne paramyxovirus that produces yearly outbreaks of fatal  
22 encephalitis in Bangladesh. Understanding the ecological conditions that lead to spillover from  
23 bats to humans can assist in designing effective interventions. To investigate the current and  
24 historical processes that drive Nipah spillover in Bangladesh, we analyzed the relationship  
25 between spillover events and climatic conditions, the spatial distribution and size of *Pteropus*  
26 *medius* roosts, and patterns of land use change in Bangladesh over the last 300 years. We found  
27 that 53% of annual variation in winter spillovers is explained by winter temperature, which may  
28 affect bat behavior, physiology, and human risk behaviors. We infer from changes in forest cover  
29 that a progressive shift in bat roosting behavior occurred over hundreds of years, producing the  
30 current system where a majority of *P. medius* populations are small (median of 150 bats), occupy  
31 roost sites for 10 years or more, live in areas of high human population density, and  
32 opportunistically feed on cultivated food resources – conditions that promote viral spillover.  
33 Without interventions, continuing anthropogenic pressure on bat populations similar to what has  
34 occurred in Bangladesh could result in more regular spillovers of other bat viruses, including  
35 Hendra and Ebola viruses.

36

37 **Keywords:** zoonotic disease; spillover; One Health; urbanization; *Pteropus*

38

## 39 **Introduction**

40           Zoonotic infections pose an increasing threat to human health [1,2], yet for many  
41 zoonoses we have a poor understanding of the biological factors that determine when and where  
42 animal hosts are infectious and pose a risk for spillover into human populations [3]. Spillover  
43 events often appear sporadic in space and time and repeated outbreaks are rare. This low  
44 replication makes it difficult to ascertain the natural history of pathogens. Moreover, rapid  
45 response to outbreaks of novel infectious diseases is facilitated when data on related pathogens  
46 have been collected through surveillance in animal hosts [4]. Only through long-term  
47 surveillance efforts that integrate knowledge of reservoir host ecology, routes of pathogen  
48 spillover, and the nature of human-animal interactions can we develop an understanding of the  
49 ecology of emerging infections and manage the risk of spillover [3]. Our goal in this study was to  
50 assess the ecological conditions that affect the spillover of Nipah virus from fruit bats to humans  
51 in Bangladesh based on almost two decades of outbreaks.

52           Nipah virus (family *Paramyxoviridae*, genus *Henipavirus*) is hosted by various *Pteropus*  
53 fruit bat species with partially overlapping ranges across countries of South and Southeast Asia  
54 [5–17] and potentially the Philippines, where an outbreak of illness in humans and horses from a  
55 Nipah-like virus occurred [18]. The range of henipaviruses including Hendra [19], Cedar [20],  
56 and others [21–23] extends throughout the geographic range of pteropodid bats to Australia,  
57 Indian Ocean islands, and sub-Saharan Africa [24]. These data, combined with limited evidence  
58 of pathology in henipavirus-infected bats [25,26], suggest that henipaviruses have had a long  
59 association with their bat reservoirs that spans the dispersal of pteropodid bats out of Southeast  
60 Asia to other regions [27–31].

61           Distinct outbreaks of Nipah virus infection have highlighted that the same pathogen may  
62 use multiple routes to spillover. Nipah virus was first discovered following an outbreak of febrile  
63 illness in pigs, pig farmers, and abattoir workers in Malaysia and neighboring Singapore between  
64 September 1998 and May 1999 [32–35]. The outbreak ended only after Malaysia established  
65 widespread surveillance of pigs, resulting in the culling of over one million animals [36].  
66 Outbreaks of Nipah virus infection in Bangladesh have a very different ecological pattern. Since  
67 2001 when the first cases of human encephalitis in Bangladesh and India were linked to Nipah  
68 virus [5,37], outbreaks have been reported almost every year in Bangladesh and more  
69 sporadically in neighboring India [38,39]. Outbreaks in Bangladesh are seasonal, with cases  
70 occurring between December and April [40] and cluster primarily in the central and northwest  
71 districts of the country. Unlike the outbreaks in Malaysia, those in Bangladesh do not involve an  
72 intermediate animal host and are instead linked to drinking fresh or fermented sap (*tari*) from  
73 silver date palm trees (*Phoenix sylvestris*) [41–43]. Geographic variation in observed spillover  
74 frequency across Bangladesh is partly explained by the proportion of households that drink fresh  
75 date palm sap [44] and the distance to the nearest hospital where systematic Nipah virus  
76 surveillance occurs [40]. The independence of these spillover events is supported by the genetic  
77 variability among Nipah virus sequences from humans and bats in Bangladesh collected from  
78 separate outbreaks, contrasting with the more homogeneous sequences from Malaysia [45].  
79 Lastly, human-to-human transmission of Nipah virus occurs in Bangladesh [46,47] with an  
80 average reproduction number (the average number of secondary cases per case patient) of 0.33  
81 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.19–0.59) estimated over 2001–2014 [47] or 0.2 (95% CI: 0.1–  
82 0.4) over 2007–2018 [38]. Human-to-human transmission of Nipah virus has also been reported  
83 during Nipah virus outbreaks in India in 2001, 2007, and 2018 [37,39,48,49]. Although human-

84 to-human transmission was not widely acknowledged in Malaysia at the time of the outbreak  
85 [34], methods for detecting such transmission events (e.g., contact tracing) may not have been in  
86 place. Additionally, numerous cases reported in the literature had no contact with pigs,  
87 suggesting human-to-human transmission may be an alternative explanation [35,50,51]. Thus,  
88 the extent of human-to-human transmission that occurred during the Malaysian Nipah virus  
89 outbreak remains unclear.

90 One striking similarity between Nipah virus ecology in Bangladesh and Malaysia is that  
91 spillovers were facilitated by human resource supplementation in modified landscapes [52]. In  
92 Malaysia this involved planting fruit trees in close proximity to piggeries [53,54] whereas in  
93 Bangladesh the key resource appears to be date palm sap. *Pteropus medius* (formerly *P.*  
94 *giganteus*) frequently visit date palm trees to consume sap, potentially contaminating sap by  
95 licking the shaved area of the tree, urinating or defecating in the collection pots, or in some  
96 cases, becoming trapped and dying in the pot [42,55,56]. Visits by *P. medius* are highest during  
97 winter months (Islam et al., in preparation) when date palm sap is primarily harvested to drink  
98 fresh (October to March or April) [41,55,57] and when other available cultivated fruit resources  
99 for bats are low [58]. While *Phoenix sylvestris* is a native species in Bangladesh [59–62], date  
100 palm sap would not be available to bats if trees were not tapped by sap collectors. *P. medius* is  
101 found throughout Bangladesh and bats shed Nipah virus in their urine in all seasons [63]. Nipah  
102 virus can remain infectious at 22 °C in neutral pH bat urine for up to four days and artificial sap  
103 (13% sucrose, 0.21% bovine serum albumin, pH 7) for over one week [64,65]; most fresh sap  
104 and fermented *tari* is consumed within hours of collection [41,43,55]. While the prevalence of  
105 Nipah virus shedding in *P. medius* is generally low [63], presenting a bottleneck in spillover, the  
106 risk of foodborne transmission increases for communities with higher sap consumption [44].

107 These patterns imply that the spatiotemporal clustering of Nipah spillovers is a convergence of  
108 human and bat consumption behavior, wherein the risk of consuming sap contaminated with  
109 Nipah virus shed from bats is highest during winter when most sap is consumed by humans, and  
110 in regions with high rates of sap consumption.

111 However, there are still aspects of Nipah virus ecology in bats and their interface with  
112 human populations that are unclear. First, there is substantial year-to-year variation in the  
113 number of Nipah virus spillover events in Bangladesh [38] that may be explained by ecological  
114 factors influencing bat behavior and viral shedding. Cortes et al. [40] showed that differences in  
115 winter temperature can explain variation in Nipah virus spillovers, but this analysis only covered  
116 the period 2007–2013 and missed the decrease in spillovers observed after 2015 [38]. Second,  
117 we lack comprehensive information on the population biology, roosting and feeding behavior,  
118 and movement ecology of *P. medius* in Bangladesh. Like other *Pteropus* spp. bats, *P. medius*  
119 populations appear to be in decline due to hunting and habitat loss [66–68], but *P. medius* also  
120 appears to thrive in the human-dominated landscapes of Bangladesh. This adaptability derives  
121 from the opportunistic feeding habits of *Pteropus* species and their ability to forage over large  
122 areas [63,69–71]. Even though Bangladesh is already the most densely populated country that is  
123 not a small city-state or island [72], more *P. medius* roosts in Bangladesh are found in areas with  
124 higher human population density, forest fragmentation, and supplemental food resources from  
125 residential fruit trees [73,74]. However, villages with Nipah virus spillovers did not have more *P.*  
126 *medius* roosts or total bats in the village or within 5 km of the village boundary than villages  
127 where spillovers have not been detected [44]. National surveys of *P. medius* roost sites and  
128 population trends, including mapping of food resources used by bats, would provide a better  
129 understanding of *P. medius* interactions with humans. Lastly, we lack a historical perspective on

130 how land use changes in Bangladesh may have influenced *P. medius* populations and behavior,  
131 thereby setting the stage for the emergence of Nipah virus. Analysis of these aspects of Nipah  
132 virus ecology will provide clearer insights into the potential drivers of Nipah virus spillover from  
133 bats.

134         The objective of this study was to describe the ecological factors that produce frequent  
135 spillover of Nipah virus, including climate effects on bat behavior or physiology, the geography  
136 of bat roosting sites in Bangladesh, and the relationship between historical land use change and  
137 bat roosting behavior. Following the results of Cortes et al. [40], we hypothesized that Nipah  
138 virus spillovers would have a strong relationship with winter temperature that explains annual  
139 variation in spillover numbers between 2001–2018. Regarding *P. medius* roosting sites, we  
140 hypothesized that spatial variables related to climate, human population density, land use, and  
141 anthropogenic food resources such as fruit trees and date palm trees could explain variation in  
142 the occupancy and size of roosting bat populations. Finally, we hypothesized that land use  
143 change, specifically the loss of primary forests, has been a continuous process throughout human  
144 occupation of the region that was accelerated during British occupation. This progressive loss of  
145 forests likely led to a shift in roosting sites toward more urban areas closer to anthropogenic food  
146 resources, a condition that facilitates spillover but predates the first recognized outbreaks of  
147 Nipah virus infection by many years. By assessing these patterns, we develop a more  
148 comprehensive view of Nipah virus ecology in Bangladesh and provide a path forward for  
149 research and management of this system.

150

## 151 **Materials and Methods**

### 152 *Nipah virus spillover events*

153           To investigate the spatial and temporal patterns of Nipah virus spillover in Bangladesh,  
154 we compiled data on the number of spillover events and affected administrative districts during  
155 2001–2018. Cases prior to 2007 were detected through community investigations following  
156 reports of clusters of encephalitis. Cases from 2007 onward reflect those identified through  
157 systematic surveillance for Nipah virus infection at three tertiary care hospitals combined with  
158 investigations of all cases detected to look for clusters, as well as any reports of possible  
159 outbreaks through media or other information sources [38]. Independent spillover events were  
160 defined as index cases of Nipah virus infection within a given outbreak year. This definition  
161 excludes cases that resulted from secondary human-to-human transmission following spillover.

162

### 163 *Climate data*

164           Expanding on the results from Cortes et al. [40] showing associations between climate  
165 and the number of spillover events during 2007–2013, we used data from 20 weather stations in  
166 Bangladesh. Mean temperature at three-hour intervals and daily precipitation between 1953–  
167 2015 were obtained from the Bangladesh Meteorological Department. Daily temperature and  
168 precipitation summary data from 2015 onwards were obtained from the National Climatic Data  
169 Center [75] and merged with the older data. We also downloaded monthly indices for three  
170 major climate cycles that lead to temperature and precipitation anomalies in the region: the  
171 multivariate ENSO index (MEI) for the El Niño–Southern Oscillation, the Indian Ocean dipole  
172 mode index (DMI), and the subtropical Indian Ocean dipole index (SIOD). Data were retrieved  
173 from the Japan Agency for Marine–Earth Science and Technology Application Laboratory [76]



174 and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Physical Sciences Laboratory [77].  
175 Based on the frequency of Nipah virus spillovers occurring in winter, we focused on weather  
176 summary statistics for each year that covered the period from the start of the preceding  
177 December to the end of February of a focal outbreak year. We calculated the mean and recorded  
178 the minimum temperature over all stations, the percentage of days below 17 °C, and the  
179 cumulative precipitation from all stations over the focal period. The choice of 17 °C was  
180 arbitrary but represents an upper bound for relative coolness during winter that does not produce  
181 any zeros. Mean winter MEI, DMI, and SIOD values were also calculated for each year.

182

### 183 *Survey of bat roost sites and food resources*

184 The spatial distribution of *Pteropus medius* in Bangladesh was inferred from a country-  
185 wide survey of villages as part of investigations regarding risk factors for Nipah spillover  
186 performed over the winters of 2011–2012 and 2012–2013 [44]. Briefly, trained teams of data  
187 collectors interviewed key informants within villages, who identified known bat roost sites (both  
188 occupied and unoccupied) in the village and within 5 km of the village and reported details of the  
189 duration of roost occupancy and perceived population trends. The interviewers also mapped the  
190 location and number of date palm trees (*Phoenix sylvestris*) and known feeding sites that bats  
191 were reported to visit within 500 m of the villages. Feeding sites included fruit trees planted in  
192 orchards or in residential areas: jujube (*Ziziphus mauritiana*), banana, mango, guava, lychee, star  
193 fruit, jackfruit, papaya, sapodilla (*Manilkara zapota*), mulberry, hog plum (*Spondias mombin*),  
194 Indian olive (*Elaeocarpus serratus*), and other species.

195

196 *Spatial covariates of bat roost sites*

197           To evaluate spatial covariates that could explain the occupancy (presence/absence of  
198 bats) and abundance (estimated population size) of bats living in mapped roost sites, we  
199 extracted data from available raster surfaces describing human population density, land use,  
200 bioclimatic variables (e.g., mean annual temperature and precipitation), elevation, slope, and  
201 forest cover. Spatial covariate raster files were downloaded from WorldPop [78,79], the  
202 Socioeconomic Data and Applications Center (SEDAC) [80], WorldClim [81], and a study on  
203 global forest cover change [82]. We also calculated the distance from an index roost site to the  
204 nearest village, neighboring roost, date palm tree, and feeding site, and the number of villages,  
205 other mapped roosts, date palm trees, and feeding sites within a 15 km radius around each roost.  
206 Average nightly foraging distances of individual *P. medius* in two colonies in Bangladesh were  
207 estimated to be 10.8 km and 18.7 km, so 15 km was chosen to represent the distance a bat might  
208 expect to travel to reach a suitable feeding site [63]. The number of potential covariates was  
209 initially reduced by removing variables that were colinear (Pearson's correlation greater than  
210 0.7). Descriptions, sources, spatial resolution, and distribution statistics for all 32 covariates are  
211 provided in Table A1.

212

213 *Historical land use data*

214           Given the reliance of *P. medius* on tall trees for roosting and various native and cultivated  
215 fruit trees for food, we gathered data on historical changes in land use, particularly forested  
216 lands, across Bangladesh from data sources covering separate but overlapping time periods.  
217 Reconstructed natural biomes and anthropogenic biomes from 1700–2000 were extracted from  
218 rasters produced by Ellis et al. [83] using the HYDE 3.1 data model [84] and available from

219 SEDAC. We reclassified their land use subcategories into three primary categories: dense  
220 settlements, consisting of urban and suburban areas with high human population density (>100  
221 persons/km<sup>2</sup> for settlements, >2500 persons/km<sup>2</sup> for urban areas); rice villages and other  
222 croplands or rangelands; and forested areas, including populated woodlands and remote forests.  
223 Land use data for the years 1992, 2004, 2015, and 2018 were downloaded from the Organisation  
224 for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) land cover database [85], derived from  
225 European Space Agency Climate Change Initiative Land Cover maps [86]. Data for 1990 and  
226 2016 were provided by the World Bank [87]. Land cover over the period 1930–2014 came from  
227 an analysis by Reddy et al. [88]. Finally, forest cover from 2000 and subsequent forest loss as of  
228 2017 were calculated from maps produced by Hansen et al. [82] using the R package *gfcanalysis*  
229 [89,90]. For the calculations from Hansen et al. data, we chose a cutoff of 40% forest cover  
230 density to match the definition of dense forests used by Reddy et al. Across these datasets, we  
231 calculated the percentage of Bangladesh’s total land area (147,570 km<sup>2</sup> [88]) that was classified  
232 as forest.

233

### 234 *Statistical analysis*

235 Separate Nipah virus spillover events were clustered geographically by the latitude and  
236 longitude of affected administrative districts and temporally by the date of illness of each index  
237 case using a bivariate normal kernel via the R package *MASS* [91]. To examine the association  
238 between Nipah virus spillovers and climate variables, separate generalized linear models were  
239 produced that examined climate summary statistics and the number of spillover districts or  
240 independent spillover events assuming a Poisson distribution for each response. Model selection  
241 was performed to choose the best fitting combination of climate covariates according to Akaike’s

242 information criterion corrected for small sample sizes (AICc) [92] using the R package *MuMIn*  
243 [93].

244         The importance of spatial covariates in explaining variation in the occupancy and  
245 abundance of bats at roost sites was assessed through a combination of linear modeling and  
246 machine learning. The covariates were standardized, and data were split into two sets: an  
247 occupancy dataset of 488 mapped roost sites with a binary variable describing whether bats were  
248 currently present or not and an abundance dataset of 323 mapped roost sites with the estimated  
249 count of bats at each currently occupied roost at the time of the interview. Both datasets were  
250 split into training (80%) and testing (20%) sets for validation of models [94]. Generalized linear  
251 models (GLMs) were fit with all potential covariates, assuming a binomial distribution for roost  
252 site occupancy and a negative binomial distribution for roost counts, which was chosen because  
253 of the observed overdispersion of the data, with a variance:mean ratio greater than unity. Due to  
254 the large number of potential covariates, least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (lasso)  
255 regularization was implemented to reduce the number of covariates and minimize prediction  
256 error [95]. We also used random forests to perform covariate selection and assess explanatory  
257 power [96]. This machine learning method constructs many decision trees using random subsets  
258 of the response variable and covariates then averages the predictions. This method of  
259 constructing and averaging a set of uncorrelated decision trees reduces overfitting relative to  
260 single decision trees. Linear modeling and random forests were performed in R using the  
261 packages *caret*, *glmnet*, and *ranger* [97–99].


262

263 **Results**

264 *Spatiotemporal patterns of Nipah virus spillover*

265           Based on 183 spillover events from 2001–2018, we confirmed previous analyses  
266 [38,40,44] showing that Nipah virus spillovers are spatially clustered within districts in the  
267 central and northwest regions of Bangladesh (Figure 1A). Outbreak years vary in the intensity of  
268 spillover and winter is the primary season when spillovers occur throughout the country (Figure  
269 1B,C), although there are occasional events in early spring in central Bangladesh. With the  
270 exception of 2002, 2006, and 2016, Nipah virus spillovers have been observed every year since  
271 the virus was first identified in 2001, and as observed by Nikolay et al. [38], more spillovers  
272 were observed between 2010–2015 than before or after this period (Figure 1D). In accordance  
273 with previous work [40] covering 2007–2013, we confirmed that much of this yearly variation in  
274 spillover events (53%) can be explained by winter weather over the longer period 2001–2018.  
275 Mean winter temperature, minimum winter temperature, and the percentage of days below 17 °C  
276 all showed statistically significant associations with yearly spillover events and the number of  
277 affected districts ( $P < 0.001$ ; Figures A1–A3). There were no significant associations with  
278 cumulative winter precipitation ( $P > 0.05$ ; Figure A4) or the three climate oscillation indices  
279 (MEI, DMI, and SIOD; Figure A5). The percentage of days below 17 °C was chosen as the  
280 single best fitting covariate for both outcomes according to AICc (Tables A2–A3), showing that  
281 colder winter temperatures were associated with more spillovers and more affected districts  
282 during 2010–2015, followed by fewer spillovers and affected districts during the relatively  
283 warmer period of 2016–2018 (Figure 1D,E; Figure A3). Sensitivity analysis of the association  
284 between spillovers and the number of winter days below a certain temperature threshold  
285 confirmed that the relationship was strongest at thresholds of 16 to 18 °C, but was statistically

286 significant for thresholds ranging from 15 to 20 °C. We note that spillover observations prior to  
287 2007 mostly appear as undercounts relative to those expected by the winter temperatures (Figure  
288 1E; Figures A1–A3), which may be attributed to the lack of systematic surveillance during that  
289 period [38].




290

291 **Figure 1.** Spatiotemporal patterns of Nipah virus spillover events across Bangladesh, 2001–  
292 2018. Color contours in panels A–C show the spatial density of events estimated with a bivariate  
293 normal kernel. Panels D–E show the variation in the number of Nipah spillover events across  
294 years and the association with cold winter temperatures. Gray dots in panel E show the years  
295 before systematic Nipah virus surveillance.  
296

297 *Spatial distribution and sizes of Pteropus medius roosts*

298 Interviewers mapped a total of 474 roost sites in and around 204 villages, 315 that were  
299 occupied at the time of the interview and 159 that were unoccupied. According to interviewees,  
300 most occupied roosts (186, 59%) were reported as being at least occasionally occupied for more  
301 than 10 years, with an average occupancy duration of 8.5 years (Figure 2A). The majority (294,  
302 93%) of roosts were reported to be continuously occupied every month within the last year, with  
303 an average duration of 11.6 months (Figure 2B). This pattern of continuous occupancy was  
304 reported by interviewees to have been similar over the last 10 years (Figure 2C). Interviewees  
305 generally could not recall what season bats began roosting at sites, but when reported, roosts  
306 were first occupied more frequently in winter than other seasons (Figure A6A). When  
307 considering intermittently occupied roost sites (<12 months of occupancy in a year), bats were  
308 also more likely to be present at roost sites during winter (Figure A6B).

309




310

311 **Figure 2.** Duration of occupancy of *Pteropus medius* populations at occupied roost sites.  
312 According to interviewees, occupied roosts were most frequently occupied for more than 10  
313 years (A) and for 12 months out of the year (B). Continuous roost occupancy was similar over  
314 the past 10 years (C).

315

316 The size of occupied roosts varied widely, from only one bat to an estimated 8,000 bats at  
317 one roost in west-central Bangladesh, with a median size of 150 bats (Figure 3A,B). Studies of *P.*  
318 *medius* demonstrate that this distribution of individual roost sizes is similar to those reported in  
319 Pakistan, India, Nepal, and Sri Lanka [100–106]. This contrasts with reports of much larger  
320 roosts of thousands of *P. lylei* in Cambodia and Thailand [13,107], and roost sizes of *P. alecto*  
321 and *P. poliocephalus* in Australia estimated in the tens of thousands [108–110].  
322



323

324 **Figure 3.** Size and geographic distribution of *Pteropus medius* populations at occupied roost  
325 sites (N = 307) in Bangladesh. Roost sizes varied widely from 0 to 8,000 bats (A) but most  
326 roosts contained fewer than 1,000 bats (B). Roosts of varying size were observed throughout the  
327 country (C) where human population density is high (1,134 persons/km<sup>2</sup> in the whole country in  
328 2010).  
329



330 Roost sizes did not appear to be spatially clustered, such that large and small roosts are  
 331 intermixed throughout the country (Figure 3C). The clustering of roosts in the central and  
 332 northwest regions of Bangladesh appears to be a spatial artefact of the sampling design, which  
 333 targeted roost sites predominantly in and nearby villages where Nipah virus spillover events have  
 334 occurred (Figure A7). Following model selection using lasso, the remaining spatial covariates  
 335 generally had poor explanatory power for roost occupancy (presence/absence of bats) and  
 336 abundance (roost size), with  $R^2$  of 15% or less for testing and training sets (Table 1). AUC was  
 337 70% or less for models of occupancy, which indicates poor discriminatory power for predicting  
 338 occupied and unoccupied roosts [111].

339

340 **Table 1.** Performance metrics of GLM and random forests of bat roost occupancy and  
 341 abundance.

<b>Response variable</b>	<b>Set</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Response error</b>	<b>RMSE</b>	<b>MAE</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>AUC</b>
Occupancy (presence/absence of bats)	Training (n = 380)	GLM	0.48	0.45	0.42	0.12	0.7
		Random forest		0.48	0.41	0.04	0.61
	Test (n = 94)	GLM	0.46	0.46	0.43	0.02	0.59
		Random forest			0.51	0.43	0
Abundance (roost size)	Training (n = 255)	GLM	670	631	314	0.14	
		Random forest			643	312	0.09
	Test (n = 60)	GLM	744	711	320	0.1	
		Random forest			709	327	0.08

342 RMSE – root mean square error, MAE – mean absolute error, AUC – error under the receiver  
 343 operating characteristic curve.

344

345           These results broadly indicate that bat roosts are not linearly associated with the available  
346 covariate data and largely reflect the geography of nearby villages that were surveyed (Tables  
347 A5–A6). For example, an average roost site is situated in an area with high human population  
348 density, close to inland water bodies, with a nearby feeding site (fruit trees) or date palm tree  
349 within 5 km, and numerous feeding sites or date palm trees within a 15 km radius around the site  
350 (Table 2; Figure A8). This pattern is consistent with Bangladesh as a whole, where human  
351 population density is high everywhere (Figure 3C) and villages contain numerous potential fruit  
352 and date palm trees that could attract bats (Figure A7). Only seven out of 474 roost sites had no  
353 date palm trees or feeding sites within 15 km of the roost site. However, all of these roost sites  
354 had a date palm tree or feeding site within 25 km of the roost site. Roost sizes showed similarly  
355 static distributions compared to the other 28 covariates assessed (Table A1; Figures A9–A11).  
356 Similar to other studies of *P. medius*, roost sites were close to water bodies (Table 1)  
357 [101,102,105], but distance to water did not explain variation in the occupancy or abundance of  
358 bats at roost sites (Tables A5–A6).

359


360 **Table 2.** Distribution of select spatial covariates across all mapped roost sites.

<b>Covariate</b>	<b>Median (IQR)</b>
Human population density (persons/km <sup>2</sup> )	996 (858–1,260)
Distance to nearest inland water (km)	0.6 (0.3–1)
Distance to nearest feeding site (km)	2 (0.9–3.6)
Distance to nearest date palm tree (km)	1.2 (0.2–2.7)
Number of feeding sites within 15 km of roost site	11 (3–20)
Number of date palm trees within 15 km of roost site	80 (29–307)

361

362           Despite the widespread distribution of bat roost sites and the presence of some relatively  
363 large roosts (>1,000 bats), interviewees report that, with respect to their own memory, most  
364 roosts are decreasing in size (Figure 4A). These patterns support anecdotal reports of decreasing

365 *P. medius* populations from biologists and bat hunters, a trend attributed to cutting of roost trees  
366 and overhunting [66,67]. Local Nipah virus spillover investigation teams have reported that  
367 village residents will often cut down roost trees within villages after an outbreak [44]. In support  
368 of this, we observed that roost sites in and around Nipah virus case villages had more unoccupied  
369 roosts than control villages that were either near (>5 km) or far (>50 km) from case villages  
370 (Figure 4B). Besides cutting down roost trees, interviewees listed a number of other reasons that  
371 bats left a roost site, including that bats were hunted, or bats were harassed with rocks, mud,  
372 sticks, or gunfire (Figure 4C).  
373



374


375 **Figure 4.** Reported trends for *Pteropus medius* populations at occupied roost sites (A);  
376 distribution of unoccupied roost sites across Nipah virus case villages and control villages (B);  
377 and reported reasons for bats no longer occupying roost sites (C).

378

379 *Historical land use change in Bangladesh*

380           According to the collated data, the majority of forest loss in Bangladesh occurred prior to  
381 the 20<sup>th</sup> century but has steadily continued to the present (Figure 5). Prior to human occupation  
382 of the land area comprising Bangladesh, the whole country was likely covered in dense tropical  
383 forest, similar to neighboring countries in Southeast Asia [83]. Evidence of human occupation in  
384 Bangladesh dates back at least 20,000 years, rice cultivation and domesticated animals occurred  
385 before 1500 BCE, and sedentary urban centers were seen by the fifth century BCE [112].  
386 Clearing of land for rice cultivation continued through to the 16<sup>th</sup> century CE, by which time rice  
387 was being exported from the Bengal delta to areas of South and Southeast Asia. During Mughal  
388 rule over the Bengal delta starting in the 1610, the Ganges (Padma) River shifted eastward, so  
389 Mughal officials encouraged colonists to clear forests and cultivate rice in eastern Bangladesh  
390 [112]. Thus, much of the native forests in Bangladesh had been converted to cultivated land prior  
391 to 1700 (Figure 5).

392



393

394 **Figure 5.** Historical change in forested land area in Bangladesh according to available sources.  
395 Inset displays the rate of dense forest loss (annual percent change) since 2000, with a recent  
396 increase in this rate of decline, drawn from Hansen et al. [82]. A cutoff value of 40% was used to  
397 define dense forests. Only gross forest loss is displayed, since data on forest gain only covers the  
398 period 2000–2012.  
399

400 Following the Battle of Plassey in 1757, the British East India Company took control of  
401 the country and established Permanent Settlement, a system of land taxation that set a fixed tax  
402 burden for landholders (zamindars). While the intention was that the fixed tax rates would allow  
403 zamindars to invest more in agricultural development of the land through better seeds, irrigation,  
404 and tools, this never materialized. Since the British would auction the zamindar's land if they fell  
405 behind on their tax obligation, land became a valuable commodity that was bought and sold by  
406 wealthy bureaucrats and zamindars. This fostered a hierarchical system where the peasantry

407 working the land paid rent but had no property rights, while landowners were only attached to  
408 the land through a series of intermediary managers. To meet their tax obligation and collect rent  
409 from tenant farmers, landowners encouraged cultivation of cash crops (cotton, indigo, sugarcane,  
410 silk, tea, tobacco, and jute) meant for export in the global market. Agrarian production increased  
411 not through agricultural intensification of already cultivated land, but through clearing of native  
412 forest. Forest cover declined dramatically during the 1700s and 1800s (Figure 5; Figure A12)  
413 and the system of Permanent Settlement existed with some modifications until the 1950s [112].

414         Production of sugar for export and local consumption came predominantly from  
415 sugarcane during the colonial period, but a minor proportion (perhaps 10–15%) was produced  
416 from date palm sap from cultivated *Phoenix sylvestris*. While historically date palm sugar was  
417 used locally for the preparation of sweetened foods, it became integrated into the global sugar  
418 trade starting in 1813 and the value of date palm sap increased. The number of date palms in  
419 Bangladesh increased rapidly from the 1830s and remained high until at least the early 1900s,  
420 propelled by British encouragement of landowners and the development of mills by the British to  
421 produce sugar from date palm sap [61]. Roughly 1,370 metric tons of raw sugar (*gur*) was  
422 produced from date palm sap on average during 1792–1813 in Bangladesh, which increased to  
423 38,000 tons of *gur* in 1848 and 162,858 tons by 1905, and then decreased to 66,930 tons by 1911  
424 [61]. The most recent figures from the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics for 2016–2017 put the  
425 area of Bangladesh under date palm cultivation for sap at 20.8 km<sup>2</sup> with a production of 169,056  
426 metric tons of palm sap (perhaps 10% of which might be converted to *gur*) [113,114]. This is  
427 compared to 920 km<sup>2</sup> under sugarcane producing 3,862,775 tons of sugarcane juice during the  
428 same year [113].

429 Today, Bangladesh has less than 14% of its forest remaining (Figure 5) and the only  
430 dense forests are restricted to the southwestern mangrove forests of the Sundarbans and the  
431 southeastern forests of the Chittagong Hill Tracts (Figure A12). The portion of the Sundarbans in  
432 Bangladesh is a protected as the Sundarban Reserve Forest containing three large wildlife  
433 sanctuaries. The region of the Chittagong Hills had enjoyed a level of political autonomy during  
434 Mughal rule and was also the last part of Bangladesh to come under state rule after the British  
435 invaded in 1860 but retained some regional autonomy in their system of taxation and land rights  
436 [112]. Combined with the more rugged terrain of this region, intensification of industrial forestry  
437 and agricultural production was delayed until the 1900s, and this region remains one of the least  
438 populated areas of the country (Figure 3). These conditions have thereby preserved much of the  
439 primary forest until the present (Figure A12). The conditions in neighboring Myanmar were  
440 similar, as the British did not begin their rule of the country until 1824. Prior to British rule,  
441 Myanmar's agricultural economy was not as export-focused compared to Bangladesh, but this  
442 shifted towards intensified production of rice for export during the colonial period [115]. Partly  
443 due to a delayed agricultural intensification imposed by the British, trees still cover around half  
444 of Myanmar's land area [85] and the population density was only 77 persons/km<sup>2</sup> in 2010 [72].

445 Recent deforestation in Bangladesh has continued at a steady pace, with a net rate of  
446 0.75% or less per year during 1930–2014 [88], and is concentrated in eastern Chittagong  
447 Division (Figure A13). However, there has been a rise in deforestation since 2013 (Figure 5  
448 inset). Additionally, felling of tall trees continued even in largely deforested areas of Bangladesh  
449 for the purpose of curing tobacco leaves and brick burning [67]. Since *P. medius* relies on tall  
450 tree species such as banyan (*Ficus benghalensis*) to form large roosts [73], the loss of single tall  
451 trees can scatter bats into ever smaller populations.

452

## 453 **Discussion**

### 454 *Historical land use change, bat ecology, and Nipah virus spillover*

455           Given the nearly two decades of research on Nipah virus in Bangladesh, there are facets  
456 of its ecology that are now clear. Historical patterns of forest loss have drastically diminished  
457 native habitat for fruit bats. *Pteropus medius* bats now live in mostly small, resident roosts in  
458 close proximity to humans and opportunistically feed on cultivated food resources. These  
459 gradual but dramatic changes have produced a system that facilitates spillover of a bat-borne  
460 virus. The consequence is almost annual spillover of Nipah virus in winter months following  
461 consumption of raw or fermented date palm sap that has been contaminated with bat excreta  
462 containing Nipah virus.

463           Our analysis suggests that the current state of the bat-human ecological system in  
464 Bangladesh supports Nipah virus spillover: a mobile metapopulation of reservoir hosts living  
465 amongst humans and sharing food resources that has likely existed for many years prior to the  
466 first recognized outbreaks. While the loss of forests in Bangladesh is still occurring and  
467 potentially affecting the distribution of *P. medius*, the majority of the land use change from forest  
468 to cultivated areas occurred at least a century ago (Figure 5). Cultivation of date palm trees for  
469 their sap and other products is a tradition that has likely been practiced for centuries [116], and  
470 bats have been potentially consuming sap for an equal amount of time. Importantly, the date  
471 palm sap industry was greatly expanded by the British during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup>  
472 centuries and continues at a similar scale to the present [61,113]. Time-calibrated phylogenetic  
473 analyses indicate that Nipah virus has been circulating in *P. medius* in Bangladesh and India  
474 since the 1950s or earlier [6,117,118]. Thus, none of the conditions that promote Nipah virus




475 spillover in Bangladesh are new. Spillovers almost certainly occurred in the past but were  
476 undetected prior to the first isolation of Nipah virus in 1999 and the subsequent development of  
477 diagnostic tests. Even recent outbreaks since surveillance was established in 2007 might be  
478 missed. Hegde et al. found that because encephalitis case patients are less likely to attend a  
479 surveillance hospital if it is distant from their home and if their symptoms are less severe, at least  
480 half of all Nipah virus outbreaks during 2007–2014 were likely missed [119].

481         The ecological state of Nipah virus in Bangladesh has important similarities and  
482 differences with the ecology of the related Hendra virus in *Pteropus* spp. in Australia. Spillover  
483 events from bats primarily occur in the cooler, dry winter months in both Australia and  
484 Bangladesh, and evidence from Australia suggests that this season is when bats are potentially  
485 experiencing nutritional stress, are residing in small roosts close to humans, and are shedding  
486 more viruses [24,120]. In contrast to *P. medius* in Bangladesh, *Pteropus* populations in Australia  
487 exhibit a range of population sizes and behaviors, from large, nomadic groups that track  
488 seasonally available nectar sources to small, resident colonies that feed on anthropogenic  
489 resources [108]. The increasing incidence of Hendra virus spillovers is linked with periods of  
490 acute food shortage that shift bats from nomadism to residency and drive bats to feed on  
491 suboptimal food sources, thereby exacerbating stress and associated viral shedding (Eby et al., in  
492 review) [121].

493         We propose that the systems of Nipah virus in Bangladesh and Hendra virus in Australia  
494 represent distinct points on a continuum describing patterns of bat aggregation and feeding  
495 behavior in a landscape of available roosting sites and food resources (Figure 6). One end of the  
496 spectrum is characterized by seasonal shifts from smaller populations to large aggregations of  
497 bats in response to transient pulses in fruit and nectar resources (fission-fusion). The other end of

498 the spectrum represents a permanent state of fission, where bats are distributed in small, mostly  
499 resident roosts in a matrix of anthropogenic food resources. Bangladesh appears to fall at the  
500 latter end of the spectrum, wherein historical land use change and urbanization removed the  
501 native forest habitats that supported *Pteropus medius* populations, leaving limited roosting sites  
502 but abundant cultivated fruits that are sufficient for sustaining small populations of bats.  
503 Australia would traditionally have been on the opposite end of the spectrum, but loss of winter  
504 habitat and urban encroachment may be pushing the system towards more permanent fission,  
505 which could result in more consistent spillovers of Hendra virus (Eby et al. in review) [121].  
506 Similar anthropogenic pressures acting on pteropodid bat populations in Southeast Asia or Africa  
507 could push these systems into a state similar to Bangladesh, consequently increasing the risk of  
508 henipavirus spillover [24].  
509



510

511 **Figure 6.** Long-term shifts in pteropodid bat populations and seasonal movements due to  
512 anthropogenic land use change. Black arrows show seasonal movements of bats into large  
513 aggregations. Dashed gray arrows represent occasional bat movement between roost sites.  
514

515 *Seasonality of date palm sap consumption and spillovers*

516 Beyond the broad ecological forces that facilitate henipavirus spillover from bats, there  
517 are epidemiological patterns that will require further research to explain. Perhaps the most  
518 complex are the causes of winter seasonality in Nipah virus spillovers. Recent evidence suggests  
519 that bats shed Nipah virus at low levels throughout the year [63]. Date palm trees are also tapped  
520 year-round for *tari* production but harvesting increases during winter months to meet increased  
521 demand for *tari* and fresh sap [41,43]. Visits by *P. medius* to date palm trees are more frequent in  
522 winter [56], even when date palms are tapped year-round for *tari* production (Islam et al., in  
523 preparation). Therefore, the risk of viral spillover is always present, but may increase during

524 winter because bats are capitalizing on a resource when it is most available, thereby increasing  
525 the probability that sap is contaminated during the winter harvest.

526         The observation that more Nipah virus spillovers occur during years with colder winters  
527 indicates that climate is affecting one or more factors in the system: date palm physiology, bat  
528 and human behavior, bat physiology and immunology that affect viral replication, or some  
529 combination of these factors. Date palm sap collectors report that date palm sap is sweeter and  
530 flows more freely during cooler weather [43,56,61]. These might be physiological responses of  
531 *Phoenix sylvestris* to seasonal weather conditions (e.g., sugar or water is concentrated in the  
532 trunk during cool, dry weather), yet no data are available on variation in sap flow or sugar  
533 content for this species outside of winter months [61]. Harvesting date palm sap when it is  
534 sweetest would be optimal not only for the collectors, but also for bats. Fewer cultivated fruits  
535 are available during winter than other seasons [58], so bats may gravitate towards date palms  
536 because it is readily available during a time of relative food scarcity. More surveys of *P. medius*  
537 feeding behavior and the fruits they consume at different times of the year would be necessary to  
538 assess this hypothesis [122]. Complementary experiments could be performed to evaluate  
539 whether pteropodid bats perceive small differences in sugar concentration and modify their  
540 feeding behavior in response to varying energy demands [123].

541         Another hypothesis, derived from research on Hendra virus in Australian bats, posits that  
542 bats shed viruses more frequently during periods of nutritional stress that compromise bat  
543 immune function [24,124]. Increased metabolic demands of thermoregulation during winter  
544 when food resources are already limited could produce physiological and nutritional stress in  
545 bats. Bats may seek out alternative foods (e.g., date palm sap) to compensate for this stress.  
546 Whether *P. medius* are shedding more Nipah virus when they are experiencing physiological or

547 nutritional stress in winter is an open question. We need more documentation of body condition,  
548 biomarkers of stress and immune function, or abortion rates among female bats to understand  
549 any relationships between Nipah virus shedding, stress, and climate [24,125–127].

550 We also lack information on how seasonal bat movements might influence Nipah virus  
551 spillover dynamics. Although our data suggest that most roost sites are continuously occupied  
552 (Figure 2), there may still be some seasonal dynamics in bat population sizes as individuals make  
553 occasional movements to use seasonally available resources or aggregate for mating. There is  
554 evidence from India and Nepal that *P. medius* roost populations vary seasonally, with larger  
555 populations in fall and winter than in summer [128,129]. This is mirrored by our data showing  
556 winter is the season when more roosts were founded, and bats are present at intermittently  
557 occupied sites (Figure A6). There is also evidence that *P. medius* home ranges contract during  
558 the dry season (including winter) than the wet season [63]. Nevertheless, genetic data on *P.*  
559 *medius* and Nipah virus in Bangladesh indicate that bat movements are common enough to  
560 promote genetic admixture and spread distinct Nipah virus genotypes among geographically  
561 distant *P. medius* populations [6]. To better understand how bat movements influence spillover  
562 dynamics, we need more information on seasonal variation in bat population sizes at roost sites  
563 and potentially individual movement tracking data, which could be used to parameterize  
564 metapopulation models of Nipah virus transmission.

565

#### 566 *Roost tree loss and Pteropus roosting behavior*

567 In addition to the causes of seasonality in Nipah virus spillover, more research is needed  
568 to determine the effects of current deforestation and human disturbance on *P. medius*  
569 populations. While historical patterns of deforestation and land use change have undoubtedly

570 reduced available habitat for pteropodid bats (Figure 5), the effects of current deforestation may  
571 be easiest to measure at the scale of individual roost trees. If a single tree in a largely deforested  
572 area has qualities that are preferred by bats and therefore supports a large population of bats, loss  
573 of that tree could have a very large effect on the bat population but would contribute very little to  
574 overall deforestation rates. Our statistical analysis was unable to explain substantial variation in  
575 the occupancy and size of roosts using available data on spatial covariates, including land use,  
576 human population density, bioclimatic variables, and distribution of cultivated fruit and date  
577 palm trees (Table 1; Table A1). Similar results were observed for *P. medius* populations in Uttar  
578 Pradesh, India [101]. Kumar and Elangovan [101] were unable to explain variation in colony size  
579 using data on distance to human settlements, roads, or water bodies. However, they did find that  
580 colony size increased with tree height, trunk diameter, and canopy spread. The majority of  
581 colonies were found in tree species with wide canopies, including *Ficus* spp., mango, *Syzygium*  
582 *cumini*, and *Madhuca longifolia* [101]. Hahn et al. [73] compared occupied roost trees to non-  
583 roost trees within a 20x20 m area around central roost trees and found that *P. medius* in  
584 Bangladesh favor tall canopy trees with large trunk diameters. Therefore, future efforts to  
585 understand variation in *P. medius* population sizes across Bangladesh should collect more data  
586 on characteristics of roost trees. Furthermore, the sampling design of our population meant that  
587 no bat roosts could have been observed further than 5 km from a village, meaning that bat roosts  
588 in remnant forested areas in the Sundarbans and Chittagong Hills were much less likely to be  
589 included in the study (Figure A7). Further surveys of roost sites may reveal distinct roosting  
590 patterns of *P. medius* populations living in these areas or in other areas within the range of *P.*  
591 *medius* where human population density is lower and forested habitat is more intact.

592 Our survey data also indicate that many roost sites are frequently abandoned following  
593 harassment, hunting, or removal of roost trees and that more unoccupied roosts are found near  
594 villages that have experienced Nipah virus spillover (Figure 4). Presumably these bats disperse  
595 and form new roosts or join existing roosts, but the new roost trees may be of lower quality than  
596 the previous roost and only support a smaller population of bats. More granular data on the  
597 cumulative effects of roost tree loss on average *P. medius* population sizes would refine our  
598 conceptual model of shifting roosting behavior in pteropodid bats (Figure 6). Moreover,  
599 movements of bats following abandonment of roost sites could have implications for Nipah virus  
600 transmission dynamics. Dispersal of bats following roost tree loss or harassment could lead  
601 infected bats to seed outbreaks elsewhere [124]. Therefore, reactionary cutting of roost trees in  
602 villages with Nipah virus spillovers is counterproductive for spillover prevention and bat  
603 conservation and should be discouraged.

604

#### 605 *Possible interventions to prevent Nipah virus spillover*

606 Finally, there is a need to explore possible interventions to prevent Nipah virus spillover.  
607 Without a vaccine for Nipah virus, much of the research has focused on mitigating the risk of  
608 spillovers. Several studies in Bangladesh have centered on educating the public about the risks of  
609 drinking raw date palm sap and methods for preventing bat access to date palm sap during  
610 collection [130–132]. There is also a need for increased surveillance of bats and humans in close  
611 contact with bats in Bangladesh and other areas within the range of *Pteropus* bats. These  
612 enhanced surveillance efforts could include serosurveys of bat hunters, date palm sap collectors,  
613 people who drink sap or eat fruits that have been partially consumed by bats, and people who  
614 live in close proximity to bat roost sites [13,66,133,134]. While there has been no evidence that

615 consuming fruits partially eaten by bats is associated with Nipah virus spillover to humans in  
616 Bangladesh and Cambodia [13,135], this route was believed to be the cause of the 1998–1999  
617 outbreaks in pigs that led to human cases in Malaysia and Singapore [54]. A 2009 survey of  
618 livestock in Bangladesh living nearby to *Pteropus* bat roosts also found henipavirus antibodies in  
619 6.5% of cattle, 4.3% of goats, and 44.2% of pigs [136]. Animals were more likely to be  
620 seropositive if they had a history of feeding on fruits partially eaten by bats or birds and drinking  
621 date palm juice from Asian palmyra palms (*Borassus flabellifer*) [136]. Therefore, Nipah virus  
622 transmission from livestock to humans in Bangladesh is a risk that should be explored with  
623 additional serosurveys and efforts to limit contact of livestock with fruits and other materials  
624 potentially contaminated with bat excreta.

625         Similar risks may apply in neighboring India where Nipah virus outbreaks have been  
626 linked to fruit bats [48,137]. The index case of a 2007 Nipah outbreak in West Bengal was  
627 reported to frequently drink date palm liquor (*tari*) and had numerous bats living in trees around  
628 their home [48]. Researchers speculate that the 2018 and 2019 outbreaks in Kerala, India, may be  
629 linked to consumption of partially eaten fruits [137]. However, this has not been confirmed via  
630 detection of Nipah virus on partially eaten fruits or case-control studies [39,44]. The index case  
631 associated with 23 cases of Nipah virus infection during the 2018 Kerala outbreak reported  
632 possible contact with an infected baby bat, but this was also not confirmed [39]. Silver date palm  
633 is not cultivated for sap in Kerala, but coconut palm and Asian palmyra palm are [39]. The  
634 narrow-mouthed containers that are used to collect sap from these palm species are thought to  
635 prevent bat access to the sap within the container [39] but might not prevent bats from accessing  
636 and contaminating sap at the tapping site or from inflorescences. Additional studies using  
637 infrared cameras to understand fruit bat feeding behavior around other palm trees harvested for



638 sap and possible intervention methods similar to those done in Bangladesh are warranted  
639 [56,130]. Such information would help to clarify how Nipah virus is transmitted from fruit bats  
640 to humans in India and allow for ecological comparison of outbreaks in these two neighboring  
641 countries.

642 At a higher level, methods that limit human-bat contact through ecological interventions  
643 may be beneficial. Plantations of fruit- and nectar-producing tree species could provide  
644 alternative food for *P. medius*, such as cotton silk (*Ceiba petandra*, *Bombax ceiba*), Indian mast  
645 tree (*Polyalthia longifolia*), and Singapore cherry (*Muntingia calabura*). Trees that produce fruit  
646 year-round or specifically during winter could provide bats with the required nutrition that would  
647 have been acquired from date palm sap or other cultivated fruits. In combination with methods to  
648 prevent bat access to date palm sap, ecological interventions that would allow *P. medius*  
649 populations to persist in Bangladesh and other areas while lowering the risk of Nipah virus  
650 spillover should be explored.

651

## 652 **Conclusions**

653 The ecological conditions that produce yearly spillovers of Nipah virus in Bangladesh are  
654 not a new phenomenon, but rather a culmination of centuries of anthropogenic change. The  
655 opportunistic feeding behavior of *P. medius* has allowed populations to adapt to these modified  
656 landscapes, persisting in small, resident colonies feeding on cultivated fruits. Shared use of date  
657 palm sap by bats and humans is a key route for Nipah virus spillover during winter months.  
658 Continued research on this system could reveal how bat behavior and physiology influence the  
659 seasonality of Nipah spillovers and explore potential ecological interventions to prevent  
660 spillover.

661

662 **Supplementary Materials:** The following are available online at [www.mdpi.com/xxx](http://www.mdpi.com/xxx),

663 Appendix A: Supplementary tables and figures.

664

665 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, E.G., R.P., and P.H.; data curation, C.M., E.G., and

666 H.S.; formal analysis, C.M.; visualization, C.M.; writing – original draft preparation, C.M.;

667 writing – reviewing and editing, all authors. All authors have read and agreed to the published

668 version of the manuscript.

669

670 **Funding:** C.M., E.G., S.L., R.K.P., P.J.H. were funded by the DARPA PREEMPT program

671 Cooperative Agreement D18AC00031; R.K.P. and P.J.H. by the U.S. National Science

672 Foundation (DEB-1716698); and R.K.P. by the USDA National Institute of Food and

673 Agriculture (Hatch project 1015891).

674

675 **Acknowledgments:** We thank Peggy Eby and Birgit Nikolay for early discussions on data

676 sources and analyses.

677

678 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

679

## 680 **References**

681 1. Woolhouse, M.E.J.; Gowtage-Sequeria, S. Host range and emerging and reemerging

682 pathogens. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2005**, *11*, 1842–1847.

683 2. Jones, K.E.; Patel, N.G.; Levy, M.A.; Storeygard, A.; Balk, D.; Gittleman, J.L.; Daszak, P.

- 684 Global trends in emerging infectious diseases. *Nature* **2008**, *451*, 990–993,  
685 doi:10.1038/nature06536.
- 686 3. Plowright, R.K.; Parrish, C.R.; McCallum, H.; Hudson, P.J.; Ko, A.I.; Graham, A.L.;  
687 Lloyd-Smith, J.O. Pathways to zoonotic spillover. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **2017**, *15*, 502–  
688 510, doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2017.45.
- 689 4. Daszak, P.; Olival, K.J.; Li, H. A strategy to prevent future epidemics similar to the 2019-  
690 nCoV outbreak. *Biosaf. Heal.* **2020**, *2*, 6–8, doi:10.1016/j.bsheal.2020.01.003.
- 691 5. Hsu, V.P.; Hossain, M.J.; Parashar, U.D.; Ali, M.M.; Ksiazek, T.G.; Kuzmin, I.;  
692 Niezgodna, M.; Rupprecht, C.; Bresee, J.; Breiman, R.F. Nipah virus encephalitis  
693 reemergence, Bangladesh. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2004**, *10*, 2082–2087,  
694 doi:10.3201/eid1012.040701.
- 695 6. Olival, K.J.; Latinne, A.; Islam, A.; Epstein, J.H.; Hersch, R.; Engstrand, R.C.; Gurley,  
696 E.S.; Amato, G.; Luby, S.P.; Daszak, P. Population genetics of fruit bat reservoir informs  
697 the dynamics, distribution and diversity of Nipah virus. *Mol. Ecol.* **2020**, *29*, 970–985,  
698 doi:10.1111/mec.15288.
- 699 7. Breed, A.C.; Meers, J.; Sendow, I.; Bossart, K.N.; Barr, J.A.; Smith, I.;  
700 Wacharapluesadee, S.; Wang, L.; Field, H.E. The distribution of henipaviruses in  
701 Southeast Asia and Australasia: is Wallace’s line a barrier to Nipah virus? *PLOS One*  
702 **2013**, *8*, e61316, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0061316.
- 703 8. Breed, A.C.; Yu, M.; Barr, J.A.; Cramer, G.; Thalmann, C.M.; Wang, L.-F. Prevalence of  
704 henipavirus and rubulavirus antibodies in pteropid bats, Papua New Guinea. *Emerg.*  
705 *Infect. Dis.* **2010**, *16*, 1997–1999, doi:10.3201/eid1612.100879.
- 706 9. Field, H.; de Jong, C.E.; Halpin, K.; Smith, C.S. Henipaviruses and fruit bats, Papua New

- 707 Guinea. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2013**, *19*, 670–671, doi:10.3201/eid1904.111912.
- 708 10. Wacharapluesadee, S.; Boongird, K.; Wanghongsa, S.; Ratanasetyuth, N.; Supavonwong,  
709 P.; Saengsen, D.; Gongal, G.N.; Hemachudha, T. A longitudinal study of the prevalence  
710 of Nipah virus in *Pteropus lylei* bats in Thailand: evidence for seasonal preference in  
711 disease transmission. *Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis.* **2010**, *10*, 183–190,  
712 doi:10.1089/vbz.2008.0105.
- 713 11. Wacharapluesadee, S.; Samseeneam, P.; Phermpool, M.; Kaewpom, T.; Rodpan, A.;  
714 Maneeorn, P.; Srongmongkol, P.; Kanchanasaka, B.; Hemachudha, T. Molecular  
715 characterization of Nipah virus from *Pteropus hypomelanus* in Southern Thailand. *Virol.*  
716 *J.* **2016**, *13*, 53, doi:10.1186/s12985-016-0510-x.
- 717 12. Reynes, J.-M.; Counor, D.; Ong, S.; Faure, C.; Seng, V.; Molia, S.; Walston, J.; Georges-  
718 Courbot, M.C.; Deubel, V.; Sarthou, J.-L. Nipah virus in Lyle’s flying foxes, Cambodia.  
719 *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2005**, *11*, 1042–1047, doi:10.3201/eid1107.041350.
- 720 13. Cappelle, J.; Hoem, T.; Hul, V.; Furey, N.; Nguon, K.; Prigent, S.; Dupon, L.; Ken, S.;  
721 Neung, C.; Hok, V.; et al. Nipah virus circulation at human–bat interfaces, Cambodia.  
722 *Bull. World Health Organ.* **2020**, *98*, 539–547, doi:10.2471/BLT.20.254227.
- 723 14. Yob, J.M.; Field, H.; Rashdi, A.M.; Morrissy, C.; van der Heide, B.; Rota, P.; bin Adzhar,  
724 A.; White, J.; Daniels, P.; Jamaluddin, A.; et al. Nipah virus infection in bats (order  
725 Chiroptera) in peninsular Malaysia. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2001**, *7*, 439–441,  
726 doi:10.3201/eid0703.017312.
- 727 15. Chua, K.B.; Koh, C.L.; Hooi, P.S.; Wee, K.F.; Khong, J.H.; Chua, B.H.; Chan, Y.P.; Lim,  
728 M.E.; Lam, S.K. Isolation of Nipah virus from Malaysian island flying-foxes. *Microbes*  
729 *Infect.* **2002**, *4*, 145–51.

- 730 16. Rahman, S.A.; Hassan, S.S.; Olival, K.J.; Mohamed, M.; Chang, L.-Y.; Hassan, L.; Saad,  
731 N.M.; Shohaimi, S.A.; Mamat, Z.C.; Naim, M.S.; et al. Characterization of Nipah virus  
732 from naturally infected *Pteropus vampyrus* bats, Malaysia. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2010**, *16*,  
733 1990–1993, doi:10.3201/eid1612.091790.
- 734 17. Sendow, I.; Field, H.E.; Adjid, A.; Ratnawati, A.; Breed, A.C.; Darminto; Morrissy, C.;  
735 Daniels, P. Screening for Nipah virus infection in West Kalimantan province, Indonesia.  
736 *Zoonoses Public Health* **2010**, *57*, 499–503, doi:10.1111/j.1863-2378.2009.01252.x.
- 737 18. Ching, P.K.G.; de los Reyes, V.C.; Sucaldito, M.N.; Tayag, E.; Columna-Vingno, A.B.;  
738 Malbas, F.F.; Bolo, G.C.; Sejvar, J.J.; Eagles, D.; Playford, G.; et al. Outbreak of  
739 henipavirus infection, Philippines, 2014. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2015**, *21*, 328–331,  
740 doi:10.3201/eid2102.141433.
- 741 19. Halpin, K.; Young, P.L.; Mackenzie, J.S.; Field, H.E. Isolation of Hendra virus from  
742 pteropid bats: a natural reservoir of Hendra virus. *J. Gen. Virol.* **2000**, *81*, 1927–1932,  
743 doi:10.1099/0022-1317-81-8-1927.
- 744 20. Marsh, G.A.; de Jong, C.; Barr, J.A.; Tachedjian, M.; Smith, C.; Middleton, D.; Yu, M.;  
745 Todd, S.; Foord, A.J.; Haring, V.; et al. Cedar virus: a novel henipavirus isolated from  
746 Australian bats. *PLOS Pathog.* **2012**, *8*, e1002836, doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1002836.
- 747 21. Brook, C.E.; Ranaivoson, H.C.; Broder, C.C.; Cunningham, A.A.; Héraud, J.; Peel, A.J.;  
748 Gibson, L.; Wood, J.L.N.; Metcalf, C.J.; Dobson, A.P. Disentangling serology to elucidate  
749 henipa- and filovirus transmission in Madagascar fruit bats. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **2019**, *88*,  
750 1001–1016, doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12985.
- 751 22. Drexler, J.F.; Corman, V.M.; Müller, M.A.; Maganga, G.D.; Vallo, P.; Binger, T.; Gloza-  
752 Rausch, F.; Rasche, A.; Yordanov, S.; Seebens, A.; et al. Bats host major mammalian

- 753 paramyxoviruses. *Nat. Commun.* **2012**, *3*, 796, doi:10.1038/ncomms1796.
- 754 23. Peel, A.J.; Sargan, D.R.; Baker, K.S.; Hayman, D.T.S.; Barr, J.A.; Cramer, G.; Suu-Ire,  
755 R.D.; Broder, C.C.; Lembo, T.; Wang, L.-F.; et al. Continent-wide panmixia of an African  
756 fruit bat facilitates transmission of potentially zoonotic viruses. *Nat. Commun.* **2013**, *4*,  
757 2770, doi:10.1038/ncomms3770.
- 758 24. Kessler, M.K.; Becker, D.J.; Peel, A.J.; Justice, N. V; Lunn, T.; Crowley, D.E.; Jones,  
759 D.N.; Eby, P.; Sánchez, C.A.; Plowright, R.K. Changing resource landscapes and spillover  
760 of henipaviruses. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **2018**, *1429*, 78–99, doi:10.1111/nyas.13910.
- 761 25. Williamson, M.M.; Hooper, P.T.; Selleck, P.W.; Westbury, H.A.; Slocombe, R.F.  
762 Experimental Hendra virus infection in pregnant guinea-pigs and fruit bats (*Pteropus*  
763 *poliocephalus*). *J. Comp. Pathol.* **2000**, *122*, 201–207, doi:10.1053/jcpa.1999.0364.
- 764 26. Halpin, K.; Hyatt, A.D.; Fogarty, R.; Middleton, D.; Bingham, J.; Epstein, J.H.; Rahman,  
765 S.A.; Hughes, T.; Smith, C.; Field, H.E.; et al. Pteropid bats are confirmed as the reservoir  
766 hosts of henipaviruses: a comprehensive experimental study of virus transmission. *Am. J.*  
767 *Trop. Med. Hyg.* **2011**, *85*, 946–951, doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2011.10-0567.
- 768 27. Almeida, F.C.; Giannini, N.P.; Simmons, N.B.; Helgen, K.M. Each flying fox on its own  
769 branch: a phylogenetic tree for *Pteropus* and related genera (Chiroptera: Pteropodidae).  
770 *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **2014**, *77*, 83–95, doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2014.03.009.
- 771 28. Almeida, F.C.; Giannini, N.P.; Simmons, N.B. The evolutionary history of the African  
772 fruit bats (Chiroptera: Pteropodidae). *Acta Chiropterologica* **2016**, *18*, 73–90,  
773 doi:10.3161/15081109ACC2016.18.1.003.
- 774 29. Almeida, F.C.; Simmons, N.B.; Giannini, N.P. A species-level phylogeny of Old World  
775 fruit bats with a new higher-level classification of the family Pteropodidae. *Am. Museum*

- 776 *Novit.* **2020**, *2020*, 1–24, doi:10.1206/3950.1.
- 777 30. Tsang, S.M.; Wiantoro, S.; Veluz, M.J.; Sugita, N.; Nguyen, Y.; Simmons, N.B.; Lohman,  
778 D.J. Dispersal out of Wallacea spurs diversification of *Pteropus* flying foxes, the world's  
779 largest bats (Mammalia: Chiroptera). *J. Biogeogr.* **2019**, *47*, 527–537,  
780 doi:10.1111/jbi.13750.
- 781 31. Stribna, T.; Romportl, D.; Demjanovič, J.; Vogeler, A.; Tschapka, M.; Benda, P.;  
782 Horáček, I.; Juste, J.; Goodman, S.M.; Hulva, P. Pan African phylogeography and  
783 palaeodistribution of rousettine fruit bats: ecogeographic correlation with Pleistocene  
784 climate vegetation cycles. *J. Biogeogr.* **2019**, *46*, 2336–2349, doi:10.1111/jbi.13651.
- 785 32. Chua, K.B.; Goh, K.J.; Wong, K.T.; Kamarulzaman, A.; Tan, P.S.K.; Ksiazek, T.G.; Zaki,  
786 S.R.; Paul, G.; Lam, S.K.; Tan, C.T. Fatal encephalitis due to Nipah virus among pig-  
787 farmers in Malaysia. *Lancet* **1999**, *354*, 1257–1259, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(99)04299-3.
- 788 33. Paton, N.I.; Leo, Y.S.; Zaki, S.R.; Auchus, A.P.; Lee, K.E.; Ling, A.E.; Chew, S.K.; Ang,  
789 B.; Rollin, P.E.; Umapathi, T.; et al. Outbreak of Nipah-virus infection among abattoir  
790 workers in Singapore. *Lancet* **1999**, *354*, 1253–1256, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(99)04379-  
791 2.
- 792 34. Goh, K.J.; Tan, C.T.; Chew, N.K.; Tan, P.S.K.; Kamarulzaman, A.; Sarji, S.A.; Wong,  
793 K.T.; Abdullah, B.J.J.; Chua, K.B.; Lam, S.K. Clinical features of Nipah virus encephalitis  
794 among pig farmers in Malaysia. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2000**, *342*, 1229–1235,  
795 doi:10.1056/NEJM200004273421701.
- 796 35. Parashar, U.D.; Sunn, L.M.; Ong, F.; Mounts, A.W.; Arif, M.T.; Ksiazek, T.G.;  
797 Kamaluddin, M.A.; Mustafa, A.N.; Kaur, H.; Ding, L.M.; et al. Case-control study of risk  
798 factors for human infection with a new zoonotic paramyxovirus, Nipah virus, during a

- 799 1998-1999 outbreak of severe encephalitis in Malaysia. *J. Infect. Dis.* **2000**, *181*, 1755–  
800 1759, doi:10.1086/315457.
- 801 36. Chua, K.B. Nipah virus outbreak in Malaysia. *J. Clin. Virol.* **2003**, *26*, 265–275,  
802 doi:10.1016/S1386-6532(02)00268-8.
- 803 37. Chadha, M.S.; Comer, J.A.; Lowe, L.; Rota, P.A.; Rollin, P.E.; Bellini, W.J.; Ksiazek,  
804 T.G.; Mishra, A.C. Nipah virus-associated encephalitis outbreak, Siliguri, India. *Emerg.*  
805 *Infect. Dis.* **2006**, *12*, 235–240, doi:10.3201/eid1202.051247.
- 806 38. Nikolay, B.; Salje, H.; Khan, A.K.M.D.; Sazzad, H.M.S.; Satter, S.M.; Rahman, M.;  
807 Doan, S.; Knust, B.; Flora, M.S.; Luby, S.P.; et al. A framework to monitor changes in  
808 transmission and epidemiology of emerging pathogens: lessons from Nipah virus. *J.*  
809 *Infect. Dis.* **2020**, *221*, S363–S369, doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa074.
- 810 39. Arunkumar, G.; Chandni, R.; Mourya, D.T.; Singh, S.K.; Sadanandan, R.; Sudan, P.;  
811 Bhargava, B.; Gangakhedkar, R.R.; Gupta, N.; Bhargava, B.; et al. Outbreak investigation  
812 of Nipah virus disease in Kerala, India, 2018. *J. Infect. Dis.* **2019**, *219*, 1867–1878,  
813 doi:10.1093/infdis/jiy612.
- 814 40. Cortes, M.C.; Cauchemez, S.; Lefrancq, N.; Luby, S.P.; Jahangir Hossain, M.; Sazzad,  
815 H.M.S.; Rahman, M.; Daszak, P.; Salje, H.; Gurley, E.S. Characterization of the spatial  
816 and temporal distribution of Nipah virus spillover events in Bangladesh, 2007–2013. *J.*  
817 *Infect. Dis.* **2018**, *217*, 1390–1394, doi:10.1093/infdis/jiy015.
- 818 41. Luby, S.P.; Rahman, M.; Hossain, M.J.; Blum, L.; Husain, M.M.; Gurley, E.; Khan, R.;  
819 Ahmed, B.-N.; Rahman, S.; Nahar, N.; et al. Foodborne transmission of Nipah virus,  
820 Bangladesh. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2006**, *12*, 1888–1894, doi:10.3201/eid1212.060732.
- 821 42. Rahman, M.A.; Hossain, M.J.; Sultana, S.; Homaira, N.; Khan, S.U.; Rahman, M.; Gurley,



- 822 E.S.; Rollin, P.E.; Lo, M.K.; Comer, J.A.; et al. Date palm sap linked to Nipah virus  
823 outbreak in Bangladesh, 2008. *Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis.* **2012**, *12*, 65–72,  
824 doi:10.1089/vbz.2011.0656.
- 825 43. Islam, M.S.; Sazzad, H.M.S.; Satter, S.M.; Sultana, S.; Hossain, M.J.; Hasan, M.;  
826 Rahman, M.; Campbell, S.; Cannon, D.L.; Ströher, U.; et al. Nipah virus transmission  
827 from bats to humans associated with drinking traditional liquor made from date palm sap,  
828 Bangladesh, 2011–2014. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2016**, *22*, 664–670,  
829 doi:10.3201/eid2204.151747.
- 830 44. Gurley, E.S.; Hegde, S.T.; Hossain, K.; Sazzad, H.M.S.; Hossain, M.J.; Rahman, M.;  
831 Sharker, M.A.Y.; Salje, H.; Islam, M.S.; Epstein, J.H.; et al. Convergence of humans, bats,  
832 trees, and culture in Nipah virus transmission, Bangladesh. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2017**, *23*,  
833 1446–1453, doi:10.3201/eid2309.161922.
- 834 45. Harcourt, B.H.; Lowe, L.; Tamin, A.; Liu, X.; Bankamp, B.; Bowden, N.; Rollin, P.E.;  
835 Comer, J.A.; Ksiazek, T.G.; Hossain, M.J.; et al. Genetic characterization of Nipah virus,  
836 Bangladesh, 2004. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2005**, *11*, 1594–1597, doi:10.3201/eid1110.050513.
- 837 46. Gurley, E.S.; Montgomery, J.M.; Hossain, M.J.; Bell, M.; Azad, A.K.; Islam, M.R.;  
838 Molla, M.A.R.; Carroll, D.S.; Ksiazek, T.G.; Rota, P.A.; et al. Person-to-person  
839 transmission of Nipah virus in a Bangladeshi community. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2007**, *13*,  
840 1031–1037, doi:10.3201/eid1307.061128.
- 841 47. Nikolay, B.; Salje, H.; Hossain, M.J.; Khan, A.K.M.D.; Sazzad, H.M.S.; Rahman, M.;  
842 Daszak, P.; Ströher, U.; Pulliam, J.R.C.; Kilpatrick, A.M.; et al. Transmission of Nipah  
843 virus — 14 years of investigations in Bangladesh. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2019**, *380*, 1804–1814,  
844 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1805376.

- 845 48. Arankalle, V.A.; Bandyopadhyay, B.T.; Ramdasi, A.Y.; Jadi, R.; Patil, D.R.; Rahman, M.;  
846 Majumdar, M.; Banerjee, P.S.; Hati, A.K.; Goswami, R.P.; et al. Genomic characterization  
847 of Nipah virus, West Bengal, India. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2011**, *17*, 907–909,  
848 doi:10.3201/eid1705.100968.
- 849 49. Kumar, C.P.G.; Sugunan, A.P.; Yadav, P.; Kurup, K.K.; Aarathie, R.; Manickam, P.;  
850 Bhatnagar, T.; Radhakrishnan, C.; Thomas, B.; Kumar, A.; et al. Infections among  
851 contacts of patients with Nipah Virus, India. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2019**, *25*, 1007–1010,  
852 doi:10.3201/eid2505.181352.
- 853 50. Tan, C.T.; Tan, K.S. Nosocomial transmissibility of Nipah virus. *J. Infect. Dis.* **2001**, *184*,  
854 1367–1367, doi:10.1086/323996.
- 855 51. Mounts, A.W.; Kaur, H.; Parashar, U.D.; Ksiazek, T.G.; Cannon, D.; Arokiasamy, J.T.;  
856 Anderson, L.J.; Lye, M.S. A cohort study of health care workers to assess nosocomial  
857 transmissibility of Nipah virus, Malaysia, 1999. *J. Infect. Dis.* **2001**, *183*, 810–813,  
858 doi:10.1086/318822.
- 859 52. Altizer, S.; Becker, D.J.; Epstein, J.H.; Forbes, K.M.; Gillespie, T.R.; Hall, R.J.; Hawley,  
860 D.M.; Hernandez, S.M.; Martin, L.B.; Plowright, R.K.; et al. Food for contagion:  
861 synthesis and future directions for studying host–parasite responses to resource shifts in  
862 anthropogenic environments. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2018**, *373*, 20170102,  
863 doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0102.
- 864 53. Chua, K.B.; Chua, B.H.; Wang, C.W. Anthropogenic deforestation, El Niño and the  
865 emergence of Nipah virus in Malaysia. *Malays. J. Pathol.* **2002**, *24*, 15–21.
- 866 54. Pulliam, J.R.C.; Epstein, J.H.; Dushoff, J.; Rahman, S.A.; Bunning, M.; Jamaluddin, A.A.;  
867 Hyatt, A.D.; Field, H.E.; Dobson, A.P.; Daszak, P. Agricultural intensification, priming

- 868 for persistence and the emergence of Nipah virus: a lethal bat-borne zoonosis. *J. R. Soc.*  
869 *Interface* **2012**, *9*, 89–101, doi:10.1098/rsif.2011.0223.
- 870 55. Nahar, N.; Sultana, R.; Gurley, E.S.; Hossain, M.J.; Luby, S.P. Date palm sap collection:  
871 exploring opportunities to prevent Nipah transmission. *Ecohealth* **2010**, *7*, 196–203,  
872 doi:10.1007/s10393-010-0320-3.
- 873 56. Khan, M.S.U.; Hossain, J.; Gurley, E.S.; Nahar, N.; Sultana, R.; Luby, S.P.; Khan,  
874 M.S.U.; Hossain, J.; Gurley, E.S.; Nahar, N.; et al. Use of infrared camera to understand  
875 bats' access to date palm sap: implications for preventing Nipah virus transmission.  
876 *Ecohealth* **2010**, *7*, 517–525, doi:10.1007/s10393-010-0366-2.
- 877 57. Luby, S.P.; Hossain, M.J.; Gurley, E.S.; Ahmed, B.-N.; Banu, S.; Khan, S.U.; Homaira,  
878 N.; Rota, P.A.; Rollin, P.E.; Comer, J.A.; et al. Recurrent zoonotic transmission of Nipah  
879 virus into humans, Bangladesh, 2001–2007. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2009**, *15*, 1229–1235,  
880 doi:10.3201/eid1508.081237.
- 881 58. Rahman, M.; Rahman, J. Medicinal value and nutrient status of indigenous fruits in  
882 Bangladesh. *Nov. J. Med. Biol. Sci.* **2014**, *3*, 1–10, doi:10.20286/nova-jmbs-030423.
- 883 59. KewScience. *Phoenix sylvestris*. Available online:  
884 [http://wcsp.science.kew.org/namedetail.do?name\\_id=152708](http://wcsp.science.kew.org/namedetail.do?name_id=152708) (accessed on Oct 14, 2020).
- 885 60. Chaluvadi, S.R.; Young, P.; Thompson, K.; Bahri, B.A.; Gajera, B.; Narayanan, S.;  
886 Krueger, R.; Bennetzen, J.L. *Phoenix* phylogeny, and analysis of genetic variation in a  
887 diverse collection of date palm (*Phoenix dactylifera*) and related species. *Plant Divers.*  
888 **2019**, *41*, 330–339, doi:10.1016/j.pld.2018.11.005.
- 889 61. Annett, H.E.; Lele, G.K.; Amin, B.M. The date sugar industry in Bengal: an investigation  
890 into its chemistry and agriculture. *Mem. Dep. Agric. India* **1913**, *2*, 281–389.

- 891 62. Blatter, E. *The palms of British India and Ceylon*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1926;
- 892 63. Epstein, J.H.; Anthony, S.J.; Islam, A.; Kilpatrick, A.M.; Ali Khan, S.; Balkey, M.D.;
- 893 Ross, N.; Smith, I.; Zambrana-Torrel, C.; Tao, Y.; et al. Nipah virus dynamics in bats
- 894 and implications for spillover to humans. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2020**, 202000429,
- 895 doi:10.1073/pnas.2000429117.
- 896 64. Fogarty, R.; Halpin, K.; Hyatt, A.D.; Daszak, P.; Mungall, B.A. Henipavirus susceptibility
- 897 to environmental variables. *Virus Res.* **2008**, 132, 140–144,
- 898 doi:10.1016/j.virusres.2007.11.010.
- 899 65. de Wit, E.; Prescott, J.; Falzarano, D.; Bushmaker, T.; Scott, D.; Feldmann, H.; Munster,
- 900 V.J. Foodborne transmission of Nipah virus in Syrian hamsters. *PLOS Pathog.* **2014**, 10,
- 901 e1004001, doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1004001.
- 902 66. Nahar, N.; Asaduzzaman, M.; Mandal, U.K.; Rimi, N.A.; Gurley, E.S.; Rahman, M.;
- 903 Garcia, F.; Zimicki, S.; Sultana, R.; Luby, S.P. Hunting bats for human consumption in
- 904 Bangladesh. *Ecohealth* **2020**, doi:10.1007/s10393-020-01468-x.
- 905 67. Khan, M.A.R. Status and distribution of bats in Bangladesh with notes on their ecology.
- 906 *Zoos' Print J.* **2001**, 16, 479–483, doi:10.11609/JoTT.ZPJ.16.5.479-83.
- 907 68. Mickleburgh, S.P.; Hutson, A.M.; Racey, P.A. A review of the global conservation status
- 908 of bats. *Oryx* **2002**, 36, 18–34, doi:10.1017/S0030605301000011.
- 909 69. Epstein, J.H.; Olival, K.J.; Pulliam, J.R.C.; Smith, C.; Westrum, J.; Hughes, T.; Dobson,
- 910 A.P.; Zubaid, A.; Rahman, S.A.; Basir, M.M.; et al. *Pteropus vampyrus*, a hunted
- 911 migratory species with a multinational home-range and a need for regional management.
- 912 *J. Appl. Ecol.* **2009**, 46, 991–1002, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2009.01699.x.
- 913 70. Oleksy, R.; Racey, P.A.; Jones, G. High-resolution GPS tracking reveals habitat selection

- 914 and the potential for long-distance seed dispersal by Madagascan flying foxes *Pteropus*  
915 *rufus*. *Glob. Ecol. Conserv.* **2015**, *3*, 678–692, doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2015.02.012.
- 916 71. Roberts, B.J.; Catterall, C.P.; Eby, P.; Kanowski, J. Long-distance and frequent  
917 movements of the flying-fox *Pteropus poliocephalus*: implications for management. *PLOS*  
918 *One* **2012**, *7*, e42532, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0042532.
- 919 72. United Nations. World Population Prospects 2019, Online Edition. Available online:  
920 <https://population.un.org/wpp/>.
- 921 73. Hahn, M.B.; Epstein, J.H.; Gurley, E.S.; Islam, M.S.; Luby, S.P.; Daszak, P.; Patz, J.A.  
922 Roosting behaviour and habitat selection of *Pteropus giganteus* reveal potential links to  
923 Nipah virus epidemiology. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **2014**, *51*, 376–387, doi:10.1111/1365-  
924 2664.12212.
- 925 74. Hahn, M.B.; Gurley, E.S.; Epstein, J.H.; Islam, M.S.; Patz, J.A.; Daszak, P.; Luby, S.P.  
926 The role of landscape composition and configuration on *Pteropus giganteus* roosting  
927 ecology and Nipah virus spillover risk in Bangladesh. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **2014**, *90*,  
928 247–255, doi:10.4269/ajtmh.13-0256.
- 929 75. National Climatic Data Center (NCDC). NCDC Climate Data Online. Available online:  
930 <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cdo-web/search> (accessed on Jan 15, 2020).
- 931 76. Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology Application Laboratory. APL  
932 VirtualEarth. Available online:  
933 <http://www.jamstec.go.jp/virtualearth/general/en/index.html> (accessed on Nov 12, 2020).
- 934 77. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Physical Sciences Laboratory.  
935 Multivariate ENSO Index Version 2 (MEI.v2). Available online:  
936 <https://psl.noaa.gov/enso/mei/> (accessed on Nov 12, 2020).

- 937 78. Lloyd, C.T.; Sorichetta, A.; Tatem, A.J. High resolution global gridded data for use in  
938 population studies. *Sci. Data* **2017**, *4*, 170001, doi:10.1038/sdata.2017.1.
- 939 79. Lloyd, C.T.; Chamberlain, H.; Kerr, D.; Yetman, G.; Pistolesi, L.; Stevens, F.R.;  
940 Gaughan, A.E.; Nieves, J.J.; Hornby, G.; MacManus, K.; et al. Global spatio-temporally  
941 harmonised datasets for producing high-resolution gridded population distribution  
942 datasets. *Big Earth Data* **2019**, *3*, 108–139, doi:10.1080/20964471.2019.1625151.
- 943 80. Doxsey-Whitfield, E.; MacManus, K.; Adamo, S.B.; Pistolesi, L.; Squires, J.; Borkovska,  
944 O.; Baptista, S.R. Taking advantage of the improved availability of census data: a first  
945 look at the gridded population of the world, version 4. *Pap. Appl. Geogr.* **2015**, *1*, 226–  
946 234, doi:10.1080/23754931.2015.1014272.
- 947 81. Fick, S.E.; Hijmans, R.J. WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for  
948 global land areas. *Int. J. Climatol.* **2017**, *37*, 4302–4315, doi:10.1002/joc.5086.
- 949 82. Hansen, M.C.; Potapov, P. V; Moore, R.; Hancher, M.; Turubanova, S.A.; Tyukavina, A.;  
950 Thau, D.; Stehman, S. V; Goetz, S.J.; Loveland, T.R.; et al. High-resolution global maps  
951 of 21st-century forest cover change. *Science*. **2013**, *342*, 850–853,  
952 doi:10.1126/science.1244693.
- 953 83. Ellis, E.C.; Klein Goldewijk, K.; Siebert, S.; Lightman, D.; Ramankutty, N.  
954 Anthropogenic transformation of the biomes, 1700 to 2000. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **2010**,  
955 *19*, 589–606, doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00540.x.
- 956 84. Klein Goldewijk, K.; Beusen, A.; Van Drecht, G.; de Vos, M. The HYDE 3.1 spatially  
957 explicit database of human-induced global land-use change over the past 12,000 years.  
958 *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **2011**, *20*, 73–86, doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00587.x.
- 959 85. OECD. Land cover in countries and regions. Available online:

- 960 [https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=LAND\\_COVER](https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=LAND_COVER) (accessed on Aug 6,  
961 2020).
- 962 86. ESA-CCI. Land cover. Available online: <http://maps.elie.ucl.ac.be/CCI/viewer/> (accessed  
963 on Aug 6, 2020).
- 964 87. World Bank. Forest area (% of land area) - Bangladesh. Available online:  
965 [https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/AG.LND.FRST.ZS?end=2016&locations=BD&start=](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/AG.LND.FRST.ZS?end=2016&locations=BD&start=1990)  
966 1990 (accessed on Aug 6, 2020).
- 967 88. Reddy, C.S.; Pasha, S.V.; Jha, C.S.; Diwakar, P.G.; Dadhwal, V.K. Development of  
968 national database on long-term deforestation (1930-2014) in Bangladesh. *Glob. Planet.*  
969 *Change* **2016**, *139*, 173–182, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2016.02.003.
- 970 89. Cooper, M.; Zvoleff, A. *gfcanalysis*: tools for working with Hansen et al. Global Forest  
971 Change dataset. Available online: <https://cran.r-project.org/package=gfcanalysis>.
- 972 90. R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Available online:  
973 <http://www.r-project.org>.
- 974 91. Ripley, B.; Venables, B.; Bates, D.M.; Hornik, K.; Gebhardt, A.; Firth, D. *MASS*: support  
975 functions and datasets for Venables and Ripley's *MASS*. Available online: [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/package=MASS)  
976 [project.org/package=MASS](https://cran.r-project.org/package=MASS).
- 977 92. Burnham, K.P.; Anderson, D.R. Multimodel inference: understanding AIC and BIC in  
978 model selection. *Sociol. Methods Res.* **2004**, *33*, 261–304.
- 979 93. Bartoń, K. *MuMIn*: multi-model inference. Available online: [http://cran.r-](http://cran.r-project.org/package=MuMIn)  
980 [project.org/package=MuMIn](http://cran.r-project.org/package=MuMIn).
- 981 94. Guyon, I. A scaling law for the validation-set training-set size ratio. *AT&T Bell Lab.* **1997**.
- 982 95. Friedman, J.; Hastie, T.; Tibshirani, R. Regularization paths for generalized linear models

- 983 via coordinate descent. *J. Stat. Softw.* **2010**, 33, 1–22, doi:10.18637/jss.v033.i01.
- 984 96. Breiman, L. Random forests. *Mach. Learn.* **2001**, 45, 5–32,  
985 doi:10.1023/A:1010933404324.
- 986 97. Kuhn, M.; Wing, J.; Weston, S.; Williams, A.; Keefer, C.; Engelhardt, A.; Cooper, T.;  
987 Mayer, Z.; Kenkel, B.; R Core Team; et al. *caret*: classification and regression training.  
988 Available online: <https://cran.r-project.org/package=caret>.
- 989 98. Friedman, J.; Hastie, T.; Tibshirani, R.; Narasimhan, B.; Tay, K.; Simon, N.; Qian, J.  
990 *glmnet*: lasso and elastic-net regularized generalized linear models. Available online:  
991 <https://cran.r-project.org/package=glmnet>.
- 992 99. Wright, M.N.; Wager, S.; Probst, P. *ranger*: a fast implementation of random forests.  
993 Available online: <https://cran.r-project.org/package=ranger>.
- 994 100. Krystufek, B. Indian flying fox *Pteropus giganteus* colony in Peradeniya Botanical  
995 Gardens, Sri Lanka. *Hystrix, Ital. J. Mammal.* **2009**, 20, 29–35.
- 996 101. Kumar, R.; Elangovan, V. Effect of tree characteristics on roost selection of the Indian  
997 flying fox, *Pteropus giganteus*. *J. Bat Res. Conserv.* **2019**, 12, 100–106,  
998 doi:10.14709/BarbJ.12.1.2019.13.
- 999 102. Kumar, J.; Kanaujia, A. Distribution and population status of fruit-bat (*Pteropus*  
1000 *giganteus*) in district Lakhimpur-Kheri, Uttar Pradesh, India. *G-Journal Environ. Sci.*  
1001 *Technol.* **2015**, 3, 23–28.
- 1002 103. Neupane, K.R.; Basnet, K.; Katuwal, H.B. Plight of Indian flying fox (*Pteropus*  
1003 *giganteus*) in lowlands of eastern Nepal. *World J. Zool.* **2016**, 11, 81–85.
- 1004 104. Sharma, B.; Subedi, A.; Gyawali, K.; Ghimire, P.; Bist, B.S.; Baniya, S. Can *Pteropus*  
1005 *giganteus* Brünnich, 1782 co-exist in a human dominated landscape? A case study in



- 1006 Pokhara valley, western Nepal. *J. Bat Res. Conserv.* **2018**, *11*, 1–7.
- 1007 105. Gulraiz, T.L.; Javid, A.; Mahmood-Ul-Hassan, M.; Maqbool, A.; Ashraf, S.; Hussain, M.;
- 1008 Daud, S. Roost characteristics and habitat preferences of Indian flying fox (*Pteropus*
- 1009 *giganteus*) in urban areas of Lahore, Pakistan. *Turkish J. Zool.* **2015**, *39*, 388–394,
- 1010 doi:10.3906/zoo-1401-71.
- 1011 106. Khan, W.; Nisa, N.N.; Khan, A.R.; Rahbar, B.; Mehmood, S.A.; Ahmed, S.; Kamal, M.;
- 1012 Shah, M.; Rasool, A.; Pahanwar, W.A.; et al. Roosting ecology and morphometric
- 1013 analysis of *Pteropus medius* (Indian flying fox) in Lower Dir, district, Pakistan. *Brazilian*
- 1014 *J. Biol.* **2020**, doi:10.1590/1519-6984.221935.
- 1015 107. Chaiyes, A.; Duengkae, P.; Wacharapluesadee, S.; Pongpattananurak, N.; Olival, K.J.;
- 1016 Hemachudha, T. Assessing the distribution, roosting site characteristics, and population of
- 1017 *Pteropus lylei* in Thailand. *Raffles Bull. Zool.* **2017**, *65*, 670–680.
- 1018 108. Giles, J.R.; Plowright, R.K.; Eby, P.; Peel, A.J.; McCallum, H. Models of Eucalypt
- 1019 phenology predict bat population flux. *Ecol. Evol.* **2016**, *6*, 7230–7245,
- 1020 doi:10.1002/ece3.2382.
- 1021 109. Welbergen, J.A.; Klose, S.M.; Markus, N.; Eby, P. Climate change and the effects of
- 1022 temperature extremes on Australian flying-foxes. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2008**, *275*,
- 1023 419–425, doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.1385.
- 1024 110. van der Ree, R.; McDonnell, M.J.; Temby, I.; Nelson, J.; Whittingham, E. The
- 1025 establishment and dynamics of a recently established urban camp of flying foxes
- 1026 (*Pteropus poliocephalus*) outside their geographic range. *J. Zool.* **2006**, *268*, 177–185,
- 1027 doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2005.00005.x.
- 1028 111. Hosmer, D.W.; Lemeshow, S. *Applied logistic regression, second edition*; Wiley and

- 1029 Sons, Inc.: New York, 2000; ISBN 9780471654025.
- 1030 112. Van Schendel, W. *A history of Bangladesh*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge,  
1031 2009; ISBN 9780511997419.
- 1032 113. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics *Bangladesh Agricultural Statistics Yearbook 2017*; 2018;
- 1033 114. Alam, G.M.M.; Khatun, M.N. Sweetening food security in Bangladesh: present situation  
1034 and future strategy. *Pakistan Sugar J.* **2012**, *27*, 10–18.
- 1035 115. Aung-Thwin, M.A.; Aung, M.H.; Steinberg, D.I. Myanmar. *Encycl. Br.* 2020.
- 1036 116. Ahmed, F.U. Traditional agroforestry systems in Bangladesh. *Agrofor. Newsl.* **1995**, *3*, 6–  
1037 9.
- 1038 117. Sun, B.; Jia, L.; Liang, B.; Chen, Q.; Liu, D. Phylogeography, transmission, and viral  
1039 proteins of Nipah virus. *Virol. Sin.* **2018**, *33*, 385–393, doi:10.1007/s12250-018-0050-1.
- 1040 118. Whitmer, S.L.M.; Lo, M.K.; Sazzad, H.M.S.; Zufan, S.; Gurley, E.S.; Sultana, S.;  
1041 Amman, B.; Ladner, J.T.; Rahman, M.Z.; Doan, S.; et al. Inference of Nipah virus  
1042 evolution, 1999-2015. *Virus Evol.* **2020**, doi:10.1093/ve/veaa062.
- 1043 119. Hegde, S.T.; Salje, H.; Sazzad, H.M.S.; Hossain, M.J.; Rahman, M.; Daszak, P.; Klena,  
1044 J.D.; Nichol, S.T.; Luby, S.P.; Gurley, E.S. Using healthcare-seeking behaviour to  
1045 estimate the number of Nipah outbreaks missed by hospital-based surveillance in  
1046 Bangladesh. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **2019**, *48*, 1219–1227, doi:10.1093/ije/dyz057.
- 1047 120. Páez, D.J.; Giles, J.; McCallum, H.; Field, H.; Jordan, D.; Peel, A.J.; Plowright, R.K.  
1048 Conditions affecting the timing and magnitude of Hendra virus shedding across  
1049 pteropodid bat populations in Australia. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **2017**, *145*, 3143–3153,  
1050 doi:10.1017/S0950268817002138.
- 1051 121. Plowright, R.K.; Eby, P.; Hudson, P.J.; Smith, I.L.; Westcott, D.; Bryden, W.L.;

- 1052 Middleton, D.; Reid, P.A.; McFarlane, R.A.; Martin, G.; et al. Ecological dynamics of  
1053 emerging bat virus spillover. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2015**, 282, 20142124,  
1054 doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2124.
- 1055 122. Mahmood-Ul-Hassan, M.; Gulraiz, T.L.; Rana, S.A.; Javid, A. The diet of Indian flying-  
1056 foxes (*Pteropus giganteus*) in urban habitats of Pakistan. *Acta Chiropterologica* **2010**, 12,  
1057 341–347, doi:10.3161/150811010X537927.
- 1058 123. Walter, M.H.; Verdong, A.; Olmos, V.; Weiss, C.C.; Vial, L.-R.; Putra, A.; Müller, J.;  
1059 Tschapka, M.; Schnitzler, H.-U. Discrimination of small sugar concentration differences  
1060 helps the nectar-feeding bat *Leptonycteris yerbabuenae* cover energetic demands. *J. Exp.*  
1061 *Biol.* **2020**, jeb.215053, doi:10.1242/jeb.215053.
- 1062 124. Plowright, R.K.; Peel, A.J.; Streicker, D.G.; Gilbert, A.T.; McCallum, H.; Wood, J.;  
1063 Baker, M.L.; Restif, O. Transmission or within-host dynamics driving pulses of zoonotic  
1064 viruses in reservoir–host populations. *PLOS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **2016**, 10, e0004796,  
1065 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004796.
- 1066 125. Edson, D.W.; Field, H.E.; McMichael, L.; Jordan, D.; Kung, N.Y.; Mayer, D.; Smith, C.S.  
1067 Flying-fox roost disturbance and Hendra virus spillover risk. *PLOS One* **2015**, 10,  
1068 e0125881, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0125881.
- 1069 126. McMichael, L.; Edson, D.; Mayer, D.; Broos, A.; Kopp, S.; Meers, J.; Field, H.  
1070 Physiologic biomarkers and Hendra virus infection in Australian black flying foxes  
1071 (*Pteropus alecto*). *J. Wildl. Dis.* **2017**, 53, 111, doi:10.7589/2016-05-100.
- 1072 127. McMichael, L.; Edson, D.; Smith, C.; Mayer, D.; Smith, I.; Kopp, S.; Meers, J.; Field, H.  
1073 Physiological stress and Hendra virus in flying-foxes (*Pteropus* spp.), Australia. *PLOS*  
1074 *One* **2017**, 12, e0182171, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0182171.

- 1075 128. Dey, S.; Roy, U.S.; Chattopadhyay, S. Distribution and abundance of three populations of  
1076 Indian flying fox (*Pteropus giganteus*) from Purulia district of West Bengal, India.  
1077 *TAPROBANICA J. Asian Biodivers.* **2013**, 5, 60, doi:10.4038/tapro.v5i1.5664.
- 1078 129. Manandhar, S.; Thapa, S.; Shrestha, T.K.; Jyakhwo, R.; Wright, W.; Aryal, A. Population  
1079 status and diurnal behaviour of the Indian flying fox *Pteropus giganteus* (Brünnich, 1782)  
1080 in Kathmandu Valley, Nepal. *Proc. Zool. Soc.* **2018**, 71, 363–375, doi:10.1007/s12595-  
1081 017-0219-x.
- 1082 130. Khan, S.U.; Gurley, E.S.; Hossain, M.J.; Nahar, N.; Sharker, M.A.Y.; Luby, S.P. A  
1083 randomized controlled trial of interventions to impede date palm sap contamination by  
1084 bats to prevent Nipah virus transmission in Bangladesh. *PLOS One* **2012**, 7, e42689,  
1085 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0042689.
- 1086 131. Nahar, N.; Mondal, U.K.; Sultana, R.; Hossain, M.J.; Khan, M.S.U.; Gurley, E.S.;  
1087 Oliveras, E.; Luby, S.P. Piloting the use of indigenous methods to prevent Nipah virus  
1088 infection by interrupting bats' access to date palm sap in Bangladesh. *Health Promot. Int.*  
1089 **2013**, 28, 378–386, doi:10.1093/heapro/das020.
- 1090 132. Nahar, N.; Asaduzzaman, M.; Sultana, R.; Garcia, F.; Paul, R.C.; Abedin, J.; Sazzad,  
1091 H.M.S.; Rahman, M.; Gurley, E.S.; Luby, S.P. A large-scale behavior change intervention  
1092 to prevent Nipah transmission in Bangladesh: components and costs. *BMC Res. Notes*  
1093 **2017**, 10, 225, doi:10.1186/s13104-017-2549-1.
- 1094 133. Pernet, O.; Schneider, B.S.; Beaty, S.M.; Lebreton, M.; Yun, T.E.; Park, A.; Zachariah,  
1095 T.T.; Bowden, T.A.; Hitchens, P.; Ramirez, C.M.; et al. Evidence for henipavirus spillover  
1096 into human populations in Africa. *Nat. Commun.* **2014**, 5, 1–10,  
1097 doi:10.1038/ncomms6342.

- 1098 134. Das, P.; Sazzad, H.M.S.; Aleem, M.A.; Rahman, M.Z.; Rahman, M.; Anthony, S.J.;  
1099 Lipkin, W.I.; Gurley, E.S.; Luby, S.P.; Openshaw, J.J. Hospital-based zoonotic disease  
1100 surveillance in Bangladesh: design, field data and difficulties. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B*  
1101 *Biol. Sci.* **2019**, *374*, 20190019, doi:10.1098/rstb.2019.0019.
- 1102 135. Hegde, S.T.; Sazzad, H.M.S.; Hossain, M.J.; Alam, M.-U.; Kenah, E.; Daszak, P.; Rollin,  
1103 P.; Rahman, M.; Luby, S.P.; Gurley, E.S. Investigating rare risk factors for Nipah virus in  
1104 Bangladesh: 2001–2012. *Ecohealth* **2016**, *13*, 720–728, doi:10.1007/s10393-016-1166-0.
- 1105 136. Chowdhury, S.; Khan, S.U.; Cramer, G.; Epstein, J.H.; Broder, C.C.; Islam, A.; Peel,  
1106 A.J.; Barr, J.A.; Daszak, P.; Wang, L.-F.; et al. Serological evidence of henipavirus  
1107 exposure in cattle, goats and pigs in Bangladesh. *PLOS Negl. Trop. Dis.* **2014**, *8*, e3302,  
1108 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0003302.
- 1109 137. Yadav, P.D.; Shete, A.M.; Kumar, G.A.; Sarkale, P.; Sahay, R.R.; Radhakrishnan, C.;  
1110 Lakra, R.; Pardeshi, P.; Gupta, N.; Gangakhedkar, R.R.; et al. Nipah virus sequences from  
1111 humans and bats during Nipah outbreak, Kerala, India, 2018. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2019**, *25*,  
1112 1003–1006, doi:10.3201/eid2505.181076.
- 1113