It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

1	Quantifying and characterizing hourly human exposure to malaria vectors bites in rural
2	southwest Burkina Faso
3	
4	Soma D.D <sup><math>1,2,3</math></sup> <sup>§*</sup> , Zogo B <sup><math>3,4,5</math></sup> <sup>§</sup> , Taconet P <sup><math>1,3</math></sup> , Somé A <sup><math>1,6</math></sup> , Coulibaly S <sup><math>1</math></sup> , Baba-Moussa L <sup><math>5</math></sup> ,
5	Ouédraogo G.A <sup>2</sup> , Koffi A <sup>4</sup> , Pennetier C <sup>3,4</sup> , Dabiré K.R <sup>1</sup> , Moiroux N <sup>1,3</sup>
6	
7	<sup>1</sup> Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé (IRSS), Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso
8	<sup>2</sup> Université Nazi Boni (UNB), Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso
9	<sup>3</sup> MIVEGEC, Univ. Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, Montpellier, France
10	<sup>4</sup> Institut Pierre Richet (IPR), Bouaké, Côte d'Ivoire
11	<sup>5</sup> Université d'Abomey Calavi, Abomey-Calavi, Benin
12	<sup>6</sup> Université Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso
13	<sup>§</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work
14	*Corresponding author
15	Email: <u>dieusoma@yahoo.fr</u> (DDS)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

21

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

#### 22 Abstract

**Background:** To sustain the efficacy of malaria vector control, the World Health Organization (WHO) recommends the combination of effective tools. Before designing and implementing additional strategies in any setting, it is critical to monitor or predict when and where transmission occurs. However, to date, very few studies have quantified the behavioural interactions between humans and *Anopheles* vectors. Here, we characterized residual transmission in a rural area of Burkina Faso where long lasting insecticidal nets (LLIN) are widely used.

30 **Methods:** We analysed data on both human and malaria vectors behaviours from 27 villages 31 to measure hourly human exposure to vector bites in dry and rainy seasons using 32 mathematical models. We estimated the protective efficacy of LLINs and characterised where 33 (indoors *vs.* outdoors) and when both LLIN users and non-users were exposed to vector bites.

**Results:** The percentage of the population who declared sleeping under a LLIN the previous night was very high regardless of the season, with an average LLIN use ranging from 92.43% to 99.89%. The use of LLIN provided > 80% protection against exposure to vector bites. The proportion of exposure for LLIN users was 29-57% after 05:00 and 0.05-12 % before 20:00. More than 80% of exposure occurred indoors for LLIN users and the estimate reached 90% for children under five years old in the dry cold season.

40 **Conclusions:** This study supports the current use of LLIN as a primary malaria vector control 41 tool. It also emphasises the need to complement LLIN with indoor-implemented measures 42 such as indoor residual spraying (IRS) and/or house improvement to effectively combat 43 malaria in the rural area of Diébougou. Furthermore, malaria elimination programmes would 44 also require strategies that target outdoor biting vectors to be successful in the area.

45 Keywords: Diébougou, LLIN, Anopheles, humans, behaviours, residual transmission

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

#### 46 **Background**

47 Massive distribution of long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) is a core intervention for 48 malaria control in Burkina Faso. Scaling-up of coverage with LLIN in sub-Saharan Africa has 49 been very successful between 2000 and 2015 during which malaria morbidity and mortality 50 have dropped considerably [1]. Unfortunately, this significant progress is stalling or even 51 reversing in some countries. Burkina Faso is indeed one of the sixteen (16) in the world that 52 documented an increase in malaria burden from 2016 to 2017 [2]. This trend might be 53 attributed to the recent increases in prevalence and strength of pyrethroid resistance in malaria 54 vectors [3–5]. Another possible cause is the development of behavioural resistance in vector 55 populations [6–8]. In sub-Saharan Africa, there have been many reports of changes in vector 56 species and/or vector biting behaviours to avoid contact with LLIN [6-8]. Such changes in 57 vector populations are considered by many specialists as an important threat for indoor 58 control strategies such as LLIN [9, 10].

59 To sustain the efficacy of vector control, the WHO recommends the combination of effective 60 tools [11]. At present, there are a number of recommended tools available and many others 61 under development that can potentially be combined with LLIN [12, 13]. However, national 62 malaria control programs (NMCPs) are now facing challenges to design effective control 63 strategies due to high variations in malaria epidemiology between and even within countries 64 [14]. To do so, NMCP must be able to monitor or predict when and where transmission 65 occurs. Entomological data alone are not sufficient to address this question, missing 66 information about behaviours of local human populations in order to measure/predict human 67 exposure to malaria vectors bite [15-17]. Unfortunately, only few studies to date have 68 quantified and characterized human exposure to malaria vectors bites by analysing data on 69 both human and vector behaviours [17].

70 The present work is a baseline study conducted in the Diébougou area, southwest Burkina 71 Faso, to quantify the behavioural interactions between humans and *Anopheles* mosquitoes. 72 Results of the entomological surveys previously reported [18] were used in combination with 73 human behavioral data to study human exposure to Anopheles vector bites. The work is part 74 of a large randomized control trial designed to investigate whether the combination of LLINs 75 with other vector control tools can provide additional protection over malaria cases and 76 transmission. The trial was carried out in Southwest Burkina Faso where malaria vectors 77 shows high levels of pyrethroid resistance.

78

## 79 Methods

80 This study was conducted in 27 villages located in the Diébougou health district, southwest 81 Burkina Faso in order to collect baseline data for a randomized controlled trial (Fig. 1). These 82 villages were selected based on geographical (distance between two villages higher than 2 km 83 and accessibility during the rainy season) and demographic (a population size ranging from 84 200 to 500 inhabitants) criteria [18]. The climate in the study area is tropical with one dry 85 season from October to April (including a cold period from December to February and a hot 86 period from March to April) and one rainy season from May to September. Average daily 87 temperature amplitudes are 18-36°C, 25-39°C and 23-33°C in dry cold, dry hot and rainy 88 season, respectively. The mean annual rainfall is 1200 mm. The natural vegetation is 89 dominated by wooded savannah dotted with clear forest gallery. The main economic activity 90 is agriculture (cotton growing and cereals) followed by artisanal gold mining and production 91 of coal and wood [19, 20].

# 92 Fig 1. Map of the study area and villages surveyed

We conducted three entomological surveys in the dry cold (January 2017), dry hot (March
2017) and rainy seasons (June 2017), respectively. During each survey, we collected human

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

95 landing mosquitoes both indoors and outdoors from 17:00 h to 09:00 h in 4 houses per 96 villages during one night [18]. All the mosquitoes collected were morphologically identified 97 [21,22] and Anopheles spp. mosquitoes were subsequently identified to the species level by 98 polymerase chain reaction [23–25]. Detailed descriptions of the methods used are provided in 99 our previous publication [18]. Overall, Anopheles funestus s.s was the main malaria vector in 100 the study area during the dry cold season [18]. During the dry hot and rainy seasons, 101 Anopheles coluzzii and Anopheles gambiae s.s were the dominant species. The mean 102 endophagy rate (ER) of malaria vectors was 63.23%, 50.18% and 57.18% during the dry cold, 103 dry hot and rainy seasons, respectively [18].

104 In order to obtain appropriate data regarding relevant human behaviours, we surveyed 401 105 and 339 randomly selected households in dry (February to April 2017) and rainy (September 106 2017) seasons, respectively (corresponding to an average of 15 and 13 households per 107 village). Among people usually leaving in each selected household, we randomly selected 3 108 persons (maximum) belonging to each of the 3 following age groups: 0-5 years old, 6-17 109 years old and  $\geq 18$  years old. We asked the head of the household the time at which each 110 selected person (1) entered and exited his own house the night preceding the survey and (2) 111 the time each LLIN user entered and exited his sleeping space the night preceding the survey 112 [16]. In order to know the relative weight of each age group in the population, we recorded 113 the number of individuals belonging to these groups in each households. A total of 3045 and 114 2880 individuals were surveyed representing 35.08% and 33.17% of the 27 villages' 115 population according to a census carried out by our team in 2016 [18]. The human 116 behavioural surveys were carried out using tablets running Open Data Kit (ODK) forms.

We used data from the human and *Anopheles* spp behavioural surveys to measure the human exposure to *Anopheles* spp. bites in dry season (cold and hot) and rainy season using mathematical models as previously described in Killeen et al. [15] and Moiroux et al. [16].

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

120 We estimated the average *true* personal protection of using a LLIN (i.e. the proportion of 121 exposure to all bites occurring both indoors and outdoors that is prevented by using a LLIN) 122 as well as the proportion of exposure which occurred indoors for LLIN users either 123 accounting for the personal protection provided by net use or ignoring it to compare with 124 available estimates for unprotected people. Exposure when sleeping under a LLIN was 125 assumed to be reduced by 92% [16]. Moreover, to characterize residual transmission, we 126 calculated the proportion of exposure occurring before 20:00 and after 5:00 (i.e. the times 127 preceding and following the period when most (>50%) of LLIN users are protected).

All the exposure values were calculated at the village and study area levels, for each age group as well as for the total population. Because the number of individuals sampled per age group in each household is the same, the relative proportions of each age group in our sample are equal and do not reflect the relative proportions in the population. We therefore predicted the average number of people being indoors, outdoors and under nets at the population levels by summing weighted numbers of people of each age group. For these calculation and to produce figures, we used an R [26] package named "biteExp" developed by our team.

135

### 136 **Results**

137 The average declared LLIN use rate was very high in the study population ranging from 138 95.49% in the dry season to 99.67% in the rainy season (Table 1). The declared LLIN use rate 139 was higher in the 0-5 years old age group (97.87% in the dry season to 100% in the rainy 140 season) compared to children aged 6-17 years old (95.36% in the dry season to 99.79% in the 141 rainy season) and adults (92.45% in the dry season to 99.19% in the rainy season) (Table 1). 142 However, we found that the LLIN use rate varied among villages (see Additional file 1) with 143 the lowest rates observed in Kpédia (68.42%), Palembera (71.73%) and Diagnon (78.78%) in 144 the adults group during the dry season. In the other villages, during dry and rainy seasons,

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

145 LLIN use rates ranged from 80 to 100% whatever the season (see Additional file 1). Figure 2 146 shows humans and *Anopheles* behavior profiles as well as average hourly exposure and 147 prevented exposure to bites for LLIN users in our study area.

148 The majority of the population was indoors from 20:00 in both dry and rainy seasons (Figs. 149 2A, 2B and 2C). These populations woke up around 05:00 in the early morning in all seasons 150 (Figs. 2A, 2B and 2C). Most of the total exposure to Anopheles bites occurred indoors (> 151 94%, Table 1) but was largely preventable by using of LLIN (Figs. 2D, 2E and 2F). Indeed, 152 LLIN were estimated to provide average 'true' personal protection against 84.93%, 80.89% 153 and 82.82% of exposure in dry cold season, dry hot season and rainy season, respectively 154 (Table 1, Additional file 2). The peak of exposure for users occurred indoors between 05:00 155 and 06:00 just before sunrise whatever the season (Figs.2D, 2E and 2F). On average, between 156 33 and 57% of residual exposure of LLIN users occurred after wake up (after 5:00) depending 157 on age groups. Early bites (before 20:00) represented less than 12 % of the residual exposure 158 of LLIN users (Table 1).

159

160

# 161 Fig. 2 Hourly human and Anopheles spp behavior (A, B, C) and hourly exposure to bites

## 162 of LLIN users (D, E, F) in the Diébougou health District, Burkina Faso

163 Human behavioural data plotted in panel A and B are the same (only one dry season survey) but

164 *plotted with different entomological data.* 

loors, "before <sup>F</sup> aso <b>)5:00h</b>	medRxiv preprint doi: https:// preprint (which was not certifie
Non-users	– <b>id</b> oi.o
8.16 [0-100]	- H
9.01 [0-100]	is m
12.20 [0-100]	o1/20 view
10.11 [0-100]	) is t availa
13.19 [0-100]	he a able
12.27 [0-100]	r.190 utho unde
12.32 [0-100]	o148 r/fun er a (
12.55 [0-100]	der, t
9.81 [0-44]	his v who 8Y-N
10.42 [0-50]	ersic has D 4.
10.55 [0-50]	on po gran 0 Int
10.27 [0-48]	osted ited r
8	December 18, 2019. The copyright holder for this redRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity onal license .
	Aoors, "before Faso <b>Non-users</b> 8.16 [0-100] 9.01 [0-100] 12.20 [0-100] 12.27 [0-100] 12.27 [0-100] 12.32 [0-100] 12.32 [0-100] 12.32 [0-100] 12.55 [0-50] 10.55 [0-50] 10.55 [0-50] 10.27 [0-48]

Table 1 Average LLIN use rates, true average protection efficacy of LLINs against exposure to vector bites and proportions of indoors, "before 166

Exposure indoors (%[min-max])

Non-users

96.67 [0-100]

97.64 [0-100]

98.74 [0-100]

97.83 [0-100]

93.31 [75-100]

96.52 [72-100]

98.15 [82-100]

96.28 [78-100]

94.91 [62-100]

96.96 [91-100]

98.60 [96-100]

96.90 [82-100]

Exposure before 20:00h

Non-users

0.04 [0-0.34]

0.12 [0-0.73]

0.62 [0-100]

0.31 [0-100]

0.82 [0-1]

0.99 [0-2]

2.13 [0-3]

1.41 [0-2]

2.17 [0-5]

2.22 [0-8]

2.31 [0-11]

2.23 [0-9]

(%[min-max])

LLIN users

0.07 [0-0.13]

0.58 [0-1]

3.93 [0-100]

1.66 [0-100]

3.38 [0-26]

4.57 [0-5]

11.30 [0-20]

6.56 [0-30]

10.08 [0-23]

10.24 [0-25]

11.33 [0-19]

10.47 [0-23]

167 bed" and "after bed" exposure to Anopheles bites for both LLIN users and non-users in 27 villages of the Diébougou area, Burkina Faso

79.92 [0-100]

85.44 [0-100]

90.52 [0-100]

85.62 [0-100]

69.57 [19-100]

82.70 [21-100]

88.73 [29-100]

80.54 [24-100]

75.61 [11-100]

83.28 [45-100]

89.21 [69-100]

81.93 [27-100]

\*True average LLIN

personal protection

83.44 [0-92]

83.79 [0-92]

86.73 [0-92]

84.93 [0-92]

78.00 [0-92]

79.88 [2-92]

83.63 [13-92]

80.89 [5-92]

79.13 [53-92]

81.83 [51-92]

87.00 [72-92]

82.82 [58-92]

efficacy (% [min-max]) LLIN users

LLIN use rate

(%[min-max])

92.45 [68-100]

95.36 [71-100]

97.87 [81-100]

92.45 [68-100]

95.36 [71-100]

97.87 [81-100]

99.19 [92-100]

99.79 [94-100]

100.00

population 99.67 [97-100]

population 95.49 [77-100]

population 95.49 [77-100]

Age

18+

(years)

6 to 17

0 to 5

18+

6 to 17

0 to 5

18+

6 to 17

0 to 5

Season

Dry cold

season

Dry hot

season

Rainy

season

168 Min and max reported in brackets give the value recorded in the village with the lower and the higher average value, respectively.

169 \*True average LLIN personal protection efficacy: estimated proportion of *Anopheles* bites prevented by the use of a LLIN.

170

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

# 172 **Discussion**

173 The average declared LLIN use rate was very high (>95%) in all age groups of our study 174 population. The LLIN use rate was slightly higher in children under five years of age than the 175 rest of the population. This finding is consistent with results from a multi-country analysis 176 that revealed that the most vulnerable groups are preferentially protected by LLIN in sub-177 Saharan Africa [27]. At the village level, the use rate rarely fall under 80%, being consistently 178 higher than the nationwide LLIN use value of 67% published by WHO in 2017 [28]. This 179 may be explained by the fact that the study was conducted approximately 6 months after a 180 wide LLIN distribution. However, our reported LLIN use may be overestimated because it 181 was based on self-reported survey questions, the most commonly used method to assess 182 bednet use [29]. To more accurately estimate LLIN use, future studies quantifying human 183 exposure to mosquito bites should consider using other measurement methods such as 184 electronic monitoring devices [30, 31].

185 This study shows that the overall protective efficacy of LLINs against vector bites in the rural 186 area of Diébougou was high (80-85 %) during the three seasons. Our estimates for LLIN 187 personal efficacy were comparable with those found in Benin (80% and 87%) [16] but were 188 higher than those reported elsewhere such as in Kenya (51 %) [32] and Tanzania (70%, 59% 189 and 38%) [15, 33]. Our results support strongly the use of LLIN as a primary malaria vector 190 control tool in the area. Nevertheless, such a protection level (85% in average) has to be put 191 into perspective with the high malaria transmission and endemicity [18] in order to 192 measure/realize the importance of malaria residual transmission in the area.

We estimated that 33-57% of residual exposure to *Anopheles* bites of LLIN users occurred after 5:00 and 0.07-12% occurred before 20:00 when most of users are awake. The proportion of exposure for LLIN users has been higher in the late part of the morning than in the early part of the evening in some settings while the opposite trend has been observed in other

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

197 settings [15, 16, 34, 35]. In our study area, over 80% of human exposure to vector bites 198 occurred indoors for LLIN users. For children under five years who use LLINs, the exposure 199 rate occurring indoors reached 90%. Therefore, these results suggest that adding other indoor 200 intervention such as indoor residual spraying (IRS) to LLINs would be relevant to reduce 201 malaria transmission in the rural area of Diébougou. In 2017, 28 countries in the world have 202 implemented IRS in combination with LLINs to combat malaria [2]. IRS contributed to an 203 estimated 10 (5-14)% of the reduction in malaria burden achieved recently [36]. When used 204 together, IRS and LLINs are expected to target vectors at different stages of their gonotrophic 205 cycle using insecticides with different mode of action. However, trials assessing the impact of 206 the combination IRS+LLIN over LLIN use alone have yielded conflicting results [37–42]. 207 House improvement is another indoor measure which needs careful consideration and deep 208 investigations. Indeed, house improvement has been strongly associated with reduced malaria 209 transmission and disease in many studies [44–46]. The main house improvement interventions 210 studied are closed eaves, closed ceilings, window screens and metal-roof houses as opposed to 211 eaves, ceilings, windows openings and thatched-roof houses. Such improvements protect 212 against malaria by providing physical barriers that prevent vectors from entering houses and 213 can reduce vector survivorship [44, 47]. Nonetheless, there is compelling evidence that even a 214 full coverage of effective measures within houses would not be sufficient to suppress 215 transmission of malaria in Africa [43].

In this study, we evidenced that a significant proportion of LLIN users exposure to vector bites occurred outdoors (ranging from 9.48% to 30.43%), with the highest estimate recorded in adults (over the age of 18 years old) during the dry hot season. Many studies conducted in various areas of Africa reported similar or even higher estimates of exposure occurring outdoors [15, 33, 35, 48]. Recently, a systematic review categorized Burkina Faso along with Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, and Tanzania as countries with high levels of outdoor vector biting

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

[10]. However, our results do not fully support this categorization since we show that both
LLIN users and LLIN non users are far more exposed to vector bites indoors than outdoors in
the study area. Nevertheless, strategies targeting outdoor bites would probably be required to
achieve malaria elimination in the area.

Almost all the existing indoor vector control strategies face two important evolutive challenges. First, they induce a strong selective pressure on physiological resistance in vector populations because they almost all rely on synthetic chemicals [49]. Second, they also induced selective pressure for behavioral changes in vector populations resulting in a reduced contact with interventions [49]. In this context, there is a crucial need to monitor these resistance mechanisms, as well as residual transmission, after the deployment of strategies to inform decision makers in order to allow them to adapt their strategic plans.

233

# 234 Conclusions

235 This study showed that most of the population of the rural area of Diébougou reported using 236 LLINs the previous night. The use of LLIN prevented more than 80% of Anopheles bite 237 exposure. Nevertheless, LLIN users are still exposed to vector bites which occurred mostly 238 indoors in late morning. Therefore, complementary strategies that target indoor biting vectors 239 in combination with LLIN should be prioritized to control malaria in this area. However, as 240 vectors are able to behaviourally evolve in response to indoor control tool implementation, 241 successful malaria control programmes should also integrate monitoring of malaria vector 242 behaviours. Moreover, as it is predictable that outdoor biting phenotypes will be selected, it 243 urges to also evaluate and implement outdoor measures.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

## 245 List of abbreviations

246 Endophagy Rate (ER); IRS: Indoor Residual Spraying; LLIN: Long-Lasting Insecticidal Nets;

- 247 ODK: Open Data Kit; NMCP: National Malaria Control Programs; WHO: World Health
- 248 Organization.
- 249

## 250 **Declarations**

# 251 Ethics approval and consent to participate

252 The protocol of this study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee 253 of the Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé (IEC-IRSS) and registered as 254 N°A06/2016/CEIRES. We received community agreement before the beginning of human 255 and Anopheles spp behavioral surveys. Behavioral surveys did not involved participants under 256 16 years old. Indeed, questionnaires were administrated only to the heads of households and 257 informations relative to children under 16 years old were therefore directly collected from 258 either a parent or guardian. All mosquito collectors involved in the entomological surveys 259 gave their informed consent but none of them were under 16 years old. Mosquito collectors 260 and supervisors received a vaccine against yellow fever as a prophylactic measure. Collectors 261 were treated free of charge for malaria according to WHO recommendations.

262

# 263 Consent for publication

264 Not applicable.

265

#### 266 Availability of data and materials

267 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the 268 corresponding author on reasonable request.

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

#### 269 Competing interests

- 270 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
- 271

## 272 Funding:

- 273 This work was part of the REACT project, funded by the French Initiative 5% Expertise
- 274 France (No. 15SANIN213).
- 275

#### 276 Authors' contributions

277

278 NM, RKD and DDS conceived and designed the study. DDS and SC collected the data. DDS

and NM analyzed the data. DDS and BZ drafted the manuscript. NM, CP, PT, AS, LMB,

GAO, AK and RKD reviewed the manuscript; all authors read and approved the finalmanuscript.

282

#### 283 Acknowledgements

284 We acknowledge the Burkina Faso Ministry of Health, particularly Dr. Dembélé Henri and 285 local medical team who facilitated the data collection. We thank all the villagers and local 286 authorities for their kind collaboration throughout the study. Special thanks are due to Mr. 287 Maiga Issouf for his strong commitment during human behavioural surveys. We are very 288 grateful to Mr. Dahounto Amal for their substantial contributions and collaboration. We thank 289 all the IRSS field staff for their assistance; the "Laboratoire Mixte International sur les 290 Maladies à Vecteurs" (LAMIVECT) for their technical support. We also thank to Mr. 291 Ouattara Adama for their support.

- 292
- 293

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

# 294 **References**

- 1. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of
- 296 malaria control on *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa between 2000 and 2015. Nature.

297 2015;526:207–11.

- 298 2. WHO. World malaria report 2018. 2018;238.
- 299 http://www.who.int/malaria/publications/world-malaria-report-2018.
- 300 3. Dabiré KR, Diabaté A, Djogbenou L, Ouari A, N'Guessan R, Ouédraogo J-B, et al.
- 301 Dynamics of multiple insecticide resistance in the malaria vector Anopheles gambiae in a rice
- 302 growing area in South-Western Burkina Faso. Malar J. 2008;7:188.
- 4. Toé KH, Jones CM, N'fale S, Ismai HM, Dabiré RK, Ranson H. Increased pyrethroid
- 304 resistance in malaria vectors and decreased bed net effectiveness Burkina Faso. Emerg Infect

305 Dis. 2014;20:1691–6.

- 306 5. Toé KH, N'Falé S, Dabiré RK, Ranson H, Jones CM. The recent escalation in strength of
- 307 pyrethroid resistance in Anopheles coluzzi in West Africa is linked to increased expression of
- 308 multiple gene families. BMC Genomics. 2015;16:1–11.
- 309 6. Ojuka P, Boum Y, Denoeud-Ndam L, Nabasumba C, Muller Y, Okia M, et al. Early biting
- and insecticide resistance in the malaria vector *Anopheles* might compromise the effectiveness

of vector control intervention in Southwestern Uganda. Malar J. 2015;14:1–8.

- 312 7. Moiroux N, Gomez MB, Pennetier C, Elanga E, Djènontin A, Chandre F, et al. Changes in
- 313 anopheles funestus biting behavior following universal coverage of long-lasting insecticidal
- 314 nets in benin. J Infect Dis. 2012;206:1622–9.
- 8. Fornadel CM, Norris LC, Glass GE, Norris DE. Analysis of Anopheles arabiensis blood
- feeding behavior in southern zambia during the two years after introduction of insecticide-

- treated bed nets. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2010;83:848–53.
- 318 9. Ranson H, Lissenden N. Insecticide Resistance in African Anopheles Mosquitoes: A
- 319 Worsening Situation that Needs Urgent Action to Maintain Malaria Control. Trends Parasitol.
- 320 2016;32:187–96. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2015.11.010.
- 321 10. Sherrard-Smith E, Skarp JE, Beale AD, Fornadel C, Norris LC, Moore SJ, et al. Mosquito
- 322 feeding behavior and how it influences residual malaria transmission across Africa. Proc Natl
- 323 Acad Sci U S A. 2019;:201820646.
- 324 11. WHO. Global plan for insecticide resistance management in malaria vectors. World
- Health Organization. 2012;:13.
- 326 https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44846/9789241564472\_eng.pdf.
- 12. Killeen GF, Tatarsky A, Diabate A, Chaccour CJ, Marshall JM, Okumu FO, et al.
- 328 Developing an expanded vector control toolbox for malaria elimination. BMJ Glob Heal.

329 2017;2:e000211.

- 13. Barreaux P, Barreaux AMG, Sternberg ED, Suh E, Waite JL, Whitehead SA, et al.
- 331 Priorities for Broadening the Malaria Vector Control Tool Kit. Trends Parasitol.
- 332 2017;33:763–74.
- 14. Kelly-Hope LA, McKenzie FE. The multiplicity of malaria transmission: A review of
- entomological inoculation rate measurements and methods across sub-Saharan Africa.
- 335 Malaria Journal. 2009;8:19.
- 15. Killeen GF, Kihonda J, Lyimo E, Oketch FR, Kotas ME, Mathenge E, et al. Quantifying
- behavioural interactions between humans and mosquitoes : Evaluating the protective
- 338 efficacy of insecticidal nets against malaria transmission in rural Tanzania. BMC Infect Dis.
- 339 2006;6:1–10.

- 16. Moiroux N, Damien GB, Egrot M, Djenontin A, Chandre F, Corbel V, et al. Human
- 341 exposure to early morning Anopheles funestus biting behavior and personal protection
- provided by long-lasting insecticidal nets. PLoS One. 2014;9:8–11.
- 17. Monroe A, Moore S, Koenker H, Lynch M, Ricotta E. Measuring and characterizing night
- time human behaviour as it relates to residual malaria transmission in sub Saharan Africa :
- a review of the published literature. Malar J. 2019;:1–12. doi:10.1186/s12936-019-2638-9.
- 18. Soma DD, Zogo BM, Somé A, Tchiekoi BN, Hien DF de S, Pooda HS, et al. Anopheles
- bionomic, insecticide resistance and malaria transmission in southwest Burkina Faso : a pre-
- 348 intervention study. BioRxiv Prepr. 2019.
- 19. INSD. Tableau de bord économique et social 2014 de la région du Sud Ouest. 2015.
- 20. INSD. Enquête nationale sur le secteur de l'orpaillage (ENSO). 2017.
- 351 21. Mattingly PF, Rageau J, La CA, Des F, Du M, Xii SA. Contributions de la faune des
- 352 moustiques du Sud-Est Asiatique. XII. Contrib Am Entomol Inst. 1973;7.
- 353 22. Gillies MT and Coetzee M. A supplement to the *Anophelinae* of Africa South of the
- 354 Sahara (Afrotropical Region). South African Inst Med Res. 1987;:143.
- 23. Koekemoer LL, Kamau L, Hunt RH, Coetzee M. A cocktail polymerase chain reaction
- assay to identify members of the Anopheles funestus (Diptera: Culicidae) group. Am J Trop
- 357 Med Hyg. 2002;66:804–11.
- 358 24. Cohuet A, Simard F, Berthomieu A, Raymond M, Fontenille D WM. Isolation and
- 359 characterization of microsatellite DNA markers in the malaria vector Anopheles funestus. Mol
- 360 Ecol Notes. 2002;2:498–500.
- 361 25. Santolamazza F, Mancini E, Simard F, Qi Y, Tu Z, della Torre A. Insertion
- 362 polymorphisms of SINE200 retrotransposons within speciation islands of Anopheles gambiae

- 363 molecular forms. Malar J. 2008;7:163. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-7-163.
- 26. The R Development Core Team. R□: A Language and Environment for Statistical
- 365 Computing. 2008;2:1–2547. http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/gpl.html.
- 27. Olapeju B, Choiriyyah I, Lynch M, Acosta A, Blaufuss S, Filemyr E, et al. Age and
- 367 gender trends in insecticide-treated net use in sub-Saharan Africa: a multi-country analysis.
- 368 Malar J. 2018;17:423.
- 369 28. WHO. World Malaria Report 2017. 2017. doi:10.1071/EC12504.
- 29. Krezanoski PJ, Bangsberg DR, Tsai AC. Quantifying bias in measuring insecticide-treated
- bednet use: meta-analysis of self-reported vs objectively measured adherence. J Glob Health.
- 372 2018;8:010411.
- 373 30. Koudou BG, Malone D, Hemingway J. The use of motion detectors to estimate net usage
- by householders, in relation to mosquito density in central Cote d'Ivoire: Preliminary results.
- 375 Parasites and Vectors. 2014.
- 376 31. Krezanoski PJ, Santorino D, Agaba A, Dorsey G, Bangsberg DR, Carroll RW. How Are
- 377 Insecticide-Treated Bednets Used in Ugandan Households? A Comprehensive
- 378 Characterization of Bednet Adherence Using a Remote Monitor. Am J Trop Med Hyg.

379 2019;00:1-8.

- 380 32. Cooke MK, Kahindi SC, Oriango RM, Owaga C, Ayoma E, Mabuka D, et al. 'A bite
- 381 before bed': exposure to malaria vectors outside the times of net use in the highlands of
- 382 western Kenya. Malar J. 2015;14:259.
- 383 33. Geissbühler Y, Chaki P, Emidi B, Govella NJ, Shirima R, Mayagaya V, et al.
- 384 Interdependence of domestic malaria prevention measures and mosquito-human interactions
- in urban Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Malar J. 2007;6:126.

- 386 34. Kamau A, Mwangangi JM, Rono MK, Mogeni P, Omedo I, Midega J, et al. Variation in
- the effectiveness of insecticide treated nets against malaria and outdoor biting by vectors in
- 388 Kilifi, Kenya. Wellcome open Res. 2017;2:22.
- 389 35. Russell TL, Govella NJ, Azizi S, Drakeley CJ, Kachur SP, Killeen GF. Increased
- 390 proportions of outdoor feeding among residual malaria vector populations following increased
- use of insecticide-treated nets in rural Tanzania. Malar J. 2011;10:80. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-
- 392 10-80.
- 393 36. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of
- malaria control on *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa between 2000 and 2015. Nature.
- 395 2015;526:207–11.
- 396 37. West PA, Protopopoff N, Wright A, Kivaju Z, Tigererwa R, Mosha FW, et al. Indoor
- 397 Residual Spraying in Combination with Insecticide-Treated Nets Compared to Insecticide-
- 398 Treated Nets Alone for Protection against Malaria : A Cluster Randomised Trial in
- 399 Tanzania. PLOS Med. 2014;11:1–12.
- 400 38. Protopopoff N, Mosha JF, Lukole E, Charlwood JD, Wright A, Mwalimu CD, et al.
- 401 Effectiveness of a long-lasting piperonyl butoxide-treated insecticidal net and indoor residual
- 402 spray interventions, separately and together, against malaria transmitted by pyrethroid-
- 403 resistant mosquitoes: a cluster, randomised controlled, two-by-two fact. Lancet. 2018;:1–12.
- 404 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30427-6.
- 405 39. Kafy HT, Ismail BA, Mnzava AP, Lines J, Abdin MSE, Eltaher JS, et al. Impact of
- 406 insecticide resistance in Anopheles arabiensis on malaria incidence and prevalence in Sudan
- 407 and the costs of mitigation. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2017;114:E11267–75.
- 408 40. Corbel V, Akogbeto M, Damien GB, Djenontin A, Chandre F, Rogier C, et al.
- 409 Combination of malaria vector control interventions in pyrethroid resistance area in Benin: a

410 cluster randomised controlled trial. Lancet Infect Dis. 2012;12:617–26.

- 411 41. Pinder M, Jawara M, Jarju LBS, Salami K, Jeffries D, Adiamoh M, et al. Efficacy of
- 412 indoor residual spraying with dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane against malaria in Gambian
- 413 communities with high usage of long-lasting insecticidal mosquito nets: A cluster-randomised
- 414 controlled trial. Lancet. 2015;385:1436–46.
- 415 42. Loha E, Deressa W, Gari T, Balkew M, Kenea O, Solomon T, et al. Long-lasting
- 416 insecticidal nets and indoor residual spraying may not be sufficient to eliminate malaria in a
- 417 low malaria incidence area: results from a cluster randomized controlled trial in Ethiopia.
- 418 Malar J. 2019;18:141.
- 419 43. World Health Organization. Control of residual malaria parasite transmission. 2014.
- 420 44. Tusting LS, Ippolito MM, Willey BA, Kleinschmidt I, Dorsey G, Gosling RD, et al. The
- 421 evidence for improving housing to reduce malaria: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
- 422 Malaria Journal. 2015.
- 423 45. Rek JC, Alegana V, Arinaitwe E, Cameron E, Kamya MR, Katureebe A, et al. Rapid
- 424 improvements to rural Ugandan housing and their association with malaria from intense to
- 425 reduced transmission: a cohort study. Lancet Planet Heal. 2018.
- 426 46. Killeen GF, Govella NJ, Mlacha YP, Chaki PP. Suppression of malaria vector densities
- 427 and human infection prevalence associated with scale-up of mosquito-proofed housing in Dar
- 428 es Salaam, Tanzania: re-analysis of an observational series of parasitological and
- 429 entomological surveys. Lancet Planet Heal. 2019;3:e132–43.
- 430 47. Lindsay SW, Jawara M, Mwesigwa J, Achan J, Bayoh N, Bradley J, et al. Reduced
- 431 mosquito survival in metal-roof houses may contribute to a decline in malaria transmission in
- 432 sub-Saharan Africa. Sci Rep. 2019;9:7770.

It is made available under a	CC-BY-ND 4.0	International	license
------------------------------	--------------	---------------	---------

- 433 48. Huho B, Briët O, Seyoum A, Sikaala C, Bayoh N, Gimnig J, et al. Consistently high
- 434 estimates for the proportion of human exposure to malaria vector populations occurring
- 435 indoors in rural Africa. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42:235–47.
- 436 49. Lies Durnez and Marc Coosemans. Residual Transmission of Malaria: An Old Issue for
- 437 New Approaches. In: Anopheles mosquitoes New insights into malaria vectors. Intech Open
- 438 Science; 2013. p. 671–704. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/55925.

439

- 440 **Figures, tables and additional files**
- 441
- 442 Fig. 1 Map of the study area and villages surveyed
- 443
- 444 Fig. 2 Hourly human and Anopheles spp behavior (A, B, C) and hourly exposure to bites
- 445 of LLIN users (D, E, F), Burkina Faso
- 446 Human behavioural data in panel A and B are the same (only one dry season survey) but plotted with
- 447 *different entomological data.*

448

Table 1 Average LLIN use rates, true average protection efficacy of LLINs against
transmission and proportions of indoors, early evening and late morning exposure to *Anopheles* bites for both LLIN users and non-users in 27 villages of the Diébougou area,
Burkina Faso

453

454 Additional file 1. LLIN Use rate per village

It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

- 456 Additional file 2. True average protection efficacy of LLINs against transmission and
- 457 Proportions of indoors, early evening and late morning exposure to Anopheles bites per
- 458 village





