medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Malaria awareness of adults in high, moderate and low transmission settings: A cross-sectional study in rural East Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia

Robertus Dole Guntur[1,4#a], Jonathan Kingsley[2,3#b], Fakir M. Amirul Islam[1#a]

[1] Department of Health Science and Biostatistics, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia
[2] Department of Health Science and Medical Science, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia
[3] Centre of Urban Transition, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia
[4] Department of Mathematics, Universitas Nusa Cendana, Kupang, NTT, Indonesia

[#a] Current Address: Department of Health Science and Biostatistics, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn Campus, Victoria, Australia 3122
[#b] Current Address: Department of Health Science and Medical Science, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn Campus, Victoria, Australia 3122

Corresponding author:
E-mail: rguntur@swin.edu.au (RDG)

Abstract

Introduction. The Indonesian roadmap to malaria elimination in 2009 indicated that the country is progressing towards achieve malaria elimination by 2030. Currently, most of the districts in the western part of Indonesia have eliminated malaria, however, none of the districts in East Nusa Tenggara Province (ENTP) have met set targets. This study aims to investigate the status of malaria awareness of rural adults in the ENTP.

Methods. A cross-sectional study was conducted between October and December 2019. Fourteen hundred and ninety-five participants from high, moderate, and low malaria endemic settings (MES) in ENTP were interviewed using a semi-structure questionnaire. A malaria awareness index was developed based on ten questions. Chi-square test was applied to investigate the significance of associations of malaria awareness with the three malaria endemic settings.

Results. Participants were between 18 and 89 years old, 51.4% were female and 45.5% had completed primary education. Malaria awareness index was 48.8% with the highest in low MES 64.8%, followed by the moderate MES 44.4% and the high MES 37.2% ($p<0.001$). Of total participants, 81.3% were aware that malaria could be prevented and 75.1% knew at least one prevention measure. Overall, the awareness of fever as the main symptom of malaria, seeking treatment within 24 hours when suffering with malaria, and mosquito bites as the transmission mode of malaria was poor, 37.9%, 46.0%, and 59.1% respectively. The poor level of awareness was statistically significantly different amongst three MES, the level of awareness was the lowest in the high endemic setting.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Conclusion. Malaria awareness of rural adults needs to be improved to address Indonesia's national action plan. Results indicate public health programs at a local government level should incorporate the malaria awareness index in their key strategic intervention packages to address local malaria awareness.

Introduction

Malaria is a major health problem globally with an estimated 1.2 billion people living at high risk of being infected [1]. However, malaria cases and associated death have decreased in the last decade [2]. From 2010 to 2018, the total number of malaria cases decreased by about 1% per year and deaths due to malaria declined 5% per year [1]. The number of countries reporting that local transmission less than 51 cases increased from 5 countries in 2010 to 11 countries in 2018 [3].

Countries having zero local transmission in the last three consecutive years are eligible for requesting malaria elimination certification from WHO [3]. In South-East Asia Region (SEARO), two countries, the Maldives and Sri Lanka have been certified malaria-free areas by the WHO recently [4]. In alignment with the global action plan for a malaria-free world [5] and global technical strategy for malaria elimination [6], the WHO SEARO action plan indicates that all countries in the region will be malaria-free zones by 2030 [4].

The road map of malaria elimination in Indonesia has been declared since April 2009, proclaiming that Indonesia also aims to eliminate malaria by 2030 [7, 8]. All malaria endemic districts in Indonesia were divided into four categories based on the annual prevalence incidence (API) [9]. Currently, 55.5% of the total number of districts in the country (285 out of 514 districts) has been categorized as malaria elimination districts in 2018 [9]. All of the districts in the provinces of DKI Jakarta, Bali and East Java have been categorized as malaria elimination areas, whereas none of the districts from five provinces in the eastern part of Indonesia such as Papua, West Papua, Maluku, North Maluku, and East Nusa Tenggara Province (ENTP) has met this categorization [9].

The ENTP is a province with an API value five times higher compared to the national API of Indonesia [10]. This province has 21 districts and one municipality [11]. Ten districts and a municipality are low endemic meanwhile the number of districts has been classified as moderate and high endemic is six and five districts respectively [9]. Various malaria research projects have been carried out in the province [12-16], however the investigation on human aspects of malaria was limited in the province. In fact, knowledge and behaviour of the community play a significant role in supporting malaria elimination [17, 18]. Having high level of malaria awareness in communities enables them to improve self-protection [19], seeking early treatment [20], reducing malaria prevalence [21], and consequently speeding up malaria elimination [22].

A number of studies around malaria knowledge have been undertaken in Indonesia since the declaration of national commitment to eliminate malaria [23-26]. Knowledge on long-lasting insecticide-treated nets (LLINs), which is the most effective tool to prevent malaria [27] and currently adopted as the primary vector control interventions in many parts of Indonesia [8], was not investigated in those studies. Also, most of the studies were conducted in the western part of the country, most of which have been classified as malaria elimination district. Studies were also conducted at sub-district and village levels. One population-based study on 4,050 participants in North Maluku Province revealed that only about half of the respondents knew about symptoms of malaria and the majority of participants (98%) did not know the main

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cause of malaria [26]. However, approximately 50% of the participants were less than 18 years old which was hardly suitable candidates for measuring the level of knowledge of a particular community.

In the ENTP, various studies of malaria knowledge were conducted [28-30]. Most of these studies were conducted at village and subdistrict level. One population level study related to human aspects of malaria was conducted in ENTP in 2018 [30], however, the study investigated only the practice of malaria prevention of the rural community. To date, the investigation on malaria knowledge related to symptoms, transmission mode, prevention method and the perception of malaria treatment seeking behaviour of rural adults in different types of malarial endemic settings in the ENTP has not been performed yet. Investigation of malaria awareness of rural communities is critical for Indonesia considering that 52% of malaria cases in the country were contributed by rural communities [10] and variation of malaria prevention practice amongst provinces exists in the country [30]. Understanding the level of malaria knowledge of rural communities is essential for the development and implementation of evidence-based strategies to accelerate progress for malaria elimination. Therefore, this research will fill this gap with the aim of investigating malaria awareness of rural adults in three different MES in order to support national commitment of Indonesia government to eliminate malaria by 2030.

Materials and methods

Study Population

ENTP is one of 34 provinces in Indonesia. It is in the eastern part of the country. The total population of ENTP is 5.3 million, contributing about 2.04% of the total population of Indonesia [11]. The ratio of male to female (50.5% to 49.5%) was almost comparable with that of Indonesia (50.2% to 49.8%). The area of the province is 47,931.54 km^2, with the population density 114 people per square kilometre, located between 1180° and 1250° east longitudes and between 80° and 120° south latitudes [11]. This project was conducted in three regencies of different malaria endemic settings (MES) (Fig 1).

Fig 1. Map of Study Sites

The sample was comprised of 1495 participants (51.4%, n = 768 female) aged from 18 to 89 recruited using three-stage sampling procedure with systematic random sampling procedure at cluster level 3 from each of the total 49 villages from ENTP. The sample size was based on the prevalence of malaria in ENTP of 1.99% in 2018 estimated by the Indonesian basic health research, which is called Riskesdas [10]. Sample size calculation was described in detail previously [31]. Overall, the sample size was sufficiently large enough to detect a minimum 5% difference in the proportion of malaria awareness amongst high, moderate, and low malaria endemic settings (Statistical power > 90%, p=0.05).

Recruitment strategy

A three-stage sampling procedure was applied in order to recruit adults from three districts. Three out of 22 districts have been selected based on the annual parasite incidence (API) of malaria. In each selected district, the number of clusters was selected from each sub-district based on their relative population. In each village, a systematic random sampling technique

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

was used to get 20-40 participants per village proportionate to the population size of the villages. In the selected households, the research teams first approached the heads of the households for interviews. In case the household heads, either husband or wife, are absent, any residents over 18 years of age could serve as study participants [32].

Malaria awareness measure

A questionnaire comprising ten questions was used to assess malaria awareness of rural adults as described in supplementary material section. The questionnaire consisted of two parts, including basic malaria understanding and basic malaria knowledge. In each question, one mark was awarded for each correct answer, while incorrect answers were given zero points. Total marks for ten questions were evaluated as follows. The level of knowledge with the accurate rate above 80%, 60 – 79%, 1 –59%, 0 were classified as excellent, good, poor, and zero level of awareness, respectively. The rank of excellent and good was categorised as having malaria awareness while poor and zero level of awareness was classified as unaware of malaria [33, 34].

Socio-demographic covariates

Demographic information comprising gender, age, education level, and socio- economic status (SES) was collected. Gender was categorised as male and female. Age was classified as 5 groups, less than 30 years old, 30 – 40 years, 40 – 50 years, 50 – 60 years and above 60 years old. The level of education was categorised as no education, primary school level of education (grade 1 to 6), junior high school (grade 7 to 9), senior high school (grade 10 to 12), and diploma or above education level. The SES group was assessed according to the ownership of durable asset and housing characteristics [35]. In each selected household, the participant was asked for ownership of ten items of durable assets including radio, television, electricity, bike, motorcycle, hand phone, fridge, tractor, generator and car. Housing characteristics were evaluated by having access to water taps in dwellings and main material of house. Houses having floor and wall constructed of cement were categorised as modern houses, otherwise as non-modern houses. In total, there are 12 items used to construct the SES level. Three levels of SES were defined by counting ownerships of the items. Low SES was defined as having zero or one item; moderate SES was defined as owning 2 – 4 items and high SES was defined as having more than 4 items [35].

Statistical Analyses

The participants' socio demographic characteristics including gender, age group, education level, and SES were reported using description statistics. A chi-square test was applied to evaluate the association of basic malaria understanding, basic malaria knowledge, the level of malaria knowledge, and the level of malaria awareness amongst three types of malaria endemic settings. The P value of 0.05 or less was termed to be statistically significant. Statistical software SPSS version 27 (SPSS Inc.) was used for analyses.

Ethics approval

The research was conducted in accordance with the tenet of The Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by Human Ethics Committee of the Swinburne University of Technology (Reference: 20191428-1490) and from Health Research Ethics Committee, National Institute of Health Research and Development (HERC-NIHRD) the Indonesian Ministry of Health (Reference: LB.02.01/2/KE.418/2019). Written consent was obtained from participants having full capacity to give voluntary consent in his/her own right on the basis of sufficient

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

information provided. For participants who were unable to read the consent documentation, the participants gave their authority to their spouse or immediate family to read the consent form. Their spouse/immediate family provided a signature on the consent form on behalf of the participants and the ethics committee approved this consent procedure. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw from study at any stage or to restrict their data from their analysis.

Results

Demographic characteristics of the study population

Of the total participants aged between 18 and 89 years (mean 43.8 years and standard deviation 12.8 year), 51.4% was female. In terms of educational attainment, the majority of respondents had completed primary education (45.4%) and almost 20% of them did not have any formal education. The disparity of education distribution amongst these three settings was evidence, having no education in high MES was 35% compared to 2.6% in the low MES. Socio economic status of participants depicted that the majority of them (57.5%) living in moderate SES. The socio-demographic characteristics of the participants based on the malaria endemic setting are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of study participants and participants from a national representative sample in three different MES in the East Nusa Tenggara Province (ENTP), Indonesia

			Malaria Endemic Setting (MES)**		
Characteristics	**ENTP**	**Total n (%)**	**High**	**Moderate**	**Low**
Total	5456203	1,495	495 (33.1)	500 (33.4)	500 (33.4)
Gender[11]					
Females	50.5	768 (51.4)	264 (53.3)	267 (53.4)	237 (47.4)
Males	49.5	727 (48.6)	231 (46.7)	233 (46.6)	263 (52.6)
***Age Group[11]**					
< 30	39.9	205 (13.7)	79 (16.0)	64 (12.8)	62 (12.4)
30 – 39	18.9	418 (28.0)	137 (27.7)	108 (21.6)	173 (34.6)
40 – 49	16.4	371 (24.8)	138 (27.9)	123 (24.6)	110 (22.0)
50 – 59	12.7	295 (19.7)	69 (13.9)	129 (25.8)	97 (19.4)
> 60	12.1	206 (13.8)	72 (14.5)	76 (15.2)	58 (11.6)
Education Level[11]					
No education	30.4	279 (18.7)	173 (35.0)	93 (18.6)	13 (2.60)
Primary school	27.5	678 (45.4)	205 (41.4)	205 (41.0)	268 (53.6)
Junior High School	16	229 (15.3)	47 (9.50)	97 (19.4)	85 (17.0)
Senior High School	18.6	210 (14.1)	53 (10.7)	83 (16.6)	74 (14.8)
Diploma or above	7.6	99 (6.60)	17 (3.40)	22 (4.40)	60 (12.0)
Socio-Economic Status[36]					
Poor	89.6	449 (30.0)	151 (30.5)	105 (21.0)	193 (38.6)
Average	4.80	860 (57.5)	286 (57.8)	331 (66.2)	243 (48.6)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Rich	5.70	186 (12.4)	58 (11.7)	64 (12.8)	64 (12.8)

*The percentage of people in different age groups at national level has been calculated based on the total people of aged above 15 years; ** High: East Sumba District, Moderate: Belu District and low: East Manggarai District.

Major malaria knowledge by malaria endemic settings in the ENTP

The difference of malaria knowledge on various aspects amongst three different settings is shown in Table 2. In terms of basic malaria understanding, the percentage of respondents hearing malaria terms and being aware that malaria could be prevented was high accounting for 86.1% and 81.3% respectively, whilst the awareness of malaria has dangerous effect on health was only 64.1%. In terms of basic malaria knowledge, the awareness of fever as the main symptom of malaria was low (37.9%), which was 50.2% in the low MES, 46.8% in the moderate and 16.6% in the high malaria endemic settings (P<0.001).The awareness of mosquito bites as the main cause of malaria was also low (59.1%).

The percentage of participants knowing at least one prevention measure to prevent malaria was high accounting for 75.1%, with 85.7% in high malaria endemic settings followed by 70.8% in low malaria endemic settings and 68.8% in moderate malaria endemic settings (P<0.001). Whilst, the proportion of participants knowing at least two malaria prevention measures was low, which is only 39.6%, the highest 61.8% in low endemic settings, followed by 32.3% in high settings and 24.6% in moderate settings (P<0.001). The percentage of participants knew that sleeping under LLINs to prevent malaria was also low, which is only 50.3%, the highest 72.3% in high MES, followed by 42% in moderate and 36% in low MES.

In terms of malaria treatment seeking behaviour, the proportion of participants who were awareness to seek treatment within 24 hour if they or their family members suffered with malaria was also low (46%), the highest 58.8% in the low MES, 44.6% in the moderate MES and 34.3% in the high MES and the level of awareness was significantly different (P<0.001).

Table 2. Distribution of major malaria knowledge of rural adults in three different malaria endemic settings (MES) in the East Nusa Tenggara Province (ENTP), Indonesia

Overall average of malaria knowledge of rural adults in the ENTP

As shown in Fig 2, 48.8% of rural adults in ENTP had malaria knowledge scores above 60% correct and 17.4% had above 80% correct. The proportion of participants having poor malaria knowledge score was high accounting for 42.9%, with 60.4% in high endemic settings followed by 44.2% in moderate endemic settings and 24.4% in low endemic settings.

Fig 2. Distribution of malaria knowledge score amongst participants.

Malaria awareness of rural adults in the ENTP

Among the participants, the percentage of awareness in basic malaria understanding was very high accounting for 83%, with 95.4% in high malaria endemic settings followed by 72.6% in moderate malaria endemic settings and 81.4% in low malaria endemic settings (P<0.001).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The proportion of rural adults having the awareness of basic malaria knowledge was low, which was only 35%, the highest 52.2% in the low API settings, followed by 33.6% and 19.0% in the moderate and high API settings, respectively. Overall, only 48.8% of rural adults in the ENTP had malaria awareness. The malaria awareness in low MES was the highest (64.8%) followed by 44.4% in the moderate malaria endemic settings and 37.2% in the high malaria endemic settings. The difference in awareness was statistically significant amongst these three settings (P<0.001) as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of malaria awareness of rural adults in three different malaria endemic settings (MES) in the East Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia

Items	Awareness, n (%)			ENTP N=1495	P Value
	Malaria Endemic Setting (MES)*				
	High N=495	Moderate N=500	Low N=500		
Part I : Basic malaria understanding	472 (95.4)	363 (72.6)	407 (81.4)	1242 (83.1)	< 0.001
Part II : Basic malaria knowledge	94 (19.0)	168 (33.6)	261 (52.2)	523 (35.0)	< 0.001
Malaria awareness	184 (37.2)	222 (44.4)	324 (64.8)	730 (48.8)	< 0.001

* High: East Sumba District, Moderate: Belu District and low: East Manggarai District

Discussion

This is the first population-based study focusing on malaria awareness of rural adults amongst three malaria endemic settings from ENTP since the launch of national commitment of Indonesia government to eliminate malaria by 2030. The main finding of the study was that malaria awareness of rural adults was very low, which causes a significant barrier to malaria elimination in the region. The results indicate more than half of rural adults in the study sample of the ENTP had poor malaria knowledge. Malaria knowledge of rural adults should be part of the key intervention to boost malaria elimination status of the province. A similar study conducted in 2016 revealed that 48% of China rural adults had poor malaria knowledge [33], however the proportion of rural adult having poor malaria knowledge in this study was high. The local authority should improve malaria knowledge of rural communities in the ENTP to support malaria elimination plan. The improvement of awareness on infectious disease, including malaria, enables community to improve their self-protection and seek early treatment [37], finding treatment source preference [38] and finally it could reduce the malaria prevalence [21].

Results of this study indicate that a high proportion of rural adults in high and moderate MES has poor malaria knowledge. This finding was consistent with another study in Southern Africa [39] that revealed that residents in high MES had lower malaria knowledge compared with those in low MES. However, this finding was different to a similar study on malaria awareness for rural adults in China in 2016 that reported that the poor malaria knowledge in high MES was lower than those who were in low MES [33]. Findings of the study indicates that more attention should be paid for rural adults in high and moderate MES to escalate the malaria elimination. However, much attention should be paid to rural adults in low MES considering that high numbers of inter province migration flow [40] and inter district migration flow [41] could lead to imported malaria cases in this province. The improvement

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of malaria knowledge in low MES is also critical to prevent relapse malaria cases. A study in a district in North Sumatera Province Indonesia categorized as low MES [23], revealed that low level of malaria knowledge was associated with a relapse of malaria cases in the region.

Findings of this study also indicated that basic malaria knowledge of rural adults was very low. Only about 38% of rural adults could identify fever as the main symptom of malaria. This finding indicates that more than half of rural adults did not have the ability to identify correctly the main symptom of the disease which may lead to low level of awareness for malaria infection. These result contrasted a study conducted in Cabo Verde [42], that was on track to achieve malaria elimination zone by 2020 [3], which indicated that the high level of participants could identify fever as the main symptom of malaria. With regard to transmission mode of malaria, more than half of rural adults knew that malaria was caused by mosquito bite. This proportion is lower than reported in countries ready for malaria elimination such as Iran, which revealed that the majority of rural communities recognised mosquito bites as the main cause of malaria [43]. The finding of this study indicated that there is still a large proportion of rural adults with a lack of awareness for protecting themselves from mosquito bites. Failure to improve the awareness of this community leads to low levels of the usage of malaria prevention methods promoted by the Indonesia government which in turn will increase the burden of malaria in this province.

There are four malaria prevention measures that are familiar to the rural adults in the ENTP, including sleeping under non-LLINs, using mosquito coils, keeping houses clean and sleeping under LLINs. However, the proportion of participants that knew these methods was very low and disparity amongst MES for this knowledge was marked. It is worth noting that the percentage of rural adults having knowledge at least one prevention measure is high whereas the proportion of rural adults having knowledge of at least two prevention methods was very low. Combining various methods to prevent malaria is more effective than only one approach [44].

In our study, the proportion of rural adults having knowledge of sleeping under LLINs to prevent malaria was low. This finding is lower than reported in other studies in Tanzania [45] and Southern Africa [39] which revealed a high proportion of community knew that sleeping under treated nets was a protective method to prevent malaria. This discrepancy might be because of different levels of knowledge in transmission mode of malaria. In this research only about half of the studied population knew malaria was caused by mosquito bite. Similar studies have been reported from Iran, a country that reported zero indigenous cases in 2018 [3], which revealed that high level of awareness of transmission mode of malaria is in agreement with the knowledge on sleeping under LLINs aiming to protect from mosquito bites [46]. Failure to improve the awareness of communities about the benefits of sleeping under LLINs provided a negative impact on the malaria elimination program. Systematic review on the use of LLINs indicated that despite LLINs being provided free of charge and supported by government agencies and many non-government organisations, lack of awareness among communities lead them to misuse of LLINs, for instance for protecting and storage of food material [47].

The study revealed that there is a significant difference regarding knowledge of sleeping under LLINs amongst three different settings. The highest percentage for this knowledge was for rural adults in high endemic settings, followed by moderate settings and the lowest was in low settings. This finding is consistent with study in Bangladesh [21] and Colombia [48]. The high level of this knowledge in high endemic settings might be due to long term exposure

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

with LLINs distribution program in the region. It is understood that in malaria endemic communities with many ongoing programs of malaria intervention, the level of malaria prevention knowledge should be higher compared to other areas which have less malaria prevention programs. Since 2008, the target program of LLINs distribution in East Sumba district was higher compared with other districts [14] and in 2017 during the mass campaign of LLINs in the country, this district was also included in the program [49].

With regard to perception on treatment seeking behaviour, our study found that the awareness of seeking treatment within 24 hours when participants or their family members suffer with malaria was poor. This is consistent with other studies in some parts of Indonesia [23, 50], and other South East Asia countries such as Myanmar [20] and Cambodia [51]. The poor level of seeking malaria treatment in this study might occur since over one third of the total participants still believed that malaria was not dangerous for their health. Therefore, they treated malaria at home first for several days before they visited a local health centre. Prompt treatment seeking behaviour is critical to escalate for malaria elimination. With considering low awareness of rural adults in the ENTP, more efforts are needed to improve the awareness of the rural adults since failure to seek treatment within 24 hours after onset of the clinical symptoms lead to increased fatality rate [52].

Community engagement is fundamental to malaria elimination [53]. To improve the community participation, the community awareness should be measurable. The study indicates that malaria awareness of participants is poor and malaria awareness index is not part of the malaria elimination program of the ENTP currently [54], therefore, malaria awareness index should be part of the key strategic interventions of the ENTP to improve malaria awareness of the community. Having this index in their malaria elimination program enables the local authority for implementing and evaluating the progress of malaria awareness of the local community at district, sub-district and village level.

It is suggested the partnership between the health department and education department of the ENTP plays a significant role in promoting malaria knowledge as a part of local curriculum to improve malaria awareness index of local community. Students could be an important agent for change. They could be encouraged to share their malaria knowledge with their family as be shown in other countries [55, 56]. The great achievement of the Chinese government to achieve zero local malaria transmission for the first time in 2017 was also supported by the massive effort to improve malaria awareness of communities including school children [57]. Considering that a high proportion of residents in rural areas in the ENTP have no education level [11, 58], the malaria education program in countryside schools could improve malaria awareness of rural communities.

This research is the first reliable data on malaria awareness and knowledge in the general population in ENTP Indonesia, particularly for adults living in remote areas. Data provides a large and representative sample size for this population. The potential weakness of our study is that data collection had been collected in one time period and from one province. The study needs to be repeated in a random sample in other regions for capturing a truly representative sample of rural adults nationally. Because of limited resources for the study, we cannot check the inter or intra interviewer's reliability. The interviewers do not have a chance to interview the same research participants, indicating that inter-intra reliability could not be evaluated. However, interviewers were selected for those having certified degree in nursing and they participated in one day intensive training applying the same approach. Despite those

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

limitations, findings of the study have provided insights into the level of malaria knowledge of rural adults of the ENTP.

Conclusions

Malaria awareness of rural adults needs to be improved. Public health programs of the local government should incorporate malaria awareness index as a key intervention and this index should be measurable by setting up the reasonable target to improve the awareness of the local communities. Having this index in malaria elimination programs of the ENTP will help local authorities to manage and evaluate the progress of malaria awareness of the local community at district, sub-district and village level. Public health campaigns should be focused on improving basic malaria knowledge such as main symptom, transmission mode, prevention methods of malaria, seeking early treatment behaviour for rural adults in the province. This method will support a national action plan for malaria elimination in the country. Failure to address the awareness in rural communities will mean malaria elimination will fall short.

Acknowledgments

We thank all respondents for their participation in this project. Our gratitude also dedicated to the governor of ENTP, head of East Sumba, Belu, and East Manggarai District, nine head of sub-districts, and forty-nine village leaders for allowing conducted this research in their region.

Authors' Contributions

RDG designed the study, prepared the data collection instruments, organised ethics, conducted primary data collection, analysed the data and wrote the draft manuscript. FMAI and JK supervised the study, reviewed the paper and provided substantial inputs. All authors have approved the manuscript for submission.

References

1. World Health Organization. World Malaria Report 2019. 2019. [cited 2020 May 12]. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/world-malaria-report-2019.
2. Guglielmi G. Malaria cases are falling worldwide. Nature [Internet]. 2019. 19 December 2019 [cited 2020 15 October]. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-03746-3.
3. World Health Organization. The e-2020 initiative of 21 malaria eliminating countries 2019 progress report. 2019. [cited 2020 June 20]. Available from: https://www.who.int/malaria/publications/atoz/e-2020-progress-report-2019/en/.
4. World Health Organization South-East Asia Region. Regional Action Plan 2017–2030. Towards 0. Malaria-Free South-East Asia Region. World Health Organization, Regional Office for South-East Asia.2017. [cited 2020 April 14]. Available from: http://apps.searo.who.int/PDS_DOCS/B5394.pdf.
5. Roll Back Malaria Partnership. THE GLOBAL MALARIA ACTION PLAN : For a malaria free world. 2008 Available from: https://web.archive.org/web/20100415074020/http://www.rollbackmalaria.org/gmap/gmap.pdf.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

6. World Health Organization. Global technical strategy for malaria 2016-2030. 2015 [cited 2020 Jan 18]. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/176712/9789241564991_eng.pdf?sequence=1.
7. Ministry of Health. Decree of the Health Minister the Republic of Indonesia number 293 / MENKES / SK / IV / 2009 : Elimination Malaria in Indonesia. . In: Indonesia HMotRo, editor. Jakarta2009.
8. Ministry of Health. National Action Plan for Acceleration of Malaria Elimination 2020-2024. Ministry of Health The Republic of Indonesia. 2020. [cited 2020 May 20]. Available from: https://www.apmen.org/apmen/Resources/Country%20Briefings/Indonesia-NSPMalaria-English-%20final.pdf.
9. Ministry of Health. The current development situation of malaria control program in Indonesia 2018. 2018 [cited 2020 May 10]. Available from: http://www.malaria.id/p/blog-page_43.html.
10. Ministry of Health. National Report of Basic Health Research 2018 Ministry of Health (MoH)of the Republic of Indonesia. 2019. [cited 2020 April 10]. Available from: http://labdata.litbang.kemkes.go.id/images/download/laporan/RKD/2018/Laporan_Nasional_RKD2018_FINAL.pdf.
11. The Central Bureau of Statistics East Nusa Tenggara Province. East Nusa Tenggara Province (ENTP) in Figures 2020. 2020 [cited 2020 August 18]. Available from: https://ntt.bps.go.id/publication/download.html?nrbvfeve=MDgwYWE3YmRlMDQ1NGYwN2U3ODQ4YjQ5&xzmn=aHR0cHM6Ly9udHQuYnBzLmdvLmlkL3B1YmxpY2F0aW9uLzIwMjAvMDQvMjcvMDgwYWE3YmRlMDQ1NGYwN2U3ODQ4YjQ5L3Byb3ZpbnNpLW51c2EtdGVuZ2dhcmEtdGltdXItZGFsYW0tYW5na2EtMjAyMC5odG1s&twoadfnoarfeauf=MjAyMC0wOC0yMSAwODo1NzoyMw%3D%3D.
12. Nixon CP, Nixon CE, Arsyad DS, Chand K, Yudhaputri FA, Sumarto W, et al. Distance to Anopheles sundaicus larval habitats dominant among risk factors for parasitemia in meso-endemic Southwest Sumba, Indonesia. Pathog Glob Health. 2014;108:369-80. doi: 10.1179/2047773214Y.0000000167. PubMed PMID: 25495283.
13. Syafruddin D, Bangs MJ, Sidik D, Elyazar I, Asih PB, Chan K, et al. Impact of a Spatial Repellent on Malaria Incidence in Two Villages in Sumba, Indonesia. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2014;91(6):1079-87. doi: https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.13-0735.
14. Willa RW, Noshirma M, Adnyana NWD. Malaria Vector Control Programs Inventory as a Preliminary Intervention Model in East Nusa Tenggara Province Idonesia. Journal of Health Ecology. 2013;12 (1):34 - 41.
15. Ndoen E, Wild C, Dale P, Sipe N, Dale M. Relationships between anopheline mosquitoes and topography in West Timor and Java, Indonesia. Malar J. 2010;9(1):242. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-9-242.
16. Yoshikawa H, Tokoro M, Nagamoto T, Arayama S, Asih PBS, Rozi IE, et al. Molecular survey of Blastocystis sp. from humans and associated animals in an Indonesian community with poor hygiene. Parasitology International. 2016;65(6):780-4. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parint.2016.03.010.
17. Dlamini SV, Liao C-W, Dlamini ZH, Siphepho JS, Cheng P-C, Chuang T-W, et al. Knowledge of human social and behavioral factors essential for the success of community malaria control intervention programs: The case of Lomahasha in Swaziland. Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection. 2017;50(2):245-53. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmii.2015.05.003.
18. Yasuoka J, Kikuchi K, Nanishi K, Ly P, Thavrin B, Omatsu T, et al. Malaria knowledge, preventive actions, and treatment-seeking behavior among ethnic minorities in Ratanakiri

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Province, Cambodia: a community-based cross-sectional survey. BMC public health. 2018;18(1):1206-. doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-6123-0. PubMed PMID: 30367615.

19. Spjeldnæs AO, Kitua AY, Blomberg B. Education and knowledge helps combating malaria, but not degedege: a cross-sectional study in Rufiji, Tanzania. Malar J. 2014;13:200. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-13-200. PubMed PMID: 24885180.
20. Naing PA, Maung TM, Tripathy JP, Oo T, Wai KT, Thi A. Awareness of malaria and treatment-seeking behaviour among persons with acute undifferentiated fever in the endemic regions of Myanmar. Trop Med Health. 2017;45:31. doi: 10.1186/s41182-017-0070-9. PubMed PMID: 29213208.
21. Alam MS, Kabir MM, Hossain MS, Naher S, Ferdous NEN, Khan WA, et al. Reduction in malaria prevalence and increase in malaria awareness in endemic districts of Bangladesh. Malar J. 2016;15(1):552. doi: 10.1186/s12936-016-1603-0.
22. Saha A, Sarker M, Kabir M, Lu G, Müller O. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding malaria control among the slash and burn cultivators in Rangamati Hill tracts of Bangladesh. Malar J. 2019;18(1):216-. doi: 10.1186/s12936-019-2849-0. PubMed PMID: 31238990.
23. Tanjung N, Sitorus MEJ, Tanjung R, Sinaga HT. Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Relapse Malaria Patients. a Cross Sectional Study from Mandailing Natal District, Indonesia. Indian J Public Health Res Dev. 2019;10:416-9. doi: DOI: 10.5958/0976-5506.2019.00530.8.
24. Trapsilowati W, Pujiyanti A, Setyaningsih R, Wigati. Description of Community Knowledge Attitude and Practice on Malaria in Purworejo Regency 2015. Journal of Vector-borne Diseases Studies. 2018;10 No.1.
25. Yulidar, Wilya V. Knowledge, attitude, and behavior of society for malaria in District of Alue Bilie, Nagan Raya, Aceh Indonesia. Journal of Health Epidemiology and Communicable Disease. 2016;2(1):28-32.
26. Thaha RM. Malaria Related Knowledge, Practice and Behavior of People in South Halmahera, Indonesia. Int J Health Sci Res. 2014;4(11):188-95.
27. Wangdi K, Furuya-Kanamori L, Clark J, Barendregt JJ, Gatton ML, Banwell C, et al. Comparative effectiveness of malaria prevention measures: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Parasit Vectors. 2018;11:210. doi: 10.1186/s13071-018-2783-y.
28. Mading M, Willa RW. Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) of the Pregnant Women to Malaria in Sout West Sumba Regency. Journal of Health Ecology. 2014;13(4):279-88.
29. Diaz GF. The relationship between knowledge and perceptions of the head of the household about malaria to the preventive behavior of malaria transmission : Cross-sectional study in Southwest Sumba. [Bachelor of Nursing Education]. Surabaya: Universitas Airlangga; 2017.
30. Ipa M, Widawati M, Laksono AD, Kusrini I, Dhewantara PW. Variation of preventive practices and its association with malaria infection in eastern Indonesia: Findings from community-based survey. PloS one. 2020;15(5):e0232909-e. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0232909. PubMed PMID: 32379812.
31. Guntur RD, Kingsley J, Islam FMA. Malaria in East Nusa Tenggara Province (Indonesia): Protocol for a Cross-sectional Study. JMIR Preprints. 15/08/2020:23545. 2020. doi: 10.2196/preprints.23545.
32. Devine A, Kenangalem E, Burdam FH, Anstey NM, Poespoprodjo JR, Price RN, et al. Treatment-Seeking Behavior after the Implementation of a Unified Policy of Dihydroartemisinin-Piperaquine for the Treatment of Uncomplicated Malaria in Papua, Indonesia. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene. 2018;98(2):543-50. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.17-0680. PubMed PMID: 29280424.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

33. Tang S, Ji L, Hu T, Wang R, Fu H, Shao T, et al. Public awareness of malaria in the middle stage of national malaria elimination programme. A cross-sectional survey in rural areas of malaria-endemic counties, China. Malar J. 2016;15(1):373. doi: 10.1186/s12936-016-1428-x.
34. Yin J, Xia Z, Wang R, Zhang Q, Fang W, Zhou S. Public awareness of malaria at the beginning of a national malaria elimination program in China. J Infect Dev Ctries. 2015;9(4):416-20. doi: 10.3855/jidc.5307. PubMed PMID: 25881532.
35. Zafar SN, Fatmi Z, Iqbal A, Channa R, Haider AH. Disparities in Access to Surgical Care within a Lower Income Country: An Alarming Inequity. World Journal of Surgery. 2013;37(7):1470-7. doi: 10.1007/s00268-012-1732-8.
36. National Population and Family Planning Board, The Central Bureau of Statistics Indonesia, Ministry of Health, ICF. Indonesia Demographic and Health Survey 2017. Jakarta, Indonesia: BKKBN, BPS, Kemenkes, and ICF. 2018. . Available from: https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR342/FR342.pdf.
37. Lu SH, Tian BC, Kang XP, Zhang W, Meng XP, Zhang JB, et al. Public awareness of tuberculosis in China: a national survey of 69 253 subjects. The international journal of tuberculosis and lung disease : the official journal of the International Union against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease. 2009;13(12):1493-9. PubMed PMID: 19919766.
38. Birhanu Z, Yihdego YY-e, Yewhalaw D. Caretakers' understanding of malaria, use of insecticide treated net and care seeking-behavior for febrile illness of their children in Ethiopia. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2017;17(1):629. doi: 10.1186/s12879-017-2731-z.
39. Kanyangarara M, Hamapumbu H, Mamini E, Lupiya J, Stevenson JC, Mharakurwa S, et al. Malaria knowledge and bed net use in three transmission settings in southern Africa. Malar J. 2018;17(1):41. doi: 10.1186/s12936-018-2178-8.
40. The Central Bureau of Statistics Indonesia. Statistics of Migration Indonesia. 2016a. Available from: https://www.bps.go.id/publication/download.html?nrbvfeve=NDMyMDk2Y2Y2NjZiMzczYjc5NzQ5NDlj&xzmn=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuYnBzLmdvLmlkL3B1YmxpY2F0aW9uLzIwMTYvMDEvMDQvNDMyMDk2Y2Y2NjZiMzczYjc5NzQ5NDljL3N0YXRpc3Rpay1taWdyYXNpLWluZG9uZXNpYS1oYXNpbC1zdXJ2ZWktcGVuZHVkdWstYW50YXItc2Vuc3VzLTIwMTUuaHRtbA%3D%3D&twoadfnoarfeauf=MjAyMC0wOS0xOSAxOTo0MjowMw%3D%3D.
41. The Central Bureau of Statistics Indonesia. Statistics of Migration Nusa Tenggara Timur Indonesia. 2016b. Available from: https://www.bps.go.id/publication/download.html?nrbvfeve=N2E3MDY2OWJhNTBjNTRlYjI2MGM4NzU4&xzmn=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuYnBzLmdvLmlkL3B1YmxpY2F0aW9uLzIwMTYvMDEvMDYvN2E3MDY2OWJhNTBjNTRlYjI2MGM4NzU4L3N0YXRpc3Rpay1taWdyYXNpLW51c2EtdGVuZ2dhcmEtdGltdXItaGFzaWwtc3VydmVpLXBlbmR1ZHVrLWFudGFyLXNlbnN1cy0yMDE1Lmh0bWw%3D&twoadfnoarfeauf=MjAyMC0wOS0xOSAxNzoxNDozNA%3D%3D.
42. DePina AJ, Dia AK, de Ascenção Soares Martins A, Ferreira MC, Moreira AL, Leal SV, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and practices about malaria in Cabo Verde: a country in the pre-elimination context. BMC Public Health. 2019;19(1):850. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-7130-5.
43. Nejati J, Moosa-Kazemi SH, Saghafipour A, Soofi K. Knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) on malaria, from high malaria burden rural communities, southeastern Iran. J Parasit Dis. 2018;42(1):62-7. doi: 10.1007/s12639-017-0965-8. PubMed PMID: 29491561.
44. Fullman N, Burstein R, Lim SS, Medlin C, Gakidou E. Nets, spray or both? The effectiveness of insecticide-treated nets and indoor residual spraying in reducing malaria

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

morbidity and child mortality in sub-Saharan Africa. Malar J. 2013;12(1):62. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-12-62.

45. Munisi DZ, Nyundo AA, Mpondo BC. Knowledge, attitude and practice towards malaria among symptomatic patients attending Tumbi Referral Hospital: A cross-sectional study. PloS one. 2019;14(8):e0220501. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0220501.
46. Soleimani-Ahmadi M, Vatandoost H, Zare M, Alizadeh A, Salehi M. Community knowledge and practices regarding malaria and long-lasting insecticidal nets during malaria elimination programme in an endemic area in Iran. Malar J. 2014;13(1):511. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-13-511.
47. Dhiman S, Veer V. Culminating anti-malaria efforts at long lasting insecticidal net? Journal of Infection and Public Health. 2014;7(6):457-64. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2014.06.002.
48. Forero DA, Chaparro PE, Vallejo AF, Benavides Y, Gutiérrez JB, Arévalo-Herrera M, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of malaria in Colombia. Malar J. 2014;13(1):165. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-13-165.
49. Ministry of Health. Guidelines for Implementing the Distribution of Treated Mosquito Nets in Eastern Indonesia 2017. 2017 12/12/2018. Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1iK4TnXmPA4j6vj1WMXGwV2AB7ApSzof3/view.
50. Sanjana P, Barcus MJ, Bangs MJ, Ompusunggu S, Elyazar I, Marwoto H, et al. Survey of community knowledge, attitudes, and practices during a malaria epidemic in central Java, Indonesia. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2006;75:783-9. PubMed PMID: 17123966.
51. ACTwatch Group, PSI/Cambodia. Kingdom of Cambodia Household Survey Report. 2011 [cited 2020 31 May]. Available from: www.actwatch.info.
52. World Health Organization. World Malaria Report 2015. 2015 [cited 2020 March 5]. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/200018/9789241565158_eng.pdf;jsessionid=842155972E6F5D0B613D98B844DA5A56?sequence=1.
53. Whittaker M, Smith C. Reimagining malaria: five reasons to strengthen community engagement in the lead up to malaria elimination. Malar J. 2015;14(1):410. doi: 10.1186/s12936-015-0931-9.
54. East Nusa Tenggara Province. Regulation of the Governor of East Nusa Tenggara Number 11 Year 2017 : Malaria Elimination in East Nusa Tenggara (ENTP). . In: Indonesia HDE, editor. 2017.
55. Ayi I, Nonaka D, Adjovu JK, Hanafusa S, Jimba M, Bosompem KM, et al. School-based participatory health education for malaria control in Ghana: engaging children as health messengers. Malar J. 2010;9(1):98. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-9-98.
56. Bambo F, Bande JD, Bacar GC, Martin S. Integrating malaria education into primary school activities2018 [cited 2020 Oct 2]. Available from: https://www.malariaconsortium.org/resources/publications/1079/integrating-malaria-education-into-primary-school-activities.
57. Zhang S, Zhang L, Feng J, Yin J, Feng X, Xia Z, et al. Malaria elimination in the People's Republic of China: current progress, challenges, and prospects. 2018:233-55.
58. Guntur R, Lobo M. Statistical Modelling for Dropped Out School Children (DOSC) in East Nusa Tenggara Province Indonesia. Journal of Physics: Conference Series. 2017;812(1):012073.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

THAILAND
VIETNAM
CAMBODIA
PHILIPPINES
MALAYSIA
INDONESIA
Jakarta
Bali
ENTP
3
1
2
TIMOR LESTE
Malaria Endemic Settings
1. High
2. Moderate
3. Low
Darwin
AUSTRALIA
International Border

Fig 2. Distribution of malaria knowledge score amongst participants.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.04.20243675; this version posted December 7, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	Items	Total	Malaria Endemic Setting**			P value
			High	Moderate	Low	
	Part I : Basic malaria understanding					
1	Hearing malaria term	1287 (86.1)	480 (97.0)	398 (79.6)	409 (81.8)	<0.001
2	Malaria has dangerous effect on health	959 (64.1)	363 (73.3)	229 (45.8)	367 (73.4)	<0.001
3	Malaria could be prevented	1216 (81.3)	466 (94.1)	362 (72.4)	388 (77.6)	<0.001
	Part II : Basic malaria knowledge					
4	Main symptom of malaria	567 (37.9)	82 (16.6)	234 (46.8)	251 (50.2)	<0.001
5	Transmission mode of malaria	883 (59.1)	320 (64.6)	294 (58.8)	269 (53.8)	0.002
	Prevention knowledge					
6	Sleeping under non-LLINs	349 (23.3)	26 (5.3)	55 (11.0)	268 (53.6)	<0.001
7	Sleeping under LLINs	752 (50.3)	358 (72.3)	210 (42.0)	184 (36.8)	<0.001
8	Using mosquito coils	344 (23.0)	113 (22.8)	120 (24.0)	111 (22.2)	0.79
9	Keeping house clean	539 (36.1)	123 (24.8)	137 (27.4)	279 (55.8)	<0.001
	Knowing at least one prevention measure	1122 (75.1)	424 (85.7)	344 (68.8)	354 (70.8)	< 0.001
	Knowing at least two prevention measures	592 (39.6)	160 (32.3)	123 (24.6)	309 (61.8)	<0.001
10	**Seeking treatment for malaria***	687 (46.0)	170 (34.3)	223 (44.6)	294 (58.8)	<0.001

*Seeking treatment within 24 hours when participants or their family suffered with malaria;

** High: East Sumba District, Moderate: Belu District and low: East Manggarai District