

1 **Incentivizing Multiple Objectives in Active Surveillance for Urban Disease Vectors**

2

3 **Claudia Arevalo-Nieto¹, Justin Sheen², Gianfranco Condori-Luna, Carlos Condori-Pino¹, Julianna**
4 **Shinnick², Jennifer K. Peterson^{2,3}, Ricardo Castillo-Neyra², Michael Z. Levy^{2*}**

5

6 ¹Zoonotic Disease Research Laboratory, One Health Unit, School of Public Health and Administration, Universidad
7 Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Arequipa, Perú

8

9 ²Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, U.S.A.

10 ³University Honors College, Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA

11 *Corresponding author

12

13 **Keywords:** Epidemiologic surveillance, risk maps, vector control, spatial search, Chagas disease,
14 *Triatoma infestans*, behavioral incentives

15

16

17

18 **ABSTRACT**

19 Large-scale vector control campaigns have successfully reduced infectious disease incidence around the
20 world. In addition to preventing new infections, these campaigns produce a wealth of information about
21 the distribution and density of insect vectors, which can be incorporated into risk maps. These maps can
22 effectively communicate risk map data to technicians on the ground, although encouraging them to use
23 the data remains a challenge. We carried out a series of rolling trials in which we evaluated risk map use
24 under different incentive schemes. Participants in the studies were trained field technicians tasked with
25 house-to-house surveillance for insect vectors of Chagas disease in Arequipa, Peru. A novel incentive
26 scheme based on poker best achieved a dual objective: to encourage technicians to preferentially visit
27 higher-risk houses while surveilling evenly across the search zone. The poker incentive structure may be
28 well-suited to improve entomological surveillance activities and other complex multi-objective tasks.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 MAIN

37 Vector-borne diseases kill at least 700,000 people each year¹. A common method for interrupting vector-
38 borne disease (VBD) transmission is to target vector populations, especially blood feeding insects, in
39 human-dominated areas, often through large-scale vector control campaigns. These efforts have
40 successfully reduced VBD incidence²⁻⁴, and in the process have also produced a wealth of information
41 about vector distribution and density⁵. Such data could be invaluable in guiding subsequent surveillance
42 and control activities, but often remains underutilized.

43
44 One avenue for utilizing vector control data is to incorporate them into risk maps. In recent years, risk
45 map technology has advanced rapidly⁶⁻¹⁰; computational power now allows for precise inference over
46 large areas¹¹⁻¹³, while mobile technology can bring up-to-date predictions directly to surveillance
47 personnel in the field^{9,14,15}. Nonetheless, achieving optimal use of the complex spatio-temporal
48 information provided by risk maps still hinges on the behavior of the technicians tasked with the job.
49 Simply generating and delivering a map does not ensure its appropriate use⁹, which can require the end
50 user to be cognizant of multiple types of information at once, in addition to changing their habitual
51 behaviors.

52
53 In this study, we asked if incentives could help to bridge the gap between risk map delivery and optimal
54 map use. We investigated this question using risk maps for domestic infestations of the Chagas disease
55 vector *Triatoma infestans* in Arequipa, Peru (pop: ~1.3 million). Chagas disease is a vector-borne
56 infection caused by the parasite *Trypanosoma cruzi*. The disease is chronic if left untreated, leading to
57 serious cardiac, gastrointestinal, and/or peripheral nervous system morbidity in about 30% of those
58 infected¹⁶.

59
60 Over the past two decades, a large-scale insecticide campaign in Arequipa has significantly reduced the
61 number of Chagas disease vector infestations in the city, resulting in infrequent infestations of households
62 (there are no wild vectors in the region) that are sporadically distributed across the urban landscape.
63 At the height of the campaign, over 30 dedicated field personnel worked on vector control. However, that
64 number has dropped with the prevalence of infestation and presently there are no full-time staff dedicated
65 to Chagas disease vector control. Inspections are conducted by technicians who are responsible for a
66 variety of disease prevention activities, in addition to routine laboratory work [Laura Tamayo, pers.
67 comm.]. Our risk maps provide surveillance personnel with the opportunity to make evidence-based
68 decisions when looking for *T. infestans* in the challenging post-vector control campaign scenario, and
69 ultimately, help to prevent vector re-emergence.

70
71

72 METHODS

73

74 Overview

75 We conducted a rolling series of four trials in which we evaluated map use by vector control personnel
76 (hereafter referred to as participants) under different incentive schemes. Each trial took place in a district
77 of Arequipa, Peru that had a history of *T. infestans* infestation (described below).

78 **Ethics statement**

79 All participants provided written informed consent to participate in the study. The study was approved by
80 the institutional review boards of the University of Pennsylvania (protocol number 824603) and the
81 Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia (protocol number 66427).

82

83 **Study sites**

84 Trials were conducted in four of Arequipa's twenty-nine districts: the Socabaya district, the Cayma
85 district, the Jose Luis Bustamante y Rivero (JLByR) district, and the Miraflores district. All districts had a
86 population of at least 75,000 people, and a history of substantial *T. infestans* infestation during the
87 insecticide treatment phase of the vector control campaign between 2007 and 2012. Further demographic
88 and historical information for each district are provided in the supplementary materials.

89

90 **Experimental design**

91 Each of the four trials had at least two arms in which we tested different incentive schemes. Trials
92 followed a crossover design in which participants were compared to themselves across arms of the same
93 trial¹⁷. Participants were assigned to a trial arm for five days (Mon-Fri), working for approximately five
94 hours per day. For logistical reasons (vacations), some individuals did not participate in every trial. Six
95 individuals participated in the first three trials, and nine in the final trial.

96

97 In each trial arm, a participant was assigned to surveil a new 'search zone,' which were contiguous areas
98 within one of the four districts that contained 400-600 households. This number of households is similar
99 to that which a vector control technician might surveil in a given week. The boundaries of the zones were
100 artificial, (as are the politically-defined districts in which they are located), but they generally followed
101 natural features of the landscape. Each search zone was included in the study only once. We randomized
102 the assignment of search zones and the order in which each arm was carried out.

103

104 **Risk maps**

105 Risk maps for vector infestation were provided on smart phones using the VectorPoint mobile app
106 (described in detail in^{9,18}). Each participant had at least one month of experience using the app prior to the
107 study. Briefly, the VectorPoint app provides a map of each search zone in which each household in the
108 zone is displayed as a dot that is colored one of five colors. Each of the five colors represents the risk of
109 that household being infested with *T. infestans* relative to all other houses in its search zone (Figure 1).

110

111 Risk estimates displayed in the map were generated using infestation data from the Arequipa vector
112 control campaign run in a longitudinal, spatio-temporal model described previously^{9,18}. The model was
113 run every evening to incorporate new information collected during inspections that day. To avoid any
114 influence from vector surveillance activities in nearby areas, we ran the model on each search zone
115 individually. Risk maps were updated and synched with the app each morning for participant use.

116

117 **Spatial coverage**

118 We quantified spatial coverage of the search zone using a new functionality in the VectorPoint app that
119 draws lines between inspected houses and divides the uninspected spaces into triangles. Every time a new
120 house was inspected, the house became a vertex in a set of Delaunay triangles¹⁹. New triangles were
121 formed in the app in real time, and were immediately visible to the participants, allowing them to monitor

122 their spatial coverage. We used the number of uninspected houses in the largest triangle as the metric with
 123 which we evaluated spatial coverage (Figure 1).

124

125 Incentive structures

126 Each incentive structure was designed to encourage participants to utilize the household-level infestation
 127 risk information presented in the risk map while also displaying good spatial coverage of their search
 128 zone. We refer to this as our ‘dual objective,’ which we represent visually in Figure 1. Rewards were
 129 rewarded in Peruvian soles. One Peruvian sol is equivalent to approximately \$0.28USD.

130

- 131 • **Fixed risk information utilization:** Under this incentive scheme, one of five payment amounts was
 132 awarded to participants for each house they inspected. The five payment amounts were positively
 133 correlated with the five risk levels (as shown by five colors in the risk map) in order to encourage
 134 participants to utilize the household level risk information presented in maps.




Figure 1. Representation of risk-based and spatial incentives. Left: Map displaying a search area of N households, each represented by a dot that is colored one of five colors representing relative risk of vector infestation. Top right: ‘ α ’ represents the reward for risk information utilization, which was earned in a stochastic or fixed incentive scheme. Bottom right: ‘ β ’ represents the reward for spatial coverage, which is calculated by subtracting the maximum number of uninspected houses bounded by Delaunay triangles formed between the inspected houses, T , from the minimum expected coverage ($N \cdot 0.05$). In the first three trials, the total reward was a weighted average of α and β . In the final trial, values of α and β were added together to form hierarchical ‘poker hands’.

135

- 136 • **Spatial coverage:** Under the spatial coverage incentive, participants were rewarded for surveilling
 137 evenly across the total area of their search zone, quantified as described above. A minimum expected
 138 coverage was established as 5% of the total number of houses in each search zone. As a reminder, the
 139 inspected houses formed vertices of a set of Delaunay triangles¹⁹. The largest of these triangles--

- 140 which represents the biggest 'hole' in the search area, was identified (Figure 1). If the largest of the
141 triangles contained fewer houses than the minimum expected coverage, a reward was given. The size
142 of the reward increased with each subsequent decrease in the number of households situated in the
143 largest triangle.
144
- 145 • **Secret houses:** With this incentive, we aimed to encourage participants to use the risk information in
146 the maps by providing rewards for visiting certain 'secret' houses that were not revealed to
147 participants ahead of time. Participants were informed that houses with a higher infestation risk level
148 had a higher probability of being 'secret' houses. We chose secret houses using weighted random
149 selection, in which each house was weighted proportionally to its estimated risk quintile. We
150 informed participants at the end of each day if they had inspected a secret house. Monetary values
151 awarded for inspecting a secret house differed by trial and arm.
152
 - 153 • **Pay per detection:** In this incentive structure we aimed to motivate participants to adopt both target
154 strategies by allocating large financial rewards for detecting and inspecting infested houses. The
155 probability of finding an infested house in Arequipa is very low, so the larger reward was balanced by
156 the lower expectation of a payout.
157
 - 158 • **Poker incentive structure (Figure 2):** Under this incentive structure points were awarded for
159 achieving the goals described below. When participants accumulated 500 or 1000 points, they could
160 trade the points in for four hours or a day off work, respectively. The possible goals ('poker hands')
161 were:
162
 - 163 ○ **High card (one point per home inspection):** A point was awarded for each home inspection
164 carried out, regardless of spatial coverage achieved or house risk level. A home inspection was
165 analogous to a poker hand that has no flush or straight, and is thus scored on its highest card.
 - 166 ○ **Straight (100 points):** The next level up was a 'straight,' which describes a poker hand of five
167 cards in sequence, but of different suits. In this case, spatial coverage was analogous to card
168 sequence; when spatial coverage exceeded 5%, a 'straight' was achieved.
 - 169 ○ **Flush (100 points):** A 'flush' refers to a poker hand with five cards of the same suit in no
170 sequential order. In our poker incentive scheme, a flush was achieved when the mean risk level of
171 all houses inspected in a week was at least four (out of five possible levels/quintiles).
 - 172 ○ **Straight flush (300 points):** A 'straight flush' is a poker hand with five cards of the same suit
173 (the flush) in sequential order (the straight). Hence, a straight flush was achieved under the poker
174 incentive scheme by inspecting houses with a mean risk level of four *and* spatial coverage over
175 5%.
 - 176 ○ **Wild card (500 points):** Detecting infestations in a low-prevalence situation involves some
177 combination of strategy and luck. We draw the analogy to using a wildcard--which, in some
178 versions of poker, confers great advantages to the player who draws it. In our poker incentive
179 scheme, participants scored a 'wild card' by detecting an infested house.

Poker analogy	Hands	Points	Additional Points
<p>Wild Card</p>		500+	+50 if they find another infested house
<p>Straight Flush</p>		300+	+5/triangle + 5/highest risk 4/high risk 3/medium risk 2/low risk 1/lowest risk
<p>Flush</p>		100+	5/highest risk 4/high risk 3/medium risk 2/low risk 1/lowest risk
<p>Straight</p>		100+	+5/triangle
<p>High Card</p>		0-100	+1 if they inspect a house

Figure 2. Poker incentive scheme. The first column displays the poker hands corresponding to different ways to earn points. The second column shows the goal that participants could choose to achieve: infested house detection (shown as a bug), higher risk houses (shown as the five-color risk quintile), and good spatial coverage (shown as a map). The house picture represents carrying out home inspections regardless of risk level or spatial coverage. The last two columns describe the base number of points for each hand and additional points that were awarded when participants achieved the goals shown in the second column.

180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201

Statistical analyses

All statistical tests were carried out in the R statistical computing environment²⁰. Given the ordinal nature of the outcome variable for risk information utilization, we used a proportional odds logistic regression (POLR function from the MASS Package²¹) to compare the number of houses that participants inspected in each risk quintile under the different arms of each trial. For analyses of spatial coverage in the trials with two arms (Cayma, JLByR and Miraflores trials), we performed a paired t-test for each trial in which we compared spatial between arms. To analyze spatial coverage in the Socabaya trial, which had three experimental arms and one control arm, we carried out a paired t-test comparing spatial coverage in each of the three experimental arms to that of the control arm.

RESULTS

Table 1 is provided as a quick reference for the incentive scheme descriptions. Trial names reflect the district in which they were carried out. Data for each participant are available in Tables S1 and S2 and in Figure S1. All results are summarized in Table 2.

Incentive	Description
Secret houses	Participants rewarded for inspecting houses designated as ‘secret houses’ using random selection weighted toward higher risk houses
Spatial coverage	Participants rewarded for decreasing Delaunay triangle size beyond a minimum threshold.
Pay-per-detection	Participants rewarded for finding an infested house
Poker scheme	Participants rewarded for achieving tasks named for different poker schemes

Table 1. Overview of the incentive schemes tested in this study. Detailed information for each scheme is found in the Methods section and Figures 1 and 3.

202

203 **Socabaya trial**

204 In this trial, there were six participants and four arms (A-D), which were distinguished by the incentive
205 schemes tested: Secret houses, spatial coverage, and pay per detection. Over the course of four weeks, six
206 participants visited a total of 2,824 houses and conducted 965 inspections in 24 search zones. Financial
207 incentives significantly improved spatial coverage (Figure 3; Arm A: paired t-test, $t = -5.4155$, $p < 0.01$;
208 Arm B: paired t-test, $t = -7.6817$, $p < 0.001$). The average size of the largest triangle in Arms A and B,
209 (the two arms in which spatial coverage was incentivized) was 18.0 uninspected houses (range: 10.0 to
210 26.0) and 15.7 uninspected houses (range: 10.0 to 25.0), respectively. In Arms C and D, (in which spatial
211 coverage was not incentivized), the largest group of uninspected houses averaged 52.7 (range: 35.0 to
212 71.0) and 50.0 (range: 35.0 – 72.0), respectively. We found no significant differences in risk information
213 utilization in any of the arms (A, B and D) when compared with the control arm (Figure S1). The
214 monetary value of the economic incentives awarded in this trial was an average of 10.1% of a
215 participant’s salary (ranging from 4.0% to 13.0%).

216

217

218
219
220




Figure 3. Spatial coverage maps for each participant in the Socabaya trial. Rows represent participants, columns represent trial arms. Incentives used in each arm were: (A) Fixed incentive for spatial coverage and a stochastic incentive for inspecting higher risk houses; (B) Fixed incentive for spatial coverage and an increased payout of the stochastic incentive for inspecting higher risk houses; (C) no incentives (control arm); and (D) pay per detection. Spatial coverage is represented by Delaunay triangulation in which triangles are formed connecting inspected houses (colored dots represent the inspected houses by the infestation risk shown as a gradient from yellow (lowest quintile) to dark red (highest quintile)). Arms A and B both had significantly higher spatial coverage than Arms C and D (paired t-test, $p < 0.01$, $p < 0.001$, respectively).

221 Cayma trial

222 We hypothesized that the relatively low use of risk information in the Socabaya trial might be due to the
223 uncertainty involved in searching for secret houses, as compared to increasing spatial coverage. To test
224 this hypothesis, we compared a fixed risk utilization incentive to the secret houses incentive. Here, there
225 were six participants and two arms (A and B). For the fixed risk utilization, five reward amounts (0.1, 0.2,
226 0.3, 0.4 and 0.5 soles) corresponding to the five house infestation risk levels (lowest, low, medium, high,
227 and highest) were awarded, as calculated by:

$$\frac{0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, \text{ or } 0.1 \text{ soles}}{6 \text{ soles}}$$

230 Six soles were selected for the denominator to align with the secret houses incentive amount in arm B.
231

232 The fixed payment significantly increased risk information utilization, (POLR model, OR 1.45, 95% CI
233 [1.08 - 1.96], $p < 0.02$, Figure 4) compared to the stochastic payout scheme of the secret houses incentive.
234 The average size of the largest triangle in arms A and B was 19.2 (range:10.0 – 44.0) and 17.8 (range: 9.0
235 – 29.0), respectively. There was no significant difference in spatial coverage between arms A and B.
236 Payouts in arm A ranged from 1.0 % to 6.5% of the participants' monthly salaries (mean 4.8%), and arm
237 B payouts averaged 5.0% of a participant's salary (ranging from 0.5% to 6.5%).
238
239




Figure 4. Infestation risk quintile distribution of households inspected by participants in the Cayma trial. Each set of two bars represents one participant, and each bar a study arm (A or B). A fixed incentive was used in arm A while the incentive in arm B was stochastic. Colors are ordered by risk quintile, going from the lowest (light yellow, bottom) to the highest (dark red, top). Arm A, (fixed incentive) had significantly higher risk information utilization than Arm B (stochastic incentive; POLR model, $p < 0.02$). Superscripts 1 and 2 in the x axis text indicate arm order.

240 **Jose Luis Bustamante y Rivero (JLByR) Trial**

241 In this trial, we attempted to further incentivize utilization of the risk information in the maps by
242 increasing the payout for inspecting higher-risk houses. There were six participants and two arms.
243

244 We had divergent results among participants in this trial. In arm A, one participant carried out 95% of
245 their inspections in houses in the highest risk category, and the remaining 5% of their inspections were
246 carried out in houses in the second-highest risk category, Figure 5). This participant greatly increased
247 their use of risk information relative to arm B, but at the expense of spatial coverage. The other five
248 participants did not significantly increase their inspections of higher risk houses in Arm A when
249 compared to Arm B (POLR, odds ratio (OR) = 1.35, 95% CI [0.92-1.98], $p < 0.2$). The average size of the
250 largest triangle in arms A and B was 42.5 (range: 10.0 – 120.0) and 60.0 (range: 20.0 – 77.0),
251 respectively. We did not find any significant difference in spatial coverage between Arm A and Arm B.
252 The average award in arm A was 0.67% of participants' salaries (ranging from 0 to 1.71%).
253




Figure 5. Distribution of household infestation risk quintile of households inspected by participants in the Jose Luis Bustamante y Rivero (JLByR) Trial. Each set of two bars represents one participant, and each bar, a study arm (A or B). Colors are ordered by risk quintile, going from the lowest (light yellow, bottom) to the highest (dark red, top). In arm A, the secret houses and spatial coverage incentives were used, while arm B employed only the pay-per-detection incentive. Superscripts 1 and 2 in the x axis text indicate arm order.

254 **Miraflores Trial**

255 In arm A of this trial, we introduced a new incentive structure that was analogous to different hands of
256 poker (described in detail in the Methods and in Figure 2). Rewards were given in the form of points that
257 could be traded in for time off work, rather than monetary incentives. In arm B of this trial, we used the
258 pay per detection incentive, with 500 points awarded for detecting an infested house. This trial had nine
259 participants and two arms.

260
261 The poker incentive scheme resulted in achieving our dual objective of increasing risk information
262 utilization (Figure 6) and spatial coverage of the search zone (Figure 7). Participants inspected a
263 significantly greater number of high-risk houses (POLR, OR = 2.11, 95% CI [1.52- 2.93], $p < 0.001$), and
264 achieved better spatial coverage (paired t-test, $t = 2.40$, $p < 0.05$) when compared to the pay per detection
265 arm. The largest group of uninspected houses averaged for poker arm and control arm contained 33.0
266 houses (range: 17.0 – 46.0) and 68.3 houses (range: 30.0 -109.0), respectively).

267
268 Two participants received half a day off (valued at 1.6 % of their monthly salary) by earning 500 points
269 (V8 and V9) under the poker arm. No participant received a reward under the points per detection arm.

270
271
272




Figure 6. Distribution of household infestation risk quintile of households inspected by participants in the Miraflores Trial. Each set of two bars represents one participant, and each bar, a study arm (A and B). Colors are ordered by risk quintile, going from the lowest (light yellow, bottom) to the highest (dark red, top). Arm A was the poker incentive while arm B was pay per detection. The poker arm (A) had significantly different risk information utilization than arm B (POLR model, $p < 0.001$). Superscripts indicate arm order.

273




Figure 7. Spatial coverage maps for each participant in the Miraflores trial. Rows represent nine participants; columns represent trial arms. Incentives used in each arm were: A) poker incentive; and B) pay per detection. Spatial coverage is represented by Delaunay triangulation in which triangles are formed connecting inspected houses (colored dots represent the inspected houses by the infestation risk shown as a gradient from yellow (lowest quintile) to dark red (highest quintile)). Arm A had significantly higher spatial coverage than Arm B (paired t-test, $p < 0.05$).

Trial	Arm	Incentive	Payout	Reward ¹	Behavior change
Socabaya	A	Secret houses	Stochastic	4 soles	None
		Spatial coverage	Fixed	4 soles	Increased spatial coverage
	B	Secret Houses	Stochastic	6 soles	None
		Spatial coverage	Fixed	2 soles	Increased spatial coverage
	C	None (control)	n/a	n/a	None
D	Pay per detection	Stochastic	40 soles	None	
Cayma	A	Spatial coverage	Fixed	2 soles	None
		Risk information use	Fixed	*	Increased risk information use
	B	Spatial coverage	Fixed	2 soles	None
		Secret Houses	Stochastic	6 soles	None
JLByR ²	A	Secret Houses	Stochastic	10 soles	None*
		Spatial coverage	Fixed	1 sol	None
	B	Pay per detection	Stochastic	40 soles	None
Miraflores	A	Poker	Fixed	Vacation time (accrued in points)	Increased spatial coverage AND Increased risk information use
	B	Pay per detection	Stochastic	½ day off work	None

Table 2. Results overview. ¹One sol = \$0.28 USD. ² Jose Luis Bustamante y Rivero. *Calculated by dividing 0.1,0.2,0.3,0.4, or 0.5 soles by a denominator of 6 soles.

274

275 DISCUSSION

276 The World Health Organization calls surveillance a 'cornerstone' of public health security and practice²²,
 277 but if it is a cornerstone, it is one that must be constantly shaped to different architectures of control
 278 agencies, and new epidemiologic scenarios^{23,24}. Urban disease vectors present a unique surveillance
 279 challenge, especially when infestations are infrequent and/or control personnel reduced. In these cases,
 280 evidence-based tools such as risk maps can enhance field surveillance, especially if used to their full
 281 advantage. In this series of rolling trials, we evaluated infestation risk map use by entomologic
 282 surveillance technicians under different incentive schemes. We used incentives to encourage the adoption
 283 of two search strategies: maximal spatial coverage of the surveillance zone and preferential inspections of
 284 houses with higher infestation risks. We found that technicians adopted one of the search strategies under
 285 several of the incentive structures, but our dual objective was only achieved under the poker scheme.
 286

287 In pursuit of the incentive structure that would achieve our dual objective, we observed that stochastic
288 incentives (secret houses and pay-per-detection) did not successfully influence participant behavior, even
289 with payout amounts that were higher than those associated with fixed incentives. A preference for
290 guaranteed payouts over lotteries or variable micropayments has been observed in some prior studies²⁵⁻²⁸,
291 although many revolved around one-time executions of target behaviors²⁶⁻²⁸, and the collective findings
292 are variable²⁹. Regardless, a preference for the known versus the unknown (ambiguity aversion³⁰) is a
293 widely-observed phenomenon³¹, and it is fairly unsurprising that we observed this preference when
294 incentivizing more complex behaviors.

295
296 Despite the success of fixed payments in incentivizing a single behavior, when we used weighted
297 incentives to encourage both high spatial coverage and preferential inspections of higher risk houses, we
298 failed. Participants apparently discovered that they could more easily maximize their earnings by focusing
299 solely on the spatial triangulation. When incentives were more heavily weighted toward risk utilization,
300 one inspector abandoned attempts to achieve high spatial coverage and focused solely on visiting higher
301 risk houses³². This outcome may be due to the arduous nature of the work itself- searching for infrequent
302 and sporadically distributed vectors across a large city is tedious at best. The simplest route to the fastest
303 payout may well have been the more salient option if intrinsic motivation was low from the beginning,
304 which has been observed in health-related behaviors (reviewed in³³⁻³⁵), although less so in health workers
305 specifically³⁶. Weighted incentives, at least in our case, seem to be limited in their ability to encourage
306 complex behaviors. Only when we introduced the poker incentive scheme did participants both
307 preferentially inspect higher risk houses and maximize their spatial coverage. In the poker scheme, the
308 payouts for achieving each objective were complementary- there was no way to earn a higher reward
309 without achieving both of them. For instance, to achieve the high scoring, “straight flush,” inspectors
310 needed to both visit high risk houses and achieve substantial spatial coverage to receive a single fixed
311 reward.

312
313 In epidemiologic surveillance, incentives or stipends have been used to increase data collection through
314 new mobile tools, surveys, or disease testing, both at the individual/family level³⁷⁻⁴⁰ and at the community
315 level through Community Health Workers (CHWs)⁴¹⁻⁴³. Many recent studies tested uptake of new mobile
316 disease surveillance tools in low and middle income countries^{40,41,43,44}. A handful of vector control studies
317 have successfully incentivized citizen scientists using cash rewards for data collection^{45,46}, or by using
318 paid, online crowd-sourcing to collect data⁴⁷. Relatively few epidemiologic surveillance studies have
319 attempted to use incentives to encourage more complex behaviors. In one notable study, salary incentives
320 were used to increase uptake of a mobile, cloud-based tool for dengue surveillance by Public Health
321 Inspectors in Sri Lanka. While spatial coverage was not encouraged with specific incentives, the authors
322 observed that salary and bonus increases did result in a better spatial coverage⁴¹.

323
324 The poker scheme worked well for entomologic surveillance. As it is an easily communicated means to
325 encourage multi-objective tasks, it could be generalized to other surveillance scenarios, and perhaps much
326 more broadly. The success of the Miraflores trial also suggests that non-monetary incentives may be a
327 feasible option when incentivizing complex behaviors, which may be especially useful for public health
328 departments, whose resources are often scarce⁴⁸. In addition to potentially being more cost-effective than
329 cash payouts, some studies have found that non-monetary incentives have unique benefits such as

330 increasing employee investment in their organization⁴⁹, social reinforcement if other team members see
331 the incentive received, and simply the enjoyment derived from looking forward to the incentive⁵⁰.

332
333 Our trial was short for practical reasons; we do not know if we would obtain the same results over the
334 years or decades-long course of a vector surveillance campaign. The poker incentive was used during the
335 last study in a rolling trial, so it is possible that technicians became more accustomed to responding to
336 incentives as they participated in each sequential study. Furthermore, we have previously found that there
337 is a great deal of heterogeneity in surveillance among technicians, whether measured by sensitivity⁵¹ or
338 productivity⁹. Given our relatively small sample size, individual differences could change in response to
339 each incentive. Finally, we measured improvement in two domains: spatial coverage and risk level
340 utilization. Although these metrics are used as surrogates for optimal infestation risk map use and
341 effective surveillance, we do not know if improvement in both of these realms will lead to identifying
342 more infested houses.

343
344 Eliminating disease vectors in cities involves familiar challenges: insecticide resistance, resistance to
345 using insecticides in general, and resistance to changing the *status quo*^{52,53}. In the post-spray phase of a
346 largely successful vector control campaign, surveillance strategies must evolve and adopt new control
347 methods that are suited to their post-spray scenario if they are to prevent vector re-emergence.
348 Implementation of data-based tools is a feasible option, although real improvements will only occur with
349 the buy-in of those doing the day-to-day work in the field. Using an incentive such as the poker scheme,
350 that is customized to achieve specific program objectives, is one potentially feasible approach to bridging
351 the gap between tool design and optimal tool use.

352
353
354 **Data Availability:** All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files. A public
355 repository with tools and code used in the app with the added triangulation feature is available in the
356 following public repository: <https://github.com/chirimacha/VectorPoint-Triangulation>. Code for statistical
357 analyses and relevant data for reproducibility are also located in the repository.

358
359

360 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

361 The authors gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the Ministerio de Salud del Perú (MINSA), the
362 Dirección General de Salud de las Personas (DGSP), the Estrategia Sanitaria Nacional de Prevención y
363 Control de Enfermedades Metaxénicas y Otras Transmitidas por Vectores (ESNPCEMOTVS), the
364 Dirección General de Salud Ambiental (DIGESA), the Gobierno Regional de Arequipa, the Gerencia
365 Regional de Salud de Arequipa (GRSA), the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO/OPS), the
366 Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Uptake Inc, Joseph Kable and Alexander
367 Gutfraind.

368
369
370
371
372
373

374 **REFERENCES**

- 375 1. World Health Organization. Vector-borne diseases fact sheet. [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/vector-borne-diseases)
376 [sheets/detail/vector-borne-diseases](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/vector-borne-diseases) (2020).
- 377 2. Barnes, K. I., Chanda, P. & Ab Barnabas, G. Impact of the large-scale deployment of
378 artemether/lumefantrine on the malaria disease burden in Africa: case studies of South Africa,
379 Zambia and Ethiopia. *Malar J* **8**, S8 (2009).
- 380 3. Pryce, J., Richardson, M. & Lengeler, C. Insecticide-treated nets for preventing malaria. *Cochrane*
381 *Database of Systematic Reviews* (2018) doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000363.pub3.
- 382 4. Schofield, C. J. & Dias, J. C. P. The Southern Cone Initiative against Chagas Disease. *Advances in*
383 *parasitology* **42**, 1–27 (1999).
- 384 5. Wardrop, N. A. Integrated epidemiology for vector-borne zoonoses. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* **110**,
385 87–89 (2016).
- 386 6. Fiordelli, M., Diviani, N. & Schulz, P. J. Mapping mhealth research: A decade of evolution. *Journal*
387 *of Medical Internet Research* **15**, (2013).
- 388 7. Braae, U. C., Devleeschauwer, B., Sithole, F., Wang, Z. & Willingham, A. L. Mapping occurrence
389 of *Taenia solium* taeniosis/cysticercosis and areas at risk of porcine cysticercosis in Central America
390 and the Caribbean basin. *Parasites Vectors* **10**, 424 (2017).
- 391 8. Hay, S. I. *et al.* Global mapping of infectious disease. (2013).
- 392 9. Gutfraind, A. *et al.* Integrating evidence, models and maps to enhance Chagas disease vector
393 surveillance. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* **12**, e0006883 (2018).
- 394 10. Rogers, D. J., Suk, J. E. & Semenza, J. C. Using global maps to predict the risk of dengue in Europe.
395 *Acta Tropica* **129**, 1–14 (2014).
- 396 11. Charras-Garrido, M., Abrial, D., Goer, J. D., Dachian, S. & Peyrard, N. Classification method for
397 disease risk mapping based on discrete hidden Markov random fields. *Biostatistics* **13**, 241–255
398 (2012).

- 399 12. Forbes, F., Charras-Garrido, M., Azizi, L., Doyle, S. & Abrial, D. Spatial risk mapping for rare
400 disease with hidden Markov fields and variational EM. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* **7**, 1192–1216 (2013).
- 401 13. Malone, J., Bergquist, R., Martins, M. & Luvall, J. Use of Geospatial Surveillance and Response
402 Systems for Vector-Borne Diseases in the Elimination Phase. *TropicalMed* **4**, 15 (2019).
- 403 14. Karimuribo, E. D. *et al.* A Smartphone App (AfyaData) for Innovative One Health Disease
404 Surveillance from Community to National Levels in Africa: Intervention in Disease Surveillance.
405 *JMIR Public Health Surveill* **3**, e94 (2017).
- 406 15. Mtema, Z. *et al.* Mobile Phones As Surveillance Tools: Implementing and Evaluating a Large-Scale
407 Intersectoral Surveillance System for Rabies in Tanzania. *PLoS Medicine* **13**, 1–12 (2016).
- 408 16. Bern, C. Chagas' Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* **373**, 456–466 (2015).
- 409 17. Solis Sanchez, G & Orejas Rodríguez-Arango, G. Epidemiología y metodología científica aplicada a
410 la Pediatría (II): Diseños en investigación epidemiológica. *Educación Continuada* **49** (1998).
- 411 18. Rose, E. B. *et al.* Risk maps for cities: Incorporating streets into geostatistical models. *Spatial and*
412 *Spatio-temporal Epidemiology* **27**, 47–59 (2018).
- 413 19. Chizari, H., Hosseini, M., Poston, T., Razak, S. A. & Abdullah, A. H. Delaunay Triangulation as a
414 New Coverage Measurement Method in Wireless Sensor Network. *Sensors* **11**, 3163–3176 (2011).
- 415 20. R.Core.Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* (R Foundation for Statistical
416 Computing, 2017).
- 417 21. Venables, W. N. & Ripley, B. D. *Modern Applied Statistics with S.* (Springer, 2002).
- 418 22. World Health Organization. Threats to public health security. in *The World Health Report 2007 - A*
419 *safer future: global public health security in the 21st century* (World Health Organization, 2007).
- 420 23. Chretien, J.-P. *et al.* Syndromic Surveillance: Adapting Innovations to Developing Settings. *PLoS*
421 *Med* **5**, e72 (2008).
- 422 24. Lee, L. M., Thacker, S. B., & Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The cornerstone of
423 public health practice: public health surveillance, 1961--2011. *MMWR Suppl* **60**, 15–21 (2011).

- 424 25. Khoi, N., Casteleyn, S., Moradi, M. & Pebesma, E. Do Monetary Incentives Influence Users'
425 Behavior in Participatory Sensing? *Sensors* **18**, 1426 (2018).
- 426 26. Halpern, S. D. *et al.* Lottery-Based versus Fixed Incentives to Increase Clinicians' Response to
427 Surveys. *Health Services Research* **46**, 1663–1674 (2011).
- 428 27. Thirumurthy, H. *et al.* The Effects of Providing Fixed Compensation and Lottery-Based Rewards on
429 Uptake of Medical Male Circumcision in Kenya: A Randomized Trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*
430 **72**, 7 (2016).
- 431 28. Niza, C., Rudisill, C. & Dolan, P. Vouchers versus Lotteries: What Works Best in Promoting
432 Chlamydia Screening? A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. *Applied Economic Perspectives and*
433 *Policy* **36**, 109–124 (2014).
- 434 29. Vlaev, I. Changing health behaviors using financial incentives: a review from behavioral economics.
435 9 (2019).
- 436 30. Ellsberg, D. Risk, Ambiguity, and the Savage Axioms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **75**, 643–
437 669 (1961).
- 438 31. Machina, M. J. & Siniscalchi, M. Ambiguity and Ambiguity Aversion. in *Handbook of the*
439 *Economics of Risk and Uncertainty* vol. 1 729–807 (Elsevier, 2014).
- 440 32. Schmidt, A. M. & DeShon, R. P. What to do? The effects of discrepancies, incentives, and time on
441 dynamic goal prioritization. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **92**, 928 (20070716).
- 442 33. Kamenica, E. Behavioral Economics and Psychology of Incentives. *Annu. Rev. Econ.* **4**, 427–452
443 (2012).
- 444 34. Promberger, M. & Marteau, T. M. When Do Financial Incentives Reduce Intrinsic Motivation?
445 Comparing Behaviors Studied in Psychological and Economic Literatures. *Health Psychol* **32**, 950–
446 957 (2013).
- 447 35. Deci, E. L., Koestner, R. & Ryan, R. M. Extrinsic Rewards and Intrinsic Motivation in Education:
448 Reconsidered Once Again. *Review of Educational Research* **71**, 1–27 (2001).

- 449 36. de Bruin, S. R., Baan, C. A. & Struijs, J. N. Pay-for-performance in disease management: a
450 systematic review of the literature. *BMC Health Serv Res* **11**, 272 (2011).
- 451 37. Doody, M. M. Randomized Trial of Financial Incentives and Delivery Methods for Improving
452 Response to a Mailed Questionnaire. *American Journal of Epidemiology* **157**, 643–651 (2003).
- 453 38. Parkes, R., Kreiger, N., James, B. & Johnson, K. C. Effects on Subject Response of Information
454 Brochures and Small Cash Incentives in a Mail-Based Case-Control Study. *Annals of Epidemiology*
455 **10**, 117–124 (2000).
- 456 39. McGovern, M. E. *et al.* Do gifts increase consent to home-based HIV testing? A difference-in-
457 differences study in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* dyw122 (2016)
458 doi:10.1093/ije/dyw122.
- 459 40. Prieto, J. T. *et al.* Will Participatory Syndromic Surveillance Work in Latin America? Piloting a
460 Mobile Approach to Crowdsourc e Influenza-Like Illness Data in Guatemala. *JMIR Public Health*
461 *Surveill* **3**, (2017).
- 462 41. Lwin, M. O. *et al.* Lessons From the Implementation of Mo-Buzz, a Mobile Pandemic Surveillance
463 System for Dengue. *JMIR Public Health Surveill* **3**, e65 (2017).
- 464 42. Githinji, S. *et al.* Using mobile phone text messaging for malaria surveillance in rural Kenya. *Malar J*
465 **13**, 107 (2014).
- 466 43. Katona, L. B. *et al.* A New Paradigm for Disease Surveillance in Vietnam. *Telemedicine and e-*
467 *Health* **20**, 493–495 (2014).
- 468 44. Meyers, D. J. *et al.* Combining Healthcare-Based and Participatory Approaches to Surveillance:
469 Trends in Diarrheal and Respiratory Conditions Collected by a Mobile Phone System by Community
470 Health Workers in Rural Nepal. *PLoS ONE* **11**, e0152738 (2016).
- 471 45. Tarter, K. D. *et al.* Using citizen science to enhance surveillance of *Aedes aegypti* in Arizona, 2015–
472 17. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc* **35**, 11–18 (2019).
- 473 46. Jordan, R. C., Sorensen, A. E. & Ladeau, S. Citizen Science as a Tool for Mosquito Control. *Journal*
474 *of the American Mosquito Control Association* **33**, 241–245 (2017).

- 475 47. Chunara, R. *et al.* Online reporting for malaria surveillance using micro-monetary incentives, in
476 urban India 2010-2011. *Malar J* **11**, 43 (2012).
- 477 48. World Health Organization. *Primary healthcare systems (PRIMASYS): Case study from Peru,*
478 *abridged version.*
- 479 49. Sorauren, I. F. Non-Monetary Incentives: Do People Work Only for Money? *Bus Ethics Q* **10**, 925–
480 944 (2000).
- 481 50. Jeffrey, S. A. Justifiability and the Motivational Power of Tangible Noncash Incentives. *Human*
482 *Performance* **22**, 143–155 (2009).
- 483 51. Hong, A. E., Barbu, C. M., Small, D. S., Levy, M. Z., & the Chagas Disease Working Group in
484 Arequipa. Mapping the spatial distribution of a disease-transmitting insect in the presence of
485 surveillance error and missing data. *J. R. Stat. Soc. A* **178**, 641–658 (2015).
- 486 52. Shah, S. *The Fever: How Malaria Has Ruled Humankind for 500,000 Years.* (Farrar, Straus and
487 Giroux, 2010).
- 488 53. Barbu, C. M. *et al.* Residual infestation and recolonization during urban *Triatoma infestans* bug
489 control campaign, Peru. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* **20**, 2055–2063 (2014).
- 490 54. Comité Distrital de Seguridad Ciudadana CODISEC Cayma. *Plan de acción distrital de seguridad*
491 *ciudadana del distrito de Cayma.* (2020).
- 492 55. Cori Mamani, J. A., Quispe Parizaca, R. Y., Ruiz Martínez, A. S., Tafur Santillán, C. E. &
493 Yancachajlla Tito, D. Planeamiento estratégico del distrito de Cayma. (Pontificia Universidad
494 Católica del Perú, 2018).
- 495 56. Municipal Distrital de Jose Luis Bustamante y Rivero. *Plan de acción de seguridad ciudadana 2019.*
496 (2019).
- 497 57. Comité Distrital de Seguridad Ciudadana CODISEC Miraflores. *Plan de acción distrital de*
498 *seguridad ciudadana - Miraflores 2020.* 80 (2020).
- 499
500

501 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

502

503 **S1. District descriptions**

504 **Socabaya:** The district of Socabaya is located in Southwest Arequipa. The district has a geographic area
505 of 18.64 km² and a growing population of 80,000 people²¹. The insecticide spray portion of the vector
506 control campaign took place in Socabaya in 2007, at which time *T. infestans* were detected in 9.8% of
507 treated houses.

508

509 **Cayma** The district of Cayma is located in the northern part of Arequipa, with a population of
510 103,458^{54,55} and a geographic area of 246 Km². The insecticide spray phase of the *T. infestans* control
511 campaign was carried out in Cayma in 2012, at which time 6.4% of targeted households in the district
512 were infested (the district was sprayed in a focalized manner; not all the houses in the district were
513 sprayed). Entomological surveillance has been more frequent in Cayma than in the Socabaya district.

514

515 **Jose Luis Bustamante y Rivero (JLByR)** The district is located in southeast Arequipa, and borders
516 Socabaya. JLByR has a geographic area of 11.06 Km² with a population of 76,410 people⁵⁶. The
517 insecticide application portion of the vector control campaign in the JLByR district took place in 2006, at
518 which time 12.5% of houses were found to be infested with *T. infestans*.

519

520 **Miraflores** Located in Northeast Arequipa, this district has an area of 28.7 km² and a population of
521 104,068 inhabitants⁵⁷. The insecticide application phase of the vector control campaign was carried out in
522 Miraflores in 2011, at which time 2.2% of houses were found to be infested with *T. infestans*.

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

Participant	Number of uninspected houses in the largest triangle									
	Socabaya trial				Cayma trial		JLByR trial		Miraflores trial	
	A*	B*	C	D	A	B	A	B	A	B
V1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	109
V2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	39
V4	-	-	-	-	44	21	66	68	36	158
V5	22	17	50	35	12	13	21	72	23	30
V6	26	17	49	71	11	29	14	47	46	61
V7	11	25	35	67	10	13	-	-	-	-
V8	23	13	72	46	-	-	10	20	18	30
V9	10	12	43	51	10	9	24	32	27	47
V13	16	10	51	46	28	22	120	77	71	69
V14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	72
MEAN	18	15.7	50	52.7	19.2	17.8	42.5	60	33	68.3

Table S1. Spatial coverage data by participant per trial and arm (A-D). Columns contain the number of uninspected houses in the largest triangle formed by connecting the vertices of all inspected houses following a week of inspections. Dashes indicate that the participant did not participate in the trial. *Significant difference compared to control arm. Arm A: $p < 0.01$. Arm B: $p < 0.001$.

544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556

Participant	Reward amount (in Peruvian soles ¹)									
	Socabaya trial				Cayma trial				JLByR trial	
	A (Stochastic)		B (Stochastic)		A** (Fixed)		B (Stochastic)		A (Stochastic)	
	<i>Risk info use</i>	<i>*Spatial coverage</i>	<i>Risk info use</i>	<i>*Spatial coverage</i>	<i>Risk info use</i>	<i>Spatial coverage</i>	<i>Risk info use</i>	<i>Spatial coverage</i>	<i>Risk info use</i>	<i>Spatial coverage</i>
V1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
V2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
V4	-	-	-	-	15.9	18	12	42	0	0
V5	4	84	12	70	15.2	64	0	58	0	23
V6	12	156	6	54	12.5	66	12	24	10	26
V7	4	152	6	60	17.3	68	0	62	-	-
V8	0	152	12	70	-	-	-	-	10	34
V9	12	128	6	66	19.4	78	12	78	0	21
V13	0	76	12	50	16.4	44	6	40	20	0
V14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	5.33	124.7	9	64.3	16.1	56.3	7	50.7	6.7	17.3
% salary (monthly)	0.45%	10.6%	0.8%	5.5%	1.4%	3.4%	0.6%	4.3%	0.6%	1.4%

Table S2. Monetary rewards earned by participants. Shown by trial, arm, and incentive type (risk information use and spatial coverage). Dash indicates no participation in the trial. Results from the final trial (Miraflores) are in Table 8, as a different payout type was awarded. Final row shows payout as a percentage of the inspector's monthly salary (approximately \$350 USD). ¹One sol ≈ \$0.28USD.

*Significant difference in spatial coverage compared to the control arm ($p < 0.001$). ** Risk information use in the fixed arm was significantly different than in the stochastic arm (Cayma trial only; $p < 0.02$).

557
558
559
560
561
562
563

564
565
566
567
568
569

Figure S1.




Figure S1. Distribution of infestation risk quintile for the households inspected by participants in the Socabaya Trial. Each set of four bars represents one participant, and each bar a study arm (A-D). Colors are ordered by risk quintile, going from the lowest (light yellow, bottom) to the highest (dark red, top). Superscripts above each arm name (A-D) in the x axis text indicate arm order.

