Systematic review of the entomological impact of insecticide-treated nets evaluated using experimental hut trials in Africa

Rebecca K Nash[1], Ben Lambert[1], Raphael N'Guessan[2,3], Corine Ngufor[3,4], Mark Rowland[3], Richard Oxborough[5], Sarah Moore[6], Patrick Tungu[7], Ellie Sherrard-Smith[1], Thomas S Churcher[1]

Corresponding author email: r.nash@imperial.ac.uk

[1]MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Imperial College London, Norfolk Place, London, W2 1PG, UK.
[2]Institut Pierre Richet / Institut National de Santé Publique, Bouaké, Côte d'Ivoire.
[3]London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, WC1E 7HT, UK.
[4]Centre de Recherches Entomologiques de Cotonou, Cotonou, Benin.
[5]PMI VectorLink Project, Abt Associates, 6130 Executive Blvd, Rockville, MD 20852 USA.
[6]Bagamoyo Research and Training Centre, Ifakara Health Institute, P.O. Box 74, Bagamoyo, Pwani, Tanzania.
[7]National Institute for Medical Research (NIMR), P.O. Box 9653, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Abstract

Background: Resistance of anopheline mosquitoes to pyrethroid insecticides is spreading rapidly across sub-Saharan Africa, diminishing the efficacy of insecticide-treated nets (ITNs) — the primary tool for preventing malaria. The entomological efficacy of indoor vector control interventions can be measured in experimental hut trials (EHTs), which are specially designed to quantify the protection provided under controlled conditions. Experimental hut structures resemble local housing but allow collection of surviving exiting mosquitoes as well as dead or dying mosquitoes. There is a need to understand how the spread of resistance changes ITN efficacy and to elucidate factors influencing EHT results, including differences in experimental hut construction and design features, to support the development of novel vector control tools.

Methods: A comprehensive database of EHTs was compiled and summarised following a systematic review to identify all known trials investigating ITNs or indoor residual spraying (IRS) across sub-Saharan Africa. This analysis focuses on EHTs investigating ITNs and uses Bayesian statistical models to characterise the complex interaction between ITNs and mosquitoes, the variability between studies, and the impact of pyrethroid resistance.

Results: As resistance rises, the entomological efficacy of ITNs declines. They induce less mortality and are less likely to deter mosquitoes from entering huts. Despite this, ITNs continue to offer considerable personal protection by reducing mosquito feeding until resistance reaches high levels. There are clear associations between the different entomological impacts of ITNs, though there is still substantial variability between studies, some of which can be accounted for by hut design. The relationship between EHT outcomes and the level of resistance (as measured by discriminating dose bioassays) is highly uncertain.

Conclusions: The meta-analyses show that EHTs are an important reproducible assay for capturing the complex entomological efficacy of ITNs on blood-feeding mosquitoes. The impact of pyrethroid resistance on these measures appears broadly consistent across a wide geographical area once hut design is accounted for, suggesting results can be extrapolated beyond the sites where the trials were conducted. Further work is needed to understand factors influencing EHT outcomes and how the relationship between outcomes and resistance varies when different methods are used to assess the level of resistance in wild mosquito populations. This will allow more precise estimates of the efficacy of these important vector control tools.

Keywords: experimental hut trial, ITN, CTN, LLIN, vector, *Anopheles*

Background

Insecticide-treated bed nets (ITNs) are the most widely used entomological interventions against malaria. ITNs include conventionally-treated nets (CTNs), where nets are 'dipped' in insecticide solution, and more recent and widely used long-lasting insecticide treated nets (LLINs), where the insecticide is incorporated or coated into the net's fibres and maintain effective levels for up to 3 years or more[1]. Between 2000 and 2015, over 450 million cases of malaria are estimated to have been averted by ITNs.[2] Over 230 million nets were distributed across Africa in 2020 alone[3]. Indoor residual spraying (IRS) of insecticides on the walls of houses is also highly effective, although uptake and application is less widespread[2].

The effectiveness of global malaria control is threatened by widespread resistance of mosquitoes to pyrethroids — the only insecticide class used on the vast majority of LLINs.[4-8] Resistance can be quantified using discriminating-dose bioassays, which measure the survival of wild mosquitoes after exposure to insecticide.[9] As the frequency and intensity of pyrethroid resistance spreads across sub-Saharan Africa[10], new types of nets are being developed to meet the challenge. The World Health Organisation (WHO) has identified four putative classes of ITNs – pyrethroid only, pyrethroid plus the synergist piperonyl butoxide (PBO), pyrethroid plus non-pyrethroid insecticide (with a different mode of action), and pyrethroid plus insect growth regulator. Only two of these – pyrethroid and pyrethroid-PBO – are currently recommended by WHO. Several brands of nets have been developed within each of these ITN classes, some of which are still under evaluation to fully demonstrate their public health value.

The WHO must evaluate and endorse vector control products that fall into the recommended intervention class before they can be purchased by United Nations agencies[11,12]. This prequalification process assesses whether the intervention satisfies international standards for quality, safety and efficacy[12]. As part of the assessment, the entomological efficacy of products is evaluated in experimental hut trials (EHTs). EHTs are an important 'real-life' bioassay used in the development and evaluation of new vector control tools and new products within an existing WHO-recognised class that target the mosquito inside houses. They involve human volunteers sleeping in huts designed to replicate housing in the study area. Huts are specially constructed with baffles and traps to retain mosquitoes that enter, which allows the mosquitoes entering, exiting, blood-feeding, and dying, to be collected without human interference and counted the next morning. Huts can either be a control hut, typically allocated either an untreated net or no net at all, or an intervention hut with an indoor intervention, such as an ITN or IRS. To reduce bias due to hut locations within the site, interventions tend to be rotated if possible. The key indicators used to assess the efficacy of an ITN or IRS are intervention-induced mortality and blood-feeding inhibition, although many other factors that may have an epidemiological impact can also be investigated, such as the relative number caught in intervention huts compared to the control hut[13].

EHTs allow different indoor vector control tools to be directly compared at the same time within the same trial. These studies are known to have substantial measurement error due to the complex interaction between wild free-flying mosquitoes, the interventions themselves, the volunteer behaviour or odour, and the environment[14]. The accuracy and generalisability of EHTs conducted at different times and places is less clear and is exacerbated by variability in factors such as the mosquito species in the study area and deliberate differences in hut construction, size or design. There are

three main hut designs used in sub-Saharan Africa, including: West African, East African and Ifakara style huts[15-17]. Each design differs in features such as the size of hut, the number and shape of entrances for mosquitoes and the type of exit trap, all of which are likely to affect trial outcomes. Massue et al. [18] previously tried to quantify the effect of hut design by carrying out a trial at the same site using huts of each type concurrently, but due to low mosquito numbers, were unable to determine differences in intervention effectiveness between huts. More recently, Oumbouke et al.[19] evaluated West African and Ifakara huts and found differences in behaviour of nuisance Culex mosquitoes, though the impact on anopheline mosquitoes is undetermined. All other EHT sites tend to contain huts of a single type making comparisons between hut designs difficult. This is exacerbated as EHT outcomes may also depend on other factors specific to the site which cannot be controlled, for example, the local species of mosquito. These confounding factors could also make disentangling the processes influencing EHT outcomes difficult.

EHTs provide an important tool for assessing the entomological impact of ITNs on pyrethroid resistant mosquitoes in controlled field conditions. Despite their key importance in evaluating some of the world's most effective public health tools, the variability of EHTs have rarely been studied. Products tend to be evaluated in WHO trial sites in both east and west Africa to partly address this deficiency when evaluating a new product. The lack of replicate EHTs in the same region or differences in vector species is a further problem. Meta-analyses of EHT data testing specific products are increasingly used to compare interventions and parameterise mathematical models of the transmission dynamics of malaria[20-24]. This study conducts a systematic review of published literature, WHO documentation and other grey literature, to summarise all known EHTs of ITN or IRS interventions conducted in Africa. A systematic review of the entomological impact of IRS in EHTs was recently completed by Sherrard-Smith et al[21], so this study focuses on ITNs and extends an earlier meta-analysis of EHTs comparing treated and untreated nets, which found no clear relationship between resistance and ITN efficacy[25]. Here, we use statistical models to characterise how increasing pyrethroid resistance in the mosquito population (as measured using discriminating dose bioassays) changes the entomological efficacy of ITNs and quantify the impact of hut design on trial outcomes.

Methods

Search Strategy. A database of all relevant EHTs was compiled following a systematic search based on PRISMA guidelines (see Supplementary Figure 1). The protocol for the review was prospectively registered on PROSPERO (CRD42019117858). Electronic databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, Global Health, Scopus, Web of Science and Google Scholar were searched using the strategy outlined in Supplementary Table 1. Searches were adapted for each database and followed the same structure where possible. The identified studies were then screened using the inclusion and exclusion criteria displayed in Supplementary Table 2. If the criteria were fulfilled, data were then extracted into piloted forms. In addition, data from unpublished studies were taken from WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES) working group meeting reports, and contact was made with authors who regularly conduct EHTs to acquire any further grey literature.

Location of EHTs. The EHT sites were mapped using the ggspatial package in R[26]. If coordinates for the trial site were not explicitly stated in the study, then the relevant coordinates were obtained by either matching the sites to those where coordinates had been provided elsewhere, or by using the description of the study site to find coordinates in Google Maps™ or OpenStreetMap™. Trials using

the Ifakara hut design (n=6) were removed from the ensuing analyses as the design was only identified at one site.

Summary statistics. Analyses are restricted to EHTs evaluating ITNs, including conventionally treated nets (CTNs) and long-lasting insecticide treated nets (LLINs), as the entomological impact of IRS has recently been evaluated elsewhere[18]. ITNs are either pyrethroid-only (including deltamethrin, permethrin and alphacypermethrin insecticides), pyrethroid-PBO (pyrethroid combined with the synergist piperonyl butoxide (PBO)), non-pyrethroid (including insecticides such as chlorfenapyr and pyriproxyfen) or pyrethroid-combination (pyrethroid combined with an insecticide from an alternative insecticide class, such as the pyrrole, chlorfenapyr). EHTs generally report either the number or proportion of mosquitoes that fed, died, exited and the total number of mosquitoes collected, in each control or intervention arm of the trial. Mortality data is reported as the number of mosquitoes collected from a hut that die over the subsequent 24-hours. If the ITN incorporated the insecticide chlorfenapyr, then the mortality reported is usually 72-hour delayed mortality to be consistent with its mode of action. It is assumed that if a mosquito enters a hut with an intervention attempting to blood-feed, they can either exit without blood-feeding, successfully blood-feed (which we define as being blood-fed and alive) or die.

As in previous work, we aim to determine the association between (i) the level of resistance measured in the field and EHT mosquito survival (A1) and (ii) Mosquito survival and other outcomes measured in EHTs (A2).

Pyrethroid resistance and ITN survival (A1). We attempt to characterise the association between the level of pyrethroid resistance in the local mosquito population and mosquito survival in EHTs of pyrethroid-only ITNs. The fraction of mosquitoes surviving discriminating dosages of insecticide for 24-hours following exposure can act as an indicator of the level of pyrethroid resistance in the population[27,28]. Discriminating dose bioassays (hereby referred to as bioassays) include the WHO susceptibility test and the Centers for Disease Control bottle assay[29,30]. The level of mortality determined in these bioassays is known to vary depending on environmental factors[31] (which were not systematically measured across EHTs), but they remain the most widely used method for assessing resistance in wild mosquitoes and were selected for analysis. All EHTs identified in the systematic review that evaluated pyrethroid-only ITNs were screened to identify those where concurrent bioassays were conducted on the same mosquito population. The analysis was then restricted to EHT mortality data for unwashed nets, and, if studies did not report the total numbers of mosquitoes tested in the bioassay, they were allocated a total of 50 mosquitoes (corresponding to half the standard number of mosquitoes tested) to reduce their weighting on the fit. If a trial took place before the year 2000, when mass ITN distribution campaigns began[2] (n=2), there was assumed to be no pyrethroid resistance. They were allocated a total number of 50 mosquitoes tested in the bioassay and all were assumed to survive. Raw data on the number of mosquitoes tested and surviving were used, so they are not corrected for control mortality.

We modelled the number of mosquitoes that survived in the bioassay for trial i (X_B^i) using a binomial model:

$$X_B^i \sim B(N_B^i, \theta_B^i) \qquad [1]$$

where N_B^i is the number of mosquitoes tested and θ_B^i represents the probability of survival in the bioassay, which, in turn, is modelled:

$$logit\ \theta_B^i = logit\ \bar{\theta}_B^i + \varphi_{j[i]}, \quad [2]$$

where $logit\ \theta = \log[\theta/(1-\theta)]$ and $\varphi_{j[i]}$ is a location-level effect corresponding to the location, j, where trial i took place (i.e. there are potentially multiple trials per location). Here, $0 \leq \bar{\theta}_B^i \geq 1$ represents the estimate of bioassay survival when that trial was conducted after accounting for location-level variability. We set priors: $\bar{\theta}_B^i \sim U(0,1)$, $\varphi_{j[i]} \sim N(0, \sigma_B)$ and $\sigma_B \sim halfN(0,1)$.

The number of mosquitoes surviving in hut trials (X_H^i) is characterised in a similar fashion:

$$X_H^i \sim B(N_H^i, \theta_H^i), \quad [3]$$

$$logit\ \theta_H^i = logit\ \bar{\theta}_H^i + \varphi'_{j[i]}, \quad [4]$$

where N_H^i is the number of mosquitoes caught in the experimental hut for each trial arm i. As before, we specify the following priors on the location-specific effects: $\varphi'_{j[i]} \sim N(0, \sigma_H)$ and $\sigma_H \sim halfN(0,1)$. We model the relationship between survival in bioassays with that in an EHT conducted within the same study using:

$$logit\ \bar{\theta}_H^i = N(logit\ f(\bar{\theta}_B^i, \alpha, \beta), \sigma), \quad [5]$$

Where $\sigma > 0$ effectively accounts for idiosyncratic variation about the relationship between bioassay survival and EHT survival. The function $f(.)$ captures the mean relationship between bioassay survival and hut survival, and we consider two potential forms for this. A logistic growth model,

$$f(\bar{\theta}_B^i, \alpha, \beta) = 1 - (1/(1 + \exp(-((1 - \bar{\theta}_B^i) - \alpha)\beta))), \quad [6]$$

And a log-logistic curve model,

$$f(\bar{\theta}_B^i, \alpha, \beta) = 1 - (1/(1 + ((1 - \bar{\theta}_B^i)/\beta)^{-\alpha})), \quad [7]$$

The parameters σ, α and β are set the following priors: $\sigma \sim N(0,2)$, $\alpha \sim N(0,2)$ and $\beta \sim C(0,1)$.

Association between different EHT outcomes (A2). ITNs are thought to induce different types of mosquito behaviour change which influence malaria transmission[33]. Following previous work, we investigate the relationship between mosquito survival in EHTs and other factors that influence ITN efficacy to allow the full impact of ITNs to be characterised[20]. EHTs investigating all types of ITN that provided count data for mosquito mortality, blood-feeding and the total number collected in huts were identified. These factors were often estimated across different time horizons, be it daily, weekly or across the whole study (which normally involves a full rotation of all interventions and volunteers sleeping in all huts[13]). The majority of studies examined only report aggregate measures across the full study rather than broken down by day or week. Trials not providing the total count of mosquitoes caught and only reporting the proportion of fed mosquitoes were included in the analyses assuming that the total count in the trial was half the overall median (this aimed to lessen their effect due to

uncertainty in the number tested). Data for 24-hour delayed mortality was used, unless the net incorporated the insecticide chlorfenapyr, in which case 72-hour delayed mortality was used to be consistent with its mode of action. Models with all net types grouped together are statistically compared to the relationships for ITNs of different classes. Differences between products within the same class are not currently considered.

Deterrence. Volatile compounds from insecticidal interventions may dissuade mosquitoes from entering houses where the intervention has been deployed[32]. This mosquito avoidance behaviour may protect people in houses with interventions but could reduce the overall community effect of indoor vector control tools[33]. Deterrence is defined as the reduction in mosquito entry into houses with an intervention compared to houses without the insecticide[9]. It is typically measured in EHTs by comparing the number of mosquitoes caught in control and intervention huts. The extent to which mosquitoes are deterred by pyrethroid insecticide is thought to diminish in mosquito populations with higher levels of pyrethroid resistance[20,34,35].

Some EHT studies evaluating ITNs have found higher numbers of mosquitoes caught in intervention huts versus control huts[25,36]. The reason for this apparent "attraction" of mosquitoes to huts containing pyrethroid insecticide is unclear. Different hypotheses for the phenomenon have been proposed though all require further experimental testing with wild mosquitoes[34]. One explanation is more mosquitoes are caught in the intervention arms because they escape the control hut at a greater rate. The window-slit entrances of West African huts are intended to greatly limit mosquito escape back through hut entrances and newer East African huts have been modified to include eave baffles for the same purpose, but escape is likely still possible despite these measures and the exit traps which may be further exacerbated due to differences in collector efficiency. Exit rates may also be lower in intervention huts because the insecticide either kills the mosquito (so it can be counted) or exerts a sub-lethal effect on a mosquito, resulting in it being knocked down or simply disorientated[37-39]. As resistance increases, the combination of fewer mosquitoes being deterred from entering and the sub-lethal effects of insecticide on those individuals which enter and attempt to bite may result in higher counts in intervention huts.

It is not possible to directly estimate the number of mosquitoes escaping control and ITN huts using data that's available to us. One reason for this is that due to evolution in the designs there is variation in the presence, and style, of baffles between different EHTs over the 15 years of data included in our analysis. Hut designs have been refined to reflect advances in knowledge, though these differences may not be documented. Instead, we use a modelling framework to estimate the relative difference in the probabilities of being caught in the control huts and ITN huts.

We modelled the number of mosquitoes caught in control huts (X_C^i) and caught in intervention huts (X_I^i) for each trial arm i using negative binomial models:

$$X_C^i \sim NB(N_A^i \times \theta_C^i, \kappa), \quad [8]$$

$$X_I^i \sim NB(N_A^i \times \theta_I^i, \kappa), \quad [9]$$

where N_A^i is the number of ambient mosquitoes (immediately outside of the hut), θ_C^i represents the probability of an ambient mosquito entering and being subsequently collected in the control hut and θ_I^i represents the probability of an ambient mosquito entering and being collected in the intervention

hut. In eqs. [8] and [9], we use the parameterisation of the negative binomial such that $X \sim NB(\mu, \kappa)$ indicates X has mean μ and variance $\mu + \mu^2/\kappa$, where κ is an overdispersion parameter. We set the parameters N_A^i, κ and θ_C^i the following priors: $N_A^i \sim LogN(5,1)$, $\kappa \sim C(0,1)$ and $\theta_C^i \sim Beta(1,10)$.

θ_C^i is assumed to remain constant irrespective of the level of EHT survival, whereas θ_I^i corresponds to the probability an ambient mosquito enters and is collected from an intervention hut given that they were undeterred by the ITN, which is assumed to change with the level of EHT survival.

$$\theta_I^i = 1 - \theta_D^i \qquad [10]$$

The probability of mosquitoes being deterred (θ_D^i) from an intervention hut is assumed to be explained using the following flexible function $g(.)$, where parameters δ_1-δ_3 determine the shape of the relationship:

$$\theta_D^i = g\left(\theta_H^i, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\right) \qquad [11]$$

$$g\left(\theta_H^i, \delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\right) = \delta_1 \left(\exp\left(\delta_2 \left(1 - \exp\left(\delta_3 \theta_H^i\right)\right)/\delta_3\right)\right), \qquad [12]$$

The parameters δ_1-δ_3 are set the following priors: $\delta_1 \sim N(0.8,1)$, $\delta_2 \sim N(0.8,1)$ and $\delta_3 \sim N(3,2)$. We also considered a simple linear function to describe this relationship, but this was ultimately rejected (Supplementary Table 6 and Supplementary Figure 5).

To estimate the difference in the proportion of mosquitoes collected in control huts relative to intervention huts as EHT survival increases, we use the following ratio (δ_C):

$$\delta_C = (\theta_C^i - \theta_I^i)/\ \theta_C^i \qquad [13]$$

Successfully blood-feeding. We define successful blood-feeding as the number of female mosquitoes that blood-feed and survive after entering an experimental hut. All studies which did not include the standard six deliberately made holes in the ITN were excluded from this section of the analyses. For most studies, it was not possible to determine whether mosquitoes had fed and survived or fed and died as aggregated feeding data are presented. As in Sherrard-Smith et al.[21], we adjusted the number of fed mosquitoes (N_F) by the proportion that died, which implicitly assumes that feeding and dying are independent events. N_H is the total number of mosquitoes collected in the hut and N_D is the total number of mosquitoes that died.

$$X_{SF} = N_F(1 - (N_D/N_H)) \qquad [14]$$

We modelled the number of mosquitoes successfully blood-fed in each trial arm i (X_{SF}^i) as a binomial model:

$$X_{SF}^i \sim B(N_H^i, \theta_{SF}^i) \qquad [15]$$

where N_H^i is the total number of mosquitoes collected in the hut and θ_{SF}^i represents the probability of successfully blood-feeding, which is itself modelled:

$$logit\ \theta_{SF}^{i} = logit\ \bar{\theta}_{SF}^{i} + \varphi_{j[i]} \quad [16]$$

where, as above, $\varphi_{j[i]}$ is a location-level effect corresponding to the location, j, where trial arm i took place. Here, $0 \leq \bar{\theta}_{SF}^{i} \geq 1$ represents the estimate of successful blood-feeding in the trial after accounting for location-level variability. As before, we set the following priors: $\varphi_{j[i]} \sim N(0, \sigma)$ and $\sigma \sim halfN(0,1)$. We model the relationship between successful blood-feeding and survival in the same hut trial using:

$$logit\ \bar{\theta}_{SF}^{i} = logit\ h(\theta_{H}^{i}, \delta_4, \delta_5) \quad [17]$$

where $\sigma > 0$ effectively accounts for idiosyncratic variation about the relationship between hut trial survival and successful blood-feeding. The function $h(.)$ captures the mean relationship between hut survival and successful blood-feeding:

$$h\left(\theta_{H}^{i}, \delta_4, \delta_5\right) = 1 - (\exp\ (\delta_4(1 - \exp\left(\delta_5 \theta_{H}^{i}\right))/\delta_5)), \quad [18]$$

where the parameters are set the following priors: $\delta_4 \sim N(0,0.01)$ and $\delta_5 \sim N(8,0.3)$

Exiting unfed. Those mosquitoes which enter a hut and do not die or successfully feed, are assumed to exit the hut without feeding. Mosquitoes are defined as having exited irrespective of whether they were caught in exit traps or collected (unfed and alive) from within the hut. Therefore, the probability of a mosquito exiting unfed (θ_{EU}^{i}) in trial arm i can be estimated by 1 minus the probability of successfully blood-feeding and the probability of dying:

$$\theta_{EU}^{i} = 1 - \bar{\theta}_{SF}^{i} - \left(1 - \theta_{H}^{i}\right) \quad [19]$$

Bayesian models were fit to the data using a version of dynamic Hamiltonian Monte Carlo sampling implemented via Stan[40] and can be found in the supplementary material. Four chains were run for 4000 iterations each, with the first 2000 iterations discarded as warm-up. The posterior distributions and 95% Bayesian credible intervals were estimated, with the posterior predictive fits of the model to data shown throughout the text (e.g. Fig. 3B, C & D).

Outcomes of a feeding attempt as resistance increases. In a feeding attempt, a mosquito is either deterred from entering a hut by the ITN or is undeterred and enters the hut, where they then either die, successfully blood-feed or exit unfed. To show the relationship between these outcomes and resistance, EHT survival was translated to bioassay survival using function [6] and [7].

Results

Summary of EHTs in Sub-Saharan Africa

The review identified 115 eligible studies reporting data from 135 experimental hut trials (EHTs) (Supplementary Figure 1). These trials were conducted at 26 different sites across 11 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. The majority of these sites were located in western Africa (n=17), with only 1 site in central Africa and 8 across eastern Africa (Figure 1). Muheza, Tanzania was identified as the site with the highest number of trials (n=26), followed by Kou Valley, Burkina Faso (n=15) and Malanville,

Benin (n=14). Most trials were carried out in western Africa (n=80), whilst 54 trials were performed in eastern Africa and 1 in central Africa.



Figure 1. Maps of EHT sites where ITNs and/or IRS have been investigated. Panels show sites across (A) Sub-Saharan Africa; (B) Eastern Africa (54 trials), including Ethiopia, Tanzania and Madagascar; (C) West (80 trials) and Central Africa (1 trial), including The Gambia, Mali, Ivory Coast, Burkina Faso, Togo, Benin, Nigeria and Cameroon. Point size indicates the number of studies at each site, whilst point colour denotes the design of hut used, be it East African (red), Ifakara (green) or West African (blue).

The earliest trial identified used the East African hut design and took place in 1988, whereas the first trials identified using the West African and Ifakara designs were in 1995 and 2010 respectively (Supplementary Figure 2A). The greatest number of trials identified in the analyses of the literature were conducted in 2008 (n=16) with high numbers reported between 2010-2015 (Supplementary Figure 2A).

Of the 135 trials identified, 58% were carried out in the West African hut design (n=79), 37% used East African huts (n=50) and just 4% of trials used Ifakara huts (n=6). The majority included at least one intervention arm that investigated ITNs (n=112). There were far fewer trials investigating IRS (n=33) and only 6 trials were identified that looked at ITNs used in combination with IRS. There were a small number of ITN or IRS trials that included EHT arms exploring the use of other intervention types (n=7), which include insecticide treated plastic sheeting, wall linings, net wall hangings and coils.



Figure 2. Characteristics of EHT data. A) The number of EHTs investigating IRS or ITNs that collected data on each hut design and mosquito species (as reported in the study). Bar colours indicate the design of the hut used in the trial as shown in the legend, be it East African (red), West African (blue) or Ifakara (green). B) Summary of the reported mortality observed in hut trials evaluating unwashed pyrethroid-only ITNs and how these change over time. Points are coloured according to the hut design (see A). C) Histograms showing the average number of mosquitoes collected per night in the control huts of EHTs. The dotted line represents the mean number collected in trials of each hut design. Note: Some trials collected multiple mosquito species, therefore single trials may be counted more than once in this figure.

452 In Figure 2A, we summarise the EHT data according to the collected species in trials involving IRS
453 (top) and ITNs (bottom). The most frequently reported mosquito species in the study area of trials
454 was *Anopheles gambiae* sensu lato (*s.l.*) (n=128, 85%). Only 46% of the trials which identified
455 members of the *An. gambiae s.l.* complex identified mosquitoes to the species level, including
456 *Anopheles arabiensis* (n=22, 17%), *Anopheles coluzzii* (n=5, 4%) and *Anopheles gambiae* sensu stricto
457 (*s.s.*) (n=32, 25%). There were 20 trials where *Anopheles funestus* was present (13%) and 2 trials
458 where the results were presented for all Anopheles species pooled together. A total of 15 trials
459 identified more than one mosquito species during a trial, though this may be because many studies
460 aggregated data to the level of the species complex. Of these 15 trials, 11 reported total counts of
461 mosquitoes and the dominant mosquito species comprised on average 67% of all mosquitoes caught
462 (range 52-98%).
463
464 Overall, there is a decline in mortality seen in EHTs evaluating unwashed pyrethroid-only ITNs over
465 the last 20 years (Figure 2B). During this time the level of mortality observed in trial arms with
466 untreated nets remained broadly constant indicating pyrethroid-only ITNs are now killing fewer
467 mosquitoes entering experimental huts. Similar reductions in blood-feeding inhibition induced by
468 pyrethroid-only ITNs were also observed over time (Supplementary Figure 3, Sup. Table 5).
469
470 The mean number of mosquitoes collected per night in control huts of each hut design were n=9 for
471 East, n=12 for West and n=33 for Ifakara huts (Figure 2B). Across all designs, there was considerable
472 variability in the number of mosquitoes caught in control huts per night, ranging from 0 to 43 for
473 East, 0 to 74 for West and 0 to 88 for Ifakara huts (Supplementary Figure 2B). There was a strong
474 association between the species of mosquitoes caught and hut design, likely reflecting the mosquito
475 species composition in the sites that the different huts were built (Figure 1). As a result of this, our
476 analyses could not disentangle differences in behaviour across species versus that induced by hut
477 design. For example, *An. arabiensis* was only caught in an East African or Ifakara hut design trial whilst
478 *An. coluzzii* was only identified in West African huts (Figure 2A). *An. funestus* mosquitoes were
479 identified in sites of different hut designs, though the numbers reported in the West African huts
480 were very low (fewer than 2 mosquitoes per night). Consequentially, although this is sub-optimal, all
481 future analyses group all species together to examine differences in hut design. As such, care should
482 be taken when interpreting our results, since the entomological impact of ITNs likely reflects
483 differences in hut design and local factors associated with mosquito species (and other unmeasured
484 factors).
485
486 Analyses are restricted to the East and West African hut designs as the number of trials identified
487 using huts of the Ifakara style are relatively low, they were only carried out in one trial site, and the
488 data appeared to exhibit outlying trends (Figure 2B, Supplementary Figure 4).
489
490 **Pyrethroid resistance and ITN mortality.** Thirty-seven EHTs were identified where concurrent
491 pyrethroid discriminating dose bioassays and EHTs of pyrethroid-only ITNs were conducted on the
492 same mosquito population (Supplementary Table 3).[41-71] After excluding Ifakara huts, there were 107
493 datapoints (paired bioassay survival and EHT survival) from 34 EHTs. The higher the reported bioassay
494 resistance level in a mosquito population, the more likely mosquitoes were to survive 24 hours after
495 entering a hut with a pyrethroid-only ITN (Figure 3A). The shape of the relationship is highly
496 uncertain, with no clear pattern showing how EHT survival changes with increasing levels of
497 resistance. Despite there being a clear positive association between bioassay and EHT survival, there
498 was considerable variability in the data. To reflect this uncertainty, we fit two functions representing

the mean association between bioassay survival and EHT survival to the data – logistic and log-logistic models. The logistic model suggests 25% of mosquitoes survive in EHTs when mosquito populations are deemed fully susceptible to pyrethroids (i.e. 0% bioassay survival). Conversely, the log-logistic model indicates there is greater EHT survival (~50%) in a fully susceptible population, with incremental changes in reported bioassay survival being less predictive of changes in EHT survival until very high levels of resistance. This more gradual reduction in ITN-induced mortality with increasing resistance suggests the impact of pyrethroid resistance at low to moderate levels may be less. Both models fit the data equally well (leave-one-out cross-validation indicates that there was a negligible difference between the models, with an expected log predictive density (elpd) of -844.9 for the logistic versus -846.6 for the log-logistic model (higher values indicating better fit)). Similar trends are observed if the same functions are fit to trials of different hut design (Figure 4A). Twenty-four-hour mortality measured in Ifakara huts appeared consistently low regardless of the level of susceptibility to pyrethroids, further justifying their exclusion from these analyses (Supplementary Figure 4).

Mosquito response to ITNs. Eighty-two EHTs investigating ITNs of all types were included in the analyses comparing different EHT outcomes (Supplementary Table 4)[46-117]. In addition to mortality data, 65 of these provided the total number of mosquitoes collected and 81 provided data for blood-feeding. The following section reports models fit to data for all ITNs, irrespective of the insecticide used, as comparisons with models restricting data to pyrethroid-only, pyrethroid-PBO or pyrethroid-combination nets showed no significant improvement in fit (Supplementary Table 7).



Figure 3. Entomological outcomes as predicted by bioassay survival. A) Comparison of the level of pyrethroid resistance as measured using a discriminating dose bioassay and the percentage of mosquitoes which enter a hut with a pyrethroid-

524 only ITN and survive 24 hours after being collected. Solid lines show the fitted relationship using either the logistic (green)
525 or log-logistic (yellow) models. Vertical and horizontal lines show 95% confidence interval estimates for each data point.
526 B-C) show the relationship between EHT survival (24h post-collection, unless the ITN incorporated the insecticide
527 chlorfenapyr, in which case 72h survival was used) and the probability of B) being caught inside a control hut relative to
528 a hut with any type of ITN (where anywhere above the grey dashed-line indicates more mosquitoes were caught in the
529 control hut), C) mosquitoes successfully feeding and surviving, or D) exiting the hut without feeding. The point size in B-
530 D is proportional to the total number of mosquitoes collected in the trial and coloured according to hut design: East (red)
531 or West (blue). Solid lines in A-D show the best fit relationship whilst the lighter shaded area indicates 95% credible
532 intervals for the best fit curves. E-F) The models from A-D were combined to summarise how the average probability that
533 blood-feeding mosquitoes will be killed, exit without feeding, deterred from entering or successfully blood-feed, varies
534 with bioassay survival. The relationship between bioassay and EHT survival is highly uncertain so both the logistic model
535 (E) and the log logistic model (F) are presented.
536
537 On average, fewer mosquitoes were collected in huts with ITNs compared to control huts, but as the
538 level of survival in EHTs increased, the difference between the number of mosquitoes collected from
539 control versus ITN huts fell (Figure 3B). For example, in susceptible mosquito populations (where
540 <25% of mosquitoes that enter ITN huts survive), on average 20% more mosquitoes were collected
541 in control huts. Whereas, once all mosquitoes survive, the number of mosquitoes collected from
542 control huts is estimated to be equal to the number in ITN huts (Figure 3B). This suggests that the
543 level of ITN-induced deterrence appears to decrease in mosquito populations with higher levels of
544 pyrethroid resistance. Similar patterns were seen in huts of both East and West African design (Figure
545 4B). In both cases, the difference in the number of mosquitoes collected in control huts versus
546 intervention huts declined, but this trend was much more evident in data from West African huts.
547 Once mosquito survival increases beyond 85%, the model indicates the number of mosquitoes
548 collected from West African ITN huts exceed the number in control huts. Fitting the models across
549 data from each hut design separately provided a significantly better fit than when pooling analyses
550 (Supplementary Table 6). Fitting an alternative linear relationship resulted in slightly poorer fits than
551 the non-linear model in both pooled and hut-design specific analyses (Supplementary Table 6 & Sup.
552 Figure 5). As part of deriving the relationship shown in Figure 3B, we also estimate the probability of
553 deterrence and the probability of escape (i.e. exiting the huts without being caught in exit traps) from
554 the control hut, and these are shown in Supplementary Figures 5 & 6. The model suggests that there
555 are greater numbers of mosquitoes escaping from the West African design of hut. This is driven by a
556 greater number of studies reporting more mosquitoes in ITN huts compared to control huts at high
557 levels of pyrethroid resistance (Figure 4B).
558
559 The proportion of mosquitoes that successfully blood-feed (feed and survive) increases dramatically
560 with survival, with the model predicting on average around 60% of mosquitoes successfully blood-
561 feeding at 100% survival (Figure 3C). There is a substantial difference in the proportion of mosquitoes
562 that successfully blood-feed as survival increases between the different hut designs (Figure 4C).
563 There is a more dramatic rise in West African huts, with over 60% of mosquitoes estimated to
564 successfully blood-feed at 100% survival. In contrast, less than 10% of mosquitoes are estimated to
565 successfully blood-feed in East African huts when all mosquitoes survive. If a mosquito does not die
566 or successfully blood-feed, it is assumed they will ultimately exit the hut without feeding. This means
567 that the proportion of mosquitoes exiting unfed decreases at high mosquito survival due to increases
568 in blood-feeding, especially in West African huts (Figure 4D).
569
570 We can use the estimated relationships shown in Figure 3A-D to predict what happens to a mosquito
571 when it attempts to blood-feed on a person sleeping under an ITN. Due to the dependency on
572 bioassay survival for each of these relationships, the likely outcome of a feeding attempt depends on

the local pyrethroid resistance level. In Figure 3E-F, we show the probability of death, deterrence, exiting without feeding and successfully blood-feeding as a function of bioassay survival: panel E shows the results for the logistic model and panel F shows the log-logistic. 3E shows gradual changes in ITN efficacy as resistance rises, with ITN-induced killing and deterrence falling to less than 10% and successful blood-feeding estimated to increase from just over 1% to 42%. By contrast, when the relationship between hut survival and bioassay survival is described by the log-logistic fit (Figure 3F) there is a much sharper change in entomological outcomes at very high resistance levels. Successful blood-feeding is estimated to increase even further, from 5% to 56%, whilst killing and deterrence reduced to 0% and 5% respectively. The estimates for the outcome of a mosquito feeding attempt using the log-logistic fit for the East and West African hut design are shown in Figure 4E and 4F respectively, with plots using the logistic fit in Supplementary Figure 7.



Figure 4. Entomological outcomes as predicted by bioassay survival according to East and West African hut designs. A) Comparison of the level of pyrethroid resistance as measured using a discriminating dose bioassay and the percentage of mosquitoes which enter a hut and survive 24 hours. Solid lines show the fitted relationship for the East (red) and West (blue) African hut design assuming the log-logistic function. Comparable plots showing the logistic function are provided in Supplementary Figure 7A. B-C) show the relationship between EHT survival (24h post-collection, unless the ITN incorporated the insecticide chlorfenapyr, in which case 72h survival was used) and the probability of B) being caught inside a control hut relative to a hut with any type of ITN (where anywhere above the grey dashed-line indicates more mosquitoes were caught in the control hut), C) mosquitoes successfully feeding and surviving, or D) exiting the hut without feeding. The point size in B-D is proportional to the total number of mosquitoes collected in the trial and coloured according to hut design. Solid lines in A-D show the best fit relationship whilst the lighter shaded area indicates 95% credible intervals for the best fit curves. E-F) The models from A-D were combined to summarise how the average probability that blood-feeding mosquitoes will be killed, exit without feeding, deterred from entering or successfully blood-feed, varies with bioassay survival for either East (E) or West (F) African hut design. Both (E-F) show the log-logistic model, see Supplementary Figure 7B-C for models using the logistic function.

Discussion

As pyrethroid resistance rapidly spreads across sub-Saharan Africa, it is important to understand how the entomological impact of vector control interventions are changing so the most effective malaria control tools can be deployed. Experimental hut trials (EHTs) are an affordable and relatively quick method for determining the efficacy of interventions that target the mosquito within the home. They were originally developed to assess the impact of insecticidal interventions which mostly delivered fast-acting neurotoxic insecticides, relative to a control arm without the insecticide. The rise of pyrethroid resistant mosquitoes and the development of alternative classes of ITNs and IRS means that they are increasingly being used to assess the efficacy of different interventions and compare products. This shifting of the question from "does something work" to "how well does it work" requires a better understanding of the measurement error of this complicated real-world assay, particularly as alternative classes of ITN may have slow-killing effects, or sublethal effects that are not well demonstrated in an EHT. Evaluation of the impact of pyrethroid resistant mosquitoes necessitates comparison between sites with different mosquito populations so results need to be compared between different trials. However, differences in the design of hut used in different sites make it hard to directly compare EHT results. This systematic review compiles all published data and known grey literature to investigate the differences between West African and East African hut designs and more accurately quantify the impact of resistance on the entomological efficacy of ITNs.

The review identified 135 experimental hut trials characterising the entomological efficacy of ITNs and IRS. The number of trials conducted appears to be increasing over time, reflecting the importance of this assay in evaluating new indoor vector control tools. Fewer studies were identified reporting data collected after 2016 (Supplementary Figure 2A) likely reflecting the delay between the trial and publication of results rather than a drop in the number of EHTs conducted. The trials evaluating pyrethroid-only ITNs were conducted during a time when local mosquito populations exhibited a range of susceptibility to pyrethroid insecticides. A decline in EHT mortality and blood-feeding inhibition induced by pyrethroid-only ITNs is seen over time (Figure 2B, Supplementary Figure 3B, Sup. Table 5) which is likely to result from changes in the underlying susceptibility of the local mosquito population seen over the same time-period[10]. These trends provide strong evidence of the diminished entomological efficacy of ITNs since the year 2000, though other explanations are also possible. This study groups together all ITNs and earlier studies are more likely to be dipped in insecticide (CTNs) rather than those which incorporate or impregnate the insecticide into the netting (LLINs). Differences in the dominant vector species, subtle changes in hut design and study protocol, and the use of other interventions targeting mosquitoes in the region, are likely to influence results, though there were insufficient data available throughout the time-period to investigate these potentially confounding factors.

The reduction in pyrethroid ITN mortality over time is further supported by the association between bioassay and hut trial survival observed in studies which reported both assays conducted on the same mosquito population (Figure 3A). Unfortunately, only a minority of EHT studies (37/135) reported bioassay data in the same publication. This lack of data makes the shape of the relationship between these metrics highly uncertain. The unclear association between the more controlled pyrethroid bioassay and the more real-life EHT is to be expected, though it is likely to be exacerbated by the measurement error in both. The discriminating dose bioassay is known to be highly variable, with the accuracy depending on the ambient conditions under which the assay is conducted, the type of assay

647 used, and the number of mosquitoes exposed (which in some instances appears relatively low)[31].
648 EHTs tend to have data from many more mosquitoes (when summed across the length of the trial),
649 but also have considerable variability, reflecting the greater biological realism of EHTs. Mosquitoes
650 sampled and used in the bioassay will be different from those which naturally enter experimental
651 huts in their species composition, age and factors related to their rearing. For example, bioassays
652 which use mosquitoes reared from larvae may be collected from a small number of breeding sites at
653 a single time point, whilst EHTs report data from mosquitoes which are likely to have developed in a
654 more diverse set of breeding sites over the period of multiple months. The relationship between
655 bioassay and EHT survival has been used to infer how the effectiveness of ITNs changes with the level
656 of pyrethroid resistance[20]. Given the variability in these data we used two different functional forms
657 to characterise the relationship. Fits for the logistic model indicate a more linear relationship
658 between bioassay and EHT survival, which is relatively similar to previous models fit with smaller
659 datasets, though the gradient of the change is more gradual[20]. Fits with the log-logistic model suggest
660 that survival in EHTs with pyrethroid ITNs is higher in susceptible mosquito populations, though
661 changes less as bioassay survival increases until nearly all mosquitoes survive exposure in the
662 bioassay. This model suggests the greatest difference in hut trial survival is seen when between 80-
663 100% of mosquitoes survive exposure in a bioassay. The shallower gradient of the relationship may
664 have important implications for understanding how resistance may change over time. It suggests that
665 the loss of efficacy of pyrethroid ITNs could be more gradual than the changes in mortality observed
666 in the discriminating dose bioassays. Further work is needed to understand if this is true or an artifact
667 of the assay used for approximating resistance. Discriminating dose bioassays were originally
668 designed to identify resistance when it first appeared and were not intended to compare populations
669 with higher levels of resistance, where assays such as dose response (intensity) assays are
670 recommended[27]. Susceptibility and tube bioassays expose mosquitoes to a lower concentration of
671 insecticide than is typically used on ITNs, so may not be able to distinguish between populations with
672 moderate and high EHT survival. Grouping these data together would tend to make the relationship
673 between bioassay and hut trial survival steeper in more resistant populations, which may not be the
674 case if other tests were used. It is important to realise that changes in the shape of the relationship
675 translating field measurements of resistance (measured using the discriminating dose bioassay) to
676 ITN entomological efficacy (measured in the EHT) does not alter the public health impact of
677 resistance which has shown to be substantial[118,119]. It does however highlight why observational
678 studies looking for associations between bioassay data and malaria may have been inconclusive[120],
679 as large differences in bioassay survival may not always translate into substantial changes in ITN
680 efficacy. This will have important implications for how ITN epidemiological efficacy might be
681 predicted to change in a site over time and what methods we should use to track susceptibility to
682 insecticides.
683
684 To try to understand how mosquito behaviour changes with susceptibility, all ITN data were analysed
685 together, grouping together nets with different insecticides (with and without synergists) without
686 separating trials using East and West African huts. There is a strong association between survival of
687 mosquitoes which enter ITN huts and the probability of mosquitoes being deterred, successfully
688 blood-feeding and exiting without feeding, though there is considerable variability between studies
689 - reflected by point estimates often falling a long way from the best fit line. The ratio between the
690 number of mosquitoes collected in the control huts compared to ITN huts is particularly variable,
691 with some huts exhibiting high survival having twice as many mosquitoes collected in the control hut,
692 whereas some have twice as many mosquitoes in the ITN hut (Figure 3B). On average, the model
693 predicts deterrence is high in susceptible mosquito populations and falls to zero as survival increases.

Here we assume that no mosquito escapes from huts with ITNs and the level of deterrence may be greater if this is not the case. Our EHT data were unable to directly estimate mosquito entrance and escape so it is unclear why more mosquitoes are often collected in control huts compared to intervention huts. The deterrent effect of ITNs and how it changes with resistance is thought to be an important component of the effectiveness of indoor vector control,[24,121] so further work is needed to verify this behaviour and evaluate other hypotheses for the possible cause[36].

The probability of mosquitoes feeding and surviving - termed 'successful blood-feeding' - rose exponentially with increasing survival. When all mosquitoes that enter a hut survive, the model predicts that those mosquitoes have a probability of successfully feeding of almost 60% (Figure 3C). This high loss of blood-feeding inhibition is broadly consistent with a previous study[20], though the current systematic review contains recent studies with higher levels of mosquito survival, exacerbating the trends. The non-linear increase in blood-feeding with increased survival indicates ITNs provide personal protection until high levels of survival, which is likely to have important implications for the transmission of malaria. Those mosquitoes that do not blood-feed or die are classified as having exited the hut unfed. It is unclear whether these mosquitoes are able to attempt to re-feed immediately or whether they may experience some sub-lethal impact of the insecticide[122-124].

Experimental huts were originally designed so that their structure reflect the type of houses found within the region. This study has shown that most EHTs have been carried out in Western Africa, reflected by the greater number of trials conducted with West African hut design. Studies in East Africa are carried out in either East African or Ifakara huts, with the latter being a relatively new design developed to more accurately represent the houses in villages in south eastern Tanzania[17]. This work provides strong evidence that hut design influences hut trial outcomes. This is consistent with the two previous small EHTs[18,19] that directly compared hut design in the same site, unlike this study, which examines differences between sites. Ifakara huts are much larger, with a volume of 51.35m^3 compared to 18.90m^3 and 13.3m^3 for East and West African huts respectively[18]. The mean number of mosquitoes collected per night in Ifakara huts is over double the mean collected in either East or West huts. Whilst this could reflect location differences in mosquito densities or species, when directly compared, Massue et al found that Ifakara huts collected 3 to 4 times the number of mosquitoes than the other designs.[18] Greater mosquito collections are beneficial in increasing the power of EHTs, but it is possible that the size of the hut has contributed to the much lower mosquito mortality observed, regardless of the level of resistance measured in the mosquito population. In a larger hut, mosquitoes could be less likely to come into contact with a net and therefore the interventions may appear to induce lower mortality. This finding is in contrast with a Benin study, which found greater mortality in Ifakara huts compared to West African huts, though these findings were based on nuisance Culex mosquitoes as opposed to anopheline mosquitoes[19]. The lack of a clear picture illustrates the difficulty in disentangling the impact of hut design and the response of the local vector population that enter these huts. Due to this stark difference in mortality (Supplementary Figure 4) and the very few Ifakara trials identified, Ifakara huts were not included in the probability predictions for the outcomes of a mosquito feeding attempt.

The relationship between bioassay and hut trial survival appears substantially different for East and West African huts, with, on average, higher survival seen in West African huts for a given level of bioassay mortality. Care should be taken in interpreting this result due to both the difference in mosquito species between EHT sites and because of the sparsity of data which makes the shape of

741 the relationship highly uncertain (differences in the logistic curve presented in Figure S7 suggest the
742 difference is less assuming this functional form). There were more distinct differences in the
743 estimated relationships between hut trial survival and other mosquito behaviours for EHTs with East
744 and West African designs. The probability of deterrence from ITN huts, and therefore the ratio
745 between the probability of mosquitoes being collected in control huts compared to ITN huts, fell
746 more sharply in West African huts than East African huts. Beyond 80% survival, slightly more
747 mosquitoes were collected from West African ITN huts than control huts. Similar trends have
748 reportedly been observed in Ifakara trials too. It is unclear why data from East African huts does not
749 exhibit the same trend, as higher numbers of mosquitoes are always caught in control huts of this
750 design. East and West African huts differ in their size, eaves, window size and the use of baffles,
751 though differentiating the difference of these design factors is beyond the scope of these data.
752 Overall, more mosquitoes were caught in control huts with a West African design than an East African
753 design, though this is likely to result from differences in productivity in the breeding sites nearby than
754 solely through differences in mosquito escape. It is important to note that there are relatively few
755 datapoints at higher levels of survival for East African huts, so this difference in the relationship
756 should be interpreted with caution.
757
758 The greatest disparity between hut designs was in the relationship between hut trial survival and
759 successful blood-feeding. The probability of mosquitoes entering a hut and successfully feeding in
760 West African huts increased exponentially to over 60%, whilst it never exceeded 10% in East African
761 huts (Figure 4C). *An. arabiensis* mosquitoes often found in East Africa have been shown to have a
762 lower propensity to blood-feed on humans than other Anopheles species and are also more likely to
763 bite outdoors.[28-32] From visual inspection of the data, this low-level blood-feeding did not appear to
764 be specific to a particular mosquito species. Nevertheless, differences are likely to exist, so
765 comparison of East and West African hut results should stratify by mosquito species. It could also be
766 suggested that due to the smaller size of West African huts, mosquitoes may be more likely to come
767 into contact with the volunteer sleeper and feed. Mosquitoes evaluated in the West African hut
768 design are also able to move unimpeded between the veranda exit trap and the hut, potentially
769 having more opportunities to feed. In contrast, mosquitoes in East African huts are channelled in one
770 direction by air flow, potentially making them less likely to return into the hut. Where data are
771 aggregated, we have made an assumption of independence in those that feed and die or feed and
772 survive. Further work is needed to understand the behaviour of mosquitoes in huts of different
773 design, potentially using video tracking technology to directly observe feeding outcomes of individual
774 mosquitoes[130].
775
776 The statistical models allowed the impact of insecticide susceptibility on the efficacy of ITNs to be
777 summarised as the relationship between bioassay survival and the outcome of a single mosquito
778 blood-feeding attempt. These summaries can be used to parameterise mathematical models of the
779 transmission dynamics of malaria[20] to estimate the public health impact of ITNs. The uncertainty in
780 the bioassay and EHT survival relationship means that there is still some ambiguity in the rate at
781 which pyrethroid ITN efficacy changes with increasing resistance. Both models suggest that low levels
782 of resistance reduce the ability of ITNs to kill mosquitoes and will likely reduce the community impact
783 of mass ITN distribution. Nevertheless, it is important to note that at these moderate levels of
784 resistance the results suggest pyrethroid-only ITNs still provide users with personal protection by
785 reducing blood-feeding even when ITNs have holes. This personal protection is predicted to persist
786 until relatively high levels of resistance. This is especially the case if there is a more gradual change
787 in hut trial survival with increasing pyrethroid resistance (as illustrated by the log-logistic model).

There are also differences in EHT outcomes when the models are fit to all data together or separated by hut type. In East African huts, ITNs are estimated to provide a higher degree of personal protection against moderately resistant mosquito populations, but this protection dramatically declines against highly resistant populations. Which EHT design best represents the efficacy of ITNs in the field is unclear. Models parameterised with each of these options could be compared to field data to select the predictive measure. Whatever the result, no hut trial design can adequately represent the diverse array of housing seen across a region. Large scale observational studies have shown housing type does influence malaria prevalence but there was no evidence of changes in the effectiveness of ITNs[131]. Hut design does however influence EHT outcomes so care should be taken when comparing products evaluated in different hut designs, especially when comparing blood-feeding. Comparison of interventions relative to control huts (i.e. induced mortality or blood-feeding inhibition) may reduce these differences, though this may also bias results if absolute values vary substantially. A standard hut design allows differences between local mosquito populations and the intervention to be systematically compared without the confounding factor of hut design. Researchers could therefore consider building huts of an existing design to allow results to be more easily interpreted and compared to other trials, even if these designs do not match the predominant local house type. If this approach is taken it will be important to account for the real-world differences in housing type over time to understand whether they influence the efficacy of indoor vector control interventions.

These analyses have some notable additional limitations. This is predominantly due to sparsity of data which in particular limited differentiation between mosquito species. The majority of trials report results from the *An. gambiae* sensu lato (*s.l.*) species complex and do not distinguish between individual members which have very different behaviour. This means that all mosquito species are considered the same given the level of EHT survival, which is unlikely to be the case. Clearly, it would have been beneficial to be able to differentiate between species that are known to differ in their behaviour. Nevertheless, grouping all species together provides a snapshot of the efficacy of ITNs against indoor-biting mosquitoes during the study period, and is therefore likely to be representative of the impact of ITNs on indoor feeding mosquitoes in that site. It would have been useful to compare different vector control products and how their estimated efficacy varies between studies and hut designs[119,132,133], but there were too few datapoints for trials using the same net brands to investigate this thoroughly. The vast majority of studies only reported summary data making it impossible to differentiate whether mosquitoes that died had fed or not. We encourage future trials to submit all disaggregated raw data when publishing trial results to allow differences between huts, volunteers and changes over the course of the study to be disentangled and allow more precise efficacy estimates. It would also be valuable for trials to measure retention of mosquitoes within huts as a matter of course to enable us to quantify the escape that is unaccounted for by exit traps. This study has grouped together a wide range of ITNs from different classes, for example, with and without synergist or with an additional active ingredient. Though the level of mortality induced by different ITNs varies, this study shows that the relationship between mortality and other behaviours measured in EHTs are relatively consistent. This should be verified further as the number of EHTs increases and novel ITNs with new modes of action are evaluated. Similarly, we do not differentiate between products within a class of ITNs. This was due to the high between-study variability, which means that products need to be directly compared within the same trial to allow meaningful comparisons. There is currently a sparsity of these studies, so though there may be substantial differences between products, it could not systematically be evaluated here. Finally, the use of discriminating dose bioassays to measure resistance is likely to become increasingly problematic as resistance spreads.

These assays are currently the most widely used method for assessing resistance in field populations but are unable to differentiate between highly resistant populations when dose response assays or the use of genetic markers of resistance will be required. Future EHT studies of new and existing products should be encouraged to characterise the local mosquito population as much as possible using different metrics, such as these measures of resistance, to allow results of EHTs to be extrapolated to different field populations.

This systematic review highlighted gaps in EHT literature. ITNs are the main method of malaria control so the results of EHTs are applied across sub-Saharan Africa and beyond. Despite this, there were only 26 study sites identified in 11 countries where products were evaluated. For example, there were very few studies conducted in central Africa, where only 1 trial was identified in northern Cameroon. Given the substantial financial investment in vector control and the importance of ITNs and IRS in public health it would be beneficial for trials to be carried out in more geographically diverse settings to allow these products to be tested against a wider range of mosquito species. The review also identified that very few trials investigated the use of IRS in combination with ITNs, and none that showed the impact over a long time-period as insecticide decayed on the walls. The added benefit of this combination of vector control tools is unclear, with varying results found in RCTs.[134-136]

Conclusion

These analyses present EHT predictions for the changes to the entomological efficacy of pyrethroid-only ITNs used against mosquito populations with increasing levels of pyrethroid resistance. The EHT is a hugely important assay which provides high quality data on indoor vector control tools in near real-world settings. Results show the impact of pyrethroid resistance on the interaction between mosquito, human and ITNs is substantial and highly complex. It highlights that EHT results can be variable, and the causes of this variability are often unknown, meaning that results should be interpreted with care. Nevertheless, the high number of trials conducted with diverse populations of mosquitoes across Africa means that this variability can be characterised and accounted for, allowing EHTs to provide unparalleled information on some of the world's most important disease control interventions.

Acknowledgements

The work was supported by the Innovative Vector Control Consortium (IVCC), the Wellcome Trust [200222/Z/15/Z] MiRA and the UK Medical Research Council (MRC)/ UK Department for International Development (DFID) under the MRC/DFID Concordat agreement.

Data Availability

Data extracted from published studies is provided in the Supplementary Material (A1 Studies & A2 Studies). Unpublished data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and subject to agreement with the data owners.

882 **References**
883

884 1. WHO. *Guidelines for laboratory and field testing of long-lasting insecticidal mosquito nets.*
885 Geneva, World Health Organization; 2005.
886 2. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of malaria
887 control on Plasmodium falciparum in Africa between 2000 and 2015. *Nature*. 2015;
888 526(7572):207–11.
889 3. The Alliance for Malaria Prevention. (AMP) Net Mapping Project IVCC upgrade. [Internet].
890 Available from: https://netmappingproject.allianceformalariaprevention.com/ Accessed: 3rd
891 December 2020
892 4. WHO. *Global plan for insecticide resistance management in malaria vectors.* GPIRM; 2012.
893 5. Hemingway J. The role of vector control in stopping the transmission of malaria: threats and
894 opportunities. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2014; 369(1645).
895 6. Hemingway J. The way forward for vector control. *Science*. 2017; 358(6366): 998-999.
896 7. Ranson H. Current and Future Prospects for Preventing Malaria Transmission via the Use of
897 Insecticides. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med*. 2017; 7:a026823
898 8. Ranson H, Lissenden N. Insecticide Resistance in African Anopheles Mosquitoes: A
899 Worsening Situation that Needs Urgent Action to Maintain Malaria Control. Trends in
900 Parasitology. 2016; 32(3):187–96.
901 9. WHO. *Guidelines for laboratory and field-testing of long-lasting insecticidal nets.* Geneva:
902 World Health Organization; 2013.
903 10. Hancock PA, Hendriks CJM, Tangena J-A, Gibson H, Hemingway J, Coleman M, et al.
904 Mapping trends in insecticide resistance phenotypes in African malaria vectors. *PLOS*
905 *Biology.* 2020 Jun 25;18(6):e3000633.
906 11. WHO. *List of WHO Prequalified Vector Control Products.* 2020. Available at:
907 https://www.who.int/pq-vector-control/prequalified-
908 lists/PrequalifiedProducts27January2020.pdf?ua=1 Accessed: 6th August 2020.
909 12. WHO. *The evaluation process for vector control products.* WHO Information Note. 2017.
910 Available at: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/255644/WHO-HTM-GMP-
911 2017.13-eng.pdf?sequence=1 Accessed: 6th August 2020.
912 13. WHO. *Design of epidemiological trials for vector control products, Report of a WHO Expert*
913 *Advisory Group.* Chateau de Penthes, Geneva; 2017. Available at:
914 https://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/vector_ecology/resources/WHO_HTM_NTD_VEM
915 _2017.04/en/ Accessed: 3rd December 2020.
916 14. Johnson PCD, Barry SJE, Ferguson HM, Müller P. Power analysis for generalized linear mixed
917 models in ecology and evolution. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution.* 2015;6(2):133–42.
918 15. Smith, A. A verandah-trap hut for studying the house-frequenting habits of mosquitoes and
919 for assessing insecticides. I.—A description of the verandah-trap hut and of studies on the
920 egress of Anopheles gambiae Giles and Mansonia uniformis (Theo.) from an untreated
921 Hut. *Bulletin of Entomological Research,* 1965; 56(1), 161-167.
922 16. Darriet F, N'Guessan R, Hougard JM, Traoré-Lamizana M, Carnevale P. An experimental tool
923 essential for the evaluation of insecticides: the testing huts (in French). *Bull Soc Pathol Exot*.
924 2002;95:299–303.
925 17. Okumu FO, Moore J, Mbeyela E, Sherlock M, Sangusangu R, Ligamba G, et al. A Modified
926 Experimental Hut Design for Studying Responses of Disease-Transmitting Mosquitoes to
927 Indoor Interventions: The Ifakara Experimental Huts. *PLOS ONE*. 2012; 7(2):e30967.

18. Massue DJ, Kisinza WN, Malongo BB, Mgaya CS, Bradley J, Moore JD, et al. Comparative performance of three experimental hut designs for measuring malaria vector responses to insecticides in Tanzania. *Malaria Journal*. 2016; 15(1):165.
19. Oumbouke WA, Fongnikin A, Soukou KB, Moore SJ, N'Guessan R. Relative performance of indoor vector control interventions in the Ifakara and the West African experimental huts. *Parasites & Vectors.* 2017; 10(1):432
20. Churcher TS, Lissenden N, Griffin JT, Worrall E, Ranson H. The impact of pyrethroid resistance on the efficacy and effectiveness of bednets for malaria control in Africa. *eLife* 2016; 5:e16090.
21. Sherrard-Smith E, Griffin JT, Winskill P, Corbel V, Pennetier C, Djénontin A, et al. Systematic review of indoor residual spray efficacy and effectiveness against Plasmodium falciparum in Africa. *Nature Communications*. 2018; 9(1):4982.
22. Briët OJ, Penny MA, Hardy D, Awolola TS, Van Bortel W, Corbel V, et al. Effects of pyrethroid resistance on the cost effectiveness of a mass distribution of long-lasting insecticidal nets: a modelling study. *Malaria Journal*. 2013 Feb 25;12(1):77.
23. Briët OJ, Koenker H, Norris L, Wiegand R, Vanden Eng J, Thackeray A, et al. Attrition, physical integrity and insecticidal activity of long-lasting insecticidal nets in sub-Saharan Africa and modelling of their impact on vectorial capacity. *Malaria Journal*. 2020 Aug 28;19(1):310.
24. Killeen GF, Kihonda J, Lyimo E, Oketch FR, Kotas ME, Mathenge E, et al. Quantifying behavioural interactions between humans and mosquitoes: Evaluating the protective efficacy of insecticidal nets against malaria transmission in rural Tanzania. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2006 Nov 10;6(1):161.
25. Strode C, Donegan S, Garner P, Enayati AA, Hemingway J. The Impact of Pyrethroid Resistance on the Efficacy of Insecticide-Treated Bed Nets against African Anopheline Mosquitoes: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLOS Medicine*. 2014; 11(3):e1001619.
26. Dewey Dunnington (2020). ggspatial: Spatial Data Framework for ggplot2. R package version 1.1.1. Available from: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggspatial
27. WHO. *Test procedures for insecticide resistance monitoring in malaria vector mosquitoes – 2nd ed*; 2016 (updated June 2018). Available at: https://www.who.int/malaria/publications/atoz/9789241511575/en/ Accessed: 3rd December 2020.
28. WHO. *Global report on insecticide resistance in malaria vectors: 2010–2016*; 2018. Available at: https://www.who.int/malaria/publications/atoz/9789241514057/en/ Accessed: 3rd December 2020.
29. CDC. *Guideline for Evaluating Insecticide Resistance in Vectors Using the CDC Bottle Bioassay.* [Internet]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/malaria/resources/pdf/fsp/ir_manual/ir_cdc_bioassay_en.pdf Accessed: 3rd December 2020.
30. Brogdon WG and McAllister JC. Simplification of adult mosquito bioassays through use of time-mortality determinations in glass bottles. *Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association*. 1998 Jun;14(2):159–64.
31. Glunt KD, Paaijmans KP, Read AF, Thomas MB. Environmental temperatures significantly change the impact of insecticides measured using WHOPES protocols. *Malaria Journal*. 2014 Sep 3;13(1):350.
32. Briët OJ, Smith TA, Chitnis N. Measurement of overall insecticidal effects in experimental hut trials. *Parasites & Vectors.* 2012 Nov 13;5(1):256.

33. Killeen GF, Chitnis N, Moore SJ, Okumu FO. Target product profile choices for intra-domiciliary malaria vector control pesticide products: repel or kill? *Malaria Journal*. 2011 Jul 28;10(1):207.
34. Mulatier M, Pennetier C, Porciani A, Chandre F, Dormont L, Cohuet A. Prior contact with permethrin decreases its irritancy at the following exposure among a pyrethroid-resistant malaria vector Anopheles gambiae. *Scientific Reports*. 2019 Jun 3;9(1):8177.
35. Porciani A, Diop M, Moiroux N, Kadoke-Lambi T, Cohuet A, Chandre F, et al. Influence of pyrethroïd-treated bed net on host seeking behavior of Anopheles gambiae s.s. carrying the kdr allele. *PLOS ONE*. 2017 Jul 31;12(7):e0164518.
36. Moiroux N, Chandre F, Hougard J-M, Corbel V, Pennetier C. Remote Effect of Insecticide-Treated Nets and the Personal Protection against Malaria Mosquito Bites. *PLOS ONE*. 2017 Jan 27;12(1):e0170732.
37. Siegert PY, Walker E, Miller JR. Differential Behavioral Responses of Anopheles gambiae (Diptera: Culicidae) Modulate Mortality Caused by Pyrethroid-Treated Bednets. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. 2009 Dec;102(6):2061–71.
38. Thiévent K, Hauser G, Elaian O, Koella JC. The interaction between permethrin exposure and malaria infection affects the host-seeking behaviour of mosquitoes. *Malaria Journal*. 2019 Mar 14;18(1):79.
39. Glunt KD, Coetzee M, Huijben S, Koffi AA, Lynch PA, N'Guessan R, et al. Empirical and theoretical investigation into the potential impacts of insecticide resistance on the effectiveness of insecticide-treated bed nets. *Evolutionary Applications*. 2018;11(4):431–41.
40. Stan Development Team. 2018. *RStan: the R interface to Stan*. R package version 2.17.3. http://mc-stan.org
41. Okumu FO, Mbeyela E, Lingamba G, Moore J, Ntamatungiro AJ, Kavishe DR, et al. Comparative field evaluation of combinations of long-lasting insecticide treated nets and indoor residual spraying, relative to either method alone, for malaria prevention in an area where the main vector is Anopheles arabiensis. *Parasites and Vectors*. 2013; 6(1):46–46.
42. Moore S, et al. Field evaluation of an alpha-cypermethrin+PBO long-lasting insecticidal net (Veeralin LN) against natural populations of Anopheles arabiensis in experimental huts, Tanzania. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)] 2016; Report of the nineteenth WHOPES working group meeting: WHO/HQ, Geneva, 8-11 February 2016: review of Veeralin LN, VectoMax GR, Bactivec SC.
43. Guillet P, N'Guessan R, Darriet F, Traore-Lamizana M, Chandre F. Combined pyrethroid and carbamate 'two-in-one' treated mosquito nets: Field efficacy against pyrethroid-resistant Anopheles gambiae and Culex quinquefasciatus. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*. 2001; 15(1):105–12.
44. Mosha FW, Lyimo IN, Oxborough RM, Matowo J, Malima R, Feston E, et al. Comparative efficacies of permethrin-, deltamethrin- and α-cypermethrin-treated nets, against Anopheles arabiensis and Culex quinquefasciatus in northern Tanzania. *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Parasitology*. 2008; 102(4):367–76.
45. Bayili K, N'do S, Namountougou M, Sanou R, Ouattara A, Dabire RK, et al. Evaluation of efficacy of Interceptor G2, a long-lasting insecticide net coated with a mixture of chlorfenapyr and alpha-cypermethrin, against pyrethroid resistant Anopheles gambiae s.l. in Burkina Faso. *Malaria journal*. 2017; 16(1):190–190.
46. Agossa FR, Padonou GG, Gnanguenon V, Oke-Agbo F, Zola-Sahossi J, Degnonvi H, et al. Laboratory and field evaluation of the impact of washings on the effectiveness of LifeNetReg., OlysetReg. and PermaNetReg. 2.0 in two areas, where there is a high level of

1021 resistance of Anopheles gambiae to pyrethroids, Benin, West Africa. *Malaria Journal*. 2014;
1022 13(193).
1023 47. Asale A, Getachew Y, Hailesilassie W, Speybroeck N, Duchateau L. Evaluation of the efficacy
1024 of DDT indoor residual spraying and long-lasting insecticidal nets against insecticide resistant
1025 populations of Anopheles arabiensis Patton (Diptera: Culicidae) from Ethiopia using
1026 experimental huts. *Parasites and Vectors*. 2014; 7(1):131–131.
1027 48. Corbel V, Chabi J, Dabire RK, Etang J, Nwane P, Pigeon O, et al. Field efficacy of a new mosaic
1028 long-lasting mosquito net (PermaNetReg. 3.0) against pyrethroid-resistant malaria vectors: a
1029 multi centre study in Western and Central Africa. *Malaria Journal*. 2010; 9(113):113–113.
1030 49. Ketoh GK, Ahadji-Dabla KM, Chabi J, Amoudji AD, Apetogbo GY, Awokou F. Efficacy of two
1031 PBO long lasting insecticidal nets against natural populations of Anopheles gambiae s.l. in
1032 experimental huts, Kolokope, Togo. *PLoS ONE*. 2018; 13(7):e0192492–e0192492.
1033 50. Koudou BG, Koffi AA, Malone D, Hemingway J. Efficacy of PermaNet® 2.0 and PermaNet® 3.0
1034 against insecticide-resistant Anopheles gambiae in experimental huts in Côte d'Ivoire.
1035 *Malaria Journal*. 2011; 10.
1036 51. Kweka EJ, Lyaruu LJ, Mahande AM. Efficacy of PermaNetReg. 3.0 and PermaNetReg. 2.0 nets
1037 against laboratory-reared and wild Anopheles gambiae sensu lato populations in northern
1038 Tanzania. *Infectious Diseases of Poverty*. 2017; 6(11).
1039 52. Malima R, Tungu PK, Mwingira V, Maxwell C, Magesa SM, Kaur H, et al. Evaluation of the
1040 long-lasting insecticidal net Interceptor LN: Laboratory and experimental hut studies against
1041 anopheline and culicine mosquitoes in northeastern Tanzania. *Parasites and Vectors*. 2013;
1042 6(1):296–296.
1043 53. Malima RC, Magesa SM, Tungu PK, Mwingira V, Magogo FS, Sudi W, et al. An experimental
1044 hut evaluation of Olyset nets against anopheline mosquitoes after seven years use in
1045 Tanzanian villages. *Malaria Journal*. 2008; 7:38–38.
1046 54. Mosha FW, Lyimo IN, Oxborough RM, Matowo J, Malima R, Feston E, et al. Comparative
1047 efficacies of permethrin-, deltamethrin- and α-cypermethrin-treated nets, against Anopheles
1048 arabiensis and Culex quinquefasciatus in northern Tanzania. *Annals of Tropical Medicine and*
1049 *Parasitology*. 2008; 102(4):367–76.
1050 55. N'Guessan R, Odjo A, Ngufor C, Malone D, Rowland M. A chlorfenapyr mixture net
1051 InterceptorReg. G2 shows high efficacy and wash durability against resistant mosquitoes in
1052 West Africa. *PLoS ONE*. 2016; 11(11):e0165925–e0165925.
1053 56. Ngufor C, Chouaibou M, Tchicaya E, Loukou B, Kesse N, N'Guessan R, et al. Combining
1054 organophosphate-treated wall linings and long-lasting insecticidal nets fails to provide
1055 additional control over long-lasting insecticidal nets alone against multiple insecticide-
1056 resistant Anopheles gambiae in Cote d'Ivoire: an experimental hut. *Malaria Journal*. 2014;
1057 13(396).
1058 57. Ngufor C, Fagbohoun J, Critchley J, N'Guessan R, Todjinou D, Malone D, et al. Which
1059 intervention is better for malaria vector control: insecticide mixture long-lasting insecticidal
1060 nets or standard pyrethroid nets combined with indoor residual spraying? *Malaria Journal*.
1061 2017; 16(340).
1062 58. Ngufor C, N'Guessan R, Fagbohoun, Todjinou D, Odjo A, Malone D, et al. Efficacy of the
1063 Olyset Duo net against insecticide-resistant mosquito vectors of malaria. *Science*
1064 *Translational Medicine*. 2016; 8(356):356ra121-356ra121.
1065 59. Ngufor C, Tchicaya E, Koudou B, N'Fale S, Dabire R, Johnson P, et al. Combining
1066 organophosphate treated wall linings and long-lasting insecticidal nets for improved control
1067 of pyrethroid resistant Anopheles gambiae. *PLoS ONE*. 2014; 9(1):e83897–e83897.

1068 60. Pennetier C, Bouraima A, Chandre F, Piameu M, Etang J, Rossignol M, et al. Efficacy of Olyset
1069 Plus, a New Long-Lasting Insecticidal Net Incorporating Permethrin and Piperonil-Butoxide
1070 against Multi-Resistant Malaria Vectors. *PLoS ONE*. 2013; 8(10):e75134–e75134.
1071 61. Toe KH, Muller P, Badolo A, Traore A, Sagnon N, Dabire RK, et al. Do bednets including
1072 piperonyl butoxide offer additional protection against populations of Anopheles gambiae s.l.
1073 that are highly resistant to pyrethroids? An experimental hut evaluation in Burkina Faso.
1074 *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*. 2018;32(4):407–16.
1075 62. Tungu P, Magesa S, Maxwell C, Malima R, Masue D, Sudi W, et al. Evaluation of permanet 3.0
1076 a deltamethrin-PBO combination net against Anopheles gambiae and pyrethroid resistant
1077 Culex quinquefasciatus mosquitoes: An experimental hut trial in Tanzania. *Malaria Journal*.
1078 2010; 9(1).
1079 63. Rowland M, et al. Unpublished trial investigating Interceptor G2 in Moshi, Tanzania.
1080 64. Tungu P, et al. An experimental hut study to evaluate the efficacy and wash resistance of
1081 Interceptor® G2 long-lasting insecticidal nets against natural populations of Anopheles
1082 funestus and Anopheles gambiae s.l. in Muheza, Tanzania. [Unpublished report submitted by
1083 BASF to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme]. 2016; Report of the twentieth WHOPES
1084 working group meeting, WHO/HQ, Geneva, 20–24 March 2017: review of Interceptor G2 LN,
1085 DawaPlus 3.0 LN, DawaPlus 4.0 LN, SumiLarv 2 MR, Chlorfenapyr 240 SC. Geneva: World
1086 Health Organization; (WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2017.04). Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
1087 65. Rowland M, et al. Unpublished WHOPES trial investigating Interceptor G2 in Muheza,
1088 Tanzania.
1089 66. Oxborough RM, Kitau J, Matowo J, Feston E, Mndeme R, Mosha FW, et al. ITN mixtures of
1090 chlorfenapyr (pyrrole) and alphacypermethrin (pyrethroid) for control of pyrethroid resistant
1091 Anopheles arabiensis and Culex quinquefasciatus. *PLoS ONE*. 2013; 8(2):e55781–e55781.
1092 67. Miller JE, Lindsay SW, Armstrong JRM. Experimental hut trials of bednets impregnated with
1093 synthetic pyrethroid or organophosphate insecticide for mosquito-control in The Gambia.
1094 *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*. 1991; 5(4):465–76.
1095 68. Mosha FW, Lyimo IN, Oxborough RM, Malima R, Tenu F, Matowo J, et al. Experimental hut
1096 evaluation of the pyrrole insecticide chlorfenapyr on bed nets for the control of Anopheles
1097 arabiensis and Culex quinquefasciatus. *Tropical Medicine and International Health*. 2008;
1098 13(5):644–52.
1099 69. Darriet F, Guillet P, N'Guessan RN, Doannio JMC, Koffi AA, Konan LY, et al. The impact of
1100 permethrin and deltamethrin resistance in Anopheles gambiae s.s. on the efficacy of
1101 insecticide-treated mosquito nets. 1999; (WHO/MAL/99.1088).
1102 70. Ngufor C, Critchley J, N'Guessan R, Akogbeto M. Comparing the efficacy of insecticide
1103 mixture and combination strategies for improved control and management of pyrethroid
1104 resistant malaria vectors in Southern Benin, West Africa. *American Journal of Tropical*
1105 *Medicine and Hygiene*. 2016; 95(5 Supplement 1):16–7.
1106 71. Ngufor C, et al. Unpublished short report on Olyset Plus, Olyset and PermaNet 3.0 in Cové,
1107 Benin.
1108 72. Allossogbe M, Gnanguenon V, Agossa FR, Zola-Sahossi J, Akinro B, Houtoukpe A, et al.
1109 Comparative efficacy of five types of long-lasting insecticide-treated nets (PermaNet 3.0®,
1110 PermaNet 2.0®, Olyset Plus®, Olyset Net®, and LifeNet®) in a semi-natural environment
1111 against resistant Anopheles gambiae sensu lato and Mansonia africana in Cove, Benin.
1112 *International Journal of Mosquito Research*. 2017; 4(5):07–13.

1113 73. Badolo A, Guelbeogo W, Tiono A, Traore A, Sagnon N. Experimental hut evaluation of
1114 Fendona 6SC-treated bednets and interceptor long-lasting nets against Anopheles gambiae
1115 s.l. in Burkina Faso. *Journal of Vector Borne Diseases*. 2012; 49(4):234–41.
1116 74. Bayili, K. Evaluation de l'efficacité d'une moustiquaire bitraitée (Olyset Duo) sur les
1117 populations d'Anopheles gambiae s.l résistantes aux pyréthrinoïdes pour le contrôle du
1118 paludisme. 2015; Master's degree thesis. Research Institute of Health Sciences.
1119 http://www.beep.ird.fr/collect/upb/index/assoc/IDR-2015-BAY-EVA/IDR-2015-BAY-EVA.pdf
1120 75. Camara S, Ahoua Alou LP, Koffi AA, Clegban YCM, Kabran J-P, Koffi FM, et al. Efficacy of
1121 Interceptor G2, a new long-lasting insecticidal net against wild pyrethroid-resistant
1122 Anopheles gambiae s.s. from Cote d'Ivoire: a semi-field trial. *Parasite*. 2018; 25:42–42.
1123 76. Chandre F, Dabire RK, Hougard JM, Djogbenou LS, Irish SR, Rowland M, et al. Field efficacy of
1124 pyrethroid treated plastic sheeting (durable lining) in combination with long lasting
1125 insecticidal nets against malaria vectors. *Parasites and Vectors*. 2010; 3(65).
1126 77. Djenontin A, Moiroux N, Bouraima A, Zogo B, Sidick I, Corbel V, et al. Field efficacy of a new
1127 deltamethrin long lasting insecticidal net (LifeNet©) against wild pyrethroid-resistant
1128 Anopheles gambiae in Benin. *BMC public health*. 2018; 18(1):947–947.
1129 78. Graham K, Kayedi M, Maxwell C, Kaur H, Rehman H, Malima RC, et al. Multi-country field
1130 trials comparing wash-resistance of PermaNetTM and conventional insecticide-treated nets
1131 against anopheline and culicine mosquitoes. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*. 2005;
1132 19(1):72–83.
1133 79. Koffi AA, Ahoua Alou LP, Djenontin A, Kabran J-P, Dosso Y, Kone A, et al. Efficacy of Olyset
1134 Duo, a permethrin and pyriproxyfen mixture net against wild pyrethroid-resistant Anopheles
1135 gambiae s.s. from Cote d'Ivoire: an experimental hut trial. *Parasite*. 2015; 22:28–28.
1136 80. Mahande AM, Msangi S, Lyaruu LJ, Kweka EJ. Bio-efficacy of DuraNet long-lasting insecticidal
1137 nets against wild populations of Anopheles arabiensis in experimental huts. *Tropical*
1138 *Medicine and Health*. 2018; 46(1):36–36.
1139 81. N'Guessan R, Asidi A, Boko P, Odjo A, Akogbeto M, Pigeon O, et al. An experimental hut
1140 evaluation of PermaNet® 3.0, a deltamethrin-piperonyl butoxide combination net, against
1141 pyrethroid-resistant Anopheles gambiae and Culex quinquefasciatus mosquitoes in southern
1142 Benin. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2010;
1143 104(12):758–65.
1144 82. N'Guessan R, Boko P, Odjo A, Chabi J, Akogbeto M, Rowland M. Control of pyrethroid and
1145 DDT-resistant Anopheles gambiae by application of indoor residual spraying or mosquito nets
1146 treated with a long-lasting organophosphate insecticide, chlorpyrifos-methyl. *Malaria*
1147 *Journal*. 2010; 9(44):44–44.
1148 83. N'Guessan R, Boko P, Odjo A, Knols B, Akogbeto M, Rowland M. Control of pyrethroid-
1149 resistant Anopheles gambiae and Culex quinquefasciatus mosquitoes with chlorfenapyr in
1150 Benin. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2009; 14(4):389–95.
1151 84. N'Guessan R, Corbel V, Akogbeto M, Rowland M. Reduced efficacy of insecticide-treated nets
1152 and indoor residual spraying for malaria control in pyrethroid resistance area, Benin.
1153 *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2007; 13(2):199–206.
1154 85. N'Guessan R, Darriet F, Doannio JMC, Chandre F, Carnevale P. Olyset Net® efficacy against
1155 pyrethroid-resistant Anopheles gambiae and Culex quinquefasciatus after 3 years' field use in
1156 Côte d'Ivoire. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*. 2001; 15(1):97–104.
1157 86. Ngufor C, N'Guessan R, Fagbohoun J, Odjo A, Malone D, Akogbeto M, et al. Olyset Duo® (a
1158 pyriproxyfen and permethrin mixture net): an experimental hut trial against pyrethroid

resistant Anopheles gambiae and Culex quinquefasciatus in southern Benin. *PLoS ONE*. 2014; 9(4):e93603–e93603.

87. Winkler MS, Tchicaya E, Koudou BG, Donze J, Nsanzabana C, Muller P, et al. Efficacy of ICON® Maxx in the laboratory and against insecticide-resistant anopheles gambiae in central Cote d'Ivoire. *Malaria Journal*. 2012; 11(167).
88. Tungu P et al. WHOPES Phase II study to evaluate the efficacy and wash resistance of Interceptor G2 long-lasting insecticidal nets against natural populations of Anopheles funestus in experimental huts in Muheza, Tanzania. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme]. 2017; Report of the twentieth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 20-24 March 2017. Review of: Interceptor G2 LN, DawaPlus 3.0 LN, DawaPlus 4.0 LN, SumiLarv 2 MR, Chlorfenapyr 240 SC. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2017.04.
89. Bayili K et al. Phase II field evaluation of long-lasting nets DawaPlus 3.0 (deltamethrin and PBO in roof panel; deltamethrin alone in the side panels) and DawaPlus 4.0 (deltamethrin and PBO) of Tana Netting against natural populations of Anopheles gambiae s.l in Burkina Faso [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme]. 2017; Report of the twentieth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 20-24 March 2017. Review of: Interceptor G2 LN, DawaPlus 3.0 LN, DawaPlus 4.0 LN, SumiLarv 2 MR, Chlorfenapyr 240 SC. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2017.04.
90. Tungu P et al. Phase II study to evaluate the efficacy and wash resistance of DawaPlus 3.0 and DawaPlus 4.0 against natural populations of Anopheles funestus s.s. in experimental huts in Muheza, Tanzania [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme]. 2017; Report of the twentieth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 20-24 March 2017. Review of: Interceptor G2 LN, DawaPlus 3.0 LN, DawaPlus 4.0 LN, SumiLarv 2 MR, Chlorfenapyr 240 SC. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2017.04.
91. N'Guessan R et al. Experimental hut evaluation of an alphacypermethrin + PBO mixture long-lasting insecticidal net Veeralin LN of Vector Control Innovations Pvt Ltd., India against natural populations of Anopheles gambiae in M'Be, Côte d'Ivoire. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)]. 2016; Report of the nineteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 8-11 February 2016. Review of: Veeralin LN, Vectomax GR, Bactivec SC. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2016.2.
92. Koffi AA et al. WHOPES Phase 2 Trial. Field evaluation of a deltamethrin longlasting insecticidal net (Panda Net® 2.0 of Life Ideas Company Ltd) against natural populations of Anopheles gambiae in experimental huts in Côte d'Ivoire. DOC/IRD/ABC/20150210 [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)]. 2015; Report of the eighteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 29 June - 1 July 2015. Review of: MiraNet LN, Panda Net 2.0 LN, Yahe LN, Safenet LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2015.2.
93. Koffi AA et al. Field evaluation of a deltamethrin long-lasting insecticidal net (Yahe manufactured by Fujian Yamei Industry, China) against natural populations of Anopheles gambiae in experimental huts in Côte d'Ivoire. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)]. 2015; Report of the eighteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 29 June - 1 July 2015. Review of: MiraNet LN, Panda Net 2.0 LN, Yahe LN, Safenet LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2015.2.
94. N'Guessan R et al. WHOPES Phase 2 Trial. Experimental hut study of an alphacypermethrin long-lasting insecticidal net (MiraNet LN of A to Z Textile Mills, Tanzania) against natural populations of Anopheles gambiae from M'be, Côte d'Ivoire [Unpublished report to the WHO

1206 Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)]. 2015; Report of the eighteenth WHOPES working
1207 group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 29 June - 1 July 2015. Review of: MiraNet LN, Panda Net
1208 2.0 LN, Yahe LN, Safenet LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2015.2.
1209 95. Kweka E et al. Experimental hut evaluation of MiraNet® against resistant populations of
1210 Anopheles arabiensis in Northern Tanzania [Unpublished report of Tropical Pesticides
1211 Research Institute, Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania]. 2015; Report of the eighteenth
1212 WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 29 June - 1 July 2015. Review of:
1213 MiraNet LN, Panda Net 2.0 LN, Yahe LN, Safenet LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2015.2.
1214 96. Tungu P et al. WHOPES Phase 2 Trial. Field evaluation of a long-lasting insecticidal net
1215 MiraNet LN (alpha-cypermethrin incorporated LN of A to Z Textile Mills, Tanzania) against
1216 natural populations of Anopheles funestus in experimental huts in Muheza, Tanzania.
1217 [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)]. 2015; Report of
1218 the eighteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 29 June - 1 July 2015.
1219 Review of: MiraNet LN, Panda Net 2.0 LN, Yahe LN, Safenet LN.
1220 WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2015.2.
1221 97. Tungu P et al. Field evaluation of a long-lasting insecticidal net Panda Net 2.0 LN
1222 (deltamethrin incorporated LN of Life Ideas Company Ltd) against natural populations of
1223 Anopheles funestus and Anopheles gambiae s.l. in experimental huts in Muheza, Tanzania.
1224 [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)]. 2015; Report of
1225 the eighteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 29 June - 1 July 2015.
1226 Review of: MiraNet LN, Panda Net 2.0 LN, Yahe LN, Safenet LN.
1227 WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2015.2.
1228 98. N'Guessan R et al. Wash resistance efficacy of Veeralin® LN against pyrethroid-resistant
1229 Anopheles gambiae: an experimental hut trial in M'Be, Côte d'Ivoire. [Unpublished joint
1230 report of London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, UK and Centre de Recherche
1231 Entomologique de Cotonou, Benin submitted to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme
1232 (WHOPES)]. 2015; Report of the nineteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ,
1233 Geneva 8-11 February 2016. Review of: Veeralin LN, Vectomax GR, Bactivec SC.
1234 WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2016.2.
1235 99. Tungu K et al. Evaluation of Yahe LN against Anopheles gambiae s.l. and Culex
1236 quinquefasciatus in experimental huts in Tanzania. National Institute for Medical Research,
1237 Amani Research Centre, Muheza, Tanzania and London School of Hygiene and Tropical
1238 Medicine, London, UK. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme
1239 (WHOPES)]. 2013; Report of the sixteeth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva
1240 22-30 July 2013. Review of: Pirimiphos-methyl 300 CS, Chlorfenapyr 240 SC, Deltamethrin
1241 62.5 SC-PE, Duranet LN, Netprotect LN, Yahe LN, Spinosad 83.3 Monolayer DT, Spinosad 25
1242 Extended release GR. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2013.6.
1243 100. Tungu PK et al. Evaluation of Olyset Plus LN against Anopheles gambiae in experimental huts
1244 in Tanzania. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES).] 2012;
1245 Report of the fifteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 18-22 June 2012.
1246 Review of: Olyset Plus, Interceptor LN, Malathion 440 EW, Vectobac GR.
1247 WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2012.5.
1248 101. Sidick I et al. Efficacy of a deltamethrin long-lasting insecticidal net (LifeNet from Bayer)
1249 against wild susceptible populations of Anopheles gambiae in experimental huts, Benin
1250 (DOC/IRD/CREC/02/2011). [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme
1251 (WHOPES).] 2011; Report of the fourteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ,

Geneva 11-15 April 2011. Review of: Spinosad EC, LifeNet LN, MAGNet LN, Royal Sentry LN, Yahe LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2011.7

102. Chabi J et al. Efficacy of a deltamethrin long-lasting insecticidal net (DawaPlus 2nd generation - Tana netting) against wild susceptible populations of Anopheles gambiae in experimental huts, Benin (DOC/IRD/CREC/01/09). [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES).] 2009; Report of the thirteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 28-30 July 2009. Review of: Olyset LN, DawaPlus 2.0 LN, Tianjin Yorkool LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2009.5.
103. Tungu PK et al. Evaluation of DawaPlus 2.0 LN against Anopheles gambiae in experimental huts in Muheza, United Republic of Tanzania. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES).] 2009; Report of the thirteenth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 28-30 July 2009. Review of: Olyset LN, DawaPlus 2.0 LN, Tianjin Yorkool LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2009.5.
104. Dabire R et al. Efficacy of a lambda-cyhalothrin longlasting insecticidal net (Lambda LN from Syngenta) against Anopheles gambiae in experimental huts in Burkina Faso. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES).] 2008; Report of the twelfth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 8-11 December 2008. Review of: Bioflash GR, PermaNet 2.0, PermaNet 3.0, PermaNet 2.5, Lambda-cyhalothrin LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2009.1
105. Tungu PK et al. Evaluation of the lambda-cyhalothrin LN developed by Syngenta against Anopheles gambiae and An. funestus in experimental huts in Muheza, United Republic of Tanzania. [Unpublished report to the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES).] 2008; Report of the twelfth WHOPES working group meeting. WHO/HQ, Geneva 8-11 December 2008. Review of: Bioflash GR, PermaNet 2.0, PermaNet 3.0, PermaNet 2.5, Lambda-cyhalothrin LN. WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2009.1
106. Adeogun AOO, Olojede JB, Oduola AO, Awolola TS. Efficacy of a combination long lasting insecticidal net (PermaNet® 3.0) against pyrethroid resistant Anopheles gambiae s.s. and Culex quinquefasciatus: an experimental hut trial in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Clinical & Biomedical Research.* 2012; 6:37-50.
107. Chouaibou M, Simard F, Chandre F, Etang J, Darriet F, Hougard J-M. Efficacy of bifenthrin-impregnated bednets against Anopheles funestus and pyrethroid-resistant Anopheles gambiae in North Cameroon. *Malaria journal*. 2006; 5:77–77.
108. Corbel V, Chandre F, Brengues C, Akogbéto M, Lardeux F, Hougard JM, et al. Dosage-dependent effects of permethrin-treated nets on the behaviour of Anopheles gambiae and the selection of pyrethroid resistance. *Malaria Journal*. 2004; 3.
109. Fane M, Cisse O, Traore CSF, Sabatier P. Anopheles gambiae resistance to pyrethroid-treated nets in cotton versus rice areas in Mali. *Acta Tropica*. 2012; 122(1):1–6.
110. Fanello C, Kolaczinski JH, Conway DJ, Carnevale P, Curtis CF. The kdr pyrethroid resistance gene in Anopheles gambiae: tests of non-pyrethroid insecticides and a new detection method for the gene. *Parassitologia*. 1999; 41:323–6.
111. Guillet P, N'Guessan R, Darriet F, Traore-Lamizana M, Chandre F, Carnevale P. Combined pyrethroid and carbamate 'two-in-one' treated mosquito nets: field efficacy against pyrethroid-resistant Anopheles gambiae and Culex quinquefasciatus. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology.* 2001; 15(1):105–12.
112. Hougard J-M, Corbel V, N'Guessan R, Darriet F, Chandre F, Akogbéto M, et al. Efficacy of mosquito nets treated with insecticide mixtures or mosaics against insecticide resistant

Anopheles gambiae and Culex quinquefasciatus (Diptera: Culicidae) in Côte d'Ivoire. *Bulletin of Entomological Research*. 2003; 93(6):491–8.

113. Kitau J, Oxborough R, Kaye A, Chen-Hussey V, Isaacs E, Matowo J, et al. Laboratory and experimental hut evaluation of a long-lasting insecticide treated blanket for protection against mosquitoes. *Parasites and Vectors*. 2014; 7(129).
114. Kolaczinski JH, Fanello C, Herve JP, Conway DJ, Carnevale P, Curtis CF. Experimental and molecular genetic analysis of the impact of pyrethroid and non-pyrethroid insecticide impregnated bednets for mosquito control in an area of pyrethroid resistance. *Bulletin of Entomological Research*. 2000; 90(2):125–32.
115. Malima RC, Oxborough RM, Tungu PK, Maxwell C, Lyimo I, Mwingira V, et al. Behavioural and insecticidal effects of organophosphate-, carbamate- and pyrethroid-treated mosquito nets against African malaria vectors. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*. 2009; 23(4):317–25.
116. Sanou A, et al. Unpublished study based in Tengrela and Tiefora, Burkina Faso.
117. Tungu PK, et al. Unpublished study based in Muheza, Tanzania.
118. Protopopoff N, Mosha JF, Lukole E, Charlwood JD, Wright A, Mwalimu CD, et al. Effectiveness of a long-lasting piperonyl butoxide-treated insecticidal net and indoor residual spray interventions, separately and together, against malaria transmitted by pyrethroid-resistant mosquitoes: a cluster, randomised controlled, two-by-two factorial design trial. *Lancet*. 2018 Apr 21;391(10130):1577–88.
119. Staedke SG, Gonahasa S, Dorsey G, Kamya MR, Maiteki-Sebuguzi C, Lynd A, et al. Effect of long-lasting insecticidal nets with and without piperonyl butoxide on malaria indicators in Uganda (LLINEUP): a pragmatic, cluster-randomised trial embedded in a national LLIN distribution campaign. *Lancet*. 2020 Apr 18;395(10232):1292–303.
120. Kleinschmidt I, Bradley J, Knox TB, Mnzava AP, Kafy HT, Mbogo C, et al. Implications of insecticide resistance for malaria vector control with long-lasting insecticidal nets: a WHO-coordinated, prospective, international, observational cohort study. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2018 Jun 1;18(6):640–9.
121. Hellewell J, Sherrard-Smith E, Ogoma S, Churcher TS. Assessing the impact of low-technology emanators alongside long-lasting insecticidal nets to control malaria. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2021 Feb 15;376(1818):20190817.
122. Duncan J. Post-treatment effects of sublethal doses of dieldrin on the mosquito Aedes aegypti L. *Annals of Applied Biology*. 1963; 52(1):1–6.
123. Kennedy JS. The excitant and repellent Effects on Mosquitoes of sub-lethal Contacts with DDT. *Bulletin of Entomological Research*. 1947; 37(4):593–607.
124. Viana M, Hughes A, Matthiopoulos J, Ranson H, Ferguson HM. Delayed mortality effects cut the malaria transmission potential of insecticide resistant mosquitoes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2016; 113(32):8975–80.
125. Tirados I, Costantini C, Gibson G, Torr SJ. Blood-feeding behaviour of the malarial mosquito Anopheles arabiensis: implications for vector control. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*. 2006; 20(4):425–37.
126. Main BJ, Lee Y, Ferguson HM, Kreppel KS, Kihonda A, Govella NJ, et al. The Genetic Basis of Host Preference and Resting Behavior in the Major African Malaria Vector, Anopheles arabiensis. *PLOS Genetics*. 2016; 12(9):e1006303.

127. Massebo F, Balkew M, Gebre-Michael T, Lindtjørn B. Zoophagic behaviour of anopheline mosquitoes in southwest Ethiopia: opportunity for malaria vector control. *Parasites & Vectors*. 2015; 8(1):645.
128. Massebo F, Balkew M, Gebre-Michael T, Lindtjørn B. Blood meal origins and insecticide susceptibility of Anopheles arabiensis from Chano in South-West Ethiopia. *Parasites & Vectors*. 2013; 6:44.
129. Mahande, A., Mosha, F., Mahande, J. et al. Feeding and resting behaviour of malaria vector, *Anopheles arabiensis* with reference to zooprophylaxis. *Malaria Journal.* 2007; 6, 100
130. Parker JEA, Angarita-Jaimes N, Abe M, Towers CE, Towers D, McCall PJ. Infrared video tracking of Anopheles gambiae at insecticide-treated bed nets reveals rapid decisive impact after brief localised net contact. *Scientific Reports*. 2015 Sep 1;5(1):13392.
131. Tusting LS, Bottomley C, Gibson H, Kleinschmidt I, Tatem AJ, Lindsay SW, et al. Housing Improvements and Malaria Risk in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Multi-Country Analysis of Survey Data. *PLOS Medicine*. 2017 Feb 21;14(2):e1002234.
132. Rowland M, Protopopoff N. Dawn of the PBO-Pyrethroid Long Lasting Net – Light at Last. *Outlooks on Pest Management*. December 2018, 29(6) pp. 242-244(3)
133. Lorenz LM, Bradley J, Yukich J, Massue DJ, Mboma ZM, Pigeon O, et al. Comparative functional survival and equivalent annual cost of 3 long-lasting insecticidal net (LLIN) products in Tanzania: A randomised trial with 3-year follow up. *PLOS Medicine*. 2020 Sep 18;17(9):e1003248.
134. Corbel V, Akogbeto M, Damien GB, Djenontin A, Chandre F, Rogier C, et al. Combination of malaria vector control interventions in pyrethroid resistance area in Benin: a cluster randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2012; 12(8):617–26.
135. Kleinschmidt I, Schwabe C, Shiva M, Segura JL, Sima V, Mabunda SJA, et al. Combining Indoor Residual Spraying and Insecticide-Treated Net Interventions. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2009; 81(3):519–24.
136. Protopopoff N, Van Bortel W, Marcotty T, Van Herp M, Maes P, Baza D, et al. Spatial targeted vector control in the highlands of Burundi and its impact on malaria transmission. *Malaria Journal.* 2007; 6(1).