

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

A systematic review assessing the potential for release of vector species from competition following insecticide-based population suppression of *Anopheles* species in Africa

Alima Qureshi¹, John B. Connolly^{1*}

¹Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, Ascot, SL5 7PY, UK

*Corresponding author: john.connolly12@imperial.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 **Abstract**

24

25 **Background:** While insecticide-based vector control can effectively target vector species in
26 areas of high malaria endemicity, such as *Anopheles gambiae* in Africa, residual disease
27 transmission can occur. Understanding the potential role of competitive displacement
28 between vector species could inform both current insecticide-based vector control
29 programmes and the development of future complementary interventions.

30

31 **Methods:** A systematic review was conducted to identify studies of insecticide-based vector
32 control of *Anopheles* species in Africa that reported indices for absolute densities of vector
33 species. After screening against inclusion, exclusion and risk of bias criteria, studies were
34 assigned to three categories based on whether they showed population density changes
35 involving decreases in two or more vector species (D), increases in two or more vector
36 species (I), or increases in one vector species concomitant with decreases in another vector
37 species (ID). Category ID studies could thus provide evidence consistent with the release of
38 vector species from competition following the insecticide-based population suppression of
39 *Anopheles* species.

40

41 **Results:** Of 5,569 papers identified in searches, 30 were selected for quantitative and
42 qualitative analysis. Nineteen studies were assigned to category D and 1 study to category I.
43 Ten studies categorised as ID provided evidence ranging from weak to persuasive that release
44 from competition could have contributed to changes in species composition. Category ID
45 showed no statistical differences from category D for reductions in malaria transmission and
46 levels of insecticide resistance, but did so for insecticide type, pyrethroids being associated
47 with category ID. A qualitative assessment identified 5 studies that provided the most

48 convincing evidence that release from competition could have contributed to changes in
49 species composition.

50

51 **Conclusion:** This review identified evidence that insecticide-based reductions in the density
52 of *Anopheles* species in Africa could facilitate the release of other vector species from
53 competition. While it remains uncertain whether this evidence is representative of most
54 entomological sequelae from the use insecticide-based vector control in the field, 5 studies
55 provided persuasive evidence that insecticide use could lead, at least under some
56 circumstances, to competitive release of non-targeted vector species. These results should
57 inform current and future integrated vector management approaches to malaria control.

58

59

60 **Keywords:** *Anopheles*, vector control, population density, aquatic habitats, competitive
61 release, niche replacement, insecticide, insecticide-treated bednet (ITN), long-lasting
62 insecticide-treated bednet (LLIN), indoor residual spraying (IRS).

63

64

65 **Background**

66 An ecological niche can be considered as the habitat supplying the resources that are required
67 for the survival and reproduction of a species, or the roles and interactions that one species
68 has within a community of other species [1]. Competitive reduction reflects situations where
69 the density of the population of one species decreases, because of competitive interactions,
70 directly or indirectly, with another. Competitive displacement is that more extreme situation
71 where competitive interactions of one species with another causes its local extinction.

72 Competitive interactions between sympatric vector species could thus potentially play a role
73 in continued disease transmission [1].

74

75 Aquatic habitats for mosquito larval development are regarded as having the most impact on
76 adult population densities [2, 3]. Here, competition can occur via (i) exploitation, where
77 individuals compete for limited resources, (ii) interference, where individuals obstruct the
78 development of others, (iii) apparent competition, where there are differential effects of a
79 predator or parasite on co-occurring species, or (iv) oviposition deterrence, where egg-laying
80 by one species is avoided where a competitor species is present [1]. Therefore, differential
81 effects of vector control measures on sympatric vector species could facilitate the release of
82 co-located vector species from competitive displacement or reduction by the targeted species,
83 sometimes termed ‘release from competition’ or ‘competitive release’, leading to ‘niche
84 replacement’ or ‘niche expansion’ of other vector species, potentially facilitating residual or
85 increased transmission of malaria or other vector-borne diseases.

86

87 Insecticide-based vector control interventions, such as Long-Lasting Insecticide-treated
88 bednets (LLINs) and Indoor Residual Spraying (IRS), are known to target more effectively
89 vector species that are endophilic, anthropophilic and nocturnal. In Africa, the dominant
90 malaria vectors are *Anopheles gambiae s.s.*, *Anopheles coluzzii*, *Anopheles arabiensis* and
91 *Anopheles funestus* [4]. Although *An. funestus* is a complex consisting of 13 species within
92 Africa, of these only the species *An. funestus* is thought to play a role in malaria transmission
93 [5]. While the above four named species typically blood feed nocturnally, *An. funestus* and
94 *An. arabiensis* can also exhibit crepuscular and in some instances diurnal behaviour [6, 7] *An.*
95 *gambiae s.s.* and *An. coluzzii* are endophilic and anthropophilic in contrast to their sibling
96 species *An. arabiensis*, which displays exophilic, zoophilic behaviour. Thus, sufficient

97 numbers of less-efficiently targeted vector species could possibly remain in the area of vector
98 control and contribute residual, or even resurgent, transmission of malaria.

99

100 Differences in characteristics of individual species could further lead to a range of
101 sensitivities of sympatric vectors to insecticides, impacting on behavioural responses seen
102 post-intervention. Some species are known to be behaviourally resilient, exhibiting plasticity,
103 rather than showing evidence of altered innate preferences and subsequent ‘resistance’ to
104 intervention [8]. These differences could potentially aid and further the strength of any
105 competitive interactions seen. Moreover, *An. gambiae s.s.* and *An. arabiensis* are sibling
106 species known to co-occur within aquatic habitats [9, 10]. Mesocosm experiments show
107 competition affects development rate of each species in the opposite way. Development time
108 for *An. arabiensis* increases in the presence of *An. gambiae s.s.* and decreases for *An.*
109 *gambiae s.s.* in the presence of *An. arabiensis* [11]. In the laboratory, *An. arabiensis* shows
110 reduced survival when reared with *An. gambiae s.s.* compared to when reared alone [12].
111 When employing targeted vector control measures, it is thus possible to envisage that reduced
112 densities of *An. gambiae s.s.* could facilitate competitive release of *An. arabiensis*. However,
113 some caution should be exercised in interpreting whether mesocosm and laboratory-based
114 data are representative of field settings. Indeed, sampling of *Anopheles* larvae from aquatic
115 habitats can yield highly heterogeneous densities [13], making field studies exploring
116 competitive mechanisms potentially challenging.

117

118 Nonetheless, understanding the dynamics of changes in vector species composition and any
119 competitive reduction or displacement could be important for the effective use of current
120 insecticide-based vector control programmes and inform the development of novel
121 interventions [14]. While evidence for protective effects of insecticide-based methods of

122 vector control is convincing [15], between 2014-2019 previous global gains in malaria
123 control decelerated, particularly in Africa where the burden of malaria is highest [16].
124 Although there is extensive literature on studies of competitive interactions between
125 mosquito vector species outside of Africa [1, 17-19], the synthesis of studies within Africa
126 investigating the impacts of insecticide-based vector control on competitive interactions
127 between species of *Anopheles* and other vector species remains more limited [14, 20].
128 Moreover, while numerous studies from Africa have demonstrated that use of insecticides
129 can result in substantial population suppression of dominant malaria vectors, such as *An.*
130 *gambiae s.s.* or *An. funestus*, many have typically reported changes in the relative
131 proportions, rather than absolute densities, of targeted species to non-target ones [21-24],
132 making it impossible to differentiate reliably between established preferential effects of
133 insecticides on target versus non-target species and any genuine increases in the densities of
134 non-target species that might indicate true competitive release.
135
136 Thus, the extent of evidence showing decreases in the densities of targeted vector species and
137 concurrent increases in the density or densities of other species remains unclear. Restriction
138 of a synthesis of the impacts of insecticide-based vector control on competitive interactions to
139 African studies would involve analysis of a more discrete set of vector species than would be
140 the case for a global investigation. This could, therefore, elicit a more precise evaluation of
141 the entomological impacts of insecticide-based malaria vector control programmes in Africa.
142 The aim of this systematic review was thus to critically assess published research to
143 determine whether insecticide-based vector control interventions in Africa targeting
144 *Anopheles* mosquitoes could potentially facilitate the competitive release of other vector
145 species.
146

147 **Methods**

148

149 **Search strategy**

150 A review protocol was developed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for
151 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses [25] guidelines and registered with the PROSPERO
152 International prospective register of systematic reviews (record ID CRD42020194304) [26,
153 27]. The systematic literature review was undertaken from June to September 2020, using
154 PubMed, Web of Science and Science Direct. Each was searched from inception of each
155 search engine until September 2020. Search terms used included ‘intervention’, ‘insecticide’,
156 ‘insecticide residual spraying’, ‘long lasting insecticidal nets’, ‘anopheles’, ‘vector’,
157 ‘changes’, ‘resurgence’, use of which was based on search strings created from three
158 categories; exposure/treatment, subject and outcome. Boolean operators ‘OR’, ‘AND’, and
159 ‘NOT’ were used to narrow or broaden results. Reference lists of selected articles were also
160 searched. EndNote and Microsoft Excel were used as reference manager software.

161

162 **Eligibility criteria**

163 Studies identified were screened against eligibility criteria in specific stages to provide clarity
164 on the causes of exclusion. The first stage was undertaken by AQ and involved screening of
165 title and abstract for the following inclusion criteria for studies: within Africa; species of
166 *Anopheles* mosquitoes included as a mosquito of interest; insecticide-based intervention
167 tested; data contained either before and after, or with and without, intervention arms (Table
168 1). In the second stage, AQ and JBC conducted full text reviews of all studies based on the
169 previous inclusion criteria plus the following: inclusion of at least two species of mosquito
170 species, with at least one being from the *Anopheles* genus; inclusion of *Anopheles* and other
171 species density outcome data for both before and after or with and without intervention

172 implementation, with accepted density outcome data and trial design criteria, as well as
 173 inclusion and exclusion criteria as described in Table 1.

174

Criteria	Inclusion	Exclusion
Time period	Search engine inception (1940) through to September 2020	-
Language	English	Any language other than English
Region	Africa	Any region other than Africa
Trial design	Randomised control trials; non-randomised control trials; controlled before-and-after studies; cluster randomised trials with distance of more than 2km between different treatment clusters [28]; observation studies; cohort studies; cross sectional studies; small scale trials; interrupted time series studies; studies without a separate control group – provided that the comparator data was sourced from before intervention implementation took place	Laboratory-based studies; opinion pieces; modelling studies; conference abstracts; experimental hut trials; Cluster randomised trials with less than 2km distance between different treatment clusters [29-32]
Intervention type	Insecticide-based intervention	Any intervention not utilising insecticide
Mosquito type	At least one <i>Anopheles</i> mosquito species, in addition to other mosquito genera	Any mosquito genera combination that does not include <i>Anopheles</i> ; any non-mosquito species
Mosquito number	Data from minimum two types of mosquito species required, one of those being of the <i>Anopheles</i> genus (see above - 'Mosquito type')	Studies where only data from one mosquito species is recorded
Primary outcome data	Density measurements including Entomological Inoculation Rate (EIR); Human Biting Rate (HBR); other adult or larval density metrics such as Pyrethrum Spray Catches (PSCs); Human Landing Catches (HLCs); number of mosquitoes per person through human house or catch measured directly through human bait or indirectly through light traps or knockdown catches or baited huts, per stated unit of time, with a maximum time interval measurement of a month/30 days; Rate Ratio based on density data; other proportional data which is calculated using density data	Species composition data without corresponding density data; any other mosquito-based data measurement not sourced from mosquito density data; any study without any density data for the minimum of two mosquito species, one of them being of the <i>Anopheles</i> genus; any studies with time interval measurements over a month/30 days
Secondary outcome data	Proportional data for species identified in primary outcome data; epidemiological supporting data – malaria incidence and infection prevalence in any age group, diagnostically confirmed by microscopy, PCR or diagnostic test; sporozoite rates in mosquitoes; any confounding factors – measures that may have contributed to fluctuations in mosquito density e.g. land use change	Any other outcome data
Data comparator types	Data from non-intervention arm within a similar or the same locality as intervention arm; Data from an experimental hut set-up with a non-intervention arm as a comparator/control; Data from before intervention roll-out from within the same locality that intervention roll-out took place; Data from intervention arms, when being compared to non-intervention arms, have a high bed-net uptake (>50%); Data to have at least four samples/replicates or measurements per treatment, for all data compared; If not averaged over a year, data comparisons to be sourced from same seasons. If averaged yearly, maximum 30-day intervals acceptable for data from which average is taken	Data with non-intervention and intervention arms not sourced from same/similar locality as intervention arm; Data sourced post intervention roll-out is not sourced from the same or a similar locality from which pre-intervention data was sourced; Data with experimental hut set-up without a non-experimental comparator/control; Data from intervention arms, when being compared to non-intervention arms, have a low bed-net uptake (<50%); Data with less than four samples/replicates per treatment arm for all data compared; Any data comparisons from clearly different seasons (as stipulated in study); Any yearly averages that were not sources from data taken every 30 days or less

175 **Table 1.** A summary of inclusion and exclusion criteria used in order to ascertain study eligibility for systematic
 176 review.

177

178 **Risk of bias**

179 The final stage of eligibility assessment required studies to undergo bias assessment through
180 the *robvis* ROB1 tool [33], and subsequent exclusion of studies that were found to be at risk
181 of ‘High’ bias. Bias and validity assessments were undertaken through a set of outlined bias
182 risks, for each individual study satisfying all inclusion criteria (See Supplementary Table 1 in
183 Supplementary File 1).

184

185 **Data extraction**

186 A table was constructed to summarise all study results. AQ extracted data relating to author,
187 year, country, intervention type, insecticide used, vectors involved, replicates for each
188 treatment, percentage mosquito reduction in density (calculated from density data from
189 studies) and corresponding unit of measurement, percentage proportional reduction mosquito
190 and corresponding unit of measurement, percentage reduction in transmission (calculated
191 from transmission data from studies) and corresponding measurement, bias risk, confounding
192 factors, and any other details or comments. Use of percentage reduction meant that any
193 increases in density or transmission were noted as negative numbers, and any decreases were
194 noted as positive numbers (see Supplementary File 2). The following formula was used to
195 establish percentage reduction from extracted data, where ‘first value’ represents data before
196 or without intervention, and ‘second value’ represents data after or with intervention:

197
$$\text{Percentage reduction} = 100 - \text{first value} / \text{second value} * 100$$

198

199 **Categorisation of studies**

200 Following risk of bias assessments, all surviving studies were subsequently assigned to
201 density categories based on reported density changes in vector species:

- 202 • Category D - two or more vector species decreasing in absolute densities.
- 203 • Category I - two or more vector species increased in absolute densities.
- 204 • Category ID - one or more vector species decreased in absolute densities, concomitant
- 205 with increased density in one or more other vector species.

206 Individual studies were further stratified by data on location, species, date, trap type, and trap
207 placement (indoors or outdoors), intervention and density. Some studies consisted of multiple
208 density or malaria transmission observations for the stratifications. To differentiate between
209 data arising from these multiple individual observations within studies, from overall data
210 arising from studies, data involving the number of such observations within studies is denoted
211 by the terms ‘observations within studies’ or ‘individual observations’. Multiple observations
212 within a study either fell into the same density category or were heterogeneous for density
213 categories.

214

215 **Synthesis and statistical tests**

216 After scrutiny of the quality and quantity of extracted data, a mixed narrative and quantitative
217 approach was adopted for results synthesis. Statistical test application to the dataset was
218 limited due to the heterogeneity of data observations within and between individual studies,
219 such as varieties of vector species identified and multiple sources of mosquito collection
220 (indoors and outdoors, trap collection or HLCs). Considering some studies reported multiple
221 data observations (e.g. data from two different sampling methods or intervention types) any
222 statistical comparisons were made between individual data observations from each study as
223 opposed to whole studies, in order to avoid exclusion of any data. Only studies showing
224 statistically significant density data were included in the review. Statistical tests forming the
225 basis of the meta-analysis consisted of Chi-square tests of independence that considered
226 categorical variables such as intervention type, insecticide use, and insecticide resistance

227 status, and rates of transmission. A Bonferroni adjustment was applied to the result, to
228 minimise the potential for Type I error [34]. Mean transmission intensity change differences
229 between study characteristics such as insecticide resistance, were assessed using a one-way
230 ANOVA.

231

232 When extracting and assessing vector density data, to avoid bias, all fluctuations in density
233 that were recorded in each study were considered. For example, if a study took either a
234 “before and after intervention” data collection approach, or a longitudinal data collection
235 approach, or a combination of both, all data satisfying inclusion criteria were extracted and
236 assessed statistically and/or qualitatively.

237

238 Where only a proportion of longitudinal data or “before and after intervention” data from
239 within the same study involved category ID, the entire study was assigned to category ID.
240 Transmission data that was tested statistically could be sourced from either sporozoite rates
241 or clinical incidence and prevalence data, with pooled results termed ‘transmission changes’.
242 These data were assessed as individual observations rather than as whole studies, as some
243 studies measured multiple sporozoite rates and therefore had multiple transmission
244 observations for each study.

245

246 All statistical testing was carried out using IBM SPSS Version 27. Narrative analysis was
247 carried out in accordance with ‘Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic
248 reviews: reporting guideline’ [35].

249

250

251

252 **Results**

253 From 5569 publications screened for this review, 30 studies were eligible for quantitative and
254 qualitative assessments (See Supplementary Tables 2 and 3 in Supplementary File 1). The
255 review and selection process is detailed in Fig 1.

256

257 **Quantitative analysis**

258 *Summary of density changes in response to interventions*

259 Of the 30 studies selected for analysis, in total there were 50 and 23 data observations on
260 changes to density data or malaria transmission intensity data ('transmission data'),
261 respectively. 66% (n=33), 2% (n=1), and 32% (n=16) of individual density data observations
262 within those studies were assigned to category D, I and ID, respectively. Chi square tests of
263 independence were used to compare various characteristics of studies fulfilling the three
264 density change categories. Results are displayed in Table 2. A significant relationship was
265 found between insecticide type used and category, where use of a pyrethroid insecticide was
266 more likely to result in a category ID density change.


267

268 *Insecticide resistance data compared with transmission data*

269 A chi-square test of independence revealed no significant relationship between insecticide
270 resistance status and category of change in malaria transmission (increased, decreased or no
271 change), $\chi^2(1, n = 23) = 0.049, p = 0.825$. There were no statistically significant differences
272 in mean transmission, between the two insecticide resistance categories (insecticide
273 resistance reported, or not reported) as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,21) = 17.401, P$
274 $= .945$).

275

276



277

278

279 **Fig 1.** Flowchart summary of all search number results, and exclusion and inclusion numbers at each stage of the

280 search.

281

Study Characteristics	Number of observations within category D studies (%)	Number of observations within category I studies (%)	Number of observations within category ID studies (%)	Chi square tests of independence
Intervention type				
ITNs or LLINs	10 (30.4)	1 (100)	12 (75)	$\chi^2(4) = 11.564$
IRS	16 (48.4)	-	1 (6.25)	$P = 0.021$
Other (Push-Pull systems, Hessian strips, LLIB [#])	7 (21.2)	-	3 (18.75)	Bonferroni adjusted
ITB [§] + Sisal curtains, ITN + LLIN Combination)				$P < 0.0125$ $n = 50$
Insecticide type				
Pyrethroids	16 (48.5)	1 (100)	15 (93.7)	$\chi^2(2) = 10.157$
Non-pyrethroids	17 (51.5)	-	1 (6.3)	$P = 0.006^*$ Bonferroni adjusted
				$P < 0.0125$ $n = 50$
Insecticide resistance				
Resistance	18 (55)	1 (100)	7 (43.8)	$\chi^2(2) = 1.445$
No Resistance	15 (45)	-	9 (56.2)	$P = 0.486$ Bonferroni adjusted
				$P < 0.0125$ $n = 50$
Malaria transmission				
Increased transmission	2 (16)	-	1 (9)	$\chi^2(1) = 0.290$
Decreased transmission	10 (84)	-	10 (91)	$P = 0.590$ Bonferroni adjusted
				$P < 0.016$ $n = 23$
Collection methods				
Indoor	24 (72)	-	10 (55.7)	$\chi^2(4) = 5.705$
Outdoor	3 (10)	-	3 (16.6)	$P = 0.222$
Indoor + Outdoor	6 (18)	1 (100)	5 (27.7)	Bonferroni adjusted
				$P < 0.0125$ $n = 50$

282 **Table 2.** A summary of Chi square comparisons of study characteristics and density change categories. [#]LLIB: long-lasting insecticide-
 283 treated blanket; [§]ITB: insecticide-treated bednet *Represents a significant difference with Bonferroni correction
 284

285

286 **Transmission data compared to density data**

287 Only a subset of studies that were selected for final analysis recorded transmission data, as
 288 this was not a primary observation required for review as per study eligibility criteria. Where
 289 category D individual observations within studies had monitored transmission (n=12),
 290 average percentage transmission reduction was 48.57, 95% CI [1,96.15]. In category ID
 291 (n=11), average percentage transmission reduction was 54.803, 95% CI [30.16,79.44]. There
 292 were no statistically significant differences between category mean transmission data as
 293 determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(1,21) = 222.709, p = .805$).

294

295 **Qualitative assessment**

296 Because of the heterogeneity in insecticide-based vector control tools used and vector species
297 studied, it was not considered appropriate to conduct a meta-analysis on density and
298 transmission data on the 10 category ID studies that were identified. Instead, each of these
299 studies were subjected to stringent qualitative assessment, regardless of the outcomes of
300 quantitative analyses.

301

302 Qualitative assessment of category ID studies led to the dismissal of 5 studies from further
303 consideration as these were judged to provide only weak evidence for competitive release,
304 such as marginal effects on population densities, or possible alternative explanations that
305 could account for changes in vector species composition such as insecticide resistance or
306 changes in rainfall (see Supplementary File 1). The remaining 5 category ID studies were
307 judged to provide more compelling evidence that release from competition could have
308 contributed to changes in species composition due to release from competition and are
309 described below.

310

311 Sougoufara *et al.* [36] examined the impact of the introduction in 2008 of LLINs on densities
312 of the three sympatric species of the *An. gambiae* complex in Dielmo, Senegal. In 2006, prior
313 to LLIN introduction, *An. coluzzii*, *An. gambiae*, and *An. arabiensis* represented 57%, 19%,
314 and 21% of *Anopheles* captured in human landing catches (HLCs), and accounted for 4.33,
315 1.45 and 1.62 bites per person per night (bpn), respectively. By 2008, with introduction of
316 LLINs in July, the three species represented 14%, 3% and 83% of proportions of HLCs and
317 had densities of 2.00, 0.44 and 12.12 bpn. Changes in rainfall alone could not account for this
318 change in species densities, as precipitation in 2008 was 834.4mm and 583.4mm in 2006.
319 Indeed, the heavier rainfall observed in 2008 should have favoured higher densities of *An.*

320 *coluzzii* and *An. gambiae s.s.* as both species are typically most abundant in wet season in
321 Dielmo [36].

322

323 Over this same timeframe, the prevalence of malaria in children under 14 years of age
324 declined from 36.8% to 12.3%, and from 27.6% to 9.0% for those aged over 15 years,
325 presumably reflecting the shift in composition of the complex to the less endophilic,
326 anthropophilic *An. arabiensis*. By 2010, there was a rebound in the numbers of *An. gambiae*,
327 but not of *An. coluzzii*, which continued to show a decline in density. Although the absolute
328 density of *An. arabiensis* was lower in 2010 than in 2008, it remained the most abundant
329 species, with *An. coluzzii*, *An. gambiae*, and *An. arabiensis* accounting for 8, 31 and 60%,
330 respectively, of HLC samples. This rebound of *An. gambiae s.s.* may have been as a result of
331 the emergence of insecticide resistance, as increases in pyrethroid resistance had been
332 reported in the area in *An. gambiae s.l.* [37], although individual species of the complex were
333 not specifically investigated. Adherence to bednet usage may also have contributed to this
334 rebound, as self-reported LLIN usage in Dielmo reduced from 75.6% in 2008 [37] to 58.3%
335 in 2010 [36].

336

337 Russell *et al.* [38] also reported a shift in the composition of the *An. gambiae* complex from
338 *An. gambiae s.s.* to *An. arabiensis*. In that study, the impact of the 2006 introduction of
339 insecticide-treated nets (ITNs) in rural Tanzania [22] was examined between 2004 and 2009
340 [38]. Using the absolute density data of the *An. gambiae s.l.* reported in Russell *et al.* [38] for
341 2004 and 2009, and relative density data for *An. gambiae s.s.* and *An. arabiensis* reported in
342 the intervention area for 2004 [39, 40] and 2009 [38], the changes in absolute densities of *An.*
343 *gambiae s.s.* and *An. arabiensis* over this period was calculated. These data confirmed an
344 almost complete reversal in the absolute densities of *An. gambiae s.s.* and *An. arabiensis*

345 between 2004 and 2009 for this Tanzanian study (Table 3). Moreover, the authors showed
346 that this shift in species composition was not related to rainfall patterns in the area.

347

Measurement	Species	2004	2009
Absolute density \pm standard error (bpn)	<i>An. gambiae s.l.</i>	0.660 \pm 0.006	0.575 \pm 0.008
Relative proportions \pm standard error (%)	<i>An. gambiae s.s.</i>	94.7 \pm 0.05#	0.5
	<i>An. arabiensis</i>	5.3 \pm 0.05#	99.5
Absolute density, calculated using relative proportion (bpn)	<i>An. gambiae s.s.</i>	0.625	0.003
	<i>An. arabiensis</i>	0.035	0.572

Table 3. Evidence from Russell *et al.* [38] for increases in the absolute population densities of *An. arabiensis* concomitant with decreases in absolute densities of *An. gambiae* following rollout of LLINs in 2006 [22]. #Data from Scholte [39] and Scholte *et al.* [40].

348

349 Zhou *et al.* [41] reported similar, although less dramatic, observations concerning an increase
350 in density of *An. arabiensis* following decreased density of *An. gambiae s.s.* They examined
351 the entomological impacts of the introduction of ITNs in 2006 in villages in Western Kenya
352 between 2002 and 2010. In Kombewa, where the main vectors were *An. gambiae s.l.* and *An.*
353 *funestus s.l.*, mosquito density decreased by 90% from 2002 to 2007. The 2003 density of *An.*
354 *gambiae s.l.* was 1.3 females per house per night (fhn), with 1.7% of those samples being *An.*
355 *arabiensis*. In 2009, *An. gambiae s.l.* accounted for 0.23 fhn, 61.7% being *An. arabiensis*.

356


357 These data allowed the calculation here of the absolute density of *An. gambiae s.s.*, which
358 decreased more than 14-fold from 1.278 fhn in 2003 to 0.088 fhn in 2009. Over the same
359 timeframe, there was more than a six-fold increase in the absolute density of *An. arabiensis*
360 from 0.022 to 0.142 fhn. In Iguhu, *An. gambiae s.s.* decreased more than 11-fold from 2.178
361 fhn in 2003 to 0.195 fhn in 2006, whereas *An. arabiensis* doubled in density from 0.022 to
362 0.045 fhn over the same period.

363
364 Bayoh *et al.* [42] also examined the species composition of *An. gambiae s.l.* in two regions in
365 western Kenya: Asembo, where ITN ownership was circa 90% from 1999 onwards, and
366 neighbouring Seme where ITN coverage was below 5% in 1999, but gradually increased to
367 circa 30% in 2003 and was greater than 70% by 2007. In these communities, *An. gambiae s.s.*
368 and *An. arabiensis* were the two dominant malaria vectors, with *An. gambiae s.s.*
369 predominating until 1999. After 1999, the proportion of *An. gambiae s.s.* relative to *An.*
370 *arabiensis* steadily declined, so that by 2009 the latter accounted for circa 99% of indoor
371 PSCs and the former 1%. These changes could not be accounted for by rainfall.

372
373 Consistent with this proportional data from adult collections, in 2003, the absolute larval
374 density of *An. gambiae s.s.* in Seme, with low ITN coverage, was higher than that of *An.*
375 *arabiensis* and of that found in Asembo where ITN coverage was high. As ITN coverage
376 increased in Seme between 2003 and 2009, the relative proportion of *An. gambiae s.s.* to *An.*
377 *arabiensis* obtained in larval collections declined. Thus, the evidence regarding competitive
378 releases of species from this study was consistent with that of Sougoufara *et al.* [36], Russell
379 *et al.* [38] and Zhou *et al.* [41]

380
381 Gillies and Smith [43] reported on the impacts on the *An. funestus* group from the application
382 of IRS using dieldrin in the Kihurio village in the South Pare region of Tanganyika (now
383 Tanzania) in East Africa. Before spraying in November 1955, endophilic, anthropophilic *An.*
384 *funestus* predominated seasonally in box shelter catches while numbers of exophilic,
385 zoophilic *An. rivulorum* were considerably lower (Fig 2).

386



387

388 **Fig 2. Replacement of *An. funestus* by *An. rivulorum* in Kihurio, South Pare Area, Tanganyika Territory (modern day Tanzania), East Africa, following IRS with**
 389 **dieldrin in November 1955.** Data were extracted from Tables I and II and our figure was based on Fig 1 in Gillies and Smith [43]. Green dashed line shows when IRS occurred.
 390 No samples of *An. funestus* were recorded after January 1956. *Proxies for absolute density were recorded as average monthly catch of mosquitoes from the resting boxes that
 391 were used as traps throughout the study area, the number of which varied from day to day. The number of catches per month also varied. Density was therefore calculated
 392 using the unit “20 box/days” which represented the average catch of mosquitoes from outdoor traps in the study area on any one day in a month, which allowed comparison
 393 between data at different timepoints. Reproduced with permission and adapted from Tables I and II and Fig 1 in Gillies and Smith [43].

394 After spraying, from January 1956, no sample from box catches was identified as *An.*
395 *funestus*, while there were substantial increases in the seasonal density of the population of
396 *An. rivulorum*. Although increases in vector densities showed marked seasonal variation (Fig
397 2), the shift in species composition persisted for more than two years, indicating that such
398 changes in species composition were unlikely to be from environmental or rainfall conditions
399 associated with a particular season. Nor were there any reported changes in irrigation in
400 Kihurio over this time. *An. rivulorum* was identified by the presence of “two spots” on its
401 fifth wing vein, which were never found in *An. funestus*.

402

403 The proportion of *An. rivulorum* displaying this phenotype was reported to vary from region
404 to region, so it was possible that the proportion displaying “two spots” changed over the
405 course of the study. However, while this could have exaggerated the magnitude of the effect
406 from the shift in population densities, it would not alone account for the substantial increase
407 in density of *An. rivulorum*.

408

409 The authors also reported overlap, albeit incomplete, in the aquatic habitats of *An. rivulorum*
410 and *An. funestus*, found in flooded rice paddies and irrigation channels. *An. funestus*, but not
411 *An. rivulorum*, was also reported to occupy stagnant aquatic habitats. After spraying, the
412 authors did not observe the colonisation of any stagnant water sites by *An. rivulorum*. Rather,
413 they speculated that interspecific competition in overlapping aquatic habitat sites may have
414 accounted for the relative rarity of *An. rivulorum* before spraying. With the near elimination
415 of *An. funestus* following IRS, *An. rivulorum* could have been released from competition,
416 causing such a dramatic expansion in its numbers.

417

418 Gillies and Smith [43] also noted that there was a second possibility for release from
419 competition. Other studies in the area had previously reported on the reduction of population
420 density of *An. gambiae*, in addition to *An. funestus* [44]. *An. gambiae* was also found to
421 overlap with *An. rivulorum* in aquatic habitats, so some competitive interactions could be
422 envisaged. However, the annual peak numbers of *An. gambiae* were from January to March,
423 whereas both *An. funestus* and *An. rivulorum* peaked seasonally between April and June. This
424 supports the argument that the increases in density of *An. rivulorum* were caused by the
425 elimination of *An. funestus* leading to the release of *An. rivulorum* from competition in
426 aquatic habitats. Despite its increased population density, *An. rivulorum* did not contribute to
427 malaria transmission in the area because it was principally zoophilic.

428

429

430 **Discussion**

431 The aim of this systematic review was to search for evidence indicating the potential for
432 vector species to be released from competition following insecticide-based vector control of
433 *Anopheles* species in Africa. Of necessity, studies that were included in this review reported
434 population density data for at least two species of mosquito, with at least one belonging to the
435 *Anopheles* genus, both before and after, or with and without, intervention implementation
436 (Table 1).

437

438 The stringency of inclusion and exclusion criteria meant that some studies that have
439 previously been cited [1, 20] as providing evidence for release of vector species from
440 competition following insecticide use in Africa, such as Gillies and Furlong [45], were
441 identified but excluded from this analysis because they provided insufficient data on densities
442 of both insecticide-targeted species and other vector species.

443


444 Although all category ID studies provided some degree of evidence that opposing changes in
445 species densities were consistent with the release of other vector species from competition
446 (Fig 3 panel A), it is also important consider alternative explanations. Competitive
447 interactions between targeted *Anopheles* species and other vector species could also occur
448 through indirect effects via predator prey interactions where two species could be in apparent
449 asymmetric competition with each other via predator-prey interactions [46], with differential
450 impact of the insecticide on one species leading to the other species to increase in density
451 (Fig 3 panel B). In theory, in such a scenario both species would not need to share habitats,
452 but would need to share predators that could, for example, visit separate larval habitats. Both
453 species would of course still need to co-locate in the same vicinity to be preyed upon by a
454 shared predator.

455

456 Insecticide resistance could also influence changes to species composition. Helinski *et al.*
457 [47] and Zhou *et al.* [48] reported that reduced susceptibility to the insecticide was the most
458 likely cause of divergent changes in species densities resulting from insecticide use. As a
459 result, these category ID studies were excluded from the qualitative assessment. However,
460 even if a species were fully resistant to an insecticide, its density should only be maintained
461 in the presence of the insecticide, but not increase, unless additional factors are also
462 influencing species composition, such as release from competition (Fig 3 panel C), or
463 increases in habitat resources (Fig 3 panel D). In support of this, we found that instances of
464 insecticide resistance were reported for similar proportions of observations across all density
465 categories (55 and 44% in categories D and ID, respectively) and there was no statistically
466 significant relationship between insecticide resistance status and category of density change.

467

468



469

470 **Fig 3. Possible scenarios for changes in densities of species observed in studies from category ID.**

471 Intervention involves insecticide-based vector control measure targeting vector species *V* resulting in its
 472 decreased population density, concomitant with increased population density of other vector species *D*. White
 473 circles represent population densities. Black lines represent competitive pressure on a species at the tip of
 474 arrowheads, with “+” indicating a positive effect and “+ +” indicating an even stronger positive effect, while “-”
 475 indicates a negative effect and “- -” a stronger negative effect. “0” indicates negligible competitive effects.
 476 Effects shown in parentheses indicate apparent competitive effects (Holt and Bonsall, 2014). Blue arrows
 477 indicate potentially positive effects on population densities from increases in habitat resources, such as increased
 478 rainfall. The ^{IR} superscript after *D* indicates insecticide resistance in that species. Panels A and B adapted from
 479 Connolly *et al.*, *Malaria J.* (in press).

480

481 Another possible explanation to account for changes in species composition could involve
482 differential effects of the insecticide on one species over another, combined with an increase
483 in habitat resources, such as increased rainfall or changes to irrigation practices that might
484 augment aquatic habitats. The less affected species could then increase in numbers while the
485 other species reduced in density, without the need to invoke any explanations involving
486 interspecific competition (Fig 3 panel E). Some studies did attempt to address this scenario
487 by searching for evidence for altered patterns of rainfall or irrigation that could support
488 species composition changes, finding none [36, 43], while, one was excluded from the
489 narrative analysis because the reported evidence was judged to be consistent with changes in
490 species composition being driven by changes in rainfall [49].

491

492 The most common interventions in category ID studies involved LLINs or ITNs. Species that
493 are endophilic and anthropophilic are behaviourally vulnerable to indoor insecticide-based
494 vector control measures such as IRS and LLINs, which can thus lead to their effective
495 suppression. In the 10 category ID studies identified, there was heterogeneity in species that
496 increased or decreased in density. *An. arabiensis*, a species known to exhibit behavioural
497 plasticity in response to vector control, was found to increase in density in four of these
498 studies but decrease in none. By contrast, *An. funestus*, which shows less behavioural
499 plasticity and has more fixed habitat requirements [50], decreased in density in four of these
500 studies and increased in one. A greater ability to display behavioural evasion of endophilic
501 and anthropophilic needs could thus lead to residual disease transmission. Indeed, mosquito
502 taxa exhibiting such evasive traits may be more accurately described as behaviourally
503 resilient rather than insecticide resistant [8]. Thus, for each species there is likely to be an

504 interplay between physiological status to insecticides and behavioural plasticity that together
505 determine the impact of the intervention.

506

507 Limitations also surround the diversity in methods of mosquito collection between each
508 study. Whilst many studies collected indoor in addition to outdoor samples of mosquitoes,
509 some only carried out indoor collections. This may be problematic to interpret, due to the
510 behaviourally selective nature of indoor collections, likely to influence the balance of species
511 densities indoors. For example, *An. gambiae s.s.* tends to bite at night indoors and then rest
512 on the walls of dwelling and so is likely to be over-represented in indoor resting catches
513 compared with less endophilic species. However, results indicated that density change type
514 was not influenced by mosquito collection location. Nonetheless, where indoor and outdoor
515 data were reported separately rather than averaged, one study showed that density changes
516 seen from indoor collections (category ID) differed from those seen in outdoor collections
517 (category D) [51]; and two studies showed data consistent with density change type between
518 indoor and outdoor collections [52, 53].

519

520 Two additional factors may have contributed to the substantial variation in the strength of
521 evidence supporting release of other vector species from competition found in category ID
522 studies. Firstly, it is known that there can be heterogeneity in observed larval densities in
523 aquatic habitats in the field [13]. This could lead to variability in the propensity for
524 competition between vector species to occur, which could be observed as variability in the
525 frequency and effect size of any releases of other vector species from competition following
526 population suppression of *Anopheles* species. Secondly, release of other vector species from
527 competition could vary temporally. Some releases might only be temporary and occur over
528 relatively short time frames. For example, should LLIN use decline in human behavioural

529 responses to reductions in populations of targeted species, the density of that targeted species
530 could again increase to reduce or reverse any effects of release from competition on the
531 densities of other vector species [36, 37]. Thus, densities reported in in any one study may
532 not have reflected maximal levels of differences in density changes between *Anopheles*
533 species and other disease vectors.

534

535 Despite the considerable heterogeneity between category ID studies, potentially involving
536 complex interactions between habitat, climate, environment, and land use changes that may
537 have further contributed to changes in species compositions, qualitative analysis identified
538 five studies reporting significant opposing increases and decreases in vector species that were
539 considered to provide compelling evidence that it was possible for competitive release to
540 occur following insecticide-based population suppression of *Anopheles* vector species [36,
541 38, 41-43]. In all five cases, highly effective malaria vectors appeared to be replaced with less
542 efficient vectors of malaria transmission. Moreover, in the two of these studies that had also
543 reported on data relevant to disease incidence, indicators of malaria transmission also
544 decreased [41, 54] , suggesting that release of vector species from competition did not
545 increase disease transmission under those conditions.

546

547 Aquatic habitats for mosquito larval development are believed to have the most impact on
548 adult population numbers [2, 3]. Prerequisites, therefore, for direct interspecies competitive
549 interactions between mosquito species are that they are both sympatric and share the same
550 aquatic habitats. Indeed, it is noteworthy that for the five most compelling studies identified
551 in this review putative competitor species of insecticide-targeted *Anopheles* species were
552 invariably sibling species. Sibling species *An. gambiae s.s.* and *An. arabiensis* are known to
553 share larval habitats and competitive interactions between these species have been observed

554 [11], supporting an association of changes in species composition with competitive release
555 [38, 41, 42]. *An. coluzzii* and *An. arabiensis* have also been reported to share aquatic habitats,
556 adding weight to the conclusions of Sougoufara *et al.* [36] that reductions in the density of
557 *An. coluzzii* could have released *An. arabiensis* from competition. Similarly, Gillies and
558 Smith [43] found that *An. rivulorum* replaced its sibling species *An. funestus* following IRS
559 and it was reported that both species shared larval habitats.

560

561 Consistent with such observations, this review found no convincing evidence that insecticide-
562 based population suppression of *An. gambiae s.l.* could lead to increases in the densities of
563 species outside of the *Anopheles* genus, such as *Ae. aegypti*, a major vector species
564 responsible for the transmission of dengue and yellow fever. Indeed, *Ae. aegypti* and *An.*
565 *gambiae s.l.* do not share aquatic habitats, with the former favouring water tanks, discarded
566 containers, tyres, shells or treeholes [55] and the latter preferring natural aquatic habitats
567 ranging from small, clean, sunlit, ephemeral ones that lack vegetation to larger, riparian, more
568 permanent bodies of water, typically with overhanging vegetation, such as riverbanks with
569 slow-moving water or irrigation channels of rice paddies [56]. Moreover, *Ae. aegypti* is
570 considered an urban dweller whereas *An. gambiae* occupies rural locations.

571

572 While it cannot be asserted that the evidence obtained by this review is representative of
573 entomological sequelae from the use of insecticide-based vector control in the field, at least 5
574 studies provided persuasive evidence that insecticide use could, at least under some
575 circumstances, lead to competitive release of non-targeted vector species. These observations
576 should therefore form part of the considerations relating to integrated vector management
577 approaches for malaria control in Africa [57]. More broadly, novel forms of vector control
578 that could in future effectively target malaria vector species [58, 59] might also result in

579 increases in the densities of non-targeted, sympatric vector species that share larval habitats
580 or predators, at least under certain circumstances. Hence, such interventions could effectively
581 reduce the incidence of malaria and thus overall disease burden even amid the background of
582 competitive releases of other non-targeted, sympatric vector species.

583

584

585 **Declarations**

586

587 **Acknowledgements**

588 We thank Camilla Beech, Austin Burt, Mamadou Coulibaly, Silke Fuchs, Charles Godfray,
589 Talya Hackett, Andrew McKemey, John Mumford, Samantha O’Loughlin, Seynabou
590 Sougoufara, Frederic Tripet, Geoff Turner, and Katie Willis for useful input over the course
591 of this study.

592

593 **Funding**

594 Both authors are members of the Target Malaria not-for-profit research consortium, which
595 receives core funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and from the Open
596 Philanthropy Project Fund, an advised fund of Silicon Valley Community Foundation.

597

598 **Authors’ contributions**

599 AQ and JBC developed the study design and wrote the manuscript. AQ performed the
600 literature searches and conducted screening of abstracts. Both AQ and JBC screened full text
601 articles and assessed selected articles for risk of bias. AQ and JBC read, summarised, and
602 categorised all literature selected from searches. AQ and JBC generated the figures and
603 tables. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

604

605 **Abbreviations**

606 **bmn:** bites per man per night

607 **bpn:** bites per person per night

608 **fhn:** females per house per night

609 **Category D:** density of all species decreased with use of insecticide-based vector control

610 **Category I:** density of all species increased with use of insecticide-based vector control

611 **Category ID:** density of one or more vector species increased while the density of another
612 one or more species decreased with use of insecticide-based vector control

613 **HLC:** Human landing catch

614 **IRS:** Indoor residual spraying

615 **ITN:** insecticide-treated bednet

616 **LLIN:** long-lasting insecticide-treated bednet

617 **LTC:** light trap collection

618 **PSC:** pyrethrum spray catch

619 **UTN:** untreated bednet

620

621 **Availability of data and materials**

622 Not applicable. All data and material is presented in the manuscript and supplementary
623 material.

624

625 **Ethics declarations**

626

627 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:**

628 Not applicable.

629

630 **Consent for publication:**

631 Not applicable.

632

633 **Competing interests:**

634 Both authors are part of the Target Malaria not-for-profit research consortium, which aims to
635 develop novel malaria vector control tools that complement existing insecticide-based vector
636 control interventions. JBC is an employee of Imperial College London, whose role for the
637 Target Malaria not-for-profit research consortium is funded by Bill & Melinda Gates
638 Foundation, and who has received travel grants from the Foundation for the National
639 Institutes of Health. AQ is an employee of Imperial College London, whose role is funded by
640 the Open Philanthropy Project Fund, an advised fund of Silicon Valley Community
641 Foundation.

642

643

644 **References**

- 645 1. Lounibos LP: **Competitive Displacement and Reduction.** *Journal of the American*
646 *Mosquito Control Association* 2007, **23 (Suppl. 2):**276-282.
- 647 2. Godfray HC: **Mosquito ecology and control of malaria.** *J Anim Ecol* 2013, **82:**15-
648 25.
- 649 3. Barreaux AMG, Stone CM, Barreaux P, Koella JC: **The relationship between size**
650 **and longevity of the malaria vector *Anopheles gambiae* (s.s.) depends on the**
651 **larval environment.** *Parasit Vectors* 2018, **11:**485.
- 652 4. Sinka ME, Bangs MJ, Manguin S, Coetzee M, Mbogo CM, Hemingway J, Patil AP,
653 Temperley WH, Gething PW, Kabaria CW, et al: **The dominant *Anopheles* vectors**
654 **of human malaria in Africa, Europe and the Middle East: occurrence data,**
655 **distribution maps and bionomic precis.** *Parasit Vectors* 2010, **3:**117.

- 656 5. Sougoufara S, Doucouré S, Backé Sembéne PM, Harry M, Sokhna C: **Challenges for**
657 **malaria vector control in sub-Saharan Africa: Resistance and behavioral**
658 **adaptations in Anopheles populations.** *J Vector Borne Dis* 2017, **54**:4-15.
- 659 6. Doucoure S, Thiaw O, Wotodjo AN, Bouganali C, Diagne N, Parola P, Sokhna C:
660 **Anopheles arabiensis and Anopheles funestus biting patterns in Dielmo, an area**
661 **of low level exposure to malaria vectors.** *Malar J* 2020, **19**:230.
- 662 7. Sougoufara S, Diedhiou SM, Doucoure S, Diagne N, Sembene PM, Harry M, Trape
663 JF, Sokhna C, Ndiath MO: **Biting by Anopheles funestus in broad daylight after**
664 **use of long-lasting insecticidal nets: a new challenge to malaria elimination.**
665 *Malar J* 2014, **13**:125.
- 666 8. Govella NJ, Chaki PP, Killeen GF: **Entomological surveillance of behavioural**
667 **resilience and resistance in residual malaria vector populations.** *Malaria Journal*
668 2013, **12**.
- 669 9. Coetzee M, Craig M, le Sueur D: **Distribution of African malaria mosquitoes**
670 **belonging to the Anopheles gambiae complex.** *Parasitol Today* 2000, **16**:74-77.
- 671 10. Chen H, Minakawa N, Cui L, Yan G: **Conspecific Sharing of Breeding Sites by**
672 **Anopheline Female Mosquitoes (Diptera: Culicidae) Inferred from Microsatellite**
673 **Markers.** *Journal of Insect Behavior* 2007, **21**:24-33.
- 674 11. Paaijmans KP, Huijben S, Githeko AK, Takken W: **Competitive interactions**
675 **between larvae of the malaria mosquitoes Anopheles arabiensis and Anopheles**
676 **gambiae under semi-field conditions in western Kenya.** *Acta Trop* 2009, **109**:124-
677 130.
- 678 12. Kirby MJ, Lindsay SW: **Effect of temperature and inter-specific competition on**
679 **the development and survival of Anopheles gambiae sensu stricto and An.**
680 **arabiensis larvae.** *Acta Trop* 2009, **109**:118-123.
- 681 13. Majambere S, Lindsay SW, Green C, Kandeh B, Fillinger U: **Microbial larvicides**
682 **for malaria control in The Gambia.** *Malar J* 2007, **6**:76.
- 683 14. James SL, Marshall JM, Christophides GK, Okumu FO, Nolan T: **Toward the**
684 **Definition of Efficacy and Safety Criteria for Advancing Gene Drive-Modified**
685 **Mosquitoes to Field Testing.** *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis* 2020, **20**:237-251.
- 686 15. Wangdi K, Furuya-Kanamori L, Clark J, Barendregt JJ, Gattton ML, Banwell C, Kelly
687 GC, Doi SAR, Clements ACA: **Comparative effectiveness of malaria prevention**
688 **measures: a systematic review and network meta-analysis.** *Parasit Vectors* 2018,
689 **11**:210.

- 690 16. WHO: **World Malaria Report**. 2020.
- 691 17. Juliano SA, Philip Lounibos L: **Ecology of invasive mosquitoes: effects on resident**
692 **species and on human health**. *Ecology Letters* 2005, **8**:558-574.
- 693 18. Trapido H, Aitken TH: **Study of a residual population of Anopheles L.**
694 **labranchiae Falleroni in the Geremeas Valley, Sardinia**. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*
695 1953, **2**:658-676.
- 696 19. Gilotra SK, Rozeboom LE, Bhattacharya NC: **Observations on possible competitive**
697 **displacement between populations of Aedes aegypti Linnaeus and Aedes**
698 **albopictus Skuse in Calcutta**. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 1967,
699 **37**:437-446.
- 700 20. Collins CM, Bonds JAS, Quinlan MM, Mumford JD: **Effects of the removal or**
701 **reduction in density of the malaria mosquito, Anopheles gambiae s.l., on**
702 **interacting predators and competitors in local ecosystems**. *Med Vet Entomol* 2019,
703 **33**:1-15.
- 704 21. Mbogo CN, Baya NM, Ofulla AV, Githure JI, Snow RW: **The impact of**
705 **permethrin-impregnated bednets on malaria vectors of the Kenyan coast**. *Med*
706 *Vet Entomol* 1996, **10**:251-259.
- 707 22. Russell TL, Lwetoijera DW, Maliti D, Chipwaza B, Kihonda J, Charlwood JD, Smith
708 TA, Lengeler C, Mwanyangala MA, Nathan R, et al: **Impact of promoting longer-**
709 **lasting insecticide treatment of bed nets upon malaria transmission in a rural**
710 **Tanzanian setting with pre-existing high coverage of untreated nets**. *Malar J*
711 2010, **9**:187.
- 712 23. Mutuku FM, King CH, Mungai P, Mbogo C, Mwangangi J, Muchiri EM, Walker ED,
713 Kitron U: **Impact of insecticide-treated bed nets on malaria transmission indices**
714 **on the south coast of Kenya**. *Malaria Journal* 2011, **10**.
- 715 24. Mwangangi JM, Mbogo CM, Orindi BO, Muturi EJ, Midega JT, Nzovu J, Gatakaa H,
716 Githure J, Borgemeister C, Keating J, Beier JC: **Shifts in malaria vector species**
717 **composition and transmission dynamics along the Kenyan coast over the past 20**
718 **years**. *Malar J* 2013, **12**:13.
- 719 25. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P: **Preferred reporting items**
720 **for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement**. *BMJ* 2009,
721 **339**:b2535.
- 722 26. **PROSPERO, International prospective register of systematic reviews**
723 [\[https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/\]](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/)

- 724 27. Connolly JB, Qureshi A: **Systematic review of evidence on the potential for**
725 **insecticide-based control of the human malaria vector *An. gambiae* to release**
726 **other disease vectors from competition.** *PROSPERO* 2020, **CRD42020194304.**
- 727 28. Verdonschot PFM, Besse-Lototskaya AA: **Flight distance of mosquitoes**
728 **(Culicidae): A metadata analysis to support the management of barrier zones**
729 **around rewetted and newly constructed wetlands.** *Limnologica* 2014, **45:69-79.**
- 730 29. Midega JT, Mbogo CM, Mwambi H, Wilson MD, Ojwang G, Mwangangi JM, Nzovu
731 JG, Githure JI, Yan G, Beier JC: **Estimating Dispersal and Survival of *Anopheles***
732 ***gambiae* and *Anopheles funestus* Along the Kenyan Coast by Using Mark–**
733 **Release–Recapture Methods.** *Journal of Medical Entomology* 2007, **44:923-929.**
- 734 30. Takken W, Charlwood JD, Billingsley PF, Gort G: **Dispersal and survival of**
735 ***Anopheles funestus* and *A. gambiae* s.l. (Diptera: Culicidae) during the rainy**
736 **season in southeast Tanzania.** *Bulletin of Entomological Research* 2009, **88.**
- 737 31. Thomas CJ, Cross DE, Bøgh C: **Landscape movements of *Anopheles gambiae***
738 **malaria vector mosquitoes in rural Gambia.** *PLoS One* 2013, **8:e68679.**
- 739 32. Gillies MT: **Studies on the dispersion and survival of *Anopheles gambiae* Giles in**
740 **East Africa, by means of marking and release experiments.** *Bulletin of*
741 *Entomological Research* 1961, **52:99-127.**
- 742 33. McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT: **Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package**
743 **and Shiny web app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments.** *Res Synth Methods*
744 2020.
- 745 34. Wright SP: **Adjusted P-Values for Simultaneous Inference.** *Biometrics* 1992, **48.**
- 746 35. Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, Katikireddi SV, Brennan SE, Ellis S,
747 Hartmann-Boyce J, Ryan R, Shepperd S, Thomas J, et al: **Synthesis without meta-**
748 **analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline.** *BMJ* 2020, **368:16890.**
- 749 36. Sougoufara S, Harry M, Doucouré S, Sembène PM, Sokhna C: **Shift in species**
750 **composition in the *Anopheles gambiae* complex after implementation of long-**
751 **lasting insecticidal nets in Dielmo, Senegal.** *Med Vet Entomol* 2016, **30:365-368.**
- 752 37. Trape J-F, Tall A, Sokhna C, Ly AB, Diagne N, Ndiath O, Mazonot C, Richard V,
753 Badiane A, Dieye-Ba F, et al: **The rise and fall of malaria in a west African rural**
754 **community, Dielmo, Senegal, from 1990 to 2012: a 22 year longitudinal study.**
755 *Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2014, **14:476-488.**
- 756 38. Russell TL, Govella NJ, Azizi S, Drakeley CJ, Kachur SP, Killeen GF: **Increased**
757 **proportions of outdoor feeding among residual malaria vector populations**

- 758 **following increased use of insecticide-treated nets in rural Tanzania. *Malar J*
759 2011, **10**:80.**
- 760 39. Scholte EJ: **The entomopathogenic fungus *Metarhizium anisopliae* for mosquito**
761 **control. Impact on the adult stage of the African malaria vector *Anopheles***
762 ***gambiae* and filariasis vector *Culex quinquefasciatus*.** Wageningen University,
763 Laboratory of Entomology; 2004.
- 764 40. Scholte EJ, Ng'habi K, Kihonda J, Takken W, Paaismans K, Abdulla S, Killeen GF,
765 Knols BG: **An entomopathogenic fungus for control of adult African malaria**
766 **mosquitoes.** *Science* 2005, **308**:1641-1642.
- 767 41. Zhou G, Afrane YA, Vardo-Zalik AM, Atieli H, Zhong D, Wamae P, Himeidan YE,
768 Minakawa N, Githeko AK, Yan G: **Changing patterns of malaria epidemiology**
769 **between 2002 and 2010 in Western Kenya: the fall and rise of malaria.** *PLoS One*
770 2011, **6**:e20318.
- 771 42. Bayoh MN, Mathias DK, Odiere MR, Mutuku FM, Kamau L, Gimnig JE, Vulule JM,
772 Hawley WA, Hamel MJ, Walker ED: ***Anopheles gambiae*: historical population**
773 **decline associated with regional distribution of insecticide-treated bed nets in**
774 **western Nyanza Province, Kenya.** *Malar J* 2010, **9**:62.
- 775 43. Gillies MT, Smith A: **The effect of a residual house-spraying campaign in East**
776 **Africa on species balance in the *Anopheles funestus* group. The replacement of**
777 ***A. funestus* Giles by *A. rivulorum* Leeson.** *Bulletin of Entomological Research*
778 1960, **51**.
- 779 44. Smith A: **Effect of residual house spraying in the plains of anopheline densities in**
780 **huts on the Pare Mountains.** *Nature* 1959, **183**:198-199.
- 781 45. Gillies MT, Furlong M: **An investigation into the behaviour of *Anopheles parensis***
782 **Gillies at Malindi on the Kenya coast.** *Bulletin of Entomological Research* 1964,
783 **55**:1-16.
- 784 46. Holt RD, Bonsall MB: **Apparent Competition.** *Annual Review of Ecology,*
785 *Evolution, and Systematics* 2017, **48**:447-471.
- 786 47. Helinski ME, Nuwa A, Protopopoff N, Feldman M, Ojuka P, Oguttu DW, Abeku TA,
787 Meek S: **Entomological surveillance following a long-lasting insecticidal net**
788 **universal coverage campaign in Midwestern Uganda.** *Parasit Vectors* 2015, **8**:458.
- 789 48. Zhou GF, Lee MC, Githeko AK, Atieli HE, Yan GY: **Insecticide-Treated Net**
790 **Campaign and Malaria Transmission in Western Kenya: 2003-2015.** *Frontiers in*
791 *Public Health* 2016, **4**.

- 792 49. Sougoufara S, Thiaw O, Cailleau A, Diagne N, Harry M, Bouganali C, Sembene PM,
793 Doucoure S, Sokhna C: **The Impact of Periodic Distribution Campaigns of Long-**
794 **Lasting Insecticidal-Treated Bed Nets on Malaria Vector Dynamics and Human**
795 **Exposure in Dielmo, Senegal.** *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*
796 2018, **98**:1343-1352.
- 797 50. Nambunga IH, Ngowo HS, Mapua SA, Hape EE, Msugupakulya BJ, Msaky DS,
798 Mhumbira NT, McHwembo KR, Tamayamali GZ, Mlembe SV, et al: **Aquatic**
799 **habitats of the malaria vector Anopheles funestus in rural south-eastern**
800 **Tanzania.** *Malar J* 2020, **19**:219.
- 801 51. Mmbando AS, Ngowo HS, Kilalangongono M, Abbas S, Matowo NS, Moore SJ,
802 Okumu FO: **Small-scale field evaluation of push-pull system against early- and**
803 **outdoor-biting malaria mosquitoes in an area of high pyrethroid resistance in**
804 **Tanzania.** *Wellcome open research* 2017, **2**:112-112.
- 805 52. Meyers JI, Pathikonda S, Popkin-Hall ZR, Medeiros MC, Fuseini G, Matias A, Garcia
806 G, Overgaard HJ, Kulkarni V, Reddy VP, et al: **Increasing outdoor host-seeking in**
807 **Anopheles gambiae over 6 years of vector control on Bioko Island.** *Malar J* 2016,
808 **15**:239.
- 809 53. Pinder M, Jawara M, Jarju LBS, Salami K, Jeffries D, Adiamoh M, Bojang K, Correa
810 S, Kandeh B, Kaur H, et al: **Efficacy of indoor residual spraying with**
811 **dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane against malaria in Gambian communities with**
812 **high usage of long-lasting insecticidal mosquito nets: a cluster-randomised**
813 **controlled trial.** *Lancet* 2015, **385**:1436-1446.
- 814 54. Sougoufara S, Harry M, Doucoure S, Sembene PM, Sokhna C: **Shift in species**
815 **composition in the Anopheles gambiae complex after implementation of long-**
816 **lasting insecticidal nets in Dielmo, Senegal.** *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*
817 2016, **30**:365-368.
- 818 55. Saleh F, Kitau J, Konradsen F, Alifrangis M, Lin CH, Juma S, McHenga SS, Saadaty
819 T, Schioler KL: **Habitat Characteristics For Immature Stages of Aedes aegypti In**
820 **Zanzibar City, Tanzania.** *J Am Mosq Control Assoc* 2018, **34**:190-200.
- 821 56. Diabate A, Dabire RK, Kim EH, Dalton R, Millogo N, Baldet T, Simard F, Gimnig
822 JE, Hawley WA, Lehmann T: **Larval development of the molecular forms of**
823 **Anopheles gambiae (Diptera: Culicidae) in different habitats: a transplantation**
824 **experiment.** *J Med Entomol* 2005, **42**:548-553.

- 825 57. Beier JC, Keating J, Githure JJ, Macdonald MB, Impoinvil DE, Novak RJ:
826 **Integrated vector management for malaria control.** *Malar J* 2008, **7 Suppl 1**:S4.
827 58. Alphey L: **Genetic control of mosquitoes.** *Annu Rev Entomol* 2014, **59**:205-224.
828 59. Burt A, Coulibaly M, Crisanti A, Diabate A, Kayondo JK: **Gene drive to reduce**
829 **malaria transmission in sub-Saharan Africa.** *Journal of Responsible Innovation*
830 2018, **5**:S66-S80.
831