

27 associated with increased odds of accepting IRS (AOR = 29.34, 95% CI: 11.14 - 77.30). High
28 acceptability level was associated with unemployment (AOR = 1.92, 95% CI: 1.07 - 3.44).
29 There were no associations found between acceptability levels and community-level factors
30 such as information, education, communication dissemination, awareness achieved through
31 door-to-door sensitization, and public address system.

32 **Conclusion:** Acceptability level of indoor residual spraying was relatively high among
33 households of Luangwa District suggesting that the interventions are more acceptable which is
34 essential in reaching malaria elimination by 2030. Finding that community factors known to
35 influence acceptability such as information, education and communication as well as awareness
36 were not important to influencing acceptability suggests need for reinforcing messages related
37 to indoor residual spraying and redefining the community sensitization approaches to make
38 indoor residual spraying more acceptable.

39 **Key words:** Acceptability, Indoor residual spraying, Malaria, Luangwa District

40

41 **Introduction**

42 Malaria still remains a global public health problem with an estimated 241 million malaria
43 cases in 2020 in 85 malaria endemic countries increasing from 227 million in 2019, with most
44 of this increase coming from countries in the WHO African Region.(1). Malaria is endemic in
45 Zambia despite massive scale up of control efforts in the past decade and is one of the most
46 important vector-borne infection of concern (2). Similar to most sub-Saharan African countries,
47 indoor residual spraying (IRS) remains one of the strategies most effective for malaria control
48 (3).

49 IRS is based on the principle that the sprayed insecticide leaves a residue of chemical on the
50 interior wall of the house that is effective to kill mosquitoes resulting in the disruption of the
51 disease transmission (4). However, acceptability by the households and community leaders is

52 important to achieve high coverage (5,6) and accelerate the movement towards malaria
53 elimination by the year 2030 (7).

54 Acceptability of IRS varies from country to country and is influenced by different factors. For
55 example, household acceptability of IRS was 97.6% in Southern Mexico, 41% in Mozambique
56 29.4% in South Africa and 27.8% in eastern Ethiopia (8,9,10). WHO recommends that at least
57 80% of the households should be sprayed for the intervention to have an impact on transmission
58 cycle. There are several factors that are associated with households' refusal of IRS
59 implementation. Among these factors are community understanding and beliefs about the
60 purpose of an IRS program (8–10). Some members of the community have concerns on the
61 negative effects of IRS and have fear of IRS program, which may lead to refusal of the
62 intervention (10). Other concerns are in regard to spray residue discoloring inner walls, allergic
63 reactions to the chemical, households being informed at short notice, challenges of furniture
64 movement and not being available at the time of spraying (11–14). Furthermore, for malaria
65 control strategies using IRS to be more effective, meaningful and sustainable, aspects such as
66 community engagement, knowledge, attitudes and practices has to be taken into consideration
67 (15).

68 Some areas in Zambia such as Luangwa district remain high malaria transmission zones despite
69 several intervention strategies. According to the district malaria surveillance report for 2018,
70 malaria incidence for Luangwa district was at 459 per 1000. In 2019, Luangwa district had
71 69.2% of sprayed houses after the implementation of IRS. The district had a gap of 10.8% to
72 reach the minimum target of 80% for high-risk endemic areas (17). To our knowledge, limited
73 evidence exists on acceptability of IRS by the households in Luangwa district, Zambia.
74 Therefore, the current study set out to measure acceptability and associated factors of IRS for
75 the control of malaria by the households in Luangwa district, Zambia.

76 **Implementation of IRS in Luangwa**

77 Implementation of IRS in Zambia began in 2003, following the success of IRS by the private
78 sector at the Konkola Copper Mines. Currently, the National Malaria Control Centre (NMCC)
79 of the ministry of health is implementing IRS for malaria as part of an integrated vector
80 management strategy. In 2010 the NMCC with President's Malaria Initiatives support,
81 expanded IRS to cover a total of 1.3 million structures in 54 districts, representing 75% of the
82 districts in the country and protecting over 6 million people. From these structures Luangwa
83 district targeted 4000 structures to be sprayed.

84 According to Malaria reports from Luangwa District Health Office it clearly stated that from
85 the time IRS started, the operations were done once annually during the months of December
86 and January. Government policy is that IRS is supposed to be carried out every six months
87 because the chemical which was mainly used (Actellic) lasted for six months. A study revealed
88 that the practice of conducting IRS once per year, compromises the effectiveness of the
89 intervention (20). As a result, the district was still recording high malaria incidence rates in the
90 country.

91 **Materials and Methods**

92 **Study setting**

93 The study was conducted in Luangwa district which is located in Eastern part of Lusaka
94 Province from October to November 2020. Luangwa district is served by seventeen rural health
95 facilities, two of which have both inpatient and outpatient services. Most households are
96 primarily situated along the Luangwa River with fishing and small-scale agriculture being the
97 primary livelihoods of the population. The geographical location of the district and given that
98 most populations live along Luangwa River makes the district be more prone to having high
99 prevalence of malaria cases especially with the marked seasonal patterns after the rains from
100 December to April.

101

102 **Study design and population**

103 A cross-sectional survey was conducted in November 2020 in Luangwa district to assess the
104 acceptability of indoor residual spraying for malaria control. The cross-sectional study was
105 chosen because it assesses the prevalence of disease in clinic based samples and can usually be
106 conducted relatively faster and inexpensive (17). The study population was a subset of the
107 target population who experienced indoor residual spraying for the past one year. Luangwa
108 district has approximately 4672 number of households with a projected population of 35710
109 (18). The households were selected based on the eligibility criteria.

110 **Inclusion criteria**

111 All households who were contacted and asked to spray their homes were included in the study

112 ***Exclusion criteria***

113 All those who didn't give consent to be included in the study and were not available at the
114 time of data collection were excluded

115

116 **Sample size and sampling**

117 This was a two-stage cluster sampling method and was on hierarchical structure. The hierarchy
118 (multilevel) follows households as level-1, and communities as level-2 implying that
119 households were nested in communities. The sample size was determined by the use of the
120 prevalence formula with a proportion of 0.5, the sample size was 385, in order to adjust for the
121 required sample size for cluster sampling a design effect (deff) of 2 was used which brought
122 the sample size to 770 a 10 % non-response rate was adjusted and 856 households were invited
123 for interview, 790 completed the interview yielding 92% response rate.

124 A probability proportional to size was used to determine the total number of households to be
125 selected in each community. This was determined by dividing the total catchment population
126 for a health facility over the total population for the district multiplied by the sample size. The
127 study thus sampled 78 households from Luangwa Boma, 62 from Feira, 27 from Luangwa
128 District Hospital, 61 from Mandombe, 16 from Mphuka, 19 from Jenairo, 25 from Kapoche,

129 18 from Kanemele, 65 from Luangwa high school, 70 from Katondwe mission, 77 from
130 Chitope, 45 from Mangelengele, 70 from Kaunga, 39 from Kasinsa, 48 from Kavalamanja and
131 70 from Sinyawagora.

132

133 ***Data collection techniques and tools***

134 Structured questionnaires were administered by trained research assistants and investigator to
135 collect data at each of the sampled households using Magpi data collection tool. The
136 questionnaire was all inclusive to gather information pertaining to community acceptability
137 and associated factors involving interventions of indoor residual house spraying for malaria
138 transmission.

139 **Variables**

140 **Outcome variable**

141 The outcome variable was acceptability which was defined as the extent to which people
142 delivering or receiving a health care intervention consider IRS to be appropriate, based on
143 anticipated or experienced cognitive and emotional response to the intervention (19).
144 Acceptability was measured using a 5-point likert scale, with the following categories: strongly
145 disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree. Acceptability was determined by
146 answering four questions on a scale of 0 to 4, with 0 indicating strongly disagree and 4
147 indicating strongly agree. The greatest possible score was obtained by multiplying the highest
148 Likert scale code by the total number of questions. An individual was judged to have high
149 acceptability if they had a score of 12 or higher, indicating at least 75% agreement with the
150 implementation of the IRS (20).

151 **Independent variables**

152 ***House hold level fixed effects***

153 The household level factors included: timing of IRS, advised to wait before entering
154 the house after spraying, employment status, residential, informed consent, attitude,
155 gender and educational level.

156 **Community level random effects**

157 The community level factors included: information, education and communication
158 dissemination and conduct of awareness campaigns.

159

160 ***Data analysis and modelling***

161 **Model diagnostics and adequacy checking**

162 We used variance inflation factor (VIF) to check for multicollinearity among the independent
163 variables with the cut-off point of $1/VIF$ not more than 0.1. None of the variables in the model
164 suggested multicollinearity. The final model included possible interaction terms (household-
165 level variables, community-level variables, and intra-level interactions) and none were
166 significant. The statistical significance level was set at alpha 0.05 (two-tailed). All analyses
167 were conducted with Stata 14.1 (Stata Corp., College Station, Texas, USA).

168 **Statistical analysis**

169 We conducted descriptive statistics that included frequency analysis (percentages) for
170 categorical variables. Univariable analysis was conducted to assess candidate variables as
171 determinates for acceptability, was quantified by the OR and 95% confidence interval (CI).
172 The effect of each independent variable on the outcome variable was assessed as candidate
173 variable for the multivariable analysis using a significance level of $p < 0.2$.

174 **Building multilevel model**

175 In our study, we wanted to estimate the proportion variation due to chance of not accepting
176 IRS rather than accepting it that lies between communities. Data was nested with two levels of
177 hierarchy (individual households and communities). Household level one variables were nested
178 within level two (communities). We constructed a null model (model without predictors) using

179 the command: “xtmelogit” with an option of “var” and “or” to obtain odds ratios and the
180 equation is:

$$181 \quad Y_{ij} = B_{00} + U_{0j} + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (1)$$

182

183 Where: Y_{ij} is the acceptability status of the i^{th} household in j^{th} community; B_{00} is the probability
184 of not accepting IRS without the independent variables; U_{0j} is the community-level effect and
185 ε_{ij} is the error term at household level.

186 The intraclass correlation which represented the proportion of the between-community
187 variation was calculated using the following formula:

188

$$189 \quad ICC = \frac{\text{Var}(U_{0j})}{\text{Var}(U_{0j}) + (\pi^2/3)} \quad (2)$$

190

191 Where: $\text{Var}(U_{0j})$ is equal to the random intercept variance at the second level (community).

192 As the value of $\text{Var}(U_{0j})$ increases, the more the variation of odds between communities. The
193 value of π^2 (is approximately 3.29) from the standard logistic distribution. ICC represents the
194 proportion of variation in not accepting IRS between communities which ranges from zero to
195 one. If the ICC is closer to one (significant different from zero) suggests that there is significant
196 variation in not accepting IRS between communities and if closer to zero (not significant
197 different from zero) no variation and the traditional single level regression may be appropriate
198 for analysis (21).

199 The null model showed that $\text{Var}(U_{0j})$ of 4.91 and the ICC was 59% suggesting that multilevel
200 regression model was appropriate than the traditional single level regression analysis. In this
201 study 59% in variation in odds of not accepting IRS was explained by community-level
202 differences.

203 Second, constrained intermediary model was constructed to determine the extent of variation
 204 in the household-level variables between communities. We estimated the variation of the effect
 205 of household variables on the odds of not accepting IRS from household to household to
 206 hospital since we thought this could be influenced by the services characteristics. A constrained
 207 was constructed with level-1 variables and community variables with no interaction between
 208 household-level variables with community-level variables(Aguinis, 2013). The following is the
 209 general equation:

$$210 \quad Y_{ij} = B_{00} + B_{10} * X_{ij} + B_{01} * X_j + U_{0j} \quad (3)$$

211 Where: X_{ij} is level-1 variables; X_j are level-2 variables (community variables); B_{10} is fixed
 212 slope for the household-level variables, and B_{01} is fixed slope for X_j , which is the overall effect
 213 of the household level variables. This was followed by construction the augmented model
 214 which was done by testing household-level variables one by one. It is similar to the constrained
 215 model and the random slope variance suggests the variation of household-level variables from
 216 one community to the other and contains residual term associated with household-level
 217 variables. The following is the general equation:

$$218$$

$$219 \quad Y_{ij} = B_{00} + (B_{10} + U_{1j}) * X_{ij} + B_{01} * X_j + U_{0j} \quad (4)$$

220

221 Where: U_{1j} represents the deviance of the community-specific slope which is the effect of
 222 household-level variables in a given community. The construction of the two models is to
 223 assess which one better fit to the data. Better fit was determined by likelihood ratio test and the
 224 smaller the deviance the better the fit.

225 Third, the final model was constructed to determine whether variables that can explain not
 226 accepting IRS and the following formula represents the model:

227

$$228 \quad Y_{ij} = B_{00} + (B_{10} + U_{1j}) * X_{ij} + B_{01} * X_j + B_{11} * X_{ij} * X_j + U_{0j} \quad (5)$$

229

230 The equation is similar to equations two and three except that B_{11} estimates the coefficient for
231 the interaction between household-level variables and community-level variables. In the
232 analysis, the odds ratios were reported with the corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI).

233

234 **Interpretation of the final model**

235 Before interpreting the final model, we considered a number of important aspects. First, Akaike
236 Information Criteria (AIC) value for the random intercept was bigger compared to the one for
237 random intercept and fixed coefficient model suggesting that the model with random intercept
238 and fixed slope had a better fit than null model with random intercept in explaining not
239 accepting IRS. Second, the deviance for the null model was bigger than the one for the random
240 intercept and fixed slope model suggesting that the latter model was better (i.e., the lower the
241 deviance the better the model). Third, the deviance-based chi-square value was significant
242 suggesting that random coefficient model was better than single-level multiple logistic
243 regression model in predicting not accepting IRS.

244 **Ethical clearance**

245 This study obtained ethical clearance from University of Zambia Biomedical Research Ethics
246 Committee (UNZABREC) (IRB 00001131) and National Health Research Authority of
247 Zambia (000014/14/09/2020), Verbal informed consent was obtained from the participants
248 before answering the questionnaire. All the participants had the chance to leave the study at
249 any time.

250

251

252

253 **Results**

254 Table 1 shows the social demographic and community characteristics of participants. Among
255 the 790 participants, majority 353 (44.9%) were in the age range between 31 – 45 years, 442
256 (54.4%) were females and 566 (71.4%) were married. Most of the participants 492 (62.3%)
257 had no or primary education and 487 (61.7%) were employed. More than three-quarters 696
258 (88.1%) were from rural areas and two-thirds 528 (66.8%) of the households had children under
259 the age of 5 years. Almost everyone 787 (99.6%) indicated that they were given instructions
260 for preparation of IRS, 769 (97.3%) were informed before spraying, 729 (92.3%) had positive
261 attitude toward IRS and 783 (99.1%) were advised to wait after IRS. Majority 646 (81.8%)
262 indicated that they had no side effects after IRS and 710 (89.9%) responded that the timing for
263 IRS was no appropriate.

264 For community characteristics, majority 728 (92.2%) households participated in the
265 preparatory meetings, 765 (96.8%) households revealed that spray operators had identity cards
266 and most of the community participants 720 (91.1%) complied to IRS intervention. Most of
267 the awareness campaigns 357 (45.2%) were mostly done through public address system.
268 Slightly above half 414 (52.4%) had IEC disseminated through meetings and 403 (51.0%)
269 households revealed that spray operators were in the age range between 25 – 29 years. All
270 community members were aware, engaged and persuaded to participate in IRS programme.

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279 *Table 1: Basic and community characteristics of household in Luangwa district*

Basic characteristics		Community characteristics	
Characteristic	Frequency (%)	characteristic	Frequency (%)
Age (years)		Meeting held	62 (7.9)
< 30	192 (24.4%)	No	728 (92.2)
31- 45	353 (44.9%)	Yes	
≥ 46	242 (30.8%)		
Gender		Id card	
Male	368 (46.6)	No	765 (96.8)
Female	422 (53.4)	Yes	25 (3.2)
Marital status		Community complies	
Single	223 (28.3%)	No	70 (8.9)
Married	566 (71.7%)	Yes	720 (91.1)
Educational level		Awareness done	
No education or Primary	492 (62.3%)	Meetings	227 (28.7%)
Secondary	244 (30.9%)	Door to door	206 (26.1%)
Tertiary	54 (6.8%)	PA system	357 (45.2%)
Employment status		IEC disseminated	
Employed	487 (61.7%)	Meetings	414 (52.4%)
Unemployed	303 (38.4%)	Electronic print media	376 (47.6)
Residential		Age of operators (years)	
Urban	94 (11.9)	≤24	59 (7.5)
Rural	696 (88.1)	25-29	403 (51.0)
		≥ 30	328 (41.5)
Number of children under 5 years			
None	252 (31.9)		
1 – 3	528 (66.8)		
≥ 4	10 (1.3)		
Informed before spraying			
No	21 (2.7)		
Yes	769 (97.3)		
Instruction for IRS			
No	3 (0.4)		
Yes	787 (99.6)		
Timing			
timing not appropriate	710 (89.9)		
timing appropriate	80 (10.1)		
Attitude			
negative	61 (7.7)		
positive	729 (92.3)		
Side effects			
No	646 (81.8)		
Yes	144 (18.2)		
Advised to wait			
No	7 (0.9)		
Yes	783 (99.1)		

280

281

282

283 **Acceptability Parameters**

284 The questions that participants were asked regarding acceptability of IRS were on a 5-point
285 Likert's scale. In this study, the overall acceptability of IRS 687 (87%, [95% CI: 1.01-1.24]).
286 More than half 442 (55.9%) of the participants agreed to the approach used, 442 (55.9%) agreed
287 to the implementation approach, 428 (54.2%) liked the implementation and 422 (53.4%)
288 welcomed the implementation of IRS (Table 2).

289 ***Table 2: Acceptability parameters and participants responses***

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Does the approach used for IRS meets your approval?	21 (2.7)	7 (0.9)	16 (2.0)	442 (55.9)	304 (38.5)
Is the implementation approach of IRS appealing?	41 (5.2)	19 (2.4)	17 (2.2)	442 (55.9)	265 (33.5)
Do you like the implementation of IRS?	29 (3.7)	30 (3.8)	17 (2.2)	428 (54.2)	286 (36.2)
Do you welcome the implementation of IRS?	0 (0)	10 (1.3)	15 (1.9)	422 (53.4)	343 (43.4)

290

291

292 **Multilevel predictors of indoor residual spraying acceptability**

293 **Final model**

294 To arrive at the final model, we used the empty and intermediate model and being guided by
295 the deviance of the augmented intermediated model and constrained model as well as the
296 Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) the final model which is a combination of a random slope
297 was found to be appropriate. Therefore, the results presented are for the adjusted multilevel
298 analysis. In the univariate analysis to select potential variables for the adjusted multilevel
299 analysis timing, side effects, attitude, advised to wait, informed about spraying and IEC
300 dissemination were significant.

301 Table 3 shows the adjusted multilevel analysis, if accepted, production will need this
302 reference to link the reader to the table. Household level factors timing not being appropriate
303 for IRS significantly reduced the odds of accepting the intervention (OR 0.55, 95%CI: 0.20-
304 0.86). Advised to wait before entering the household after IRS significantly increased the

305 odds of accepting IRS by 8.47 times (95%CI: 1.00-72.13). Employment status increased the
306 odds of accepting IRS (OR 1.92, 95%CI: 1.07-3.44) p value 0.029. Positive attitude among
307 household heads increased the odds of accepting IRS (OR 29.34 95%CI: 11.14-77.30) p
308 value 0.0001. The other variables were not significant.

309 In the adjusted multilevel analysis, for community level factors Information, education and
310 communication disseminated through electronic print media insignificantly increased the
311 odds of accepting IRS intervention (OR 1.71, 95%CI: 0.22-13.20). Awareness of IRS
312 campaign done through public address system insignificantly increased the odds of accepting
313 IRS (OR 1.05, 955CI: 0.06-18.00) and the awareness done through door-to-door sensitization
314 insignificantly increased the odds of accepting IRS intervention (OR 1.86, 95%CI: 0.04-
315 16.97). Other known community level factors such as community awareness, community
316 engagement and community member persuasion were not factors in this study because all the
317 participants were aware, engaged and persuaded to participate in IRS programming.

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331 **Table 3: Multilevel analysis of predictors of IRS acceptability**

	Unadjusted estimates		Adjusted estimates	
	Household level factors			
Variable	OR (95%CI)	P. value	OR (95%CI)	P. value
Timing				
Timing appropriate	1			
Timing not appropriate	0.33 (0.19-0.58)	<0.0001	0.55 (0.20-0.86)	0.019
Side effects				
No	1			
yes	0.28 (0.18-0.43)	<0.0001	0.76 (0.40-1.45)	0.402
Gender				
Male	1			
Female	0.81 (0.53-1.24)	0.338	1.20 (0.65-2.19)	0.562
Attitude				
Negative	1			
Positive	46.15 (23.56-90.43)	<0.0001	29.34 (11.14-77.30)	<0.0001
Advised to wait				
No	1			
Yes	17.68 (3.38-92.39)	0.001	8.47 (1.00-72.13)	0.050
Informed spraying				
No	1			
yes	5.45 (2.24-13.29)	<0.0001	3.72(0.67-20.49)	0.132
Educational level				
Primary and below	1			
Secondary	0.66 (0.42-1.03)	0.067	0.82 (0.46-1.46)	0.499
Tertiary	0.72 (0.32-1.61)	0.429	1.06 (0.39-2.85)	0.911
Employment status				
Employed	1			
Unemployed	1.67 (1.06-2.63)	0.028	1.92 (1.07-3.44)	0.029
Residential				
Urban	1			
Rural	0.99 (0.52-1.88)	0.964	1.25 (0.24-6.51)	0.795
	Community level factors			
IEC disseminated				
Meetings	1			
Electronic print media	2.71 (1.71-4.28)	<0.0001	1.71 (0.22-13.20)	0.607
Awareness done				
Meetings	1			
Door to door sensitization	1.07 (0.59-1.94)	0.813	1.86 (0.04-16.97)	0.922
PA system	0.79 (0.48-1.30)	0.358	1.05 (0.06-18.00)	0.973

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339 **Discussion**

340 This study was set to measure the level of acceptability of the interventions involving IRS
341 among household's heads in Luangwa District and factors contributing to the level of
342 acceptability. The key findings of the study indicate that the overall acceptability of IRS among
343 household heads was relatively high at 87%. The main factors in this current study that were
344 found to contribute significantly towards the level of acceptability include timing, attitude,
345 advised to wait and employment status. Although not significant, it was observed that
346 community level factors such as dissemination of information, education and communication
347 contributed to the level of acceptability.

348 In this study, we found relatively high variability in acceptability of indoor residual spraying
349 across different settings. The acceptability level of IRS varies from one setting to another based
350 on different influencing factors. In this current study the highest variability of acceptability was
351 at 70% and lowest was 3%. This finding indicate that the difference may be attributed to the
352 differences in the community settings and understanding of information education regarding
353 indoor residual spraying. A study to identify community knowledge and acceptance of indoor
354 residual spraying found that most participants who accepted the spraying were happy that the
355 intervention was being done to combat malaria in their communities, but participants in some
356 geographic areas felt it had limited effectiveness or safety. Additionally, participants from rural
357 areas and whose homes had not previously been sprayed prior to their acceptance of the
358 campaign were generally more satisfied and perceived IRS as more effective than those
359 participants from urban areas (22). The implication of this finding is that combating malaria in
360 these communities may remain a challenge. Therefore, there is need to reinforce information
361 education on indoor residual spraying.

362 There are several household factors that contribute to acceptability of IRS, among the factors
363 is timing of spraying, this current study revealed that timing of spraying has an impact on
364 acceptance of IRS, these findings indicate that appropriate timing of spraying during the

365 campaign can improve the acceptance of IRS intervention. A study on acceptability and
366 perceived side effects of insecticide IRS found that timing of the spraying period is important
367 in the implementation of IRS program and refusal rate to have the housing units sprayed, were
368 high if the period is ill timed (28). Therefore, combating Malaria, based on IRS is associated
369 with willingness of households to accept the spraying of residual insecticides during the
370 spraying campaign (24).

371 Positive or good attitude towards IRS program is key in acceptance of IRS intervention (22).
372 For example, a study in Uganda found that respondents with positive attitude were more likely
373 to accept IRS intervention (25). Similarly, this study found that those with positive attitude had
374 higher odds of acceptability than those with negative attitude. Reports suggests that attitudes
375 and misconceptions related to acceptance or refusal of IRS found that knowledge and
376 perception towards malaria lay a groundwork for acceptance or non-acceptance of malaria
377 interventions ((26). Others have reported that prior IRS experience, impacts a negative attitude
378 towards IRS as refusal was because they did not feel that the past campaigns were as effective
379 as had been promised (32). However, certain behavior such as modification of the wall surface
380 post IRS has potential to reduce actual IRS effectiveness and impact as fewer people are truly
381 protected by IRS ((26).

382 Side effects associated with the chemicals used for IRS contribute to acceptance or refusal of
383 the intervention, this study found that side effects had no significant impact on acceptance of
384 IRS. These findings are contrary to a study which found that symptoms most frequently
385 associated with a chemical used were headache, abdominal pain dysuria and vomiting. The
386 most lasting symptoms were itching, sneezing and vomiting (33). A study found that a strong
387 repugnant smell associated with IRS was reported to be a deterrent to IRS use. Participants
388 reported developing allergic reactions including asthma and swelling of the face on entering a
389 sprayed house (34). A study found that some householders were concerned about the health

390 implications such as the exposure of asthmatic patients to the odor, and other householders
391 associated the odor with inability to sleep (30).

392 On plausible explanation why there was a difference between this study and others could be
393 due to small number in this study for those who indicated that they were not advised to wait
394 (<1%) which could have affected statistical efficiency.

395 In the current study, community level factors such as information, education and
396 communication dissemination to the households were not associated with acceptability. On a
397 contrary, a study found that inadequate information and education prior to IRS increased the
398 odds of non-acceptance (35).

399 This study has limitations that could have affected the findings of the study. First, assessment
400 of acceptability was based on self-reported and may have affected the accuracy of
401 measurements leading to “misclassification”. Participants were asked through a structured
402 questionnaire and this has potential for desirability bias which we could not rule out. In that
403 sense, we believe the reported estimates may be under or over estimated. Second, the inferent
404 nature of a cross-sectional design could not support causal relationships. Despite the limitations
405 our study brings out key issues around acceptability level of IRS. Also, the use of multilevel
406 logistic regression analysis was appropriate considering clustering effect of the different
407 communities to obtain reliable estimates and standard errors .

408 It is therefore, recommended that for future studies should utilize longitudinal design so that
409 all variable can be observed and detect changes or developments in the study population over
410 time. In this way accurate and causal relationship can be drawn.

411 **Conclusion**

412 This study was set to measure acceptability levels and associated factors of IRS among
413 household heads of Luangwa district. The findings suggest that acceptability level of IRS was
414 relatively high proposing that the interventions are more acceptable among people of Luangwa
415 district which is key in reaching malaria elimination by 2030. Although some factors such as
416 community awareness, community engagement and persuasion of community members known

417 to influence acceptability of IRS were not factors in this study, it will be important to determine
418 what factors may have led to a high level of acceptability through further research. There is
419 need for the district to improve on the starting time of IRS if the desired impact of preventing
420 malaria is to be achieved.

421 **Acknowledgements**

422 We thank the data collection team from Luangwa District health facilities spearheaded by
423 Edson Musonda for their assistance and support in conducting interviews. We also thank
424 Professor Joseph Mumba Zulu for his contributions during manuscript development.
425 Additionally, the corresponding author is a recipient of a TDR scholarship under the
426 postgraduate training scheme in implementation research at the University of Zambia, School
427 of Public Health. We are grateful for the support from the training scheme, as provided by the
428 UNICEF/UNDP/World Bank/WHO special programme for Research and Training in Tropical
429 Diseases (TDR).

430 **Author Contributions:**

431 MA designed the study, coordinated recruitment of participants, collected & entered data,
432 analyzed & drafted the manuscript. CJ designed the study, participated in data analysis &
433 reviewed draft manuscript. PK guided data analysis & reviewed draft manuscript. JZ, JL, CM
434 designed the study & reviewed draft manuscript. All authors read & approved the final
435 manuscript.

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445 **Reference**

- 446 1. World malaria report [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Dec 30]. Available from:
447 <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240040496>
- 448 2. Ministry of Health. NATIONAL MALARIA ELIMINATION STRATEGIC PLAN
449 2017-2021. 2017;
- 450 3. World Health Organization. Global Malaria Programme, Unit WHOM. Indoor residual
451 spraying : use of indoor residual spraying for scaling up global malaria control and
452 elimination : WHO position statement [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2006
453 [cited 2021 Dec 29]. Report No.: WHO/HTM/MAL/2006.1112. Available from:
454 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/69386>
- 455 4. Kolaczinski K, Kolaczinski J, Kilian A, Meek S. Extension of indoor residual spraying
456 for malaria control into high transmission settings in Africa. *Transactions of The Royal
457 Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2007 Sep 1;101(9):852–3.
- 458 5. Montgomery CM, Munguambe K, Pool R. Group-based citizenship in the acceptance of
459 indoor residual spraying (IRS) for malaria control in Mozambique. *Social Science
460 & Medicine*. 2010;70(10):1648–55.
- 461 6. Larsen DA, Borrill L, Patel R, Fregosi L. Reported community-level indoor residual
462 spray coverage from two-stage cluster surveys in sub-Saharan Africa. *Malaria Journal*.
463 2017 Jun 13;16(1):249.
- 464 7. Indoor Residual Spraying: An operational manual for IRS for malaria transmission,
465 control and elimination [Internet]. PSM Toolbox. [cited 2021 Dec 29]. Available from:
466 [https://www.psmtoolbox.org/en/tool/policy/malaria/indoor-residual-spraying/indoor-
467 residual-spraying-an-operational-manual-for-irs-for-malaria-transmission-control-and-
468 elimination/](https://www.psmtoolbox.org/en/tool/policy/malaria/indoor-residual-spraying/indoor-residual-spraying-an-operational-manual-for-irs-for-malaria-transmission-control-and-elimination/)
- 469 8. Gobena T, Berhane Y, Worku A. Women’s knowledge and perceptions of malaria and
470 use of malaria vector control interventions in Kersa, Eastern Ethiopia. *Global Health
471 Action*. 2013;6(1).
- 472 9. Munguambe K, Pool R, Montgomery C, Bavo C, Nhacolo A, Fiosse L, et al. What
473 drives community adherence to indoor residual spraying (IRS) against malaria in
474 Manhiça district, rural Mozambique: A qualitative study. *Malaria Journal*. 2011;10:1–
475 13.
- 476 10. Ediau M, Babirye JN, Tumwesigye NM, Matovu JK, MacHingaidze S, Okui O, et al.
477 Community knowledge and perceptions about indoor residual spraying for malaria
478 prevention in Soroti district, Uganda: A cross-sectional study. *Malaria Journal*. 2013
479 Dec 27;12(1):170.
- 480 11. Hargreaves K, Hunt RH, Brooke BD, Mthembu J, Weeto MM, Awolola TS, et al.
481 *Anopheles arabiensis* and *An. quadriannulatus* resistance to DDT in South Africa.
482 *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*. 2003 Dec 1;17(4):417–22.
- 483 12. Mazigo HD, Obasy E, Mauka W, Manyiri P, Zinga M, Kweka EJ, et al. Knowledge,
484 Attitudes, and Practices about Malaria and Its Control in Rural Northwest Tanzania.
485 *Malar Res Treat*. 2010;2010:794261.

- 486 13. Hlongwana KW, Zitha A, Mabuza AM, Maharaj R. Knowledge and practices towards
487 malaria amongst residents of Bushbuckridge, Mpumalanga, South Africa. *Afr J Prim*
488 *Health Care Fam Med*. 2011 Jul 12;3(1):257.
- 489 14. Phiri E, Baboo KS, Miller J. Effect of Indoor Residual Spraying on the Incidence of
490 Malaria in Kaoma District of Western Zambia. *Medical Journal of Zambia*.
491 2015;42(4):150–8.
- 492 15. Okumu FO, Moore SJ. Combining indoor residual spraying and insecticide-treated nets
493 for malaria control in Africa: a review of possible outcomes and an outline of
494 suggestions for the future. 2011.
- 495 16. WHO. Global Malaria Programme Indoor residual spraying Use of indoor residual
496 spraying for scaling up global malaria control and elimination.
- 497 17. Setia MS. Methodology Series Module 3: Cross-sectional Studies. *Indian J Dermatol*.
498 2016;61(3):261–4.
- 499 18. CSO. 2010 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING Population and
500 Demographic Projections 2011-2035. 2013.
- 501 19. Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis JJ. Acceptability of healthcare interventions: an
502 overview of reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC Health Services*
503 *Research*. 2017 Jan 26;17(1):88.
- 504 20. Gemmill AW, Leigh B, Ericksen J, Milgrom J. A survey of the clinical acceptability of
505 screening for postnatal depression in depressed and non-depressed women. *BMC Public*
506 *Health*. 2006 Dec;6(1):211.
- 507 21. Sommet N, Morselli D. Keep Calm and Learn Multilevel Linear Modeling: A Three-
508 Step Procedure Using SPSS, Stata, R, and Mplus. *International Review of Social*
509 *Psychology*. 2021 Sep 9;34(1):24.
- 510 22. Magaço A, Botão C, Nhassengo P, Saide M, Ubisse A, Chicumbe S, et al. Community
511 knowledge and acceptance of indoor residual spraying for malaria prevention in
512 Mozambique: a qualitative study. *Malaria Journal*. 2019 Jan 25;18(1):27.
- 513 23. Phiri E, Baboo KS, Miller J. Effect of Indoor Residual Spraying on the Incidence of
514 Malaria in Kaoma District of Western Zambia. *Medical Journal of Zambia*.
515 2015;42(4):150–8.
- 516 24. Adegun J, Adegboyega J. Knowledge and the preventive strategies of Malaria among
517 Migrant Farmers in Ado-Ekiti Local Government Area of Ekiti State, Nigeria. *AJSIR*.
518 2011 Dec;2(6):883–9.
- 519 25. Ediau M, Babirye JN, Tumwesigye NM, Matovu JK, Machingaidze S, Okui O, et al.
520 Community knowledge and perceptions about indoor residual spraying for malaria
521 prevention in Soroti district, Uganda: a cross-sectional study. *Malaria Journal*. 2013
522 May 27;12(1):170.
- 523 26. Kaufman M, Rweyemamu D, Koenker H, Macha J. “My children and I will no longer
524 suffer from malaria”: a qualitative study of the acceptance and rejection of indoor
525 residual spraying to prevent malaria in Tanzania. *Malaria journal*. 2012 Jul 2;11:220.

- 526 27. Opiyo MA, Paaijmans KP. ‘We spray and walk away’: wall modifications decrease the
527 impact of indoor residual spray campaigns through reductions in post-spray coverage.
528 *Malaria Journal*. 2020 Jan 17;19(1):30.
- 529 28. Rodríguez AD, Penilla RP, Rodríguez MH, Hemingway J, Trejo A, Hernández-Avila
530 JE. Acceptability and perceived side effects of insecticide indoor residual spraying
531 under different resistance management strategies. *Salud pública Méx* [Internet]. 2006
532 Aug [cited 2021 Jul 28];48(4). Available from:
533 [http://www.scielosp.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0036-](http://www.scielosp.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0036-36342006000400006&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=en)
534 [36342006000400006&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=en](http://www.scielosp.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0036-36342006000400006&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=en)
- 535 29. Ingabire CM, Rulisa A, Van Kempen L, Muvunyi C, Koenraadt CJM, Van Vugt M, et
536 al. Factors impeding the acceptability and use of malaria preventive measures:
537 Implications for malaria elimination in eastern Rwanda. *Malaria Journal*. 2015;14(1):1–
538 11.
- 539 30. Suuron VM, Mwanri L, Tsourtos G, Owusu-Addo E. An exploratory study of the
540 acceptability of indoor residual spraying for malaria control in upper western Ghana.
541 *BMC Public Health*. 2020 Apr 6;20(1):465.

542