Title

Risk factors for arboviral seropositivity in children in Teso South Sub County, Western Kenya

Authors and Affiliations

Mary Inziani[1*], Jane Kilonzo[2], Marthaclaire Kerubo[2], Sylvia Mango[3], Mary Kavurani[2], Allan Ndirangu[2], Elizabeth Njeri[2], Diuniceous Oigara[3], Sylvester Ayoro[3], Shingo Inoue[4,5], Kouichi Morita[5], and Matilu Mwau[2,3]

Affiliations

[1]Centre for Virus Research, Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya

[2]KEMRI Laboratory for Molecular Biology, Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya

[3]Centre for Infectious and Parasitic Diseases Control Research, Kenya Medical Research Institute, Alupe, Kenya

[4]Nagasaki University Africa Research Station, Nairobi, Kenya

[5]Nagasaki University Institute of Tropical Medicine, Nagasaki, Japan

[*]To whom all correspondence should be addressed

E-mail: mmuyeku@kemri.go.ke; inzianimatilu@gmail.com (MI)

Abstract

Arboviruses are responsible for epidemics and are emerging and re-emerging in sub-Saharan Africa. However, the risk factors for arboviral diseases are poorly described in Kenyan children. Knowledge of risk factors can facilitate earlier diagnosis and better treatment and implementation of effective prevention in children.

This study determined risk factors for seropositivity to Yellow fever (YFV), Dengue (DENV), Chikungunya (CHIKV) and West Nile (WNV) viruses among children at two facilities in Teso Sub-County in Western Kenya.

In a hospital-based cross-sectional survey, the risk factors for seropositivity to the arboviruses were assessed. Eligible children aged 1 to 12 (n = 656) who visited Alupe Sub County Hospital and KEMRI Alupe Clinic in Teso Sub County were recruited. Socio-demographic, environmental, behavioural and medical information was collected using a questionnaire. Blood drawn from these children was screened for antibodies to YFV, DENV, CHIKV and WNV using Indirect Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assays. Descriptive statistics were used to summarise seroprevalence, socio-demographic, clinical and environmental variables. Binomial logistic regression described the relationship between the risk factors and arbovirus seropositivity.

Seropositivity to at least one arbovirus was found in 27.7%, with 15.7% being positive for DENV, 9.6% for WNV, 5.6% for CHIKV and 4.4% for YFV.

The factors that significantly increased the risk to at least one of the arboviruses were: age 6-9 years (by 18%, p=0.006) compared to those 1-3 years, school attendance (by 66%, p=0.000) compared to none, the primary caregiver being “Other” (by 17%,

p=0.026) and not the parent, the use of Olyset (by 7%, *p*=0.039), or an unknown mosquito net (by 26%, *p*=0.020) compared to Permanet.

The risk of yellow fever seropositivity was increased where vegetation was close to the house (by 5%, *p*=0.042) compared to where vegetation was far. The risk was decreased by the use of an unknown bed net (by 4%, p=0.046) compared to Permanet and having a past history of rash (by 6%, p=0.018).

For Dengue Fever, females were at an increased risk (by 8%, *p*=0.002) compared to males and having water bodies near the house (7%, *p*=0.030).

The risk of chikungunya was increased by school attendance (by 25%, *p*=0.021) compared to not, the use of mosquito repellents (by 10%, *p*=0.006) compared to no interventions and having had a rash in the past (by 6%, *p*=0.043). The risk was decreased by roofing with iron sheets (by 3%, *p*=0.048) compared to grass-thatching.

WNV seropositivity risk was higher in those aged 3-6 years (by 8%, *p*=0.004) and 6-9 years (by 15%, *p*=0.004) than in those aged 1-3 years. It was increased in those attending school (by 37%, *p*=0.006) compared to those not, and those using Olyset (by 11%, *p*=0.000) or an unknown bed net (by 30%, *p*=0.001) compared to Permanet. The risk was lower by between 25% and 33% (*p*<0.003) in those in pre-school, in lower and upper primary compared to those not in school. These factors are amenable to interventions that can be implemented to prevent and reduce arbovirus infections in children in endemic areas in Kenya.

Author Summary

Yellow fever, Dengue, Chikungunya and West Nile are viruses (Arboviruses) transmitted to humans by mosquitoes. These infections are common in Sub-Saharan Africa and often affect children. However, the risk factors associated with arboviral infections are not well described, and yet, knowledge of these predisposing factors in children is essential for early diagnosis, correct treatment, and prevention. We carried out this study to determine the factors associated with these infections. We recruited 656 children aged between 1-12 years who sought health services at Alupe Sub-County Hospital and KEMRI Alupe Clinic in Teso Sub-County, Western Kenya. We used a structured questionnaire to collect data on sociodemographic, behavioural, environmental, and clinical factors. We then drew blood from these children and screened it for the four arboviruses. Out of 656 participants, 182 (27.7%) were seropositive for at least one of the four arboviruses, 29 (4.4%) for Yellow Fever, 102 (15.7%) for Dengue, 36 (5.6%) for Chikungunya and 62 (9.6%) for West Nile virus. We established that gender, age, school attendance, the primary caregiver, design of the house, type of mosquito nets used, skin rashes and other mosquito control methods all influence the risk of seropositivity. These behavioural, environmental, sociodemographic and clinical factors that influence arbovirus seropositivity are amenable to interventions that can be implemented within the community to reduce the risk and prevalence of arboviruses in children in endemic areas in Kenya.

Introduction

Arthropod-borne viruses (arboviruses) such as Chikungunya (CHIKV), Yellow Fever (YFV), Dengue Virus (DENV), and West Nile Virus (WNV) are transmitted by Aedes,

Culex and Anopheles mosquitoes (1-9). They affect both adults and children, causing widespread morbidity. They are responsible for epidemics and are emerging and re-emerging in many parts of sub-Saharan Africa. Several outbreaks have been reported in Kenya (4, 6, 7, 10-12). Due to their immature immune system, children in endemic areas are highly susceptible to arbovirus infections (13). Infections present with non-specific signs and symptoms (13), including fever, jaundice, swollen lymph glands, neuro-invasive disease (8, 14), joint inflammation (15) and rashes (16).

In sub–Saharan Africa, arbovirus infections are often undiagnosed and unreported, with febrile illnesses often assumed to be malaria, typhoid or other bacterial infections (8, 17). Due to a lack of diagnostics in some places, febrile illnesses and malaria-negative fevers are often treated presumptively with antimalarials and antibiotics. The risk factors for arboviral disease are not well described. Therefore doctors in sub–Saharan Africa lack the index of suspicion necessary to make a presumptive diagnosis of arboviral infection (18).

Despite evidence of these arbovirus outbreaks reported in Kenya and the morbidity associated with them, few surveys have been done to document the burden or magnitude of infections from these viruses (19), and little is known about the epidemiologic characteristics of arbovirus prevalence and the associated risk factors in Kenyan children (20, 21).

This paper describes sociodemographic, clinical, behavioural and environmental factors associated with seropositivity to Yellow Fever, Dengue, Chikungunya and West Nile viruses among children in Teso South Sub County, Western Kenya.

Materials and methods

In this hospital-based cross-sectional study conducted between August 2010 and February 2011, we assessed the risk factors for seropositivity to Yellow Fever, Dengue, Chikungunya and West Nile viruses amongst children in Teso Sub County, Western Kenya. We recruited children aged 1 to 12 years (n = 656) from those who visited Alupe Sub County Hospital and KEMRI Alupe Clinic for health services.

Socio-demographic, environmental and medical information was collected using a structured questionnaire. The participant's clinical records and immunisation card were reviewed where available. Approximately 2.5 ml of venous blood was drawn from these children and tested for antibodies to YFV, WNV, DENV and CHIKV. An indirect Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (Indirect ELISA) was performed to detect virus-specific IgA/IgM/IgG serocomplex antibodies using an in-house kit method described by Igarashi (22, 23) with a few modifications to suit the local laboratory settings (24).

The optical density (OD) was measured with an ELISA plate reader at 492 nm within 20 minutes after adding the stop solution. OD specific for the virus was calculated as follows: (Mean OD of virus-coated wells) – (Mean OD of PBS-F coated wells). If the particular OD reading was more than 1.0, that serum was regarded as positive. Where serum samples were of insufficient volume, YFV ELISA was performed first, followed by DENV2, CHIKV, WNV, DENV1 and DENV3 in order of preference.

The primary outcome was YFV, DENV, CHIKV and WNV IgA/IgM/IgG seropositivity.

Statistical Methods

All the data collected was saved in an excel database on a secure computer, cleaned and coded. Overall seropositivity rates, as well as virus-specific seropositivity rates,

were calculated. Simple descriptive statistics were used to summarise socio-demographic, clinical and environmental exposure variables. Sociodemographic, environmental and clinical factors were evaluated for correlation with arbovirus seropositivity. The predictor variables included age, sex, schooling, vaccination status, caregiver characteristics and behavioural, clinical and environmental characteristics. Before fitting our model, we hypothesised that the various sociodemographic, clinical, behavioural and environmental factors influence exposure to arboviruses, hence seropositivity. Before fitting our model to predict arbovirus seropositivity, Spearman's correlation was used to examine the relationship between predictor and outcome variables. The Poisson regression model was used to calculate incidence rate ratios (IRR) and associated 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Only those variables with a $p < 0.05$ at univariate analysis were included in the full model. All statistical analyses were conducted with Stata/SE 17.0 for Mac (Stata Corp, College Station, Texas, USA). The level of significance was set at $p \leq 0.05$.

Ethical Statement

This study was approved by the ethical review committee of Kenyatta National Hospital (Approval number P108/03/2010). Informed written consent was obtained from caregivers, and verbal assent was obtained from children above seven years of age before participating in the study. The study was conducted in line with the requirements of the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2000.

Results

The study recruited 656 participants, 316 (48.2%) males and 340 (51.8%) females. All were successfully screened for YFV and DENV2. Due to insufficient sample volume, varying numbers of samples were screened for WNV (n=649), CHIKV (n=649), DENV1 (n=368) and DENV3 (n=203). We have previously reported these participant characteristics (13).

Risk of seropositivity to any arbovirus

Univariate and multivariate analyses of the risk of seropositivity to any arbovirus are presented in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. Of the study subjects, 182 (27.7%) were seropositive for at least one of the four arboviruses (13). In univariate analysis, seropositivity to any arbovirus was influenced by gender, age, school, caregiver, bed net type, eaves and rash. Being female was associated with a 7% increase in seropositivity to any arbovirus (IRR 1.07, 95% CI 1.01-1.13, p=0.016) compared to being male; this difference was not observed in the multivariate model. The risk was also significantly increased in those aged 6-9 years and 9-12 years (p<0.05) compared to those aged 1-3 years, and in the multivariate model, only those aged 6-9 years had an increase in seropositivity when compared to those aged 1-3 years (IRR 1.18, 95% CI 1.05-1.33, p = 0.006). Being in school was associated with an 8% increase in overall arbovirus seropositivity (IRR 1.08, 95%CI 1.02-1.13, p=0.007) when compared with not being in school. In the multivariate model, the risk was higher by 66% (IRR 1.66, 95% CI 1.29-2.13, p=0.000). The risk increased by 16% in children who were in upper primary school (IRR 1.16, 95% CI 1.07-1.27, p=0.001) when compared to those, not in school. However, in the multivariate model, all children in any class had at least

a 37% decrease in the risk of being seropositive for any arbovirus (*p*=0.000) compared to those not in school. The risk of being seropositive was also elevated when the caregiver was “Other” and not the parent (IRR 1.29, 95% CI 1.14-1.45, *p*=0.000); a significant increase was also seen in the multivariate model. The risk of being seropositive was increased if the type of bed net used was either Olyset (IRR 1.10, 95%CI 1.04-1.18, *p*=0.002) or unknown (IRR 1.29, 95% CI 1.13-1.48, *p*=0.000) and not Permanet. The multivariate model also shows these increased risks ($p<0.05$).

Risk of seropositivity to Yellow Fever

The risk of yellow fever seropositivity decreased by 4% (IRR 0.96, 95% CI 0.92-0.99, *p*=0.021) in those 9-12 years old, compared to those aged 1-3 years, in the univariate model. In the multivariate model, there was no significant difference. Those using mosquito nets of an unknown brand had a 5% decrease in risk of yellow fever seropositivity (IRR 0.95, 95% CI 0.92-0.97, *p*=0.000); in the multivariate model, it was 4% (*p*=0.046). In the univariate model, the risk for YFV seropositivity decreased by 3% (IRR 0.97, 95% CI 0.94-0.1.00, *p*=0.040) in those who lived close to water bodies when compared to those who did not. The multivariate model showed a 7% decrease (*p*=0.030). In the multivariate model, vegetation near the house was associated with a 5% increase in risk (IRR 1.05, 95% CI 1.00-1.09, *p*=0.042), though the univariate model did not show this. These risks are detailed in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively.

Risk of seropositivity to any Dengue Virus

In univariate analysis, the risk of being seropositive to any of the three DENV viruses increased by 8% in females (IRR 1.08, 95% CI 1.03-1.13, *p*=0.001) when compared to males; the increase was also 8% (IRR 1.08, 95% CI 1.03-1.13, *p*=0.002) in the

multivariate model. It was 10% higher in children aged 6-9 years (IRR 1.10, 95% CI 1.02-1.19, *p*=0.015) when compared to children aged 1-3 years; it was insignificant in the multivariate model. The risk of being seropositive to any dengue virus decreased by 8% (IRR 0.92, 95% CI 0.86-0.98, *p*=0.011) in those whose KEPI Vaccination cards were fully filled when compared with those whose cards were not; this difference was not present in the multivariate model. In univariate analysis, the risk was significantly higher in those who lived in houses roofed with iron sheets when compared to those who lived in grass-thatched houses (IRR 1.05, 95% CI 1.00-1.11, *p*=0.039), but this was not reflected in the multivariate model. The risk was reduced in the univariate model by 10% if the house had open eaves (IRR 0.90, 95% CI 0.84-0.95, *p*=0.001); this decrease was absent in the multivariate model. The risk was 5% lower for those who lived next to water bodies (rivers, swamps, ponds, canals, or lakes) when compared to those who lived far from water bodies (IRR 0.95, 95% CI 0.91-1.00, *p*=0.032). In the multivariate model, the risk for those who lived near water bodies was reduced by 7% (IRR 0.93, 95% CI 0.87-0.99, *p*=0.030). These risks are also detailed in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively.

Risk of seropositivity to Chikungunya Virus

For CHIKV, the risk of seropositivity was elevated in those who attended school (IRR 1.25, 95% CI 1.03-1.50, *p*=0.021) in the multivariate model. However, at the granular level, the risk decreased by at least 16% in those in any class in primary school in the multivariate model ($p<0.05$) when compared to those, not in school; this was not seen in the univariate model. In the univariate model, the risk decreased by 6% in those who had received all the KEPI vaccines (IRR 0.94, 95% CI 0.89-1.00, *p*=0.041). It

increased by 11% for those who used mosquito repellents (IRR 1.11, 95% CI 1.03-1.19, *p*=0.007) when compared to those who did not use any mosquito control method; the increase was 10% in the multivariate model (IRR 1.10, 95% CI 1.03-1.17, *p*=0.006). The risk was 4% lower in those who complained of feeling sick in the univariate model (IRR 0.96, 95% CI 0.93-0.99, *p*=0.008); this was not seen in the multivariate model. In the multivariate model, the risk was increased by 7% in those with a past history of rash compared to those who did not (IRR 1.06, 95% CI 1.00-1.13, *p*=0.043). Further, the risk of being seropositive for CHIKV in the multivariate analysis was 3% lower in those who lived in houses roofed with iron sheets when compared to those who lived in grass thatched houses (IRR 0.97, 95% CI 0.94-1.00, *p*=0.048); Univariate and multivariate analysis of the risk of seropositivity to CHIKV are presented in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively.

Risk of seropositivity to West Nile Virus

For WNV, the risk of seropositivity increased by at least 8% in any age category older than the 1-3 years age category ($p<0.05$). In the multivariate model, only the age groups 3-6 years and 6-9 years had significantly increased risks. It decreased by 7% for those who lived in the village compared to those who lived in town (IRR 0.93, 95% CI 0.87-0.99, *p*=0.018); this was not seen in the multivariate model. The risk increased by 5% (IRR 1.05, 95% CI 1.01-1.10, *p*=0.015) for those attending school compared to those not, but this risk was 37% higher in the multivariate model (IRR 1.37, 95%CI 1.09-1.72, *p*=0.006). The risk was 10% higher in children in upper primary school (IRR 1.10, 95%CI 1.02-1.19, *p*=0.017) when compared to those not in school, but in the multivariate model, the risk was at least 25% lower for children in any class ($p<0.05$).

For those whose caregiver was “Other”, the risk increased by 17% (IRR 1.17, 95% CI 1.02-1.34, p=0.024) compared to those whose caregiver was the parent. There was no significant difference in the multivariate model. The risk increased by at least 11% for those who slept under Olyset mosquito nets, 13% for Supanet and 32% if the bed net was an unknown brand compared to Permanet (p<0.05). In the multivariate model, the risk was at least 11% higher for those sleeping under Olyset and 30% if the brand of the net was unknown (p<0.05). In the univariate model, the risk of WNV seropositivity increased by 9% in those who had a rash when compared to those who did not have a rash (IRR 1.09, 95% CI 1.04-1.14, p=0.000) and by 9% in those who had had a past rash when compared to those who had not had one (IRR 1.09, 95% CI 1.02-1.17 p=0.011). This was not reflected in the multivariate model. The risk was significantly decreased in those who felt sick compared to those who did not (IRR 0.94, 95% CI 0.91-0.98, p=0.004). These significant differences were not seen in the multivariate model. In the univariate model, living under a mixed iron sheets and tiles roof increased the risk by 18% (IRR 1.18, 95% CI 1.06-1.32, p=0.004) compared to living under a thatched grass roof. This was not the case in multivariate analysis. In the univariate model, living near water bodies and having vegetation close to the house significantly increased the risk by 9% and 5%, respectively (p<0.05). No significant differences were detected in the multivariate model. These risks are detailed in Table 1 (Univariate analysis) and Table 2 (Multivariate analysis).

Table 1: Univariate Poisson regression analysis of risk factors for Arbovirus, Yellow, Dengue, Chikungunya and West Nile Virus seropositivity

Participant characteristics	Total pop	Any arbovirus +ve (n=182)			YFV +ve (n=29)			Any DENV +ve (n=102)			CHIKV +ve (n=36)			WNV +ve (n=62)		
	n (%)	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value
Sociodemographic Factors																
Gender																
Male	316 (48.2)	Ref														
Female	340 (51.8)	**1.07**	**1.01-1.13**	**0.016**	1.02	0.99-1.05	0.255	**1.08**	**1.03-1.13**	**0.001**	1.02	0.99-1.05	0.253	1.00	0.96-1.05	0.829
Age group (Years)																
1 - 3	228 (36.8)	Ref														
>3 - 6	211 (34.0)	1.06	0.99-1.13	0.090	0.99	0.95-1.03	0.488	0.97	0.92-1.03	0.306	1.02	0.98-1.06	0.396	**1.08**	**1.03-1.13**	**0.001**
>6 - 9	99 (16.0)	**1.13**	**1.05-1.23**	**0.002**	1.00	0.95-1.06	0.900	**1.10**	**1.02-1.19**	**0.015**	0.99	0.95-1.03	0.721	**1.11**	**1.04-1.19**	**0.001**
>9 - 12	82 (13.2)	**1.17**	**1.07-1.27**	**0.001**	**0.96**	**0.92-0.99**	**0.021**	1.07	0.99-1.17	0.095	1.03	0.97-1.10	0.264	**1.10**	**1.03-1.18**	**0.006**
Residence																
Town	115 (17.8)	Ref														
Village	532 (82.2)	0.99	0.93-1.07	0.850	1.01	0.98-1.05	0.531	1.02	0.96-1.09	0.501	1.01	0.97-1.05	0.545	**0.93**	**0.87-0.99**	**0.018**
School attendance																
Not in school	347 (52.9)	Ref														
In school	309 (47.1)	**1.08**	**1.02-1.13**	**0.007**	0.98	0.95-1.01	0.157	1.05	1.00-1.10	0.069	1.02	0.99-1.05	0.269	**1.05**	**1.01-1.10**	**0.015**
Class																
None	346 (52.8)	Ref														
Pre- school	136 (20.8)	1.04	0.97-1.12	0.237	0.98	0.94-1.01	0.180	1.03	0.96-1.09	0.427	1.01	0.96-1.05	0.800	1.05	0.99-1.10	0.108

Participant characteristics	Total pop	Any arbovirus +ve (n=182)			YFV +ve (n=29)			Any DENV +ve (n=102)			CHIKV +ve (n=36)			WNV +ve (n=62)		
	n (%)	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value
Lower primary	97 (14.8)	1.04	0.97-1.13	0.282	0.99	0.94-1.03	0.564	1.05	0.97-1.13	0.220	1.01	0.96-1.06	0.772	1.03	0.97-1.09	0.411
Upper primary	76 (11.6)	**1.16**	**1.07-1.27**	**0.001**	0.97	0.93-1.01	0.198	1.07	0.98-1.16	0.114	1.06	0.99-1.13	0.094	**1.10**	**1.02-1.19**	**0.017**
KEPI Card Completed																
No	132 (20.3)	Ref														
Yes	519 (79.7)	0.93	0.87-1.00	0.091	1.03	1.00-1.06	0.091	**0.92**	**0.86-0.98**	**0.011**	0.97	0.92-1.02	0.196	1.00	0.95-1.05	0.982
KEPI Vaccines completed																
No	92 (14.3)	Ref														
Yes	551 (85.7)	0.98	0.91-1.06	0.624	1.03	0.99-1.06	0.128	1.01	0.95-1.08	0.744	**0.94**	**0.89-1.00**	**0.041**	1.00	0.94-1.06	0.918
YFV vaccinated																
No	644 (98.3)	Ref														
Yes	11 (1.7)	0.85	0.73-1.00	0.047	0.96	0.94-0.97	0.000	0.86	0.84-0.88	0.000	0.95	0.93-0.96	0.000	1.00	0.85-1.17	0.956
Primary Caregiver																
Parent	590 (90.1)	Ref														
Grandparent	39 (6.0)	1.08	0.97-1.21	0.177	1.03	0.95-1.12	0.420	1.03	0.92-1.14	0.627	1.03	0.95-1.12	0.465	1.02	0.93-1.13	0.627
Other	26 (4.0)	**1.29**	**1.14-1.45**	**0.000**	1.00	0.93-1.07	0.920	1.10	0.96-1.27	0.154	1.10	0.97-1.24	0.126	**1.17**	**1.02-1.34**	**0.024**
Mosquito repellents use																
None	512 (78.2)	Ref														
Repellents	73 (11.2)	1.06	0.97-1.16	0.171	0.98	0.94-1.02	0.363	0.98	0.91-1.06	0.651	**1.11**	**1.03-1.19**	**0.007**	1.01	0.94-1.07	0.865
Sprays	70 (10.7)	1.04	0.95-1.14	0.383	1.00	0.95-1.05	0.877	1.03	0.95-1.11	0.545	1.02	0.96-1.07	0.589	1.03	0.96-1.11	0.364
Sleep under a bed net																

Participant characteristics	Total pop	Any arbovirus +ve (n=182)			YFV +ve (n=29)			Any DENV +ve (n=102)			CHIKV +ve (n=36)			WNV +ve (n=62)		
	n (%)	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value
No	38 (5.8)	Ref														
Yes	618 (94.2)	0.97	0.86-1.09	0.595	1.02	0.97-1.07	0.490	1.05	0.96-1.15	0.300	0.98	0.90-1.06	0.573	0.90	0.81-1.00	0.056
Type of bed-net																
Permanet	290 (44.2)	Ref														
Unknown	23 (3.5)	**1.29**	**1.13-1.48**	**0.000**	**0.95**	**0.92-0.97**	**0.000**	1.01	0.88-1.16	0.850	**1.13**	**0.99-1.29**	**0.007**	**1.32**	**1.14-1.52**	**0.000**
Olyset	211 (32.2)	**1.10**	**1.04-1.18**	**0.002**	0.98	0.95-1.02	0.279	1.03	0.97-1.09	0.318	1.03	0.99-1.08	0.109	**1.11**	**1.06-1.16**	**0.000**
Supanet	67 (10.2)	1.05	0.96-1.16	0.270	0.99	0.94-1.05	0.730	0.94	0.88-1.02	0.120	0.99	0.95-1.04	0.744	**1.13**	**1.04-1.22**	**0.003**
Mixed	51 (7.8)	1.04	0.94-1.15	0.458	0.98	0.93-1.04	0.599	0.97	0.88-1.06	0.455	1.00	0.95-1.06	0.966	1.05	0.98-1.13	0.151
Environmental Factors																
Type of Roof																
Grass thatch	228 (34.8)	Ref														
Iron sheets	387 (59.0)	1.04	0.98-1.10	0.171	0.99	0.96-1.03	0.692	**1.05**	**1.00-1.11**	**0.039**	0.97	0.93-1.00	0.066	0.98	0.94-1.03	0.470
Iron sheets/tiles	41 (6.25)	**1.14**	**1.02-1.28**	**0.023**	1.00	0.93-1.07	0.988	1.05	0.94-1.16	0.395	0.97	0.90-1.04	0.423	**1.18**	**1.06-1.32**	**0.004**
Presence of eaves																
No	611 (93.1)	Ref														
Yes	45 (6.9)	0.95	0.86-1.06	0.369	0.98	0.93-1.02	0.321	**0.90**	**0.84-0.95**	**0.001**	1.04	0.96-1.13	0.366	1.00	0.92-1.08	0.953
Water bodies near house																
No	385 (58.7)	Ref														
Yes	271 (41.3)	1.03	0.97-1.09	0.305	**0.97**	**0.94-1.00**	**0.040**	**0.95**	**0.91-1.00**	**0.032**	1.03	1.00-1.07	0.092	**1.09**	**1.04-1.13**	**0.000**

Participant characteristics	Total pop	Any arbovirus +ve (n=182)			YFV +ve (n=29)			Any DENV +ve (n=102)			CHIKV +ve (n=36)			WNV +ve (n=62)		
	n (%)	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value
Vegetation near house																
No	411 (62.7)	Ref														
Yes	245 (37.4)	1.01	0.96-1.07	0.716	1.02	0.99-1.05	0.236	0.97	0.92-1.02	0.215	1.01	0.97-1.05	0.584	**1.05**	**1.00-1.10**	**0.037**
Clinical Factors																
Feeling sick																
No	379 (57.8)	Ref														
Yes	277 (42.2)	**0.94**	**0.89-1.00**	**0.034**	1.02	0.99-1.05	0.302	1.00	0.95-1.05	0.912	**0.96**	**0.93-0.99**	**0.008**	**0.94**	**0.91-0.98**	**0.004**
Rash																
No	451 (68.8)	Ref														
Yes	205 (31.3)	**1.06**	**1.00-1.13**	**0.039**	0.98	0.95-1.01	0.167	1.00	0.95-1.05	0.965	1.01	0.97-1.05	0.548	**1.09**	**1.04-1.14**	**0.000**
Past history of rash																
No	563 (85.8)	Ref														
Yes	93 (14.2)	1.05	0.97-1.14	0.205	**0.95**	**0.93-0.97**	**0.000**	0.95	0.89-1.01	0.113	1.06	1.00-1.12	0.062	**1.09**	**1.02-1.17**	**0.011**
Sore throat																
No	611 (93.1)	Ref														
Yes	45 (6.86)	0.95	0.86-1.06	0.369	0.98	0.93-1.02	0.321	**0.92**	**0.85-0.99**	**0.019**	0.99	0.93-1.05	0.714	1.06	0.96-1.16	0.232

Table 2: Multivariate Poisson regression analysis of Arbovirus, Yellow, Dengue, Chikungunya and West Nile Virus seropositivity

Participant characteristics	Total pop	Any arbovirus +ve (n=182)			YFV +ve (n=29)			Any DENV +ve (n=102)			CHIKV +ve (n=36)			WNV +ve (n=62)		
	n (%)	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value	IRR	95% CI	p value
Sociodemographic Factors																
Gender																
Male	316 (48.2)	Ref														
Female	340 (51.8)	1.05	0.99-1.11	0.082	1.03	0.99-1.07	0.124	**1.08**	**1.03-1.13**	**0.002**	1.01	0.98-1.04	0.642	0.99	0.95-1.03	0.573
Age group (Years)																
1 - 3	228 (36.8)	Ref														
>3 - 6	211 (34.0)	1.06	0.98-1.15	0.141	1.01	0.96-1.06	0.664	0.97	0.91-1.04	0.386	1.01	0.97-1.05	0.659	**1.08**	**1.03-1.14**	**0.004**
>6 - 9	99 (16.0)	**1.18**	**1.05-1.33**	**0.006**	1.03	0.96-1.11	0.391	1.10	0.99-1.22	0.078	1.01	0.94-1.05	0.650	**1.15**	**1.03-1.27**	**0.004**
>9 - 12	82 (13.2)	1.13	0.97-1.32	0.117	0.93	0.85-1.02	0.113	1.06	0.91-1.23	0.440	1.00	0.91-1.09	0.513	1.08	0.97-1.20	0.182
Residence																
Town	115 (17.8)	Ref														
Village	532 (82.2)	1.04	0.96-1.12	0.350	0.99	0.95-1.03	0.676	1.04	0.97-1.12	0.285	1.03	1.00-1.06	0.092	0.96	0.90-1.02	0.202
School attendance																
Not in school	347 (52.9)	Ref														
In school	309 (47.1)	**1.66**	**1.29-2.13**	**0.000**	1.07	0.96-1.21	0.232	1.13	0.88-1.45	0.323	**1.25**	**1.03-1.50**	**0.021**	**1.37**	**1.09-1.72**	**0.006**
Class (n=655)																
None	346 (52.8)	Ref														
Pre- school	136 (20.8)	**0.58**	**0.44-0.75**	**0.000**	0.91	0.80-1.03	0.142	0.90	0.69-1.17	0.432	**0.79**	**0.66-0.96**	**0.015**	**0.67**	**0.53-0.84**	**0.000**

Lower primary	97 (14.8)	**0.55**	**0.43-0.71**	**0.000**	0.95	0.84-1.06	0.349	0.86	0.68-1.10	0.226	**0.81**	**0.67-0.98**	**0.028**	**0.70**	**0.53-0.89**	**0.003**
Upper primary	76 (11.6)	**0.63**	**0.52-0.76**	**0.000**	0.10	0.93-1.10	0.864	0.91	0.75-1.10	0.331	**0.84**	**0.74-0.97**	**0.016**	**0.75**	**0.63-0.89**	**0.001**
KEPI card completed																
No	132 (20.3)	Ref														
Yes	519 (79.7)	0.98	0.89-1.09	0.748	1.04	0.99-1.10	0.116	0.93	0.84-1.02	0.119	1.00	0.95-1.07	0.875	1.06	0.98-1.15	0.123
KEPI Vaccines completed																
No	92 (14.3)	Ref														
Yes	551 (85.7)	1.05	0.94-1.17	0.418	0.99	0.94-1.05	0.731	1.09	0.98-1.21	0.112	0.99	0.92-1.06	0.731	0.97	0.90-1.04	0.430
YFV vaccinated																
No	644 (98.3)	Ref														
Yes	11 (1.7)	0.81	0.69-0.96	0.012	0.96	0.92-1.01	0.104	0.84	0.77-0.90	0.000	0.93	0.88-0.99	0.017	0.95	0.82-1.10	0.483
Primary Caregiver																
Parent	590 (90.1)	Ref														
Grandparent	39 (6.0)	1.02	0.89-1.16	0.804	1.06	0.96-1.17	0.246	1.01	0.90-1.13	0.875	0.98	0.93-1.04	0.585	0.97	0.88-1.07	0.501
Other	26 (4.0)	**1.17**	**1.02-1.35**	**0.026**	1.02	0.94-1.09	0.660	1.08	0.94-1.24	0.296	1.00	0.92-1.08	0.981	1.10	0.96-1.26	0.184
Mosquito repellents use																
None	512 (78.2)	Ref														
Repellants	73 (11.2)	1.06	0.96-1.17	0.258	1.01	0.96-1.07	0.707	1.04	0.95-1.13	0.400	**1.10**	**1.03-1.17**	**0.006**	0.96	0.89-1.05	0.403
Sprays	70 (10.7)	1.01	0.92-1.12	0.787	1.00	0.94-1.07	0.898	1.02	0.93-1.11	0.679	1.00	0.95-1.06	0.903	0.99	0.92-1.06	0.705
Sleep under a bed net																
No	38 (5.8)	Ref														
Yes	618 (94.2)	0.99	0.86-1.14	0.851	0.97	0.90-1.05	0.491	0.93	0.81-1.08	0.355	1.03	0.99-1.07	0.107	0.97	0.86-1.10	0.631

Type of bed-net																
Permanet	290 (44.2)	Ref														
Unknown	23 (3.5)	**1.26**	**1.09-1.46**	**0.020**	**0.96**	**0.93-1.00**	**0.046**	0.98	0.84-1.15	0.833	1.12	0.98-1.29	0.106	**1.30**	**1.12-1.52**	**0.001**
Olyset	211 (32.2)	**1.07**	**1.00-1.15**	**0.039**	0.99	0.95-1.03	0.505	1.01	0.95-1.07	0.780	1.02	0.98-1.05	0.398	**1.11**	**1.05-1.16**	**0.000**
Supanet	67 (10.2)	1.02	0.91-1.14	0.728	1.00	0.93-1.07	0.954	0.96	0.87-1.06	0.419	0.97	0.93-1.02	0.230	1.08	1.00-1.16	0.062
Mixed	51 (7.8)	1.00	0.90-1.11	0.977	1.00	0.94-1.07	0.956	0.93	0.86-1.01	0.100	0.99	0.94-1.04	0.685	1.06	0.99-1.14	0.098
None	14 (2.1)	1.11	0.86-1.42	0.437	0.96	0.88-1.05	0.387	0.87	0.74-1.02	0.078	1.19	0.97-1.46	0.097	1.10	0.89-1.35	0.387
Environmental Factors																
Type of Roof																
Grass thatch	228 (34.8)	Ref														
Iron sheets	387 (59.0)	1.02	0.96-1.08	0.503	0.99	0.96-1.03	0.747	1.03	0.98-1.08	0.300	**0.97**	**0.94-1.00**	**0.048**	0.97	0.93-1.02	0.246
Iron sheets/tiles	41 (6.25)	1.06	0.93-1.20	0.385	1.02	0.94-1.10	0.655	1.02	0.91-1.15	0.687	0.95	0.89-1.01	0.084	1.08	0.96-1.22	0.211
Presence of eaves																
No	611 (93.1)	Ref														
Yes	45 (6.9)	0.95	0.84-1.07	0.391	0.99	0.92-1.06	0.742	0.94	0.87-1.03	0.197	0.98	0.91-1.05	0.584	0.96	0.87-1.06	0.457
Water bodies near house																
No	385 (58.7)	Ref														
Yes	271 (41.3)	0.94	0.87-1.02	0.120	0.97	0.92-1.02	0.202	**0.93**	**0.87-0.99**	**0.030**	0.99	0.95-1.03	0.712	0.97	0.92-1.03	0.407
Vegetation near house																
No	411 (62.7)	Ref														

Yes	245 (37.4)	0.99	0.93-1.06	0.728	**1.05**	**1.00-1.09**	**0.042**	1.00	0.94-1.06	0.905	1.00	0.96-1.04	0.828	1.00	0.95-1.05	0.979
Water containers Covered																
No	550 (84.0)	Ref														
Yes	105 (16.0)	1.11	0.89-1.39	0.364	0.92	0.76-1.12	0.428	1.03	0.83-1.27	0.807	1.04	1.00-1.08	0.067	1.07	0.99-1.16	0.089
Clinical Factors																
Feeling sick																
No	379 (57.8)	Ref														
Yes	277 (42.2)	0.98	0.93-1.05	0.603	1.00	0.96-1.04	0.884	**0.96**	**0.93-1.00**	**0.043**	0.97	0.93-1.00	0.068	1.02	0.98-1.06	0.332
Presence of Rash																
No	451 (68.8)	Ref														
Yes	205 (31.3)	1.01	0.94-1.09	0.790	1.00	0.95-1.06	0.876	**0.97**	**0.93-1.00**	**0.047**	0.97	0.93-1.00	0.077	1.04	0.98-1.11	0.183
Past history of rash																
No	563 (85.8)	Ref														
Yes	93 (14.2)	1.04	0.94-1.16	0.414	**0.94**	**0.90-0.99**	**0.018**	**1.07**	**1.01-1.14**	**0.018**	**1.06**	**1.00-1.13**	**0.043**	1.06	0.97-1.81	0.436
Throat Infection																
No	611 (93.1)	Ref														
Yes	45 (6.9)	1.06	0.96-1.15	0.172	0.97	0.93-1.00	0.065	1.02	0.97-1.07	0.465	1.02	0.97-1.07	0.384	1.05	0.98-1.35	0.336

Discussion

In this study, we found that the risk of being seropositive to selected arboviruses varied with sociodemographic, clinical and environmental factors. Being female was seen to be a risk factor for DENV in both univariate and multivariate analyses. In Sub-Saharan Africa, females are more commonly involved in activities that increase their exposure to daytime-biting mosquito bites, leading to a higher risk of seropositivity to DENV. Other studies have reported similar findings with a higher risk in female participants (21, 25, 26).

We noted that older children were at an increased risk for any arbovirus seropositivity in the univariate model. Still, in the multivariate model, the increased risk was seen in those aged 3-6 and 6-9 years and was attributable to WNV. This finding was supported by the increased risk in those attending school compared to those not attending. Increasing age has been associated with arbovirus exposure in various studies (27). Our thesis is that at these age groups, children begin going to school, they begin to play outside much earlier and stay late, leading to increased exposure to aedes mosquitos which bite mainly during the daytime (28) but also at dusk in East Africa (29), and culex mosquitoes which are more active at dawn and dusk (30).

When we looked at preschool, lower primary and upper primary groups, we found that the upper primary group had a significantly increased risk of arbovirus seropositivity attributable to WNV. However, in the multivariate model, each group had a significantly decreased risk of seropositivity to an arbovirus, mainly attributable to CHIKV and WNV. This finding has baffled us, and we posit that there is an additional variable that may explain this finding.

Where the primary caregiver was not the parent or the grandparent, the risk of being seropositivity for any arbovirus was higher. In the univariate model, this was attributable to WNV; in the multivariate, the risk was also significant. Parents and grandparents tend to give more protection and care to the children than other relatives that are further removed, reducing exposure to mosquito vectors.

For CHIKV, the risk of being seropositive was elevated if mosquito repellents were used. The CHIKV vector, *Aedes spp*. mainly bites during the day (28). Mosquito control measures such as nets, repellents and coils are used at night and may not affect the risk. Therefore, the increase in risk is difficult to explain. While sprays may contain agents that effectively reduce mosquito density, repellents may expel mosquitoes from indoors and lead to a rise in mosquitoes outdoors, where biting will occur during the day.

Mosquito nets are primarily used to prevent malaria transmission, and for this, they have been very effective. In our multivariate model, we found that using Olyset, Supanet and unknown brands of bednets was associated with an increased risk of seropositivity to WNV. WNV is transmitted mainly by *Culex spp*, a medium-sized mosquito that bites in the evening and at night. It could be that the treatment of these nets is ineffective, or the mesh size is large enough to allow culicine species through. Unknown brands of bed nets had a >26% higher risk of seropositivity when compared to Permanet. The unknown brands may be those tailored locally and may not be insecticide-treated and, therefore, less effective than the insecticide-treated brands. On the other hand, nets often get holes when damaged, with some bed nets more likely to get holes than others (31).

We studied the risk of seropositivity to arboviruses in children who reported or manifested clinical signs and symptoms. The univariate model shows that feeling sick, common during arbovirus and other infections, was associated with a reduced risk of CHIKV and WNV infection. This was not the case in the multivariate model, and the risk was elevated for any dengue virus seropositivity. But having a rash was associated with an increased risk of WNV seropositivity, as expected in the univariate model; in the multivariate, a rash was associated with a decreased risk of YFV seropositivity. Since this cross-sectional study did not diagnose current arbovirus infections, the signs and symptoms we recorded could not necessarily be linked to arbovirus infection. A study by Chauhan et al., 2019, showed an overlap of signs and symptoms between malaria, typhoid and arboviruses; thus, there could be similarity in clinical features when a current arbovirus infection is present (32). The signs and symptoms of CHIKV and DENV are similar to other infectious diseases in the acute phase; hence, most cases initially classified as arbovirus in the clinical phase may not be arboviral (5). Be that as it may, our multivariate model suggested that a history of a past rash increased the risk of testing DENV or CHIKV seropositive. Our findings indicate that YFV, DENV and CHIKV should be important differential diagnoses for clinicians who record a past rash during history-taking.

Water bodies and vegetation cover near houses have been associated with an increased risk of arbovirus infections (5, 33). This was true for vegetation in our study, for YFV, as expected. Interestingly, the presence of water bodies near the home did not increase our study's overall risk of arbovirus seropositivity. Rather, this was associated with a decreased risk of seropositivity to any DENV. This study was conducted in Western Kenya, where major programs have regularly targeted mosquito

reduction in and around large water bodies using drones and other modern technologies.

In houses roofed with iron sheets, the risk of CHIKV seropositivity was lower than in those thatched with grass. Temperatures in houses roofed with iron sheets drop quickly as soon as the sun sets; culicine species are temperature sensitive (34).

Conclusion

We find compelling evidence that there are socio-demographic, clinical and environmental risk factors within the community in Teso Sub County that are associated with arbovirus seropositivity. Some of these risk factors are amenable to interventions that can be initiated and implemented within the community. We also conclude that mosquito nets are not nearly as effective at preventing arbovirus infection as they have been for malaria.

Recommendations

From the foregoing, we recommend that programs aimed at reducing exposure to arbovirus be designed based on risk factors identified within the community. We recommend that mosquito nets that have well-established efficacy be used. We also recommend additional mosquito prevention measures to reduce daytime biting.

References

1. Manning JE, Morens DM, Kamhawi S, Valenzuela JG, Memoli M. Mosquito saliva: the hope for a universal arbovirus vaccine? The Journal of infectious diseases. 2018;218(1):7-15.

2. Braack L, Gouveia de Almeida AP, Cornel AJ, Swanepoel R, De Jager C. Mosquito-borne arboviruses of African origin: review of key viruses and vectors. Parasites & vectors. 2018;11(1):1-26.

3. Njenga MK, Nderitu L, Ledermann J, Ndirangu A, Logue C, Kelly C, et al. Tracking epidemic chikungunya virus into the Indian Ocean from East Africa. Journal of General Virology. 2008;89(11):2754-60.

4. Sang RC, Dunster L. The growing threat of arbovirus transmission and outbreaks in Kenya: a review. East African medical journal. 2001;78(12):655-61.

5. Rodrigues NCP, Daumas RP, de Almeida AS, Dos Santos RS, Koster I, Rodrigues PP, et al. Risk factors for arbovirus infections in a low-income community of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2015-2016. PLoS One. 2018;13(6):e0198357.

6. Ellis EM, Neatherlin JC, Delorey M, Ochieng M, Mohamed AH, Mogeni DO, et al. A household serosurvey to estimate the magnitude of a dengue outbreak in Mombasa, Kenya, 2013. PLoS neglected tropical diseases. 2015;9(4):e0003733.

7. Tchouassi DP, Bastos AD, Sole CL, Diallo M, Lutomiah J, Mutisya J, et al. Population genetics of two key mosquito vectors of Rift Valley fever virus reveals new insights into the changing disease outbreak patterns in Kenya. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases. 2014;8(12):e3364.

8. Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, et al. The global distribution and burden of dengue. Nature. 2013;496(7446):504-7.

9. Barrett AD, Monath TP. Epidemiology and ecology of yellow fever virus. Advances in virus research. 2003;61:291-317.

10. Rigau-Pérez JG, Clark GG, Gubler DJ, Reiter P, Sanders EJ, Vorndam AV. Dengue and dengue haemorrhagic fever. The lancet. 1998;352(9132):971-7.

11. Marchi S, Trombetta CM, Montomoli E. Emerging and re-emerging arboviral diseases as a global health problem. Public Health: Emerging and Re-emerging Issues United Kindgom: IntechOpen. 2018:25-46.

12. Sergon K, Njuguna C, Kalani R, Ofula V, Onyango C, Konongoi LS, et al. Seroprevalence of chikungunya virus (CHIKV) infection on Lamu Island, Kenya, October 2004. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene. 2008;78(2):333-7.

13. De Rivera IL, Parham L, Murillo W, Moncada W, Vazquez S. Humoral immune response of dengue hemorrhagic fever cases in children from Tegucigalpa, Honduras. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene. 2008;79(2):262-6.

14. Watson JT, Pertel PE, Jones RC, Siston AM, Paul WS, Austin CC, et al. Clinical characteristics and functional outcomes of West Nile fever. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2004;141(5):360-5.

15. Feldstein LR, Rowhani-Rahbar A, Staples JE, Weaver MR, Halloran ME, Ellis EM. Persistent arthralgia associated with chikungunya virus outbreak, US Virgin Islands, December 2014–February 2016. Emerging infectious diseases. 2017;23(4):673.

16. Wise EL. Metagenomic identification and characterisation of emerging and re-emerging viruses causing disease in febrile patients: University of Plymouth; 2020.

17. Suchi NK, Mohammed HI, Ademola AO, Rinmecit PG. Parallel and concurrent infection of Dengue virus and Plasmodium falciparum among patients with febrile illnesses attending Bingham University Health Centre, Karu, Nigeria. Int J Trop Dis Health. 2020;41:45-51.

18. Jentes ES, Robinson J, Johnson BW, Conde I, Sakouvougui Y, Iverson J, et al. Acute arboviral infections in Guinea, west Africa, 2006. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene. 2010;83(2):388.

19. Hortion J, Mutuku FM, Eyherabide AL, Vu DM, Boothroyd DB, Grossi-Soyster EN, et al. Acute flavivirus and alphavirus infections among children in two different areas of Kenya, 2015. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene. 2019;100(1):170.

20. Budodo RM, Horumpende PG, Mkumbaye SI, Mmbaga BT, Mwakapuja RS, Chilongola JO. Serological evidence of exposure to Rift Valley, Dengue and Chikungunya Viruses among agropastoral communities in Manyara and Morogoro regions in Tanzania: A community survey. PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases. 2020;14(7):e0008061.

21. Awando JA, Ongus JR, Ouma C, Mwau M. Seroprevalence of anti-dengue virus 2 serocomplex antibodies in out-patients with fever visiting selected hospitals in rural parts of western Kenya in 2010-2011: a cross sectional study. Pan African Medical Journal. 2014;16(1).

22. Igarashi A. Technical manual of arbovirus study. Nagasaki: Nagasaki University Institute of Tropical Medicine. 2000:8-14.

23. Bundo K, Igarashi A. Antibody-capture ELISA for detection of immunoglobulin M antibodies in sera from Japanese encephalitis and dengue hemorrhagic fever patients. Journal of virological methods. 1985;11(1):15-22.

24. Inziani M, Adungo F, Awando J, Kihoro R, Inoue S, Morita K, et al. Seroprevalence of yellow fever, dengue, West Nile and chikungunya viruses in children in Teso South Sub-County, Western Kenya. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2020;91:104-10.

25. Bravo L, Roque VG, Brett J, Dizon R, L'Azou M. Epidemiology of dengue disease in the Philippines (2000-2011): a systematic literature review. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014;8(11):e3027.

26. Bomasang E, Suzara-Masaga EC. Clinical and laboratory features of the dengue virus serotypes among infected adults in Cardinal Santos Medical Center. Philippine Journal of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases. 2008;37(2).

27. Garg S, Chakravarti A, Singh R, Masthi NR, Goyal RC, Jammy GR, et al. Dengue serotype-specific seroprevalence among 5-to 10-year-old children in India: a community-based cross-sectional study. International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2017;54:25-30.

28. Yasuno M, Tonn RJ. A study of biting habits of Aedes aegypti in Bangkok, Thailand. Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 1970;43(2):319.

29. McClelland G. Observations on the mosquito, Aëdes (Stegomyia) aegypti (L.), in East Africa. I.—The biting cycle in an outdoor population at Entebbe, Uganda. Bulletin of Entomological Research. 1959;50(2):227-35.

30. Bowman LR, Rocklöv J, Kroeger A, Olliaro P, Skewes R. A comparison of Zika and dengue outbreaks using national surveillance data in the Dominican Republic. PLoS neglected tropical diseases. 2018;12(11):e0006876.

31. Mutuku FM, Khambira M, Bisanzio D, Mungai P, Mwanzo I, Muchiri EM, et al. Physical condition and maintenance of mosquito bed nets in Kwale County, coastal Kenya. Malaria journal. 2013;12:1-14.

32. Chauhan S, Sharma S, Surender SP. Concurrent dengue and typhoid infection: study from a tertiary care centre in Muzaffarnagar, India. Int J Res Med Sci. 2019;7:1615.

33. Zahouli JB, Koudou BG, Müller P, Malone D, Tano Y, Utzinger J. Effect of land-use changes on the abundance, distribution, and host-seeking behavior of Aedes arbovirus vectors in oil palm-dominated landscapes, southeastern Côte d'Ivoire. PloS one. 2017;12(12):e0189082.

34. Ngami MV. Culicine mosquito species diversity, host feeding preferences and insecticide resistance status in taita-taveta county, Kenya: School of Medicine, Kenyatta University; 2020.

Authorship Contributions

Conceptualization and design of the study:

M. Inziani, M. Mwau.

Methodology

M. Inziani, S. Inoue, M. Mwau

Acquisition of data/Data curation

M. Inziani, S. Inoue, M. Mwau

Formal Analysis and interpretation of data

M. Inziani, M. Kerubo, S. Mango, J. Kilonzo, M. Mwau

Visualization

M. Inziani, M. Kerubo, J. Kilonzo, A. Ndirangu, M. Mwau

Validation

M. Inziani, S. Mango, M. Kerubo, J. Kilonzo, A. Ndirangu, M. Mwau

Project administration

M. Mwau, S. Inoue, K. Morita

Resources

M. Mwau, K. Morita

Funding Acquisition

M. Mwau, K. Morita

Investigation

M. Inziani, S. Inoue, M. Mwau

Supervision:

M. Inziani, M. Mwau, S. Inoue, K. Morita

Drafting the original manuscript

M. Inziani, D. Oigara, S. Mango, E. Njeri, J. Kilonzo, M. Kerubo, S. Ayoro, D. Oigara, A. Ndirangu, M. Kavurani, M. Mwau,

Manuscript - review & editing

M. Inziani, J. Kilonzo, M. Kerubo, S. Mango, M. Kavurani, A. Ndirangu, E. Njeri, S. Ayoro, D. Oigara, S. Inoue, K. Morita, M. Mwau

Approval of the version of the manuscript to be published:

M. Inziani, J. Kilonzo, M. Kerubo, S. Mango, M. Kavurani, A. Ndirangu, E. Njeri, S. Ayoro, D. Oigara, S. Inoue, K. Morita, M. Mwau.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge all the people, listed and not listed, whose contributions made this research possible. We thank Dr Toru Kubo and his team from the Department of Virology (Nagasaki University Institute of Tropical Medicine, Nagasaki, Japan), research colleagues from the Department of Pediatrics and Child Health (University of Nairobi, Kenya) and Prof. Masaaki Shimada (Nagasaki University Africa Research Station, Nairobi, Kenya) who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted the research.

We also wish to thank Joyce Ngoi, Minayo Chahilu, Carolyne Kirwaye and Sheila Kageha and Janet Owando (Kenya Medical Research Institute) for their technical

support and Michael Obura, Evans Omao, the staff of KEMRI Alupe Clinic and Alupe Sub-County Hospital who were instrumental in the recruitment and data collection.

We would also like to thank Dr Jimmy Wafula and other staff members at Alupe Sub-County Hospital for making the research possible.

The parents/guardians and the children who agreed to participate in this study deserve special thanks.

We acknowledge the financial, infrastructural and technical support accorded by Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya, and the financial and technical support offered by the Department of Virology, Nagasaki University Institute of Tropical Medicine, Nagasaki, Japan.

Funding Sources

This work was supported by Kenya Medical Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya and the Department of Virology, Nagasaki University Institute of Tropical Medicine, Nagasaki, Japan.

The study sponsors had no role in the study design, in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript, and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.