Non-household environments make a major contribution to dengue transmission: Implications for vector control

Victor Hugo Peña-García[1,2], A. Desiree LaBeaud[2], Bryson A. Ndenga[3], Francis M. Mutuku[4], Donal A. Bisanzio[5], Erin A. Mordecai[1*], Jason R. Andrews[2*]

[1] Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

[2] School of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

[3] Kenya Medical Research Institute, Kisumu, Kenya

[4] Department of Environmental and Health Sciences, Technical University of Mombasa, Mombasa, Kenya

[5] RTI International, Washington, DC, USA

*Contributed equally

Abstract

Aedes-borne pathogens have been increasing in incidence in recent decades despite vector control activities implemented in endemic settings. Vector control for *Aedes*-transmitted arboviruses typically focuses on households because vectors breed in household containers and bite indoors. Yet, our recent work shows a high abundance of *Aedes* spp. vectors in public spaces. To investigate the impact of non-household environments on dengue transmission and control, we used field data on the number of water containers and abundance of *Aedes* mosquitoes in Household (HH) and Non-Household (NH) environments in two Kenyan cities, Kisumu and Ukunda, from 2019-2022. Incorporating information on human activity space, we developed an agent-based model to simulate city-wide conditions considering HH and five types of NH environments in which people move and interact with other humans and vectors during peak biting times. We additionally evaluated the outcome of vector control activities implemented in different environments in preventive (before an epidemic) and reactive (after an epidemic commences) scenarios. We estimated that over half of infections take place in NH environments, where the main spaces for transmission are workplaces, markets, and recreational locations. Accordingly, results highlight the important role of vector control activities at NH locations to reduce dengue. A greater reduction of cases is expected as control activities are implemented earlier, at higher levels of coverage,

with greater effectiveness when targeting only NH as opposed to when targeting only HH. Further, local ecological factors such as the differential abundance of water containers within cities are also influential factors to consider for control. This work provides insight into the importance of vector control in both household and non-household environments in endemic settings. It highlights a specific approach to inform evidence-based decision making to target limited vector control resources for optimal control.

Introduction

Arthropod-borne diseases (VBDs) are a group of infections caused by pathogens such as parasites, bacteria, and viruses that are transmitted by biting arthropods; together, they put 80% of world's population at risk [1]. Dengue virus, transmitted by *Aedes* mosquitoes, is among the most important VBDs because of the close relationship with human environments [2,3]. Dengue is estimated to cause around 400 million infections globally per year[4,5] and recent trends show an increase in cases annually[6].

This increase in dengue transmission is occurring despite implementation of control activities in endemic settings, leading to a general perception that control activities have failed. However, while this uncertainty can be explained by a lack of reliable evidence of effectiveness of actual control strategies[7], some authors argue that vector control measures are inadequately implemented[8-10]. As a result, one of the main issues to be addressed is the improvement of vector control programs[11].

The design of vector control strategies should be as effective as possible while keeping costs, time, and human resources needed to carry on the interventions as low as possible. In search of this efficiency, vector control strategies have predominantly focused on households (HH) [12]. The rationale behind this assumption is that people spend more time in household environments than in any other structure, while sharing the same space with cohabitants and biting, breeding vectors. As a result, most vector control guidelines are marginally or not including Non-Household (NH) locations as targets of interventions[13-15]. Yet, recent evidence suggests a larger role of non-household environments in infection risk[16-20], which was supported by a significant reduction of cases reported during pandemic lockdown, when people spent more time in households and less time outside of them[21,22].

To better understand the role of non-household environments in dengue transmission, we developed an agent-based model of dengue transmission and calibrated it to data on mosquito breeding places and abundance in various environments from two Kenyan cities [23]. With the model, we estimated the relative contribution of both environments to dengue transmission and evaluated the outcome when control strategies are focused in either or both types of environments under two possible scenarios: a preventive

scenario, where the vector control activities begin prior to an outbreak, and a reactive scenario, where vector control measures are implemented after the beginning of an outbreak.

Results

Infections in non-household environments are higher than expected

In the first stage of this work, we simulated dengue transmission integrating HH and NH conditions from two Kenyan city sites over a modeled population of approximately 20,000 people. In the model, mosquitoes do not move among structures, but human individuals do move between HH and NH settings and spend a given number of hours. These were estimated from data taken from our prior fieldwork surveys, and reflect the actual frequency and time of people on different urban spaces (See Methods section). We grouped urban spaces into six classes (HH and five types of NH locations: workplaces, schools, recreational, religious, and marketplaces) and for each the presence of individuals was established as regular or random. In this way, schools, workplaces, and HH were set as regular, daily attendance while in the remaining NH structures, i.e., religious, recreational, and marketplaces attendance was randomly sampled according to reported time spent in each setting by age.

During a period of 731 days (i.e. two years), the model yielded a median of 784 (Interquartile Range [IQR]: 350 – 1557) infections happening in Kisumu while a median of 3971 (IQR: 2680 – 5445) happened in Ukunda (Figure 1). By explicitly quantifying the number of infections happening in different urban environments, the model estimated a slightly higher proportion of infections taking place in NH structures, accounting for around 57.4% (IQR: 47.7 – 58.2) of infections from Kisumu and 56.3% (IQR: 53.1 – 57.4) of infections from Ukunda. Workplaces were the most common NH site of infections, accounting for 77.1% (IQR: 54.7-99) in Kisumu and 30.9% (IQR: 28.8 – 32.4) in Ukunda. Markets and shopping locations accounted for 9.3% (IQR: 0 – 18.8) and 27.4% (IQR: 26.2 – 29.2) of NH infections for Kisumu and Ukunda, respectively. Recreational locations accounted for 10.9% (IQR: 0.0 – 19.4) of NH infections in Kisumu and 21.4% (IQR: 20.3 – 21.8) in Ukunda. Finally, religious places and schools had the lowest number of infections accounting for 2.7% (IQR: 0.0 – 7.1) and 0% (no infections recorded) for Kisumu and 18.9% (IQR: 17.9 – 19.1) and 1.3% (IQR: 0.0 – 5.1) for Ukunda, respectively.

In addition, we wanted to understand how infection risk for children (15 years old and younger) and adults (those older than 15 years) is distributed in different environments. Though infections in schools only took place in Ukunda, a higher proportion of infections in children is happening in schools, as expected, while a higher proportion of infections in adults happen in workplaces. Following schools, the model predicted the highest

proportion of infections in children happening in households followed by recreational places for both cities.



Figure 1: HH and NH environments contribute nearly equally to dengue transmission. Number of infections (y-axis) over time (x-axis) by environment, age, and city. The number of infections recorded along the simulated two-year period by environments and cities is depicted in panel A. Panel B shows the distribution of infections by including both the total number and by age group (considering children those individuals 15 years old or younger and adults those older than 15) for the six environments considered for each city.

Differential effectiveness in preventive control among urban environments

In the first vector control scenario, the vector control activities were simulated to happen before the beginning of the epidemic. The vector control activities varied in three different ways: 1) the intensity of the control: simulated as percentage of water containers eliminated; 2) according to environment, where control is applied only in one

of the environments (i.e., HH or NH) or in both; and 3) according to container size within environments, where the size of mosquito breeding places were considered by only eliminating either large (larger than 10 liters), small (smaller than 10 liters) containers, or irrespective of the size (Figure 2).

NH environments provide a powerful lever for vector control, especially when vector control was preventative. Control in NH was more effective than control in HH: for example, considering 50% control intensity in Kisumu, HH-only control reduced cases by 54.2% (IQR: 10.1 - 73.3) while NH-only control reduced cases by 68% (IQR: 48.4 - 80.4), and controlling both reduced cases by 76.6% (IQR: 61.3 - 85.7) . In Ukunda, the difference is even more dramatic: 35.6% (IQR: 2.2 - 66.2) reduction in cases from control in HH containers alone, 84.6% (IQR: 62.9 - 95.4) reduction for NH containers alone, and 93.2% (IQR: 80.4 - 97.5) reduction for control in both HH and NH (Figure 2).

On the other hand, the importance of container size is different between cities, where small containers (less than 10 liters volume) were more important for Kisumu while removal of large containers (more than 10 liters volume) yielded a greater reduction of cases in Ukunda. Thus, when 50% control intensity is applied on both environments, a reduction of 66.6% (IQR: 45.6 - 79.6) of cases can be seen when only small containers are removed while a 49.5% (IQR: 0.0 - 70.3) reduction resulted from removing only large containers in Kisumu. Nevertheless, a greater reduction is observed when the control is done irrespective of the size of the container with a reduction of 76.6% (IQR: 61.3 - 85.7) in the same city. On the other hand, in Ukunda, removing only small containers led to a 34.9% (IQR: 0.6 - 66.1) of cases reduction versus a 73.5% (IQR: 43.7 - 94.8) reduction when large containers are targeted. Similar to Kisumu, the greatest reduction in cases resulted when control is performed on all container types, with a 93.2% (IQR: 80.4 - 97.5) case reduction in Ukunda (Figure 2).



Figure 2: NH environments are equally or more effective than HH environments for dengue control across cities, container sizes, and control intensities, which combine to determine the most effective strategy. Effectiveness of vector control strategies evaluated under the preventive scenario. Effectiveness is expressed as reduction in percentage of dengue cases compared to the epidemic size with no vector control interventions. The vector control strategies vary according to control intensity (number of containers eliminated) and the target environment (Households, Non-Households or both) and container size (small for water containers with capacity less than 10 liters, large for containers with capacity greater than 10 liters, or irrespective of size).

The effectiveness difference among HH and NH is consistent between preventive and reactive strategies

We then evaluated the scenario when the vector control activities are implemented after the beginning of the epidemic. Besides varying the same conditions as in the preventive scenario, we also considered that vector control activities carried out as a response to an epidemic can take some days to be implemented. To evaluate this, we simulated the control implemented at days 1, 50 and 100 after the beginning of the epidemic.

As expected, the greatest reduction in cases is observed when vector control strategies are implemented sooner to the beginning of the epidemic showing timing to be as important as the environment. For example, considering a 50% control intensity, the effectiveness declines from 74.3% (IQR: 60.7 - 85.8) when control is implemented at day 1 to 44.3% (IQR: 20.5 - 62.7) when control is implemented at day 100 for Kisumu, and from 89.1% (at day 1, IQR: 75.3 - 94.9) to 63.6% (at day 100, IQR: 44.9 - 78.8) in Ukunda, representing an increase in effectiveness of 30% and 25.5% for Kisumu and Ukunda, respectively. By increasing the intensity to 100%, the effectiveness shifts from 90.2% (IQR: 86.3 - 96.1) at day 1 to 52.9% (36.1 - 66.8) at day 100 in Kisumu, and from 98.5% (IQR: 97.8 - 99.0) at day 1 to 80.4% (IQR: 72.5 - 82.9) at day 100 in Ukunda. On another hand, when we examined the change in the effectiveness by increasing the control intensity at day 50, it goes from 68.8% (IQR: 57.5 - 77.4) to 44.99% (IQR: 8.3 - 65.0) when intensity is shifted from 100% to 25% in Kisumu. In Ukunda, the change is sharper, going from 91.8% (IQR: 88.6 - 94.4) effectiveness at 100% of control intensity to 37.7% (IQR: 7.25 - 62.9) effectiveness at 25% of control intensity (Figure 3).

Like in the preventive scenario, for reactive control the highest reduction is achieved when control is applied in HH and NH environments, capturing their unique contributions to transmission. However, when control is applied in only one or the other, control targeted to NH environments was more effective than that targeted to HH (Figure 3 and Figures S2-S3).



Figure 3: Reactive control is more effective in non-household or all environments combined than household environments alone, regardless of timing, intensity, and city. Effectiveness is expressed as the reduction in the percentage of dengue cases compared to the epidemic curve with no vector control interventions. The vector control strategies vary according to control intensity (number of containers eliminated; y-axis), the target environment (Households, Non-Households or both; panel columns); the day of implementation after the beginning of the epidemic (x-axis); and city (panel rows).

Discussion

Recent field work reported a high number of vectors in NH environments in the Kenyan cities of Kisumu and Ukunda, suggesting potentially high risk for *Aedes*-borne viruses transmission in these environments[23]. However, until now it was unclear how the total burden of transmission varied based on container type and density, human activity space within HH and NH environments, and variation over time, across ages, and between cities. Here, we developed an agent-based model that incorporates field data on vector occurrence and abundance, container density and type, and human activity space across age structure in Kisumu and Ukunda to explore the consequences of NH environments for dengue transmission. Specifically, we tested the hypothesis that dengue vector control could be improved by extending it to NH spaces. The model

supports this hypothesis, demonstrating that the contribution of NH spaces to transmission is as high or higher than HH (Fig. 1), and that controlling vectors in both NH and HH environments provides the most effective reductions in transmission for a given amount of effort (Figs. 2-3).

By looking beyond the number of infections in NH, our model suggests that these environments act as spreaders of the virus among households. In this way, while a limited number of new infections can happen inside a household, the high movement of individuals in NH environments provides a source of new infections and transmission spreading among households. In line with this, some previous modeling work had suggested the importance of movement of people in dengue transmission[24-27]. It is very likely that this role is also mediated by intermediate spaces among households like those defined in this work as NH environments, such as workplaces, schools, social spaces, religious spaces, and marketplaces, where the presence of vectors had already suggested a role in transmission[16,17,20].

Among the five categories of NH spaces, workplaces contributed most to transmission (Fig. 1). This is not the first work suggesting such a large contribution. Previous work developed on a Zika outbreak in Singapore by Prem and colleagues predicted an even higher proportion of infections, with an estimated of 64% (at least 51%) of infections happening at workplaces[28]. Besides HH and schools, workplaces are the locations where individuals spend most of their time, which increases the probability of being bitten by a mosquito (See Supplementary information for details of parameterization). For these spaces, we considered an average of 19 people per workplace (Supplementary information), which is higher than the average number of inhabitants per household and hence increases the probability of having an infected individual at a given timepoint. By contrast, in schools, which have a considerably higher average number of students of 360 (see Supplementary Information), while the probability of having an infected person at any given time is surely high, the probability of a mosquito biting the infected individual among the entire student population is low, and the density of mosquitoes in schools is not high enough to compensate for this low per-person biting probability. This is especially true in Kisumu, where low overall incidence explains the lack of infections in schools, while the high incidence in Ukunda increases the presence of infected individuals in schools and hence the probability of human-to-vector infections and subsequent spread. Considering the population size with which we worked (see Methods section), previous reports of infection risk in schools [17,18], and the vulnerability of children that congregate in schools, our data suggests that this type of environment still represents some level of infection risk and its inclusion in vector control activities is necessary. This is particularly true as this is the main NH environment where children are at risk for dengue exposure.

In line with this, the proportion of infections in children and adults in different environments likely reflects the age structure of individuals visiting these locations. In this model, we assume that the epidemic starts in a fully naive population; accounting for age-structured variation in pre-existing immunity would possibly alter the risk scenario for children [29].

The scientific literature supports the presence of significant risk in spaces other than HH in other parts of the globe [17-20]. Some of these previously identified spaces that were not evaluated in this work include abandoned and open spaces and hotels, because we did not have data available on time spent in these locations. Accordingly, it is possible that a slight increase of NH infections is still to be quantified by considering those environments.

Results under the preventive and reactive scenarios yielded similar results: higher effectiveness is achieved when control considers only NH compared to only HH, and a combined approach that includes HH and NH is most effective. This points to an important disconnect between our results and current vector control practices, which primarily focus on HH spaces and neglect NH vector control [13-15]. Scientific literature related to vector control household-focused interventions is overwhelming [12,30], while there are no interventions designed to be focused on both. Though we cannot definitively attribute the lack of successful dengue control to transmission in NH settings, our data-driven model suggests that this could be an important part of the problem, and we advocate for future studies in other locations studying this phenomenon.

Our model includes a novel mosquito density-dependent function that allows us to realistically model vector population dynamics from a larval perspective and at the scale of individual containers (as described by McCormack and colleagues[31]), which also allows us to estimate the relative importance of different container size in transmission and control (see Supplementary Information). By using the function, our results suggest that the relative importance of containers is city-specific since it depends on the frequency of these containers across cities. Accordingly, small containers in Kisumu are much more frequent than large containers (See Supplementary Information) so slightly higher effectiveness is achieved when control is targeting only them. The situation is different in Ukunda where a higher effectiveness is observed when focusing on both types of containers, where control targeting large containers is more effective as this type of container is more productive[32,33]. These results suggest that the effectiveness of container-focused vector control depends on a trade-off between the productivity of containers and their frequency, where large containers are more productive but less frequent than small containers. In addition, it requires detailed data on vector abundance by container type, which is not easily characterized. These data exist in these cities because of our research programs there and is not regularly collected by the local municipalities, where an emphasis on malaria and *Anopheles spp.* leaves

significant gaps in *Aedes spp.* data. However, control implementation irrespective of container size is always more effective regardless of the city. This aligns with the result showing the most effective control when both HH and NH are included, suggesting that multiple ecological conditions (small and large containers in multiple HH and NH environments) contribute to transmission that together more comprehensively reach the susceptible host population than any single contributor.

This model is meant to realistically represent the transmission conditions in both cities but has some limitations. Though agent-based models are excellent for capturing heterogeneity and variation within populations, especially when rich data are available for parameterization, our model cannot estimate some other potential variability sources like mosquito movement or variability in time in the number of breeding places. Likewise, the addition of other types of buildings beyond the six types we included in this study might provide a more comprehensive perspective of urban locations where transmission can be happening, like those described previously by our team[23]. Our estimates of movement are mainly based on the time people spend in given locations, but other potential sources of variability were not included like intra-urban distances[26,34], decrease of mobility due to illness[35], and travel to other urban centers and rural areas. Movement data were collected using semi-structured interview (SSI, see Methods section), which relies on people's recollection. Consequently, the collected data may be influenced by recollection bias, a common limitation of SSIs. Recollection bias could lead participants to list only highly-visited locations, potentially overlooking places that are less frequently visited. Additionally, the time spent in each location may be affected by participants' different senses of time, which are linked to their individual characteristics.

Unfortunately, data related to density of mosquitoes in specific NH locations were not available or did not match with information collected from the people movement data survey. Some assessed spaces reported by Peña-García[23] having mosquitoes like “open spaces”, “gardens” or “banana plantation” were not reported by people as places where they spend any time. Equally, NH categories included in the model like “workplaces” can group some of the categories reported by Peña-García. For these reasons, the initial conditions for the mosquito dynamics were the same for all NH buildings in the model. In this way, differences related to different NH locations are mainly due to the number of people attending the locations and the time spent in these. It is important to mention that mosquito positivity status per location and their number of containers were randomly assigned considering the total variability found for NH locations in the work of Peña-García[23] (Supplementary Methods).

In conclusion, the results of this work suggest not only that NH locations are important in dengue transmission, but that vector control activities would be unsuccessful if these spaces are not properly included. When exploring in detail the NH locations, differential risk depends on the number of people and the time they spend in these places, which

can make some age groups particularly vulnerable to infection at given locations and certain locations critical for certain age groups. Equally, because cities differ in their abundance and distribution of container sizes, comprehensive vector control approaches that focus on multiple types of containers across HH and NH spaces are necessary to break chains of transmission. Through our model, we provide evidence-based insights for new directions aimed at designing new vector control strategies that can make limited resources be used in optimal control activities.

Methods

Model overview

Simulated populations and environments

The aims of this work were 1) to identify the contribution of HH and NH to the total number of dengue infections and 2) evaluate the outcome of different vector control strategies on dengue transmission in urban areas. Having this in mind, we developed an agent-based model taking as a basis data and conditions from Kenyan cities of Kisumu (located at the western part of the country next to Lake Victoria) and Ukunda (coastal city at the eastern part of the country).

To develop the model, we created two synthetic populations representing each of the Kenyan cities. To do this, we considered the number of inhabitants per household for each city according to information provided by reports of 2019 Kenya Population and Housing Census [36], which is also in accordance with previously reported for both cities[23], where the mean number of inhabitants per household is 4.6 for Kisumu and 7.3 for Ukunda. The size of synthetic populations was set to be around 20,000 individuals (final size was 20,172 for Ukunda and 20,160 for Kisumu), so the number of households was set accordingly to both size of human population and the mean number of house inhabitants.

Following the aim of this work, we additionally created a synthetic NH environment. For this, we considered information related to the presence of water containers in these environments and available data about the presence of people at different urban spaces (See Supplementary Information and Data Obtaining section) to define five different types of NH environments: workplaces, schools, religious (representing churches, mosques, etc.), markets (including shopping places of any kind), and recreational (grouping any place where people attend for entertainment or gatherings like bars, nightclubs, parks, etc.). The number of workplaces and schools were defined according to information extracted from previous reports informing the average number of either workers[37] (rounded to 19) or students[38] (rounded to 360) for each of the respective environments. For the remaining NH structures, we defined as 1 market and recreational place for every 30 houses and 1 religious space for every 50 houses.

We used data on proportions of containers in HH and NH environments that we previously published [23]. With those proportions, each structure was assigned a specific number of water containers, each with an assigned size based on our data on the size distribution of containers[23].

Each individual of the synthetic population was assigned an age following the proportions reported in the Census of 2019 [36]. Each individual was also assigned an occupation being either student, worker, both, or none (for example, toddlers or retired) following the general student and worker age reported in Kenyan Quarterly Labour Force Report (2021)[37] and Basic Education Statistical Booklet (2019)[38].

Population dynamics

The model was configured to simulate on a daily basis what happens in each structure where humans and vectors are present and hence, infections can take place. The presence of human individuals at a given location depends on the type of structure, where households, workplaces and schools are daily-attending locations, and religious, markets, and recreational places are daily-randomly assigned attendings. In this sense, for each structure falling into the first category, the same individuals are met and interacting daily. For the latter three types of structures, the number and selection of individuals occurs randomly on a daily basis (See Supplementary Information). Finally, we also included movement among HH with a probability of 0.1 for a given HH to receive a non-habitant individual each day. In this model we are assuming that mosquitoes are not moving among structures, so it is the movement of humans that drives the spread of the virus.

When a given structure has mosquitoes and humans there is a chance of transmission if any of them is infected. The probability of a human being bitten in a given structure depends on the number of both mosquitoes and humans and the time that humans spend in the structure. For simplicity, each structure was assigned with a specific number of hours for people to spend that is defined according to the type of structure. Data to define the number of hours per structure was estimated based on fieldwork developed in the same study cities (See Data Obtaining section and Supplementary Information).

Mosquito population dynamics are not determined in a city-wise but in a structure-wise level having in mind that different patterns of transmission are obtained when space fragmentation is considered[31]. To do this, we considered that the main limiting driver of mosquito population growth is happening at the larval stages [39,40] and hence depending on the breeding place availability, their volume, and larval density. Accordingly, we developed a density-dependent function to estimate the number of individuals in the

next discrete time (day) describing the larval survival as a function of the density of mosquito immature stages and temperature, as follows:

$$f(D) = \frac{1}{1+e^{0.09D-0.55}} d$$

where

$$d = -0.166 + 0.08T - 0.0014T^2$$

In this equation, d is a term that relates temperature (T) with the remaining terms in the equation and D is the larval density expressed as the ratio of the number of larvae and the number of liters of water available for breeding in the structure. The number of larvae and mosquito mortality rates are also temperature-dependent following the functions described previously[41-43] (See Supplementary Information for details related to implementation of functions in this work).

Infection dynamics

For a susceptible mosquito that bites an infected human, it can be moved from susceptible to exposed stage according to temperature-dependent vector competence and later be moved to infectious stage with temperature-dependent EIP (Extrinsic Incubation Period) following functions previously described [41]. Infectious mosquitoes remain in this stage until death, for which the rate also depends on temperature using a previously published function[41].

Humans that are bitten by infected mosquitoes are moved to latent stage where they remain for 5 days. At the end of this period, they are moved to the infectious stage lasting 7 days before moving to a recovered stage. Since the model does not explicitly simulate the circulation of DENV serotypes, we consider complete protection lasting for 100 days (based on cross-protection described from classic work on dengue[44,45]), and after this period humans are returned to a susceptible state.

The type of structure where each infection takes place, and the date were recorded. Each computational run considers a temporal window of 731 days comprising between January 1st of 2020 until December 31st of 2021. Data are temporarily grouped yielding the number of cases happening every week. Results are expressed as median and interquartile range (IQR) of infections among 400 runs. All simulations were run on Sherlock cluster at Stanford University (Stanford Research Computing Center).

Data acquisition

Information related to the number of containers in different environments was obtained from fieldwork performed between 2020 and 2022 in both study sites and previously reported in detail [23]. Briefly, 400 m^2 urban areas were sampled with four different strategies targeting different stages of mosquitoes: ovitraps to obtain information on eggs, container surveys to obtain information of larval stages and container availability, Prokopack aspirators to obtain information related to adults, and BG-Sentinel to obtain information from breeding place-searching females. Information on sample location was recorded including the type of environment (HH or NH), number of water containers and their size category, the *Aedes* positivity status, and number of house inhabitants was also recorded when applicable.

Temperature data was collected in both cities by using temperature data loggers (HOBO®), and the daily average was calculated during the entire simulated period comprising from January 1 of 2020 until December 31 of 2022.

People movement survey

We carried out a semi-structured interview (SSI) to gather information about people's movement routine in Kenyan settings from November 1st to December 2nd, 2021. SSIs have been previously employed to gather data on routine human movement in other settings[46]. The survey was carried out in two community cohorts corresponding each of them to both Kenyan cities included in this work; i.e. Kisumu and Ukunda. Both cohorts are part of an ongoing longitudinal study[47]. We interviewed 201 individuals in Ukunda and 243 in Kisumu, carefully selected to represent the gender and age group distribution of their respective cohorts. The developed SSI included questions aimed at capturing commonly visited locations during weekly activities. Participants were asked to list locations, besides their households, such as workplaces, markets and shops, schools, and religious places that they usually visit in a week. Participants also provided an estimated amount of time spent in each location per week. The SSI was conducted by trained local technicians who provided an overview of the study. Questionnaires targeting child-aged individuals unable to respond by their own were completed by their guardians. For subjects below 18 years of age capable of answering the questionnaire, we obtained permission from their guardians. All locations listed by participants were georeferenced by the survey team, either by collecting GPS ground points or by gathering coordinates through Google Map. The questionnaire used in this study is available as Supplementary Information.

Vector Control Strategies Assessed

The strategies tested in this model are focused on the reduction of vector populations and the intensity of the control was quantified as the reduction percentage of water-

holding containers as potential mosquito breeding places. Container elimination was evaluated under two control scenarios termed “preventive” and “reactive”. The preventive control scenario refers to the elimination of containers on day 0 preceding the start of an epidemic. To ensure a proper start of the epidemic at the designated time, there were no infections happening in the two weeks preceding it. On the other hand, the reactive control scenario refers to the elimination of containers after the rise in cases defining the start of an epidemic. Having in mind that reactive control initiatives can take some days to be implemented for several reasons (planning, resource allocation, recruitment, among other stages), we considered 1, 50 and 100 days after the start of the epidemic as different reaction times (the day when control was accomplished, additional results for control implemented after 250 days are included in Supplementary Information).

For both control scenarios, the effort of the control strategies was quantified as percentage of water containers removed. Given that our goal was also to quantify the contribution of urban HH and NH environments in the total number of cases, we additionally evaluated the effectiveness of control when it is focused only on one or both of these environments. In addition, we also included the outcome of the control when it is focused on large (those with a volume higher that 10 liters) or small (with a volume less than 10 liters) containers to provide insights on different mosquito population-related parameters and their effects on transmission and subsequent control effectiveness.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the teams that performed fieldwork and collected the data on which this work was based on in both Kisumu and Ukunda cities. Additionally, we acknowledge the funding entities that supported this work: NIH through grant R01AI102918 (PI LaBeaud). V.H.P.G. is supported by grants R01AI102918 and R35GM133439; E.A.M. is supported by NIH grants R35GM133439, R01AI102918, and R01AI168097, and NSF grant DEB-2011147 (with Fogarty International Center); A.D.L is supported by grants R01AI102918, R01AI149614, R01AI155959, D43TW011547.

Author contributions

A.D.L., E.A.M., J.R.A. and V.H.P.G. conceived the work. V.H.P.G. conducted the analysis. A.D.L., E.A.M., J.R.A., D.A.B and V.H.P.G participated in the writing of the paper. A.D.L., E.A.M. and J.R.A secured funding for the project. B.A.N., F.M.M, A.D.L. and D.A.B. collected and curated the data.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1 World Health Organization. Global Vector Control Response 2017-2030. 53 (World Health Organization, Geneva, 2017).

2 Scott, T. W. *et al.* Longitudinal studies of *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) in Thailand and Puerto Rico: blood feeding frequency. *J Med Entomol* **37**, 89-101 (2000).

3 Scott, T. W. *et al.* Blood-feeding patterns of *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) collected in a rural Thai village. *J Med Entomol* **30**, 922-927 (1993).

4 Bhatt, S. *et al.* The global distribution and burden of dengue. *Nature* **496**, 504-507 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12060

5 GBD 2016 Disease and Injury Incidence and Prevalence Collaborators. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet* **390**, 1211-1259 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32154-2

6 Yang, X., Quam, M. B. M., Zhang, T. & Sang, S. Global burden for dengue and the evolving pattern in the past 30 years. *J Travel Med* **28** (2021). https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taab146

7 Bowman, L. R., Donegan, S. & McCall, P. J. Is Dengue Vector Control Deficient in Effectiveness or Evidence?: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **10**, e0004551 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0004551

8 Morrison, A. C., Getis, A., Santiago, M., Rigau-Perez, J. G. & Reiter, P. Exploratory space-time analysis of reported dengue cases during an outbreak in Florida, Puerto Rico, 1991-1992. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **58**, 287-298 (1998).

9 Achee, N. L. *et al.* A critical assessment of vector control for dengue prevention. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **9**, e0003655 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0003655

10 Lorenz, C. & Chiaravalloti-Neto, F. Control methods for *Aedes aegypti*: Have we lost the battle? *Travel Med Infect Dis* **49**, 102428 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2022.102428

11 Morrison, A. C., Zielinski-Gutierrez, E., Scott, T. W. & Rosenberg, R. Defining challenges and proposing solutions for control of the virus vector Aedes aegypti. *PLoS Med* **5**, e68 (2008). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0050068

12 Montenegro-Quiñonez, C. A. *et al.* Interventions against Aedes/dengue at the household level: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *EBioMedicine* **93**, 104660 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2023.104660

13 Pan American Health Organization. Manual for Indoor Residual Spraying in Urban Areas for A*edes aegypti* Control. Report No. 978-92-75-12114-6, 60 (Washington, D.C., 2019).

14 World Health Organization. *Dengue guidelines for diagnosis, treatment, prevention and control : new edition*. (World Health Organization, 2009).

15 World Health Organization. Vector control operations framework for Zika virus. (World Health Organization, Geneva, 2016).

16 Huang, C. H. *et al.* Relationship between the Incidence of Dengue Virus Transmission in Traditional Market and Climatic Conditions in Kaohsiung City. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol* **2021**, 9916642 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9916642

17 Suwanbamrung, C., Promsupa, S., Doungsin, T. & Tongjan, S. Risk factors related to dengue infections in primary school students: exploring students' basic knowledge of

dengue and examining the larval indices in southern Thailand. *J Infect Public Health* **6**, 347-357 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2013.04.006
18 Pérez-Pérez, J. *et al.* Entomovirological Surveillance in Schools: Are They a Source for Arboviral Diseases Transmission? *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **18** (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18116137
19 Kampango, A. *et al.* Risk factors for occurrence and abundance of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes bromeliae* at hotel compounds in Zanzibar. *Parasit Vectors* **14**, 544 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-021-05005-9
20 Barrera, R., Acevedo, V. & Amador, M. Role of Abandoned and Vacant Houses on *Aedes aegypti* Productivity. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **104**, 145-150 (2021). https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0829
21 Wilder-Smith, A. Dengue during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Travel Med* **28** (2021). https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taab183
22 Sasmono, R. T. & Santoso, M. S. Movement dynamics: reduced dengue cases during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet Infect Dis* **22**, 570-571 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00062-7
23 Peña-García, V. H. *et al.* The Importance of Including Non-Household Environments in Dengue Vector Control Activities. *Viruses* **15** (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/v15071550
24 Stoddard, S. T. *et al.* The role of human movement in the transmission of vector-borne pathogens. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **3**, e481 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0000481
25 Stoddard, S. T. *et al.* House-to-house human movement drives dengue virus transmission. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **110**, 994-999 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1213349110
26 Reiner, R. C., Stoddard, S. T. & Scott, T. W. Socially structured human movement shapes dengue transmission despite the diffusive effect of mosquito dispersal. *Epidemics* **6**, 30-36 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epidem.2013.12.003
27 Zhang, Y. *et al.* Modeling the relative role of human mobility, land-use and climate factors on dengue outbreak emergence in Sri Lanka. *BMC Infect Dis* **20**, 649 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-020-05369-w
28 Prem, K. *et al.* Inferring who-infected-whom-where in the 2016 Zika outbreak in Singapore-a spatio-temporal model. *J R Soc Interface* **16**, 20180604 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2018.0604
29 Katzelnick, L. C. *et al.* Antibody-dependent enhancement of severe dengue disease in humans. *Science* **358**, 929-932 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aan6836
30 Horstick, O. & Runge-Ranzinger, S. Multisectoral approaches for the control of vector-borne diseases, with particular emphasis on dengue and housing. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* **113**, 823-828 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1093/trstmh/trz020
31 McCormack, C. P., Ghani, A. C. & Ferguson, N. M. Fine-scale modelling finds that breeding site fragmentation can reduce mosquito population persistence. *Commun Biol* **2**, 273 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-019-0525-0
32 Harrington, L. C., Ponlawat, A., Edman, J. D., Scott, T. W. & Vermeylen, F. Influence of container size, location, and time of day on oviposition patterns of the dengue vector, *Aedes aegypti*, in Thailand. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis* **8**, 415-423 (2008). https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2007.0203
33 Ouédraogo, W. M. *et al.* Impact of physicochemical parameters of *Aedes aegypti* breeding habitats on mosquito productivity and the size of emerged adult mosquitoes in Ouagadougou City, Burkina Faso. *Parasit Vectors* **15**, 478 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-022-05558-3
34 Perkins, T. A. *et al.* Theory and data for simulating fine-scale human movement in an urban environment. *J R Soc Interface* **11** (2014). https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2014.0642

35 Perkins, T. A. *et al.* Calling in sick: impacts of fever on intra-urban human mobility. *Proc Biol Sci* **283** (2016). https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.0390
36 Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. 2019 Kenya Population and Housing Census. Volume 1: Population by County and Sub-county. 49 (Nairobi, 2019).
37 Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. Quarterly Labour Force Report. Quarter 1. (Nairobi, 2021).
38 Kenya Ministry of Education. Basic Education Statistical Booklet, 2019. (Nairobi, 2019).
39 Smith, D. L., Perkins, T. A., Tusting, L. S., Scott, T. W. & Lindsay, S. W. Mosquito population regulation and larval source management in heterogeneous environments. *PLoS One* **8**, e71247 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0071247
40 Walker, M., Chandrasegaran, K., Vinauger, C., Robert, M. A. & Childs, L. M. Modeling the effects of *Aedes aegypti*'s larval environment on adult body mass at emergence. *PLoS Comput Biol* **17**, e1009102 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009102
41 Mordecai, E. A. *et al.* Detecting the impact of temperature on transmission of Zika, dengue, and chikungunya using mechanistic models. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **11**, e0005568 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005568
42 Caldwell, J. M. *et al.* Climate predicts geographic and temporal variation in mosquito-borne disease dynamics on two continents. *Nat Commun* **12**, 1233 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21496-7
43 Huber, J. H., Childs, M. L., Caldwell, J. M. & Mordecai, E. A. Seasonal temperature variation influences climate suitability for dengue, chikungunya, and Zika transmission. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **12**, e0006451 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006451
44 Sabin, A. B. The dengue group of viruses and its family relationships. *Bacteriol Rev* **14**, 225-232 (1950).
45 Sabin, A. B. Research on dengue during World War II. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* **1**, 30-50 (1952). https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.1952.1.30
46 Paz-Soldan, V. A. *et al.* Strengths and weaknesses of Global Positioning System (GPS) data-loggers and semi-structured interviews for capturing fine-scale human mobility: findings from Iquitos, Peru. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* **8**, e2888 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0002888
47 Khan, A. *et al.* Spatiotemporal overlapping of dengue, chikungunya, and malaria infections in children in Kenya. *BMC Infect Dis* **23**, 183 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-023-08157-4