

1 Community benefits of mass distribution of three types of dual-active-ingredient long-lasting 2 insecticidal nets against malaria prevalence in Tanzania: evidence from a 3-year cluster- 3 randomized controlled trial

4 Eliud Andrea Lukole^{1,2*}, Jackie Cook³, Jacklin F Mosha¹, Nancy S Matowo², Manisha A Kulkarni⁴
5 Elizabeth Mallya⁵, Tatu Aziz¹, Jacklin Martin⁵, Mark Rowland², Immo Kleinschmidt^{3,9,10}, Alphaxard
6 Manjurano¹, Safari Kinung'hi¹, Franklin W Mosha⁵, Natacha Protopopoff²

- 7
- 8 1. Department of Parasitology, National Institute for Medical Research, Mwanza Medical
9 Research Centre, Mwanza, Tanzania
- 10 2. Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London,
11 United Kingdom
- 12 3. MRC International Statistics and Epidemiology Group, Department of Infectious Disease
13 Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United
14 Kingdom
- 15 4. School of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada
- 16 5. Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Moshi, Tanzania
- 17 6. National Malaria Control Program, Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender,
18 Elderly and Children, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
- 19 7. Wits Research Institute for Malaria, School of Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences,
20 University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
- 21 8. Southern African Development Community Malaria Elimination Eight Secretariat,
22 Windhoek, Namibia
- 23

24 Abstract

25 Background

26 Long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) were once fully effective for the prevention of malaria;
27 however, mosquitoes have developed resistance to pyrethroids, the main class of insecticides used
28 on nets. Dual active ingredient LLINs (dual-AI LLINs) have been rolled out as an alternative to
29 pyrethroid (PY)-only LLINs to counteract this. Understanding the minimum community usage at
30 which these novel nets generate an effect that also benefits non-net users against malaria infection is
31 vital for planning net distribution strategies and mobilization campaigns.

32 Methods

33 We conducted a secondary analysis of a 3-year randomized controlled trial (RCT) in 84 clusters in
34 North-western Tanzania to evaluate the effectiveness of three dual-AI LLINs: pyriproxyfen and
35 alpha(α)-cypermethrin (pyriproxyfen-PY), chlorfenapyr and α -cypermethrin (chlorfenapyr-PY), and
36 the synergist piperonyl-butoxide and permethrin (PBO-PY) compared to α -cypermethrin only nets

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

37 (PY-only). We measured malaria infection prevalence using 5 cross-sectional surveys between 2020
38 and 2022. We assessed net usage at the cluster level and malaria infection in up to two children aged
39 between 6 months and 14 years in 45 households per cluster and compared infection prevalence
40 between net users and non-users with the different net types and usage levels.

41 **Findings**

42 A total of 22,479 children from 12,654 households were tested for malaria using rapid diagnostic
43 tests in January 2020, 2021, & 2022 and July 2020 & 2021. In all surveys combined, 23%
44 (5,062/22,479) of children reported not using a net the night before the surveys. The proportion of
45 non-net users was highest in the later surveys. Across all study arms and at each time point, users of
46 nets had significantly lower malaria infection than non-users. Overall, malaria prevalence was 52%
47 (2649/5062) among non-net users and 32% (5572/11845) among users (of any net). Among non-net
48 users, community-level usage of >40% of dual-AI LLIN was significantly associated with protection
49 against malaria infection: chlorfenapyr-PY (OR: 0.44 (95% CI: 0.27-0.71), p=0.0009), PBO-PY (OR:
50 0.55 (95% CI: 0.33-0.94), p=0.0277) and pyriproxyfen-PY (OR: 0.61 (95% CI: 0.37-0.99), p=0.0470)
51 compared with non-users in clusters with >40% usage of PY-only LLINs. There was weak evidence
52 of protection against malaria infection to non-net users in the chlorfenapyr-PY arm when community-
53 level usage was \leq 40% (OR: 0.65 (95% CI: 0.42-1.01), p=0.0528) compared to those living in clusters
54 with >40% usage of pyrethroid-only LLINs. The study was limited to non-users which were defined
55 as participants who did not sleep under any net the night before. This might not capture occasional
56 net usage during the week.

57 **Conclusion**

58 Our study demonstrated that at a community usage of 40% or more of dual-AI LLINs, non-net users
59 benefited from the presence of these nets. Noticeably, even when usage was \leq 40% in the
60 chlorfenapyr-PY arm, non-users were better protected than non-users in the higher coverage PY-only
61 arm. The greater difference in malaria risk observed between users and non-users across all study
62 arms indicates that nets play a crucial role in providing personal protection against malaria infection

63 for the people using the net and that net usage needs to be maximized to realize the full potential of
64 all nets.

65

66 **Funding**

67 Department for International Development, UK Medical Research Council, Wellcome Trust, and
68 Department of Health and Social Care (#MR/R006040/1). The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
69 via the Innovative Vector Control Consortium (IVCC).

70 Keywords: dual active ingredient LLINs, community effect, malaria prevalence, Tanzania

71 **Background**

72 Long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) have been the core intervention for malaria control for many
73 years and have contributed to a decline of >25% global cases and >66% global deaths since 2000.¹⁻⁴
74 LLINs work by providing a barrier preventing mosquitoes from taking bloodmeals from people
75 sleeping under them and by killing or reducing a mosquito's lifespan via the insecticide on the netting,
76 known as a 'community effect'. Only older mosquitoes transmit malaria due to the time required for
77 the parasite to develop in the mosquito between blood meals therefore, reducing the lifespan of
78 mosquitoes ensures fewer can transmit.⁵ In this way, LLINs not only reduce vector-human contact
79 for those using the nets but also reduce mosquito vector populations and hence the risk of malaria
80 transmission for the community at large (whether using nets or not).⁶⁻⁹ This has been demonstrated
81 in experimental hut trials,¹⁰⁻¹² modeling^{7, 13}, and community trials^{6, 14} where a higher level of
82 coverage of pyrethroid-only nets resulted in a decrease in malaria risk, even in those not using nets.
83 Previous findings with pyrethroid-only nets have suggested that community coverage needs to be at
84 least 15% and up to 85% before the community effect is realised.¹⁵ However, this is a wide range to
85 rely on for program implementation.

86 The community-wide effect depends on the insecticidal properties of the LLIN,¹⁶ as well as LLIN
87 characteristics (coverage, netting integrity), and vector species behaviour (anthropophilic and

88 zoophilic nature).¹⁷ Moreover, the presence of non-human alternative hosts, time spent indoors, under
89 a net, and outdoors during peak biting hours, and insecticide resistance are also determinants of mass
90 effect.

91 Insecticide resistance continues to be a threat to the effectiveness of pyrethroid-only LLINs.<sup>10, 16, 18-
92 ²³ In high insecticide resistance settings, the main mechanism of protection to pyrethroid-only net
93 users is likely to be via the physical barrier of the net preventing mosquito bites- meaning non-users
94 do not benefit to the same extent. Therefore, switching to novel malaria control tools, such as dual-
95 AI LLINs is imperative.²²</sup>

96 Dual-AI LLINs have been shown to be more effective than pyrethroid-only nets, where mosquitoes
97 are resistant to pyrethroids.²⁴⁻²⁹ This is due to their unique modes of action, ranging from neutralising
98 the potency of pyrethroids in resistant vectors (piperonyl butoxide), sterilizing vectors that survive
99 exposure to pyrethroids (pyriproxyfen), to disrupting the vectors' ability to produce energy
100 (chlorfenapyr), thereby restoring the effectiveness of LLINs against resistant mosquitoes.²⁴⁻²⁹
101 Therefore, understanding the coverage levels required for community-wide effect is vital to help
102 determine net coverage targets and plans for future campaigns.

103 Tanzania has one of the highest burdens of malaria cases and deaths.⁴ In Tanzania, malaria is highest
104 in the Lake Victoria zone. The core malaria intervention in the country is LLINs, which have been
105 distributed widely in the country since 2007.³⁰ Although Tanzania has made great efforts to
106 implement LLINs in the general population, gaps in use, access, coverage, and ownership remain. As
107 such, several distribution channels including mass campaigns, School Net Programs (SNP), antenatal
108 care (ANC) and the Expanded Programme on Immunization and Targeted Replacement Campaign
109 (TRC) are being implemented across the country. Dual-AI LLINs, particularly PBO LLINs, have
110 been distributed in Tanzania through the SNP and ANC since 2018 in areas with high malaria burden,
111 however, high coverage of the population at risk remains a challenge. An understanding of the

112 required level of coverage to achieve community benefits is key to the proper allocation of limited
113 malaria control resources.

114 In this study, we assess malaria risk among users and non-users living in areas with different
115 community coverage of dual-AI LLINs as part of a secondary analysis of a large RCT assessing the
116 impact of dual-AI LLIN in Misungwi, Tanzania.²⁶

117

118 **Methods**

119 **Study site, design, and participants**

120 Data used for this secondary analysis was collected in a 3-year, four parallel-arm cluster randomized
121 controlled trial (cRCT) conducted in 84 clusters on the southern border of Lake Victoria, Misungwi
122 district (latitude 2°51'00.0"S, longitude 33°04'60.0" E), Mwanza region, in North-western
123 Tanzania.^{26, 31} The following treatments were randomly allocated to 21 clusters each: Interceptor®
124 with only pyrethroid (PY) insecticide (alpha-cypermethrin, [control] arm), Interceptor® G2
125 (Chlorfenapyr-PY LLIN (alpha-cypermethrin + chlorfenapyr), Royal Guard® (Pyriproxyfen-PY
126 LLIN (alpha-cypermethrin + pyriproxyfen), and Olyset™ Plus (permethrin + piperonyl-butoxide
127 (PBO)). The trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03554616).

128

129 **Procedures**

130 A total of 147,230 study LLINs were distributed (1 net for 2 persons) in 42,394 households as part
131 of the trial between January 26 and January 28, 2019. In addition, there was continuous distribution
132 of pyrethroid-only LLINs in the study area through ANC, and in September 2021 (33 months post-
133 trial net distribution), 40,000 PBO LLINs were evenly distributed across study arms via SNP.

134 Malaria infection prevalence was measured during cross-sectional surveys at 12 months (t12;
135 January/February 2020), 18 months (t18; July/August 2020), 24 months (t24; January/February
136 2021), 30 months (t30; July/August 2021), and 36 months (t36; January/February 2022) post-

137 intervention. Up to two children aged between 6 months and 14 years from 45 randomly selected
138 households per cluster were tested for malaria infection using rapid diagnostic tests (RDT) (CareStart
139 malaria HRP2 [pf], DiaSys, Wokingham, UK). In all consenting households, information on residents
140 was recorded and all nets were visually examined by a trained interviewer, and the information on
141 use status was recorded.

142 Data collection took place on smartphones using the Open-Data-Kit (ODK) software. Data from each
143 field team was directly uploaded to a secure database at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical
144 Medicine (LSHTM). After completion of the surveys, datasets were transferred to STATA release
145 15 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) for further aggregation, cleaning, and analysis.

146 **Statistical analysis**

147 Household socio-economic status (SES) indices were constructed based on self-reported ownership
148 of certain goods (animals, poultry, phone, radio, bicycle, motorbike) and household possessions
149 (including electricity, source of drinking water, toilet, number of sleeping rooms, type of cooking
150 fuel). Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to develop a score which was then subdivided
151 into wealth tertiles (lowest, middle, and highest) at the household level. House characteristics and
152 structures (including roof, floor, eaves, walls, ceiling, and plastering,) were not included in the
153 construction of SES, instead, they were used to create a household design index and subdivided into
154 tertiles (low-quality, medium-quality, and high quality).

155
156 Community LLIN usage was derived as the proportion of all individuals (children and adults) in the
157 household sleeping under study LLINs the previous night in that cluster. To assess the community
158 effect of the dual-AI LLINs (Chlorfenapyr-PY, Pyriproxyfen-PY, and PBO-PY) relative to PY-only
159 LLIN, the following analysis was conducted: 1/ the comparison of malaria prevalence between net
160 users and non-users per arm per timepoint, 2/ comparison of malaria prevalence in non-net users in
161 each dual-A.I. LLIN arm vs non-net users in the PY-only LLIN arm, 3/ comparison of malaria
162 prevalence in net users (of any net) in each dual-AI LLIN arm vs net users in PY-only LLIN arm.

163 Analyses 1 to 3 were done regardless of the cluster net usage level. 4/ To check if the level of dual-
164 AI LLIN community usage had an impact on the non-net users, we compared malaria prevalence in
165 all participants and non-net users living in clusters with $>40\%$ or $\leq 40\%$ community usage of dual-
166 AI LLIN only *versus* non-users living in standard LLIN (PY-only) clusters with community usage $>$
167 40% . Previous studies have demonstrated a strong association between $>50\%$ community usage of
168 pyrethroid-only LLINs^{7, 32} and decreased malaria, so a lower cut-off (40%) was selected to assess
169 dual-AI LLINs. All analyses used mixed-effect logistic regression assessing the effect of net types
170 and varied usage levels on malaria infection controlling for age, sex, quality of dwelling, and cluster
171 baseline characteristics (malaria infection prevalence in children aged 6 months to 14 years and LLIN
172 usage), with cluster and survey timepoint as random effects. The interaction term between the
173 community-level usage variable and survey timepoint was included to test for the presence of effect
174 modification of the odds ratio.

175

176 **Ethical considerations**

177 Ethical approval for the RCT was obtained from the institutional review boards of the Tanzanian
178 National Institute for Medical Research (reference number: NIMR/HQ/R.8a/Vol.IX/2743),
179 Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College (2267), London School of Hygiene and Tropical
180 Medicine (14952), and University of Ottawa (H-05-19-4411).

181

182 **Role of the funding source**

183 The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation,
184 or writing of the report.

185

186 **Results**

187 Between 07 January 2020 and 10 February 2022, five repeated cross-sectional surveys were
188 conducted in 12,654 consenting households post-net distribution. Overall, 23% (5062/22479) (14%

189 (619/4380) at t12, 22% (1049/4785) at t18, 20% (998/4988) at t24, 30% (1202/3997) at t30, and 28%
190 (1194/4329) at t36) of children did not sleep under any net the previous night. Residents not sleeping
191 under study LLINs the previous night doubled in each arm at t36 compared to t12 (Figure 1). Net use
192 was highest in children under 5 years old. In houses with not enough nets for every member (i.e. less
193 than 1 net for every 2 people), boys over the age of 5 years were least likely to sleep under a net.
194 People classified as highest SES were least likely to use nets. However, there was no difference in
195 usage between girls and boys when under 5 years of age (Table 1).

196 Following net distribution, malaria prevalence was 52% (2649/5062) in non-net users [34%
197 (210/619) at t12, 58% (612/1049) at t18, 52% (518/998) at t24, 63% (755/1202) at t30, and 46%
198 (554/1194) at t36]; and 32% (5572/11845) in net users overall [20% (754/3761) at t12, 43%
199 (1622/3736) at t18, 34% (1341/3990) at t24, 39% (1102/2795) at t30, 24% (752/3135) at t36]. A
200 summary of malaria prevalence among users of study nets, users of other nets, and non-net users by
201 study arm and survey is presented in (Appendix 1).

202 In non-net users, at t12, there was no evidence for lower malaria prevalence in the dual AI-LLIN
203 arms compared to the PY-only arm. At t18, t24, and t30 no statistically significant reduction in
204 malaria prevalence was observed in either the PBO-PY arm or pyriproxyfen-PY arm compared with
205 standard-PY. In non-net users living in the chlorfenapyr-PY arm, the odds of malaria infection were
206 over 40% lower than for non-net users living in the PY-only arm at t18 [t18: adjusted odds ratio
207 (aOR) 0.56 (95% CI 0.35-0.90), p=0.0166], and t30 [aOR 0.57 (95% CI 0.33-0.96), p=0.0353] (Table
208 2). At t36, non-net users in every dual-AI LLIN arm had lower malaria prevalence than non-net users
209 living in the PY-only LLIN arm (Table 2).

210 Across all timepoints, users of nets in the chlorfenapyr-PY arm had reduced odds of malaria infection
211 compared to users of PY-only LLIN. For those using PBO-PY nets, there were reduced odds of
212 malaria infection at t12 and t18 but not at t30 or t36 when compared to net users in the PY-only arm.
213 For those using pyriproxyfen-PY nets, there were reduced odds of infection at t12 and t30 but not at

214 t18, t24, or t36, compared to those using PY-only nets (Table 2). Within each arm, malaria prevalence
215 was generally significantly lower in net users than in non-net users except at t12 in standard-PY [30%
216 (286/964)-users vs 41% (64/156)-non-users; $p=0.1444$] and PBO-PY LLIN [18% (168/941)-users vs
217 30% (38/127)-non-users; $p=0.0769$] (Table 2). Malaria prevalence in non-net users in all three dual-
218 AI arms were similar or higher than amongst net users in the PY-only arm, i.e. the personal protection
219 provided by users of PY-LLIN only nets was similar or slightly better than the protection provided
220 by the community effect of dual-AI nets, however not statistically significant at any time point
221 (Appendix 4).

222 Table 3 presents the results of the impact of community usage on community effect by assessing
223 malaria prevalence in non-net-users. Among non-net users, community usage of dual-AI LLIN higher
224 than 40% was associated with reduced odds of malaria infection in those living in the pyriproxyfen-
225 PY LLIN arm (aOR: 0.61 [95% CI: 0.37-0.99], $p=0.0470$), PBO-PY LLIN arm (aOR 0.55 [95% CI:
226 0.33-0.94], $p=0.0277$); and chlorfenapyr-PY LLIN arm (aOR 0.44 [95% CI: 0.27-0.71], $p=0.0009$)
227 compared with their counterparts with over 40% usage in the PY-only arm. There was weak evidence
228 of reduced odds of malaria infection in non-users living in the chlorfenapyr-PY LLIN arm when
229 community-level usage was $\leq 40\%$ (55.1% (157/285)) compared to those living in PY-only arms
230 when community usage was over 40% (45.7% (495/1083); aOR 0.65 [95% CI: 0.42-1.01], $p=$
231 0.0528).

232 High coverage clusters ($> 40\%$) were concentrated in the early years implying that the majority of
233 the nets in this group were new nets (with fresh insecticide), whilst, in the later years, the majority of
234 the clusters were concentrated in $\leq 40\%$ category and hence mostly old nets (Appendix 2).
235 Furthermore, the sensitivity analysis was performed to assess the effect of community coverage levels
236 ($\leq 40\%$ and $> 40\%$) on malaria prevalence in all participants (users and non-users on the nets)
237 (Appendix 3).

238 To see if the effect of community usage was modified by the survey period, we examined for an
239 interaction between usage and survey timepoint. The test for interaction between levels of community
240 dual-AI LLIN usage and survey time point showed no difference in the effect of community dual-AI
241 LLIN usage on the odds of malaria infection among children who did not use nets $p=0.3092$.

242

243 **Discussion**

244 This is a secondary analysis of a cluster randomised trial of Dual-Active Ingredient long-lasting
245 insecticidal nets (Dual-AI LLINs) assessing the community effect of three dual-AI LLINs
246 (chlorfenapyr-PY LLIN, pyriproxyfen-PY LLIN, and PBO-PY LLIN) compared with PY-only LLIN.
247 Net users were always more protected than non-net users regardless of net type and survey timepoint,
248 underscoring the importance of personal protection provided by nets. In addition, regardless of
249 community usage levels, non-net users living in the chlorfenapyr-PY arm were more protected than
250 non-net users in the PY-only arm. However, PBO-PY LLIN and pyriproxyfen-PY LLIN did not
251 provide better protection to non-net users compared to PY-only LLIN except at 36 months post-
252 intervention. We also found that community usage of dual-AI LLIN above 40% provided
253 significantly better protection against malaria infection to non-users compared to the same group in
254 the PY-LLIN arm, and this protection extended to non-users in areas with low ($\leq 40\%$) community
255 usage of chlorfenapyr-PY LLINs.

256 An early review by Lines et al.¹⁵ identified 21 studies assessing the community effect of pyrethroid-
257 only LLINs and reported a wide range of minimum community coverage levels (from 15% to 85%),
258 leading to community effects protecting people sleeping without nets. Consistent with this, a study
259 conducted in Kenya³³ concluded that at least 35% community coverage of nets is required to protect
260 people sleeping without nets, while another study⁶ reported that residents not using nets and living
261 within 300 meters from a community using insecticide-treated nets (usage greater than 50%) were
262 protected against malaria compared to those further away. Meanwhile, Lindblade et al.³⁴ found that

263 community net usage (>82%) protected both users and non-users equally. Models have been also
264 used to estimate the threshold of community net usage necessary to detect a community effect. For
265 example, Killeen et al.⁷ modelled that coverage of 35%-65% would be needed to achieve
266 community-wide benefits. Another model,²³ suggested that as soon as one person uses an LLIN, there
267 is a small indirect impact on non-users (even if marginal at this coverage) compared to a hypothetical
268 scenario where nobody is using an LLIN. The benefits for both users and non-users increase with net
269 usage.

270 The present study adds to the body of existing evidence and demonstrates that when a net is very
271 effective as observed for chlorfenapyr-PY LLINs both users and non-users are protected even at
272 moderate to low levels of community coverage. With less effective nets such as PBO-PY LLIN and
273 pyriproxyfen-PY LLINs, the impact on non-net users was not as important. Users of PBO-PY LLIN
274 had lower malaria prevalence compared to PY-only LLIN users up to 18 months. There was no
275 difference in prevalence between non-users during the same period suggesting limited community
276 protection from these nets except when PBO-PY LLIN community coverage was above 40%. Greater
277 and longer-lasting efficacy has been observed with this class of nets in two other RCTs. Although
278 neither of these trials specifically examined the impact of the net on non-users, in Uganda, the effect
279 of PBO-PY LLIN on malaria prevalence was more pronounced when only children using PBO-PY
280 LLIN (per protocol) were considered, rather than including all children regardless of net usage status
281 (intention to treat),²⁸ suggesting a small or no community effect. The community coverage of PBO-
282 PY LLIN was not known in this study. In another study in Tanzania, during the first two years of
283 follow-up, similar malaria reduction was observed when intention-to-treat and per-protocol analyses
284 were done, indicating that both non-net users and net users may have been protected equally by PBO-
285 PY LLIN.²⁷ In the third year, however, only children using the PBO-PY LLIN benefited from the
286 protection as net usage and efficacy declined.³⁵ However in this trial, usage of PBO-PY LLIN during
287 the first two years of the study was much higher (from 79% to 54%) than reported in the present
288 study (74% to 30%) and could explain the difference of impact.

289 Pyriproxyfen-PY LLINs were designed to provide a community effect through sterilizing vectors as
290 well as reducing the lifespan of female vectors after they were blood-fed³⁶ and survived exposure to
291 the insecticide on the net. In the present trial, malaria prevalence was reduced in net users only at 12
292 months compared to the PY-only LLINs. There was no impact on non-net users living in the
293 pyriproxyfen-PY LLINs arm compared to non-users in the PY-only LLIN arm except when coverage
294 was greater than 40%. Pyriproxyfen-PY LLINs seem to have had limited or no impact on malaria
295 indicators in other trial conducted in West Africa.²⁹

296
297 It is worth noting in the present study that 36 months after distribution, individuals not using nets in
298 the intervention study groups had lower odds of infection compared to those not using nets in the PY-
299 only arm. This impact was likely associated with the distribution of new PBO-PY LLINs across all
300 arms four months before the 36-month survey, which increased the usage of new nets and effective
301 nets. In addition, PBO may enhance the efficacy of pyriproxyfen as it does for pyrethroid as these
302 two insecticides may have similar mechanisms of resistance.³⁷

303 Regardless of the impact of the net on non-net users, using any net was always more protective against
304 malaria prevalence than not using one. This was observed for all net types including the PY-only
305 LLIN. This result is consistent with other studies that reported higher malaria prevalence or incidence
306 in non-net users compared to users sleeping under standard PY-only LLINs even in areas with
307 pyrethroid resistance.³⁸⁻⁴²

308 This study has several limitations worth noting. The study was not designed for this secondary
309 analysis and may have insufficient power to adequately assess separately the impact on users and
310 non-users. Net usage was estimated on information provided by households' members which might
311 not always be reliable. Finally, non-users were defined as children who did not sleep under any net
312 the night before and might not capture occasional net usage during the week which also may influence
313 the conclusions.

314 Regardless, this secondary analysis provides supplementary insight into the efficacy of these novel
315 dual-active ingredient LLINs within a region characterized by moderate malaria transmission and
316 high resistance to pyrethroids. In settings with limited resources and the presence of insecticide
317 resistance, the deployment of an effective net, such as chlorfenapyr-PY, even at suboptimal coverage,
318 could be considered as it would be more effective and even more cost-effective²⁶ than high coverage
319 of pyrethroid-only LLINs. This aligns with previous modelling work⁴³ which emphasized that a
320 massive reduction in mosquitoes would be more important than coverage alone. However, even the
321 most effective net in this study did not produce a sufficient reduction in mosquitoes to prevent users
322 of these nets from being exposed to high levels of malaria infection. A key message was that net users
323 were always better protected than non-users and therefore after providing the most effective nets,
324 national malaria control program could consider maximizing usage for better impact. Finally, as
325 observed by other studies⁴⁴⁻⁴⁹ pyrethroid-only nets still provided some protection in this area of
326 pyrethroid resistance. Non-users of nets in clusters where chlorfenapyr-pyrethroid nets were used
327 were better protected than non-users in clusters where pyrethroid only nets were used, but even the
328 more effective nets did not adequately control malaria and infection prevalence was still very high
329 even amongst users of these nets. New, more effective vector control tools are therefore urgently
330 needed to provide better protection against malaria than the protection provided by nets.

331 **Conclusion**

332 In areas where resistance to pyrethroids is prevalent in malaria vectors, chlorfenapyr-PY LLINs offer
333 enhanced protection to individuals who use them as well as those who do not, even at lower coverage
334 levels. This added protection for non-users is not seen with less effective nets containing PBO and
335 pyriproxyfen unless the overall community usage exceeds 40%. Users were more protected than non-
336 users and emphasized the necessity to optimize net usage to benefit from their full potential.
337 Nonetheless, in regions facing constrained financial resources and insecticide resistance, the
338 distribution of the most effective net could be considered over the high-population coverage of

339 conventional nets. This strategic allocation would ensure maximal impact in the control of malaria
340 despite limitations in resources and resistance challenges.

341 References

- 342 1. Cibulskis, R.E., et al., *Malaria: Global progress 2000 - 2015 and future challenges*. Infect Dis Poverty,
343 2016. **5**(1): p. 61.
- 344 2. WHO, *World malaria report 2022*. 2022.
- 345 3. WHO, *World malaria report 2019*. 2019: Geneva.
- 346 4. WHO, *World Malaria report 2023*.
- 347 5. Collins, W.E. and G.M. Jeffery, *Plasmodium malariae: parasite and disease*. Clin Microbiol Rev, 2007.
348 **20**(4): p. 579-92.
- 349 6. Hawley, W.A., et al., *Community-wide effects of permethrin-treated bed nets on child mortality and*
350 *malaria morbidity in western Kenya*. Am J Trop Med Hyg, 2003. **68**(4 Suppl): p. 121-7.
- 351 7. Killeen, G.F., et al., *Preventing childhood malaria in Africa by protecting adults from mosquitoes with*
352 *insecticide-treated nets*. PLoS Med, 2007. **4**(7): p. e229.
- 353 8. Hambisa, M.T., et al., *Long lasting insecticidal net use and its associated factors in Limmu Seka*
354 *District, South West Ethiopia*. BMC Public Health, 2018. **18**(1): p. 124.
- 355 9. Eisele, T.P. and R.W. Steketee, *African malaria control programs deliver ITNs and achieve what the*
356 *clinical trials predicted*. PLoS Med, 2011. **8**(9): p. e1001088.
- 357 10. Strode, C., et al., *The impact of pyrethroid resistance on the efficacy of insecticide-treated bed nets*
358 *against African anopheline mosquitoes: systematic review and meta-analysis*. PLoS Med, 2014. **11**(3):
359 p. e1001619.
- 360 11. Bayili, K., et al., *Experimental hut evaluation of DawaPlus 3.0 LN and DawaPlus 4.0 LN treated with*
361 *deltamethrin and PBO against free-flying populations of Anopheles gambiae s.l. in Vallee du Kou,*
362 *Burkina Faso*. PLoS One, 2019. **14**(12): p. e0226191.
- 363 12. Menze, B.D., et al., *An Experimental Hut Evaluation of PBO-Based and Pyrethroid-Only Nets against*
364 *the Malaria Vector Anopheles funestus Reveals a Loss of Bed Nets Efficacy Associated with GSTe2*
365 *Metabolic Resistance*. Genes (Basel), 2020. **11**(2).
- 366 13. Chitnis, N., T. Smith, and R. Steketee, *A mathematical model for the dynamics of malaria in*
367 *mosquitoes feeding on a heterogeneous host population*. J Biol Dyn, 2008. **2**(3): p. 259-85.
- 368 14. Levitz, L., et al., *Effect of individual and community-level bed net usage on malaria prevalence among*
369 *under-fives in the Democratic Republic of Congo*. Malar J, 2018. **17**(1): p. 39.
- 370 15. Jo Lines, N.C.a.L.P., *Systematic reviews, background papers and other unpublished evidence*
371 *considered in the development of recommendations*, in *WHO Guidelines for malaria*. 2022.
- 372 16. WHO, *Implications of insecticide resistance for malaria vector control with long-lasting insecticidal*
373 *nets: trends in pyrethroid resistance during a WHO-coordinated multi-country prospective study*.
374 *Parasit Vectors*, 2018. **11**(1): p. 550.
- 375 17. Kim, S., et al., *Using a human-centered design approach to determine consumer preferences for long-*
376 *lasting insecticidal nets in Ghana*. Glob Health Sci Pract, 2019. **7**(2): p. 160-170.
- 377 18. Agossa, F.R., et al., *Impact of insecticide resistance on the effectiveness of pyrethroid-based malaria*
378 *vectors control tools in Benin: decreased toxicity and repellent effect*. PLoS One, 2015. **10**(12): p.
379 e0145207.
- 380 19. Ranson, H., et al., *Pyrethroid resistance in African anopheline mosquitoes: what are the implications*
381 *for malaria control?* Trends Parasitol, 2011. **27**(2): p. 91-8.
- 382 20. Ranson, H. and N. Lissenden, *Insecticide Resistance in African Anopheles Mosquitoes: A Worsening*
383 *Situation that Needs Urgent Action to Maintain Malaria Control*. Trends Parasitol, 2016. **32**(3): p.
384 187-196.
- 385 21. Protopopoff, N., et al., *High level of resistance in the mosquito Anopheles gambiae to pyrethroid*
386 *insecticides and reduced susceptibility to bendiocarb in north-western Tanzania*. Malar J, 2013. **12**: p.
387 149.

- 388 22. Churcher, T.S., et al., *The impact of pyrethroid resistance on the efficacy and effectiveness of bednets*
389 *for malaria control in Africa*. Elife, 2016. **5**.
- 390 23. Unwin, H.J.T., et al., *Quantifying the direct and indirect protection provided by insecticide treated bed*
391 *nets against malaria*. Nat Commun, 2023. **14**(1): p. 676.
- 392 24. Accrombessi, M., et al., *Efficacy of pyriproxyfen-pyrethroid long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) and*
393 *chlorfenapyr-pyrethroid LLINs compared with pyrethroid-only LLINs for malaria control in Benin: a*
394 *cluster-randomised, superiority trial*. Lancet, 2023. **401**(10375): p. 435-446.
- 395 25. Mosha, J.F., et al., *Effectiveness of long-lasting insecticidal nets with pyriproxyfen-pyrethroid,*
396 *chlorfenapyr-pyrethroid, or piperonyl butoxide-pyrethroid versus pyrethroid only against malaria in*
397 *Tanzania: final-year results of a four-arm, single-blind, cluster-randomised trial*. Lancet Infect Dis,
398 2023.
- 399 26. Mosha JF, K.M., Lukole E, Matowo NS, Pitt C, Messenger LA, Mallya E, Jumanne M, Aziz T, Kaaya R,
400 Shirima BA, Isaya G, Taljaard M, Martin J, Hashim R, Thickstun C, Manjurano A, Kleinschmidt I, Mosha
401 FW, Rowland M, Protopopoff N. , *Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness against malaria of three types*
402 *of dual-active-ingredient long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) compared with pyrethroid-only LLINs in*
403 *Tanzania: a four-arm, cluster-randomised trial*. Lancet. 2022 Mar 26;399(10331):1227-1241. , 2022.
- 404 27. Protopopoff, N., et al., *Effectiveness of a long-lasting piperonyl butoxide-treated insecticidal net and*
405 *indoor residual spray interventions, separately and together, against malaria transmitted by*
406 *pyrethroid-resistant mosquitoes: a cluster, randomised controlled, two-by-two factorial design trial*.
407 Lancet, 2018. **391**(10130): p. 1577-1588.
- 408 28. Staedke, S.G., et al., *Effect of long-lasting insecticidal nets with and without piperonyl butoxide on*
409 *malaria indicators in Uganda (LLINEUP): a pragmatic, cluster-randomised trial embedded in a*
410 *national LLIN distribution campaign*. Lancet, 2020. **395**(10232): p. 1292-1303.
- 411 29. Tiono, A.B., et al., *Efficacy of Olyset Duo, a bednet containing pyriproxyfen and permethrin, versus a*
412 *permethrin-only net against clinical malaria in an area with highly pyrethroid-resistant vectors in*
413 *rural Burkina Faso: a cluster-randomised controlled trial*. Lancet, 2018. **392**(10147): p. 569-580.
- 414 30. Bonner, K., et al., *Design, implementation and evaluation of a national campaign to distribute nine*
415 *million free LLINs to children under five years of age in Tanzania*. Malar J, 2011. **10**: p. 73.
- 416 31. Jacklin F. Mosha, M.A.K., Louisa A. Messenger, Mark Rowland, Nancy Matowo, Catherine Pitt, Eliud
417 Lukole, Monica Taljaard, Charles Thickstun, Alphaxard Manjurano, Franklin W. Mosha, Immo
418 Kleinschmidt, Natacha Protopopoff, *Protocol for a four parallel-arm, singleblind, cluster-randomised*
419 *trial to assess the effectiveness of three types of dual active ingredient treated nets compared to*
420 *pyrethroid-only long-lasting insecticidal nets to prevent malaria transmitted by pyrethroid*
421 *insecticideresistant vector mosquitoes in Tanzania*. 2021.
- 422 32. Larsen, D.A., et al., *Community coverage with insecticide-treated mosquito nets and observed*
423 *associations with all-cause child mortality and malaria parasite infections*. Am J Trop Med Hyg, 2014.
424 **91**(5): p. 950-8.
- 425 33. Komazawa, O., et al., *Are long-lasting insecticidal nets effective for preventing childhood deaths*
426 *among non-net users? A community-based cohort study in western Kenya*. PLoS One, 2012. **7**(11): p.
427 e49604.
- 428 34. Lindblade, K.A., et al., *Sustainability of reductions in malaria transmission and infant mortality in*
429 *western Kenya with use of insecticide-treated bednets: 4 to 6 years of follow-up*. JAMA, 2004.
430 **291**(21): p. 2571-80.
- 431 35. Protopopoff, N., et al., *Effectiveness of piperonyl butoxide and pyrethroid-treated long-lasting*
432 *insecticidal nets (LLINs) versus pyrethroid-only LLINs with and without indoor residual spray against*
433 *malaria infection: third year results of a cluster, randomised controlled, two-by-two factorial design*
434 *trial in Tanzania*. Malar J, 2023. **22**(1): p. 294.
- 435 36. Kawada, H., et al., *A small-scale field trial of pyriproxyfen-impregnated bed nets against pyrethroid-*
436 *resistant Anopheles gambiae s.s. in western Kenya*. PLoS One, 2014. **9**(10): p. e111195.
- 437 37. Yunta, C., et al., *Pyriproxyfen is metabolized by P450s associated with pyrethroid resistance in An.*
438 *gambiae*. Insect Biochem Mol Biol, 2016. **78**: p. 50-57.
- 439 38. Lindblade, K.A., et al., *A cohort study of the effectiveness of insecticide-treated bed nets to prevent*
440 *malaria in an area of moderate pyrethroid resistance, Malawi*. Malar J, 2015. **14**: p. 31.

- 441 39. Kleinschmidt, I., et al., *Implications of insecticide resistance for malaria vector control with long-*
442 *lasting insecticidal nets: a WHO-coordinated, prospective, international, observational cohort study.*
443 *Lancet Infect Dis*, 2018. **18**(6): p. 640-649.
- 444 40. Ochomo, E., et al., *Insecticide-Treated Nets and Protection against Insecticide-Resistant Malaria*
445 *Vectors in Western Kenya.* *Emerg Infect Dis*, 2017. **23**(5): p. 758-764.
- 446 41. Bradley, J., et al., *Insecticide-treated nets provide protection against malaria to children in an area of*
447 *insecticide resistance in Southern Benin.* *Malar J*, 2017. **16**(1): p. 225.
- 448 42. Tokponnon, F.T., et al., *Impact of long-lasting, insecticidal nets on anaemia and prevalence of*
449 *Plasmodium falciparum among children under five years in areas with highly resistant malaria*
450 *vectors.* *Malar J*, 2014. **13**: p. 76.
- 451 43. Killeen, G.F., *Control of malaria vectors and management of insecticide resistance through universal*
452 *coverage with next-generation insecticide-treated nets.* *Lancet*, 2020. **395**(10233): p. 1394-1400.
- 453 44. Lengeler, C., *Insecticide-treated bed nets and curtains for preventing malaria.* *Cochrane Database*
454 *Syst Rev*, 2004(2): p. CD000363.
- 455 45. Pryce, J., M. Richardson, and C. Lengeler, *Insecticide-treated nets for preventing malaria.* *Cochrane*
456 *Database Syst Rev*, 2018. **11**: p. CD000363.
- 457 46. Gamble, C., J.P. Ekwaru, and F.O. ter Kuile, *Insecticide-treated nets for preventing malaria in*
458 *pregnancy.* *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2006. **2006**(2): p. CD003755.
- 459 47. Barreaux, P., et al., *Pyrethroid-treated bed nets impair blood feeding performance in insecticide*
460 *resistant mosquitoes.* *Sci Rep*, 2023. **13**(1): p. 10055.
- 461 48. Lindblade, K.A., et al., *Impact of sustained use of insecticide-treated bednets on malaria vector*
462 *species distribution and culicine mosquitoes.* *J Med Entomol*, 2006. **43**(2): p. 428-32.
- 463 49. Escamilla, V., et al., *Effects of community-level bed net coverage on malaria morbidity in Lilongwe,*
464 *Malawi.* *Malar J*, 2017. **16**(1): p. 142.

465

466

467 **Acknowledgements**

468 We thank colleagues and staff at Pan-African Malaria Vector Research Consortium (PAMVERC) in
469 Misungwi district, Mwanza region who were involved in the project. We acknowledge the assistance
470 provided by government leaders at the Misungwi District council (district, ward, village and hamlet
471 level). We thank Dr. Safari Kinung'hi (National Institute for Medical Research (NIMR)-Mwanza
472 Center) Former Misungwi District Commissioner) and Dr. Clement Morabu (Misungwi district
473 medical officer) for their immense support for creating friendly atmosphere for running the project.
474 Finally, we thank all the participating households for their cooperation.

475

Households and nets for cross-sectional survey of malaria prevalence



