Attractive Targeted Sugar Baits for malaria control in western Kenya (ATSB-Kenya) – Effect of ATSBs on epidemiologic and entomologic indicators: a Phase III, open-label, cluster-randomised, controlled trial

Caroline Ogwang[1,2*], Aaron M Samuels[3,4], Daniel P McDermott[5], Alice Kamau[1,2], Maia Lesosky [2,#a], Kizito Obiet[1], Julia M Janssen[3], Wycliffe Odongo[3], John E Gimnig[3], Julie R Gutman[3], Jonathan S Schultz[3,4], Oliver Towett[1], Brian Seda[1], Mercy Chepkirui[1], Margaret Muchoki[1], Seline Omondi[1], Jackline Kosgei[1], Brian Polo[1], Frank Aduwo[1], Kephas Otieno[1], Martin J Donnelly[5], Simon Kariuki[1], Eric Ochomo[1,5], Feiko ter Kuile[1,2¶] Sarah G Staedke[1,2,5¶]

[1] KEMRI Centre for Global Health Research, Kisumu, Kenya

[2] Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, UK

[3] Division of Parasitic Diseases and Malaria, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

[4] Division of Parasitic Diseases and Malaria, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Kisumu, Kenya

[5] Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, UK

[#a] Current Address: National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College London, UK

* Corresponding author; E-mail: caroline.ogwang@lstmed.ac.uk (CO)

[¶]These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Attractive targeted sugar baits (ATSBs) are a novel malaria control tool designed to target mosquitoes outdoors. We conducted a cluster-randomised trial to evaluate the impact of ATSBs on malaria indicators in Kenya. Seventy clusters (≥100 households/cluster) in Siaya county were randomly assigned (1:1) to intervention or control. Pyrethroid-only long-lasting insecticidal nets were distributed to all clusters, aiming for universal coverage. Two ATSBs containing dinotefuran were hung outside household structures in intervention clusters. ATSBs were monitored every two months and replaced every six months over two years. Three consecutive cohorts of randomly selected children (1-<15 years) were enrolled, aiming to accrue 1,260 person-years over two years of follow-up. Incidence of clinical malaria (fever with a positive malaria test) was the primary outcome. A multilevel Poisson regression model was applied, with clusters as a random intercept and study arm as a fixed effect. Secondary outcomes were malaria prevalence in community residents (≥1 month), and parity of mosquitos captured through human landing catches. In March 2022, ATSBs were delivered to 33,180 of 33,419 (99.3%) household structures in intervention clusters. Overall, 268,268 ATSBs were deployed over two years. Of 2,962 cohort children enrolled (intervention=1,497; control=1,465), 2,869 (96.9%) were included in the primary analysis (intervention=1,461; control=1,408), contributing 1,445 person-years of follow-up. Malaria incidence was 1.32 episodes per person-years in the intervention arm versus 1.20 in the control (unadjusted incidence rate ratio 1.11; 95% CI: 0.75-1.65; p=0.598). Of 7,488 community residents surveyed (intervention=3,760; control=3,728), 1,474 (39.2%) intervention and 1,461 (39.2%) control participants tested positive for malaria (unadjusted odds ratio [OR] 0.98; 95% CI: 0.60-1.59; p=0.93). Of 6,457 female anopheles mosquitoes collected (intervention=4,058; control=2,399), 3,579 (88.2%) intervention and 1,973 (82.2%) control mosquitoes were parous (OR 1.34; 95% CI: 0.91-1.99; p=0.14). In Kenya, we found no evidence that ATSBs reduced clinical malaria incidence, malaria prevalence, or vector parity.

Trial registration

Clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05219565), 22 January 2022; https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT05219565

Keywords

malaria, attractive targeted sugar bait (ATSB), vector control, cluster-randomised trial, Kenya

Introduction

Between 2000 to 2015, the prevalence and incidence of *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa fell by 50% and 40%, respectively, primarily due to the scale-up of long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs), indoor residual spraying (IRS) and treatment with artemisinin-based combination therapies (ACTs) [1]. Since 2015, however, progress on malaria control has plateaued [2]. Malaria control efforts were hindered by the COVID-19 pandemic, but widespread resistance to pyrethroid insecticides, climate change, fluctuations in vector species, changes in mosquito behaviours, and resistance to artemisinin and partner drugs are other threats [2-6]. In Kenya, malaria burden remains high in the western, lake-endemic region, despite distribution of LLINs and targeted IRS [7].

LLINs are the most widely used vector control tool, supplemented by IRS [2]. Both tools target mosquito vectors that feed and rest indoors. However, vector behaviours are shifting, with increased biting outdoors and later in the morning hours, when individuals are less likely to be protected by LLINs [5, 8]. Novel tools, such as attractive targeted sugar baits (ATSBs) that target mosquitoes outdoors are needed to complement other control interventions deployed indoors. ATSBs are A4-sized panels containing fruit syrup laced with an insecticide, which exploits the sugar-feeding behaviour of mosquitoes [9]. ATSBs attract mosquitoes, luring them to feed and ingest the insecticide, which kills the mosquitoes.

In 2017, an initial entomological field trial of ATSBs was conducted in Mali, which found ATSBs were associated with significant reductions in vector density, sporozoite rate, and entomologic inoculation rate (EIR) associated with ATSBs [10]. Subsequent modelling studies suggested that ATSBs could reduce malaria incidence and parasite prevalence by over 30% annually [11]. Given these promising results, results from Zambia indicating that *Anopheles funestus* and *An. gambiae* fed readily from the ATSB stations [12], and the predicted impact of ATSBs on malaria transmission [11, 13], large-scale, Phase III cluster-randomised, controlled trials were launched in 2021 to further evaluate the

epidemiological and entomological impact of ATSBs in Kenya, Mali and Zambia [14]. Here, we present the results of the Kenyan trial.

Methods

The protocol and statistical analysis plan for the multi-country ATSB trial have been published previously [14, 15]. A description of cohort recruitment (Fig1), and the characteristics of children and households at enrolment, have also been published [16].

Study setting

The trial was conducted in Alego-Usonga and Rarieda sub-counties in Siaya County, western Kenya (Fig2), in the region of the Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) established by the Kenya Medical Research Institute and the US Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, which has been described in detail [17, 18]. Briefly, malaria transmission is perennial in this area with prevalence peaking between May-June and November-December, following the long and short rains. Malaria prevalence by microscopy in the study area was 36.8% in 2013, and was highest in children aged 5-14 years (57.9%) [19]. The primary malaria vectors are *An. funestus* and *An. arabiensis* [5, 20]. Artemether-lumefantrine (AL) has been used as the first-line therapy for case management since 2006, LLIN mass campaigns are conducted every 3-5 years (2014, 2017, 2021), and IRS is not implemented in this area [21].

Assignment of interventions

Following a census conducted from December 2020 to March 2021, we established 80 clusters by purposely grouping 1-3 adjacent villages to create a cluster of sufficient population size. To minimise contamination, clusters were divided into core and buffer areas, with core areas 300-600 meters from the perimeter, and 600-1,200 meters between cores of contiguous clusters. We aimed for a

core population of 100-400 households. Prior to randomisation, malaria incidence, prevalence, and contextual data were collected in the 80 clusters. Subsequently, 10 clusters with the fewest children aged 1-<15 years were removed, to limit resampling of individuals. Thus, 70 of the original 80 clusters were included in the trial.

Clusters were assigned to study arms using restricted randomisation to minimise imbalances, considering key baseline characteristics (malaria incidence, bednet use, RTS,S/AS01 vaccination implemented within the cluster, housing density, study clinic location, altitude, and entomological indicators), as described previously [14, 15]. A list of 100,000 possible allocation sequences was generated by a study team member not involved in trial implementation and checked against balance criteria. Any sequences that failed to balance these criteria were dropped. The remaining sequences were assessed for validity, and one was chosen randomly. Assignment to intervention or control was determined by a coin toss. The 70 clusters (32 in Alego Usonga and 38 in Rarieda) were randomised in a 1:1 ratio, 35 to the intervention arm and 35 to control. Allocation of study arms was not blinded to the investigators, field team or participants. However, laboratory technicians were blinded.

Intervention delivery

ATSB® Sarabi Bait Station (version 1.2, Westham Co., Hod-Hasharon, Israel) containing dinotefuran, a neonicotinoid insecticide, were deployed to consenting households in the 35 intervention clusters, in both core and buffer areas, from 1st to 22nd March 2022 (see timeline in Fig3). Two ATSB stations were hung approximately 1.8 meters above the ground on the exterior walls of all eligible household structures (those with a complete roof, walls $\geq$1.8 m high, and at least three complete exterior walls). The study team visited households to monitor ATSBs every two months. ATSBs that were missing or damaged were replaced, and all ATSB stations were replaced every six months. Four rounds of ATSBs were deployed over two years. All ATSBs were removed from the fieldbetween 2nd

April 2024 and 24th April 2024.; used ATSBs were incinerated. Pyrethroid-only LLINs were distributed in Siaya county by the Kenyan Ministry of Health in June 2021, aiming to achieve universal coverage (one LLIN for every two household residents). During the trial, the study team delivered supplemental pyrethroid-only LLINs to all clusters in October 2022 to households with inadequate LLIN coverage (less than one LLIN per two residents).

Cohort study

Three consecutive cohorts of children aged 1-<15 years were enrolled in March-April 2022, September-October 2022, and March-April 2023. The first two cohorts were followed for up to 6.5 months, while the third cohort was followed for up to 12.5 months. In total, the cohorts were followed from 7th March 2022 to 7th March 2024.

A list of randomly selected children aged 1-<15 years was generated for recruitment from the baseline census list for each cluster. A new list was generated for each cohort. Children on the recruitment list were invited for a screening appointment at one of nine dedicated study clinics staffed by study clinicians and community interviewers. Children were enrolled in the cohort study if they met the following selection criteria: (1) age 1 to < 15 years; (2) resident of the household (over the previous four months, and intending to stay for an additional 6-12 months); (3) provision of written informed consent by their parent or guardian; (4) provision of assent by children aged 13-14 years; (5) no evidence of pregnancy; (6) not taking cotrimoxazole prophylaxis; (7) no known sickle cell disease; (8) no contraindication to AL; and (9) not currently enrolled in another interventional study or enrolled in the previous ATSB cohort.

At enrolment, information was collected on demographics, clinical history, and self-reported LLIN use the previous night. Children were asked about history of fever within the past 48 hours, and axillary temperature was measured. A finger-prick blood sample was collected for rapid diagnostic

136 test (RDT) for malaria (First Response® Malaria Ag pLDH/HRP2 Combo Card kit) and storage on filter
137 paper at -80°C for future molecular studies. All participants were treated with AL, regardless of the
138 RDT result. Two weeks after enrolment, participants were asked to return to the clinic to assess
139 parasite clearance. Participants testing positive at the clearance visit were treated with either AL or
140 dihydroartemisinin-piperaquine (DP), according to Ministry of Health guidelines. A household survey
141 was conducted soon after enrolment to collect information on household characteristics, house
142 construction, indicators of socioeconomic status, and LLIN ownership.
143
144 Cohort participants were encouraged to seek care at study clinics and were scheduled for routine
145 clinic visits every 4 weeks. At each monthly visit, information was collected on any recent illness,
146 care-seeking, LLIN use, and travel history. A finger-prick capillary blood sample was collected for
147 storage on filter paper. If the cohort participant missed a scheduled visit, their parent or guardian
148 was called. If we failed to reach them after three attempts, a field worker was sent to their house. If
149 a participant sought care outside of the study, information on symptoms, malaria testing, and
150 antimalarial treatment were recorded. If a child was febrile (axillary temperature $\geq$37.5˚C or history
151 of fever in the previous 48 hours) at any clinic visit, a RDT was performed. If the child had been
152 treated for malaria within the past 5 weeks, a blood smear was prepared for microscopy, instead of
153 an RDT. If the RDT or blood smear was positive, the child was treated according to the Kenya
154 Ministry of Health guidelines with AL or DP. Children with severe malaria were referred to the
155 nearest hospital for treatment with parenteral artesunate. Cohort participants were excluded after
156 enrolment if they withdrew consent, moved out of the study area, or met any of the exclusion
157 criteria for cohort participation.
158
159 **Continuous malaria indicator surveys (cMIS)**
160 A cMIS survey measured malaria prevalence cross-sectionally in community residents throughout
161 the year from 5th April 2022 to 11th February 2024. Households from each cluster were randomly

162 selected from a census list and were visited once. Written informed consent and assent (for children
163 aged 13-17 years) were sought for all household residents (aged ≥1 month) who were present on the
164 day of the survey. Information on demographics, housing characteristics, and LLIN ownership and
165 use was obtained from the head of household, or their designee. A finger-prick blood sample was
166 collected from each consenting participant for an RDT. Participants who tested positive were treated
167 with AL.
168

169 **Entomology surveys**

170 Mosquito collections using human landing catches (HLC) and CDC ultraviolet light traps (UVLT) were
171 conducted monthly from 4th April 2022 to 27th March 2024 in 16 randomly selected clusters using a
172 stratified approach to ensure study arm assignments were balanced across the area. Trained
173 community members consented to participate as mosquito collectors. Ten households enrolled in
174 the cohort study were randomly chosen per cluster to participate in the HLCs. Initially, HLC
175 collections were conducted indoors and outdoors from 6:00 PM to 6:00 AM. In October 2022, the
176 sampling period was extended to 11:00 AM to capture late morning biting. UVLT collections were
177 paired with the HLCs and conducted in the same 16 clusters, but in ten different households located
178 within 50 meters of each HLC household. The timing of UVLT collections mirrored the HLCs. Seven
179 cross-sectional UVLT collections were also done in the 70 clusters, in February 2022 (baseline), May
180 and November 2022, May, July and November 2023, and February 2024 (Fig3). At each point, ten
181 households were randomly sampled in the remaining 54 clusters, resulting in comprehensive data
182 from all 70 clusters.
183

184 **Laboratory procedures**

185 For microscopy, thick and thin blood smears were prepared on the same slide by study clinicians and
186 were transported to the laboratory in Siaya County. Details on slide preparation and microscopy

procedures are included in the supplemental file. All slides were read by a second microscopist, and a third independent reviewer settled any discrepant readings. Mosquitoes collected using HLCs and UVLTs were transported to the laboratory for morphological identification. All undamaged, unfed female *Anopheles* spp. mosquitoes captured alive during HLCs were dissected to assess parity by the ovary tracheation method [22].

Sample size calculations

Full details of the sample size calculations are provided in the trial master protocol and statistical analysis plan [14, 15]. A sample size of 1,260 person-years (630 person-years per arm) was required to detect a ≥30% reduction in the incidence of clinical malaria among children aged 1-<15 years (from 845 per 1,000 person-years in the control arm to 592 in the intervention arm over two years), assuming a coefficient of variation of 0.4, two-sided alpha of 0.049, 80% power, and an anticipated 20% loss of person-time due to loss to follow up or consent withdrawal. For cMIS, a sample size of 4,200 participants annually (60 per cluster) was required to detect a 30% reduction in RDT-confirmed malaria prevalence, from 29.0% to 20.3%, assuming an intra-cluster correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.05, 80% power, a two-sided alpha of 0.05, and a 20% non-response rate, allowing for analysis within each 6-month sampling period. For vector parity, simulations (n=1,000) accounting for variation between clusters, household, months and monthly catch were conducted [23], assuming a two-sided alpha of 0.05, power of 80%, ICC of 0.04, expected female *Anopheles* per trap night of 2.5, and 16 clusters (8 per arm). To detect a 9%-point reduction, from 50% parity in the control arm, we estimated that ten entomological collections per cluster per month were required.

Outcome measures

Incidence of malaria (clinical malaria cases per person-year) in children aged 1-<15 years was the primary outcome, defined as fever (axillary temperature of ≥37.5°C or history of fever within the past 48 hours) plus a positive malaria test (RDT or microscopy). Malaria cases diagnosed within 14

213 days of AL treatment, or 28 days of DP treatment, were not counted as incident cases. To account
214 for the post-treatment prophylactic effect of AL and DP, the at-risk person-time was adjusted by
215 subtracting 14 days for each AL treatment, and 28 days for each DP treatment. Temporary absences
216 from the study area that did not interfere with monthly clinic visits were not considered to reduce
217 individual exposure time. However, absences >35 days were excluded from exposure time.
218 Secondary outcomes included (i) malaria prevalence: proportion of participants aged ≥1 month
219 testing positive by RDT; (ii) parity: proportion of dissected mosquitoes that were parous; (iii) vector
220 density (the number of female *Anopheles* collected per household). All entomological outcomes
221 were calculated for all *Anopheles* spp. collected and disaggregated by species complexes based on
222 morphological identification.
223

224 **Analytical approach**

225 All analyses were done using the intention-to-treat population. For the primary outcome, a multi-
226 level variance components model within a generalised linear framework with a Poisson likelihood
227 and a log link function was used. A random intercept was included for cluster, and study arm was
228 included as a fixed effect. We examined the distributional assumption that the mean and variance of
229 the outcome were similar after accounting for cluster effects. Adjusted analyses including pre-
230 specified covariates (sub-county, age, sex, housing type, baseline cluster-level malaria incidence and
231 adequate bednet coverage, defined as one net per two residents) were conducted [15]. Other
232 factors considered in the restricted randomisation were not included in the adjusted (or unadjusted)
233 analyses. Household structures were classified as 'improved' (finished walls and roofs, and closed
234 eaves) or 'traditional' (all other construction). Subgroup analyses by factors specified a priori (age,
235 sex, baseline parasite prevalence, housing type) were also conducted by including the subgroup
236 variable and an interaction term with study arm in an adjusted analysis. If the *p*-value of the
237 interaction terms was <0.05, separate effect estimates and confidence intervals for each sub-group
238 were presented.

239

240 Malaria prevalence was analysed using a multi-level variance components model within a
241 generalised linear framework, with a Bernoulli likelihood and a logit link function. A random
242 intercept was included for each study cluster, and the study arm was treated as a fixed effect.
243 Adjusted analyses included pre-specified covariates (region, age, sex, bednet use) [15]. Vector parity
244 and density were analysed using individual-level data through generalised linear mixed models. Both
245 unadjusted and adjusted analyses were conducted, with a random effect for clusters included in the
246 models. For the unadjusted analysis of parity, a Bernoulli likelihood was used with a logit link
247 function and a fixed effect for the study arm. The adjusted analysis included fixed effects for
248 collection location (indoors vs. outdoors), time since intervention, and calendar month for
249 seasonality. For density, a negative binomial distribution was used to account for overdispersion.
250 The unadjusted analysis included a fixed effect for the study arm, while the adjusted model
251 considered collection location, time since intervention, and calendar month. Analyses were
252 completed using R version 4.4.1.

253

254 **Research ethics approval**

255 The trial was approved by the Kenya Medical Research Institute Scientific and Ethics Review Unit
256 (KEMRI SERU: 4189), Institutional Review Board of the US Centers for Disease Control and
257 Prevention (IRB: 00008118), and the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine Research Ethics
258 Committee (LSTM REC: 21-027). A license for the trial was also granted by the National Commission
259 for Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI) in Kenya.

260

261 **Role of the funding source**

262 The ATSB study multi-country consortium, including researchers and technical advisors from IVCC
263 (the funder), designed the trial and aligned it across the three countries [14, 15]. IVCC had no role in

data collection, analysis, or interpretation, or writing of the report. All authors had full access to the study data and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

Cohort recruitment

Of 4,509 children on the cohort recruitment lists (Fig1), 804 could not be contacted (399 intervention; 405 control), and 3,705 children were screened (1,858 control; 1,847 intervention). Of these, 523 children were not eligible (250 intervention; 273 control), and 220 did not consent (111 intervention; 109 control). Reasons for exclusion are detailed in Table S1. Overall, 2,962 children were enrolled (1,497 intervention; 1,465 control), including 1,000 in cohort-1, 969 in cohort-2, and 993 in cohort-3.

Characteristics of participants and households

Characteristics of cohort participants and households were similar in both arms (Table 1). The mean cluster-level proportion of children aged <5 years, 5-9 years, and 10-<15 years was 26.5% (SD 7.4%), 34.2% (SD 7.8%), and 39.3% (SD 8.9%), respectively. The median cluster-level prevalence of positive RDTs at enrolment was 45.7% (IQR: 28.6%, 67.9%) in the intervention arm and 48.7% (IQR: 24.3%, 61.8%) in the control. We surveyed 2,644 households of 2,886 (97%) participants. The cluster-level household size and socio-economic index were evenly distributed across both study arms. Most houses were classified as traditional construction, primarily due to open eaves. Nearly all households owned at least one bed net; however, the mean cluster-level proportion of households that owned at least one net for every two residents was only 51.4% (SD 9.7%).

287 **Table 1. Cluster-level characteristics of cohort participants & households (stratified by study arm)**

Variable	Characteristic	Cohort study	
		Control arm	Intervention arm
Number of clusters		35	35
Number of cohort participants enrolled		1,465	1,497
Female sex, mean (SD) [a]		47.1% (7.5%)	48.2% (7.2%)
Age categories, mean (SD) [a]	— 1 to < 5 years	27.5% (7.4%)	25.4% (7.4%)
	— 5 to 9 years	32.5% (7.1%)	35.9% (8.2%)
	— 10 to < 15 years	40.0% (8.0%)	38.6% (9.8%)
RDT positive, median (IQR) a		48.7% (24.3%, 61.8%)	45.7% (28.6%, 67.9%)
Number of households surveyed		1,311	1,333
Household size by cluster, mean (SD) [a]	— [1 - 4] residents	26.4% (7.3%)	24.7% (7.7%)
	— [5 - 7] residents	54.2% (9.0%)	56.1% (10.0%)
	— 8+ residents	17.8% (10.2%)	17.1% (9.5%)
Socioeconomic index in terciles, mean (SD) [a]	— Poorest	34.6% (10.7%)	31.3% (10.5%)
	— Poor	31.5% (8.3%)	34.3% (8.8%)
	— Least poor	33.9% (11.2%)	34.4% (11.2%)
Household construction, mean (SD) [a,b]	— Traditional	92.5% (5.0%)	92.2% (4.9%)
	— Modern	7.5% (5.0%)	7.8% (4.9%)
Net ownership, mean (SD) [a]	Households with at least one net	98.4% (2.4%)	98.8% (2.4%)
Adequate net coverage, mean (SD) [a]	Households with 1 net for every 2 residents	52.0% (9.7%)	50.8% (9.8%)

288 [a] *Proportions at the level of each cluster*

289 [b] *Houses were classified as 'modern' (synthetic walls and roofs, eaves closed or absent) or 'traditional' (all other construction)*

290

ATSB delivery

A total of 268,268 ATSBs were deployed between March 2022 and April 2024. Of the 33,419 household structures deemed eligible for ATSBs in March 2022, 183 did not consent, and another 56 did not receive ATSBs. Thus, 66,360 ATSBs were deployed to 33,180 (99.3%) structures. The mean cluster-level coverage of ATSBs was 98.7% (range 96-100%) for eligible structures. In September 2022, March 2023, and September 2023, 66,868, 67,704, 67,336 ATSBs were deployed, respectively. New structures were mapped and consented at each deployment round. Overall, during the 2-monthly monitoring visits, 12,427 (4.6%) stations were missing (not present at the time of the monitoring visit), and 42,297 (15.8%) met criteria for replacement, primarily due to mould, sugar leakage, or damage, and were replaced with new ATSBs. All stations were replaced at the 6-month mark. Further details on ATSB density and coverage will be published separately.

Cohort follow-up

Of the 2,962 children enrolled, 2,702 (91.2%) completed the 6th follow-up visit (1,375 intervention; 1,327 control). In cohort-3, 876 (88.2%) of 993 children completed the 12th follow-up visit (448 intervention; 428 control). Overall, 2,967 routine and sick visits (1,525 intervention; 1,442 control) were associated with fever (elevated temperature $\geq$ 37.5^{o}C or history of fever in the past 48h). In the intervention arm, 937 (71.5%) of 1,310 children tested with an RDT, and 131 (59.6%) of 220 children tested by microscopy, were positive. In the control arm, 821 (66.4%) of 1,236 children tested with an RDT, and 110 (49.8%) of 221 children tested by microscopy, were positive. Overall, 2,869 (96.9%) participants (1,461 intervention, 1,408 control) were included in the primary endpoint analysis (Fig1). Children were excluded if they missed the clearance visit, lacked a microscopy result at the clearance visit (26 intervention; 37 control), or did not accrue eligible person-time after clearance (9 intervention; 18 control).

316 **Impact on primary outcome: clinical malaria incidence**

317 We captured 1,829 incident malaria cases over 1,445 person-years of follow-up. Malaria incidence
318 was 1.32 episodes per person-years in the intervention versus 1.20 in the control arm (Table 2).
319 There was no evidence of a difference in malaria incidence between the intervention and control
320 group in the unadjusted analysis (incidence rate ratio [IRR] 1.11; 95% CI: 0.75-1.65; p=0.598) or in
321 the multivariable analysis. The median cluster-level incidence of malaria overall was 1.275 cases per
322 person-year (range 0.04 to 4.59 cases per person-year). The coefficient of variation for malaria
323 incidence in the trial was 0.75. Subgroup analysis suggested that the effect of ATSBs varied by age (1-
324 <5 years: adjusted IRR 1.22 [95% CI: 0.84-1.77]; 5-<15 years: adjusted IRR 1.09 [95% CI: 0.77-1.53], p-
325 value for study arm x age group interaction=0.041) (Table 2). There were no sub-group differences
326 for other pre-specified factors. Overall, 18 serious adverse events (9 intervention; 9 control) were
327 reported; all were considered unrelated to the ATSB intervention (Table S2).
328
329

330 **Table 2. Malaria incidence (primary outcome)**

Study arm	Number of children	Episodes of malaria	Person years of observation at risk	Malaria Incidence	Unadjusted		Adjusted*	
					IRR (95% CI)	P value	IRR (95% CI)	P value
Overall								
Control	1408	857	711.64	1.20	Reference		Reference	
Intervention (ATSB)	1461	972	733.61	1.32	1.11 (0.75, 1.65)	0.598	1.10 (0.79, 1.52)	0.585
Age 1 to <5 years †								
Control	379	238	186.05	1.28	Reference		Reference	
Intervention (ATSB)	378	295	192.72	1.53	1.24 (0.76, 2.04)	0.565	1.22 (0.84, 1.77)	0.308
Age 5 to <15 years †								
Control	1029	619	525.59	1.18	Reference		Reference	
Intervention (ATSB)	1083	677	540.89	1.25	1.07 (0.74, 1.55)	0.728	1.09 (0.77, 1.53)	0.630

331 ** Adjusted for participant age, sex, adequate bednet coverage within household, housing, region, and baseline cluster-level malaria incidence (from baseline cohort)*

332 *† P-value = 0.041 for study arm x age category effect in primary outcome model fit with interaction term: ~ study arm + age category + study arm x age category, effect estimate for*
333 *interaction term 0.81 (0.66 - 0.99) (RR scale)*

334

335 **Impact on secondary outcomes: malaria prevalence**

336 In the cMIS survey, 7,488 community residents (3,760 intervention; 3,728 control) from 1,685
337 households (850 intervention; 835 control) were tested for malaria using RDTs (Table 3). Of these,
338 1,474 (39.2%) intervention and 1,461 (39.2%) control participants tested positive. There was no
339 difference in the odds of malaria infection between the two groups in the unadjusted analysis (odds
340 ratio [OR] 0.98; 95% CI: 0.60-1.59; p-value 0.93), or in the multivariable analysis (Table 3).

341

342

343 **Table 3. Secondary epidemiological and entomological outcomes**

Survey	Indicator	Study arm		Unadjusted		Adjusted	
				n/N (%)	OR (95% CI)	p-value	OR (95% CI)	p-value
Continuous malaria indicator survey	RDT positivity (all ages) *	Control		1461/3728 (39.19)	Ref		Ref	
		Intervention (ATSB)		1474/3760 (39.20)	0.98 (0.60–1.59)	0.93	0.97 (0.68–1.37)	0.85
Entomology surveillance	Parity (Female Anopheles spp.) †	Control		1973/2399 (82.2)	Ref		Ref	
		Intervention (ATSB)		3579/4058 (88.2)	1.34 (0.905–1.99)	0.14	1.30 (0.87–1.94)	0.201

Indicator	Study arm	Households sampled	Total Collected	Household Mean (SD)	Household Median (IQR)	Cluster Median (IQR)	IRR (95% CI)	p-value	IRR (95% CI)	p-value
Density by HLCs (Female *Anopheles spp.*)	Control	1925	10,846	5.63 (13.6)	0 (0 – 4)	2.06 (1.20–7.52)	Ref		Ref	
	Intervention	1924	28,840	15 (46)	0 (0 – 5)	0.913 (0.52–11.2)	0.954 (0.145–6.27)	0.96	0.985 (0.142 – 6.82)	0.99
Density by UVLTs (Female *Anopheles spp.*)	Control	1927	18,191	9.44 (22.1)	3 (0 – 9)	5.46 (3.93–10.8)	Ref		Ref	
	Intervention	1924	37,531	19.5 (52.7)	2 (0 – 14)	4.08 (1.96–22.5)	0.960 (0.257–3.59)	0.952	0.94 (0.244–3.63)	0.929
Density by UVLT CSS (Female *Anopheles spp.*)	Control	2103	22,797	10.8 (21.7)	3 (0 – 12)	7.15 (3.78–13.6)	Ref		Ref	
	Intervention	2104	29,792	14.2 (28.4)	3 (0 – 15)	5.58 (2.71–20.3)	1.02 (0.548–1.90)	0.952	0.954 (0.63–1.44)	0.822

344 ** cMIS analysis adjusted for study arm (ATSB), region, sex, age in year of survey & bednet use (slept under net last night)*

345 *† Parity analysis includes fixed effects for collection location (indoors vs. outdoors), time since intervention and calendar month as a seasonality adjustment*

346 *‡ Adjusted analysis for density includes fixed effects for study arm (ATSB) + log(baseline anopheline species number) and random effects for cluster & round*

347

Impact on secondary outcomes: entomology indicators

Between April 2022 and March 2024, 6,457 female *Anopheles spp* were collected and evaluated for parity (4,058 intervention; 2,399 control) (Table 3). Of these, 3,579 (88.2%) in the intervention arm and 1,973 (82.2%) in the control arm were parous. There was no difference in the odds of parity between the groups in the unadjusted analysis (OR 1.34; 95% CI: 0.905-1.99; p=0.14), or in the multivariable analysis. Similarly, no evidence of difference in the density of female *Anopheles spp* was found when using human landing catches or UV light traps in the unadjusted or adjusted analyses. Species-specific results for *An. funestus and An. gambiae* were similar, with no significant differences in parity or density between the intervention and control groups stratified by species or collection strategy (Table S3). Detailed results of the entomology surveys will be published separately.

Discussion

In this trial, we evaluated the impact of ATSBs on malaria indicators in western Kenya. Despite promising results from a preliminary entomology study in Mali [10], epidemiological modelling suggesting that ATSBs could substantially reduce malaria burden in similar settings [11], and a choice experiment in semi-field enclosures in Kenya suggesting that ATSBs were more attractive to local *Anopheles* mosquitoes than natural sugar sources [12], we found no evidence that ATSBs reduced malaria incidence in children aged 1-<15 years, malaria prevalence in community residents of all ages, or vector parity or density in western Kenya. Our results are consistent with the findings from the partner trial in Zambia, which found no impact of ATSBs on clinical malaria incidence, parasite prevalence or entomological indicators in a setting with seasonal malaria transmission [24, 25]. The lack of ATSB effectiveness is likely attributable to multiple factors, including competing sugar sources for vector feeding in Kenya [26, 27], uncertainty about optimal intervention coverage in this setting, product design and limited interaction with the product by local vector populations [10, 28]. For

373 ATSBs to effectively control malaria, a sufficient proportion of the mosquito population must be
374 attracted to, subsequently feed on the insecticide-laced syrup in ATSB stations, and be killed, thus
375 reducing the vector population and ultimately malaria transmission. It is unclear where along this
376 pathway ATSBs failed in Kenya. However, the lack of entomological impact on vector density
377 suggests that ATSBs did not work in western Kenya, as they appeared to in the Mali trial [10].
378
379 Why were ATSBs not effective in Kenya? Did ATSBs fail to lure mosquitoes, perhaps due to
380 competition with other natural sugar sources? This seems plausible given the range and quantity of
381 natural sugar sources in the environment which could lead to insufficient coverage [29]. Did
382 mosquitoes fail to feed on the ATSBs, or did the insecticide fail to kill mosquitoes? This is possible,
383 although laboratory experiments suggest that the mosquitoes did feed on the devices, and those
384 that fed, died [30]. Or, was the proportion of mosquitoes affected by ATSBs insufficient to reduce
385 vector density, parity and transmission in our setting? This seems most likely. Inadequate density
386 and coverage of ATSB devices, the abundance of alternative food sources, or the sheer numbers of
387 mosquitoes in the area may have all contributed. Modelling studies on mosquito feeding behaviour
388 and the potential of ATSBs to control mosquito populations and *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria
389 prevalence were fitted to data from Mali [11, 13]. However, natural sugar sources are more
390 abundant in western Kenya than in Mali. The effectiveness of ATSBs may be context specific with
391 higher efficacy in more arid regions. Studies in Mali and Israel, sites with less natural sugar sources,
392 have demonstrated a strong entomological impact of ATSBs [10, 26, 31, 32]. However, in Zambia, the
393 Phase III cluster-randomised trial evaluating ATSBs found that while vector density was reduced (but
394 not significantly) by 35%, no difference was observed in parity, sporozoite rate or EIR [24], and
395 correspondingly no significant reductions in clinical malaria incidence or malaria prevalence were
396 observed [25]. Full results of the companion trial in Mali may shed more light on the efficacy of
397 ATSBs in different settings.
398

399 Our study had several limitations. First, we currently lack a specific density target for spatial
400 deployment of ATSBs, and it remains unclear how bait stations interact with environmental factors
401 such as vector larval site locations, natural sugar sources, housing construction and human
402 settlement patterns. Further research is needed to better understand the impact of intervention
403 density and coverage, to optimise their effectiveness in diverse malaria transmission settings.
404 Second, the calculated coefficient of variation for malaria incidence, which measures heterogeneity
405 between clusters, was 0.75 in the trial, higher than the estimate of 0.4 included in our sample size
406 calculations. Underestimating coefficient of variation can compromise trial power and reduce effect
407 size precision in cluster-randomised trials [33]. However, all outcomes measured in this trial (malaria
408 incidence and prevalence, vector parity and density) were greater in the intervention arm than in
409 the control, suggesting that we were unlikely to have rejected the null hypothesis in the trial, even if
410 it had been more sufficiently powered to detect a statistically significant reduction in malaria
411 incidence.
412
413

414 Conclusion

415 In a high transmission area in western Kenya, we found no evidence that ATSBs reduced malaria
416 incidence, prevalence, or vector parity and density, consistent with the results from the companion
417 trial in Zambia. Results from the partner trial Mali are expected soon, which may provide more
418 insight into the effectiveness of ATSBs in different transmission settings. Future work on ATSBs could
419 focus on steps in the causal pathway of impact (attraction, feeding, and mortality), the complex
420 interplay between sugar feeding and host seeking by malaria vectors, and density and coverage of
421 ATSBs in a variety of environmental and transmission settings. Further research on innovative
422 malaria control interventions is also needed to address outdoor biting and residual transmission, and
423 to help build the toolbox for integrated vector management.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the clinicians, monitors, community interviewers, human landing catch volunteers, the entomology laboratory and field teams, and community health promoters for their dedicated efforts in the collection of data and ensuring the smooth running of study activities. We are grateful to the social science team led by George Okello and Teresa Bange for helping us develop our community engagement strategy. We extend our appreciation to the Siaya County Ministry of Health for approving this study. We also thank the sub-county health management teams (Alego-Usonga and Rarieda) for facilitating community engagement and the health facility in-charges for their assistance with the cohort study and allowing their facilities to be used for storage of study supplies. Special thanks to Timothy Orwa the community liaison who was instrumental in community sensitization, Benta Kamire, Helen Wong, Sheila Nyarinda, and Maurice Ondeng for their instrumental roles in facilitating study activities, Dickens Riaga for ensuring the internal consistency of the trial and Dennis Omondi, the KEMRI/ CGHR Siaya laboratory manager for overseeing sample management. We are grateful to the Siaya County Commissioner and the national government staff who enabled us to conduct field activities without any issues. Lastly, we are grateful to all participants for their willingness to take part in this trial.

Author's contributions

EO, FtK, and AMS conceived the trial, with input from DM, JJ, MJD, and SK. EO, FtK, and AMS designed the study, developed the procedures, and drafted the protocol with contributions from DM, ML, JJ, CO, MC, MM, OT, WO, KO1, BS, SO, JK, and BP. CO, KO1, BS, SO, JK, and BP led field activities and data collection, under the oversight of SGS, FtK, AMS, and EO, with support from JS, JRG, JEG, and MJD. AK, DM, FA, and OT managed the data, and ML led the data analysis, with support from AK, DM and SGS. SO and JK led the entomology surveillance

and mosquito sample processing. KO2 coordinated the collection, processing, and storage of blood samples. CO and SGS interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript, with input from ML, DM, and AK. All authors reviewed the manuscript and approved it for publication. CO, the corresponding author, had full access to all the data in the study and held final responsibility for the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding statement

This work was funded by Integrated Vector Control Consortium (IVCC), UK, through support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (grant: INV-007509), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) (grant: 81067480) and UK Aid (grant: 30041-105). The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, SDC or UK Aid.

Data sharing statement

De-identified data are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. Following publication of forthcoming secondary analyses of trial data, the de-identified trial dataset will be posted on a public repository.

469 # Figure legends

470 **Fig1: CONSORT flow diagram**

471

472 **Fig2: Map of study area:** The study included 70 clusters, each consisting of a minimum of 100
473 households in the core area. Clusters were randomised 1:1 to intervention (ATSB) or control
474 (standard care). A sub-set of 16 clusters were randomly selected for entomology surveillance.

475

476 **Fig3: Study schema**. Timeline of study activities between February 2022 to March 2024
477 Abbreviations – attractive targeted sugar bait (ATSB), continuous malaria indicator survey (cMIS),
478 human landing catches (HLCs), ultraviolet light traps (UVLTs), cross-sectional surveys (CSS). Activities
479 featured, include: four rounds of ATSB deployment and monitoring; enrolment and follow-up of
480 three consecutive cohorts of children; two years of cMIS monitoring; seven cross-sectional mosquito
481 collections using UVLTs; one year of entomology surveillance using HLCs and UVLTs for mosquito
482 collections.

483

484 # Supplemental files

485 **S1. Malaria microscopy procedures**

486 **Table S1. Cohort study recruitment**

487 **Table S2. Serious adverse events & deaths**

488 **Table S3. Additional parity outcomes**

489 # References

490 1. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of malaria
491 control on Plasmodium falciparum in Africa between 2000 and 2015. Nature.
492 2015;526(7572):207-11. doi: 10.1038/nature15535. PubMed PMID: 26375008.

493 2. World Health Organization. World Malaria Report 2023. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health
494 Organization, 2023.

495 3. Ranson H, Lissenden N. Insecticide Resistance in African Anopheles Mosquitoes: A Worsening
496 Situation that Needs Urgent Action to Maintain Malaria Control. Trends Parasitol.
497 2016;32(3):187-96. doi: 10.1016/j.pt.2015.11.010. PubMed PMID: 26826784.

498 4. Abong'o B, Gimnig JE, Torr SJ, Longman B, Omoke D, Muchoki M, et al. Impact of indoor residual
499 spraying with pirimiphos-methyl (Actellic 300CS) on entomological indicators of transmission
500 and malaria case burden in Migori County, western Kenya. Scientific reports. 2020;10(1):4518.
501 Epub 20200311. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-61350-2. PubMed PMID: 32161302; PubMed Central
502 PMCID: PMCPMC7066154.

503 5. Omondi S, Kosgei J, Musula G, Muchoki M, Abong'o B, Agumba S, et al. Late morning biting
504 behaviour of Anopheles funestus is a risk factor for transmission in schools in Siaya, western
505 Kenya. Malar J. 2023;22(1):366. Epub 2023/12/01. doi: 10.1186/s12936-023-04806-w. PubMed
506 PMID: 38037026; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10691009.

507 6. Conrad MD, Asua V, Garg S, Giesbrecht D, Niaré K, Smith S, et al. Evolution of Partial Resistance
508 to Artemisinins in Malaria Parasites in Uganda. N Engl J Med. 2023;389(8):722-32. Epub
509 2023/08/23. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2211803. PubMed PMID: 37611122; PubMed Central PMCID:
510 PMCPMC10513755.

511 7. Alegana VA, Macharia PM, Muchiri S, Mumo E, Oyugi E, Kamau A, et al. Plasmodium falciparum
512 parasite prevalence in East Africa: Updating data for malaria stratification. PLOS Glob Public
513 Health. 2021;1(12):e0000014. Epub 2022/02/26. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgph.0000014. PubMed
514 PMID: 35211700; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7612417.

515 8. Odero JI, Abong'o B, Moshi V, Ekodir S, Harvey SA, Ochomo E, et al. Early morning anopheline
516 mosquito biting, a potential driver of malaria transmission in Busia County, western Kenya.
517 Malar J. 2024;23(1):66. Epub 20240304. doi: 10.1186/s12936-024-04893-3. PubMed PMID:
518 38438933; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10910777.

519 9. Njoroge TM, Hamid-Adiamoh M, Duman-Scheel M. Maximizing the Potential of Attractive
520 Targeted Sugar Baits (ATSBs) for Integrated Vector Management. Insects. 2023;14(7). Epub
521 20230628. doi: 10.3390/insects14070585. PubMed PMID: 37504591; PubMed Central PMCID:
522 PMCPMC10380652.

523 10. Traore MM, Junnila A, Traore SF, Doumbia S, Revay EE, Kravchenko VD, et al. Large-scale field
524 trial of attractive toxic sugar baits (ATSB) for the control of malaria vector mosquitoes in Mali,

West Africa. Malar J. 2020;19(1):72. Epub 20200214. doi: 10.1186/s12936-020-3132-0. PubMed PMID: 32059671; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7023716.

11. Fraser KJ, Mwandigha L, Traore SF, Traore MM, Doumbia S, Junnila A, et al. Estimating the potential impact of Attractive Targeted Sugar Baits (ATSBs) as a new vector control tool for Plasmodium falciparum malaria. Malar J. 2021;20(1):151. Epub 20210317. doi: 10.1186/s12936-021-03684-4. PubMed PMID: 33731111; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7968277.

12. Chanda J, Wagman J, Chanda B, Kaniki T, Ng'andu M, Muyabe R, et al. Feeding rates of malaria vectors from a prototype attractive sugar bait station in Western Province, Zambia: results of an entomological validation study. Malar J. 2023;22(1):70. Epub 20230301. doi: 10.1186/s12936-023-04491-9. PubMed PMID: 36855105; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9974387.

13. Marshall JM, White MT, Ghani AC, Schlein Y, Muller GC, Beier JC. Quantifying the mosquito's sweet tooth: modelling the effectiveness of attractive toxic sugar baits (ATSB) for malaria vector control. Malar J. 2013;12:291. Epub 20130823. doi: 10.1186/1475-2875-12-291. PubMed PMID: 23968494; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3765557.

14. Attractive Targeted Sugar Bait Phase III Trial Group. Attractive targeted sugar bait phase III trials in Kenya, Mali, and Zambia. Trials. 2022;23(1):640. Epub 2022/08/10. doi: 10.1186/s13063-022-06555-8. PubMed PMID: 35945599; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9361277.

15. Yukich J, Eisele TP, terKuile F, Ashton R, Staedke S, Harris AF, et al. Master statistical analysis plan: attractive targeted sugar bait phase III trials in Kenya, Mali, and Zambia. Trials. 2023;24(1):771. Epub 2023/11/30. doi: 10.1186/s13063-023-07762-7. PubMed PMID: 38031086; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10685482.

16. Kamau A, Obiet K, Ogwang C, McDermott DP, Lesosky M, Janssen J, et al. Attractive targeted sugar baits for malaria control in western Kenya (ATSB-Kenya): enrolment characteristics of cohort children and households. Malar J. 2024;23(1):403. Epub 20241230. doi: 10.1186/s12936-024-05234-0. PubMed PMID: 39736740; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC11687092.

17. Odhiambo FO, Laserson KF, Sewe M, Hamel MJ, Feikin DR, Adazu K, et al. Profile: the KEMRI/CDC Health and Demographic Surveillance System--Western Kenya. Int J Epidemiol. 2012;41(4):977-87. doi: 10.1093/ije/dys108. PubMed PMID: 22933646.

18. Odero NA, Samuels AM, Odongo W, Abong'o B, Gimnig J, Otieno K, et al. Community-based intermittent mass testing and treatment for malaria in an area of high transmission intensity, western Kenya: development of study site infrastructure and lessons learned. Malar J. 2019;18(1):255. Epub 20190729. doi: 10.1186/s12936-019-2896-6. PubMed PMID: 31357997; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6664589.

19. Samuels AM, Odero NA, Odongo W, Otieno K, Were V, Shi YP, et al. Impact of Community-Based Mass Testing and Treatment on Malaria Infection Prevalence in a High-Transmission Area of Western Kenya: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. Clin Infect Dis. 2021;72(11):1927-35. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa471. PubMed PMID: 32324850; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9059430.

562 20. Bayoh MN, Mathias DK, Odiere MR, Mutuku FM, Kamau L, Gimnig JE, et al. Anopheles gambiae:
563 historical population decline associated with regional distribution of insecticide-treated bed nets
564 in western Nyanza Province, Kenya. Malaria journal. 2010;9:62. Epub 2010/03/02. doi:
565 10.1186/1475-2875-9-62. PubMed PMID: 20187956; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2838909.

566 21. US President's Malaria Initiative. U.S. President's Malaria Initiative Kenya Malaria Operational
567 Plan, FY 2023. 2022.

568 22. Detinova TS. Age-grouping methods in Diptera of medical importance with special reference to
569 some vectors of malaria. Monogr Ser World Health Organ. 1962;47:13-191. PubMed PMID:
570 13885800.

571 23. Johnson PC, Barry SJ, Ferguson HM, Müller P. Power analysis for generalized linear mixed models
572 in ecology and evolution. Methods Ecol Evol. 2015;6(2):133-42. Epub 20141206. doi:
573 10.1111/2041-210x.12306. PubMed PMID: 25893088; PubMed Central PMCID:
574 PMCPMC4394709.

575 24. Wagman J, Chanda B, Chanda J, Saili K, Orange E, Mambo P, et al. Entomological effects of
576 attractive targeted sugar bait station deployment in Western Zambia: vector surveillance
577 findings from a two-arm cluster randomized phase III trial. Malar J. 2024;23(1):214. Epub
578 20240718. doi: 10.1186/s12936-024-05045-3. PubMed PMID: 39026236; PubMed Central
579 PMCID: PMCPMC11264679.

580 25. Ashton RA, Saili K, Chishya C, Banda Yikona H, Arnzen A, Orange E, et al. Efficacy of attractive
581 targeted sugar bait stations against malaria in Western Province Zambia: epidemiological
582 findings from a two-arm cluster randomized phase III trial. Malar J. 2024;23(1):343. Epub
583 20241115. doi: 10.1186/s12936-024-05175-8. PubMed PMID: 39548456; PubMed Central
584 PMCID: PMCPMC11566550.

585 26. Beier JC, Muller GC, Gu W, Arheart KL, Schlein Y. Attractive toxic sugar bait (ATSB) methods
586 decimate populations of Anopheles malaria vectors in arid environments regardless of the local
587 availability of favoured sugar-source blossoms. Malar J. 2012;11:31. Epub 20120201. doi:
588 10.1186/1475-2875-11-31. PubMed PMID: 22297155; PubMed Central PMCID:
589 PMCPMC3293779.

590 27. Yalla N, Polo B, McDermott DP, Kosgei J, Omondi S, Agumba S, et al. A comparison of the
591 attractiveness of flowering plant blossoms versus attractive targeted sugar baits (ATSBs) in
592 western Kenya. PLoS One. 2023;18(6):e0286679. Epub 20230606. doi:
593 10.1371/journal.pone.0286679. PubMed PMID: 37279239; PubMed Central PMCID:
594 PMCPMC10243617.

595 28. Diarra RA, Traore MM, Junnila A, Traore SF, Doumbia S, Revay EE, et al. Testing configurations of
596 attractive toxic sugar bait (ATSB) stations in Mali, West Africa, for improving the control of
597 malaria parasite transmission by vector mosquitoes and minimizing their effect on non-target
598 insects. Malar J. 2021;20(1):184. Epub 20210414. doi: 10.1186/s12936-021-03704-3. PubMed
599 PMID: 33853632; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8048058.

600 29. Omondi S, Kosgei J, Agumba S, Polo B, Yalla N, Moshi V, et al. Natural sugar feeding rates of
601 Anopheles mosquitoes collected by different methods in western Kenya. Scientific reports.
602 2022;12(1):20596. Epub 20221129. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-25004-9. PubMed PMID:
603 36446923; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9709062.

604 30. Mwaanga G, Ford J, Yukich J, Chanda B, Ashton RA, Chanda J, et al. Residual bioefficacy of
605 attractive targeted sugar bait stations targeting malaria vectors during seasonal deployment in
606 Western Province of Zambia. Malaria Journal. 2024;23(1):169. doi: 10.1186/s12936-024-04990-
607 3.

608 31. Müller GC, Beier JC, Traore SF, Toure MB, Traore MM, Bah S, et al. Successful field trial of
609 attractive toxic sugar bait (ATSB) plant-spraying methods against malaria vectors in the
610 Anopheles gambiae complex in Mali, West Africa. Malaria Journal. 2010;9(1):210. doi:
611 10.1186/1475-2875-9-210.

612 32. Revay EE, Schlein Y, Tsabari O, Kravchenko V, Qualls W, De-Xue R, et al. Formulation of attractive
613 toxic sugar bait (ATSB) with safe EPA-exempt substance significantly diminishes the Anopheles
614 sergentii population in a desert oasis. Acta Trop. 2015;150:29-34. Epub 20150625. doi:
615 10.1016/j.actatropica.2015.06.018. PubMed PMID: 26119042; PubMed Central PMCID:
616 PMCPMC4720916.

617 33. Biggs J, Challenger JD, Hellewell J, Churcher TS, Cook J. A systematic review of sample size
618 estimation accuracy on power in malaria cluster randomised trials measuring epidemiological
619 outcomes. medRxiv. 2024:2024.04.08.24305485. doi: 10.1101/2024.04.08.24305485.

620