The potential of attractive insecticide-treated nets (ITNs) in reducing malaria transmission: a modeling study

Nicolas Moiroux*[1,2], Cédric Pennetier[1]

[1] MIVEGEC, IRD, CNRS, Univ. Montpellier - Montpellier, France
[2] Pôle de Zoologie Médicale, Institut Pasteur Dakar - Dakar, Sénégal

*Corresponding author
Correspondence: nicolas.moiroux@ird.fr

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Recent studies suggest that insecticide-treated nets (ITNs) may actively attract malaria vectors, increasing their likelihood of coming into contact with the insecticide while potentially reducing personal protection. The impact of such attractive ITN on malaria transmission at the community level remains unclear. In this study, we developed a model to compare the effectiveness of attractive, inert and deterrent ITNs under varying levels of human usage and different degrees of physiological or behavioral resistance in malaria vectors.

Methods: We developed a model to simulate the host-seeking, feeding and mortality (HSFM) of mosquito vectors facing ITNs. This model allows mosquitoes to choose between two rooms based on the presence and remote influence (attractive, inert or deterrent) of ITNs. The HSFM model was then integrated into a malaria transmission model to compare the Plasmodium transmission potential (average number of infectious bites that a vector is expected to give during its lifetime) of mosquitoes exposed to these different type of ITNs under various scenarios of ITN coverage, physiological resistance (reduced ITN-induced mortality), quantitative resistance (increased indoor escape behaviors), and qualitative resistance (increased spatial-temporal avoidance of ITNs).

Results: The model predicts that attractive ITNs consistently reduce malaria transmission potential of vectors more effectively than inert or deterrent ITNs, even in the presence of resistant vector phenotypes. For instance, at intermediate use rate (50%), strongly attractive ITNs are expected to reduce transmission by up to 67% compared to deterrent ITNs. In resistant vector populations, attractive ITNs remained more effective overall, though the reduction in transmission were less pronounced.

Conclusion: Our findings suggest that both inert and attractive ITNs could enhance malaria control efforts, outperforming current deterrent ITNs, even in resistant vector populations. Shifting from deterrent to inert or attractive ITNs could significantly improve vector control strategies, warranting further research and product development to fully explore and optimize this approach.

Keywords: ITN, LLIN, vector control, behavior, plasmodium falciparum, resistance

Introduction

Malaria is a parasitic disease caused by *Plasmodium* protozoa transmitted between humans by *Anopheles* mosquitoes. In 2022 alone, an estimated 249 million cases of malaria and 608 000 deaths were reported worldwide [1]. Thanks to the Insecticides-Treated Nets (ITNs), the malaria targets of the 2015 Millennium Development Goals for were achieved. Between 2000 and 2015, an estimated 663 million cases were averted, with 68% of this reduction attributed to ITNs [2]. During this period, ITNs were the most widespread intervention, with usage rates increasing globally from less than 2% to 54% [1].

However, despite this progress, malaria remains a serious public health concern. More concerningly, global malaria cases have been rising since 2014, with an increase of 19 million cases in 2022 compared to 2014. While the number of deaths remains stable, the sub-Saharan Africa continues to bear more than 90% of the disease burden, with most of the reported increases occurring in this region.

Several factors may be contributing to this resurgence, including insufficient ITN coverage and usage, and the spread of insecticide resistance mechanisms among malaria vector populations [3]. Resistance to pyrethroids - the only insecticide class used in ITNs until recently – has become widespread in sub-Saharan African [4]. The prevalence of both physiological and behavioral resistant phenotypes has increased among malaria vector populations, allowing mosquitoes to survive or avoid contact with treated ITNs, thereby enabling continued transmission to persist. Physiological resistance mechanisms, which enhance mosquito survival after ITN contact, are the most extensively studied. Knockdown resistance (*kdr)* mutations and the overexpression of detoxification enzymes have been well characterized, both of which reduce mosquito susceptibility to pyrethroids [5]. In contrast, behavioral resistance mechanisms are less studied but can be classified as qualitative or quantitative [6]. Qualitative behavioral resistance mechanisms allow mosquitoes to avoid insecticide contact through spatial, temporal, or trophic change. Examples include change in biting time or increased exophagy following implementations of ITN or indoor residual spraying (IRS) [7,8]. Quantitative behavioral resistance, on the other hand, occurs after insecticide contact and involve behavioral responses that reduce insecticide absorption. A well-documented example is the irritant effect of certain pyrethroids [9], which induces escape behaviors and decreases contact duration.

ITNs are mosquito bed nets made of polyester, polyethylene, or polypropylene fibers that are either coated with or incorporated with pyrethroid insecticides. A person sleeping under an ITN acts as a lure for mosquitoes, which are intended to be killed upon contact with the insecticide-treated fibers. Thus, ITNs operate as a “pull-to-kill” vector control strategy. However, paradoxically, most WHO-recommended ITNs exhibits repellent properties, reducing mosquito attraction to human dwellings and host. This property, known as deterrence [10], is measured in experimental huts and defined as the reduction in mosquito entry rates into a hut with a human under an ITN compared to a control hut with a human under an untreated net.

While deterrence increases the personal protection provided by ITNs by reducing the number of bites, it also lowers the likelihood of mosquitoes contacting the insecticide, thereby decreasing mosquito mortality rates. The impact of deterrence on community-wide malaria transmission has been evaluated using mathematical models [11], which theoretically predict that although deterrent ITNs offer better personal protection, they are less effective than inert ITNs in reducing malaria transmission.

Conversely, field studies have shown unexpectedly high levels of mosquito attraction to human hosts protected by certain WHO-recommended ITNs, with greater numbers of mosquitoes collected in huts with ITNs than in control huts with untreated nets [12]. These ITNs, which enhance mosquito attraction to hosts, could potentially increase bite exposure, reducing personal protection under sub-optimal usage conditions or when nets are physical deteriorated. Nevertheless, since ITN efficacy is primarily expected at community-wide level, the impact of such “attractive ITNs” on malaria transmission remains unexplored. Extrapolating findings of Killeen *et al.* [11], whose model did not account for the possibility that ITNs might increase mosquito attraction, we hypothesize that

attractive ITNs could contribute to malaria transmission reduction, offering opportunities for novel ITN designs.

To test this hypothesis, we developed a model for host-seeking, feeding and mortality (HSFM; Figure 1 & Methods) of vectors. This model allows mosquitoes to choose between two hosts based on both contact (killing effect) and remote (attractive, inert or deterrent) effects of ITNs on malaria vectors. The HSFM model was then integrated into a malaria transmission model (Methods; adapted from Glunt *et al.* [13]) to compare the *Plasmodium* transmission potential of mosquitoes exposed to attractive, inert, or deterrent ITNs under varying conditions. These conditions included different ITN usage rates and different levels of physiological resistance (ITN-induced mortality), quantitative behavioral resistance (indoor escaping behaviors), and qualitative behavioral resistance (spatial-temporal avoidance of ITNs).



Figure 1 - Individual Host-Seeking, Feeding, and Mortality (HSFM) model used to feed a malaria transmission model.
An Anopheles vector looking for a blood-meal (in state Host-Seeking: HS) will either enter the room of an ITN-protected human (with probability E_p) or the room of an unprotected one (with probability E_u), depending on the remote effect of the ITN (attractive, inert or repulsive) and the human ITN usage rate in the community. After entering a hut, a vector will either be diverted (impaired and postponed to host-seeking the next night, with probability D) or attempt to feed, with two possible outcomes: feeding (with probability φ_1) or death (with probability μ_1). Then, blood-fed vectors will either die due to post-bite mortality (μ_2) or survive (S_2), entering the Resting state (R). A vector that enters state R will complete its gonotrophic cycle (g) with probability S^g and enter state HS to begin a new cycle.

Results

We simulated the impact of providing human communities with attractive ITNs on malaria transmission potential (expressed as the average number of infectious bites that a vector is expected to give during its lifetime), comparing it to communities receiving either inert or deterrent ITNs. The remote effect of ITNs on malaria vectors (attractive, inert, or deterrent) was modeled through the vector preference parameter p_{ITN} (Table 1), which represents the probability that a

vector selects an ITN-protected human over an unprotected human. This parameter reflects mosquito choice behavior as measured in dual-choice olfactometer assays or experimental hut trials. The probability *Eu* (Figure 1 and Table 1) of a vector entering the room of an ITN-protected human depends on both the vector preference parameter p_{ITN} and the proportion of humans using ITNs in the population (Methods). In these simulations, attractive ITNs induced vector preferences of 0.6 or 0.7, meaning that 60% or 70% of malaria vectors, respectively, selected a human under an ITN when given a choice against an unprotected human. These levels of attraction (p_{ITN} = 0.6-0.7) have been observed multiple times in field studies (Supplementary Figure 1) [12,14]. The inert ITN induced a vector preference of p_{ITN} = 0.5, indicating no preference (i.e., vectors selected an ITN-protected or unprotected human with equal probability). In contrast, the deterrent ITN induced a vector preference of p_{ITN} = 0.36, meaning that only 36% of malaria vectors choose a human under an ITN when presented against an unprotected human. This value represent the mean deterrence effect observed among significantly deterrent ITNs reported in the literature (Supplementary Figure 1) [12].

Table 1: Description of the parameters used in the Host-Seeking, Feeding and Mortality (HSFM) model and the transmission model.

Symbol	Definition	Default value	Range [min, max] or values used for simulations	Range [min, max] and distribution for sensitivity analysis	Refs.*
S	Daily survival rate (An. gambiae s.l)	0.9	-	[0.61, 0.98]; uniform	[15]
g	Average duration of gonotrophiq cycle (in days, discrete)	3	-	[2, 5]; discrete uniform	[16,17]
p_{ITN}	Preference of vector for ITN protected human (against unprotected human) as recorded in a dual choice olfactometer or in experimental hut trials	0.5, 0.36	0.5, 0.6, 0.7	-	[12,14]
μ_{1u}	Pre-bite mortality probability when attempting to bite an unprotected human	0.03	-	[0, 0.05]; uniform	[12]
μ_{1p}	Pre-bite mortality probability when attempting to bite an ITN-protected human	0.72	[0, 1]	[0.22, 1]; uniform	[12]
D_u	Diversion probability when entering a hut of an unprotected human	0.12	-	[0, 0.3]; uniform	[18,19]
D_p	Diversion probability when entering a hut of an ITN-protected human	0.31	[0, 1]	[0, 0.51]; uniform	[12]
μ_{2u}	Post-bite mortality probability after a successful feeding on an unprotected human	0.005	-	[0, 0.028]; uniform	[12]
μ_{2p}	Post-bite mortality probability after a successful feeding on an ITN-protected human	0.29	-	[0, 1]; uniform	[12]
N_h	Size of the human community	1000	-	[300, 5000]; uniform	-
I_h	Plasmodium falciparum prevalence rate in the human population	0.5	-	[0.1, 0.9]; uniform	[20]
k	Infectiousness: probability that a vector become infected (exposed) while taking a blood meal on an infectious host	0.1	-	[0.02, 0.2]; uniform	[21]
n	Duration of extrinsic incubation period of Plasmodium falciparum (in days)	11	-	[8, 15]; discrete uniform	[22–24]
U_h	ITN usage rate in the population	0.5	[0, 1]	[0.1, 0.9]; uniform	[20]
Π	Proportion of exposure to bites that occurs during which ITN is in use (= ITN protective efficacy)	0.75	[0, 1]	[0.45, 0.9]; uniform	[25–28]

*for default values and/or ranges used in sensitivity analysis

Effect of ITN usage rates

According to our model, attractive ITNs are expected to reduce malaria transmission more effectively than inert or deterrent ITNs, regardless of usage levels. With all other parameters set to default values based on literature and field data (Table 1 and Supplementary Figure 2), the greatest transmission reduction was observed at use rates of 92–94%. At these levels, a highly attractive ITN (p_{ITN} = 0.7) is expected to reduce *Plasmodium* transmission potential - expressed as the average number of infectious bites a vector delivers during its lifetime - by 56% compared to an inert ITN (Figure 2A) and by 74% compared to a deterrent ITN (Figure 2B). Similarly, at 92-94% use rate, moderately attractive ITNs (p_{ITN} = 0.6) are predicted to reduce malaria transmission by 33% and 60% compared to inert and deterrent ITNs, respectively (Figure 2A and 2B). At 50% ITN use, inert and attractive ITNs are expected to reduce transmission by 33-63% compared to deterrent ITNs (Figure 2B). Compared to no nets (0% use), attractive LLINs used by 50% of the population are predicted to achieve a 93% reduction in transmission potential, which is 12 percentage points (p.p.) more than deterrent ITNs (81%; supplementary Figure 3A).



Figure 2 - Reduction in *Plasmodium* transmission potential induced (A) by attractive Insecticide-Treated Nets (ITNs) compared to inert ITNs and (B) by attractive and inert ITNs compared to deterrent ITN for varied levels of usage rates in the human population.
Vector preference of 0.6 indicates that 60% of malaria vectors choose an ITN-protected human if presented against an unprotected human. The reference inert ITN (panel A) induce a vector preference of 0.5 (no preference between ITN protected and unprotected humans) and the reference deterrent ITN (panel B) induce a vector preference of 0.36 (only 36% of the vectors choose an ITN-protected human against an unprotected human).

Effect of physiological resistance

Physiological resistance was defined as the vector's ability to survive a feeding attempt in a dwelling equipped with an ITN. In our model, the probability of survival during a feeding attempt corresponds to the likelihood of successfully taking a blood meal, conditioned on not being diverted (Figure 1). Our simulations indicate that, regardless of the level of physiological resistance in the vector population, attractive ITNs consistently outperform inert and deterrent ITNs in reducing

malaria transmission (Figure 3), although the reduction in transmission declines as resistance levels increase. In the absence of physiological resistance (i.e., 0% survival), and with all other parameters held constant (including ITN use rate at 50%; Table 1), moderately attractive ITNs (p_{ITN} = 0.6) and highly attractive ITNs (p_{LLIN} = 0.7) are predicted to reduce malaria transmission by 32% and 55%, respectively, relative to an inert (p_{ITN} = 0.5) ITN (Figure 3A). When compared to a deterrent ITN (p_{ITN} = 0.36) under the same conditions (no resistance), an inert ITN is expected to reduce malaria transmission by 41%, while moderately attractive (p_{ITN} = 0.6) and highly attractive ITNs (p_{ITN} = 0.7) are expected to reduce transmission by 60% and 73%, respectively (Figure 3B). Under high resistance conditions (82% survival, supplementary Figure 2B), both moderately and highly attractive ITNs still provide better community protection but yield moderate reductions in transmission potential: of 13% and 25%, respectively, relative to inert ITNs (Figure 3A) and of 29% and 38%, respectively, relative to deterrent ITNs (Figure 3B). Compared to no nets (0% use), attractive LLINs (50% use) are predicted to achieve a 74% reduction in transmission potential under high resistance conditions (82% survival), which is 17 percentage points (p.p.) more than deterrent ITNs (supplementary Figure 3B).



Figure 3 - Reduction in *Plasmodium* transmission potential induced (A) by attractive Insecticide-treated Nets (ITNs) compared to inert ones and (B) by attractive and inert ITNs compared to deterrent ITNs for varied levels of physiological resistance in the vector population.
Vector preference of 0.6 indicates that 60% of malaria vectors choose an ITN-protected human if presented against an unprotected human. The reference inert ITN (panel A) induces a vector preference of 0.5 (no preference between ITN protected and unprotected humans) and the reference deterrent ITN (panel B) induces a vector preference of 0.36 (only 36% of the vectors choose an ITN-protected human against an unprotected human). Lines become grey in the range [82; 100%], corresponding to survival levels that were never observed in [12] *(supplementary figure 2).*

Effect of quantitative behavioral resistance (escape behavior)

We then analyzed the impact of quantitative behavioral resistance on the efficacy of attractive ITNs. Specifically, we simulated increasing levels of indoor escape behavior by varying the diversion probability (D_p) in our model (Figure 1). A diverted mosquito postpones host-seeking until

the following night. The simulations demonstrated that, regardless of the level of indoor escape, attractive ITNs consistently outperform inert and deterrent ITNs in reducing malaria transmission. However, as indoor escaping increases, the relative efficacy of attractive ITNs decreases (Figure 4). When compared to an inert ITN (Figure 4A), a moderately attractive ITN is expected to reduce malaria transmission by 21% (under high resistance, 51% diversion) to 30% (under no resistance, 0% diversion), while a highly attractive ITN is expected to reduce transmission by 39 (high resistance, 51% diversion) to 51% (no resistance, 0% diversion). When compared to a deterrent ITNs (Figure 4B), malaria transmission reduction ranged from 28 to 39% for inert ITN, from 43 to 57% for moderately attractive ITNs (p_{ITN} = 0.6) and from 56 to 70% for highly attractive ITNs (p_{ITN} = 0.7), depending on the level of resistance (i.e. between 0 and 51% diversion). Compared to no nets (0% use), attractive LLINs (50% use) are predicted to achieve a 88% reduction in transmission potential under high resistance conditions (51% diversion), which is 15 percentage points (p.p.) more than deterrent ITNs (supplementary Figure 3C).



Figure 4 - Reduction in *Plasmodium* transmission potential induced (A) by attractive Insecticide-treated Nets (ITNs) when compared to inert ones and (B) by attractive and inert ITNs when compared to deterrent ITNs for varied levels of quantitative behavioral resistance (escape behavior) in the vector population.
Vector preference of 0.6 indicates that 60% of malaria vectors choose an ITN-protected human if presented against an unprotected human. The reference inert ITN (panel A) induces a vector preference of 0.5 (no preference between ITN protected and unprotected humans) and the reference deterrent ITN (panel B) induces a vector preference of 0.36 (only 36% of the vectors choose an ITN-protected human against an unprotected human). Lines become grey in the range [51; 100%], corresponding to diversion levels that were never observed in [12] *(supplementary Figure 2).*

Effect of qualitative behavioral resistance (spatiotemporal avoidance)

Mosquito vectors of malaria can alter their behavior to seek blood meals at different times or locations, reducing their exposure to ITNs. We simulated this spatiotemporal avoidance of ITNs by varying the parameter Π, which represents the proportion of human exposure to bites that occurs

while ITNs are in use (Methods). In other words, Π quantifies the fraction of total bites that ITNs effectively prevent. As spatiotemporal avoidance increases, Π decreases. Regardless of the level of spatiotemporal avoidance, attractive ITNs consistently reduce malaria transmission compared to both inert and deterrent ITNs (Figure 5). However, as spatial-temporal avoidance increases, the relative efficacy of attractive ITNs decreases. At 62% spatial-temporal avoidance (i.e. the highest value reported in literature [29]), attractive ITNs are expected to reduce malaria transmission by 17 and 31% compared to inert ITNs (Figure 5A), for moderately and highly attractive ITNs, respectively, and by 35 and 46% compared to deterrent ITNs (Figure 5B). Under the same conditions (62% spatiotemporal avoidance), an inert ITN is expected to reduce malaria transmission by 22% when compared to a deterrent ITN (Figure 5B). Compared to no nets (0% use), attractive LLINs (50% use) are predicted to achieve a 90% reduction in transmission potential under high resistance conditions (62% spatiotemporal avoidance), which is 14 percentage points (p.p.) more than deterrent ITNs (supplementary Figure 3D).



Figure 5 - Reduction in *Plasmodium* transmission potential induced (A) by attractive Insecticide-treated Nets (ITNs) when compared to inert ones and (B) by attractive and inert ITNs when compared to deterrent ITNs for varied levels of qualitative behavioral resistance (spatiotemporal avoidance) in the vector population.
Vector preference of 0.6 indicates that 60% of malaria vectors choose an ITN-protected human if presented against an unprotected human. The reference inert ITN (panel A) induces a vector preference of 0.5 (no preference between ITN protected and unprotected humans) and the reference deterrent ITN (panel B) induces a vector preference of 0.36 (only 36% of the vectors choose an ITN-protected human against an unprotected human). Lines become grey in the range [62; 100%], corresponding to spatiotemporal avoidance levels that were never observed in the field (see refs in Table 1).

Uncertainty and sensitivity analyses

We conducted an uncertainty and sensitivity analyses to evaluate the robustness of the model results and the impact of input parameters beyond those tested in prior simulations. First, we defined plausible ranges for all parameters (Table 1). We then employed Latin Hypercube Sampling [30] to generate 500 simulations comparing moderately attractive ITNs to deterrent ITNs. The uncertainty analysis revealed that, when all parameters varied within their plausible ranges,

the mean reduction in transmission potential with attractive ITNs was estimated at 39.3% (95% Credible Interval: [11.9%, 71.4%]) relative to deterrent ITNs. The sensitivity analysis (Figure 6) identified the parameters with the greatest influence on model outcomes among those not previously analyzed. The key parameters were (Figure 6A): the post-bite mortality probability in huts with ITNs (Partial Rank Correlation Coefficients (PRCC) = -0.55 [95% CI: -0.63, -0.48], Partial Slope Coefficient (PSC): -15.6 [95% CI: -17.7, -13.2]), the gonotrophic cycle duration (days) (PRCC = 0.67 [0.32, 0.72], PSC: 5.76 [5.41, 6.19]), the baseline daily survival probability (PRCC = -0.54 [-0.63, -0.48], PSC: -40.0 [-44.7, -35.6]) and the extrinsic incubation period duration in (days) (PRCC = -0.48 [-0.55, -0.41], PSC: -1.68 [: -1.91, -1.41]).



Fig 6: Results of a sensitivity analysis using Latin Hypercube Sampling, showing (A) Partial Rank Coefficients of Correlation (PRCC) of parameters and (B) simulation plots illustrating the impact of varying parameter values (excluding ITN use and resistance parameters) when comparing a moderately attractive ITN (p_{ITN} = 0.6) to a deterrent ITN (p_{ITN} = 0.36).
Intervals in Panel A are 95% Confidence Interval of PRCC. Blue curves on panel B are loess regression. See Table 1 for parameters' definitions.

Discussion

Recent evidence from both field and laboratory studies suggests that ITNs may increase the attraction of *An. gambiae* mosquitoes to human hosts, potentially raising the bite exposure of ITN users [12,31]. However, the implications of such attractive ITNs on malaria transmission at the community level remained unclear. To address this, we developed a model to assess their impact under various levels of ITN usage and vector resistance, including both physiological and behavioral resistance.

Our model predicts that attractive ITNs reduce consistently malaria transmission across all simulated scenarios, even in mosquito populations exhibiting physiological or behavioral resistance, compared to inert or deterrent ITNs. In all cases, attractive ITNs performed better than inert ITNs, which in turn outperformed deterrent ITNs in reducing malaria transmission. Currently, most widely distributed ITNs are deterrent [12,14]. Our findings suggest that shifting from deterrent to inert (or attractive) ITNs could substantially enhance malaria control efforts, as also suggested by Killeen et al. [11]. We therefore urge national and international organizations responsible for ITN evaluation, selection, and distribution, in collaboration with manufacturers, to reassess whether deterrence should remain a desirable characteristic of ITNs.

The increasing reports of attractive effects in ITNs [12] should not be seen as a drawback but rather as an opportunity for innovation in malaria control. Our findings suggest that attractive ITNs could significantly enhance malaria prevention, opening new avenues for product development. Recent advances in mosquito chemical ecology have identified numerous host-derived attractants [18], while ITN manufacturers have developed techniques to incorporate dual compounds, such as insecticides and synergists [32]. Leveraging these innovations, next-generation ITNs could be designed to integrate both insecticidal and attractive properties, optimizing vector control strategies. Such innovations would enhance the effectiveness of ITNs while maintaining their widespread acceptance and use in malaria-endemic regions. One key advantage of combining insecticides and attractants into ITNs is their potential to remain effective even in the absence of people in the room or when old ITNs are repurposed for alternative uses [33]. This innovation could extend the operational lifespan and functional utility of ITNs, further strengthening their role in malaria control. However, as previously noted [11,12], ITNs that provide limited or no personal protection will likely require adapted awareness campaign emphasizing the communal nature of protection.

While our model provides valuable insights into the potential impact of attractive ITNs on malaria transmission, it is important to acknowledge its limitations. The model relies on simplified assumptions about mosquitoes, parasites, and humans in a static environment, which does not fully capture the complexities of real-world malaria transmission dynamics. As with any model that has not been validated using field data, these results should be interpreted with caution and considered to have only theoretical value.

Conclusion

Our findings predict that attractive ITNs could significantly reduce malaria transmission at the community level, even in the presence of physiological or behavioral resistance in vectors, relative to inert and deterrent ITNs. This challenges the conventional preference for deterrent ITNs, which prioritize personal protection, and expands the possibilities for designing next-generation ITNs. By combining insecticidal and attractant properties, innovative ITNs could enhance malaria control by remaining effective despite high resistance levels and repurposing. Advances in mosquito chemical ecology and ITN manufacturing present a unique opportunity to develop more efficient tools for malaria prevention.

Methods

Host-seeking, feeding and mortality (HSFM) model

We consider a community of humans of known size N_h of which a known proportion U_h is using an ITN with a known 'true' protective efficacy of Π (i.e. the proportion of exposure to *Anopheles* bites that occurred during which ITNs are in use [11]). The average number N_p of people protected by an ITN is therefore:

(1) $$N_p = U_h \Pi N_h$$

And the average number $N_u$of unprotected people is:

(2) $$N_u = N_h - N_p$$

An individual *Anopheles* vector looking for a blood-meal (in state host-seeking (HS); Figure 1) in this human community will enter either the room of an ITN-protected human or the room of an unprotected one, depending on the remote effect of the ITN (attractive, inert or repulsive) and the availability of both types (ITN-protected or unprotected) of hosts. Here, we expressed the remote effect of ITNs as the preference p_{ITN} of *Anopheles* mosquitoes for an ITN protected human host over an unprotected one as it may be measured in a dual choice olfactometer (i.e. p_{ITN} is the proportion of *Anopheles* mosquitoes that choose the ITN-protected human over the total number of *Anopheles* having made a choice) or in experimental hut trials (i.e. p_{ITN} is the proportion of *Anopheles* mosquitoes that entered the hut equipped with an ITN over the sum of *Anopheles* mosquitoes that entered the hut with an ITN or the hut with an untreated net). Thus:

if p_{ITN} > 0.5, the ITN is attractive, i.e. it increases host attraction.

if p_{ITN} = 0.5, the ITN is inert (neither attractive nor repulsive), i.e. it do not interferes with host attraction.

if p_{ITN} < 0.5, the ITN is repulsive, i.e. it reduces host attraction.

Then, we made the assumption that an individual host-seeking *Anopheles* will be faced with two hosts, each being either protected or not, and has to make a choice (i.e., there is no possibility to avoid the choice and to continue searching). This individual *Anopheles* can be faced with one of the following cases with the corresponding probability:

- (a) a choice between two ITN-protected hosts, with probability C_{pp} or
- (b) a choice between one ITN-protected and one unprotected host, with probability C_{pu} or
- (c) a choice between two unprotected hosts, with probability C_{uu}.

Probabilities C_{pp}, C_{pu} and C_{uu} of each case 12occurring depend on the numbers N_u and N_p of unprotected and ITN-protected hosts in the community, respectively. Under the assumption that users and non-users of ITNs are randomly distributed in space, probabilities C_{pp}, C_{pu} and C_{uu} follow a hypergeometric distribution with parameters N = N_h, K = N_p , n = 2. The hypergeometric distribution can be defined as a discrete probability distribution describing the probability of getting *k* successes in *n* draws without replacement when the sample population is *N*. Each draw is either a success or a failure, and the population consists of exactly *K* successes. We calculated the probability that *k* = 2, *k* = 1 or *k* = 0 corresponding to cases (a), (b), and (c), respectively, using the following formula:

(3) $$P(X = k) = \frac{\binom{N_p}{k}\binom{N_h - N_p}{2-k}}{\binom{N_h}{2}} = \frac{\binom{N_u}{k}\binom{N_u}{2-k}}{\binom{N_h}{2}}$$

Therefore, probabilities C_{pp}, C_{pu} and C_{uu} are calculated as follow:

(4) $$C_{pp} = P(X = 2) = \frac{\binom{N_p}{2}\binom{N_u}{0}}{\binom{N_h}{2}}$$

(5) $$C_{pu} = P(X = 1) = \frac{\binom{N_p}{1}\binom{N_u}{1}}{\binom{N_h}{2}}$$

(6) $$C_{uu} = P(X = 0) = \frac{\binom{N_p}{0}\binom{N_u}{2}}{\binom{N_h}{2}}$$

With C_{pp}+ C_{pu} + C_{uu} = 1.

From this, we can compute the probabilities E_u and E_p that a host-seeking vector will enter a house with an unprotected or an ITN-protected human, respectively, as follows:

(7) $$E_u = C_{uu} + C_{pu}(1 - p_{LLIN})$$

(8) $$E_p = C_{pp} + C_{pu}p_{LLIN} = 1 - E_u$$

After entering a hut with an unprotected host, a vector will either be diverted (impaired and postponed to host-seeking the next night) with probability D_u, or will attempt to bite (with probability 1-D_u). Then, a vector attempting to bite will either be killed (pre-bite mortality) with probability μ_{1u}, or it will take a blood meal with probability ϕ_{1u}. Knowing D_u and μ_{1u}, we deduce ϕ_{1u} and calculate ϕ_u, the successful feeding probability when entering a hut with un unprotected host:

(9) $$\phi_{1u} = 1 - \mu_{1u}$$

(10) $$\phi_u = (1 - D_u)\phi_{1u}$$

Then, vectors blood fed on an unprotected host will either die with probability μ_{2u}(post-bite mortality) or survive and then rest with probability S_{2u}. Knowing μ_{2u}, we have:

(11) $$S_{2u} = 1 - \mu_{2u}$$

Parameters μ_{1u}, D_u, ϕ_u, ϕ_{1u}, S_{2u} and μ_{2u} have their equivalents μ_{1p}, D_p, ϕ_p, ϕ_{1p}, S_{2p} and μ_{2p}, respectively, for a mosquito entering a hut with an ITN-protected host. The following Expressions (12) to (14) correspond to Expressions (9) to (11) but for a hut with an ITN-protected host:

(12) $$\phi_{1u} = 1 - \mu_{1u}$$

(13) $$\phi_u = (1 - D_u)\phi_{1u}$$

(14) $$S_{2u} = 1 - \mu_{2u}$$

From our host–seeking, feeding, and mortality (HSFM) model described above, we calculate the variables needed to feed the "Vector average lifetime infectious bites" model described in Glunt *et al.* 2018 [13]:

First we need the probability P_d that a host-seeking (HS) vector will fail to feed, be diverted, and have its feeding attempt postponed to the next night (i.e., the HS vector is diverted and remains in that state until the next night, conditional on surviving). According to our HSFM model, P_d is the sum of the probabilities that a mosquito will be diverted from huts with ITN-protected and unprotected hosts:

(15) $$P_d = E_u D_u + E_p D_p$$

Diverted mosquitoes will survive until the next night with probability S_d that is equal to the known baseline daily survival rate S of *Anopheles* (set to 0.9):

(16) $$S_d = S$$

Then, we need the probability $P_{f,u}$ that an HS vector will bite successfully (the same night) on an unprotected human. According to our HSFM model, $P_{f,u}$ is the product of the probability E_u to enter a hut with an unprotected host and the probability ϕ_u to feed in that hut:

(17) $$P_{f,u} = E_u \phi_u$$

The corresponding probability $P_{f,p}$ that an HS vector will bite successfully (the same night) on an ITN-protected human is obtained by multiplying the probability E_p to enter a hut with an ITN protected host by the probability ϕ_p to feed in that hut:

(18) $$P_{f,p} = E_u \phi_p$$

The sum of $P_{f,u}$ and $P_{f,p}$ gives us the probability P_f that an HS vector will bite successfully (the same night):

(19) $$P_f = P_{f,u} + P_{f,p}$$

The proportion F_u of mosquitoes that fed on unprotected hosts is given by the following expression:

(20) $$F_u = P_{f,u}/P_f$$

According to the HSFM model, a proportion of fed mosquitoes will die quickly after feeding or survive to rest (state R; Figure X) with probabilities S_{2u} or S_{2p} depending on the type of host they encountered. Until the end of the gonotrophic cycle (of duration *g*), the mosquitoes survive at a constant daily rate S. Therefore the probability S_f to survive from a successful feeding to the state HS in the next gonotrophic cycle is:

(21) $$S_f = \left(F_u S_{2u} + (1 - F_u) S_{2p}\right) S^g$$

Transmission potential (TP) model

Variables calculated above from the HSFM model will be used in the model described by Glunt *et al.* [13] to extract the transmission potential, which is the average number of infectious bites that a vector is expected to give during its lifetime. The following formulae and those of Glunt *et al.* have some light differences in notation.

First we need to know P_{fA}, the probability that an HS vector will survive to take a feed. Theoretically, a vector may experience zero to an infinite number of diversions before feeding. Therefore, P_{fA} is equal to a geometric series with first term P_f, the probability that a vector will bite successfully (the same night), and ratio $P_d S_d$, the probability of being diverted and surviving to HS state the next night:

(22) $$P_{fA} = P_f/(1 - P_d S_d)$$

Then, we need to know the average number B_A of subsequent bites which a HS vector will survive to give. B_A is equal to a geometric series with first term P_{fA}, the probability that an HS

vector will survive to take a feed, and ratio $S_f P_{fA}$, the probability ok taking a feed and surviving to the HS state in the next gonotrophic cycle:

(23) $$B_A = P_{fA}/\left(1 - S_f P_{fA}\right)$$

The probability *c* that a vector will become infected by *Plasmodium falciparum* while taking a blood-meal is equal to the product of the infectiousness *k* (i.e., the probability of acquiring infection while biting an infected human) by the prevalence I_h of *Plasmodium falciparum* infection in the human population:

(24) $$c = kI_h$$

Therefore, the probability P_I that a vector will acquire *Plasmodium falciparum* during its lifetime is a geometric series with first term $P_{fA}c$, the probability that an HS vector will survive to take a feed and acquire *Plasmodium falciparum*, and ratio $S_f P_{fA}(1-c)$, the probability of taking a non-infectious feed and survive to the HS state in the next gonotrophic cycle:

(25) $$P_I = P_{fA}c/\left(1 - S_f P_{fA}(1-c)\right)$$

Considering a newly infected vector, it will experience a combination of diversions (i) and gonotrophic cycles (of duration *g*) during sporogonic period (*n*) until becoming an infectious vector. As described in Glunt *et al*. [13], the probability S_I that a newly infected vector will survive to state HS as an infectious individual is given by the following equation:

(26) $$S_I = S_f \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil n-g \rceil} (P_f S_f)^{\left\lceil \frac{n-g-i}{g} \right\rceil} \; (P_d\, S_d)^i \frac{\left(i + \left\lceil \frac{n-2g-i}{g} \right\rceil + if\left(\left\lceil \frac{n-g-i}{g} \right\rceil g + i = n-g, 1, 0\right)\right)!}{\left(\left\lceil \frac{n-2g-i}{g} \right\rceil + if\left(\left\lceil \frac{n-g-i}{g} \right\rceil g + i = n-g, 1, 0\right)\right)!\, i!}$$

We finally compute the transmission potential TP (i.e., the average number of infectious bites during a vector's lifetime, denoted V_{LAIB} in Glunt *et al.*) by multiplying the probability P_I that a vector will acquire *Plasmodium falciparum* during its lifetime, the probability S_I that a newly infected vector will survive to HS state as an infectious individual, and the average number B_A of subsequent bites that an HS vector will survive to give:

(27) $$TP = P_I S_I B_A$$

We calculated the relative transmission potential (RTP) between two scenarios as the ratio of the transmission potential TP_{test} computed for the tested scenario to the transmission potential TP_{ref} computed for the reference scenario:

(28) $$RTP = \frac{TP_{test}}{TP_{ref}}$$

Finally, the percentage change in malaria transmission between the tested and reference scenarios was computed based on *RTP*:

(29) $$RedTP = (RTP - 1) \times 100$$

Parameterization

The model has 15 input parameters, whose default values were defined according to the literature (Table 1). The default pre-bite and post-bite mortalities in both types of huts (with or

without ITNs), as well as diversion probability in a hut with an ITN, were set to the mean values calculated form experimental hut trials in [12] (Supplementary figure 2). Because the diversion probability in a hut without ITN D_u is expected to be overestimated in recent experimental hut trial (as they used untreated holed nets as reference), we extracted values from old trials carried out during the 1980s [18,19], where unprotected peoples (i.e., no nets at all) were used as the control. From data of experimental hut trials, the diversion probability D was calculated as the proportion of unfed and alive *Anopheles* mosquitoes out of the total number of mosquitoes entering the hut. Pre-bite mortality μ_1 was calculated as the proportion of unfed and dead *Anopheles* mosquitoes out of those that were not diverted. Post-bite mortality probability μ_2 was calculated as the proportion of dead, blood fed *Anopheles* mosquitoes out of all blood fed *Anopheles* (either alive or dead). Regarding other entomological parameters, we set the baseline daily survival rate (during resting and after diversion) S to 0.9, and the duration of the gonotrophic cycle g to 3 days, based on field data for *Anopheles gambiae* [15–17]. Default value for the duration of sporogony n was taken to be 11 days, corresponding to the value given by the formulae of Detinova's formula [24] at a temperature of 26°C for *Plasmodium falciparum*. The infectiousness k of mosquitoes when biting an infected human was set to 0.1 according to modelling work by Churcher *et al*. [21]. The default ITN use rate in the human population U_h was set to 50%, matching the current ITN use rate in sub-Saharan Africa [1]. The default proportion of human exposure to bites that occurs while ITNs are in use Π was set to 0.75, which is an intermediate value among those recorded in field studies across Africa [25–28]. We set the default value for the human community size N_h to 1000 inhabitants and the prevalence of infection in this population I_h to 50%, which is a common infection level in sub-Saharan Africa [20].

Simulations

Relative transmission potential between attractive (p_{ITN} = 0.6 or p_{ITN} = 0.7) and inert (p_{ITN} = 0.5) ITNs, or between the latter and deterrent (p_{ITN} = 0.36) ITNs, was simulated when varying (i) ITN use rate U_h in the human population, (ii) mosquito pre-bite mortality in huts equipped with ITN μ_{1p} (equivalent to varying physiological resistance), (iii) mosquito diversion when entering an hut equipped with ITN D_p (equivalent to varying behavioral quantitative resistance), and (iv) the proportion of human exposure to bites that occurs while ITNs are in use Π (equivalent to varying mosquito spatiotemporal avoidance of ITNs, i.e., behavioral qualitative resistance).

Tested p_{ITN} values for attractive ITN (0.6 and 0.7) were observed in the field [12,14]. The p_{ITN} value for the reference attractive ITN (0.36) corresponds to the mean preference value among significantly deterrent ITNs reported in [12].

Relative transmission potential between deterrent, inert or attractive ITNs and no nets (i.e. 0% use) was also simulated in the same scenarios than above.

Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis

We defined plausible ranges of values for the parameters based on the literature (Table 1 and Supplementary Figure 2). We performed Latin Hypercube Sampling [30] (500 samples) over these ranges of values, assuming that the probability density functions used for sampling parameter values were uniform distributions (either discrete or continuous). We then simulated outcomes (reduction in transmission potential) for the 500 samples. We calculated partial rank correlation coefficients (PRCC) between outcomes and parameters, as well as partial slope coefficients (PSC; i.e., linear regression coefficients) with their 95% (bootstrapped) confidence intervals.

Software:

Models were coded in R [34]. Uncertainty and sensitivity analyses were performed using the pse package [35].

Funding

The authors declare that they have received no specific funding for this study.

Conflict of interest disclosure

The authors declare that they comply with the PCI rule of having no financial conflicts of interest in relation to the content of the article. The authors are recommenders for PCI Zoology.

Data, scripts, code, and supplementary information availability

Supplementary information, scripts, code and data are available online: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15121769 [36].

References

1. World malaria report 2023. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2023. Available: https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2023

2. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of malaria control on Plasmodium falciparum in Africa between 2000 and 2015. Nature. 2015. doi:10.1038/nature15535

3. Alonso P, Noor AM. The global fight against malaria is at crossroads. Lancet. 2017;390: 2532–2534. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)33080-5

4. Ranson H, N'Guessan R, Lines J, Moiroux N, Nkuni Z, Corbel V. Pyrethroid resistance in African anopheline mosquitoes: what are the implications for malaria control? Trends Parasitol. 2011;27: 91–8. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2010.08.004

5. Donnelly MJ, Corbel V, Weetman D, Wilding CS, Williamson MS, Black WC. Does kdr genotype predict insecticide-resistance phenotype in mosquitoes? Trends Parasitol. 2009;25: 213–219. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2009.02.007

6. Carrasco D, Lefèvre T, Moiroux N, Pennetier C, Chandre F, Cohuet A. Behavioural adaptations of mosquito vectors to insecticide control. Curr Opin Insect Sci. 2019;34: 48–54. doi:10.1016/j.cois.2019.03.005

7. Moiroux N, Gomez MB, Pennetier C, Elanga E, Djenontin A, Chandre F, et al. Changes in Anopheles funestus Biting Behavior Following Universal Coverage of Long-Lasting Insecticidal Nets in Benin. J Infect Dis. 2012;206: 1622–9. doi:10.1093/infdis/jis565

8. Taconet P, Soma DD, Zogo B, Mouline K, Simard F, Koffi AA, et al. Physiological and behavioural resistance of malaria vectors in rural West-Africa: a data mining study to address their fine-scale spatiotemporal heterogeneity, drivers, and predictability. Peer Community Journal. 2024;4. doi:10.24072/pcjournal.367

9. Chareonviriyaphap T, Roberts DR, Andre RG, Harlan HJ, Manguin S, Bangs MJ. Pesticide avoidance behavior in Anopheles albimanus, a malaria vector in the Americas. J Am Mosq Control Assoc. 1997;13: 171–183.

10. WHO. Guidelines for laboratory and field-testing of long-lasting insecticidal nets. World Health Organization; 2013 p. 89. Report No.: WHO/HTM/NTD/WHOPES/2013.3.

11. Killeen GF, Chitnis N, Moore SJ, Okumu FO. Target product profile choices for intra-domiciliary malaria vector control pesticide products: repel or kill? Malar J. 2011;10: 207. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-10-207

12. Moiroux N, Chandre F, Hougard J-M, Corbel V, Pennetier C. Remote Effect of Insecticide-Treated Nets and the Personal Protection against Malaria Mosquito Bites. PLOS ONE. 2017;12: e0170732. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0170732

13. Glunt KD, Coetzee M, Huijben S, Koffi AA, Lynch PA, N'Guessan R, et al. Empirical and theoretical investigation into the potential impacts of insecticide resistance on the effectiveness of insecticide-treated bed nets. Evolutionary Applications. 2018;11: 431–441. doi:10.1111/eva.12574

14. Strode C, Donegan S, Garner P, Enayati AA, Hemingway J. The Impact of Pyrethroid Resistance on the Efficacy of Insecticide-Treated Bed Nets against African Anopheline Mosquitoes: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PLoS Med. 2014;11: e1001619. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001619

15. Silver JB. Methods of Age-grading Adults and Estimation of Adult Survival Rates. Mosquito Ecology. 2008. pp. 1161–1271. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6666-5_13

16. Afrane YA, Lawson BW, Githeko AK, Yan G. Effects of Microclimatic Changes Caused by Land Use and Land Cover on Duration of Gonotrophic Cycles of Anopheles gambiae (Diptera: Culicidae) in Western Kenya Highlands. Journal of Medical Entomology. 2005;42: 974–980. doi:10.1093/jmedent/42.6.974

17. Carnevale P, Robert V, Manguin S, Corbel V, Fontenille D, Garros C, et al. Les anophèles : biologie, transmission du Plasmodium et lutte antivectorielle. Marseille: IRD; 2009. Available: http://www.documentation.ird.fr/hor/fdi:010047862

18. Curtis CF, Myamba J, Njau R, Lines JD, World Health Organization. Division of Vector Biology and Control. Tests of repellent or insecticide impregnated curtains, bednets and anklets against malaria vectors in Tanzania / by J. D. Lines ... [et al.]. 1985. Available: https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/59327

19. Majori G, Sabatinelli G, Coluzzi M. Efficacy of permethrin-impregnated curtains for malaria vector control. Medical and Veterinary Entomology. 1987;1: 185–192. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2915.1987.tb00341.x

20. Malaria Atlas Project. In: MAP [Internet]. [cited 18 Dec 2024]. Available: https://malariaatlas.org/

21. Churcher TS, Trape J-F, Cohuet A. Human-to-mosquito transmission efficiency increases as malaria is controlled. Nat Commun. 2015;6: 6054. doi:10.1038/ncomms7054

22. Hien DF d S, Dabiré KR, Roche B, Diabaté A, Yerbanga RS, Cohuet A, et al. Plant-Mediated Effects on Mosquito Capacity to Transmit Human Malaria. PLOS Pathogens. 2016;12: e1005773. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1005773

23. Ohm JR, Baldini F, Barreaux P, Lefevre T, Lynch PA, Suh E, et al. Rethinking the extrinsic incubation period of malaria parasites. Parasit Vectors. 2018;11: 178. doi:10.1186/s13071-018-2761-4

24. Detinova TS. Age-grouping methods in Diptera of medical importance with special reference to some vectors of malaria. Monogr Ser World Health Organ. 1962;47: 13–191.

25. Russell TL, Govella NJ, Azizi S, Drakeley CJ, Kachur SP, Killeen GF. Increased proportions of outdoor feeding among residual malaria vector populations following increased use of insecticide-treated nets in rural Tanzania. Malar J. 2011;10: 80. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-10-80

26. Moiroux N, Damien GB, Egrot M, Djenontin A, Chandre F, Corbel V, et al. Human exposure to early morning Anopheles funestus biting behavior and personal protection provided by long-lasting insecticidal nets. PLoS ONE. 2014;9: e104967. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0104967

27. Huho B, Briet O, Seyoum A, Sikaala C, Bayoh N, Gimnig J, et al. Consistently high estimates for the proportion of human exposure to malaria vector populations occurring indoors in rural Africa. Int J Epidemiol. 2013;42: 235–47. doi:10.1093/ije/dys214

28. Cooke MK, Kahindi SC, Oriango RM, Owaga C, Ayoma E, Mabuka D, et al. 'A bite before bed': exposure to malaria vectors outside the times of net use in the highlands of western Kenya. Malaria Journal. 2015;14: 259. doi:10.1186/s12936-015-0766-4

29. Geissbühler Y, Chaki P, Emidi B, Govella NJ, Shirima R, Mayagaya V, et al. Interdependence of domestic malaria prevention measures and mosquito-human interactions in urban Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Malar J. 2007;6: 126. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-6-126

30. Chalom A, de Prado PI de KL. Parameter space exploration of ecological models. arXiv:12106278 [q-bio]. 2012. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.6278

31. Porciani A, Diop M, Moiroux N, Kadoke-Lambi T, Cohuet A, Chandre F, et al. Influence of pyrethroïd-treated bed net on host seeking behavior of Anopheles gambiae s.s. carrying the kdr allele. PLoS One. 2017;12. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0164518

32. Vector Control Product List | WHO - Prequalification of Medical Products (IVDs, Medicines, Vaccines and Immunization Devices, Vector Control). [cited 31 Dec 2024]. Available: https://extranet.who.int/prequal/vector-control-products/prequalified-product-list

33. Hien AS, Hien H, Bacyè FY, Badolo H, Tiono A, Diallo CO, et al. What happens to old insecticide-treated nets after households use in Burkina Faso? Malaria Journal. 2024;23: 350. doi:10.1186/s12936-024-05181-w

34. R Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2022. Available: https://www.R-project.org/

35. Chalom A, de Prado PIKL. pse: Parameter space exploration with latin hypercubes. 2017. Available: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=pse

36. Moiroux N. Nmoiroux/AttractiveITN: v0.0.9. Zenodo; 2025. doi:10.5281/zenodo.15121769