

1 **Xenomonitoring of Lymphatic filariasis and risk factors for transmission on the**  
2 **Kenyan coast**

3 Brian Bartilol<sup>1,4</sup>, Lawrence Babu<sup>2</sup>, Karisa Garama<sup>2</sup>, Jonathan Karisa<sup>2</sup>, Alice Kamau<sup>3</sup>, Charles Mwandawiro<sup>4</sup>, Caroline  
4 Wanjiku<sup>2</sup>, Charles Mbogo<sup>5</sup>, Marta Maia<sup>2,6</sup>, Joseph Mwangangi<sup>1</sup>, Martin Rono<sup>1,2,7</sup>

5

6 **Affiliations**

7 <sup>1</sup>KEMRI-Centre for Geographic Medicine Research Coast, Kilifi, Kenya

8 <sup>2</sup>KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Kilifi, Kenya

9 <sup>3</sup>Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK

10 <sup>4</sup>Eastern and Southern Africa Centre of International Parasite Control, Nairobi, Kenya

11 <sup>5</sup>Pan-African Mosquito Control Association, Nairobi, Kenya

12 <sup>6</sup>Centre for Global Health and Tropical Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

13 <sup>7</sup>Pwani University Bioscience Research Centre, Kilifi, Kenya

14 **\*Corresponding author**

15 [mrono@kemri-wellcome.org](mailto:mrono@kemri-wellcome.org) and [bbartilol@kemri-wellcome.org](mailto:bbartilol@kemri-wellcome.org)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

## 31 **Abstract**

32 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is an infectious neglected tropical disease caused by a mosquito-borne nematode  
33 and is a major cause of disability. In 2022, it was estimated that 51 million people were infected with LF.  
34 In Kenya filariasis is endemic along the entire coastal strip. The main vectors are *Anopheles funestus* and  
35 *Anopheles gambiae* in rural areas and *Culex quinquefasciatus* mosquitoes in urban areas.

36 In 2022, mosquitoes were collected from Kilifi, Kwale and Taita-Taveta counties which are located within  
37 the LF endemic region in Kenya. Subsequently, genomic Deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) was then extracted  
38 from these mosquitoes for speciation and analysis of *W. bancrofti* infection rates. The impact of socio-  
39 demographic and household attributes on infection rates were assessed using generalized estimating  
40 equations.

41 A total of 18,121 mosquitoes belonging to *Culex* (n = 11,414) and *Anopheles* (n = 6,707) genera were  
42 collected. Morphological identification revealed that Anopheline mosquito were dominated by *An.*  
43 *funestus* (n = 3,045) and *An. gambiae* (n = 2,873). *Wuchereria bancrofti* infection rates were highest in  
44 Kilifi (35.4%; 95% CI 28%-43.3%, n = 57/161) and lowest in Taita Taveta (5.3%; 95% CI 3.3%-8.0%, n =  
45 22/412). The major vectors incriminated are *An. rivulorum*, *An. funestus* sensu stricto and *An. arabiensis*.  
46 The risk of *W. bancrofti* infection was significantly higher in *An. funestus* complex (OR = 18.0; 95% CI 1.80-  
47 180; p = 0.014) compared to *An. gambiae* (OR = 1.54; 95% CI 0.16-15.10; p = 0.7). Additionally, higher risk  
48 was observed in outdoor resting mosquitoes (OR = 1.72; 95% CI 1.06-2.78; p = 0.027) and in homesteads  
49 that owned livestock (OR = 2.05; 95% CI 1.11-3.73; p = 0.021). Bednet (OR = 0.39; 95% CI 0.12-1.32; p =  
50 0.13) and poultry ownership (OR = 0.52; 95% CI 0.30-0.89, p = 0.018) seems to provide protection.

51 *Anopheles funestus* complex emerged as the primary vectors of lymphatic filariasis along the Kenyan  
52 coast. These findings also highlight that a significant portion of disease transmission potentially occurs  
53 outdoors. Therefore, control measures targeting outdoor resting mosquitoes such as zooprophyllaxis,  
54 larval source management and attractive sugar baits may have potential for LF transmission reduction.

## 55 **Author summary**

56 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) in the African continent is mainly caused by a mosquito-borne nematode:  
57 *Wuchereria bancrofti*. In urban areas transmission is mainly by *Culex quinquefasciatus* whereas in rural  
58 areas it is dominated by *Anopheles funestus* and *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes. We investigated the  
59 vectorial systems for LF in rural coastal Kenya and factors associated with the risk of diseases transmission  
60 in the region. We identified *An. funestus* sensu lato sibling species *An. rivulorum* and *An. funestus* sensu  
61 stricto as the dominant vectors of lymphatic filariasis along the Kenyan coast. We also show that a higher  
62 proportion of transmission is likely to take place outdoors necessitating the implementation of vector  
63 control strategies that target exophilic mosquitoes such as zooprophyllaxis and larval source management.  
64 Factors associated with transmission of LF include ownership of livestock and houses made of natural  
65 materials such as thatched roof and mud walls. Bednet and poultry ownership were associated with  
66 protection. We also highlight the importance of molecular xenomonitoring in the surveillance of lymphatic  
67 filariasis, because of its' non-invasive nature and potential for incriminating new vectors of lymphatic  
68 filariasis.

## 69 **Introduction**

70 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is an infectious neglected tropical disease caused by a mosquito-borne nematode:  
71 *Wuchereria bancrofti*. Globally LF accounts for 51 million cases with approximately 863 million people in  
72 47 countries still at risk. Clinical symptoms of LF are hydrocele, lymphedema and adenolymphangitis. At  
73 an advanced stage, lymphedema develops into elephantiasis which is characterized by swollen body parts  
74 (mainly legs, genitals, arms and breasts) and disfiguration that results in sociopsychological problems for  
75 patients and their families. In sub-Saharan Africa, filariasis is transmitted to humans by mosquitoes of the  
76 genus *Anopheles* and *Culex*. In urban areas transmission is mainly by *Culex quinquefasciatus* whereas in  
77 rural areas it is dominated by *Anopheles funestus* and *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes (1,2). Transmission  
78 occurs through bites from female mosquitoes infected with L3 larvae resulting from microfilariae ingested  
79 from infected humans. Once they penetrate the skin, the L3 larvae migrate to the lymphatic system where  
80 they mature into adult worms causing disruption in normal circulation leading to clinical symptoms  
81 previously described. The worms also produce microfilariae that migrate back to the blood stream and  
82 get ingested by a mosquito during a subsequent blood meal perpetuating the transmission cycle. In Kenya,  
83 filariasis is endemic along the coastal region (3–9) and recently reported in further inland in Busia county,  
84 which is located at the Kenyan-Ugandan border (10). The main vectors of LF in Kenya are *An. gambiae* s.l.,  
85 *An. funestus* and *Cx. quinquefasciatus* with varying transmission intensities which is attributed to diverse  
86 ecological and environmental conditions (6,11–14).

87 In 2002, the WHO launched the Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis (GPELF) with the  
88 ambitious target of eliminating LF by 2020 through mass drug administration (MDA) (15). Co-  
89 administration of albendazole (400mg) and diethylcarbamazine citrate (DEC) (6 mg/kg) was  
90 recommended by the WHO for all eligible individuals in filariasis endemic areas to reduce transmission  
91 and disease morbidity. New treatment guidelines recommend a triple therapy regimen consisting of  
92 diethylcarbamazine, albendazole and ivermectin in countries without onchocerciasis (16). MDA has been  
93 tremendously successful leading to a 74% decline in LF globally (15). Kenya initiated LF elimination efforts  
94 in 2002 through annual MDA campaigns using DEC and albendazole. MDA begun in Kilifi district; a known  
95 LF foci followed by scale-up campaigns in Kwale and Malindi districts in 2003. Then to Tana river, Taita-  
96 Taveta and finally Mombasa.

97 The success of this strategy relies on robust surveillance and monitoring of parasite infection. Tracking  
98 data on local populations of filariasis transmitting vectors provide an opportunity for monitoring disease  
99 transmission dynamics. Monitoring of MDA performance is mainly achieved through microscopic  
100 examination of microfilariae in night time blood and detection of circulating filarial antigens. Although  
101 microscopic examinations provides the most reliable estimates, night time sampling is a major challenge  
102 and also infections may be missed in presence of unmated adult worms (17). While monitoring of CFA can  
103 provide information about prevalence of *W. bancrofti* infection and antibody testing can provide a  
104 sensitive indicator of exposure levels, antibody testing cannot distinguish previous from current infectious  
105 leading to an over estimation of the true burden of infection. Molecular xenomonitoring (MX) that relies  
106 on polymerase chain reaction (PCR) has been suggested by WHO as an important non-invasive  
107 surveillance tool to complement human surveys (17,18). MX provides a platform for monitoring infection  
108 in known vectors and also provides an opportunity to incriminate new vectors involved in the transmission  
109 of *W. bancrofti* (19). The present paper reports LF surveillance in adult mosquitoes collected on the  
110 Kenyan coast.

## 111 **Methods**

## 112 Study area

113 The study was conducted in the counties of Kilifi, Kwale, and Taita-Taveta along the Kenyan coast (Figure.  
114 1). These three counties experience a moderately hot (21-31°C) and moist climate (>1000mm  
115 precipitation per year) and have a combined population of approximately 2.4 million people. Climatic  
116 changes observed in recent years include delays in the onset of rains, reduction in volume or drying up of  
117 wells and rivers, and increase in temperatures (20–22). Despite shared climatic conditions, the mosquito  
118 composition and abundance are heterogeneous with a notable decline in *An. gambiae* s.s population (23).  
119 A total of 16 sites were selected for vector sampling (Figure. 1). In Kilifi county, sampling was conducted  
120 in two former administrative units, Kilifi and Malindi district because MDA activities had previously been  
121 carried out extensively in the two regions.

## 122 Mosquito collection

123 Mosquitoes collection was done both indoors and outdoors in 10 households in the 16 sites using Centers  
124 for Disease Control and Prevention light traps (CDC-LT). Sampling was carried out during the dry season  
125 (January, February and March) and at the end of the wet season (July) in 2022. The traps were set at dusk  
126 (1800hrs) and collected at dawn (0600hrs) on the next day. Geo-reference coordinates were collected  
127 using the eTrex® 10 (Garmin, Kansas, United States of America). Indoor traps were set in houses where at  
128 least one member of the household person spent the night, while the outdoor traps were placed next to  
129 livestock sheds or within a distance no more than 5 metres from the house with the indoor trap. The  
130 collected mosquitoes were identified morphologically (24) and sorted by sex and physiological state and  
131 then counted. All the Anopheline mosquitoes were preserved individually in micro centrifuge tubes  
132 containing a desiccant (silica pellets) and transported to the Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) -  
133 Wellcome Trust Research laboratory for further analysis. A small proportion of the culicine mosquitoes  
134 were collected, and the rest were discarded.

## 135 Mosquito dissection

136 Using sterile scalpels and forceps, the adult female Anopheline mosquitoes were dissected into 2 parts:  
137 head and thorax and abdomen and stored at -80°C.

## 138 DNA extraction

139 Genomic deoxyribonucleic acid (gDNA) was extracted from the mosquito head and thorax as described  
140 before with minor modifications (25). Briefly, sterile tungsten beads were transferred into the 1.5ml  
141 microcentrifuge tubes and topped up with 100 µl of 10% chelex and lysed using a tissue lyser at 30 hertz  
142 for 1 minute (min). The beads were removed from the tubes and the lysate incubated at 100°C for 10 min  
143 in a Thermomixer (Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany). The solution was then centrifuged at 10,000×g for  
144 2 min, supernatant transferred to a new microcentrifuge tube and stored at -80 °C.

## 145 Molecular identification of *Anopheles gambiae* and *Anopheles funestus* sibling species

146 Diagnostic polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for *An. gambiae* sibling species was done using primers  
147 targeting the intergenic spacer (IGS) region of the ribosomal DNA (26) whereas for *An. funestus*, PCR  
148 primers targeting the internal transcribed spacer region 2 (ITS2) were used (27). Each individual PCR  
149 reaction consisted of 4µL 5X Green GoTaq® Flexi Buffer, 2.4µL Magnesium chloride, 4µL nuclease free  
150 water, 0.5µL Deoxynucleoside triphosphates (dNTPs), 0.1µL GoTaq® G2 Flexi DNA Polymerase, 1µL of each

151 primer and 4µL of the mosquito DNA template. Thermocycling conditions consisted of an enzyme  
152 activation step at 95°C for 5 min, followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 15 seconds (secs),  
153 annealing at 55°C for 20 secs, extension at 72°C for 30 seconds (sec) and a final elongation step at 72°C  
154 for 10 mins. PCR amplicons were resolved on a 1.5% agarose gel stained using RedSafe dye and visualized  
155 using the ChemiDoc Imaging System (Bio-Rad) to resolve the different species.

#### 156 **Detection of *Wuchereria bancrofti***

157 *Wuchereria bancrofti* was detected using the method described by Zhong et al. (28) with minor  
158 modifications. The PCR primers target the genus specific, multicopy (~300 copies) Ssp I repeat DNA family.  
159 The PCR reaction consisted of 4µL 5X Green GoTaq® Flexi Buffer, 2.4µL Magnesium chloride, 7µL nuclease  
160 free water, 0.5µL Deoxynucleoside triphosphates (dNTPs), 0.1µL GoTaq® G2 Flexi DNA Polymerase, 1µL  
161 of each primer and 4µL of the mosquito DNA. The cycling conditions consisted of an initial enzyme  
162 activation step at 95°C for 5 min, followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 15 secs, annealing at  
163 55°C for 20 secs, extension at 72°C for 30 secs and a final elongation step at 72°C for 10 mins. Amplicons  
164 were resolved on a 1.5% agarose gel stained with RedSafe dye and visualized on the ChemiDoc Imaging  
165 System (Bio-Rad). Samples with a band size of 188 base pairs were identified as positive.


#### 166 **Statistical analysis**

167 Data was entered and cleaned in a Microsoft excel file. Statistical analysis and data visualization were  
168 conducted using R software, version 4.2.1 (29). Infection proportions in the mosquito vectors were  
169 determined by dividing the number of *W. bancrofti* positive mosquitoes by the total number of  
170 mosquitoes analyzed per county in Kwale and Taita-Taveta and district in Kilifi county (Kilifi and Malindi).  
171 In order to assess the impact of various socio-demographic and household attributes on LF positivity, we  
172 employed a multilevel logistic regression model using Generalized Estimating Equations (GEE) assuming a  
173 binomial distribution. The GEE approach was chosen to account for the correlated nature of repeated  
174 observations within the regions. The model was fitted using the 'geeglm' function with LF positivity as the  
175 binary outcome variable. The risk factor variables included season, site of mosquito collection, mosquito  
176 species, presence or absence of eaves, livestock, poultry and bed nets, type of material used in roofs and  
177 walls and number of occupants. These factors have previously been shown to influence the transmission  
178 of vector-borne diseases(30–33). We specified a logistic link function and selected an independence  
179 correlation structure. This was done to model within region correlations considering the the binary  
180 outcome of LF (positive or negative) and the clustered nature of the data. The results are reported as odds  
181 ratios (OR) along with 95% confidence intervals (CI) to quantify the association between the risk factor  
182 and LF positivity.

#### 183 **Results**


##### 184 **Vector composition and abundance.**

185 A total of 18,121 mosquitoes were collected from 16 villages (Table 1). They belonged to the *Culex* (n =  
186 11,414, 63%), *Anopheles* 37% (n = 6,707, 37%) genera (Table 1). The mosquitoes were predominantly  
187 caught outdoors (Figure. 2). Morphological, identification revealed that *Anopheles* mosquitoes consisted  
188 of *An. funestus* s.l (n = 3045, 45.4%), *An. gambiae* s.l (n = 2,873, 42.8%), *An. coustanii* (n = 662, 9.9%), *An.*  
189 *pharoensis* (n = 75, 1.1%), *An. maculpalpis* (n = 27, 0.4%), *An. pretoriensis* (n = 23, 0.3%) and *An. moucheti*  
190 (n = 2, 0.03%).



191

192 Figure 1. A map showing mosquito sampling sites. Sampling in Kilifi county was split into two district  
 193 Kilifi (gamboge) and Malindi (malibu).



194


195 Figure 2. Proportion of mosquito collection indoors and outdoors

196

197 **Bancroftian filariasis infection rates**

198 Infection rates in the four regions were highest in Kilifi (35.4%; 95% CI 28-43.3%, n=57/161), followed by  
 199 Kwale (11.7%; 95% CI 8.1-16.3%, n = 31/264), Malindi (8.3%; 95% CI 5.2-12.6%, n = 20/240) and Taita-  
 200 Taveta (5.3%; 95% CI 3.4-8.0%, n = 22/412) (Table 2). In Kilifi, the highest proportions of *W. bancrofti*  
 201 infected mosquitoes were *An. funestus* s.l (42.1%, n = 51) followed by *An. gambiae* s.l (15.4%, n = 6). A

202 similar trend was observed for Malindi, Kwale and Taita Taveta. At the vector species level, parasite  
203 infection rates varied led by *An. rivulorum* (8.7%, n = 94), followed by *An. funestus s.s* (1.1%, n = 12), *An.*  
204 *arabiensis* (0.9%, n = 10) and *An. merus* (0.5%, n = 5) (Table 3). Notably, *An. rivulorum* is the dominant  
205 vector of LF in Kilifi, Kwale and Malindi, whereas in Taita-Taveta it is *An. funestus s.s* (n = 11) (Figure. 3).




206  
207 Figure 3. Distribution of Anopheles vectors infected with *W. bancrofti* in the Kenya Coastal region.

#### 209 Factors associated with to Bancroftian filariasis transmission.

210 The risk of *W. bancrofti* infection was significantly higher in *An. funestus* complex (OR = 18.0; 95% CI 1.80-  
211 180, p = 0.014) compared to *An. coustani* (Figure. 4). Additionally, higher risks were observed in outdoor  
212 resting mosquitoes (OR = 1.72; 95% CI 1.06-2.78, p = 0.027) and in homesteads that owned livestock (OR  
213 = 2.05; 95% CI 1.11-3.73, p = 0.021). Natural house construction materials used on the roof (OR = 1.49;  
214 95% CI 0.82-2.72; p = 0.2) and wall (OR = 4.29; 95% CI 0.48-38.5; p = 0.2) were associated with increased  
215 the odds of LF transmission. Factors associated with reduced odds of infection included access to bed nets  
216 (OR=0.39; 95% CI 0.12-1.32, p = 0.13), poultry ownership (OR=0.52; 95% CI 0.30-0.89, p = 0.017) and  
217 households with fewer than two occupants (OR=0.66; 95% CI 0.41-1.08, p = 0.10).

218





220 Figure 4. A multilevel logistic regression models based on generalized estimating equations on the  
 221 various factors that may be associated with Lymphatic filariasis transmission. The outcome was either  
 222 lymphatic filariasis positive or negative.



County	Site	Season	<i>Culex spp</i>	<i>An. funestus</i>	<i>An. gambiae</i>	<i>An. coustanii</i>	<i>An. maculipalpis</i>	<i>An. moucheti</i>	<i>An. pharoensis</i>	<i>An. pretoriensis</i>
Kilifi	Garithe*	Dry	107	0	21	0	0	0	0	0
		Wet	334	0	184	0	0	0	0	0
	Jaribuni	Dry	279	142	24	0	0	0	0	0
		Wet	5	310	7	1	3	0	0	0
	Jilore*	Dry	343	168	63	6	0	0	5	0
		Wet	55	133	53	14	0	0	59	4
	Marana*	Dry	1828	4	109	0	0	0	0	0
		Wet	742	28	115	4	0	0	0	0
	Mbogolo*	Dry	352	0	86	0	0	0	0	0
		Wet	319	1	34	0	0	0	0	0
	Rare	Dry	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Wet	13	14	3	0	0	0	0	0
	Shibe	Dry	54	8	3	0	0	0	0	0
		Wet	44	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
Sihu	Dry	80	466	21	0	0	0	1	0	
	Wet	9	302	5	0	0	0	0	0	
Kwale	Fihoni	Dry	91	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
		Wet	244	237	21	23	23	0	0	0
	Jego	Dry	374	442	1332	1	0	0	0	1
		Wet	484	24	86	8	0	0	0	0
	Kogeswa	Dry	329	22	24	0	0	0	0	0
		Wet	128	10	29	0	0	0	0	12
Migombani	Dry	365	8	41	0	0	0	0	0	
Wet	879	12	53	0	0	0	0	0		
Taita-Taveta	Kimundia	Dry	606	13	173	135	0	0	0	0
		Wet	556	83	57	150	0	0	3	0
	Kiwalwa	Dry	352	62	76	142	0	0	0	0
		Wet	64	277	26	30	0	0	2	0
	Mwarusa	Dry	1279	19	142	45	0	0	2	1
		Wet	555	77	30	72	1	0	1	0
	Njoro	Dry	336	54	31	8	0	0	0	4
		Wet	196	123	21	23	0	2	2	0

223

224

Table 1. The number of morphologically identified mosquitoes collected from the 16 villages along the Kenyan coast.

District	Species	LF positive	Total tested	Infection proportions (%)
Kilifi	<i>An. funestus</i>	51	121	42.1
	<i>An. gambiae</i>	6	39	15.4
	<i>An. nili</i>	0	1	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>35.4</b>
Kwale	<i>An. funestus</i>	27	123	22.0
	<i>An. gambiae</i>	4	138	2.9
	<i>An. maculpalpis</i>	0	3	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>11.7</b>
Malindi	<i>An. coustanii</i>	1	5	20.0
	<i>An. funestus</i>	15	62	24.2
	<i>An. gambiae</i>	4	165	2.4
	<i>An. pharoensis</i>	0	8	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>8.3</b>
Taita Taveta	<i>An. coustanii</i>	0	63	0.0
	<i>An. funestus</i>	18	121	14.9
	<i>An. gambiae</i>	3	222	1.4
	<i>An. pharoensis</i>	1	5	20.0
	<i>An. pretoriensis</i>	0	1	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>5.3</b>

225

226 Table 2. The *Wuchereria bancrofti* prevalence rates in the three coastal counties. However, it's important to note that Kilifi County is divided  
227 into Kilifi and Malindi districts.

Species	<i>W. bancrofti</i> infection rates by PCR			
	Positive (n)	Negative (n)	Species infection rate (%)	Overall infection rate (%)
<i>An. rivulorum</i> <sup>2</sup>	94	193	32.8	8.7
<i>An. funestus s.s.</i> <sup>2</sup>	12	67	15.2	1.1
<i>An. arabiensis</i> <sup>2</sup>	10	359	2.7	0.9
<i>An. merus</i> <sup>2</sup>	5	91	5.2	0.5
<i>An. funestus not detected by PCR</i> <sup>2</sup>	3	18	14.3	0.3
<i>An. leesonii</i> <sup>2</sup>	2	23	8.0	0.2
<i>An. gambiae not detected by PCR</i> <sup>2</sup>	1	10	9.1	0.1
<i>An. pharoensis</i> <sup>1</sup>	1	12	7.7	0.1
<i>An. coustani</i> <sup>1</sup>	1	67	1.5	0.1
<i>An. quadriannulatus</i> <sup>2</sup>	1	85	1.2	0.1
<i>An. parensis</i> <sup>2</sup>	0	12	0.0	0.0
<i>An. vaneedeni</i> <sup>2</sup>	0	3	0.0	0.0
<i>An. gambiae s.s.</i> <sup>2</sup>	0	2	0.0	0.0
<i>An. maculpalpis</i> <sup>1</sup>	0	3	0.0	0.0
<i>An. nili</i> <sup>3</sup>	0	1	0.0	0.0
<i>An. pretoriensis</i> <sup>1</sup>	0	1	0.0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>947</b>		<b>12.1</b>

229

230 <sup>1</sup> Identified morphologically.231 <sup>2</sup> Identified by the *An. gambiae* or the *An. funestus* complex PCR assay.232 <sup>3</sup> Identified by sequencing of the ribosomal DNA internal transcribed spacer region 2 (rDNA ITS2).233 Table 3. *Wuchereria bancrofti* infection rates in the mosquito vectors found along Kenya coastal area.

234

## 235 Discussion

236 We investigated the vectorial systems for LF in rural coastal Kenya and factors associated with the risk of  
237 diseases transmission in the region. Efforts to eliminate LF through MDA (albendazole and  
238 diethylcarbamazine citrate) as recommended by the WHO, begun in the coastal region over two decades  
239 ago. It was carried out in subsequent years and was briefly interrupted by Covid-19. Various survey studies  
240 have been carried out in the years between, reporting CFA prevalence rates ranging from 0.3% to 6.3 %  
241 in Kwale, Kilifi and Lamu county. However, no LF cases were reported in Taita-Taveta county (7). Mosquito  
242 surveys in Malindi in 2012 showed very low prevalence where only one out of 1055 pools of mosquitoes  
243 was positive for LF (34). Using MX, we can demonstrate there's active transmission of LF in Kilifi, Kwale  
244 and Taita-Taveta counties warranting further MDA campaigns.

245 Malaria and LF are co-endemic in the Kenyan coast and are transmitted by similar vectors (12,30). Over  
246 the last two decades, campaigns to control malaria, relying on long lasting insecticide bed nets (LLINs) and  
247 indoor residual sprays (IRS) have been associated with decreased malaria incidence by limiting indoor  
248 biting and resting of anthropophilic vectors, shifting vectors to more outdoor transmission (23). This study  
249 reveals a higher prevalence of LF in outdoor-resting mosquitoes, while LLIN ownership was associated  
250 with reduced risk of disease. This shows how malaria interventions may alter LF transmission dynamics by  
251 offering additional benefits that complement MDA (23,35).

252 *An. funestus* s.l and *An. gambiae* s.l are both involved in the transmission of LF in the study area with the  
253 former playing a much more significant role. In the *An. funestus* complex, *An. rivulorum* is the dominant  
254 vector of LF in counties adjacent to the Indian ocean whereas *An. funestus* s.s dominates further inland.  
255 In the *An. gambiae* complex, *An. arabiensis*, *An. merus*, *An. quadriannulatus* were positive for LF with no  
256 regional preference. Other mosquito species, such as *An. coustani* and *An. pharoensis*, were indicative of  
257 LF infection, although we had very few positive samples to draw substantive conclusions about these  
258 vectors. Although high densities of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* were observed, our work did not feature this  
259 vector since its contribution to LF transmission in rural areas is still not well understood and it plays a  
260 major role in LF transmission in urban areas (36,37).

261 Houses made up of thatched roofs and mud walls had increased likelihood of LF transmission, this is  
262 consistent with reports in Andhra Pradesh, India (38). Such structures may provide favorable resting sites  
263 for mosquitoes. House improvements, such as screening using relatively affordable material such as  
264 papyrus mats ceilings, have been shown to reduce entry of *An. funestus* and *An. gambiae* into houses by  
265 nearly 80% in western Kenya (39). Therefore, similar modifications may be adopted to limit LF  
266 transmission in coastal Kenya.

267 The presence of livestock in an homestead was strongly associated with LF transmission suggesting that  
268 domestic animals play a critical role in sustaining LF vectors (35). This has been observed for *Aedes*  
269 *albopictus* that disappeared with the elimination of rats, their preferred vertebrate host (40). Therefore,  
270 incorporating vector control tools that limit access to livestock can lead to vector suppression and possible  
271 elimination of LF vectors. Presently, there are a number of studies evaluating an array of such tools  
272 including endectocides such as Ivermectin for the control of exophagic and zoophilic mosquitoes (41–43).

273 Interestingly, the presence of poultry within homes was associated with a lower risk of LF infections. It  
274 has previously been demonstrated that *An. arabiensis* despite feeding opportunistically on animals avoids  
275 chicken regardless of its abundance. This has been attributed to feathers acting as physical obstacles for

276 mosquito feeding, chicken prey behavior towards mosquitoes (44), host-choice evolution driven by  
277 variation in the physical and chemical properties in the host blood or a combination of these factors  
278 (45,46). Chicken also contain volatiles (isobutyl butanoate, naphthalene, hexadecane and *trans*-limonene  
279 oxide) that repel *An. arabiensis* (44) and therefore are very beneficial addition to the peridomestic space.

## 280 **Conclusion**

281 In this study we identified *An. funestus* s.l sibling species *An. rivulorum* and *An. funestus* s.s. as the  
282 dominant vectors of lymphatic filariasis along the Kenyan coast. We also show that a higher proportion of  
283 transmission is likely to take place outdoors necessitating the implementation of vector control strategies  
284 that target exophilic mosquitoes such as zoophylaxis and larval source management. We also show  
285 the importance of MX in the surveillance of LF, where it's non-invasive and has the potential for  
286 incriminating new vectors of LF.

## 287 **Acknowledgement**

288 We thank the community for allowing us to conduct the research in their homes and for providing us with  
289 information. Many thanks to the technical and field staff: Festus Yaa, Gabriel Nzai, and Julius Tineja, who  
290 helped with mosquito sample collection in the field.

## 291 **Author contribution**

292 MR designed and supervised the work. BB, KG, and JK carried out the laboratory analysis. BB, MR, LB, and  
293 AK conducted the statistical analysis. AK, CK, CM, MM, JM, and MR provided insights into the data analysis  
294 and critically reviewed the draft manuscript. All the authors read and approved the manuscript.

## 295 **Funding**

296 This work is supported by The Royal Society FLAIR fellowship grant: FLR\_R1\_190497 and KEMRI IRG grant:  
297 KEMRI/IRG/INN02 (awarded to MR). The funding bodies had no role in the design, data collection, data  
298 analysis and interpretation, or writing of the manuscript.

## 299 **Data availability**

300 Most of the dataset used for analysis is available in the manuscript. We withheld the geo-data which may  
301 predispose individual homesteads to a high risk of identifiability. However, they are under the  
302 custodianship of the KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Data Governance Committee and are accessible upon request  
303 addressed to that committee.

## 304 **Consent for publication**

305 All the authors have reviewed and approved the publication of this paper. This paper has been published  
306 with the permission of the Director of the Kenya Medical Research Institute (KEMRI).

## 307 **Ethics declaration**

308 The study was approved by the KEMRI Scientific and Ethics Review Unit (SERU) with the protocol number:  
309 KEMRI/SERU/CGMR-C/024/3148. Verbal informed consent was obtained from the household heads  
310 before metadata and mosquito collection.

## 311 **References**

- 312 1. Simonsen PE, Fischer PU, Hoerauf A, Weil GJ. 54 - The Filariases. In: Farrar J, Hotez PJ, Junghanss T,  
313 Kang G, Lalloo D, White NJ, editors. Manson's Tropical Infectious Diseases (Twenty-third Edition)  
314 [Internet]. London: W.B. Saunders; 2014 [cited 2023 Apr 19]. p. 737-765.e5. Available from:  
315 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780702051012000558>
- 316 2. Derua YA, Alifrangis M, Hosea KM, Meyrowitsch DW, Magesa SM, Pedersen EM, et al. Change in  
317 composition of the Anopheles gambiae complex and its possible implications for the transmission of  
318 malaria and lymphatic filariasis in north-eastern Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2012;11:1–9.
- 319 3. Moraga P, Cano J, Baggaley RF, Gyapong JO, Njenga SM, Nikolay B, et al. Modelling the distribution  
320 and transmission intensity of lymphatic filariasis in sub-Saharan Africa prior to scaling up  
321 interventions: integrated use of geostatistical and mathematical modelling. *Parasit Vectors.* 2015 Oct  
322 24;8(1):560.
- 323 4. Estambale BBA, Simonsen PE, Knight R, Bwayo JJ. Bancroftian filariasis in Kwale District of Kenya. I.  
324 Clinical and parasitological survey in an endemic community. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 1994 Jan  
325 1;88(2):145–51.
- 326 5. Wamae CN, Mwandawiro C, Wambayi E, Njenga S, Kiliku F. Lymphatic filariasis in Kenya since 1910,  
327 and the prospects for its elimination: a review. *East Afr Med J.* 2001 Nov;78(11):595–603.
- 328 6. Muturi EJ, Mbogo CM, Mwangangi JM, Ng'ang'a ZW, Kabiru EW, Mwandawiro C, et al. Concomitant  
329 infections of Plasmodium falciparum and Wuchereria bancrofti on the Kenyan coast. *Filaria J.* 2006  
330 May 24;5(1):8.
- 331 7. Njenga SM, Kanyi HM, Mutungi FM, Okoyo C, Matendehero HS, Pullan RL, et al. Assessment of  
332 lymphatic filariasis prior to re-starting mass drug administration campaigns in coastal Kenya. *Parasit*  
333 *Vectors.* 2017 Feb 22;10(1):99.
- 334 8. Mwandawiro CS, Fujimaki Y, Mitsui Y, Katsivo M. Mosquito vectors of bancroftian filariasis in Kwale  
335 District, Kenya. *East Afr Med J.* 1997 May 1;74(5):288–93.
- 336 9. Wijers DJB. Bancroftian filariasis in Kenya. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 1977 Dec 1;71(4):451–63.
- 337 10. Kinyatta N, Wachira D, Githae R, Lusweti J, Ingonga J, Ichugu C, et al. Detection of Wuchereria  
338 bancrofti in human blood samples and mosquitoes in Matayos, Busia County-Kenya. *Sci Rep.* 2023  
339 Nov 8;13(1):19420.
- 340 11. Mwandawiro CS, Fujimaki Y, Mitsui Y, Katsivo M. Mosquito vectors of bancroftian filariasis in  
341 Kwale District, Kenya. *East Afr Med J.* 1997 May;74(5):288–93.
- 342 12. Muturi EJ, Mbogo CM, Ng'ang'a ZW, Kabiru EW, Mwandawiro C, Novak RJ, et al. Relationship  
343 between malaria and filariasis transmission indices in an endemic area along the Kenyan Coast. *J*  
344 *Vector Borne Dis.* 2006 Jun;43(2):77–83.
- 345 13. Kasili S, Oyieke F, Wamae AK, Bisen C, Mbogo C. Seasonal changes of infectivity rates of  
346 Bancroftian filariasis vectors in coast province, Kenya. *J Vector Borne Dis.* 2009 Sep;46(3):219–24.

- 347 14. Bartilol B, Omedo I, Mbogo C, Mwangangi J, Rono MK. Bionomics and ecology of *Anopheles*  
348 *merus* along the East and Southern Africa coast. *Parasit Vectors*. 2021;14(1):84.
- 349 15. Global programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis: progress report, 2021 [Internet]. [cited 2023  
350 Apr 19]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/who-wer9741-513-524>
- 351 16. Lymphatic filariasis [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 20]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-filariasis)  
352 [room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-filariasis](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-filariasis)
- 353 17. McPherson B, Mayfield HJ, McLure A, Gass K, Naseri T, Thomsen R, et al. Evaluating Molecular  
354 Xenomonitoring as a Tool for Lymphatic Filariasis Surveillance in Samoa, 2018–2019. *Trop Med Infect*  
355 *Dis*. 2022 Aug;7(8):203.
- 356 18. Pedersen EM, Stolk WA, Laney SJ, Michael E. The role of monitoring mosquito infection in the  
357 Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis. *Trends Parasitol*. 2009 Jul;25(7):319–27.
- 358 19. Mosha FW, Magayuka SA. Laboratory infection of *Anopheles pharoensis* with *Wuchereria*  
359 *bancrofti*.
- 360 20. MoALF. Climate Risk Profile for Kwale County. Nairobi, Kenya: The Ministry of Agriculture,  
361 Livestock and Fisheries (MoALF); 2016. (Kenya County Climate Risk Profile Series).
- 362 21. MoALF. Climate Risk Profile for Taita Taveta County. Nairobi, Kenya: The Ministry of Agriculture,  
363 Livestock and Fisheries (MoALF); 2016. (Kenya County Climate Risk Profile Series).
- 364 22. MoALF. Climate Risk Profile for Kilifi County. The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries  
365 (MoALF); 2016 p. Nairobi, Kenya. (Kenya County Climate Risk Profile Series.).
- 366 23. Mwangangi JM, Midega JT, Keating J, Beier JC, Borgemeister C, Mbogo CM, et al. Shifts in  
367 malaria vector species composition and transmission dynamics along the Kenyan coast over the past  
368 20 years. *Malar J*. 2013;12(1):1–9.
- 369 24. Gillies MT, Meillon BD. The Anophelinae of Africa south of the Sahara (Ethiopian  
370 zoogeographical region). *Anophelinae Afr South Sahara Ethiop Zoogeographical Reg*. 1968;
- 371 25. Musapa M, Kumwenda T, Mkulama M, Chishimba S, Norris DE, Thuma PE, et al. A simple Chelex  
372 protocol for DNA extraction from *Anopheles* spp. *J Vis Exp JoVE*. 2013;(71):1–6.
- 373 26. Scott JA, Brogdon WG, Collins FH. Identification of Single Specimens of the *Anopheles Gambiae*  
374 *Complex* by the Polymerase Chain Reaction. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 1993 Oct;49(4):520–9.
- 375 27. Koekemoer LL, Kamau L, Hunt RH, Coetzee M. A COCKTAIL POLYMERASE CHAIN REACTION  
376 ASSAY TO IDENTIFY MEMBERS OF THE ANOPHELES FUNESTUS ( DIPTERA : CULICIDAE ) GROUP.  
377 2002;6(6):804–11.
- 378 28. Zhong M, McCarthy J, Bierwert L, Lizotte-Waniewski M, Chanteau S, Nutman T, et al. A  
379 Polymerase Chain Reaction Assay for Detection of the Parasite *Wuchereria bancrofti* in Human Blood  
380 Samples. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 1996 May 1;54:357–63.



- 381 29. R Core Team R. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2013;
- 382 30. Karisa J, Ominde K, Muriu S, Munyao V, Mwikali K, Babu L, et al. Malaria vector bionomics in  
383 Taita-Taveta County, coastal Kenya. *Parasit Vectors*. 2022 Nov 16;15(1):430.
- 384 31. Adhikari R, Acharya D, Wagle A. Sociodemographic characteristics as predictors of knowledge  
385 regarding mode of transmission of Lymphatic Filariasis among population of Nepal. *PLOS Glob Public*  
386 *Health*. 2022 Oct 11;2(10):e0000082.
- 387 32. Chesnais CB, Awaca-Uvon NP, Vlamincck J, Tambwe JP, Weil GJ, Pion SD, et al. Risk factors for  
388 lymphatic filariasis in two villages of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Parasit Vectors*. 2019 Apr  
389 11;12(1):162.
- 390 33. Chakraborty S, Gao S, Allan BF, Smith RL. Effects of cattle on vector-borne disease risk to  
391 humans: A systematic review. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2023 Dec 19;17(12):e0011152.
- 392 34. Njenga SM, Kanyi HM, Mwatele CM, Mukoko DA, Bockarie MJ, Kelly-Hope LA. Integrated survey  
393 of helminthic neglected tropical diseases and comparison of two mosquito sampling methods for  
394 lymphatic filariasis molecular xenomonitoring in the River Galana area, Kilifi County, coastal Kenya.  
395 *PLOS ONE*. 2022 Dec 9;17(12):e0278655.
- 396 35. Bamou R, Rono M, Degefa T, Midega J, Mbogo C, Ingosi P, et al. Entomological and  
397 Anthropological Factors Contributing to Persistent Malaria Transmission in Kenya, Ethiopia, and  
398 Cameroon. *J Infect Dis*. 2021;223(Suppl 2):S155–70.
- 399 36. Njenga SM, Mwandawiro CS, Wamae CN, Mukoko DA, Omar AA, Shimada M, et al. Sustained  
400 reduction in prevalence of lymphatic filariasis infection in spite of missed rounds of mass drug  
401 administration in an area under mosquito nets for malaria control. *Parasit Vectors*. 2011 May  
402 25;4:90.
- 403 37. Weil GJ, Kastens W, Susapu M, Laney SJ, Williams SA, King CL, et al. The Impact of Repeated  
404 Rounds of Mass Drug Administration with Diethylcarbamazine Plus Albendazole on Bancroftian  
405 Filariasis in Papua New Guinea. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2008 Dec 9;2(12):e344.
- 406 38. Upadhyayula SM, Mutheneni SR, Kadiri MR, Kumaraswamy S, Nagalla B. A Cohort Study of  
407 Lymphatic Filariasis on Socio Economic Conditions in Andhra Pradesh, India. *PLoS ONE*. 2012 Mar  
408 19;7(3):e33779.
- 409 39. Atieli H, Menya D, Githeko A, Scott T. House design modifications reduce indoor resting malaria  
410 vector densities in rice irrigation scheme area in western Kenya. *Malar J*. 2009 May 19;8:108.
- 411 40. Lafferty KD, McLaughlin JP, Gruner DS, Bogar TA, Bui A, Childress JN, et al. Local extinction of the  
412 Asian tiger mosquito (*Aedes albopictus*) following rat eradication on Palmyra Atoll. *Biol Lett*. 2018  
413 Feb;14(2):20170743.
- 414 41. Chaccour C, Casellas A, Hammann F, Ruiz-Castillo P, Nicolas P, Montaña J, et al. BOHEMIA: Broad  
415 One Health Endectocide-based Malaria Intervention in Africa—a phase III cluster-randomized, open-  
416 label, clinical trial to study the safety and efficacy of ivermectin mass drug administration to reduce  
417 malaria transmission in two African settings. *Trials*. 2023 Feb 21;24(1):128.

- 418 42. Kobylinski KC, Tiphara P, Wamakot N, Chainarin S, Kullasakboonsri R, Sriwichai P, et al.  
419 Ivermectin metabolites reduce Anopheles survival. *Sci Rep*. 2023 May 19;13(1):8131.
- 420 43. Smit MR, Ochomo E, Aljayyousi G, Kwambai T, Abong'o B, Bayoh N, et al. Efficacy and Safety of  
421 High-Dose Ivermectin for Reducing Malaria Transmission (IVERMAL): Protocol for a Double-Blind,  
422 Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Dose-Finding Trial in Western Kenya. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2016 Nov  
423 17;5(4):e213.
- 424 44. Jaleta KT, Hill SR, Birgersson G, Tekie H, Ignell R. Chicken volatiles repel host-seeking malaria  
425 mosquitoes. *Malar J*. 2016 Jul 21;15(1):354.
- 426 45. Harrington LC, Edman JD, Scott TW. Why Do Female *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) Feed  
427 Preferentially and Frequently on Human Blood? *J Med Entomol*. 2001 May 1;38(3):411–22.
- 428 46. Lyimo IN, Ferguson HM. Ecological and evolutionary determinants of host species choice in  
429 mosquito vectors. *Trends Parasitol*. 2009 Apr 1;25(4):189–96.
- 430