Xenomonitoring of Lymphatic filariasis and risk factors for transmission on the

Kenyan coast

- Brian Bartilol^{1,4}, Lawrence Babu², Karisa Garama², Jonathan Karisa², Alice Kamau³, Charles Mwandawiro⁴, Caroline
- Wanjiku², Charles Mbogo⁵, Marta Maia^{2,6}, Joseph Mwangangi¹, Martin Rono¹²⁷

Affiliations

- ¹KEMRI-Centre for Geographic Medicine Research Coast, Kilifi, Kenya
- ²KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Kilifi, Kenya
- ³ Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK
- ⁴Eastern and Southern Africa Centre of International Parasite Control, Nairobi, Kenya
- ⁵Pan-African Mosquito Control Association, Nairobi, Kenya
- ⁶Centre for Global Health and Tropical Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
- ⁷Pwani University Bioscience Research Centre, Kilifi, Kenya

*Corresponding author

- mrono@kemri-wellcome.org and bbartilol@kemri-wellcome.org

30

31 Abstract

32 Lymphatic filariasis (LF) is an infectious neglected tropical disease caused by a mosquito-borne nematode

- 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 quinquefaciatus 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. The risk of W. bancrofti infection was significantly higher in An. funestus complex (OR = 18.0; 95% CI 1.80-46 47 180; p = 0.014) compared to An. qambiae (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.

Anopheles funestus complex emerged as the primary vectors of lymphatic filariasis along the Kenyan coast. These findings also highlight that a significant portion of disease transmission potentially occurs outdoors. Therefore, control measures targeting outdoor resting mosquitoes such as zooprophylaxis,

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 quinquefaciatus whereas in rural areas it is dominated by Anopheles funestus and Anopheles gambiae mosquitoes. We investigated the 58 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 zooprophylaxis 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 poulty 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 quinquefaciatus 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, filariasis is endemic along the coastal region (3–9) and recently reported in further inland in Busia county, 83 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 xenomontoring (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

The study was conducted in the counties of Kilifi, Kwale, and Taita-Taveta along the Kenyan coast (Figure. 113 114 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 changes observed in recent years include delays in the onset of rains, reduction in volume or drying up of 116 wells and rivers, and increase in temperatures (20–22). Despite shared climatic conditions, the mosquito 117 118 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 in two former administrative units, Kilifi and Malindi district because MDA activities had previously been 120 121 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

- for Disease Control and Prevention light traps (CDC-LT). Sampling was carried out during the dry season (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
- 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

Using sterile scalpels and forceps, the adult female Anopheline mosquitoes were dissected into 2 parts:
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 μ l 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
- in a Thermomixer (Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany). The solution was then centrifuged at $10,000 \times g$ 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

primer and 4μL of the mosquito DNA template. Thermocycling conditions consisted of an enzyme
 activation step at 95°C for 5 min, followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 15 seconds (secs),
 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
- 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. The PCR reaction consisted of 4µL 5X Green GoTag[®] Flexi Buffer, 2.4µL Magnesium chloride, 7µL nuclease 159 free water, 0.5µL Deoxynucleoside triphosphates (dNTPs), 0.1µL GoTaq[®] G2 Flexi DNA Polymerase, 1µL 160 of each primer and 4µL of the mosquito DNA. The cycling conditions consisted of an initial enzyme 161 162 activation step at 95°C for 5 min, followed by 35 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 15 secs, annealing at 55°C for 20 secs, extension at 72°C for 30 secs and a final elongation step at 72°C for 10 mins. Amplicons 163 were resolved on a 1.5% agarose gel stained with RedSafe dye and visualized on the ChemiDoc Imaging 164 System (Bio-Rad). Samples with a band size of 188 base pairs were identified as positive. 165

166 Statistical analysis

Data was entered and cleaned in a Microsoft excel file. Statistical analysis and data visualization were 167 conducted using R software, version 4.2.1 (29). Infection proportions in the mosquito vectors were 168 determined by dividing the number of W. bancrofti positive mosquitoes by the total number of 169 170 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 'geegIm' 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 indluence 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 outcome of LF (positive or negative) and the clustered nature of the data. The results are reported as odds 180 181 ratios (OR) along with 95% confidence intervals (CI) to guantify 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%).





192 Figure 1. A map showing mosquito sampling sites. Sampling in Kilif county was split into two district



193 Kilifi (gamboge) and Malindi (malibu).



196

194

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

- 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 Taveta (5.3%; 95% CI 3.4-8.0%, n = 22/412) (Table 2). In Kilifi, the highest proportions of *W. bancrofti*
- infected mosquitoes were An. funestus s.l (42.1%, n = 51) followed by An. gambiae s.l (15.4%, n = 6). A

similar trend was observed for Malindi, Kwale and Taita Taveta. At the vector species level, parasite
infection rates varied led by *An. rivulorum* (8.7%, n = 94), followed by *An. funestus s.s* (1.1%, n = 12), *An. arabiensis* (0.9%, n = 10) and *An. merus* (0.5%, n = 5) (Table 3). Notably, *An. rivulorum* is the dominant
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.

208

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. coustanii (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 (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 216 217 households with fewer than two occupants (OR=0.66; 95% CI 0.41-1.08, p = 0.10).

Characteristic	Positive	Negative		OR (95% CI)	p.value
Season					
Dry	54	714			
Wet	75	216		0.79 (0.32 to 1.95)	0.6
Site					
indoor	23	321			
outdoor	106	609	-	1.72 (1.06 to 2.78)	0.027
Species					
An. coustanii	1	67			
An. funestus	111	316		18.00 (1.80 to 180.00)	0.014
An. gambiae	17	547		1.54 (0.16 to 15.10)	0.7
Eaves					
absent	4	18			
present	125	912	—	0.98 (0.20 to 4.93)	0.983
Walling					
finished	5	18			
natural	7	22	→	4.29 (0.48 to 38.50)	0.2
rudimentary	117	890	—	0.90 (0.13 to 5.98)	0.916
Roofing					
finished	58	468			
natural	71	462	e -	1.49 (0.82 to 2.72)	0.2
Bednet					
absent	11	15			
present	118	915	•	0.39 (0.12 to 1.32)	0.13
Livestock					
absent	26	287			
present	103	643		2.05 (1.12 to 3.76)	0.02
Poultry					
absent	55	251			
present	74	679	-	0.52 (0.30 to 0.89)	0.018
Occupants					
more than two	60	396			
two or less	69	534	4 0 5 10 15	0.66 (0.41 to 1.08)	0.1

220 Figure 4. A multilevel logistic regression models based on generalized estimating equations on the

various factors that may be associated with Lymphatic filariasis transmission. The outcome was eitherlymphatic filariasis positive or negative.

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

223

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 (%)
	An. funestus	51	121	42.1
District Kilifi Kwale Malindi	An. gambiae	6	39	15.4
KIIII	An. nili	0	1	0.0
	Total	57	Total tested 121 39 1 101 161 123 138 3 264 5 62 165 8 240 63 121 222 5 1 412	35.4
	An. funestus	27	Total tested 121 39 1 161 123 138 3 264 5 62 165 8 240 63 121 222 5 1 412	22.0
Kwale Kwale An. ga An. m Total An. co	An. gambiae	4	138	2.9
Rware	An. maculpalpis	0	3	0.0
Kwale Malindi	Total	31	264	11.7
Malindi	An. coustanii	1	5	20.0
	An. funestus	15	62	24.2
Malindi	Species LF positive Total tested An. funestus 51 121 An. gambiae 6 39 An. nili 0 1 Total 57 161 An. gambiae 4 138 An. gambiae 4 138 An. gambiae 4 138 An. gambiae 0 3 Total 31 264 An. funestus 15 62 An. funestus 15 62 An. funestus 15 62 An. gambiae 4 165 An. gambiae 4 165 An. gambiae 0 8 Total 20 240 An. coustanii 0 63 An. funestus 18 121 An. gambiae 3 222 An. pharoensis 0 1 An. pretoriensis 0 1 An. pretoriensis 0 1	2.4		
	An. pharoensis	LF positive Total tested 51 121 6 39 0 1 57 161 27 123 4 138 0 3 31 264 15 62 4 165 0 8 20 240 0 63 18 121 3 222 1 5 0 13	0.0	
	Total	20	Total tested 121 39 1 161 123 138 3 264 5 62 165 8 240 63 121 222 5 1 412	8.3
	An. coustanii	0	63	0.0
	An. funestus	18	121	14.9
	An. gambiae	3	222	1.4
	An. pharoensis	bits 57 161 n. funestus 27 123 n. gambiae 4 138 n. maculpalpis 0 3 otal 31 264 n. coustanii 1 5 n. funestus 15 62 n. gambiae 4 165 n. gambiae 4 165 n. pharoensis 0 8 otal 20 240 n. coustanii 0 63 n. funestus 18 121 n. gambiae 3 222 n. pharoensis 1 5 otal 20 240 n. funestus 18 121 n. gambiae 3 222 n. pharoensis 1 5 on. pretoriensis 0 1 otal 22 412	20.0	
	An. nili 0 1 Total 57 161 An. funestus 27 123 An. gambiae 4 138 An. maculpalpis 0 3 Total 31 264 An. coustanii 1 5 An. funestus 15 62 An. gambiae 4 165 An. funestus 15 62 An. gambiae 4 165 An. pharoensis 0 8 Total 20 240 An. coustanii 0 63 An. coustanii 0 63 An. funestus 18 121 An. gambiae 3 222 An. pharoensis 1 5 An. pharoensis 1 5 An. pharoensis 1 5 An. pharoensis 1 5 An. pharoensis 0 1 An. pretoriensis 0 1	0.0		
	Total	22	412	5.3

225

Table 2. The Wuchereria. bancrofti prevalence rates in the three coastal counties. However, it's important to note that Kilifi County is divided

into Kilifi and Malindi districts.

	W. bacrofti infection rates by PCR			
Species	Positive (n)	Negative (n)	Species infection rate (%)	Overall infection rate (%)
An. rivulorum ²	94	193	32.8	8.7
An. funestus s.s ²	12	67	15.2	1.1
An. arabiensis²	10	359	2.7	0.9
An. merus²	5	91	5.2	0.5
An. funestus not detected by PCR ²	3	18	14.3	0.3
An. leesoni ²	2	23	8.0	0.2
An. gambiae not detected by PCR ²	1	10	9.1	0.1
An. pharoensis ¹	1	12	7.7	0.1
An. coustanii ¹	1	67	1.5	0.1
An. quadriannulatus²	1	85	1.2	0.1
An. parensis ²	0	12	0.0	0.0
An. vaneedeni²	0	3	0.0	0.0
An. gambiae s.s ²	0	2	0.0	0.0
An. maculpalpis ¹	0	3	0.0	0.0
An. nili ³	0	1	0.0	0.0
An. pretoriensis ¹	0	1	0.0	0.0
Total	130	947		12.1

229

¹ Identified morphologically.

² Identified by the *An. gambiae* or the *An. funestus* complex PCR assay.

³ 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.

235 Discussion

We investigated the vectorial systems for LF in rural coastal Kenya and factors associated with the risk of 236 237 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.

- Malaria and LF are co-endemic in the Kenyan coast and are transmitted by similar vectors (12,30). Over the last two decades, campaigns to control malaria, relying on long lasting insecticide bed nets (LLINs) and indoor residual sprays (IRS) have been associated with decreased malaria incidence by limiting indoor biting and resting of anthrophilic vectors, shifting vectors to more outdoor transmission (23). This study reveals a higher prevalence of LF in outdoor-resting mosquitoes, while LLIN ownership was associated 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).
- An. funestus s.I and An. gambiae s.I are both involved in the transmission of LF in the study area with the 252 253 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. guadriannulatus were positive for LF with no 256 regional preference. Other mosquito species, such as An. coustanii 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).
- Houses made up of thatched roofs and mud walls had increased likelihood of LF transmission, this is consistent with reports in Andhra Pradesh, India (38). Such structures may provide favorable resting sites for mosquitoes. House improvements, such as screening using relatively affordable material such as papyrus mats ceilings, have been shown to reduce entry of *An. funestus* and *An. gambiae* into houses by nearly 80% in western Kenya (39). Therefore, similar modifications may be adopted to limit LF transmission in coastal Kenya.
- The presence of livestock in an homestead was strongly associated with LF transmission suggesting that domestic animals play a critical role in sustaining LF vectors (35). This has been observed for Aedes albopictus that disappeared with the elimination of rats, their preferred vertebrate host (40). Therefore, incorporating vector control tools that limit access to livestock can lead to vector suppression and possible elimination of LF vectors. Presently, there are a number of studies evaluating an array of such tools including endectocides such as Ivermectin for the control of exophagic and zoophilic mosquitoes (41–43).
- Interestingly, the presence of poultry within homes was associated with a lower risk of LF infections. It
 has previously been demonstrated that *An. arabiensis* despite feeding opportunistically on animals avoids
 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
- 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

In this study we identified *An. funestus* s.l sibling species *An. rivulorum* and *An. funestus* s.s. as the dominant vectors of lymphatic filariasis along the Kenyan coast. We also show that a higher proportion of transmission is likely to take place outdoors necessitating the implementation of vector control strategies that target exophilic mosquitoes such as zooprophylaxis and larval source management. We also show 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
- AK conducted the statistical analysis. AK, CK, CM, MM, JM, and MR provided insights into the data analysis
- and critically reviewed the draft manuscript. All the authors read and approved the manuscript.

295 Funding

This work is supported by The Royal Society FLAIR fellowship grant: FLR_R1_190497 and KEMRI IRG grant: KEMRI/IRG/INN02 (awarded to MR). The funding bodies had no role in the design, data collection, data

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
- addressed to that committee.

304 **Consent for publication**

All the authors have reviewed and approved the publication of this paper. This paper has been published 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

Simonsen PE, Fischer PU, Hoerauf A, Weil GJ. 54 - The Filariases. In: Farrar J, Hotez PJ, Junghanss T,
 Kang G, Lalloo D, White NJ, editors. Manson's Tropical Infectious Diseases (Twenty-third Edition)
 [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
- Derua YA, Alifrangis M, Hosea KM, Meyrowitsch DW, Magesa SM, Pedersen EM, et al. Change in
 composition of the Anopheles gambiae complex and its possible implications for the transmission of
 malaria and lymphatic filariasis in north-eastern Tanzania. Malar J. 2012;11:1–9.
- Moraga P, Cano J, Baggaley RF, Gyapong JO, Njenga SM, Nikolay B, et al. Modelling the distribution
 and transmission intensity of lymphatic filariasis in sub-Saharan Africa prior to scaling up
 interventions: integrated use of geostatistical and mathematical modelling. Parasit Vectors. 2015 Oct
 24;8(1):560.
- 4. Estambale BBA, Simonsen PE, Knight R, Bwayo JJ. Bancroftian filariasis in Kwale District of Kenya. I.
 Clinical and parasitological survey in an endemic community. Ann Trop Med Parasitol. 1994 Jan
 1;88(2):145–51.
- Wamae CN, Mwandawiro C, Wambayi E, Njenga S, Kiliku F. Lymphatic filariasis in kenya since 1910,
 and the prospects for its elimination: a review. East Afr Med J. 2001 Nov;78(11):595–603.
- Muturi EJ, Mbogo CM, Mwangangi JM, Ng'ang'a ZW, Kabiru EW, Mwandawiro C, et al. Concomitant
 infections of Plasmodium falciparum and Wuchereria bancroftion the Kenyan coast. Filaria J. 2006
 May 24;5(1):8.
- Njenga SM, Kanyi HM, Mutungi FM, Okoyo C, Matendechero HS, Pullan RL, et al. Assessment of
 lymphatic filariasis prior to re-starting mass drug administration campaigns in coastal Kenya. Parasit
 Vectors. 2017 Feb 22;10(1):99.
- Mwandawiro CS, Fujimaki Y, Mitsui Y, Katsivo M. Mosquito vectors of bancroftian filariasis in Kwale
 District, Kenya. East Afr Med J. 1997 May 1;74(5):288–93.
- 9. Wijers DJB. Bancroftian filariasis in Kenya. Ann Trop Med Parasitol. 1977 Dec 1;71(4):451–63.
- Kinyatta N, Wachira D, Githae R, Lusweti J, Ingonga J, Ichugu C, et al. Detection of Wuchereria
 bancrofti in human blood samples and mosquitoes in Matayos, Busia County-Kenya. Sci Rep. 2023
 Nov 8;13(1):19420.
- Mwandawiro CS, Fujimaki Y, Mitsui Y, Katsivo M. Mosquito vectors of bancroftian filariasis in
 Kwale District, Kenya. East Afr Med J. 1997 May;74(5):288–93.
- Muturi EJ, Mbogo CM, Ng'ang'a ZW, Kabiru EW, Mwandawiro C, Novak RJ, et al. Relationship
 between malaria and filariasis transmission indices in an endemic area along the Kenyan Coast. J
 Vector Borne Dis. 2006 Jun;43(2):77–83.
- Kasili S, Oyieke F, Wamae AK, Bisen C, Mbogo C. Seasonal changes of infectivity rates of
 Bancroftian filariasis vectors in coast province, Kenya. J Vector Borne Dis. 2009 Sep;46(3):219–24.

- Bartilol B, Omedo I, Mbogo C, Mwangangi J, Rono MK. Bionomics and ecology of Anopheles
 merus along the East and Southern Africa coast. Parasit Vectors. 2021;14(1):84.
- Global programme to eliminate lymphatic filariasis: progress report, 2021 [Internet]. [cited 2023
 Apr 19]. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/who-wer9741-513-524
- 16. Lymphatic filariasis [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 20]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news room/fact-sheets/detail/lymphatic-filariasis
- McPherson B, Mayfield HJ, McLure A, Gass K, Naseri T, Thomsen R, et al. Evaluating Molecular
 Xenomonitoring as a Tool for Lymphatic Filariasis Surveillance in Samoa, 2018–2019. Trop Med Infect
 Dis. 2022 Aug;7(8):203.
- Pedersen EM, Stolk WA, Laney SJ, Michael E. The role of monitoring mosquito infection in the
 Global Programme to Eliminate Lymphatic Filariasis. Trends Parasitol. 2009 Jul;25(7):319–27.
- Mosha FW, Magayuka SA. Laboratory infection of Anopheles pharoensis with Wuchereria
 bancrofti.
- MoALF. Climate Risk Profile for Kwale County. Nairobi, Kenya: The Ministry of Agriculture,
 Livestock and Fisheries (MoALF); 2016. (Kenya County Climate Risk Profile Series).
- MoALF. Climate Risk Profile for Taita Taveta County. Nairobi, Kenya: The Ministry of Agriculture,
 Livestock and Fisheries (MoALF); 2016. (Kenya County Climate Risk Profile Series).
- MoALF. Climate Risk Profile for Kilifi County. The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
 (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.
- Scott JA, Brogdon WG, Collins FH. Identification of Single Specimens of the Anopheles Gambiae
 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.
- Zhong M, McCarthy J, Bierwert L, Lizotte-Waniewski M, Chanteau S, Nutman T, et al. A
 Polymerase Chain Reaction Assay for Detection of the Parasite Wuchereria bancrofti in Human Blood
 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, Vlaminck 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.
- 33. Chakraborty S, Gao S, Allan BF, Smith RL. Effects of cattle on vector-borne disease risk to
 humans: A systematic review. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2023 Dec 19;17(12):e0011152.
- 34. Njenga SM, Kanyi HM, Mwatele CM, Mukoko DA, Bockarie MJ, Kelly-Hope LA. Integrated survey
 of helminthic neglected tropical diseases and comparison of two mosquito sampling methods for
 lymphatic filariasis molecular xenomonitoring in the River Galana area, Kilifi County, coastal Kenya.
 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.
- Weil GJ, Kastens W, Susapu M, Laney SJ, Williams SA, King CL, et al. The Impact of Repeated
 Rounds of Mass Drug Administration with Diethylcarbamazine Plus Albendazole on Bancroftian
 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.
- 40. Lafferty KD, McLaughlin JP, Gruner DS, Bogar TA, Bui A, Childress JN, et al. Local extinction of the
 Asian tiger mosquito (Aedes albopictus) following rat eradication on Palmyra Atoll. Biol Lett. 2018
 Feb;14(2):20170743.
- 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, open416 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, Tipthara P, Wamaket N, Chainarin S, Kullasakboonsri R, Sriwichai P, et al.
 419 Ivermectin metabolites reduce Anopheles survival. Sci Rep. 2023 May 19;13(1):8131.
- 43. Smit MR, Ochomo E, Aljayyoussi G, Kwambai T, Abong'o B, Bayoh N, et al. Efficacy and Safety of
 High-Dose Ivermectin for Reducing Malaria Transmission (IVERMAL): Protocol for a Double-Blind,
 Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Dose-Finding Trial in Western Kenya. JMIR Res Protoc. 2016 Nov
 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.