Main Manuscript for 1

2 Efficacy of a Spatial Repellent for Control of Aedes-Borne Virus

Transmission: A Cluster Randomized Trial in Iquitos, Peru 3

Amy C. Morrison, Ph.D.^{1,2+}, Robert C. Reiner Jr., Ph.D.³⁺, William H. Elson, M.B.B.S.⁴, Helvio 4

Astete, M.S.², Carolina Guevara, M.S.², Clara del Aguila, B.S.⁵, Isabel Bazan, M.D.², Crystyan Siles, M.D.², Patricia Barrera, M.S.², Anna B. Kawiecki, M.S.¹, Christopher M. Barker, Ph.D.¹, Gissella M. Vasquez, Ph.D.⁶, Karin Escobedo-Vargas, B.S.⁶, Carmen Flores-Mendoza, Ph.D.⁶, 5 6

7

8 Alfredo A. Huaman, B.S.², Mariana Leguia, Ph.D.⁷, Maria E. Silva, Ph.D.,² Sarah A. Jenkins,

- Ph.D.², Wesley R. Campbell, M.D.², Eugenio J. Abente, Ph.D.², Robert D. Hontz, Ph.D.², Valerie 9
- A. Paz-Soldan, Ph.D.⁸, John P. Grieco, Ph.D.⁹, Neil F. Lobo, Ph.D.⁹⁺, Thomas W. Scott, Ph.D.⁴⁺, 10
- and Nicole L. Achee, Ph.D.9+ 11
- 12 ¹Department of Pathology, Microbiology, and Immunology, School of Veterinary Medicine,
- 13 University of California, Davis, CA, 95616 USA
- 14 ²Department of Virology and Emerging Infectious Diseases, U.S. Naval Medical Research Unit 15 No. 6, Lima, Peru, 3230 Lima Pl., Washington DC, 20521-3230
- 16 ³Department of Health Metrics Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, 98195 WA, USA
- 17 ⁴Department of Entomology and Nematology, University of California, Davis, CA, 95616 USA
- 18 ⁵Dirección General de Saneamiento Ambiental, Calle Alzamora 410, Iquitos, Peru
- ⁶ Department of Entomology, U.S. Naval Medical Research Unit No. 6, Lima, Peru 19
- 20 ⁷Genomics Laboratory, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel, Lima, Peru, 15000 21
- 22 ⁸Department of Global Community Health and Behavioral Sciences, Tulane School of Public 23 Health and Tropical Medicine, New Orleans, LA, 70112 USA
- 24 ⁹Department of Biological Sciences, Eck Institute for Global Health, University of Notre Dame, 25 239 Galvin Life Sciences Center. Notre Dame, IN, 46556 USA
- 26 *Indicates equal seniority
- 27 *Corresponding Author:
- 28 Nicole L. Achee, PhD
- 29 **Department of Biological Sciences**
- 30 239 Galvin Life Sciences Center
- 31 Notre Dame, IN, 46556 USA
- 32 Email: nachee@nd.edu Phone: 1-574-651-1561

33 Author Contributions: The trial was conceived and designed by NLA, ACM, RCR, JPG, NFL and

- 34 TWS; data were gathered by the field team in Iquitos (ACM, WHE, HA, IB, CS, and ABK);
- 35 laboratory testing by CG, PB, and AH; insecticide resistance testing by GMV, KEV, and CFM; and
- 36 human use issues were managed by ACM, SAJ, and WRC. ML developed a Zika virus PCR assay
- 37 used in the study. CDA provided Ministry of Health entomological information and coordinated
- 38 activities with Iquitos field teams. The NAMRU-6 supervisory team in Lima included MS, SAJ,
- 39 WRC, EJA, and RDH. CMB provided data management and ZIKV MNT laboratory testing.
- 40 Statistical analysis was conducted by RCR. The first draft of the manuscript was written by ACM,
- 41 RCR, TWS, and NLA, with revision following comments from all the authors.
- 42

43 **Disclosure Statement:** Approved for Public Distribution

44 **Competing Interest Statement:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

45 **Copyright statement:** SAJ, WRC, EJA and RDH are military service members and ACM, HA,

46 CG, IB, CS, GMV, KE, CF, AAH, and MES are employees of the U.S. Government. This work

47 was prepared as part of their official duties. Title 17 U.S.C. §105 provides that "Copyright

48 protection under this Title is not available for any work of the United States Government". Title 17

49 U.S.C. §101 defines a U.S. Government work as a work prepared by a military service member or

50 employee of the U.S. Government as part of that person's official duties.

- 51 **Disclaimer:** The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily
- reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, nor the U.S. Government.
- 54

Preprint Server: A version of this manuscript was deposited as a medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.03.21252148; posted August 3, 2021. It is made available under

- 57 a CC-BY 4.0 International license.
- 58 **Classification:** Biological Sciences and Applied Biological Sciences.
- 59 Keywords: vector control, Aedes aegypti, spatial repellent, arbovirus vector, clinical trial
- 60 This PDF file includes:
- 61
 Main Text

 62
 Figures 1 to 5

 63
 Tables 1 to 3
- 64 I

65 Abstract

66 Over half the world's population is at risk for viruses transmitted by Aedes mosquitoes, such as, 67 dengue and Zika. The primary vector, Aedes aegypti, thrives in urban environments. Despite 68 decades of effort, cases and geographic range of Aedes-borne viruses (ABV) continue to expand. 69 Rigorously proven vector control interventions that measure protective efficacy against ABV 70 diseases is limited to Wolbachia in a single trial in Indonesia, and do not include any chemical 71 intervention. Spatial repellents, a new option for efficient deployment, are designed to decrease 72 human exposure to ABV by releasing active ingredients into the air that disrupt mosquito-human 73 contact. A parallel, cluster-randomized controlled trial was conducted in Iguitos. Peru to guantify 74 the impact of a transfluthrin-based spatial repellent on human ABV infection. From 2,907 75 households across 26 clusters (13 per arm), 1,578 participants were assessed for seroconversion 76 (primary endpoint) by survival analysis. Incidence of acute disease was calculated among 16,683 77 participants (secondary endpoint). Adult mosquito collections were conducted to compare Ae. 78 aegypti abundance, blood-fed rate and parity status through mixed effect difference-in-difference 79 analyses. The spatial repellent significantly reduced ABV infection by 34.1% (1-sided 95% CI 80 lower limit, 6.9%; 1-sided p-value=0.0236, z=1.98). Aedes aegypti abundance and blood-fed 81 rates were significantly reduced by 28.6% (95% CI 24.1%, ∞); z=-9.11) and 12.4% (95% CI 4.2%, 82 ∞); z=-2.43), respectively. Our trial provides the first conclusive statistical evidence from a pre-83 planned cluster randomized controlled clinical trial with a pre-defined effect size on the primary 84 endpoint that was appropriate powered to prospectively quantify and statistically test for a 85 difference in the impact of a chemical intervention, in this case a spatial repellent, to reduce the 86 risk of ABV transmission compared to a placebo.

87 Significance Statement

88 Vector interventions are needed for Aedes-borne viral diseases (dengue, Zika, chikungunya, and 89 yellow fever) prevention, but their application is hindered by the lack of evidence proving they 90 prevent infection or disease. Our research reports the first conclusive statistical evidence from a 91 pre-planned, prospective cluster-randomized, controlled clinical trial (cRCT) of significant 92 protective efficacy (34.1% hazard estimate) against human Aedes-borne virus (ABV) infection by 93 a chemical-based vector control intervention, the most commonly used intervention category 94 among all ABV World Health Organization recommendations. A previous trial against malaria in 95 Indonesia indicated a positive trend but did not detect a significant effect. Results from our ABV 96 study will help guide public health authorities responsible for operational management and world-97 wide prevention of ABV, and incentivize new strategies for disease prevention.

98

99 Main Text

100 101 Introduction

102

Aedes-borne viral diseases (ABVD) [e.g., dengue (DENV), chikungunya (CHIKV), Zika (ZIKV),
 and yellow fever (YFV)] are devastating, expanding global public health threats that
 disproportionally affect low- and middle-income countries. Dengue, one of the most rapidly

106 increasing vector-borne infectious diseases, results in ~400 million infections each year [1,2], with

107 four billion people at risk of infection annually [3]. Currently, the primary means for ABVD

prevention is controlling the primary mosquito vector, *Aedes aegypti*. Existing vector control

109 interventions, however, have failed to prevent ABV transmission and epidemics[4–6].

110

111 There is an urgent need to develop evidence-based guidance for the use of new and existing 112 ABV vector control tools. The evidence-base for vector control against ABVs is weak, despite

113 considerable government investments in WHO-recommended control of larval habitats

114 (larviciding, container removal) and ultra-low volume (ULV) insecticide spraying [4,5,7–9]. These

115 strategies continue to be implemented despite the lack of rigorously generated data from

controlled clinical trials demonstrating they reduce ABV infection or disease [6]. The only ABV
 intervention with a proven epidemiological impact in a cluster randomized control trial (cRCT)
 assessed community mobilization to reduce mosquito larval habitats [10]. A recent test-negative
 trial with *Wolbachia*-infected mosquitoes reported a significant reduction of dengue illness in
 Indonesia[11].

121

Spatial repellents (SR) are devices that contain volatile active ingredients that disperse in air. The active ingredients can repel mosquitoes from entering a treated space, inhibit attraction to human host cues or disrupt mosquito biting and blood feeding behavior, and, thus, interfere with mosquito-human contact [12–14]. Any of these outcomes reduce the probability of pathogen transmission. Pyrethroid-based spatial repellents have shown efficacy in reducing malaria infections in China [15] and Indonesia [16]. There have, however, been no clinical trials evaluating the protective efficacy of spatial repellents against ABV infection or disease.

129

To generate evidence for public health consideration we conducted a double-blinded, parallel,
 cluster-randomized controlled trial (cRCT) to demonstrate and quantify the protective efficacy
 (PE) of a transfluthrin-based spatial repellent (SR) to reduce ABV infection incidence over two
 years in a human cohort in Iquitos, Peru.

134 135

136 Results

137

138 We report results from the intervention phase of a cRCT, conducted in 26 clusters (13 per arm, 139 see Methods and SI Section 1.2.1 for randomization scheme) each with approximately 140 140 households (60 qualifying participants) between August 2016 and March 2019 (Figure 1-2, SI 141 Section 1.1). The primary endpoint was ABV seroconversion, as measured by DENV- or ZIKV-142 specific neutralizing antibodies, in blood from children > 2 years to < 18 years collected just prior 143 to the deployment of the SR intervention, and approximately 1 and 2 years later. The SR 144 intervention was a transfluthrin passive emanator placed in participating households according to manufacturer's instructions, 1 product per 9 m² and replaced at 15 d intervals (Figure S1, SI 145 146 Section 1.3.2) during the two-year (two-transmission season) study period. Secondary endpoints 147 were clinically apparent laboratory confirmed ABV disease and indoor female Ae. aegypti. 1) 148 abundance, 2) blood-fed status (proxy for human-biting rates), and 3) parity status (proxy for age-149 structure). Participants followed for seroconversion were the 'longitudinal cohort' and those 150 followed for disease were the 'febrile surveillance cohort'.

- 151
- 152

153 STUDY POPULATION

154 A total of 2,215 persons were enrolled in the longitudinal cohort. Of these, 1,578 gualifying 155 participants (individuals who were seronegative or had a monotypic DENV antibody response 156 when they entered the trial) were included in the ITT analysis for seroconversion (Figure 3). 157 Samples were tested by microneutralization enzyme immunoassay (MNT) for seroconversion to 158 each DENV serotype and ZIKV (SI Sections 1.3.3.1 and 1.3.4.1). Only participants that provided 159 at least 2 blood samples were included in final analyses. We observed a total of 196 ABV infections from 754 (1,090 paired samples) qualifying participants in the SR arm and 294 ABV 160 161 infections from 824 (1,237 paired samples) qualifying participants in the placebo arm. Baseline 162 covariates were balanced at both the cluster and individual level (Table 1).

163

A total of 16,707 participants were followed for clinical disease in the 'febrile surveillance cohort' through approximately 3 wellness visits per week, of which 16,683 were included in the ITT analysis (**Figure S2**). Suspected acute ABV cases that provided consent provided acute and convalescent blood samples and were monitored clinically daily. Acute serum samples were tested for viral RNA by PCR (DENV and ZIKV; **SI Sections 1.3.3.2-1.3.3.4**) and by ELISA for DENV IcM (**SI Sections 1.3.3.5 1.3.4**) and by ELISA for

laboratory confirmation cases of ABV disease. Baseline covariates from the febrile surveillance
 cohort were balanced at both the cluster and individual level (**Table S4**).

172173 INTERVENTION COVERAGE

174 The household participation rate (intervention deployed at some point during the study period) per 175 cluster (SR and placebo) was of 56.6 % (SD = 10.5%), with slightly more participation in SR 176 versus placebo clusters (58.8% v 54.5%, p-value = 0.336). In households consenting to receive 177 intervention (SR or placebo), the mean percentage of days covered by an intervention at the 178 cluster-level was 81.6% (SD = 3.9), with slightly higher coverage in households assigned to SR 179 intervention (82.9%) compared to households in the placebo arm (80.3%), albeit insignificant (p-180 value = 0.153, Table S2, Figure S3). For all enrolled households, the mean percentage of days 181 with an adequate intervention application rate (1 product per 9 m^2) was 73.6% (SD = 9.1), with 182 similar rates between SR and placebo clusters (72.7% versus 74.5%, p-value > 0.999, Table S2).

183

184 SPATIAL REPELLENT EFFICACY

185 We used survival analysis with proportional hazards model with an exponential distribution 186 assumption for baseline hazard to estimate a PE (SI Section 1.5.2.1). The estimated PE of the 187 SR intervention was 34.1% (1-sided 95% CI lower limit, 6.9%) (Table 2). Reduction in the 188 arbovirus infection hazard rate was significant at the 5% significance level (Test statistic: z=1.98, 189 1-sided p-value = 0.02). Baseline covariates included in the statistical model on the hazard of 190 arbovirus infection in qualifying participants were age, which had statistically significant effects on the hazard of arbovirus infection in qualifying participants, and sex, which did not. Reported age-191 192 and sex-specific hazard rate changes are conditional. Hazard rate increases by 4.6% for every 193 one-year increase in age. Hazard rate decreases by 4.4% in males relative to females (Table 2). 194 The originally proposed ITT mixed effects logistic regression analysis (SI Section 1.5.2.2), which 195 ignores differential participation duration across gualifying participants, produced a result 196 consistent with those presented here; i.e., PE > 30% and statistical significance at the 5% level 197 (Table 2).

198

199 The Kaplan-Meier curves of arbovirus infection for qualifying participants by cluster show 200 considerable between-cluster variation (SR and placebo clusters) as evidenced by the wide 201 spread of survival curves (Figure 4). For example, there were no arbovirus infections in qualifying 202 participants in placebo Cluster 7.2, which had only 18 qualifying participants. Conversely, of the 203 11 qualifying participants who had a duration of at least 15 months between tests in Cluster 8.2, a 204 total of 5 subjects became infected since their last test. The duration between tests varied by 205 participant and across clusters (Figure S4), resulting in some Kaplan-Meier curves being 206 estimated beyond two years. In many of those clusters, the only participants that went over two 207 years between blood sampling were universally found to have had an arboviral infection. 208

209 A Poisson generalized linear regression was used to assess intervention impact on clinical 210 disease, with an offset for the number of participant-days each participant spent in each cluster. 211 No covariates were used and due to the small sample size, no random effects were incorporated 212 (SI section 1.5.3). No statistical difference between incidence in the SR and Placebo arms was 213 detected. Baseline characteristics of covariates included in the analysis of PCR/ELISA confirmed 214 DENV and ZIKV cases were balanced between SR and placebo arms (Table S5). Results from 215 an ITT fixed effect Poisson generalized linear model indicate the rate ratio is 1.144 with an upper 216 bound on the 1-sided 95% CI of 1.601. This translates into a 14.4% increase in the rate of 217 PCR/ELISA confirmed arbovirus infections by SR intervention compared with placebo with the 218 lower bound of the 1-sided 95% CI of -60.1%. This apparent increase in the intervention area 219 was not statistically significant at the 5% level (Test statistic: z = -0.975), in part because only 220 96 disease cases were detected. 51 in the SR arm and 45 in the placebo arm during 10.793.792 221 participant days that appeared balanced between SR and placebo clusters (Table S4, SI Section 222 **2.5.2.1**).

223

224 The estimated reduction in adult female Ae. aegypti abundance in clusters receiving SR 225 intervention was 28.6% (1-sided 95% CI lower limit: 24.1%, test statistic: z= -9.11) using mixed 226 effects difference-in-difference (DID) Poisson regression, with factor-level covariates (Table 3, SI 227 Section 1.5.4). Baseline mosquito abundance was balanced between treatment arms (Table S5) 228 with post-baseline quantities estimated based on 47,518 and 43,417 household collections in SR 229 and placebo arms, respectively. Baseline abundance averaged 0.277 (standard deviation [SD] 230 0.153) and 0.279 (SD 0.122) per house survey in SR and placebo arms, respectively, whereas 231 post-baseline abundance averaged 0.276 (SD 0.091) and 0.391 (SD 0.142) in the SR and 232 placebo arms, respectively (**Table 3**). There was strong indication of seasonality, with estimated 233 z-scores of 6 or greater when comparing each month to the reference month of January (Table 234 **S7**). Overall, abundance trended lower in the SR clusters compared to the placebo clusters after 235 intervention deployment for the duration of the trial, from 2017-2019 (Figure 5). Post-intervention 236 entomological surveys indicate that this difference disappeared after removal of the intervention 237 (Figure S8B).

238

239 The estimated reduction in the rate of blood-fed Ae. aegypti collected inside houses was 12.4% 240 (1-sided 95% CI lower limit: 4-2%, test statistic: z = -2.430) also using mixed effects DID Poisson 241 regression (**Table 3**). Baseline abundance of engorged Ae. aegypti was balanced across 242 treatment arms (Table S5) with post-baseline quantities estimated based on 9,257 and 11,496 243 mosquitoes assessed for blood-fed status in SR and placebo arms, respectively. Baseline 244 abundance of blood-fed mosquitoes averaged 0.593 (standard deviation 0.440) and 0.536 245 (standard deviation 0.451) per collection in SR and placebo arms, respectively. Post-baseline 246 rates averaged 0.606 (SD 0.460) and 0.634 (SD 0.447) in SR and placebo arms, respectively. 247 There was no strong indication of seasonality (Table S8).

248

There was no observed intervention effect (**Table 3**) or indication of seasonality (**Table S9**) based on the parity rate of *Ae. aegypti* females.

251

252 ADVERSE EVENTS (AE) AND SERIOUS ADVERSE EVENTS (SAE)

253 Twenty-nine AEs were reported during the trial (SI Section 2.8). Of these, three were associated 254 with blood draw (vasovagal response, two from SR and one from placebo clusters). The 255 remaining 26 AEs reflected symptoms consistent with pyrethroid/ transfluthrin exposure. 256 Reporting of these AEs was higher in the SR clusters (22 of 8,235 subjects: 0.267%) than the 257 placebo clusters (4 of 8,448 subjects: 0.047%). The relative risk of experiencing a mild adverse 258 event due to the SR product was 5.6 (95% CI: 1.9-16, p=0.0015). The 26 affected individuals (26 259 of 16,707 subjects; 0.155%) came from 18 households, often reporting different combinations of 260 the following symptoms: allergic response with itching and skin irritations (n=19; 15 from SR, four 261 from placebo clusters), dry mouth/bad taste (n=5, from SR clusters only), breathing issues (n=7, 262 from SR clusters only) including exacerbation of chronic bronchitis or asthma (n=2), and 263 headaches (n=4, from SR clusters only). The total number of AEs reported from longitudinal 264 subject cohort households during the trial was similarly low (18 of 2,907 households; 0.619%). No 265 reported SAEs (deaths) were deemed associated with the spatial repellent intervention.

266

267268 Discussion

269

Aedes-borne viruses have expanding regions of transmission, cause increasingly frequent
 epidemics, and are transmitted by one of the most anthropophilic mosquitoes. There is, therefore,
 a growing unmet need for effective ABV disease prevention [9]. Our cRCT provides the first
 conclusive statistical evidence from a pre-planned, prospective cluster-randomized, controlled

274 clinical trial (cRCT) of significant protective efficacy (34.1% hazard estimate) against

275 human Aedes-borne virus (ABV) infection by a chemical-based vector control intervention, in this

case a spatial repellent. The uniqueness of our trial in the realm of *Aedes* vector control is that it

is 1) the first pre-planned, cluster randomized controlled clinical trial 2) with a pre-defined effect

size on the primary endpoint of human infection 3) that was appropriately powered to
prospectively quantify and statistically test for a difference in the impact of a chemical intervention
against *Aedes*-borne virus human infection incidence compared to a placebo. Currently used
adult *Aedes* chemical control strategies are not supported by such evidence. Reduced human
infection caused by a reduction in mosquito biting supports development of (1) improved repellent
formulations and (2) enhanced methodologies for broad scale application.

284

285 PE was detected despite assumed dilution and contamination effects due to participant 286 movement in and out of study clusters. Unlike a vaccine, SR protected study participants in their 287 own homes or another protected home within their neighborhood (i.e., Study Cluster), but did not 288 provide continuous protection after they left treated houses. Our cohort, tested for ABV 289 seroconversion, was comprised principally of children < 17 years of age, most whom attended 290 schools that have been shown in Iquitos to be of lower risk of Ae. aegypti infestation than 291 residential sites [17]. Our outcome was demonstrated in an operational context, reflecting 292 complex interactions among ongoing Ministry of Health interventions across the study area, 293 imperfect coverage at the household-level (rooms closed to intervention, homeowner removal 294 and/or loss of intervention), <100% household participation within clusters, and the suggestion of pyrethroid resistance in the local Ae. aegypti population [18] (SI section 2.7). Reduced risk of 295 296 ABV infection was associated with a significant reduction in indoor female Ae. aegypti abundance 297 and blood feeding. Although entomological outcomes were modest, detected effects are 298 consistent with the expected mode of SR action (i.e., deterrence from house entry and/or 299 interfering with human-biting) [12,19] and the impact waned after the intervention was removed at 300 the end of the trial.

301

302 Our results support SRs as a flexible class of vector control products with positive public health 303 impact not limited to ABV diseases. Transfluthrin [15] and metofluthrin-based[20] mosquito coils 304 have been shown to reduce malaria and the same spatial repellent device used in our Iquitos trial 305 reduced malaria infections in an Indonesia cRCT[16]. The SR product we tested was generally 306 well tolerated even though it produced mild skin and respiratory irritation, a well know side effect 307 of pyrethroids. Our trial was the first to quantify these types of adverse events for a chemical 308 intervention in a double-blinded trial. Our results, therefore, support the potential for SRs to 309 reduce a variety of vector-borne diseases, augment existing public health efforts and support SRs 310 as an effective component in vector control intervention strategies. To facilitate implementation 311 and programmatic scale-up, additional assessments, which have already begun [21-24], are 312 needed. 313

314 Our Peru cRCT is one of two trials recommended by the WHO for assessing public health value 315 and developing global health policy for the SR intervention class [25]. Our study was powered to 316 detect a 30% reduction in ABV infection risk, not acute ABV disease nor virus infection rates in 317 mosquitos. During the trial period, dengue prevalence was lower than previous years and a Zika 318 epidemic occurred in 2016 [26]. This epidemiological uncertainty is typical of ABV transmission, 319 making powering ABV cRCTs challenging and helps explain why cRCTs with epidemiological 320 outcomes for ABVs are rare [27]. We used seroconversion as our primary endpoint of PE to 321 address this challenge. At our Iquitos study site, powering a trial based on clinically apparent ABV 322 disease would not be logistically feasible.

323

Fully integrating vector control into ABV disease prevention programs will require quantitative
 guidance based on quantitative measures of the impact from each intervention component.
 Ministries of Health, local to national governments and non-governmental organizations can use
 our trial results as an evidence-base for informed application of SRs. Considering the growing
 ABV public health threat, difficulties of developing vaccines against multiple viruses and past,
 poorly informed vector control failures [6], enhanced ABV disease prevention will benefit greatly
 from interventions with proven public health value.

331

332 Materials and Methods

333

335

This trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT03553277.

336 ETHICAL STATEMENT

Our study protocol (#NAMRU6.2014.0021, Supplementary Information (SI)) was approved by the U.S. Naval Medical Research Unit No. 6 (NAMRU-6) Institutional Review Board (IRB), which includes Peruvian representation and complies with US Federal and Peruvian regulations governing the protections of human subjects, and the Regional Health Authority (DIRESA), the local branch of the Peruvian Ministry of Health. IRB authorization agreements were established between the NAMRU-6, the University of Notre Dame (Sponsor), the University of California at Davis, and the University of Washington.

344

345 TRIAL DESIGN

- 346 Detailed study methods are provided in the SI.
- 347

Our trial was conducted from June 2015 through March 2019 in the Iquitos and Punchana
Districts of Iquitos, Peru (Figure 1, SI Section 1.1). Clusters were selected in January 2015.
Enrollment began June 2015. Participation included: 1) a house census, 2) disease surveillance,
annual blood draws, 4) bi-monthly entomological surveys, and 5) intervention application in the
house. Epidemiological monitoring and entomological surveillance lasted from February 2016
through March 2019 (Figure 2).

354

Our main objective was to demonstrate and quantify the protective efficacy (PE) of a SR in reducing ABV infection incidence in a human cohort. Qualifying participants were individuals in a participating house who were seronegative or had a monotypic DENV antibody response when they entered the trial. Assuming the probability of seroconversion for seronegative or monotypic individuals was 10% with a coefficient of variation of 0.25, and an alpha of 5%, we estimated we would need 26 clusters (13 per arm) with approximately 60 qualifying individuals to achieve a power of 80% to detect a reduction in the odds of 30%.

362

The primary endpoint was ABV seroconversion, as measured by DENV- or ZIKV-specific neutralizing antibodies, in blood from children ≥ 2 years to ≤ 18 years. To increase the pool of baseline seronegative participants, we expanded screening to ≥ 18 years. Secondary endpoints were clinically apparent laboratory confirmed ABV disease and indoor female *Ae.* aegypti: 1) abundance, 2) blood-fed status (proxy for human-biting rates), and 3) parity status (proxy for agestructure). Participants followed for seroconversion were the 'longitudinal cohort' and those followed for disease were the 'febrile surveillance cohort'.

370

371 RANDOMIZATION AND INTERVENTION

372 A total of 26 clusters (13 per arm) each with approximately 140 households (60 qualifying 373 participants) were randomly allocated in August 2016 to receive SR or placebo intervention by the 374 external statistician serving on the Data Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) using a random number 375 generator (<u>https://www.random.org</u>) (SI Section 1.2.1). Investigators, research staff, and study 376 participants were blinded to cluster allocation. Our intervention was a transfluthrin passive 377 emanator designed and produced by SC Johnson (Racine, WI), replaced at 2-week intervals, as 378 described previously (Figure S1, SI Section 1.3.2)[16]. Our trial was specifically designed to 379 evaluate the protective efficacy of the first in class spatial repellent product prototype to enable 380 WHO assessment for public health value of the spatial repellent product class. Spatial repellent 381 products are not yet recommended by WHO for inclusion into programmatic vector control 382 strategies. We selected the SCJ manufactured, transfluthrin-based passive emanator because it 383 represents the first in class prototype of a spatial repellent under WHO public health value 384 assessment[28]. The spatial repellent intervention used in our study is the same intervention 385 evaluated against malaria infections in Sumba Indonesia [16]. Spatial repellent and placebo

intervention had identical packaging and were deployed in houses by study personnel using a
 blinded coding scheme. The placement of the intervention followed manufacturer specifications
 for indoor use conditions.

389

390 SEROCONVERSION AND DISEASE SURVEILLANCE

391 Recruitment for the longitudinal cohort focused on children because they were likely to be 392 antibody test-negative or monotypic at baseline than adults, which would facilitate interpretation 393 of laboratory assays, and less mobile than adults[29], thus spending more time in their houses or 394 their assigned cluster. Baseline blood samples were obtained within 2 weeks before or after initial 395 intervention deployment. As new families moved into the study area, they were recruited to 396 participate, resulting in longitudinal participant enrollment throughout the interval between 397 Baseline (B), First (F), and Second/Final (S) longitudinal blood draws (Figure 3). Samples were 398 tested by microneutralization enzyme immunoassay (MNT) for seroconversion to each DENV 399 serotype and ZIKV (SI Sections 1.3.3.1 and 1.3.4.1). Only participants that provided at least 2 400 blood samples were included in final analyses.

401

The febrile surveillance cohort was recruited by nurse technicians during door-to-door wellness checks starting with the first week of intervention deployment. Suspected cases exhibited axillary temperature of \ge 37.5°C or, for suspected ZIKV infection, absence of fever but presence of rash, arthralgia, arthritis, or non-purulent conjunctivitis for \le five days. Participants meeting these criteria provided acute and convalescent (14–21 days later) serum samples and were monitored clinically daily. Acute serum samples were tested for viral RNA by PCR (DENV and ZIKV; **SI Sections 1.3.3.2-1.3.4**) and by ELISA for DENV IgM (**SI Sections 1.3.3.5,1.3.4.2**).

409

410 ENTOMOLOGICAL ENDPOINTS

411 Indoor Prokopack aspirations [30] were conducted in all consented homes at time of first 412 intervention deployment and subsequent intervention replacement; i.e., two-week intervals. Adult 413 mosquitoes were transported to the NAMRU-6 Iquitos laboratory, sedated at 4°C, identified to 414 species and sex, counted by date and house. Up to 30 female Ae. aegypti per household per 415 collection were examined for blood meal status and scored as unfed, blood-fed (fully engorged, 416 half-engorged, or trace amounts), or gravid [31]. These female mosquitoes were then dissected 417 to determine their parity status (parous, nulliparous, or gravid) (SI Section 1.3.5.1). Standard 418 insecticide resistance assays were used to assess vector susceptibility to transfluthrin one-year

- 419 into the trial (**SI Section 1.3.5.2**).
- 420 421 SAFETY MONITORING

Adverse events (AEs) and serious adverse events (SAEs) were actively collected throughout the trial during surveillance follow-up and entomological surveys (**SI Section 1.3.6**). Reported AEs were investigated by study staff and appropriate care was recommended by a study physician within 24 hours. Safety reporting to the NAMRU-6 IRB was managed by UC Davis in accordance with the approved protocol. Quarterly reports summarizing reported AEs and SAEs were reviewed by the DSMB for trial safety assessment.

428

429 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

430 Details of our analytical approach are provided in the statistical analysis plan (SAP) and SI

- 431 Section 1.5. All analyses were conducted by RCR using R 3.6.1 (R Core Team)[32] and the
- Ime4[33] and survival[34] packages. No correction for multiple testing was performed for
 secondary endpoint analyses and, as such, in accordance with CONSORT guidelines, in those
 cases we do not present p-values.
- 435
- The choice of the investigators to select and report a one-sided p-value and corresponding one-
- 437 sided confidence interval is based on the underlying assumption associated with the intervention;
- 438 i.e., the spatial repellent will not increase risk/harm (disease) over the standard of care. The
- 439 statistical translation is that we are testing to see if a) the intervention is no better than the

standard of care or b) the intervention is better than the standard of care (superior). As this is a
one-sided test of superiority, we present one-sided test results. We also provide the null and
alternative hypotheses, test statistic, and its assumed distribution to provide readers information
to interpret the p-value and confidence interval.

444

The primary analysis was an intent-to-treat (ITT) assessment of ABV seroconversion for all qualifying participants per treatment assignment who were >2 years to <18 years of age. Due to the rolling nature of enrollment, we used a survival analysis with a proportional hazards model and exponential distribution assumption for the baseline hazard (i.e., constant baseline hazard through time) and a frailty component to account for correlation within clusters. If $h(t_{ij} | x_{ij})$ is the hazard rate of the j^{th} individual in the i^{th} cluster with covariate values x_{ij} then this individual's hazard rate of an arbovirus infection can be written as:

452 453

 $h(t_{ij} \mid x_{ij}) = h_0 (t_{ij}) \cdot \exp(\beta^T x_{ij} + W_i)$

where $W_i \sim N(0, \sigma_c^2)$ is the random effect of the *i*th cluster. Covariates included age, sex, and treatment status (SR or placebo). PE was estimated as $PE = (1 - \exp(\hat{\beta})) \times 100\%$, where $\hat{\beta}$ is the estimated regression coefficient for the intervention group and $\exp(\hat{\beta})$ is the estimated hazard ratio (HR) between SR and placebo. The null hypothesis of PE = 0% is equivalent to $\beta = 0$, which is tested by Wald's test $z = \beta/s$, where *s* is the estimated standard error of $\hat{\beta}$, at the 1-sided significance level of 5%.

460

A Poisson generalized linear regression was used to assess intervention impact on clinical
disease, with an offset for the number of participant-days each participant spent in each cluster.
No covariates were used and due to the small sample size, no random effects were incorporated.

Indoor adult female *Ae. aegypti* abundance, blood-fed rates, and parity were tested through difference-in-difference Poisson generalized linear mixed models. Collections conducted in 2016 were defined as 'baseline' and collections conducted in 2017 and 2018 were estimated as 'postbaseline'. Each analysis accounted for month of year and year as fixed effects and contained a random effect by cluster. Model formulation details are presented in **SI Sections 1.5.4-1.5.6**.

470

The primary analysis conducted differs from that in the original SAP (**SI SAP**). Procedures called for yearly blood draws from children. To increase the number of qualifying participants, we expanded the age range of the longitudinal cohort to all ages \geq 2yrs. The rolling enrollment resulted in substantial variation in time intervals between blood draws. Simple logistic regression, therefore, was inadequate. The decision to alter the primary analysis was discussed and agreed upon by the study statistician and the external DSMB statistician before outputs were unblinded to the DSMB statistician.

478 479

480 Acknowledgments and Funding Sources

481

482 We extend sincere appreciation to DSMB members: Dennis Shanks, Chris Drakeley, and Neal 483 Alexander for assurances on data integrity and safety assessments. We thank the World Health 484 Organization Vector Control Advisory Group (WHO VCAG) for their comments during project 485 assessments. We are grateful for the efforts of Marianne Kent, Program Coordinator at the 486 University of Notre Dame, for her administrative, and logistical support of the program, as well as 487 Brett Fox of the University of Notre Dame Center for Research Computing for assisting with 488 central database development for data verification. We thank Kristina Davis and Matthew Sisk of 489 the University of Notre Dame Center for Research Computing and Hesburgh Libraries. 490 respectively, for their assistance in graphic development. We acknowledge Audrey Lenhart of the 491 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in Atlanta, GA USA and J. Kevin Baird of the

Eijkman-Oxford Clinical Research Unit, Jakarta, Indonesia and Nuffield Department of Medicine,
 Centre for Tropical Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom for their role on the
 Scientific Advisory Committee.

We are grateful to SC Johnson for providing integral industry and product expertise including the independent funding of the development, manufacturing, delivery, and shipment of the spatial repellent and placebo products used in the study. SC Johnson provided expertise in ensuring intervention quality, storage, application and disposal assurances throughout the trial.

500

501 We thank the residents of Iquitos for their support and participation in this study and willingness to 502 allow this study to be conducted in their homes and community. We greatly appreciate support of 503 the Loreto Regional Health Department, including Drs. Hugo Rodriguez-Ferruci, Christian Carey, 504 Carlos Alvarez, and Lic. Wilma Casanova Rojas, who facilitated our work in Iquitos. We thank the 505 Naval Medical Research Unit-6 (NAMRU-6) Virology and Emerging Infections Department (VEID) 506 leadership who provided institutional support, IRB guidance, and support supervising field staff. 507 We appreciate the commentary and advice provided by the NAMRU-6 IRB and Research 508 Administration Program for the duration of this study. We thank the NAMRU-6 VEID field team 509 which provided daily support through the duration of the project and without whom the recruitment 510 of acute dengue cases would not have been possible. We thank Cecilia Gonzales, Gloria Talledo, 511 and Gabriela Vasquez de la Torre for their administrative support of the project.

512

Financial disclosure statement: This study was funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) to the University of Notre Dame (Grant# OPP1081737). Further support was provided by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), Military Infectious Disease Research Program (MIDRP, S0520_15_LI and S0572_17_LI), and the U.S. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIH/NIAID) award number P01 Al098670. SC Johnson used internal company financial resources for the development, manufacturing, delivery, and shipment of the intervention (SR and placebo) used in the study.

- 520
- 521 522

523 References

- Murray CJL, Barber RM, Foreman KJ, Ozgoren AA, Abd-Allah F, Abera SF, et al. Global,
 regional, and national disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) for 306 diseases and injuries and
 healthy life expectancy (HALE) for 188 countries, 1990–2013: quantifying the epidemiological
 transition. Lancet. 2015;386: 2145–2191.
- Stanaway JD, Shepard DS, Undurraga EA, Halasa YA, Coffeng LE, Brady OJ, et al. The
 global burden of dengue: an analysis from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. Lancet
 Infect Dis. 2016;16: 712–723.
- Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, et al. The global distribution and burden of dengue. Nature. 2013;496: 504–507.
- Bowman LR, Donegan S, McCall PJ. Is Dengue Vector Control Deficient in Effectiveness or
 Evidence?: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2016;10: e0004551.
- Horstick O, Runge-Ranzinger S, Nathan MB, Kroeger A. Dengue vector-control services: how do they work? A systematic literature review and country case studies. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg. 2010;104: 379–386.
- Achee NL, Gould F, Perkins TA, Reiner RC Jr, Morrison AC, Ritchie SA, et al. A critical
 assessment of vector control for dengue prevention. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015;9: e0003655.

- Parks W, Lloyd L. Planning social mobilization and communication for dengue fever
 prevention and control. Geneva: WHO; 2004.
- Esu E, Lenhart A, Smith L, Horstick O. Effectiveness of peridomestic space spraying with
 insecticide on dengue transmission; systematic review. Trop Med Int Health. 2010;15: 619–
 631.
- Morrison AC, Zielinski-Gutierrez E, Scott TW, Rosenberg R. Defining challenges and
 proposing solutions for control of the virus vector Aedes aegypti. PLoS Med. 2008;5: e68.
- Andersson N, Nava-Aguilera E, Arostegui J, Morales-Perez A, Suazo-Laguna H, Legorreta-Soberanis J, et al. Evidence based community mobilization for dengue prevention in Nicaragua and Mexico (Camino Verde, the Green Way): cluster randomized controlled trial. BMJ. 2015;351: h3267.
- Utarini A, Indriani C, Ahmad RA, Tantowijoyo W, Arguni E, Ansari MR, et al. Efficacy of
 Wolbachia-infected mosquito deployments for the control of dengue. N Engl J Med.
 2021;384: 2177–2186.
- Achee NL, Bangs MJ, Farlow R, Killeen GF, Lindsay S, Logan JG, et al. Spatial repellents:
 from discovery and development to evidence-based validation. Malar J. 2012;11: 164.
- 13. World Health Organization, WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme. Guidelines for efficacy
 testing of spatial repellents. Genève, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2013.
- 559 14. WHO | Vector Control Advisory Group. 2020 [cited 26 Nov 2020]. Available:
 560 https://www.who.int/vector-control/vcag/en
- 15. Hill N, Zhou H, Wang P, Guo X, Carneiro I, Moore SJ. A household randomized, controlled
 trial of the efficacy of 0.03% transfluthrin coils alone and in combination with long-lasting
 insecticidal nets on the incidence of Plasmodium falciparum and Plasmodium vivax malaria
 in Western Yunnan Province, China. Malaria Journal. 2014. p. 208. doi:10.1186/1475-287513-208
- Syafruddin D, Asih PBS, Rozi IE, Permana DH, Nur Hidayati AP, Syahrani L, et al. Efficacy
 of a Spatial Repellent for Control of Malaria in Indonesia: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled
 Trial. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2020. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.19-0554
- Morrison AC, Sihuincha M, Stancil JD, Zamora E, Astete H, Olson JG, et al. Aedes aegypti
 (Diptera: Culicidae) production from non-residential sites in the Amazonian city of Iquitos,
 Peru. Ann Trop Med Parasitol. 2006;100 Suppl 1: S73–S86.
- 572 18. Palomino-Salcedo M. [Estado de susceptibilidad de la población natural de Aedes aegypti a
 573 los insecticidas en Punchana-Iquitos, Región Loreto (Novimbre 2014). Instituto Nacional de
 574 Salud, Peru; 2014.
- Norris E, Coats J. Current and future repellent technologies: The potential of spatial
 repellents and their place in mosquito-borne disease control. Int J Environ Res Public Health.
 2017;14: 124.
- 578 20. Syafruddin D, Bangs MJ, Sidik D, Elyazar I, Asih PBS, Chan K, et al. Impact of a spatial repellent on malaria incidence in two villages in Sumba, Indonesia. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2014;91: 1079–1087.

- Liverani M, Charlwood JD, Lawford H, Yeung S. Field assessment of a novel spatial repellent
 for malaria control: a feasibility and acceptability study in Mondulkiri, Cambodia. Malar J.
 2017;16: 412.
- Masalu JP, Finda M, Okumu FO, Minja EG, Mmbando AS, Sikulu-Lord MT, et al. Efficacy
 and user acceptability of transfluthrin-treated sisal and hessian decorations for protecting
 against mosquito bites in outdoor bars. Parasit Vectors. 2017;10: 197.
- Paz-Soldan VA, Plasai V, Morrison AC, Rios-Lopez EJ, Guedez-Gonzales S, Grieco JP, et
 al. Initial assessment of the acceptability of a Push-Pull Aedes aegypti control strategy in
 Iquitos, Peru and Kanchanaburi, Thailand. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2011;84: 208–217.
- 590 24. Jumbam DT, Stevenson JC, Matoba J, Grieco JP, Ahern LN, Hamainza B, et al. Knowledge,
 591 attitudes and practices assessment of malaria interventions in rural Zambia. BMC Public
 592 Health. 2020;20: 216.
- 593 25. World Health Organization. The evaluation process for vector control products. World Health
 594 Organization; 2017. Report No.: WHO/HTM/GMP/2017.13. Available:
 595 https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/255644
- 596 26. [cited 2 Dec 2020]. Available: https://www.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2017/2017-phe-zika 597 situation-report-per.pdf
- Anders KL, Cutcher Z, Kleinschmidt I, Donnelly CA, Ferguson NM, Indriani C, et al. Cluster Randomized Test-Negative Design Trials: A Novel and Efficient Method to Assess the
 Efficacy of Community-Level Dengue Interventions. Am J Epidemiol. 2018;187: 2021–2028.
- 601 28. Overview of intervention classes and prototype/products under Vector Control Advisory
 602 Group (VCAG) review for assessment of public health value 1. [cited 10 Mar 2022].
 603 Available: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/274451/WHO-CDS-VCAG604 2018.03-eng.pdf
- Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Bisanzio D, Stoddard ST, Paz-Soldan V, Morrison AC, Elder JP, et
 al. Using GPS technology to quantify human mobility, dynamic contacts and infectious
 disease dynamics in a resource-poor urban environment. PLoS One. 2013;8: e58802.
- 30. Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Galvin WA, Kelly R, Kitron U. A new, cost-effective, battery-powered
 aspirator for adult mosquito collections. J Med Entomol. 2009;46: 1256–1259.
- Gunning CE, Okamoto K, Astete H, Vasquez GM, Erhardt E, Del Aguila C, et al. Efficacy of
 Aedes aegypti control by indoor Ultra Low Volume (ULV) insecticide spraying in Iquitos,
 Peru. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2018;12: e0006378.
- 82. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
 Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria; 2019. Available: http://www.R-project.org/.
- Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using Ime4.
 arXiv [stat.CO]. 2014. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.5823
- Therneau TM. A Package for Survival Analysis in S. version 2.38. Comprehensive R Archive
 Network (CRAN); 28 Sep 2015 [cited 19 Jan 2021]. Available: http://cran.r project.org/package=survival



Figure 1. Location of 26 study clusters in Iquitos and Punchana Districts, Loreto Department, Iquitos, Peru. Each cluster consisted of ca. 140 households with an average distance of 300m between clusters.



Figure 2. Study timeline. Top panel: Human blood-sampling, disease surveillance, and entomological monitoring in relation to deployment of the spatial repellent intervention. Bottom panel: Intervention roll-out between August-December 2016 by cluster. Horizontal numbers correspond to cluster numbers shown in Figure 1.



Figure 3. Allocation and follow-up of the longitudinal cohort population during three blood collection periods (Baseline [B], First [F] and Second/Final [S]). The majority (62%) of participants provided samples at each collection period, whereas some only participated during year 1 (B-F) or year 2 (F-S). Participants with a single sample were lost to follow-up and four individuals moved or had two houses located in the spatial repellent and placebo clusters are shown as removed at the baseline period for clarity.



Figure 4. Kaplan-Meier curves of arbovirus infection for 13 spatial repellent (SR) and 13 placebo clusters in qualifying participants measured by seroconversion (primary endpoint) by cluster. Panel A, Hazard rates by individual cluster. Panel B, Aggregated hazard rate.



Figure 5. Mean densities of adult female *Aedes aegypti* collected per household survey in 13 spatial repellent (SR) and 13 placebo clusters by study month. Shaded areas represent the 95% Confidence Interval around the mean.

Table 1. Summary of baseline characteristics, for qualifying participants of the intent-to-treat (ITT) longitudinal cohort population in spatial repellent (SR) and placebo arms. Qualifying participants were defined as individuals in a participating house that were seronegative or had a monotypic DENV antibody response when they entered the trial.

•							
Individual-Level							
Variable	SR (n=898)	Placebo (n=952)					
Age in years (mean <u>+</u> sd) (min, max)	10·88 <u>+</u> 4·62 (2, 47)	10·19 <u>+</u> 4·39 (2, 22)					
Sex (% male)	51.6%	55.0%					
Duration in years between samples (mean <u>+</u> sd) (min, max)	1·15 <u>+</u> 0·42 (0·02 ,2·29)	1.16 <u>+</u> 0.43 (0.01, 2.35)					
No. qualifying participant observations	1,090	1,237					
No. of arbovirus seroconversions	196	294					
Cluster-Level							
Variable	SR (n=13)	Placebo (n=13)					
Cluster population (mean <u>+</u> sd) (min, max)	58·2 <u>+</u> 30·4 (21,124)	73·5 <u>+</u> 35·3 (12,132)					
Baseline susceptibility (mean <u>+</u> sd) (min, max)	81·0% <u>+</u> 12·8% (54·7%,98·1%)	84·9% <u>+</u> 6·3% (73·3%,92·5%)					

Table 2. Protective efficacy (PE) estimates from intent to treat (ITT) analyses for the spatial repellent intervention against *Aedes*-borne virus infection in qualifying participants measured by seroconversion (primary endpoint), including covariate effects.

ITT analysis	Hazard rate ratio (95% Cl)	PE (%) (95% Cl)	One-sided p-value	Covariate	Odds ratio (95% Cl)	Two-sided p-value
Survival analysis	0·659 (–∞,0·931)	34·1 (6·9,∞)	0.024			
			Age	1·046 (1·029-1·063)	6·8 x 10 ⁻⁶	
				Male	0·956 (0·821-1·112)	0.62
ITT analysis	Odds ratio (95% Cl)	PE (%) (95% Cl)	One-sided p-value	Covariate	Odds ratio (95% Cl)	Two-sided p-value
Odds reduction	0·547 (-∞,0·883)	45·3 (11·7,∞)	0.019			
			Age	1·071 (1·042-1·100)	6·9 x 10 ⁻⁷	
			Male	0·950 (0·767-1·177)	0.64	
Odds reduction on including 9–15- month sampling intervals	0·577 (–∞,0·879)	42·3 (12·1,∞)	0.016			
				Age	1·065 (1·028-1·103)	0.0005
				Male	0·970 (0·767-1·299)	0.779

Table 3. Rate reduction summary of indoor adult female *Aedes aegypti* abundance, blood-fed female abundance, and parity rates (secondary endpoints) for primary (ITT) and secondary analyses (PP). No correction for multiple testing was performed for secondary endpoint analyses and, as such, in accordance with CONSORT guidelines p-values are not presented.

Indicator	Statistics	2016 Baseline ¹		Cluster-specific Baseline ²	
		ITT	PP	ITT	PP
Indoor adult female Aedes aegypti	Rate ratio (95% one-sided CI)	0.714 (–∞,0.759)	0·737 (–∞,0·784)	0.599 (-∞,0.633)	0·607 (–∞,0·641)
abundance	Rate reduction (%) (95% one-sided CI)	28·6 (24·1,∞)	26⋅3 (16⋅2,∞)	40·1 (36·7,∞)	39.3 (35.9,∞)
Blood-fed female Aedes aegypti abundance	Rate ratio (95% one-sided CI)	0.876 (-∞,0.958)	0·876 (–∞,0·958)	0.908 (-∞,0.985)	0·929 (–∞,1·06)
	Rate reduction (%) (95% one-sided CI)	12·4 (4·2,∞)	12·4 (4·2,∞)	9·20 (1·49,∞)	7·10 (-6,∞)
Aedes aegypti parity rate	Rate ratio (95% one-sided CI)	0.922 (–∞,1.057)	0·921 (–∞,1·056)	0.928 (–∞,1.058)	0·909 (–∞,0·986)
	Rate reduction (%) (95% one-sided CI)	7·75 (-5·70,∞)	7·87 (-5·60,∞)	7·24 (-5·80,∞)	9·10 (-1·2,∞)

¹ Intent to treat (ITT, primary analysis) and per protocol (PP, secondary analysis) mixed effects difference-in-difference (DID) Poisson regression specifying measurements made throughout 2016 as 'baseline', with post-2016 measurements as 'post-baseline.' PP analysis only considering houses with SR application rates meeting manufactures specifications >75% of the days between sequential blood sampling (designated PP-1).

² ITT and PP mixed effects DID Poisson regression specifying measurements made in 2016 up to the first date of intervention deployed in each cluster as 'baseline' with all measurements following that date as 'post-baseline' for that cluster, even for houses that did not enroll until 2017 or later. PP analysis only considering houses with SR application rates meeting manufactures specifications \geq 75% of the days between sequential blood sampling (designated PP-1).