

1 **Bionomics of *Aedes aegypti* during the 2016-2017 dengue outbreaks in** 2 **Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso**

3
4 Athanase Badolo^{1#}, Aboubacar Sombié¹, Félix Yaméogo^{§1}, Dimitri W. Wangrawa^{§1,2}, Aboubakar
5 Sanon¹, Patricia M. Pignatelli³, Antoine Sanon¹, Mafalda Viana⁴, Hirotaka Kanuka^{5,6}, David
6 Weetman^{*3}, Philip J. McCall^{*3}

7
8 ¹Laboratoire d'Entomologie Fondamentale et Appliquée, Université Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso

9 ²Université Norbert Zongo, Koudougou, Burkina Faso

10 ³Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK

11 ⁴Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine, University of Glasgow

12 ⁵Department of Tropical Medicine, The Jikei University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

13 ⁶Center for Medical Entomology, The Jikei University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

14
15
16
17 [#]Corresponding author

18 E-mail: a.badolo@gmail.com

19
20 ^{*}These authors contributed equally

21 [§]These authors contributed equally

22 **Abstract**

23
24 *Background* Dengue's emergence in West Africa was typified by the Burkina Faso outbreaks in
25 2016 and 2017, the nation's largest to date. In both years, we undertook three-month surveys of
26 *Aedes* populations in or near the capital city Ouagadougou, where the outbreak was centered.

27 *Methodology* In urban, peri-urban and rural localities we collected indoor and outdoor resting
28 mosquito adults, characterized larval habitats and containers producing pupae and reared immature
29 stages to adulthood in the laboratory for identification. All mosquito adults were identified
30 morphologically. Host species from which bloodmeals were taken were identified by PCR
31 Generalized mixed models were used to investigate relationships between adult or larval densities
32 and multiple explanatory variables.

33 *Results* From samples in 1,791 houses, *Ae. aegypti* was the most abundant mosquito in the two
34 urban localities where it occurred in 46% of containers sampled and comprised over 85% of
35 collections. Results indicated a highly exophilic and anthropophilic (>90% bloodmeals of human
36 origin) vector population, but with a relatively high proportion of bloodfed females caught inside
37 houses. Habitats producing most pupae were waste tires (37% of total pupae), animal troughs (44%)
38 and large water barrels (30%).

39 While *Stegomyia* indices were not reliable indicators of adult mosquito abundance, shared
40 influences on adult and immature stage densities included rainfall and container water level,
41 collection month and container type/ purpose. Spatial analysis showed autocorrelation of densities,
42 with partial overlap in adult and immature stage hotspots.

43 *Conclusion* Results provide an evidence base for the selection of appropriate vector control
44 methods to minimize the risk, frequency and magnitude of future outbreaks in Ouagadougou. An
45 integrated strategy combining community-driven practices, waste disposal and insecticide-based
46 interventions is indicated. The prospects of developing a regional approach to arbovirus control in
47 west Africa or across Africa was discussed

49 **Author Summary**

50 *Aedes aegypti* is the most efficient vector of human diseases including yellow fever, dengue
51 chikungunya and Zika. West Africa is an emerging hotspot for dengue, as illustrated by Burkina
52 Faso's outbreaks in 2016 and 2017. Coincidentally, this study investigated the bionomics and
53 behavior of *Ae. aegypti* in urban, peri-urban and rural localities of Ouagadougou, from August to
54 October in each year. The results from over 1700 homes showed that *Ae. aegypti* preferentially fed
55 on humans and rested primarily outdoors. The most common pupal productive habitats were
56 discarded vehicle tires, animal water troughs and large water barrels. Infestation rates were higher
57 in the urban and peri-urban localities. A range of community-based control measures are suitable
58 for consideration in a vector control program to prevent outbreaks. Further work is required but the
59 study provides the most complete contemporary description of an *Ae. aegypti* population in West
60 Africa and provides sufficient evidence to develop programs for prevention and control of
61 outbreaks. The potential of a regional based vector control program for west Africa is discussed
62 briefly.

63

64

65 **Background**

66 *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes thrive in urban environments throughout the tropics and sub-tropics,
67 where they are the primary human vectors of dengue, Zika, chikungunya and urban yellow fever
68 arboviruses. Dengue is the most widespread and an estimated annual toll of 400 million infections,
69 and a threat to almost half of the human population at risk globally [1,2]. Driven by climate change,
70 further increases are predicted [3] and the search for effective and sustainable methods to control
71 peridomestic *Aedes* populations has become a primary global health challenge.

72 The worldwide expansion in *Aedes aegypti* populations in the late twentieth century followed a
73 period when the human population grew at an unprecedented rate, mainly in cities, environments
74 where this vector also could flourish [4,5]. Increases in global trade and human travel, particularly
75 access to affordable and rapid intercontinental air travel, transferred multiple strains of arboviruses
76 far beyond their original ranges into immunologically naïve populations [6], while climate change
77 increased outbreak risk in new areas out the tropics [7,8]. With almost 500 million people already
78 living in its cities and a population doubling-rate of 25 years, sub-Saharan Africa has the fastest
79 urbanization growth rate worldwide [9,10]. In many countries, sylvatic cycles of yellow fever
80 frequently initiate outbreaks [11–16] that threaten urban areas where human to human transmission
81 by *Ae. aegypti* would result in frequent outbreaks, were it not for an effective vaccine [17,18].
82 There have been significant outbreaks of chikungunya in countries of East, South and North Africa
83 [19–22] and increasingly, reports of Zika [23,24]. Indeed, better diagnostic methods are revealing
84 that chikungunya infections, though causing little mortality, are responsible for greater morbidity
85 and a higher-disease burden than previously suspected [6]. Dengue presents the greatest arboviral
86 threat to Africa, with West Africa identified as a potential dengue transmission hotspot, based on its
87 rapid rate of unplanned urbanization, widespread occurrence of *Aedes* vectors, history of arbovirus
88 transmission and poor clinical knowledge of flavivirus infections [25].

89 The vast majority of recent knowledge of *Aedes aegypti* was generated by studies in Asia and Latin
90 America [26–29], and may not be transferred reliably to African *Ae. aegypti* populations [30]. The

91 need for continent-specific knowledge is reinforced by growing evidence of the genetic and
92 phenotypic diversity of *Ae. aegypti* within Africa and differences in the epidemiology of *Aedes*-
93 borne diseases globally [4,31,32].

94 Burkina Faso experienced dengue outbreaks in 2016, resulting in 2,600 cases and 21 deaths, and in
95 2017, resulting in 14,455 cases and 29 deaths [33,34]. The outbreak continued into 2018, with a
96 further 4,386 cases and 25 deaths. Though all four dengue virus serotypes had been recorded
97 previously in Burkina Faso [35], only types I, II and III were reported in the recent outbreak, of
98 which type II was the most prevalent [36].

99 In August 2016, we began a study on the bionomics of *Ae. aegypti* in Ouagadougou, the capital city
100 of Burkina Faso, with the objective of collecting baseline data for dengue control. Though not
101 planned that way, the study coincided with the dengue outbreaks in 2016 and 2017 and sampling
102 was carried out in locations where and while transmission was occurring. Here we report the results
103 of wet season investigations into the behavioral preferences and spatial distribution of *Ae. aegypti*
104 breeding and adult resting sites across different levels of urbanization, and use this evidence base to
105 develop an appropriate, effective and sustainable vector control strategy for Ouagadougou, suitable
106 for use as a regional template within a larger integrated vector management program.

107

108 **Materials and Methods**

109 *Study Area.*

110 Burkina Faso occupies three climatic zones: the Sahelian in the north, the central Soudano-Sahelian
111 zone and Soudanian in the south. The capital city Ouagadougou lies in the Soudano-Sahelian zone,
112 within the 500 mm isohyet where 350-750 mm rain falls between June and October. Three distinct
113 localities in or near the city were selected on the basis of house design and size, house density, and
114 land use, as representatives of urban, peri-urban and rural settings.

115 1200 Logements: (1200 LG) (12°22'N; 1°29'W) is an urban setting of 1.2 km² in central

116 Ouagadougou, less than 1 km from the international airport. Roads are paved and the area is
117 connected to centralized water, waste and electricity systems. Houses are relatively modern single-
118 or two-storey and typically comprise one living room and 2-3 bedrooms, often with air
119 conditioning. Vegetation, often within gardens, is common on both private and common land.

120 Tabtenga: (12°22'N; 1°27'W) is a 10 km² peri-urban setting located within Ouagadougou,
121 approximately 5 km east of 1200 LG. Roads are unpaved, there are no electricity or waste
122 management systems and the majority of households obtain water at communal pumps. Typical
123 households are single-storey structures with 1-4 rooms, within walled compounds. Vegetation is
124 sparse.

125 Goundry: (12°30'N, 1°20'W) is a small rural farming community village situated 30 km north-east
126 of Ouagadougou, with unpaved roads, low housing density, and is surrounded by fields and trees.
127 There is a dam in the center of the villages enabling people to practice gardening during the dry
128 season. Goundry has no electricity or waste management systems and households obtain water at
129 communal pumps. Livestock, mainly cattle and sheep, and dogs are common.

130 *Study Design*

131 Longitudinal surveys were carried out during the wet season from August to October in both 2016
132 and 2017. Prior to each survey, all prospective houses were visited to inform the population of the
133 proposed project, and the proposed sampling procedures. Each day, the first house was selected at
134 random and the second and subsequent houses chosen where the family were present and agreed to
135 participate, avoiding the houses nearest to the previous one. An average of ten houses were visited
136 per day. Houses were sampled at 06:00-09:00 or 16:00-19:00 by two teams of four persons, each
137 working as follows: one person collected informed consent and household data (S1Table), a second
138 person searched for adult mosquitoes indoors and outdoors; two people recorded breeding habitat
139 characteristics and collected immature stages of mosquitoes. Areas of public or communal land
140 adjacent to sampled houses were mapped and inspected for containers, from which mosquito

141 immature stages were processed as described below.

142 ***Breeding site characterization and collection of immature mosquitoes***

143 At each property, the team worked indoors and outdoors inspecting every container capable of
144 holding sufficient water for immature mosquitoes, recording its dimensions, water volume, water
145 level, material (natural, wood, metal, cement, etc.) and utility (whether the container was in use
146 (yes) or discarded waste (no)). Where possible, water from each container was poured into a
147 graduated beak and any immature mosquitoes collected using a sieve. The water volume of heavy
148 or immovable containers, including potable water, was measured by removal with buckets, again
149 using a sieve to collect all mosquitoes, before being returning to the container. All larvae and pupae
150 were transferred alive to containers labelled by house number and breeding site location, for
151 subsequent identification.

152 Breeding habitats were categorized using the WHO operational guide [28] with minor adaptations
153 to accommodate certain features observed in Ouagadougou as follows:

- 154 - Large containers - drums and barrels; water volume > 50 L
- 155 - Medium containers - buckets, large pots and small drums; 10-49 L
- 156 - Small containers - all container types of any material < 10 L,
- 157 - Tires - stored or discarded vehicle tires
- 158 - Drinking troughs - water for livestock, of any material
- 159 - Other – ground water puddle, tree holes and flower pots

160 *Stegomyia* indices were calculated as defined by Focks[37]:

- 161 - House index (HI): defined as the percentage of houses infested with *Aedes aegypti* larvae
162 and/or pupae in a locality
- 163 - Container index (CI): the percentage of water-holding containers positive for immature
164 stages of *Aedes aegypti*

165 - Breteau index: the number of containers positive for *Aedes aegypti*/ 100 houses inspected

166 ***Pupal indices***

167 To identify the most productive dengue vector breeding sites, and to determine whether certain
168 habitats that were relatively more productive for pupae might be identified for future targeting, we
169 recorded pupae separately from larvae. Pupal mortality is typically low meaning that the number of
170 pupae is highly correlated with the number of adults [38]. To identify the most productive *Ae.*
171 *aegypti* immature stage habitats, the percentage contribution of each container type to the total
172 count of pupae is calculated as the total number of pupae per container type, divided by the total
173 number of pupae in all containers throughout the study area [28].

174 ***Adult mosquito collection***

175 Using a Prokopack aspirator [39], all adult mosquitoes were collected from each house, animal
176 shelter and external kitchen. Indoors, wall surfaces, closet or cupboard interiors and other known
177 resting places [40], were inspected using flashlights, for a total of 10 minutes per household [41].
178 Outdoors, all walls, eaves, vegetation (flowers) and shaded areas within or behind containers, stored
179 materials, and car tires within the walled area marking the perimeter of each household were then
180 inspected for an additional 10 minutes.

181 ***Processing and identification of collected mosquitoes***

182 All immature mosquito stages were sorted based on morphology then reared in cups with ground
183 Tetramin as food until adult emergence. Pupae were transferred to fresh cups and emerging adults
184 killed and preserved by freezing for identification.

185 Mosquitoes were identified by microscopy using morphological keys. *Aedes aegypti* [42–44] was
186 identified as described by Moore et al. [45] and all other culicine species were identified using
187 Edwards (1941). *Anopheles* species identification followed the keys of Gillies & Coetzee [47] and
188 Diagne et al. [48]. The SINE method [49] was used to identify *Anopheles gambiae* complex
189 mosquitoes to species level.

190 ***Identification of bloodmeal origin***

191 DNA was extracted from abdomens of bloodfed females using Qiagen DNEasy kits. Extracted
192 DNA served as template for amplification of the cytochrome b gene using human, cow, pig, dog,
193 goat and sheep species-specific primers in a cocktail PCR [50]. Each reaction contained 15.8 ul of
194 water, 2.5ul of 10x DreamTaq buffer, 0.5 ul 10mM of each dNTP, 0.5ul of 50 µM of each primer;
195 0.2 of 5U/ul DreamTaq and 3 ul of DNA for a total volume of 25ul. The PCRs were run with the
196 program 95°C for 5 min, then 50 cycles of 95°C for 60 s, 56°C for 60 s, 72°C for 60 s, followed by a
197 final extension step of 72°C for 7 min. Products were run on a 2% TAE-agarose gel, with band size
198 interpretation as follows: 334 bp (human), 453 bp (pig), 132 bp (goat or sheep), 680 bp (dog), 561
199 bp (cow). PCR products of positive bloodmeals that gave unclear gel banding-patterns were
200 sequenced using universal vertebrate primers [50], aligned using codon code aligner v 4.7
201 (Codoncode corp., USA) and their species of origin identified using NCBI BLAST searches.

202 ***Ethical approvals***

203 The study protocol received ethical approval from the National Ethical Committee (Comité
204 National d’Ethique pour la Recherche en Santé), Ministry of Health, Burkina Faso (Deliberation
205 No. 2016-6-073; 6th June 2016) and from the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine Research
206 Ethics Committee for “Dengue in Burkina Faso: establishing a vector biology evidence base for risk
207 assessment and vector control strategies for an emerging disease“ (Research Protocol 16-30; 15th
208 July 2016).

209 ***Meteorological data***

210 Daily records of minimal, maximal, mean temperatures, relative humidity and daily rainfall were
211 obtained from the National Meteorological Agency records from Ouagadougou station for 2016 and
212 2017. Intermediate calculations were made for the cumulative rainfall for previous 4 days, one
213 week, 12 days or 14 days to be included in the models.

214 ***Statistical analyses***

215 To investigate factors associated with *Aedes sp.* abundance we developed four Generalised Linear
216 Mixed Models (GLMMs) with a negative binomial link function using the R package “glmmTMB”.
217 The first (adult model) and second (bloodfed model) were fitted to the number of adults and
218 bloodfed *Aedes* collected in each house, respectively, as a function of the abiotic and biotic
219 covariates: the year of collection, locality (1200 LG, Tabtenga, Goundry), house type (mixed,
220 modern or traditional), location (indoors/outdoors), day of collection, month of collection, the
221 number of larvae collected in breeding sites located in that house, and also climate factors including
222 temperature and cumulative rainfall. The interaction terms ‘collection location’ and locality, and
223 locality and year were also included, and to account for variation arising from the sampling design
224 we included date of collection and house identifier as random effects. The third (larval model) and
225 fourth (pupal model) models were fitted to the number of larvae and pupae per container,
226 respectively, as a function of the abiotic and biotic covariates: locality, container type, water level,
227 water volume, container material, the ‘location’ (i.e. indoors/outdoors) of the containers utility,
228 rainfall and temperature, number of adults collected in the house. As in the adult mosquito model,
229 the variables location and locality, and year and locality were also included as interaction terms, and
230 date of collection and house identifier were added as random effects.

231 From these full models we selected the minimal model using a stepwise backward model selection
232 procedure based on the lowest AIC values by removing factors with highest p-value in the model. If
233 removing a variable resulted in a change of the AIC value of more than 2 and the resultant model
234 was still parsimonious. e.g. following residuals diagnostics in DHARMA [51], the simplified model
235 was kept. This procedure was repeated until removing variables no longer improved the model.

236 To ensure the models described above were appropriate, we also explored the use of alternative
237 families such as poisson and quasipoisson, but DHARMA residuals diagnostics indicated that these
238 failed to capture the dispersion in data. We tested for spatial autocorrelation both in the data and
239 residuals of the models using the Moran’s I test [52] and found no significant spatial autocorrelation
240 (for a p-value of 0.05), hence inclusion of a spatial term was not required. Finally, we estimated the

241 correlation among our potential covariates, if two variables were >50% correlated, one of them was
242 excluded from the final full model. These included temperature and relative humidity, immatures
243 total number and larvae number, number of residents and number of children. Since larvae and
244 immatures were correlated (53%), for the adult model we used the covariate ‘immatures’ (sum of
245 larvae and pupae).

246 To estimate the overlap between the spatial distributions of adult and immature stages, we used the
247 “nicheOverlap” function in the R package ‘dismo’ [53], which estimates an index of similarity
248 between rasterized density distributions based on [54] , and calculated the Pearson correlation
249 coefficient between these two distributions using the ‘layerStats’ function in the package ‘raster’
250 [55].

251 To analyse whether the location of blood-feeding (indoor vs outdoors) was in line with collection
252 densities, the expected numbers of indoor blood fed females were predicted from the total bloodfed
253 collections in each year and locality multiplied by the relative indoor density. A chi-square
254 goodness of fit test was used to determine whether observed values deviated from predictions.

255 Other comparisons between proportions used chi-square contingency table tests or Fisher exact tests
256 (depending on the expected values). *Stegomyia* index results were compared among localities using
257 non-overlapping confidence intervals as indicative of a significant difference.

258

259 **Results**

260 *Characteristics of sampled houses*

261 A total of 1,163 houses were sampled in 2016 and 631 in 2017, plus an additional 24 public spaces
262 in 2017 (S1Table), including among others, places of worship, schools, market stalls and stores. All
263 houses in 1200 LG (urban) were cement block buildings of modern designs, whereas the houses in
264 Tabtenga (peri-urban) and Goundry (rural) were a mix of traditional adobe houses and modern
265 houses. Average occupancy rates in each locality in 2016 were 5.3, 5.0 and 2.9 residents per house,

266 and insecticide-treated nets (ITNs) were seen in 75.9%, 91.5% and 75.9% of houses, with an
267 average of 0.44, 0.43 and 0.43 ITNs per person, respectively. In 2017, the average occupancy rates
268 in each locality were 5.2, 6.2 and 3.3, and ITNs were seen in 60.6%, 87.8% and 88.7% respectively,
269 with an average 0.36 ITNs per person in each localities.

270 ***Adult mosquito species abundance***

271 A total of 47,255 adult mosquitoes were collected during both years in all localities by indoor and
272 outdoor resting catches (Table 1). *Aedes aegypti* abundance varied between the sampling localities
273 in both years (2016: $\chi^2_2=187.1$; $P<<0.001$; 2017: $\chi^2_2=165.2$; $P<<0.001$). Adult *Ae. aegypti* were
274 more abundant in 1200 LG and Tabtenga, where they comprised between 9.3 and 12.8% of the total
275 catch, at house infestation rates of between 63.1 and 77.2%. Collections in Goundry were
276 consistently lower than in the urban and peri-urban sites, comprising less than 5% of the total
277 number of mosquitoes caught, with house infestation rates of less than 20.8%. Low numbers of
278 other *Aedes* species were collected, mainly in Goundry, and included *Aedes vittatus*, *Aedes*
279 *hirsutus*, and *Aedes metallicus* (Table 1).

280 Catches of other mosquitoes were dominated by *Culex quinquefasciatus* and *Anopheles gambiae s.l.*
281 (Table 1). *Culex quinquefasciatus* was by far the most abundant mosquito in the two urbanised
282 sites, 1200 LG and Tabtenga, where it comprised approximately 80% of the total collections. In
283 rural Goundry, numbers of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* were significantly lower, comprising less than 25%
284 of catches ($\chi^2_1=191.9$, $P<<0.001$). In contrast, the proportions of *An. gambiae s.l.* in catches at
285 Goundry were over ten times greater than at the urban and peri-urban localities (56% vs. 4%;
286 $\chi^2_1=11.34$, $P<<0.001$). Molecular identification of *Anopheles gambiae* complex mosquitoes
287 revealed significant variation in species composition too ($\chi^2_4=127$, $P<<0.001$) with the highest
288 proportions of *An. coluzzii* seen at Goundry, whereas *An. arabiensis* was the dominant species in
289 Tabtenga and 1200 LG (Table 1). Other *Anopheles* species (*Anopheles rufipes*, *Anopheles funestus*
290 and *Anopheles ziemani*) and the predatory culicine *Lutzia tigripes* were recorded much more
291 frequently in Goundry 1.2% vs 0.1%; Table 1).

292 **Table 1.** Species, number and proportion of adult mosquitoes collected indoors and outdoors in three localities of Ouagadougou in 2016 and 2017.
 293 Proportions were calculated only for the most common vector species *Aedes aegypti*, *Anopheles gambiae*, *Culex quinquefasciatus*.
 294 ¹ Other *Aedes* were *Ae vittatus*, *Ae hirsutus* and *Ae metallicus*; *Anopheles*² were *An. rufipes*, *An. funestus* and *An. ziemanii*.
 295

Species	1200LG (Urban)		Tabtenga (Peri-urban)		Goundry (Rural)		296
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017	297
<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	1811 (11.11%)	782 (12.56%)	976 (9.33%)	963 (12.80%)	137 (3.75%)	143 (4.56%)	
Other <i>Aedes</i> ¹	17	1	8	3	35	46	298
<i>Anopheles gambiae s.l.</i>	585 (3.59%)	143 (2.30%)	601 (5.74%)	237 (3.15%)	2,107 (57.72%)	1,659 (52.87%)	
<i>Anopheles arabiensis</i>	100 (95.24%)		102 (92.73%)		37 (37.37%)		
<i>Anopheles coluzzii</i>	3 (2.86%)		3 (2.73%)		53 (53.54%)		
<i>Anopheles gambiae</i>	2 (1.90%)		5 (4.55%)		9 (9.09%)		
Other <i>Anopheles</i> ²	3	1	6	2	66	132	
<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i>	13,877 (85.13%)	4,244 (68.14%)	8,864 (84.71%)	5,834 (77.55%)	1,128 (30.90%)	507 (16.16%)	
Other <i>Culex</i>	8	1047	6	477	140	574	
<i>Lutzia tigripes</i>	0	8	0	7	36	30	
<i>Mansonia sp.</i>	0	2	1	0	0	1	
Total collected	16,301	6,228	10,462	7,523	3,649	3,092	

299 ***Resting location and diurnal activity of adult Aedes aegypti***

300 Significantly more adult female *Ae. aegypti* were collected resting outdoors than indoors in all
301 localities in each year (S2Table), with a remarkably consistent proportion outdoors each year
302 (mean=0.73 in both 2016 and 2017), equivalent to an outdoor: indoor ratio of 2.7-fold (binomial
303 test $P < 0.001$). As can be seen in Figure 1 differences in relative proportions caught indoor and
304 outdoor varied among localities ($\chi^2_2=149, <0.001$), with a consistently lower, but still strongly
305 exophilic-biased, ratio in Tabtenga.

306

307 **Figure 1. Indoor and outdoor resting behavior of adult female *Ae. aegypti* in domestic housing**
308 **in Ouagadougou.** Geometric means and 95% confidence limits of numbers of *Ae. aegypti* adults
309 collected indoors and outdoors per house, in the three localities in 2016 and 2017.

310

311 However, the proportion of bloodfed females caught outdoor was only slightly greater than those
312 indoor (ratio = 1.05), which represents approximately twice the expected number predicted from
313 the total indoor: outdoor catch ratio (Table 2). This suggests that a preference for exophily may not
314 be sustained through the entire gonotrophic cycle.

315 Trends in morning vs. afternoon collections of *Ae. aegypti* were inconsistent across years (S3Table).

316 In 2016, there appeared to be a bias toward morning collections (59.6%; binomial test, $P < 0.001$),

317 but in 2017 morning and afternoon collections were very similar (50.3%; binomial test, $P = 0.83$).

318 Similarly, strong variation between localities in morning:afternoon collections was evident in 2016,

319 with relatively morning biased collections in the urban and peri-urban sites but afternoon-biased in

320 Goundry ($\chi^2_2=497, P < 0.001$), but was barely-evident in 2017 ($\chi^2_2=6.1, P = 0.047$).

321 **Table 2: Numbers of bloodfed *Aedes aegypti* and density/house in indoor and outdoor resting §collections in domestic housing in**
 322 **Ouagadougou.** The expected number of bloodfed mosquitoes indoors was calculated from the proportion caught indoors and compared to observed
 323 numbers bloodfed using a chi-square goodness of fit test.
 324

325

Year	Locality	Observed blood fed				Observed density				Proportion caught	Expected bloodfed	326
		Indoor	Outdoor	total	% indoor	Indoor	Outdoor	total	% indoor	Indoor	Indoor	327
2016	1200LG	118	186	304	0.39	0.51	1.79	2.30	0.22	0.22	67.41	37.928
	Tabtenga	110	92	202	0.54	0.48	0.83	1.31	0.37	0.37	74.02	17.50
	Goundry	5	13	18	0.28	0.04	0.16	0.20	0.20	0.20	3.60	0.54
2017	1200LG	42	59	101	0.42	0.37	1.86	2.23	0.17	0.17	16.76	38.02
	Tabtenga	111	55	166	0.67	0.67	0.89	1.56	0.43	0.43	71.29	22.11
	Rural	3	4	7	0.43	0.05	0.28	0.33	0.15	0.15	1.06	3.55
											total	119.69
											df	5
											P	<<0.001

329 ***Host preference of adult Aedes aegypti***

330 In total, 158/180 (88%) (S4Table) of *Ae. aegypti* mosquito blood meal samples that amplified
331 successfully by PCR were of human origin, with a higher proportion in 2016 (92%) than in 2017
332 (76%) ($\chi^2_1=7.9$, $P=0.005$). None of the relatively few bloodfed mosquitoes from Goundry amplified
333 successfully in 2017, but there was no significant difference in bloodfeeding rates between sites in
334 2016 ($\chi^2_2=0.2$, $P=0.90$). Six bloodmeals contained blood from multiple hosts: five had human and
335 canine blood and one contained both canine and bovine blood (S4Table).

336 ***Predictors of Aedes aegypti adult mosquito abundance***

337 Significant factors predicting *Ae. aegypti* adult abundance are shown in Table 3. Consistent with the
338 analyses presented above, locality (urban, peri-urban, rural) was a strong determinant, as was the
339 collection location (indoors vs. outdoors), with variation in the indoor:outdoor ratio between
340 localities shown by the significant interaction term. Whilst collections in Tabtenga and Goundry
341 were quite consistent between years, the number of *Ae. aegypti* collected in 1200 LG was much
342 lower in 2017 than 2016 (evident in the significant year and year x locality interaction terms).
343 However, it should be noted that the proportion of *Ae. aegypti* in the total mosquito catch was
344 similar, and actually slightly higher, in 1200 LG in 2017 as a result of a much lower abundance of
345 *Cx. quinquefasciatus* (Table 1). Collection month and rainfall also exerted significant effects with
346 reduced abundance in October, and a positive relationship with elevated previous over the past 14
347 days rainfall. Importantly, adult abundance was also predicted by the abundance of immature stages
348 from containers in or around the same household, with larval and pupal collections pooled due to
349 low pupal numbers. House type was retained in the minimal model, but explained little variation,
350 whilst other factors did not add to predictive value and were excluded from the final model.

351 **Table 3:** *Aedes aegypti* adult model glmm showing predictors beta estimates of effect size.
352 Confidence intervals, test statistic (z-value) and associated probability for the minimal model.
353 Significant predictors are highlighted in **bold text**, and non-significant terms, not included in the
354 model are listed on the bottom line.

Predictors	Beta	95%CL	z-value	Pr(> z)
(Intercept)	-4.64	[-5.62--3.66]	-9.28	<0.001

355 Confidence intervals, test statistic (z-value) and associated probability for the minimal model.
356 Significant predictors are highlighted in **bold text**, and non-significant terms, not included in the
357 model are listed on the bottom line.

Year [2016]	0.99	[0.5-1.48]	3.95	<0.001
Locality [Rural]				
Peri-urban	3.56	[2.63-4.5]	7.45	<0.001
Urban	4.58	[3.55-5.61]	8.70	<0.001
Location[indoors]				
outdoors	1.77	[1.31-2.22]	7.67	<0.001
Month [August]				
October	-0.91	[-1.45--0.38]	-3.34	<0.001
September	0.04	[-0.28-0.35]	0.23	0.817
14 days rainfall	0.00	[0.00-0.01]	2.28	0.023
House type [Mixed]				
Modern	-0.36	[-0.73-0.01]	-1.90	0.058
Traditional	-0.42	[-1.23-0.39]	-1.01	0.311
Immature abundance	0.00	[0.00-0.01]	4.90	<0.001
Year [2016]: Locality [Rural]				
Year: Peri-urban	-0.56	[-1.13-0.00]	-1.94	0.052
Year: Urban	-1.19	[-1.78--0.59]	-3.91	<0.001
Locality [Rural]: Location [indoors]				
Peri-urban: outdoors	-1.34	[-1.84--0.85]	-5.31	<0.001
Urban: outdoors	-0.28	[-0.8-0.24]	-1.04	0.297

Non-significant terms were collection time(am/pm), House type, Children number, ITNs presence
ITNs number, Animals presence, animal number, locality*Year, Locality*Location

358

359

Immature mosquito species abundance

Aedes aegypti comprised over 85% of immature stages collected from habitats in the urban and peri-urban localities, 1200 LG and Tabtenga, but only 46.4% in rural Goundry. In contrast, *Aedes vittatus*, which comprised less than 0.5% of the immatures collected in the two urban localities, amounted to 40.6% of the total in Goundry (S5Table). *Aedes vittatus* immatures were found mainly in water residues in the animal drinking troughs that were more common in Goundry than in the urban sites (S1Figure). Few immature *Anopheles gambiae* s.l. were collected in any site, as would be expected for a species that typically breeds in ground water pools rather than the containers sampled in this study.

Overall mosquito community composition was strongly influenced by collection location, which was consistent across the two sampling years, with significant difference between rural Goundry and the two urban sites (S1Figure).

Habitats of immature stage Aedes aegypti

Across all three localities, a total of 1,445 containers were inspected during the study of which 666 (46%) contained *Aedes aegypti* larvae or pupae (Fig.3). Immatures were found in all container types inspected and although infestation rates of container types were significantly different across the localities ($\chi^2=170$; $P<<0.001$; Figure 3), there were some consistencies. Tires were among the most heavily infested in both urbanised localities, reaching rates of 31% and 32% in Tabtenga and 1200 LG respectively, but they were of minimal importance in Goundry, where infested domestic water storage drums (40%) were the most heavily infested (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Proportion of each container type positive for larvae (Figure 3A) and positive for pupae Figure 3B).

Not all containers found to contain larvae may support development to the pupal stage and be

regarded as productive for breeding. However for pupae, in urban and peri-urban sites, tires were highly productive habitats, containing 37% and 34% of all pupae in 1200 LG and Tabtenga respectively (Table 4; Figure 3).

Other highly productive containers included large water storage containers (drums, jars or barrels) from which, in Tabtenga, an area without piped water, 40% of pupae were found. In contrast, these large containers produced only 13% of pupae in 1200 LG, an area with piped water, and where instead, small containers including miscellaneous objects (plastic and metallic boxes, terracotta pots, plastic shoes,..) were responsible for nearly 40% of the vector population.

Large water drums or barrels were also important in the semi-rural locality Goundry (30%), where the most productive habitats were animal water troughs (44%).

Table 4: Numbers of *Aedes aegypti* pupae found infesting containers and other potential habitats by locality, year of sampling and habitat type.

*Others includes ground water puddles, tree holes and plant pots of less than 3L.

	2016			2017			No. pupae	% of total pupae
	Aug	Sep	Oct	Aug	Sep	Oct		
1200 Logements								
Tires	277	322	17	219	118		953	36.91
Large containers	31	117	68	99	21		336	13.01
Medium containers	63	37	0	40	10		150	5.81
Small containers	255	470	14	249	31		1019	39.47
Animal troughs	16	19	0	6	32		73	2.80
*Others	48	0	0	3	0		51	2.00
total	690	965	99	616	212	0	2582	100.00
Tabtenga								
Tires	404	373	3	281	365		1426	33.98
Large containers	154	362	0	365	250		1131	26.95
Medium containers	219	432	9	96	35		791	18.85
Small containers	91	377	39	139	45		691	16.47
Animal troughs	29	81	1	46	0		157	3.75
*Others	0	0	0	0	0		0	0.00
total	897	1625	52	927	695	0	4196	100
Goundry								
Tires	22	56	0	85	0	0	163	4.9
Large containers	644	179	0	102	48	31	1004	30.24
Medium containers	46	37	34	1	8	99	225	6.78
Small containers	139	72	0	261	1	0	473	14.25
Animal troughs	671	124	1	541	88	30	1455	43.83
*Others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
total	1522	468	35	990	145	160	3320	100

Predictors of Aedes aegypti larval and pupal densities

A generalised linear model fitted to the number of *Aedes aegypti* larvae collected per breeding site showed an effect of year (2017 collections > 2016 collections) and significant differences between

localities, which were consistent across years, with both the urban and peri-urban localities having much higher densities than the rural site, Goundry (S6Table). Container type influenced larval density with highest larval densities found in tires. Higher water levels in containers were also associated with higher larval density and highest larval densities occurred in September compared to August and October, though all were similar. Factors such as cumulative rainfall totals measured over 2 or 7 days, temperature, container purpose, number of residents, and numbers of adult mosquitoes collected had no significant associations with larval density.

Pupal density did not differ significantly between years, and was higher only in Tabtenga than Goundry, with urban 1200 LG not significantly different (S7Table). Container type influenced pupal density, but in contrast to larvae, tires were not significantly more productive, with only animal drinking troughs significantly higher than the reference category. Container utility was important as pupal density was reduced by 43% in functional containers compared with non-functional/discarded containers Pupal density was also negatively associated with mean temperature and was also positively associated with the number of adult mosquitoes collected in the same house.

Stegomyia and pupae/person indices

The *Stegomyia* indices are summarized in Figure 2, and show that the WHO thresholds were exceeded for all stegomyia indices in Goundry. In the peri-urban locality of Tabtenga, the container and pupal indices exceeded the WHO thresholds, but the Breteau and House Indices, were less informative in 2017.

Figure 2. Breteau, container and houses indices (and 95% confidence intervals) and the number of pupae per person (PPI) (and 95% confidence limits) per year and per locality. The red line indicates the WHO thresholds that are set at 50, 20 and 35 respectively for BI, CI and HI. The PPI threshold is estimated based on an initial seroprevalence of 33% and an average temperature of 28C and for an increase of 10% of the seroprevalence [38]

Spatial distribution of immature stages and adult collections

Mapping of immature and adult densities showed some, albeit very imperfect overlaps between the different life stages in each locality (Figure 4). Niche overlap analysis showed that approaching half of the distribution of adults and immatures overlapped (index=0.44). Whilst this varied between locations, with a lower index value in Goundry (index=0.29) compared to peri-urban (index=0.56) and urban (index=0.55) the overall spatial correlation of the distribution is consistently high (Pearson correlation = 0.74) regardless of the location.

Figure 4: Densities map of *Aedes aegypti* adult (top) and larval (down) densities per house in Goundry (left), Tabtenga (middle) and 1200LG (right).

Discussion

The objective of this study was to generate detailed baseline data on the biology and behaviour of *Ae. aegypti* in Burkina Faso, contributing to the essential evidence-base for developing dengue prevention and outbreak plans. The key findings indicate that the arbovirus vector *Ae. aegypti* is common throughout Ouagadougou, and most abundant in the highly populated central areas where infestation rates reach 78% of dwellings. Adult females are predominantly anthropophilic and also highly exophilic, though feeding more indoors than exophily rates would suggest. Females also appear to oviposit in all container types, both in use or discarded. The key container habitats, those harboring the highest numbers of pupae, and from which the greatest numbers of adults emerge, were discarded car tires, large domestic water containers (drums and barrels) and small containers (including discarded vessels). *Aedes aegypti* were caught in both mornings and evenings, consistent with their expected pattern of diurnal activity, but it is unclear to what extent they may be also nocturnally active.

The profile in the rural outskirts of the city appears to be quite different. Here there was a greater diversity of mosquito species, the most common of which were *Anopheles gambiae* and *Culex quinquefasciatus*, and *Aedes vittatus*. The most productive containers in Goundry for both *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. vittatus* were animal drinking water troughs. The most significant mosquito-borne disease risk here is malaria, though the presence of significant numbers of *Ae. vittatus* is of note pending more insight into any vectorial role it might have in this area. *Aedes vittatus* occurs throughout Africa, tropical Asia, and southern Europe and was recently discovered in the Caribbean [56]. Although its vectorial capacity is not known, it occurs in both sylvatic and peridomestic environments, feeds on humans and is involved in the maintenance and transmission of yellow fever, Zika, chikungunya, and dengue [57].

However, in the higher density urban and peri-urban areas within Ouagadougou, *Ae. aegypti* was the only arbovirus vector of concern and was, almost certainly, the only active vector during the dengue outbreaks of 2016 and 2017. The likelihood of future outbreaks of dengue and other arboviruses transmitted by *Ae. aegypti* is high and a programme to prevent, limit or respond to dengue outbreaks must now be considered a public health priority to protect urban populations.

Ideally, dengue vector control programmes should involve two strategies, the first for vector population suppression, a year-round or pre wet season programme to maintain a low vector population, and the second strategy for responding rapidly to disease outbreaks[58]. Suppressing vector populations typically employs sustainable appropriate methods targeting the immature stage habitats. Diligent sustained action by community groups can have major impacts, and be effective in both outbreak prevention and response, even in the absence of insecticides [59–62]. This requires regular waste disposal for elimination of discarded materials, containers with no function and general garbage. Water barrels, tanks or jars or any other functional or in-use containers should have tightly fitting lids, while empty bottles and buckets should be stored inverted. Targeting the highly productive container types, *i.e.*, those that produce over 70% of all *Ae. aegypti* pupae, is recommended by WHO [28]. Although more work is required to identify all key container types in

Ouagadougou in dry and wet seasons, it is already clear that car tires are an important habitat responsible for producing over 30% of adult vectors in the wet season, with drums and barrels used for water storage potentially increasing in importance in the dry season. Tires are a unique and easily recognised waste item, apparently with no monetary value and a successful campaign to remove them would be a useful milestone (while raising the difficult question of what to do with the tires collected). Before decisions are reached however, the survey should be repeated in the dry season, when the vector population will be at its lowest and most vulnerable level and the most productive container types might be different.

Larviciding can also be used for larval reduction using temephos, an organophosphate and two biological insecticides Bti and pyriproxyfen. Preliminary data shows organophosphates are effective against *Aedes aegypti* larvae in Burkina [63], but data on efficacy of Bti and pyriproxyfen are awaited. Although the identification of key containers for pupal productivity may reduce the challenge, the diversity and the number of breeding containers will compromise larviciding as a stand-alone method for dengue control in Burkina Faso.

Aedes aegypti adults can be prevented from entering buildings by screens fitted to windows, which do not necessarily need to be insecticide-treated to be effective [64,65]. Indoor resting can be controlled by targeted indoor residual spraying (TIRS), where only the lower half of the walls are treated with insecticide or by using hand-held aerosol cans to spray known resting indoor sites [66–68]. Clearly, further work is required to fully elucidate resting preferences, a critical question for planning control, and we recommend that the efficacy of IRS against *Ae. aegypti* in Africa is evaluated experimentally as a priority even as we recognise that exophilic behaviour may recommend additional control methods. The high levels of exophily recorded in this study (Fig. 1) and the high exophagy levels recorded in Banfora/Ouagadougou? (Toé, et al, unpublished) raise the question of whether IRS is an appropriate method for control of *Ae. aegypti* in west Africa. Of the two *Ae. aegypti* forms known to occur in Burkina Faso, only *Ae. aegypti aegypti* (Aaa) exhibits synanthropic behaviour, including endophily and endophagy [69]. Endophilic behaviour has been

documented in *Ae. aegypti* since the earliest research [70] and is a common feature of populations worldwide [71,72]. Throughout its range in Africa, substantial or even preferential outdoor activity by *Aaa* is not unusual, and has been reported from Ghana [73], Senegal [40] and Kenya [74].

Exophilic or endophilic preferences may not be exclusively one or the other, and many *Ae. aegypti* populations exhibit both. For example, in Kenya, Teesdale recorded details of *Ae. aegypti* daily cycles of movement in and out of houses [74], while a study in Mexico recorded indoor and outdoor biting and resting, with exophagy the more common [75]. Despite this, the studies demonstrating the impact of TIRS (Targeted Indoors Residual Spray) on *Ae. aegypti* were also performed in Mexico. In Burkina Faso, we found a significantly higher than expected proportion of bloodfed females resting indoors which suggests that exophily may not dominate the entire adult stage and that adult females are likely endophagic or come indoors at some stage after bloodfeeding.

The majority of bloodmeals were identified as human in origin, with the remainder from dogs and only one sample from cattle (Table S4). Notably, only 6-7% of bloodmeals were non-human in samples from the urban localities, but 28% of bloodmeals in the semi-rural site were from dogs.

Aedes aegypti exists in two forms in Africa, *Ae. aegypti aegypti* (*Aaa*) inhabit domestic environments, breed in artificial containers, and are highly anthropophagic, and *Ae. aegypti formosus*, (*Aaf*) the forest form which is zoophilic [76]. We found that the abdominal scaling patterns used to discriminate the forms [42,77] were not useful for discriminating forms among our samples from Ouagadougou (unpublished results). Genetic studies have shown that the Ouagadougou population is an interbred population mixture of *Aaa* and *Aaf*, expressing intermediate animal and human preferences [4]. The results presented here point towards an urban population displaying predominantly *Aaa* behaviour and a rural population that is still anthropophilic but with a far greater likelihood of zoophagy [4]. Clarification of host preference is an important element of a mosquito population's vectorial capacity but doing so will require a larger sample size and additional studies to gain more insight. We recommend that this be prioritised together with the studies on indoor/outdoor feeding and resting preferences.

We found higher densities of adult *Ae. aegypti* in urban and peri-urban localities of 1200 LG and Tabtenga, compared to Goundry, the rural locality. Adults rested mainly outdoors in all sites, feeding preferentially on humans with rare canine or bovine bloodmeals and their densities were affected by month and the year of collection, the locality, the indoors/outdoors location and at a lesser extent by the immature stage abundance and the cumulative rain of 14 previous days.

Ae. aegypti was the main *Aedes* species collected at all developmental stages, in all localities, in both years. *Ae. aegypti* adults and larvae densities followed a negative gradient from urban to rural localities. Urbanisation has been identified as the main driver of *Ae. aegypti* proliferation in Africa [4,78], and other environmental changes resulting from human activities promote higher abundance and lower species diversity; lower abundance and higher species diversity are more typical of natural environments and ecosystems [79]. In our study, the diversity of all culicines was greater in the rural site, Goundry, than in the urban and peri-urban localities. Goundry is predominantly agricultural land at the edge of the bush, with trees and scrubland beyond. *Aedes vittatus* was common here only, preferring animal drinking troughs as larval habitats. Also found only at Goundry, the predatory larvae of *Lutzia tigripes* shared some habitats with a prey species, *Ae. aegypti* and may have contributed to the lower densities of *Ae. aegypti* in Goundry compared to Tabtenga and 1200 LG. Important vector mosquitoes included *Culex quinquefasciatus* which was common here though not as abundant as at the other localities, and *Anopheles gambiae* s.l., which was common.

Multiple containers types were found to contain larvae in urban and peri-urban sites, with tires the most common. The typology of containers may vary according to the locality. Drums and barrels that are used for water storage, are more abundant in the rural and peri-urban localities of Goundry and Tabtenga where piped water is either absent or rare. Studies in central and East Africa have reported tires as the main breeding sites for *Aedes* mosquitoes [78,80,81]. In Indonesia, the most abundant breeding containers were bird watering dishes, tires had the highest frequency of positivity, while large open tanks storing water (known as *Bak Mandi*) were the most productive

containers [82]. The relative importance of any container is highly context-specific and any container's contribution to the vector population can easily be underestimated [83,84].

Breeding site characteristics that affect immature stages abundance and adult life history traits include among others, dissolved oxygen, water temperature, pH, conductivity and salinity [85].

Characteristics such as dissolved solids, ammonia, nitrate, and organic matter vary significantly between urban and rural containers, which might explain some urban-rural differences in breeding of *Ae. aegypti* [86]. We examined a limited number of breeding sites characteristics and environmental variables and found that container types and water levels within, can increase larval density while containers that are in use, or classed as useful, decrease pupal density. Cumulative rainfall of the previous 14 days and mean temperature affect adult and pupal densities respectively. Investigations in Iquitos used a generalised additive model to highlight the important contribution to *Ae. aegypti* adult density of weather-related covariates including temperature, rainfall and wind [87]. Though our study did not consider other covariates related to breeding sites, the density of immature stages was the strongest covariate in the model contributing to adult density.

Immature stages as well as adult densities were more affected by the month of collection with September the peak month of higher densities, compared to August and October. Although immature stages contributed to adult density, only pupal density was affected by adult abundance. The spatial distribution of adult and immature stage hotspots showed consistent overlapping and limited dispersal of adults from the immature stage location as shown in Lacon et al [88] and in Bonnet et al. [89] who showed that removing breeding sites had a direct impact on proliferation of adults.

As the *Stegomyia* indices have not previously been reported from Burkina Faso, we do not know what levels are typical during a non-outbreak period. During our study, the *Stegomyia* index values exceeded the WHO threshold for dengue risk in the rural locality of Goundry; paradoxically as this was the site where the lowest numbers of adult *Aedes aegypti* were recorded, and far from the central area of Ouagadougou where mainly urban and cases were known to be concentrated. In

addition, there is no evidence that any quantifiable associations exist between these indices of vector immature stages abundance and dengue transmission, and the thresholds have little value for prediction of dengue outbreaks [90,91]. Instead, research has moved to investigating whether numbers of adult female *Ae. aegypti* numbers can provide more accurate and reliable alerts [91].

In this study the number of total adults collected was highly correlated with the number of fed females collected and their density models shared the same explanatory variables. In contrast to *Stegomyia* indices, which are based on immature stage numbers, estimating the total number of adult *Ae. aegypti* can be more informative but remains challenging, with precision depending of the sampling methods and sampling efforts [37]. We found a pattern of similarities between spatial distribution of adults and immature stages with hotspots overlapping in the urban sites, at least. More consistent indices are needed, to take into account *Ae. aegypti* resting and blood feeding behaviour, and the typology of breeding sites that are productive for pupae, yet potentially specific to the locality. Associating dengue active case detection in the community with holistic collection of *Ae. aegypti* bionomics collection could allow more consistent inferences to be made.

Without vaccines for three of the four arboviruses transmitted by *Ae. aegypti*, Burkina Faso, like every other country, must rely on existing vector control tools as it plans its dengue control programme. Burkina Faso has endured a heavy malaria burden for decades during which time it built considerable capacity in vector control of *Anopheles sp.* [92]. It is now attempting the same for *Ae. aegypti*, a mosquito with very different biology and behavior to malaria vectors and consequently, requiring a different approach for control.

Since so many larval habitats are essentially waste materials, clean-up campaigns accompanied by appropriate education and information programs are essential and, in fact have already been established in Ouagadougou [89]. However, selection and likelihood of success of even the most appropriate interventions should be based on more than method of delivery and insecticide susceptibility of the target population. Gaining access to a home to deliver indoor treatments may be prevented if occupants are out working or studying elsewhere. If this type of ‘refusal’ occurs at

a high rate, achieving satisfactory coverage would be compromised. A house's structure, shape or construction materials can determine its suitability for fitted interventions such as window screens. Despite evidence that it is rarely effective [93], fogging or space-spraying outdoors is a popular response to *Ae. aegypti* borne arbovirus outbreaks worldwide. A high-profile activity, space-spraying is routine for many local authorities worldwide, the expected response to an outbreak although it can impact on transmission only if it is applied at frequent intervals and sustained for many weeks [87,88]. The exophilic character of the *Aedes aegypti* populations in Ouagadougou may support this method but as the same vector populations also show high resistance to pyrethroid insecticides [63,94], selection of insecticide should be based on up to date insecticide susceptibility testing together with safety considerations.

Pending the clarification of the vector population's behavioral preferences in the key areas described above, a program for vector control of dengue in Burkina Faso should be possible despite the limited range of interventions available. The Wolbachia method offers unprecedented impacts [95]but a date when it might be considered affordable and biologically suitable for use in Africa, may be many years away. Until then, or until a time when another equally effective intervention method is available, existing methods should be sufficient to at least reduce the frequency and mitigate the impact of outbreaks.

Conclusion

This report describes the *Ae. aegypti* population before and during dengue outbreaks in Ouagadougou. Although additional dry season data are required, the study provides the most complete contemporary description of an *Ae. aegypti* population in West Africa and provides sufficient evidence to develop programs for prevention and control of outbreaks. Recognizing that many of the breeding, bloodfeeding and resting site preferences reported here are likely to occur in vector populations elsewhere in West Africa, we cannot overly stress the importance of undertaking

further research to characterize those habits in additional vector populations. Together with insecticide resistance status, these preferences determine the success of any control method and where possible, characterization should be based on evidence rather than assumption, especially if based on contexts outside Africa.

This study has done little to alter the view that the *Stegomyia* indices have limited epidemiological value or that they are likely to be more relevant in Africa than they have been elsewhere.

Identifying alternatives however remains elusive. While there are similarities between immature stage and adult densities and similarities in spatial distribution, determining how these might be applied or how they could be combined with additional epidemiological parameters to generate more accurate indices reflecting the transmission potential of *Ae. aegypti* and disease risk remains a challenge.

All of these topics fit well within a regional approach to arbovirus control. Networks mapping *Ae. aegypti* key behaviors across the African continent, together with accurate indices of arbovirus risk, insecticide susceptibility/resistance status and key epidemiological parameters would be an important step towards an effective regional/ global control strategy. We suspect that such an initiative would have broad support.

List of Tables and Figure Legends

Figure 1. Indoor and outdoor resting behavior of adult female *Ae. aegypti* in domestic housing in Ouagadougou. Geometric means and 95% confidence limits of numbers of *Ae. aegypti* adults collected indoors and outdoors per house, in the three localities in 2016 and 2017.

Figure 2. Breteau, container and houses indices (and their 95% confidence) and the number of pupae per person (PPI) (and 95% confidence limits) per year and per locality. The red line indicates the WHO thresholds that are set at 50, 20 and 35 respectively for BI, CI and HI. The PPI

threshold is estimated based on an initial seroprevalence of 33% and an average temperature of 28C and for an increase of 10% of the seroprevalence [37]

Figure 3. Proportion of each container type positive for larvae (Figure 3A) and positive for pupae Figure 3B).

Figure 4: Densities map of *Aedes aegypti* adult (top) and larval (down) densities per house in Goundry (left), Tabtenga (middle) and 1200LG (right).

Supporting Information Legends

S1Table. Household characteristics and demography in the three localities during the two years of collection, 2016 and 2017.

S2Table. Average number per house, the 95% confidence limits [in brackets] and the total number of mosquitoes (in parenthesis) of *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes collected in the study localities in 2016 and 2017

S3Table. Average number of mosquitoes per house, the 95% confidence limits [in brackets] and the total number (in parenthesis) collected in the morning (am) and in the afternoon (pm) of the three main species of mosquito collected in the study localities in 2016 and 2017.

S4Table. Number of bloodfed, number of PCR-tested, and bloodmeal sources of *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes per locality and per year.

S5Table. Relative abundance of mosquito species collected as larvae and pupae during routine house sampling in each locality and year.

S6Table. Generalised linear mixed model of *Aedes aegypti* larval density.

S7Table. Generalised linear mixed model of *Aedes aegypti* pupal density.

S1Figure. Mosquito community diversity in immature collections in each location and year.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank members and leaders of communities in the localities of 1200 Logements, Tabtenga and Goundry for their permission to perform the study and their cooperation throughout.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Athanase Badolo, David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

Data curation: Athanase Badolo, Aboubacar Sombié.

Formal analysis: Athanase Badolo, Mafalda Vienna, David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

Funding acquisition: Athanase Badolo, David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

Investigation: Athanase Badolo, Aboubacar Sombié, David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

Methodology: Athanase Badolo, David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

Project administration: Athanase Badolo, Antoine Sanon.

Resources: Athanase Badolo, Antoine Sanon, Hirotaka Kanuka.

Software: Athanase Badolo, Mafalda Vienna.

Supervision: David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

Validation: Athanase Badolo, Mafalda Vienna, David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

Visualization: Athanase Badolo, Mafalda Vienna, David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

Writing – original draft: Athanase Badolo.

Writing – review & editing: Mafalda Vienna, David Weetman, Philip J. McCall.

References

1. Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, et al. The global distribution and burden of dengue. *Nature*. 2013;496: 504–7. doi:10.1038/nature12060
2. Norrby R. Outlook for a dengue vaccine [Internet]. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2014. pp. 92–94. doi:10.1111/1469-0691.12442
3. Messina JP, Brady OJ, Golding N, Kraemer MUG, Wint GRW, Ray SE, et al. The current and future global distribution and population at risk of dengue. *Nat Microbiol*. Nature Publishing Group; 2019;4: 1508–1515. doi:10.1038/s41564-019-0476-8
4. Rose NH, Sylla M, Badolo A, Lutomiah J, Ayala D, Aribodor OB, et al. Climate and Urbanization Drive Mosquito Preference for Humans. *Curr Biol*. 2020;30: 3570-3579.e6. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2020.06.092
5. Powell JR, Tabachnick WJ. History of domestication and spread of *Aedes aegypti*--a review. *Memórias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz*. 2013. doi:10.1590/0074-0276130395
6. Shragai T, Tesla B, Murdock C, Harrington LC. Zika and chikungunya: mosquito-borne viruses in a changing world [Internet]. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. Blackwell Publishing Inc.; 2017. pp. 61–77. doi:10.1111/nyas.13306
7. Balogun EO, Nok AJ, Kita K. Global warming and the possible globalization of vector-borne diseases: A call for increased awareness and action. *Tropical Medicine and Health*. 2016. doi:10.1186/s41182-016-0039-0
8. Iwamura T, Guzman-Holst A, Murray KA. Accelerating invasion potential of disease vector *Aedes aegypti* under climate change. *Nat Commun*. Nature Research; 2020;11. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-16010-4
9. UN. World Urbanization Prospects - Population Division - United Nations [Internet]. United Nations. 2019. Available: <https://population.un.org/wup/>

10. Saghir J, Santoro J. Urbanization in Sub-Saharan Africa. Meeting Challenges by Bridging Stakeholders. *Cent Strateg Int Stud*. 2018; 7. Available: <https://www.csis.org/analysis/urbanization-sub-saharan-africa>
11. Abdulwahab Alhakimi H, Gadalla Mohamed O, Salah Eldin Khogaly H, Ahmad Omar Arafa K, Amen Ahmed W. Epidemiological, Clinical and Entomological Characteristics of Yellow Fever Outbreak in Darfur 2012. *AIMS Public Heal. American Institute of Mathematical Sciences (AIMS)*; 2015;2: 132–141. doi:10.3934/publichealth.2015.1.132
12. Woodall JP, Yuill TM. Why is the yellow fever outbreak in Angola a ‘threat to the entire world’? *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. Elsevier B.V.; 2016. pp. 96–97. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2016.05.001
13. Kaul RB, Evans M V., Murdock CC, Drake JM. Spatio-temporal spillover risk of yellow fever in Brazil. *Parasites and Vectors*. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2018;11. doi:10.1186/s13071-018-3063-6
14. Ingelbeen B, Weregemere NA, Noel H, Tshapenda GP, Mossoko M, Nsio J, et al. Urban yellow fever outbreak—Democratic Republic of the Congo, 2016: Towards more rapid case detection. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. Public Library of Science; 2018;12. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007029
15. Markoff L. Yellow Fever Outbreak in Sudan. *N Engl J Med*. New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM/MMS); 2013;368: 689–691. doi:10.1056/nejmp1300772
16. Kwagonza L, Masiira B, Kyobe-Bosa H, Kadobera D, Atuheire EB, Lubwama B, et al. Outbreak of yellow fever in central and southwestern Uganda, February-may 2016. *BMC Infect Dis*. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2018;18. doi:10.1186/s12879-018-3440-y
17. Jean K, Raad H, Gaythorpe KAM, Hamlet A, Mueller JE, Hogan D, et al. Assessing the impact of preventive mass vaccination campaigns on yellow fever outbreaks in Africa: a population-level self-controlled case-series study. Grais RF, editor. medRxiv. *PLoS Med*;

- 2020;18: 2020.07.09.20147355. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003523
18. Lucey D, Gostin LO. A yellow fever epidemic a new global health emergency? [Internet]. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association. American Medical Association; 2016. pp. 2661–2662. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.6606
 19. Konongoi SL, Nyunja A, Ofula V, Owaka S, Koka H, Koskei E, et al. Human and entomologic investigations of chikungunya outbreak in Mandera, Northeastern Kenya, 2016. PLoS One. Public Library of Science; 2018;13. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0205058
 20. Russo G, Subissi L, Rezza G. Chikungunya fever in Africa: a systematic review. Pathogens and Global Health. Taylor and Francis Ltd.; 2020. pp. 136–144. doi:10.1080/20477724.2020.1748965
 21. Humphrey JM, Cleton NB, Reusken CBEM, Glesby MJ, Koopmans MPG, Abu-Raddad LJ. Urban Chikungunya in the Middle East and North Africa: A systematic review. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. Public Library of Science; 2017;11. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0005707
 22. Gudo ES, Pinto G, Vene S, Mandlaze A, Muianga AF, Cliff J, et al. Serological Evidence of Chikungunya Virus among Acute Febrile Patients in Southern Mozambique. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. Public Library of Science; 2015;9. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004146
 23. Lourenco J, Monteiro M de L, Valdez T, Rodrigues JM, Pybus O, Faria NR, et al. Zika virus outbreak in Cabo Verde Islands, West Africa: early epidemiological findings. bioRxiv. 2017; doi:10.1101/198952
 24. Puntasecca CJ, King CH, LaBeaud AD. Measuring the global burden of chikungunya and Zika viruses: A systematic review. Mostafa A, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. Public Library of Science; 2021;15: e0009055. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009055
 25. Stoler J, al Dashti R, Anto F, Fobil JN, Awandare GA. Deconstructing “malaria”: West Africa as the next front for dengue fever surveillance and control. Acta Trop. 2014;134: 58–65. doi:10.1016/j.actatropica.2014.02.017

26. Arunachalam N, Tana S, Espino F, Kittayapong P, Abeyewickreme W, Wai KT, et al. Eco-bio-social determinants of dengue vector breeding: A multicountry study in urban and periurban Asia. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2010;88: 173–184. doi:10.2471/BLT.09.067892
27. Quintero J, Brochero H, Manrique-Saide P, Barrera-Pérez M, Basso C, Romero S, et al. Ecological, biological and social dimensions of dengue vector breeding in five urban settings of Latin America: a multi-country study. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2014;14: 38. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-38
28. Manrique-Saide P, Che-Mendoza, AzaelRizzo N, Pilger D, Lenhart A, Kroeger A, Arana B. Operational guide for assessing the productivity of *Aedes aegypti* breeding sites. *World Health Organ.* 2011;
29. Bowman LR, Tejada GS, Coelho GE, Sulaiman LH, Gill BS, McCall PJ, et al. Alarm variables for dengue outbreaks: A multi-centre study in Asia and Latin America. *PLoS One.* 2016;11: 1–23. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0157971
30. Weetman D, Kamgang B, Badolo A, Moyes CL, Shearer FM, Coulibaly M, et al. *Aedes* mosquitoes and *Aedes*-borne arboviruses in Africa: Current and future threats. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2018;15. doi:10.3390/ijerph15020220
31. Aubry F, Jacobs S, Darmuzey M, Lequime S, Delang L, Fontaine A, et al. Recent African strains of Zika virus display higher transmissibility and fetal pathogenicity than Asian strains. *Nat Commun.* Springer Science and Business Media LLC; 2021;12. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-21199-z
32. Aubry F, Dabo S, Manet C, Filipović I, Rose NH, Miot EF, et al. Enhanced Zika virus susceptibility of globally invasive *Aedes aegypti* populations. *Science (80-). American Association for the Advancement of Science;* 2020;370: 991–996. doi:10.1126/science.abd3663
33. WHO. WHO | Dengue Fever – Burkina Faso. WHO. World Health Organization; 2016;

Available: <https://www.who.int/csr/don/18-november-2016-dengue-burkina-faso/en/>

34. WHO. WHO | Dengue fever – Burkina Faso. WHO. World Health Organization; 2017;
Available: <https://www.who.int/csr/don/6-november-2017-dengue-burkina-faso/en/>
35. Tarnagda Z, Congo M, Sagna T, Ouédraogo C, Nikiéma V, Cissé A, et al. Outbreak of dengue fever in Ouagadougou , Burkina Faso, 2013. *Int J Microbiol Immunol Res.* 2014;2: 101–108.
36. Tarnagda Z, Cissé A, Bicaba BW, Diagbouga S, Sagna T, Ilboudo AK, et al. Dengue fever in Burkina faso, 2016. *Emerging Infectious Diseases.* 2018. doi:10.3201/eid2401.170973
37. Focks DA. A review of entomological sampling methods and indicators for dengue vectors. Geneva WHO. 2003; Available: http://searo.who.int/LinkFiles/Dengue_book_review_1.pdf
38. Focks DA, Haile DG, Daniels E, Mount GA. Dynamic life table model for *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culcidae): Analysis of the literature and model development. *J Med Entomol.* Entomological Society of America; 1993;30: 1003–1017. doi:10.1093/jmedent/30.6.1003
39. Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Galvin WA, Kelly R, Kitron U. A New, Cost-Effective, Battery-Powered Aspirator for Adult Mosquito Collections. *J Med Entomol.* 2009; doi:10.1603/033.046.0602
40. Diallo D, Diallo M. Resting behavior of *Aedes aegypti* in southeastern Senegal. *Parasites and Vectors.* 2020;13. doi:10.1186/s13071-020-04223-x
41. Koyoc-Cardena E, Medina-Barreiro A, Cohuo-Rodríguez A, Pavía-Ruz N, Lenhart A, Ayora-Talavera G, et al. Estimating absolute indoor density of *Aedes aegypti* using removal sampling. *Parasites and Vectors.* BioMed Central Ltd.; 2019;12. doi:10.1186/s13071-019-3503-y
42. Mattingly PF. Taxonomy of *Aedes aegypti* and related species. *Bull World Health Organ.* 1967;36: 552–554.

43. McClelland GA. A preliminary study of the genetics of abdominal colour variations in *Aedes aegypti* (L.) (Diptera, Culicidae). *Ann Trop Med Parasit.* Liverpool; 1960;54: 305-320 .
Available:
<http://www.cabdirect.org/abstracts/19621000081.html;jsessionid=BED410C009EB788A6B68C3405E724465>
44. Mattingly PF, Bruce-Chwatt LJ. Morphology and bionomics of *Aedes* (*Stegomyia*) *pseudoafricanus* Chwatt (Diptera, Culicidae), with some notes on the distribution of the subgenus *stegomyia* in Africa. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol.* 1954;48: 183–93. Available:
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/13189334>
45. Moore M, Sylla M, Goss L, Burugu MW, Sang R, Kamau LW, et al. Dual African Origins of Global *Aedes aegypti* s.l. Populations Revealed by Mitochondrial DNA. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2013;7. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0002175
46. Edwards FW. Mosquitoes of the ethiopian region. III. Culicine adults and pupae. London: British. Museum (Nat. Hist.); 1941.
47. Gillies MT, Coetzee M. A supplement to the Anophelinae of Africa south of the Sahara (Afrotropical Region). Johannesburg: South African Institute for Medical Research; 1987.
48. Diagne N, Fontenille D, Konate L, Faye O, Lamizana M, Legros F, et al. *Anopheles* of Senegal, an annotated and illustrated list. *Bull Soc Pathol Exot.* 1994;87: 267–77.
49. Santolamazza F, Mancini E, Simard F, Qi Y, Tu Z, Della Torre A. Insertion polymorphisms of SINE200 retrotransposons within speciation islands of *Anopheles gambiae* molecular forms. *Malar J.* 2008;7. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-7-163
50. Kent RJ, Norris DE. Identification of mammalian blood meals in mosquitoes by a multiplexed polymerase chain reaction targeting cytochrome B. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2005;73: 336–342.
51. Hartig F. DHARMA: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed) Regression

- Models. R Packag version 020. 2018; <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMA>. Available: <http://cran.nexr.com/web/packages/DHARMA/vignettes/DHARMA.html>
52. Ou B, Zhao X, Wang M. Power of Moran's I Test for Spatial Dependence in Panel Data Models with Time Varying Spatial Weights Matrices. *J Syst Sci Inf. Journal of Systems Science and Information (JSSI)*; 2017;3: 463–471. doi:10.1515/jssi-2015-0463
53. Hijmans RJ, Phillips S, Leathwick J, Maintainer JE. Package “dismo.” 2020.
54. Warren DL, Glor RE, Turelli M. Environmental niche equivalency versus conservatism: Quantitative approaches to niche evolution. *Evolution (N Y)*. *Evolution*; 2008;62: 2868–2883. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00482.x
55. Hijmans RJ. Geographic Data Analysis and Modeling [R package raster version 3.4-5]. Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN); 2020; Available: <https://cran.r-project.org/package=raster>
56. Alarcón-Elbal PM, Rodríguez-Sosa MA, Newman BC, Sutton WB. The first record of *Aedes vittatus* (Diptera: Culicidae) in the Dominican Republic: Public health implications of a potential invasive mosquito species in the Americas. *J Med Entomol*. Oxford University Press; 2020;57: 2016–2021. doi:10.1093/jme/tjaa128
57. Sudeep AB, Shil P. *Aedes vittatus* (Bigot) mosquito: An emerging threat to public health [Internet]. *Journal of Vector Borne Diseases*. Malaria Research Center; 2017. pp. 295–300. doi:10.4103/0972-9062.225833
58. WHO. Technical handbook for dengue surveillance, dengue outbreak prediction/detection and outbreak response (" model contingency plan ") WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data. World Heal Organ. 2016; 92. Available: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/250240/9789241549738-eng.pdf?sequence=1>
59. Toledo ME, Rodriguez A, Valdés L, Carrión R, Cabrera G, Banderas D, et al. Evidence on

- impact of community-based environmental management on dengue transmission in Santiago de Cuba. *Trop Med Int Heal*. 2011;16: 744–747. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2011.02762.x
60. Vanlerberghe V, Toledo ME, Rodríguez M, Gomez D, Baly A, Benitez JR, et al. Community involvement in dengue vector control: Cluster randomised trial. *BMJ*. 2009;338: 1477–1479. doi:10.1136/bmj.b1959
61. 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*. BMJ Publishing Group; 2015;351. doi:10.1136/bmj.h3267
62. Tschampl CA, Undurraga EA, Ledogar RJ, Coloma J, Legorreta-Soberanis J, Paredes-Solís S, et al. Cost-effectiveness of community mobilization (Camino Verde) for dengue prevention in Nicaragua and Mexico: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Int J Infect Dis*. Elsevier B.V.; 2020;94: 59–67. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.026
63. Badolo A, Sombié A, Pignatelli PM, Sanon A, Yaméogo F, Wangrawa DW, et al. Insecticide resistance levels and mechanisms in *Aedes aegypti* populations in and around Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2019;13. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007439
64. Che-Mendoza A, Medina-Barreiro A, Koyoc-Cardena E, Uc-Puc V, Contreras-Perera Y, Herrera-Bojórquez J, et al. House screening with insecticide-treated netting provides sustained reductions in domestic populations of *Aedes aegypti* in Merida, Mexico. Apperson C, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. Public Library of Science; 2018;12: e0006283. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0006283
65. Manrique-Saide P, Che-Mendoza A, Barrera-Perez M, Guillermo-May G, Herrera-Bojórquez J, Dzúl-Manzanilla F, et al. Use of insecticide-treated house screens to reduce infestations of dengue virus vectors, Mexico. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2015;21: 308–311. doi:10.3201/eid2102.140533

66. Dunbar MW, Correa-Morales F, Dzul-Manzanilla F, Medina-Barreiro A, Bibiano-Marín W, Morales-Ríos E, et al. Efficacy of novel indoor residual spraying methods targeting pyrethroid-resistant *Aedes aegypti* within experimental houses. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. Public Library of Science; 2019;13. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007203
67. Dzib-Florez S, Ponce-García G, Medina-Barreiro A, González-Olvera G, Contreras-Perera Y, Castillo-Centeno F Del, et al. Evaluating over-the-counter household insecticide aerosols for rapid vector control of pyrethroid-resistant *Aedes aegypti*. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene; 2020;103: 2108–2112. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-0515
68. Manrique-Saide P, Dean NE, Halloran ME, Longini IM, Collins MH, Waller LA, et al. The TIRS trial: Protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial assessing the efficacy of preventive targeted indoor residual spraying to reduce *Aedes*-borne viral illnesses in Merida, Mexico. *Trials*. BioMed Central Ltd; 2020;21: 839. doi:10.1186/s13063-020-04780-7
69. Badolo A, Sombie A, Pignatelli P, Yaméogo F, Sanon A, Wangrawa WD, et al. Baseline data on the bionomics of *Aedes aegypti* to support dengue control strategies in Burkina Faso. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2019; doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2018.11.052
70. Weaver SC, Reisen WK. Present and Future Arboviral Threats. *Antivir Res*. 2010;85: 328. doi:10.1016/j.antiviral.2009.10.008
71. Thavara U, Tawatsin A, Chansang C, Kong-ngamsuk W, Paosriwong S, Boon-Long J, et al. Larval occurrence, oviposition behavior and biting activity of potential mosquito vectors of dengue on Samui Island, Thailand. *J Vector Ecol*. 2001;26: 172–80. Available: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11813654/>
72. CHADEE DD. Landing periodicity of the mosquito *Aedes aegypti* in Trinidad in relation to the timing of insecticidal space spraying. *Med Vet Entomol*. *Med Vet Entomol*; 1988;2: 189–192. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2915.1988.tb00071.x

73. Captain-Esoah M, Baidoo PK, Frempong KK, Adabie-Gomez D, Chabi J, Obuobi D, et al. Biting behavior and molecular identification of *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) subspecies in some selected recent yellow fever outbreak communities in Northern Ghana. *J Med Entomol*. Oxford University Press; 2020;57: 1239–1245. doi:10.1093/jme/tjaa024
74. Teesdale C. Studies on the bionomics of *aedes aegypti* (L.) in its natural habitats in a coastal region of Kenya. *Bull Entomol Res*. Cambridge University Press; 1955;46: 711–742. doi:10.1017/S0007485300039614
75. Casas-Martínez M, Orozco-Bonilla A, Muñoz-Reyes M, Ulloa-García A, Bond JG, Valle-Mora J, et al. A new tent trap for monitoring the daily activity of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*. *J Vector Ecol*. *J Vector Ecol*; 2013;38: 277–288. doi:10.1111/j.1948-7134.2013.12041.x
76. Powell JR. Mosquitoes on the move [Internet]. *Science*. American Association for the Advancement of Science; 2016. pp. 971–972. doi:10.1126/science.aal1717
77. McCLELLAND GAH. A worldwide survey of variation in scale pattern of the abdominal tergum of *Aedes aegypti* (L.) (Diptera: Culicidae). *Trans R Entomol Soc London*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2009;126: 239–259. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2311.1974.tb00853.x
78. Zahouli JBZ, Koudou BG, Müller P, Malone D, Tano Y, Utzinger J. Urbanization is a main driver for the larval ecology of *Aedes* mosquitoes in arbovirus-endemic settings in southeastern Côte d’Ivoire. Chen C-C, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. Public Library of Science; 2017;11: e0005751. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0005751
79. Zahouli JBZ, Koudou BG, Müller P, Malone D, Tano Y, Utzinger J. Effect of land-use changes on the abundance, distribution, and host-seeking behavior of *Aedes* arbovirus vectors in oil palm-dominated landscapes, southeastern Côte d’Ivoire. *PLoS One*. 2017;12. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0189082
80. Abílio AP, Abudasse G, Kampango A, Candrinho B, Sitei S, Luciano J, et al. Distribution

- and breeding sites of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* in 32 urban/peri-urban districts of Mozambique: implication for assessing the risk of arbovirus outbreaks. Lenhart A, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. Public Library of Science; 2018;12: e0006692.
doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0006692
81. Ngugi HN, Mutuku FM, Ndenga BA, Musunzaji PS, Mbakaya JO, Aswani P, et al. Characterization and productivity profiles of *Aedes aegypti* (L.) breeding habitats across rural and urban landscapes in western and coastal Kenya. Parasites and Vectors. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2017;10: 331. doi:10.1186/s13071-017-2271-9
 82. Focks DA, Bangs MJ, Church C, Juffrie M, Nalim S. Transmission thresholds and pupal/demographic surveys in Yogyakarta, Indonesia for developing a dengue control strategy based on targeting epidemiologically significant types of water-holding containers. Dengue Bull. 2007;31: 83–102.
 83. Morrison AC, Sihuincha M, Stancil JD, Zamora E, Astete H, Olson JG, et al. *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae) production from nonresidential sites in the Amazonian city of Iquitos, Peru. Ann Trop Med Parasitol. Ann Trop Med Parasitol; 2006;100.
doi:10.1179/136485906X105534
 84. Abe M, McCall PJ, Lenhart A, Villegas E, Kroeger A. The Buen Pastor cemetery in Trujillo, Venezuela: measuring dengue vector output from a public area. Trop Med Int Heal. Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2005;10: 597–603. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2005.01428.x
 85. Medeiros-Sousa AR, de Oliveira-Christe R, Camargo AA, Scinachi CA, Milani GM, Urbinatti PR, et al. Influence of water's physical and chemical parameters on mosquito (Diptera: Culicidae) assemblages in larval habitats in urban parks of São Paulo, Brazil. Acta Trop. Elsevier B.V.; 2020;205: 105394. doi:10.1016/j.actatropica.2020.105394
 86. Overgaard HJ, Olano VA, Jaramillo JF, Matiz MI, Sarmiento D, Stenström TA, et al. A cross-sectional survey of *Aedes aegypti* immature abundance in urban and rural household

- containers in central Colombia. *Parasites and Vectors*. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2017;10: 356.
doi:10.1186/s13071-017-2295-1
87. Reiner RC, Stoddard ST, Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Astete H, Perkins TA, Sihuincha M, et al. Estimating the impact of city-wide *Aedes aegypti* population control: An observational study in Iquitos, Peru. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. Public Library of Science; 2019;13.
doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007255
88. LaCon G, Morrison AC, Astete H, Stoddard ST, Paz-Soldan VA, Elder JP, et al. Shifting Patterns of *Aedes aegypti* Fine Scale Spatial Clustering in Iquitos, Peru. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. Public Library of Science; 2014;8. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0003038
89. Bonnet E, Fournet F, Benmarhnia T, Ouedraogo S, Dabiré R, Ridde V. Impact of a community-based intervention on *Aedes aegypti* and its spatial distribution in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. *Infect Dis Poverty*. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2020;9. doi:10.1186/s40249-020-00675-6
90. Bowman LR, Runge-Ranzinger S, McCall PJ. Assessing the Relationship between Vector Indices and Dengue Transmission: A Systematic Review of the Evidence. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2014. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0002848
91. Rodriguez-Figueroa L, Rigau-Perez JG, Suarez EL, Reiter P. Risk factors for dengue infection during an outbreak in Yanes, Puerto Rico in 1991. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 1995; doi:10.4269/ajtmh.1995.52.496
92. Benelli G, Beier JC. Current vector control challenges in the fight against malaria [Internet]. *Acta Tropica*. Elsevier B.V.; 2017. pp. 91–96. doi:10.1016/j.actatropica.2017.06.028
93. Esu E, Lenhart A, Smith L, Horstick O. Effectiveness of peridomestic space spraying with insecticide on dengue transmission; systematic review. *Trop Med Int Heal*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2010;15: 619–631. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3156.2010.02489.x
94. Sombié A, Saiki E, Yaméogo F, Sakurai T, Shirozu T, Fukumoto S, et al. High frequencies

of F1534C and V1016I kdr mutations and association with pyrethroid resistance in *Aedes aegypti* from Somgandé (Ouagadougou), Burkina Faso. *Trop Med Health. Tropical Medicine and Health*; 2019;5: 4–11.

95. 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. Massachusetts Medical Society*; 2021;384: 2177–2186. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2030243

Supplementary Tables and Figures

SITable. Household characteristics and demography in the three localities during the two years of collection, 2016 and 2017.

STATISTIC	1200 Logements						Tabtenga					
	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Aug-17	Sep-17	Oct-17	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Aug-17	Sep-17	Oct-17
Premises visited	114	115	158	49	53	41	114	115	158	49	53	41
Number of residents	635	621	748	288	230	205	635	621	748	288	230	205
Premises positive for adult <i>Ae. aegypti</i>	93 (82.3%)	104 (89.7)	105 (66.5%)	41 (83.7%)	43 (79.6%)	24 (58.5%)	84 (66.1%)	128 (69.2%)	36 (44.4%)	77 (77.0%)	72 (71.3%)	36 (39.1%)
Premises positive for pupae and larvae (HI)	67 (58.8%)	54 (47.4%)	19 (16.7%)	26 (22.8%)	20 (17.5%)	0 (0.0%)	67 (58.8%)	54 (47.4%)	19 (16.7%)	26 (22.8%)	20 (17.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Premises positive for pupae (HPI)	49 (43.0%)	44 (38.3%)	10 (6.3%)	21 (42.9%)	11 (20.8%)	0 (0.0%)	49 (43.0%)	44 (38.3%)	10 (6.3%)	21 (42.9%)	11 (20.8%)	0 (0.0%)
No. containers with Water	167	144	58	114	61	0	167	144	58	114	61	0
No. containers positive for pupae and larvae (CI)	94 (56.3%)	101 (70.1%)	27 (46.6%)	71 (62.3%)	43 (70.5%)	0 (-)	94 (56.3%)	101 (70.1%)	27 (46.6%)	71 (62.3%)	43 (70.5%)	0 (-)
No. containers positive for pupae (CPI)	65 (38.9%)	64 (44.4%)	11 (0.19)	50 (43.9%)	22 (36.1%)	0 (-)	65 (38.9%)	64 (44.4%)	11 (0.19)	50 (43.9%)	22 (36.1%)	0 (-)
Total number of pupae	690	965	99	616	202	0	690	965	99	616	202	0
Pupae per person index	1.1	1.6	0.1	2.1	0.9	0.0	1.1	1.6	0.1	2.1	0.9	0.0
Breteau Index	48.0	51.5	13.8	36.2	21.9	0.0	48.0	51.5	13.8	36.2	21.9	0.0

STATISTIC	Goundry					
	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Aug-17	Sep-17	Oct-17
Premises visited	114	115	158	49	53	41
Premises positive for adult <i>Ae.aegypti</i>	38 (18.9%)	27 (18.5%)	3 (6.4%)	18 (34.0%)	22 (32.8%)	10 (18.5%)
Number of residents	635	621	748	288	230	205
Premises positive for pupae and larvae (HI)	67 (58.8%)	54 (47.4%)	19 (16.7%)	26 (22.8%)	20 (17.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Premises positive for pupae (HPI)	49 (43.0%)	44 (38.3%)	10 (6.3%)	21 (42.9%)	11 (20.8%)	0 (0.0%)
No. containers with Water	167	144	58	114	61	0
No. containers positive for pupae and larvae (CI)	94 (56.3%)	101 (70.1%)	27 (46.6%)	71 (62.3%)	43 (70.5%)	0 (-)
No. containers positive for pupae (CPI)	65 (38.9%)	64 (44.4%)	11 (0.19)	50 (43.9%)	22 (36.1%)	0 (-)
Total number of pupae	690	965	99	616	202	0
Pupae per person index	1.1	1.6	0.1	2.1	0.9	0.0
Breteau Index	48.0	51.5	13.8	36.2	21.9	0.0

S2Table. Average number per house, the 95% confidence limits [in brackets] and the total number of mosquitoes (in parenthesis) of *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes collected in the study localities in 2016 and 2017

Location	Locality					
	1200LG (urban)		Tabtenga (peri-urban)		Goundry (rural)	
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
Indoor	0.51(426)	0.37 (123)	0.48 (333)	0.67 (371)	0.04 (25)	0.05 (17)
	[0.41-0.61]	[0.25-0.49]	[0.4-0.57]	[0.54-0.81]	[0.02-0.06]	[0.02-0.09]
Outdoor	1.79 (1,373)	1.86 (659)	0.83 (643)	0.89 (592)	0.16 (112)	0.28 (126)
	[1.54-2.07]	[1.46-2.33]	[0.69-0.98]	[0.71-1.07]	[0.12-0.21]	[0.19-0.39]

S3Table. Average number of mosquitoes per house, the 95% confidence limits [in brackets] and the total number (in parenthesis) collected in the morning (am) and in the afternoon (pm) of the three main species of mosquito collected in the study localities in 2016 and 2017.

collection time	Locality					
	1200LG (Urban)		Tabtenga (peri-urban)		Goundry (Rural)	
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
am	1.37 (1,123)	1.27 (418)	0.64 (572)	0.86 (467)	0.08 (49)	0.1 (64)
	[1.15-1.61]	[0.94-1.66]	[0.54-0.75]	[0.7-1.03]	[0.04-0.11]	[0.04-0.17]
pm	0.8 (688)	0.78 (364)	0.63 (404)	0.7 (496)	0.11 (88)	0.21 (79)
	[0.67-0.94]	[0.59-1]	[0.52-0.76]	[0.56-0.85]	[0.07-0.14]	[0.14-0.29]

S4Table. Number of bloodfed, number of PCR-tested, and bloodmeal sources of *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes per locality and per year.

Year	Locality	Total collected	Total Tested	Human	Dog	Human+ Dog	Dog+ Cow
2016	1200LG	304	104	55	2	2	0
	Tabtenga	202	106	61	1	3	0
	Goundry	18	14	5	1	0	1
2017	1200LG	101	101	27	9	0	0
	Tabtenga	166	166	10	3	0	0
	Rural	7	7	0	0	0	0

S5Table. Relative abundance of mosquito species collected as larvae and pupae during routine house sampling in each locality and year. Table shows the mean number per house (and total number collected) for each species detected and the confidence limits in brackets. All identified individuals were adults that had been reared in the laboratory from field-collected immature stages.

Species	1200 LG		Tabtenga		Goundry	
	2016	2017	2016	2017	2016	2017
<i>Aedes aegypti</i> (pupae)	1.06 (601) [1.83-2.31]	2.44 (1,138) [2.69-4.39]	2.09 (1,492) [2.59-3.69]	3.64 (2,457) [3.58-6.02]	0.54 (579) [1.37-1.75]	1.14 (1994) [1.74-2.62]
<i>Aedes aegypti</i> (larvae)	19.62 (9,317) [17.31-24.56]	43.26 (11,373) [34.03-57.56]	27.96 (11,286) [23.87-35.15]	37.84 (14,550) [30.15-50.05]	3.36 (3,471) [3.56-5.35]	5.2 (5,420) [4.77-8.05]
<i>Aedes vittatus</i> (pupae)	(0) (0)	(0) (0)	0.01 (2) [0.99-1.02]	0.01 (3) [0.99-1.03]	0.47 (570) [1.3-1.65]	0.64 (1,006) [1.38-1.94]
<i>Aedes vittatus</i> (larvae)	0.003 (1) [0-1.00]	0.02 (269) [0-1.04]	0.02 (8) [0.004-1.04]	0.03 (15) [0-1.06]	1.93 (2,972) [1.39-3.59]	2.40 (2,878) [1.68-4.30]
<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i> (pupae)	0.05 (248) [1-1.1]	0.02 (3) [1-1.04]	0.16 (660) [1.06-1.27]	0.14 (163) [1.03-1.25]	0.04 (20) [1.01-1.07]	0.05 (24) [1.01-1.09]
<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i> (larvae)	0.4 (719) [1.26-1.55]	0.48 (269) [1.26-1.73]	1.03 (1,241) [1.73-2.38]	0.48 (682) [1.27-1.74]	0.33 (275) [1.21-1.46]	0.47 (440) [1.29-1.68]
<i>Culex decens</i>	(154)	(300)	(240)	(608)	(150)	(660)
<i>Culex nebulosus</i>	(142)	(62)	(23)	(2)	(38)	(1899)
<i>Culex sp.</i>	(59)	(4)	(5)	(13)	(197)	(2,892)
<i>Aedes hirsutus</i>	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(0)
<i>Aedes metallicus</i>	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(0)

Other <i>Aedes</i>	(0)	(0)	(5)	(0)	(14)	(0)
<i>Anopheles gambiae s.l.</i>	(2)	0	(21)	(4)	(6)	(4)
Other <i>Anopheles</i>	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)
<i>Lutzia tigripes</i>	(4)	(1)	(11)	(4)	(534)	(520)

S6Table. Generalised linear mixed model of *Aedes aegypti* larval density. Reference factor levels of predictors are shown in square brackets, with beta effect size estimates, confidence intervals, z-value and probabilities for predictors included in the minimal model. Significant predictor terms are shown in bold and non-significant terms, not included in the model, are listed as a footnote.


Predictors	Estimate	95%CL	z-value	Pr(> z)
Intercept	2.88	[2.35-3.40]	10.72	<0.001
Year [2016]				
2017	0.33	[0.10-0.57]	2.76	0.006
Locality [Goundry]				
Tabtenga	0.33	[0.50-1.04]	2.76	0.006
1200LG	0.77	[0.34-0.90]	5.51	<0.001
Month [August]				
October	-0.18	[-0.61-0.25]	-0.83	0.405
September	0.31	[0.05-0.56]	2.36	0.018
2-day rainfall	0.01	[0.00-0.02]	1.72	0.086
Water level (cm)	0.02	[0.00-0.03]	2.30	0.022
Container [Medium container]				
Large container	0.30	[-0.01-0.61]	1.90	0.057
Others	0.25	[-0.72-1.23]	0.51	0.610
Small container	0.18	[-0.13-0.48]	1.13	0.260
Car tire	0.35	[0.04-0.66]	2.21	0.027
Animal drinking trough	0.28	[-0.09-0.66]	1.48	0.140

Non-significant terms: temperature, container utility, container material, container height, water volume, number of residents, adult mosquito abundance, container position (shady/ sunny).

S7Table. Generalised linear mixed model of *Aedes aegypti* pupal density. Reference factor levels of predictors are shown in square brackets, with beta effect size estimates, confidence intervals, z-value and probabilities for predictors included in the minimal model. Significant predictor terms are shown in bold and non-significant terms, not included in the model, are listed as a footnote.

Predictors	Estimate	95%CL	z-value	Pr(> z)
Intercept	6.01	[3.05-8.97]	3.98	<0.001
Locality [Goundry]				
Tabtenga	0.51	[0.10-0.93]	2.41	0.016
1200LG	-0.18	[-0.60-0.24]	-0.86	0.390
Temp mean	-0.14	[-0.25--0.04]	-2.72	0.007
Container [Medium container]				
Large container	-0.10	[-0.59-0.39]	-0.41	0.684
Others	0.35	[-1.15-1.86]	0.46	0.646
Small container	-0.17	[-0.67-0.33]	-0.68	0.495
Car tire	-0.17	[-0.67-0.32]	-0.69	0.491
Animal drinking trough	0.71	[0.05-1.38]	2.12	0.034
Container utility [No]				
Yes	-0.43	[-0.84--0.01]	-2.03	0.043
Adult abundance	0.02	[0.01-0.04]	2.54	0.011

Non-significant terms: Year, month, Temperature, container utility, container material, container height, water volume, water level, number of residents, cumulative rainfall of 7 previous days, container position (shady/sunny).



1
2
3

S1Figure. Mosquito community diversity in immature collections in each location and year.



