

1 **Factors associated with access to Insecticide-Treated Nets and use of house modification**
2 **in Bagamoyo and Ulanga districts, Tanzania**

3 Odufuwa OG¹, Ross A^{2,3}, Mlacha YP^{1,2,3}, Juma O¹, Mmbaga S¹ Msellemu DF^{1,2,3} and Moore
4 SJ^{1,2,3}

5 ¹ Ifakara Health Institute, Tanzania

6 ²Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Basel, Switzerland

7 ³University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

8 ***Corresponding author:** Olukayode G. Odufuwa*: oodufuwa@ihi.or.tz;

9 olukayode.odufuwa2014@gmail.com

10 Amanda Ross: amanda.ross@swisstph.ch

11 Yeromin Mlacha: ymlacha@ihi.or.tz

12 Omary Juma: ojuma@ihi.or.tz

13 Selemani Mmbaga: smbbaga@ihi.or.tz

14 Daniel Msellemu: dmsellemu@ihi.or.tz

15 Sarah Moore: smoore@ihi.or.tz

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background**

3 Insecticide-treated Nets (ITNs) and house modifications are proven vector control tools, yet
4 full coverage has frequently not been achieved. This study investigates factors associated
5 with ITN access and use of house modification in Tanzania.

6 **Methods**

7 Baseline data from cross-sectional surveys was analysed from 7,240 households in
8 Bagamoyo (60km north of Dar es Salaam) and 1,241 households in Ulanga (a remote rural
9 area), from previous studies on spatial repellants and indoor residual spray evaluation. We
10 estimated the associations between the outcomes: population access to ITNs, ITN per
11 sleeping spaces, presence of window screens and closed eaves, and the covariates household
12 size, age, gender, pregnancy, education, mosquito entry (doors and windows), house
13 modification (window screens & closed eaves), mean distance to mosquito breeding sites and
14 wealth using regression models.

15 **Results**

16 Population access to ITNs (households with one ITN per two potential people that stayed in
17 the house the previous night of the survey) was 64% (56 - 71) and ITNs per sleeping spaces
18 (households with enough ITNs to cover all sleeping spaces used the previous night of the
19 survey) was 63% (54 - 72) in Bagamoyo, three years after the last Universal Coverage
20 Campaigns (UCC). These findings are both lower than the 80% coverage target of the
21 Tanzania National Malaria Strategic Plan (Tanzania NMSP). In Ulanga, population access to
22 ITNs was 84% (78 - 91) and ITNs per sleeping spaces was 93% (89 - 97), one year after the
23 last UCC. Household size was significantly associated with lower access to ITNs even shortly
24 after UCC. House modification was common in both areas. In Bagamoyo, screened windows

1 were more common than closed eaves (61% vs 14%) whereas in Ulanga more houses had
2 closed eaves than window screens (55% vs 12%). Households in the poorest quintile were
3 less likely to adopt window screening and closing eaves in Bagamoyo, this contrasts with
4 Ulanga district where a greater proportion of poorer households blocked eaves with mud but
5 were less likely to adopt screening.

6 **Conclusion**

7 Population access to ITN was substantially lower than the targets of the Tanzania NMSP after
8 three years and lower among larger households after one year following ITN campaign.
9 House modification was common in both areas, motivated by wealth. Improved access to
10 ITNs and window screens through subsidy, especially among larger households, uptake of a
11 combination of these two interventions may be maximized.

12 **Keywords:** Access, Insecticide Treated Nets, ITNs, House modification, Malaria,
13 Demographic, Socioeconomic, Breeding sites, Tanzania

14 **BACKGROUND**

15 Insecticide-Treated Nets (ITNs) have made the greatest contribution to the reduction in
16 malaria burden in sub-Saharan Africa [1], through both individual and especially community
17 effects that reduce the proportion of mosquitoes living long enough to transmit malaria [2].
18 ITNs work best when applied at high (>80%) coverage [2]. Hence, ITNs are recommended
19 by the World Health Organization (WHO) to be universally and continuously distributed to
20 all people at risk of malaria [3]. Multiple ITN delivery strategies and campaigns have been
21 implemented across sub-Saharan Africa, either targeting specific malaria risk populations
22 (children under 5 years of age and pregnant women), or targeting the entire population using
23 health facilities, antenatal clinics (ANC), schools, markets, door-to-door and other methods
24 [4]–[7]. Despite more than a decade of ITN campaigns, 60% of the population in malaria

1 endemic areas, including Tanzania still do not have access to an ITN [8], which means that
2 far greater malaria control could be attained with improvement in access of this highly
3 efficacious intervention.

4 House modification using window screens or blocking eaves (Figure 1) which serve as
5 barriers against mosquito entry has been shown to be associated with lower malaria infection
6 [9] and a control tool for other vector borne diseases [10]. However, house modification is
7 not currently delivered operationally as a vector control tool, being generally considered too
8 costly or difficult to implement [11]. Perhaps, because of high installation cost [12], there is
9 limited support from government or other organisations [13] to promote house modification
10 as a public health tool even though it provides protection from mosquito vectors when people
11 are indoors but outside of sleeping hours (i.e. when people are not protected by ITNs) [14],
12 and thereby can prevent malaria and other vector-borne diseases such as dengue. There is
13 evidence of houses with window screens and closed eaves among the urban Tanzanian
14 population due to their effectiveness in improving house ventilation and preventing mosquito
15 entry and nuisance [15], [16].

16 This paper reports the drivers of access to ITNs and the use of house modification between
17 two rural populations: one far from and one close to an urban centre, as it is known that
18 access to economic centers affects the economic, education, and health status of populations
19 [17]. As the NMCP in Tanzania is now stratifying vector control delivery systems (Tanzania
20 ITN Plan 2016-2020, unpublished) in line with WHO policy [18]. This work is aimed to
21 provide useful information to policy makers in maximising access to and use of these existing
22 malaria control tools.




1

2 **Figure 1: A. An ITN hanging in a rural Tanzanian home B. Screened window C. Eaves**
3 **and ventilation bricks closed with mud to prevent mosquito entry.**

4 **METHODS**

1 **Study area and demographic characteristics**

2 The study was conducted in Bagamoyo and Ulanga districts (Figure 2). Bagamoyo district is
3 located on the east coast of Tanzania, approximately 60 km north of Dar es Salaam, the
4 economic hub of the country [19] and Ulanga district is located in rural south east Tanzania,
5 300km from the regional city of Morogoro and 500km from Dar es Salaam [20]. In
6 Bagamoyo and Ulanga, the average household size was 4.4 and 4.9 persons per household,
7 respectively in the 2012 Tanzania National Census [21]. Adult literacy in Bagamoyo was
8 58% and 66% in Ulanga [22]. The average rainfall and temperature are 1200 to 2100 mm per
9 year and approximately 28°C in both districts, with slightly higher average rainfall per year
10 and temperature in Bagamoyo due to its coastal location. Above 70% of the residents in both
11 districts own pieces of land and majority of them engage in subsistence farming [19], [23].
12 The pattern of climatic conditions and land use are contributing factors toward the persistence
13 of the perennial breeding sites for mosquitoes and other diseases vectors [24].



1

2 **Figure. 2: Geographical location of Bagamoyo and Ulanga districts in Tanzania.**

3 **Study Design**

4 The study is a secondary analysis of two baseline cross-sectional surveys from a trial on
5 spatial repellents in Bagamoyo [25], and an insecticide residual spray (IRS) evaluation in
6 Ulanga [26]. The surveys were conducted randomly in nine villages in Bagamoyo district
7 from the year 2014 to 2015 and eight villages in Ulanga district from the year 2016 to 2017.

8 **Household survey data collection**

9 Data were collected using a structured questionnaire upon written informed consent from an
10 adult household member. The questionnaire surveyors collected information on ITN coverage
11 indicators: 1) households with one ITN per sleeping space (proportion of households with

1 enough ITN for all sleeping spaces) [27] and 2) proportion of the population with at least 1
2 ITN for every 2 people that slept in the household on average [28].

3 Information was collected on demographic and socio-economic characteristics (age, sex,
4 household size, house structure, livestock ownership, asset ownership, source of light,
5 occupation, level of education, and presence of pregnant occupants), household geographical
6 coordinates (longitude, latitude and elevation) and house structure (wall materials, roof
7 materials, ceiling materials, opened or closed eaves, floor materials, number of windows, if
8 windows were screened, and number of outside doors were noted based on visual observation
9 by the interviewers). The surveys were delivered using similar questionnaires in the two sites
10 except that in Ulanga, data on age, sex and educational status of heads of households and the
11 geographical coordinates were not collected.

12 **Data Management and Analysis**

13 The paper questionnaires were double-entered using EpiData software [29] and analysis was
14 carried out using STATA 14.2 [30].

15 Socioeconomic status of each household was derived from a weighted score using principal
16 component analysis (PCA), categorized into quintiles: poorest, poor, middle, high and
17 highest [31]. The binary outcomes of presence of window screens and presence of closed
18 eaves were analyzed using a logistic regression model, while the count outcomes, ITN access
19 and ITN per sleeping spaces were analysed using Poisson regression model. The associations
20 between the outcomes and the covariates, household size, age, sex, pregnancy, education,
21 mosquito entry (doors and windows), house modification (window screens and closed eaves),
22 mean distance to breeding site and socioeconomic quintiles were estimated. Village was
23 included in the regression model as a random effect to account for clustering. The age of the

1 heads of households was categorized into three levels: young adults “18-24”, adult “25-49”
2 and old adults “50-99”.

3 All covariates and interaction between education and wealth status were considered in the
4 analysis based on findings from past literature [32]–[37]. Indicator of ITN access and enough
5 ITN for sleeping spaces for this study were defined in accordance with the household surveys
6 indicators for malaria control [38] (Figure 3).

7

$$\text{Population access to ITN} = \frac{\text{Total number of ITN in the household} * 2}{\text{Total number of individuals who slept in the household the previous night}}$$
$$\text{ITN access per sleeping space} = \frac{\text{Total number of ITN in the household}}{\text{Total number of sleeping spaces used the previous night}}$$
$$\text{Population use of House modification} = \frac{\text{Proportion of households with window screens}}{\text{Proportion of households with closed eaves}}$$

8

9 **Figure 3: Indicators of ITNs access and the use of house modification**

10 **Estimating the association between mean distance of households to breeding sites and** 11 **vector control**

12 The geographical distance between the household and nearest mosquito breeding sites was
13 measured using ArcGIS 10.3 [39]. The geographical locations of permanent and temporary
14 breeding sites of all *Anopheline* species during the wet season in four villages of Bagamoyo
15 district were collected with handheld GPS (etrex 10), and confirmation of larval presence in

1 each breeding sites was done by larval dipping (Adam Saddler pers. comm). Shapefiles for
2 the Tanzania districts were obtained from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) website
3 and the Ruvu river shapefile was extracted from OpenStreetMap [40]. The mean distance of
4 each surveyed households to breeding sites was categorized into two levels: ≤ 609.5 metres
5 and > 609.5 metres, maintaining the mean travel distance of culex [41], as it is noted that
6 most of the breeding sites contain *Culex quinquefasciatus* [42].

7 **RESULTS**

8 **Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of households**

9 A total of 7,240 households in Bagamoyo and 1,241 in Ulanga districts were surveyed and
10 their demographic characteristics detailed [Additional file 1]. Roughly 28% [95% CI 27 – 30]
11 of households in Bagamoyo and 22% [16 – 29] in Ulanga consisted of more than five
12 members. From data only collected in Bagamoyo, fewer households (9% [8 – 10]) were
13 headed by young adults (18 to 24 years). There were more male headed households than
14 female (24% [21 – 27]) and most of the respondents had primary education (71% [66 – 76]).
15 The proportion of houses with more mosquito entries (windows and doors) were greater in
16 Bagamoyo (44% [39 – 49]) than Ulanga (26% [18 – 37]), indicating more larger houses and
17 wealthy households in Bagamoyo (23% [18 – 28]) than Ulanga (7% [5 – 11]). About 46% [6
18 - 91] of the houses in the population were located within a mean distance of 609.5 metres to a
19 mosquito breeding site (Table 1).

20

21

22

23

1

2

3 **Table 1: Demographic, socioeconomic and house characteristics**

DISTRICTS		BAGAMOYO	ULANGA
Variables		Household Characteristics n (%)	
Total (N)		7,240	1,241
Household size:	1 to 2	1,804 (25)	447 (36)
	3 to 5	3,373 (47)	525 (42)
	6 to 20	2,063 (28)	269 (22)
Age group:	18 - 24	628 (9)	
	25 - 49	4,192 (58)	
	50 - 99	2,417 (33)	
Gender:	Male	5,533 (76)	
	Female	1,707 (24)	
Education:	None	1,280 (18)	
	Primary	5,158 (71)	
	Secondary or Above	767 (11)	
House entry (windows and doors):	1 & 2	1,460 (22)	546 (44)
	3 & 4	2,301 (34)	367 (30)
	5 & above	2,998 (44)	327 (26)
Household location to breeding sites:	≤ 609.5 metres	864 (12)	
	> 609.5 metres	741 (10)	
Wealth Quintiles:	Poorest	1,211 (17)	485 (39)
	Poor	1,361 (19)	324 (26)
	Middle	1,531 (21)	172 (14)
	Rich	1,486 (21)	167 (13)
	Richest	1,651 (23)	93 (7)

4

5 **ITNs access in the population**

6 Population access to ITNs (mean of households with an ITN for 2 potential users that stayed
7 in the house the previous night) was estimated as 64% [95% CI 56 – 71]. ITNs per sleeping
8 spaces (mean of households with enough ITNs to cover all sleeping spaces used the previous
9 night) was also estimated as 63% [54 – 72] in Bagamoyo after 3 years of mass campaign.
10 Both lower than the 80% coverage target of the Tanzania National Malaria Strategic Plan

1 except in Ulanga where population access to ITN was 84% [78 – 91] and ITN per sleeping
2 spaces was 93% [89 – 97] after 1 year of mass campaign. Differences between ITN access in
3 the two locations are related to the timing of the survey.

4 **Factors associated with ITNs coverage in Bagamoyo and Ulanga**

5 Univariate analysis revealed that on access to ITN was on average lower among households
6 with fewer people and which head of house was younger, male, had little formal education,
7 and poor, as well as in houses that had fewer number of windows and doors, and far from a
8 breeding site in Bagamoyo and only lower among households with fewer people in Ulanga.
9 While in multivariable analysis, all factors estimated were not significantly associated with
10 access to ITNs except household size (Table 2). The consistent determinant of access to ITN
11 was larger household size.

12 Similar to access to ITNs, on average enough ITNs per sleeping spaces was less common in
13 Bagamoyo among poor households whose head had no formal education, as well as houses
14 with fewer numbers of doors and windows located above 609.5 metres from a breeding site in
15 the univariate analysis. However, there were no significant differences among the
16 demographic and socioeconomic factors regarding ITNs per sleeping spaces in both
17 Bagamoyo and Ulanga in the multivariable analysis (Table 3). Most households had even
18 distribution of ITNs per sleeping spaces on average.

19 Association of other covariates access to ITNs and ITNs per sleeping spaces were not
20 statistically significant in the univariate analysis [Additional file 2] and multivariable analysis
21 [Additional file 3].

1 **Table 2: Factors associated with access to ITNs.**

Districts	Bagamoyo				Ulanga			
Co-variates	Univariate		Multivariable		Univariate		Multivariable	
	Unadjusted OR [95% CI]		Adjusted OR [95% CI]		Unadjusted OR [95% CI]		Adjusted OR [95% CI]	
				(LR P-value)				(LR P-value)
Household size: 1-2	1		1	0.09	1		1	0.001
3-5	0.94	[0.87 - 1.10]	0.97	[0.83 - 1.14]	0.86	[0.75 - 0.98]	0.83	[0.73 - 0.96]
6-20	0.86	[0.79 - 0.93]	0.83	[0.69 - 1.00]	0.70	[0.59 - 0.84]	0.67	[0.56 - 0.81]
Age:								
18 – 24	1		1					
25 – 49	1.11	[0.99 - 1.24]	1.15	[0.89 - 1.49]	0.33			
50 – 99	1.14	[1.02 - 1.28]	1.22	[0.93 - 1.60]				
Gender:								
Male	1		1	0.59				
Female	1.07	[1.00 - 1.14]	1.05	[0.89 - 1.23]				
Education:								
None	1		1	0.73				
Primary	1.07	[0.99 - 1.15]	1.04	[0.87 - 1.25]				
Secondary	1.20	[1.08 - 1.34]	1.11	[0.86 - 1.44]				
House entry:								
1 & 2	1		1	0.19	1		1	0.23
3 & 4	1.17	[1.07 - 1.28]	1.18	[0.96 - 1.44]	0.99	[0.86 - 1.15]	1.04	[0.89 - 1.21]
5 & above	1.32	[1.22 - 1.44]	1.22	[0.98 - 1.52]	1.02	[0.88 - 1.18]	1.18	[0.98 - 1.42]
Breeding sites:								
>609.5	1		1	0.43				
≤ 609.5 metres	1.33	[1.00 - 1.79]	0.93	[0.79 - 1.11]				
Wealth Quintile: Poorest	1		1	0.16	1		1	0.97
Poor	1.07	[0.96 - 1.19]	1.08	[0.88 - 1.34]	0.97	[0.84 - 1.13]	0.98	[0.84 - 1.14]
Middle	1.15	[1.04 - 1.27]	1.18	[0.94 - 1.46]	0.91	[0.75 - 1.11]	0.93	[0.75 - 1.14]
Rich	1.22	[1.10 - 1.34]	1.26	[1.00 - 1.59]	0.99	[0.82 - 1.20]	0.98	[0.79 - 1.22]
Richest	1.35	[1.23 - 1.49]	1.33	[1.05 - 1.71]	1.00	[0.79 - 1.27]	0.99	[0.73 - 1.34]

2 Legend: The first level in each variable with the value 1 represents the reference group.

1 **Table 3: Factors associated with enough ITNs to cover all sleeping spaces in the population**

Districts	Bagamoyo			Ulanga		
Co-variates	Univariate		Multivariable	Univariate		Multivariable
	Unadjusted OR [95% CI]	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	(LR P-value)	Unadjusted OR [95% CI]	Adjusted OR [95% CI]	(LR P-value)
Household size: 1-2	1	1	0.26	1	1	0.81
3-5	1.05 [0.98 - 1.13]	1.15 [0.97 - 1.35]		1.04 [0.91 - 1.18]	1.04 [0.91 - 1.19]	
6-20	0.96 [0.88 - 1.04]	1.08 [0.89 - 1.31]		1.00 [0.85 - 1.17]	1.02 [0.86 - 1.20]	
Age:			0.60			
18 – 24	1	1				
25 – 49	1.09 [0.98 - 1.21]	1.14 [0.87 - 1.48]				
50 – 99	1.01 [0.90 - 1.13]	1.10 [0.84 - 1.46]				
Gender:			0.57			
Male	1	1				
Female	1.01 [0.94 - 1.08]	1.05 [0.89 - 1.23]				
Education:			0.57			
None	1	1				
Primary	1.13 [1.04 - 1.22]	1.06 [0.89 - 1.28]				
Secondary	1.27 [1.13 - 1.42]	1.15 [0.89 - 1.50]				
House entry:			0.43			0.96
1 & 2	1	1		1	1	
3 & 4	1.17 [1.07 - 1.27]	1.14 [0.92 - 1.39]		0.99 [0.86 - 1.13]	0.99 [0.86 - 1.14]	
5 & above	1.20 [1.11 - 1.31]	1.06 [0.85 - 1.32]		0.97 [0.84 - 1.12]	0.97 [0.81 - 1.17]	
Breeding sites: >609.5	1	1	0.24			
≤ 609.5 metres	1.31 [1.15 - 1.49]	0.90 [0.76 - 1.07]				
Wealth Quintile: Poorest	1	1	0.42	1	1	0.99
Poor	1.04 [0.93 - 1.15]	1.05 [0.85 - 1.30]		1.01 [0.87 - 1.17]	1.01 [0.87 - 1.17]	
Middle	1.13 [1.03 - 1.25]	1.15 [0.92 - 1.44]		0.95 [0.79 - 1.14]	0.96 [0.79 - 1.17]	
Rich	1.20 [1.09 - 1.33]	1.19 [0.94 - 1.51]		0.98 [0.82 - 1.18]	0.99 [0.80 - 1.22]	
Richest	1.35 [1.23 - 1.48]	1.24 [0.97 - 1.58]		1.00 [0.79 - 1.25]	0.99 [0.74 - 1.32]	

2 Legend: The first level in each variable with the value 1 represents the reference group.

1 **Use of house modifications (window screens and closed eaves) in the population**

2 Of the households visually observed for house modification, 61% [46 - 74] had window
3 screens in Bagamoyo, while only 12% [8 - 17] had window screens in Ulanga. Some houses
4 had closed eaves, 14% [10 - 20] of houses in Bagamoyo and 55% [45 - 64] in Ulanga. About
5 half (49% [38 - 59]) of the sampled houses with screened windows in Bagamoyo also used an
6 ITN and in Ulanga, 53% [44 - 63] of houses with closed eaves used an ITN. However, the
7 proportion of houses in both districts with the combination of screened windows and closed
8 eaves that reported use of an ITN the previous night of the surveys was less than 10%.

9 **Factors that are associated with the use of house modification in the population**

10 In the univariate analysis, use of window screens was lower in poor houses in which head of
11 household was older, female and had little education as well as houses with lower numbers of
12 doors and windows close to a breeding site in Bagamoyo. Similar results were found in
13 Ulanga, except that houses with fewer members were less likely to have a window screens.
14 Of these findings, only household size, age and wealth of head of household, mosquito entry
15 (higher numbers of doors and windows) and mean distance to breeding sites were strongly
16 associated with the use window screens in both Bagamoyo and Ulanga in the multivariable
17 analysis (Table 4).

18 Larger households and those headed by older individuals, female and in the poor quintile
19 were less likely to use closed eaves in Bagamoyo and similarly in Ulanga, except that
20 households in the rich quintile had low usage of closed eaves in the univariate analysis.
21 Although, only wealth and gender were significantly associated with the use of closed eaves,
22 the proportion of houses with closed eaves was lower among poor households headed by
23 make in Bagamoyo and higher in Ulanga as the poor households blocked their eaves with
24 mud the multivariable analysis (Table 5). Other co-variables explored were not statistically

- 1 associated with house modification in both univariate analysis [Additional file 2] and
- 2 multivariable analysis [Additional file 3].

1 **Table 4: Factors associated with the use of window screens in the population**

Districts	Bagamoyo			Ulanga		
Co-variates	Univariate		Multivariable	Univariate		Multivariable
	Unadjusted OR [95% CI]		Adjusted OR [95% CI] (LR P-value)	Unadjusted OR [95% CI]		Adjusted OR [95% CI] (LR P-value)
Household size: 1-2	1		1	1		0.65
3-5	1.04	[0.92 - 1.17]	0.76	1.89	[1.23 - 2.93]	1.29
6-20	0.90	[0.79 - 1.02]	0.44	2.72	[1.70 - 4.37]	1.17
Age:						
18 – 24	1		1			0.001
25 – 49	0.85	[0.71 - 1.02]	0.84			
50 – 99	0.43	[0.36 - 0.52]	0.46			
Gender:						
Male	1		1			0.71
Female	0.86	[0.77 - 0.97]	0.95			
Education:						
None	1		1			0.87
Primary	2.18	[1.92 - 2.46]	0.97			
Secondary	3.75	[3.09 - 4.56]	1.08			
House entry:						
1 & 2	1		1	1		0.03
3 & 4	3.64	[3.17 - 4.18]	2.80	3.58	[2.05 - 6.27]	1.92
5 & above	4.02	[3.52 - 4.58]	2.84	10.37	[6.18 - 17.42]	2.49
Breeding sites:						
>609.5	1		1			0.001
≤ 609.5 metres	0.74	[0.61 - 0.90]	0.64			
Wealth Quintile: Poorest	1		1	1		0.001
Poor	1.75	[1.49 - 2.06]	1.23	4.73	[1.99 - 11.27]	4.96
Middle	4.06	[3.45 - 4.77]	2.20	10.02	[4.20 - 23.91]	7.71
Rich	8.09	[6.81 - 9.62]	4.91	20.12	[8.78 - 46.10]	15.68
Richest	10.95	[9.18 - 13.06]	9.96	136.57	[57.69 - 323.32]	108.16
ITN use:						
No	1		1	1		0.34
Yes	1.26	[1.12 - 1.42]	0.87	2.60	[0.62 - 10.89]	2.03

2 Legend: The first level in each variable with the value 1 represents the reference group.

1 **Table 5: Factors associated with houses with closed eaves in the population**

Districts	Bagamoyo						Ulanga					
	Univariate		Multivariable				Univariate		Multivariable			
	Unadjusted OR [95% CI]		Adjusted OR [95% CI]		(LR P-value)		Unadjusted OR [95% CI]		Adjusted OR [95% CI]		(LR P-value)	
Household size: 1-2	1		1		0.32		1		1		0.88	
3-5	0.89	[0.76 - 1.05]	0.86	[0.56 - 1.33]			0.89	[0.69 - 1.15]	1.01	[0.77 - 1.33]		
6-20	0.81	[0.67 - 0.97]	0.69	[0.42 - 1.14]			0.65	[0.48 - 0.89]	0.93	[0.66 - 1.32]		
Age:					0.32							
18 – 24	1		1									
25 – 49	1.10	[0.87 - 1.39]	0.66	[0.36 - 1.22]								
50 – 99	0.71	[0.55 - 0.92]	0.79	[0.40 - 1.56]								
Gender:					0.03							
Male	1		1									
Female	0.82	[0.70 - 0.96]	6.09	[1.17 - 31.74]								
Education:					0.71							
None	1		1									
Primary	2.26	[1.78 - 2.87]	0.87	[0.41 - 1.83]								
Secondary	7.90	[6.03 - 10.35]	0.57	[0.12 - 2.77]								
House entry:					0.80						0.21	
1 & 2	1		1				1		1			
3 & 4	1.29	[1.04 - 1.59]	0.85	[0.48 - 1.51]			0.86	[0.66 - 1.12]	1.03	[0.77 - 1.38]		
5 & above	1.83	[1.50 - 2.24]	0.95	[0.53 - 1.70]			0.44	[0.33 - 0.58]	0.76	[0.52 - 1.10]		
Breeding sites: >100	1		1		0.32							
≤ 100 metres	0.33	[0.10 - 1.07]	1.25	[0.80 - 1.96]								
Wealth Quintile: Poorest	1		1		0.001		1		1		0.001	
Poor	0.80	[0.54 - 1.19]	1.01	[0.48 - 2.15]			0.83	[0.62 - 1.11]	0.92	[0.68 - 1.24]		
Middle	1.26	[0.89 - 1.79]	1.24	[0.56 - 2.78]			0.49	[0.34 - 0.69]	0.56	[0.37 - 0.83]		
Rich	2.32	[1.68 - 3.20]	1.81	[0.71 - 4.61]			0.59	[0.42 - 0.85]	0.80	[0.53 - 1.21]		
Richest	14.89	[11.14 - 19.90]	5.72	[1.79 - 18.28]			0.26	[0.16 - 0.42]	0.33	[0.19 - 0.56]		
ITN Use:					0.96						0.28	
No	1		1				1		1			
Yes	1.93	[1.60 - 2.34]	0.99	[0.62 - 1.58]			1.59	[0.83 - 3.02]	1.46	[0.74 - 2.90]		

2 Legend: The first level in each variable with the value 1 represents the reference group.

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 **ITNs coverage in the population**

3 Population access to ITNs after 3 years of mass distribution was lower than targets of the
4 Tanzania National Malaria Strategic Plan. The difference between the access to ITNs in
5 Bagamoyo and Ulanga (64% vs 84%) estimates that access declines at an average of 10%
6 after the first year, this suggests that a minimum interval of two years ITN distribution
7 campaigns is necessary to maintain high coverage of ITN, this is a concern as the average
8 interval between campaigns in Tanzania is at least 4 years. Population access to ITNs is a
9 more robust indicator of measuring ITN coverage [28] and was lower among large
10 households even in Ulanga where the survey was conducted shortly after residents received
11 ITNs from the national campaign. This finding has also been observed in the lake region of
12 Tanzania where household numbers are on average larger, (Ikupa Akim pers. comm).
13 Therefore our study also demonstrates that limiting the number of ITNs distribution by not
14 necessarily taking into account individual household size in the population will continue to
15 serve as hindrance to achieving high ITN coverage [28]. The Universal Coverage Campaign
16 (UCC) implemented in Tanzania to cover all sleeping spaces [4] resulted in a higher access
17 measured by ITNs per sleeping spaces (93%) rather than access to ITNs (84%) in Ulanga,
18 this demonstrates that more than two people are using a single sleeping space. This is
19 consistent as it was found that larger households had more children (< 5 years old), who were
20 more likely to share sleeping space with their parent or a sleeping space occupied by more
21 than two children. This has been found to decrease the durability of ITNs due to stretching of
22 the net resulting in damage [43], [44]. Additional efforts are required to improve household
23 access in order to maintain effective malaria control seen in previous years due to universal
24 ITN coverage campaigns.

1 Family size is an important factor that needs to be considered when planning ITNs
2 distribution campaigns. The last campaign in Tanzania achieved high coverage in Ulanga,
3 considering the indicator of population access to ITNs, but it is necessary to ensure that the
4 ITNs are actually where they are most needed, and in sufficient number in the larger
5 households which are most likely to have the most malaria vulnerable groups (children under
6 5 and pregnant women). Mosquitoes are more attracted to households with an increased
7 number of people [45], thus households with larger family size need to have adequate ITNs to
8 impact malaria. ITNs distribution in schools may be a good idea for a keep up strategy [46].
9 School age children tend to have lowest access to ITNs [47], which emphasizes the utility of
10 the school nets program in Tanzania. The slight influence of wealth was observed in
11 Bagamoyo, which may suggest that rich people purchased ITNs when the ones they were
12 given by the campaign became non-functional. Therefore, Behaviour Change
13 Communication (BCC) strategy at the community level may be targeted towards all
14 households to encourage care of ITN to last longer and continue the usage of damaged ITNs
15 as against discarding while waiting for campaigns, as it has been shown that damaged nets
16 remain insecticidal [48]. It is clear, however that more effort is needed in improving access to
17 ITNs.

18 **House modification in the population**

19 A possible explanation for the higher usage of window screens in Bagamoyo could be
20 attributed to more economic development and availability of low cost screening as reported
21 in a study conducted in Dar es Salaam – close proximity to study area [15], as compared to
22 Ulanga, a remote rural area with low income and lack of access to window screening
23 suppliers. Building materials are likely to be more expensive far from economic centres due
24 to transport cost. The majority of the houses in Bagamoyo had opened eaves possibly due to
25 low awareness of closed eaves as a tool to reduce indoor mosquito density [12] and high

1 temperature during the daytime as found in neighbouring coastal Kenya (Mombasa) [49]. The
2 use of open eaves is an efficient means of cooling houses [11] which is also a plausible
3 explanation for the observed pattern, especially since Bagamoyo has an average temperature
4 2°C higher and greater humidity than Ulanga due to its proximity to the ocean. Wealthy
5 households in Bagamoyo were more likely to have closed eaves where window screens were
6 also in common use, while in Ulanga, the poorest households were more likely to close their
7 eaves but were unable to afford window screens that gives protection from mosquitoes [50].
8 As window screening is clearly a function of wealth, it would be prudent for screens to
9 receive a subsidy and for insecticide treated screens to be made more widely available as a
10 long-term vector control intervention to protect individual users as well as the community –
11 through killing vectors that contact the screens. The acceptance of closed eaves in the rural
12 areas do not seem worrisome as it is already a common housing structure among modern
13 houses owned by wealthy people in Tanzania [51]. However, in houses with indoor fires,
14 mostly found in the remote areas, closing eaves is not advisable as may increase exposure to
15 biomass particulate matter and induce respiratory illness [52]. There is evidence of high
16 densities of indoor mosquitoes in houses with more entry points [16], which has led to the
17 observed increased use of window screens in the population as the number of windows and
18 doors increases.

19 Households headed by young individuals had more window screens installed. This group had
20 more years of formal education and were wealthier than the older age group, as access to
21 education in Tanzania has steadily improved over the last decades [53]. This might have
22 made them more knowledgeable about the importance of the tool in preventing indoor
23 mosquito entry and their wealth afforded them the opportunity to install them in their houses.
24 Window screens are useful because they 1) require no compliance, 2) tend to be long-lasting
25 and 3) protect all members of a household. This also serves as an indicator that younger

1 people are adaptive to the uptake of new tools for controlling malaria. However, the use of
2 window screens alone is not sufficient to control malaria [54]. The incorporation of
3 insecticides into window screens would improve the efficacy of this tool against mosquitoes
4 as it has improved the protective efficacy of conventional bednets and other vector control
5 tools [55]. In addition, It is logical that maximising the concurrent use of multiple vector
6 control tools, i.e. combination of ITNs and insecticidal house screening may assist in
7 transiting the current malaria phase in Tanzania to elimination [56], [57] and may also protect
8 against other vector-borne disease such as dengue [10].

9 The study area in Tanzania provides conducive breeding sites based on ecological conditions
10 and human behaviour, hence high mosquito density notable for nuisance biting [58]. Our
11 study found that window screens were less common among households at an average of
12 609.5 metres to a breeding site. This is because the poorest households were located at closer
13 proximity to breeding sites and couldn't afford the installation of window screens, which
14 means that poorer households are exposed to higher risk of mosquito bites. It is reported in
15 another study conducted in Tanzania that most of the breeding sites contain *Culex*
16 *quinquefasciatus* which are notable for nuisance biting [42] and transmission of other human
17 pathogens such as viruses and filarial worms [59]. This supports the essence of providing a
18 subsidy for window screens to reduce the exposure of the poor households to vector-borne
19 diseases.

20 **Limitations**

21 Our study was affected by non-response bias as shown in Figure 3 and desirability bias, that
22 might have influenced ITNs access estimates [60]. It was suspected that respondents denied
23 owning at least one ITN in the household due to an expectation of compensation in the form
24 of ITNs after the study. Therefore, it was necessary to use number of ITNs reported to be

1 used the previous night as a proxy for ownership, it was more adequately measured as
2 interviewers asked the use of each ITN in respect to where it was used in the household.
3 Ideally, surveys of ITN access should visually inspect the presence of nets in households
4 whenever possible to reduce the possibility of respondents giving misleading answers. The
5 study was unable to establish a detailed comparison between the study areas because the age,
6 sex and educational status of head of households as well as the geocoordinates of the
7 breeding sites in Ulanga district were not collected. Nevertheless, the study recruited a very
8 large number of participants which gave the study strong power to correctly establish
9 association between the outcomes and covariates. House structures which included window
10 screens and closed eaves were visually recorded by interviewers, and thus accurately
11 observed.

12 **CONCLUSION**

13 This study demonstrates the need to improve access to ITNs especially among larger
14 households in the population, due to the fact that access already dropped within 3 years of
15 distribution and among larger family even just after recent government distribution. Our
16 study suggests that large family households should be specially targeted in keep-up and
17 universal coverage campaigns. It is evident in the study that the wider use of window screens
18 could largely be improved by government subsidies. Therefore, it is necessary to put
19 strategies in place to improve access to window screens widely through low cost screens and
20 insecticidal screens to maximise the use of the combination of ITNs and insecticidal house
21 screening to further control malaria as well as other vector-borne diseases.

22 **Abbreviations**

23 ANC Antenatal Care

24 BCC Behavior Change Communication

- 1 DHS Demographic Health Survey (Tanzania)
- 2 EPI Expanded Programme on Immunization
- 3 GIS Geographical Information System
- 4 IHI Ifakara Health Institute
- 5 IRS Indoor Residual Spray
- 6 ITNs Insecticide Treated Nets
- 7 NMCP National Malaria Control Plan
- 8 NMSP National Malaria Strategic Plan
- 9 PCA Principal Component Analysis
- 10 SES Socioeconomic Status
- 11 UCC Universal Coverage Campaign
- 12 WHO World Health Organization

13 **DECLARATION**

14 **Author's contribution**

15 OGO conducted study analysis and paper writing. AR contributed to the statistical analysis
16 and contributed to manuscript revision. YPM contributed to the major revision of the
17 manuscript. OJ contributed to the manuscript's revision. SM contributed to data management
18 and paper writing. DFM assisted substantially with data management and involved in
19 manuscript writing. SJM conceived and designed the study, also contributed to analysis and
20 paper writing. All authors contributed to the final manuscript revisions and approved the final
21 version.

1 **Funding**

2 The study was funded by the University of NOTRE DAME (UND Fund #261655).

3 **Acknowledgement**

4 We acknowledge the efforts of the research team (technicians) of the Ifakara Health Institute,
5 Bagamoyo (IHI) and participants for taking their time to collect and provide data,
6 respectively. Dr. Adam Saddler provided advice and data source on the breeding sites, PD Dr.
7 Christian Schindler contribution on statistical analysis was helpful, as well as Raphael S. von
8 Büren who provided guidance on proximity analysis on ArcGIS. Dr. Albert Kilian and Dr.
9 Hannah Koenker provided guidance on calculation of population access to ITNs.

10 **Competing Interest**

11 The authors declare no competing interest

12 **Availability of data and materials**

13 Not applicable.

14 **Consent for publication**

15 Not applicable.

16 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

17 Ethical clearance to conduct the survey was obtained from the Medical Research
18 Coordinating Committee of the National Institute of Medical Research NIMR/HQ/R.8a/Vol.
19 IX/1899 and the Institutional Review Board of the Ifakara Health Institute IHI/IRB/EXT/18 -
20 2015 and IHI/IRB/EXT/15 - 2017 and NIMR/HQ/R8.a/Vol IX/2270.

21 **References**

- 1 [1] Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of
2 malaria control on *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa between 2000 and 2015.”*Nature*,
3 vol. 526, no. 7572, p. 207, Oct. 2015.
4
- 5 [2] Hawley WA, Phillips-Howard PA, Ter Kuile FO, Terlouw DJ, Vulule JM, Ombok M, et
6 al. Community-wide effects of permethrin-treated bed nets on child mortality and
7 malaria morbidity in western Kenya. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.*, vol. 68, no. 4 Suppl, pp.
8 121–127, Apr. 2003.
9
- 10 [3] Guidelines for malaria vector control. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019.
11 Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
12
- 13 [4] Renggli S, Mandike R, Kramer K, Patrick F, Brown NJ, McElroy PD, et al. Design,
14 implementation and evaluation of a national campaign to deliver 18 million free long-
15 lasting insecticidal nets to uncovered sleeping spaces in Tanzania. *Malar. J.*, vol. 12, p.
16 85, Mar. 2013.
17
- 18 [5] Kulkarni MA, Vanden Eng J, Desrochers RE, Hoppe Cotte A, Goodson JL, Johnston A,
19 et al. Contribution of Integrated Campaign Distribution of Long-Lasting Insecticidal
20 Nets to Coverage of Target Groups and Total Populations in Malaria-Endemic Areas in
21 Madagascar. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 420–425, Mar. 2010.
22
- 23 [6] Grabowsky M, Nobiya T, and Selanikio J. Sustained high coverage of insecticide-treated
24 bednets through combined Catch-up and Keep-up strategies. *Trop. Med. Int. Health TM*
25 *IH*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 815–822, Jul. 2007.
26
- 27 [7] Guyatt HL, Gotink MH, Ochola SA, and Snow RW. Free bednets to pregnant women
28 through antenatal clinics in Kenya: a cheap, simple and equitable approach to delivery.
29 *Trop. Med. Int. Health*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 409–420, 2002.
30
- 31 [8] Koenker H, Ricotta E, Olapeju B. October 2017. Insecticide-Treated Nets (ITN) Access
32 and Use Report. Baltimore, MD. PMI | VectorWorks Project, Johns Hopkins Center for
33 Communication Programs.
34
- 35 [9] Tusting LS, Ippolito MM, Willey BA, Kleinschmidt I, Dorsey G, Gosling RD, et al. The
36 evidence for improving housing to reduce malaria: a systematic review and meta-
37 analysis. *Malar. J.*, vol. 14, Jun. 2015.
38
- 39 [10] Vanlerberghe V, Villegas E, Oviedo M, Baly A, Lenhart A, McCall PJ, et al. Evaluation
40 of the Effectiveness of Insecticide Treated Materials for Household Level Dengue
41 Vector Control. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. e994, Mar. 2011.
42
- 43 [11] Seidlein LV, Ikonomidis K, Mshamu S, Nkya T.E, Mukaka M, Pell C, et al. Affordable
44 house designs to improve health in rural Africa: a field study from northeastern
45 Tanzania. *Lancet Planet. Health*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. e188–e199, Aug. 2017.
46
- 47 [12] Ogoma SB, Kannady K, Sikulu M, Chaki PP, Govella NJ, Mukabana WR, et al.
48 Window screening, ceilings and closed eaves as sustainable ways to control malaria in
49 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Malar. J.*, vol. 8, p. 221, Sep. 2009.
50

- 1 [13] Lindsay SW, Wilson A, Golding N, Scott TW, Takken Wl. Improving the built
2 environment in urban areas to control *Aedes aegypti*-borne diseases. *Bulletin of the*
3 *World Health Organization* 2017;95:607-608. doi:
4 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.16.189688>
5
- 6 [14] Okumu F. The paradigm of eave tubes: scaling up house improvement and optimizing
7 insecticide delivery against disease-transmitting mosquitoes. *Malar. J.*, vol. 16, May
8 2017.
9
- 10 [15] Ogoma SB, Kannady K, Sikulu M, Chaki PP, Govella NJ, Mukabana WR, et al.
11 Window screening, ceilings and closed eaves as sustainable ways to control malaria in
12 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Malar. J.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 221, Sep. 2009.
13
- 14 [16] Ogoma SB, Lweitoijera DW, Ngonyani H, Furer B, Russell TL, Mukabana WR, et al.
15 Screening Mosquito House Entry Points as a Potential Method for Integrated Control of
16 Endophagic Filariasis, Arbovirus and Malaria Vectors,” *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.*, vol. 4,
17 no. 8, Aug. 2010.
18
- 19 [17] Weiss DJ, Nelson A, Gibson HS, Temperley W, Peedell S, Lieber A, et al. A global map
20 of travel time to cities to assess inequalities in accessibility in 2015. *Nature*, vol. 553,
21 no. 7688, pp. 333–336, 18 2018.
22
- 23 [18] WHO, RBM Partnership to End Malaria. High burden to high impact: a targeted malaria
24 response, WHO/CDS/GMP/2018.25 Rev 1. Available:
25 <http://www.who.int/malaria/publications/atoz/high-impact-response/en/>. [Accessed: 01-
26 May-2019].
27
- 28 [19] Juma OA, Enumah ZO, Wheatley H, Rafiq MY, Shekalaghe S, Ali A, et al. Prevalence
29 and assessment of malnutrition among children attending the Reproductive and Child
30 Health clinic at Bagamoyo District Hospital, Tanzania. *BMC Public Health*, vol. 16,
31 Oct. 2016.
32
- 33 [20] Bardosh K, Sambo M, Sikana L, Hampson K, Welburn SC. Eliminating Rabies in
34 Tanzania? Local Understandings and Responses to Mass Dog Vaccination in Kilombero
35 and Ulanga Districts. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.*, vol. 8, no. 6, Jun. 2014.
36
- 37 [21] The United Republic of Tanzania, 2012 POPULATION AND HOUSING CENSUS.
38 Population Distribution by Administrative Areas. National Bureau of Statistics Ministry
39 of Finance Dar es Salaam and Office of Chief Government Statistician President’s
40 Office, Finance, Economy and Development Planning Zanzibar. March, 2013.
41
- 42 [22] National Bureau of Statistics, Tanzania. Social Economics of Tanzania, 2016 - Tanzania
43 Data Portal, Knoema. [Online]. Available:
44 [http://tanzania.opendataforafrica.org/TZSOCECD2016/social-economics-of-tanzania-](http://tanzania.opendataforafrica.org/TZSOCECD2016/social-economics-of-tanzania-2016?region=1000230-zanzibar&indicator=1003710-adult-literacy-rate-percent)
45 [2016?region=1000230-zanzibar&indicator=1003710-adult-literacy-rate-percent.](http://tanzania.opendataforafrica.org/TZSOCECD2016/social-economics-of-tanzania-2016?region=1000230-zanzibar&indicator=1003710-adult-literacy-rate-percent)
46 [Accessed: 06-Dec-2018].
47
- 48 [23] Alba S, Nathan R, Schulze A, Mshinda H, and Lengeler C. Child mortality patterns in
49 rural Tanzania: an observational study on the impact of malaria control interventions.
50 *Int. J. Epidemiol.*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 204–215, Feb. 2014.

- 1
2 [24] Kweka EJ, Kimaro EE., Kimaro EG, Nagagi YP, and Malele II. Major Disease Vectors
3 in Tanzania: Distribution, Control and Challenges. *Biol. Control Pest Vector Insects*,
4 Apr. 2017.
5
6 [25] Spatial Repellent Products for the Control of Vector Borne Diseases - Malaria -
7 Tanzania - Full Text View - ClinicalTrials.gov. [Online]. Available:
8 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02294214>. [Accessed: 13-Jun-2017].
9
10 [26] WHO Prequalified Vector Control Products. PQT-VC Reference: 001-001. 25/10/2017.
11
12 [27] Theiss-Nyland K, Lynch M, Lines J. Assessing the availability of LLINs for continuous
13 distribution through routine antenatal care and the Expanded Programme on
14 Immunizations in sub-Saharan Africa. *Malar. J.*, vol. 15, May 2016.
15
16 [28] Koenker H, Arnold F, Ba F, Cisse M, Diouf L, Eckert E, et al. Assessing whether
17 universal coverage with insecticide-treated nets has been achieved: is the right indicator
18 being used?. *Malar. J.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 355, Oct. 2018.
19
20 [29] Lauritsen JM, Bruus M., EpiData (version 25th. August 2005). A comprehensive tool for
21 validated entry and documentation of data. The EpiData Association, Odense, Denmark,
22 2003-2005.
23
24 [30] StataCorp. 2015. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14. College Station, TX: StataCorp
25 LP.
26
27 [31] Vyas S, Kumaranayake L. Constructing socio-economic status indices: how to use
28 principal components analysis. *Health Policy Plan.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 459–468, Nov.
29 2006.
30
31 [32] Matovu F, Goodman C, Wiseman V, Mwengee W. How equitable is bed net ownership
32 and utilisation in Tanzania? A practical application of the principles of horizontal and
33 vertical equity. *Malar. J.*, vol. 8, p. 109, May 2009.
34
35 [33] Kirby MJ, Green C, Milligan PM, Sismanidis C, Jasseh M, Conway DJ, et al. Risk
36 factors for house-entry by malaria vectors in a rural town and satellite villages in The
37 Gambia. *Malar. J.*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 2, Jan. 2008.
38
39 [34] Noor AM, Omumbo JA, Amin AA, Zurovac D, and Snow RW. Wealth, mother's
40 education and physical access as determinants of retail sector net use in rural Kenya.
41 *Malar. J.*, vol. 5, p. 5, Jan. 2006.
42
43 [35] Buchwald AG, Walldorf JA, Cohee LM, Coalson JE, Chimbiya N, Bauleni A, et al. Bed
44 net use among school-aged children after a universal bed net campaign in Malawi.
45 *Malar. J.*, vol. 15, Feb. 2016.
46
47 [36] Schantz-Dunn J and Nour NM. Malaria and Pregnancy: A Global Health Perspective.
48 *Rev. Obstet. Gynecol.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 186–192, 2009.
49

- 1 [37] Clarke SE, Bøgh C, Brown RC, Walraven GE, Thomas CJ, Lindsay SW. Risk of malaria
2 attacks in Gambian children is greater away from malaria vector breeding sites. -
3 PubMed - NCBI. [Online]. Available:
4 [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Risk%20of%20malaria%20attacks%20in](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Risk%20of%20malaria%20attacks%20in%20Gambian%20children%20is%20greater%20away%20from%20malaria%20vector%20breeding%20sites)
5 [%20Gambian%20children%20is%20greater%20away%20from%20malaria%20vector%](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Risk%20of%20malaria%20attacks%20in%20Gambian%20children%20is%20greater%20away%20from%20malaria%20vector%20breeding%20sites)
6 [%20breeding%20sites](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Risk%20of%20malaria%20attacks%20in%20Gambian%20children%20is%20greater%20away%20from%20malaria%20vector%20breeding%20sites). [Accessed: 25-Jan-2018].
7
- 8 [38] Household Survey Indicators for Malaria Control. MEASURE Evaluation. MEASURE
9 DHS. President's Malaria Initiative. Roll Back Malaria Partnership. UNICEF. World
10 Health Organization. June 2013. Available from:
11 [http://www.malariasurveys.org/documents/Household%20Survey%20Indicators%20for](http://www.malariasurveys.org/documents/Household%20Survey%20Indicators%20for%20Malaria%20Control.pdf)
12 [%20Malaria%20Control.pdf](http://www.malariasurveys.org/documents/Household%20Survey%20Indicators%20for%20Malaria%20Control.pdf)
13
- 14 [39] Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), (2014). ArcGIS Desktop Help 10.3
15 Geostatistical Analyst. <http://desktop.arcgis.com/en/>
16
- 17 [40] OpenStreetMap contributors. OpenStreetMap. [Online]. Available:
18 <https://www.openstreetmap.org/>. [Accessed: 26-Aug-2018].
19
- 20 [41] Verdonschot PFM. and Besse-Lototskaya AA. Flight distance of mosquitoes (Culicidae):
21 A metadata analysis to support the management of barrier zones around rewetted and
22 newly constructed wetlands. *Limnologica*, vol. 45, pp. 69–79, Mar. 2014.
23
- 24 [42] Chavasse DC, Lines JD, Ichimori K, Majala AR, Minjas JN, Marijani J. Mosquito
25 control in Dar es Salaam. *Med. Vet. Entomol.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 147–154, Apr. 1995.
26
- 27 [43] Msellemu D, Shemdoe A, Makungu C, Mlacha Y, Kannady K, Dongus S, et al. The
28 underlying reasons for very high levels of bed net use, and higher malaria infection
29 prevalence among bed net users than non-users in the Tanzanian city of Dar es Salaam:
30 a qualitative study. *Malar. J.*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 423, Oct. 2017.
31
- 32 [44] Kilian A, Koenker H, Obi E, Selby RA, Fotheringham M, Lynch M. Field durability of
33 the same type of long-lasting insecticidal net varies between regions in Nigeria due to
34 differences in household behaviour and living conditions. *Malar. J.*, vol. 14, Mar. 2015.
35
- 36 [45] Stuck L, Lutambi A, Chacky F, Schaettle P, Kramer K, Mandike R, et al. Can school-
37 based distribution be used to maintain coverage of long-lasting insecticide treated bed
38 nets: evidence from a large scale programme in southern Tanzania?. *Health Policy*
39 *Plan.*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 980–989, Sep. 2017.
40
- 41 [46] Kaindoa EW, Mkandawile G, Ligamba G, Kelly-Hope LA, and Okumu FO. Correlations
42 between household occupancy and malaria vector biting risk in rural Tanzanian villages:
43 implications for high-resolution spatial targeting of control interventions. *Malar. J.*, vol.
44 15, Apr. 2016.
45
- 46 [47] Walldorf JA, Cohee LM, Coalson JE, Bauleni A, Nkanaunena K, Kapito-Tembo A, et al.
47 School-Age Children Are a Reservoir of Malaria Infection in Malawi. *PLOS ONE*, vol.
48 10, no. 7, p. e0134061, Jul. 2015.
49

- 1 [48] Massue DJ, Lorenz LM, Moore JD, Ntabaliba WS, Ackerman S, Mboma ZM, et al.
2 Comparing the new Ifakara Ambient Chamber Test with WHO cone and tunnel tests for
3 bioefficacy and non-inferiority testing of insecticide-treated nets. *Malar. J.*, vol. 18, no.
4 1, p. 153, Apr. 2019.
5
- 6 [49] Atieli H, Menya D, Githeko A, Scott T. House design modifications reduce indoor
7 resting malaria vector densities in rice irrigation scheme area in western Kenya. *Malar.*
8 *J.*, vol. 8, p. 108, May 2009.
9
- 10 [50] Kaindoa EW, Finda M, Kiplagat J, Mkandawile G, Nyoni A, Coetzee M, et al. Housing
11 gaps, mosquitoes and public viewpoints: a mixed methods assessment of relationships
12 between house characteristics, malaria vector biting risk and community perspectives in
13 rural Tanzania. *Malar. J.*, vol. 17, Aug. 2018.
14
- 15 [51] Lwetoijera DW, Kiware SS, Mageni ZD, Dongus S, Harris C, Devine GJ, et al. A need
16 for better housing to further reduce indoor malaria transmission in areas with high bed
17 net coverage. *Parasit. Vectors*, vol. 6, p. 57, Mar. 2013.
18
- 19 [52] Simkovich SM, Goodman D, Roa C, Crocker ME, Gianella GE, Kirenga BJ, et al. The
20 health and social implications of household air pollution and respiratory diseases. *NPJ*
21 *Prim. Care Respir. Med.* vol. 29, Apr. 2019.
22
- 23 [53] Polat F. Inclusion in education: A step towards social justice. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* vol. 31,
24 no. 1, pp. 50–58, Jan. 2011.
25
- 26 [54] Kirby MJ, Ameh D, Green C, Jawara M, Milligan PJ, Bottomley C, et al. Efficacy of
27 two different house screening interventions against exposure to malaria and anaemia in
28 children in The Gambia: a randomized controlled trial. *Lancet*, vol. 374, no. 9694, pp.
29 998–1009, Sep. 2009.
30
- 31 [55] Read AF, Lynch PA, and Thomas MB. How to Make Evolution-Proof Insecticides for
32 Malaria Control. *PLOS Biol.*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. e1000058, Apr. 2009.
33
- 34 [56] Lindsay SW, Emerson PM, and Charlwood JD. Reducing malaria by mosquito-proofing
35 houses. *Trends Parasitol.*, vol. 18, no. 11, pp. 510–514, Nov. 2002.
36
- 37 [57] Tusting LS, Willey B, Lucas H, Thompson J, Kafy HT, Smith R, et al. Socioeconomic
38 development as an intervention against malaria: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
39 *The Lancet*, vol. 382, no. 9896, pp. 963–972, Sep. 2013.
40
- 41 [58] Geissbühler Y, Chaki P, Emidi B, Govella NJ, Shirima R, Mayagaya V, et al.
42 Interdependence of domestic malaria prevention measures and mosquito-human
43 interactions in urban Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Malar. J.*, vol. 6, p. 126, Sep. 2007.
44
- 45 [59] Molina-Cruz A, Lehmann T, Knöckel J. Could culicine mosquitoes transmit human
46 malaria?. *Trends Parasitol.*, vol. 29, no. 11, pp. 530–537, Nov. 2013.
47
- 48 [60] Roxas B, Lindsay V. Social Desirability Bias in Survey Research on Sustainable
49 Development in Small Firms: an Exploratory Analysis of Survey Mode Effect. *Bus.*
50 *Strategy Environ.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 223–235, May 2012.

1

2

3 **Additional files**

4 Additional file 1: Distribution of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, and ITNs
5 coverage and use of house modification.

6

7 Additional file 2: Univariate analysis of the factors associated with ITNs coverage and use of
8 house modification.

9

10 Additional file 3: Multivariable analysis of the factors associated with ITNs coverage and use
11 of house modification.