

1 **Determinants of exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes: a comprehensive geospatial analysis in peri-**
2 **urban Cambodia**

3
4
5 Daniel M. Parker¹, Catalina Medina^{1,2}, Jennifer Bohl³, Chanthap Lon^{3,5}, Sophana Chea^{4,5}, Sreyngim
6 Lay^{4,5}, Dara Kong⁴, Sreynik Nhek⁵, Somnang Man^{4,5}, Johannes S. P. Doehl³, Rithea Leang⁴, Hok Kry⁶,
7 Huy Rekol⁴, Fabiano Oliveira^{3,5}, Vladimir Minin², and Jessica E. Manning^{3,5}
8

9 ¹Program in Public Health, University of California, Irvine, California, U.S.A

10 ²Department of Statistics, University of California, Irvine, California, U.S.A

11 ³Laboratory of Malaria and Vector Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases,
12 National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.

13 ⁴National Center of Parasitology, Entomology and Malaria Control, Ministry of Health, Phnom
14 Penh, Cambodia

15 ⁵International Center of Excellence in Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
16 Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

17 ⁶Kampong Speu Provincial Health District, Ministry of Health, Cambodia
18
19
20

21 DMP: dparker1@hs.uci.edu

22 CM: catalmm1@uci.edu

23 JB: jennifer.bohl@nih.gov

24 CL: lonc@icercambodia.org

25 SC: cheas@icercambodia.org

26 SL: lays@icercambodia.org

27 DK: kongdaralab@gmail.com

28 SN: nsreynik@icercambodia.org

29 SM: mans@icercambodia.org

30 JSPD: johannes.doehl@nih.gov

31 RL: rithealeang@gmail.com

32 HK: hokkry@yahoo.com

33 HR: kolhuy@gmail.com

34 FO: loliveira@niaid.nih.gov

35 VM: vminin@uci.edu

36 JEM: jessica.manning@nih.gov
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68

ABSTRACT

Aedes mosquitoes are some of the most important and globally expansive vectors of disease. Public health efforts are largely focused on prevention of human-vector contact. A range of entomological indices are used to measure risk of disease, though with conflicting results (i.e. larval or adult abundance does not always predict risk of disease). There is a growing interest in the development and use of biomarkers for exposure to mosquito saliva, including for *Aedes spp*, as a proxy for disease risk. In this study, we conduct a comprehensive geostatistical analysis of exposure to *Aedes* mosquito bites among a pediatric cohort in a peri-urban setting endemic to dengue, Zika, and chikungunya viruses. We use demographic, household, and environmental variables (the flooding index (NFI), land type, and proximity to a river) in a Bayesian geostatistical model to predict areas of exposure to *Aedes aegypti* bites. We found that hotspots of exposure to *Ae. aegypti* salivary gland extract (SGE) were relatively small (< 500m and sometimes < 250m) and stable across the two-year study period. Age was negatively associated with antibody responses to *Ae. aegypti* SGE. Those living in agricultural settings had lower antibody responses than those living in urban settings, whereas those living near recent surface water accumulation were more likely to have higher antibody responses. Finally, we incorporated measures of larval and adult density in our geostatistical models and found that they did not show associations with antibody responses to *Ae. aegypti* SGE after controlling for other covariates in the model. Our results indicate that targeted house- or neighborhood-focused interventions may be appropriate for vector control in this setting. Further, demographic and environmental factors more capably predicted exposure to *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes than commonly used entomological indices.

Keywords: *Aedes*; saliva; geostatistical; environmental; dengue fever; Zika; chikungunya

69

70 INTRODUCTION

71 *Aedes* spp. mosquitoes are globally distributed arthropod vectors that transmit devastating viruses
72 including dengue, chikungunya, Zika, and yellow fever in addition to being competent to host
73 multiple other pathogens (1–4). *Aedes* spp. mosquitoes are day feeders and *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae.*
74 *albopictus* favor container habitats for larval stages, are well-suited for urban environments, and
75 feed in the daytime, making them difficult targets for blanket vector control campaigns (5–9).

76 Much of Southeast Asia is currently undergoing urbanization, including both landscape
77 changes and rural- urban migration. In 1980, an estimated 25% of the total population lived in
78 areas classified as urban compared to 2019 where 50% of the total population lives in urban
79 settings (10). In this context, there is an expansion of *Aedes* habitats coupled with an increase in
80 co-localized human populations, potentially leading to increased *Aedes*-human contact and a
81 resultant increase in arboviral infections.

82 There is increasing interest in the use of antibodies against mosquito saliva as an indicator
83 of mosquito-borne disease risk (11–13). Much of this work has focused on *Anopheles* mosquitoes
84 with regard to the malaria epidemiological systems, but as malaria is nearing elimination in many
85 Southeast Asian countries, the focus is turning to the explosive arboviral outbreaks occurring in the
86 region each year (14,15).

87 Several viral diseases are thought to be primarily transmitted by *Aedes aegypti* with some
88 transmission also attributed to *Ae. albopictus*, including dengue, chikungunya, and Zika viruses
89 (16,17). While dengue surveillance systems are relatively robust in Southeast Asia, they are less so
90 in countries reliant on clinicosyndromic approaches like Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, or more rural
91 areas of Thailand (18). Markers of exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes are valuable in assessing high-

92 risk areas where vector control can be targeted.

93 The allure of a tool that directly measures exposure to feeding *Aedes* (through antibodies
94 to *Aedes* spp. saliva) is multi-fold. Currently, an array of different entomological indices are used
95 for estimating risk of acquiring *Aedes*- borne diseases and for measuring the relative effectiveness
96 of public health campaigns that focus on vectors (19). These indices include measuring the
97 absence/presence of suitable habitat for the larval stages, the absence/presence or abundance of
98 larval stages, adult abundance, and human landing catches (HLC) (20–22). Many of these measures
99 are time- and labor-intensive and HLC is not possible in some settings for ethical and legal reasons.
100 Furthermore, studies that attempt to look for associations between these entomological indices
101 and risk of infection often have mixed results (23–26).

102 Furthermore, even in settings where *Aedes*-borne diseases like dengue fever are endemic,
103 it is difficult to design vector control studies with sufficient statistical power to assess the impact of
104 public health interventions (11). Dengue fever cases fluctuate drastically from year-to-year
105 (27,28), irrespective of vector control. Plus, many infected persons exhibit mild or no symptoms
106 and are therefore difficult to detect despite remaining highly infectious (29). As a result, trials may
107 require extremely large target populations in order to assess the relative effectiveness of a vector
108 control intervention.

109 Measuring the impact on the vector is less restrictive, more operationally feasible, and
110 economical. Measuring vector-human contact through antibody responses to *Aedes* salivary
111 proteins is more relevant to the epidemiological process of interest (e.g. transmission from
112 mosquito to human) since it is a direct measure of exposure to mosquito saliva. It also does not
113 require assumptions about associations between *Aedes* abundance and contact with humans that
114 can vary dramatically based on climate, human behavior, and seasonality (11). A direct,

115 quantitative measure of exposure to *Aedes* saliva is therefore useful for assessing risk of acquiring
116 *Aedes*-borne disease, for identifying geographic spaces where transmission is likely occurring, and
117 for measuring the impact of public health interventions.

118 In this study we use data from a longitudinal pediatric cohort study in Cambodia to conduct
119 a detailed geostatistical analysis of exposure to *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes. Recently, we
120 demonstrated that antibody responses to *Ae. aegypti* salivary gland extract (SGE) in this setting
121 were associated with risk of dengue virus infection (30). We also documented the presence of Zika
122 and chikungunya infections in this setting (31), and dengue is likewise endemic. Here, we use
123 antibody responses to *Ae. aegypti* SGE to assess demographic, household, and environmental
124 correlates of exposure to *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes.

125

126 **DATA AND METHODS**

127 **Cohort data**

128 The study location is Chbar Mon town in Kampong Spea Province of Cambodia, a peri-urban area
129 approximately 20km from the national capital Phnom Penh (Figure 1). A cohort of 775 children
130 were recruited for a study on dengue virus (DENV) infection and exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes in
131 2018 (as described in (32)). During recruitment, patient demographic and geographic data were
132 recorded including: age, gender, household characteristics including number of domestic water
133 containers or use of larvicide at their house. The geographic coordinates (latitude and longitude)
134 of each participant's house were recorded.

135 Study staff conducted semi-annual blood sampling among the cohort: in July/August 2018;
136 March/April 2019; July/August 2019; and March/April of 2020. Children with fever were able to
137 present for dengue testing via rapid test and viral PCR confirmation at any time.

138

139 **House data**

140 In a subsection of the study area (approximately 3.89km²), house visits were conducted twice yearly
141 during the study period for a total of four visits. During house visits, survey staff enumerated the
142 number of visible water containers in each house and the number of water containers infested
143 with larvae.

144

145 **Adult abundance data**

146 In July (rainy season) of 2018, 88 gravid traps (Biogents BG - GAT: <https://us.biogents.com/bg-gat/>)
147 were set in a subsection of the target area (approximately 0.86km²) to trap adult *Aedes* mosquitoes
148 to quantify adult abundance over an 8-week period of time. A 100m by 100m grid was overlaid on
149 a central portion of the target area, encompassing a dense urban setting, a creek, and touching
150 agricultural fields. Traps were set within each grid cell, at both indoor and outdoor settings, and
151 were checked daily. *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* mosquitoes were identified and tabulated at
152 the weekly level.

153

154 **Surface water data**

155 A normalized flooding index (NFI) which gives an indication of surface water was extracted for this
156 analysis (33). The data were extracted from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer
157 products (MOD13Q1/MYD13Q1 250 meter AQUA/TERRA 16-day composites). The data were
158 downloaded for each 16-day time interval (from July 2018 – May 2020) using a 250m buffer around
159 the home of each patient in the data set. Mean NFI values in the 250m radius around each
160 participant's home, corresponding to the 1-month time period leading up to each patients'

161 hospital admission date, were used in this analysis.

162

163 **Land use/ land type data:**

164 Land cover data for study area were downloaded from Open Development Cambodia

165 (<https://opendevelopmentcambodia.net>) and come from the Regional Land Cover Monitoring

166 System at 30 by 30 m resolution. We checked the general accuracy of the land cover data using

167 freely available satellite imagery (from Google Earth). We created 250m buffers around each

168 participant's house and then extracted the modal land type around each house within that 250m

169 radius using the Zonal Histogram function in QGIS.

170

171 **Geostatistical model**

172 A Bayesian geostatistical model was used to model individual-level exposure to *Aedes* bites regressed

173 on the four visits' individual level predictors, incorporating spatial correlation of the errors. The

174 outcome variable is the log antibody response to *Ae. aegypti* salivary gland extract (SGE),

175 hereafter referred to as exposure to "*Aedes* bites". Linear predictors in the model included:

176 gender, age, minimum distance from house to river, and the modal land type for an individual's

177 home. Linear time-varying predictors included: number of toilets and number of domestic water

178 containers in home, use of insecticide and larvicide, home NFI, and an indicator for wet season. The

179 sample collection periods were spaced by approximately 6 months, to assess rainy season and dry

180 season each year. Model covariates are listed in Table 1.

181 Subsequent models were fit incorporating percent of surveyed water containers found to

182 contain mosquito larvae, referred to as the larval container index, and adult abundance in a 250-

183 meter radius around each individual's home, on subsets of the data. Counts of larvae containing

184 water containers were collected at times corresponding to the four antibody collection periods.
185 Adult *Aedes* abundance was only collected in a small subset of the study area during a period
186 corresponding the first collection timepoint. Therefore, the model including this predictor was the
187 baseline visit model.

188 All model coefficients were modeled with vague normal prior distributions centered at
189 zero, to represent the investigation's uncertainty about the relationship between the model
190 predictors and mosquito exposure. Statistical analyses were performed using the R statistical
191 software system, where geostatistical models were fit using the INLA package ([https://www.r-](https://www.r-inla.org/)
192 [inla.org/](https://www.r-inla.org/)).

193 The data processing, wrangling, and analytic workflow are illustrated in Figure 2. More
194 model details can be found in the Supplemental Materials.

195

196 **Ethics statement**

197 The study protocol was approved by the institutional review boards at the US National Institutes of
198 Health and the National Ethics Committee on Human Research in Cambodia. The guardians of all
199 pediatric participants provided signed informed consent to participate in the study. The clinical
200 protocol is available at <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03534245>.

201

202 **RESULTS**

203 ***Aedes* abundance in the study area**

204 Both *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* were trapped in the study area. The most abundant was *Ae.*
205 *aegypti* (total 436; 84.5% of all trapped *Aedes*) and this species was more abundant in indoor
206 gravid traps throughout the 8 consecutive weeks of trapping during the rainy season (area

207 indicated in Figure 1, details in Supplemental figure 1 and Supplemental table 1). *Ae. aegypti*
208 mosquitoes had over 3 times the odds (3.13; 95% CI: 1.89, 5.19) of being trapped indoors when
209 compared to *Ae. albopictus*.

210

211 **Study Population Characteristics**

212 Approximately half of the cohort were female (50.5%) and the mean age of participants was 5.6
213 years. Most participant houses (60.6%) were located in urban settings, followed by unspecified
214 cropland (35.5%) and rice paddy (3.9%). The farthest distance between any participant houses in the
215 data is 6072m (mean 1652m) and for households not in urban settings, the farthest distance to an
216 urban landscape was 119m (mean 33m). Approximately half of all participants reported using
217 insecticides during the study period and less than 19% of participants reported using larvicide. The
218 mean number of water containers per house was consistently over 3 for each visit, though slightly
219 higher in wet seasons. As expected, mean NFI (flooding) values were highest in the wet season
220 and lowest in the dry season (Table 2).

221

222 **Exposure ‘hotspots’ were discrete (well-separated) and persistent**

223 Hotspots of exposure to *Aedes* bites persisted across the study duration. Figure 3 indicates the
224 prediction surface for exposure to *Aedes* saliva for each of the time points. Clear hotspots were
225 evident at spatial extents much smaller than 500-by-500m. Hot- and cold-spots were evident even
226 in lower and upper credible interval maps, and across the four visits. The extent of spatial
227 clustering (<500m and occasionally <250m) is also evident in the model variograms (Supplemental
228 figure 2).

229

230 **Demographic, household, and geographic predictors of exposure to *Ae. aegypti* bites**

231 Age and gender were statistically significant predictors of high exposure to *Aedes* bites (Figure 4).
232 The model showed that when comparing children of similar household and environmental
233 conditions, males and older children were estimated to have lower average *Ae. aegypti* SGE antibody
234 responses in comparison to females and younger children.

235 Among the household condition predictors, insecticide and larvicide use and number of
236 water containers in a child's house were not associated with a difference in average exposure
237 (Figure 4 and Supplemental Table 2). When comparing children of similar demographics and
238 environmental conditions, those with an additional toilet in their home have a mean log mosquito
239 exposure 4.36% higher (95% credible interval of: 2.56 - 6.19). A higher mean *Aedes* mosquito exposure
240 was detected among children who live in primarily urban areas compared to those who live in
241 primarily cropland or rice paddy areas, controlling for flooding, season, gender, age, and household
242 characteristics (Figure 4 and Supplemental Table 2). The model found those who lived in
243 households with higher levels of surface flooding in the month prior to a blood screening also had
244 higher exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes. When accounting for flooding, land type, and the other
245 model predictors, wet season and distance from one's house to the river were not associated with a
246 difference in mean exposure to *Aedes* bites.

247

248 **Larval model**

249 The larval container index was compared to other common entomological indicators including the
250 house index, larvae contaminated containers, and premise condition index (PCI) within a 250m
251 radius of a study participant's house. A plot of the correlation between these indices is in
252 Supplemental figure 3. Mean infested containers and mean PCI had moderate correlation with the

253 larval container index (Supplemental figure 3). The larval container index was used as a predictor
254 in the model because it incorporates information on the number of larval infested containers while
255 accounting for the number of surveyed water containers, which was not uniform across the study
256 area. 98 study participants did not have any house survey data collected within a 250m radius of
257 their house and had to be removed from the data used to build the models for this larval
258 investigation.

259 Three models were compared using this subset of data: one without the larval container
260 index; one with the larval container index; and one with the larval container index and without the
261 environmental predictors (surface flooding (NFI), land type, distance to the river). All three models
262 had similar estimation results and their MSE's from cross validation showed all three models
263 predicted approximately equally well. This is a key finding because data collection projects such as
264 the house survey are costly and our findings suggest that the larval container index, an expensive
265 and labor-intensive data point, can be replaced with the easily collected environmental predictors
266 (NFI and land type) of our model.

267 The larval model (Figure 4) is identical to our main model but with container index
268 included, and it had near identical estimation as the main model. Our model estimates the linear
269 association between living in an area with a higher percentage of larval contaminated containers
270 and exposure to *Aedes* mosquitos to be practically zero (posterior mean of 0.26 with a 95%
271 credible interval of -0.02 to 0.54), when accounting for the other variables present in our model.

272

273 **Adult mosquito model**

274 487 study participants did not have an adult *Aedes* mosquito trap within at 250m radius of their
275 house and were therefore removed from the data used in the adult abundance investigation.

276 Again, three models were fit: one with and one without average adult abundance and one
277 with average adult abundance but without the environmental predictors. We found these models
278 all to have similar estimation and prediction performance. This again suggest that the costly *Aedes*
279 abundance data can be replaced with the environmental predictors (i.e. surface flooding and land
280 type), while also accounting for demographic and household characteristics.

281 The adult model in Figure 4 is the model including adult *Aedes* abundance as a predictor
282 and it had similar estimation to the main and larval models, with increased variation due to the
283 smaller sample size. Our findings suggest there is no linear association between nearby adult
284 *Aedes* abundance and a child's exposure to these mosquitos (posterior mean of -1.05 with a 95%
285 credible interval of -4.32 to 1.87), when including the other model variables. This model also found
286 no evidence of an association between the number of toilets in a child's home and their exposure
287 to *Aedes* mosquitos.

288

289

290 **DISCUSSION**

291 Here we present a detailed geostatistical analysis of exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes among a
292 longitudinal pediatric cohort in peri-urban Cambodia. The results have practical public health
293 relevance for *Aedes* borne-diseases, which are common throughout most of the tropical and
294 subtropical world. Specifically, our results suggest that: 1) there are strong demographic and
295 geographic correlates of exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes, and 2) house-focused public health
296 strategies are likely to be efficient at disrupting *Aedes*-human contact.

297 Several clear patterns emerged from our analysis. Demographic factors (age and gender)
298 were strong and consistent predictors of exposure to *Aedes* mosquito bites. Males and older age

299 groups had lower antibody responses to *Aedes* salivary proteins. The negative association between
300 age and immunological response to *Aedes* salivary proteins has been described from several other
301 studies (34–36). This be related to chronic exposure over the lifespan, with decreased antibody
302 reaction (i.e. anergy) to *Aedes* saliva over years of exposure. At least one other study has also
303 noted the gender effect that we describe here (34). In older age groups this effect might be
304 attributable to gendered differences in exposure (through workplaces, etc.) but this differential
305 exposure is not obvious for young children unless one gender is preferred to attend school (in
306 Cambodia both genders consistently attend primary school (37)). Further work is needed to find
307 the social or biological mechanisms behind this pattern.

308 Household location was likewise a consistent predictor of exposure to *Aedes* mosquito
309 bites. Individuals who lived in agricultural areas had lower antibody responses to *Ae. aegypti* SGE
310 than those living in urban settings. This finding is intuitive in that the primary vector of dengue virus
311 (*Ae. aegypti*) is widely considered an urban-dwelling mosquito. Conversely, participants living in
312 these houses are likely to visit urban settings frequently, living only a short distance from
313 relatively dense urban dwellings (mean distance from all participant houses to urban land
314 type was 33m). Presumably, individuals living in those households also visit schools, markets,
315 temples and would be exposed during those visits. Yet, we are still able to detect significantly
316 decreased anti-*Ae. aegypti* SGE antibody levels in children living in croplands and rice paddy fields
317 when compared to those living in urban settings. Likewise, individuals who lived in households
318 with recent surface flooding (NFI) had higher exposure to *Aedes* mosquito bites. Water bodies are
319 important for the larval stages of mosquitoes (including *Aedes*). This finding, in combination with
320 the findings about living in agricultural settings, strongly suggests that households are important
321 places of exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes. While schools are often also the targets of vector control

322 interventions in Southeast Asia, the data are mixed as to how effective these interventions are in
323 reducing disease (38–40). Community-based interventions should be locally tailored.

324 In our study we found that hot- and cold-spots of exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes appeared
325 stable and relatively small (<500m) throughout the study time period. The combined geostatistical
326 results here, where small hotspots are centered on clusters of houses and are persistent across
327 time, may be the result of short flight patterns among *Aedes* mosquitoes (often thought to not be
328 further than 100m from place of birth (41)). Household-focused interventions such as spatial
329 repellents may therefore be effective at disrupting human-*Aedes* exposure in this setting (and
330 likely others).

331 In previous work we demonstrated that antibody response to *Aedes* salivary proteins is a
332 significant predictor of dengue infection (30). Several other studies have likewise sought to use
333 antibody responses to *Aedes* saliva as a predictor of dengue infection, with conflicting results (35,42–
334 45). We hypothesize that these conflicting results are related to the relative rarity of accounting for
335 prior DENV infection at baseline in addition to detection of clinically inapparent DENV cases.
336 Longitudinal studies are expensive and logistically difficult, but with validated markers for
337 exposure and disease risk, *a priori* screening of a community at the beginning of a rainy season
338 followed by an intervention could potentially prevent *Aedes*-borne disease. This is based on the
339 premise that disrupting human-*Aedes* exposure is likely to lead to disruption of dengue virus
340 transmission. Zika and chikungunya viruses have also been detected in our study setting (31,46,47)
341 and disrupting human-*Aedes* contact may likewise protect against these *Aedes*-borne diseases.

342 Finally, use of a biomarker of exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes may facilitate public health
343 intervention studies that could rely on direct measures of exposure to *Aedes* mosquitoes rather
344 than disease outcomes, substantially lowering needed sample size numbers and cost (32). We

345 tested models that incorporated standardized entomological indices including proximity to larvae-
346 infested water containers or to traps with greater abundance of adult *Aedes* mosquitoes. Neither
347 of these indices predicted antibody responses to *Ae. aegypti* SGE. Studies that use symptomatic
348 dengue infections as the primary outcome often require extremely large cohort sizes in order to
349 ensure a statistically significant difference between treatment and control arms. Reported dengue
350 cases often fluctuate markedly from year to year, even in hyperendemic settings and the same is
351 true for other *Aedes*-borne diseases. Measuring the impact of vector-focused public health
352 interventions by using a direct measure of exposure to *Aedes* saliva can alleviate this obstacle to
353 much needed research on vector control for mosquito-borne diseases.

354 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

355 Conceptualization: DMP; CM; FO; VM; JEM
356 Methodology: DMP; CM; FO; JSPD; VM; JEM
357 Software: na
358 Validation: DMP; CM; FO; VM; JEM
359 Formal Analysis: DMP; CM; FO; JSPD; VM; JEM
360 Laboratory work and analyses: JB; SC; SL; SN
361 Investigation: DMP; CM; FO; JSPD; VM; JEM
362 Resources: JEM
363 Data Curation: JEM; CM; DMP
364 Writing – Original Draft Preparation: DMP; CM; VM; JEM
365 Writing – Review & Editing: DMP; CM; JB; CL; SC; SL; DK; SN; SM; JSPD; RL; HK; HR; FO; VM; JEM
366 Visualization: DMP; CM; VM
367 Supervision: DMP; VM; JEM
368 Project Administration: JEM
369 Funding Acquisition: JEM

370

371 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

372 We thank the study participants and their parents in Chbar Mon town of Kampong Speu Province.
373 We also thank the clinical staff of Kampong Speu District Referral Hospital for their patient care
374 and their support for this project.

375

376 **FUNDING**

377 Funding for this work came from the Division of Intramural Research at the National Institute of
378 Allergy and Infectious Diseases and partially from the National Cancer Institute (contract number
379 75N910D00024, task order number 75N91019F00130 to A. M.).

380

381 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

382 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

383

References

1. Ogunlade ST, Meehan MT, Adekunle AI, Rojas DP, Adegboye OA, McBryde ES. A Review: Aedes-Borne Arboviral Infections, Controls and Wolbachia-Based Strategies. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2021 Jan 8;9(1):32.
2. Ryan SJ, Carlson CJ, Mordecai EA, Johnson LR. Global expansion and redistribution of Aedes-borne virus transmission risk with climate change. Han BA, editor. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2019 Mar 28;13(3):e0007213.
3. Kraemer MU, Sinka ME, Duda KA, Mylne AQ, Shearer FM, Barker CM, et al. The global distribution of the arbovirus vectors *Aedes aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus*. Jit M, editor. *eLife*. 2015 Jun 30;4:e08347.
4. Kraemer MUG, Reiner RC, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Gilbert M, Pigott DM, et al. Past and future spread of the arbovirus vectors *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*. *Nat Microbiol*. 2019 May;4(5):854–63.
5. Gubler DJ. Dengue, Urbanization and Globalization: The Unholy Trinity of the 21st Century. *Trop Med Health*. 2011 Dec;39(4 Suppl):3–11.
6. Kolimenakis A, Heinz S, Wilson ML, Winkler V, Yakob L, Michaelakis A, et al. The role of urbanisation in the spread of *Aedes* mosquitoes and the diseases they transmit—A systematic review. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2021 Sep 9;15(9):e0009631.
7. Leisnham P, Juliano SA. Impacts of climate, land use, and biological invasion on the ecology of immature *Aedes* mosquitoes: Implications for La Crosse emergence. *Ecohealth*. 2012 Jun;9(2):217–28.
8. Weaver SC. Urbanization and geographic expansion of zoonotic arboviral diseases: mechanisms and potential strategies for prevention. *Trends Microbiol*. 2013 Aug;21(8):360–3.
9. Wilke ABB, Vasquez C, Carvajal A, Medina J, Chase C, Cardenas G, et al. Proliferation of *Aedes aegypti* in urban environments mediated by the availability of key aquatic habitats. *Sci Rep*. 2020 Jul 31;10(1):12925.
10. Population of South-Eastern Asia (2022) - Worldometer [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 17]. Available from: <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/south-eastern-asia-population/>
11. Doucoure S, Drame PM. Salivary Biomarkers in the Control of Mosquito-Borne Diseases. *Insects*. 2015 Nov 17;6(4):961–76.
12. Rizzo C, Lombardo F, Ronca R, Mangano V, Sirima SB, Nèbiè I, et al. Differential antibody response to the *Anopheles gambiae* gSG6 and cE5 salivary proteins in individuals naturally exposed to bites of malaria vectors. *Parasites & Vectors*. 2014 Nov 28;7(1):549.
13. *Anopheles* mosquitoes - New insights into malaria vectors | IntechOpen [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 17]. Available from: <https://www.intechopen.com/books/3092>
14. Ya-umphan P, Cerqueira D, Parker DM, Cottrell G, Poinsignon A, Remoue F, et al. *Anopheles* Salivary Biomarker to Assess Malaria Transmission Risk Along the Thailand-Myanmar Border. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2016 Dec 8;jiw543.
15. Ya-Umphphan P, Cerqueira D, Cottrell G, Parker DM, Fowkes FJI, Nosten F, et al. *Anopheles* Salivary Biomarker as a Proxy for Estimating *Plasmodium falciparum* Malaria Exposure on the Thailand-

- Myanmar Border. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2018 Aug;99(2):350–6.
16. Higgs S, Vanlandingham D. Chikungunya Virus and Its Mosquito Vectors. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases.* 2015 Apr;15(4):231–40.
 17. Ayres CFJ. Identification of Zika virus vectors and implications for control. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases.* 2016 Mar;16(3):278–9.
 18. Yek C, Nam VS, Leang R, Parker DM, Heng S, Souv K, et al. The Pandemic Experience in Southeast Asia: Interface Between SARS-CoV-2, Malaria, and Dengue. *Frontiers in Tropical Diseases* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Apr 8];2. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fitd.2021.788590>
 19. Focks D. A review of entomological sampling methods and indicators for dengue vectors [Internet]. UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases.; 2004 [cited 2021 Jun 16] p. 38. Report No.: TDR/IDE/DEN/03.1. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/68575/TDR_IDE_DEN_03.1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
 20. Gao Q, Wang F, Lv X, Cao H, Zhou J, Su F, et al. Comparison of the human-baited double net trap with the human landing catch for *Aedes albopictus* monitoring in Shanghai, China. *Parasites & Vectors.* 2018 Aug 28;11(1):483.
 21. Alvarado-Castro V, Paredes-Solís S, Nava-Aguilera E, Morales-Pérez A, Alarcón-Morales L, Balderas-Vargas NA, et al. Assessing the effects of interventions for *Aedes aegypti* control: systematic review and meta-analysis of cluster randomised controlled trials. *BMC Public Health.* 2017 May 30;17(Suppl 1):384.
 22. Bouzid M, Brainard J, Hooper L, Hunter PR. Public Health Interventions for *Aedes* Control in the Time of Zikavirus—A Meta-Review on Effectiveness of Vector Control Strategies. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2016 Dec 7;10(12):e0005176.
 23. Cromwell EA, Stoddard ST, Barker CM, Van Rie A, Messer WB, Meshnick SR, et al. The relationship between entomological indicators of *Aedes aegypti* abundance and dengue virus infection. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2017 Mar 23;11(3):e0005429.
 24. Morales-Pérez A, Nava-Aguilera E, Hernández-Alvarez C, Alvarado-Castro VM, Arosteguí J, Legorreta-Soberanis J, et al. Utility of entomological indices for predicting transmission of dengue virus: secondary analysis of data from the Camino Verde trial in Mexico and Nicaragua. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases.* 2020 Oct 26;14(10):e0008768.
 25. Breteau Index threshold levels indicating risk for dengue transmission in areas with low *Aedes* infestation - PubMed [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 17]. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20409286/>
 26. Wijayanti SPM, Sunaryo S, Suprihatin S, McFarlane M, Rainey SM, Dietrich I, et al. Dengue in Java, Indonesia: Relevance of Mosquito Indices as Risk Predictors. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2016 Mar;10(3):e0004500.
 27. Ferguson NM, Donnelly CA, Anderson RM. Transmission dynamics and epidemiology of dengue: insights from age-stratified sero-prevalence surveys. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 1999 Apr

29;354(1384):757–68.

28. Katzelnick LC, Coello Escoto A, Huang AT, Garcia-Carreras B, Chowdhury N, Maljkovic Berry I, et al. Antigenic evolution of dengue viruses over 20 years. *Science*. 2021 Nov 19;374(6570):999–1004.
29. Duong V, Lambrechts L, Paul RE, Ly S, Lay RS, Long KC, et al. Asymptomatic humans transmit dengue virus to mosquitoes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2015 Nov 24;112(47):14688–93.
30. Manning JE, Chea S, Parker DM, Bohl JA, Lay S, Mateja A, et al. Development of Inapparent Dengue Associated With Increased Antibody Levels to *Aedes aegypti* Salivary Proteins: A Longitudinal Dengue Cohort in Cambodia. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2021 Oct 27;jiab541.
31. Bohl JA, Lay S, Chea S, Ahyong V, Parker DM, Gallagher S, et al. Discovering disease-causing pathogens in resource-scarce Southeast Asia using a global metagenomic pathogen monitoring system. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2022 Mar 15;119(11):e2115285119.
32. Manning JE, Oliveira F, Parker DM, Amaratunga C, Kong D, Man S, et al. The PAGODAS protocol: pediatric assessment group of dengue and Aedes saliva protocol to investigate vector-borne determinants of Aedes-transmitted arboviral infections in Cambodia. *Parasites & Vectors* [Internet]. 2018 Dec [cited 2019 Sep 28];11(1). Available from: <https://parasitesandvectors.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13071-018-3224-7>
33. Boschetti M, Nutini F, Manfron G, Brivio PA, Nelson A. Comparative Analysis of Normalised Difference Spectral Indices Derived from MODIS for Detecting Surface Water in Flooded Rice Cropping Systems. Schumann GJP, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2014 Feb 20;9(2):e88741.
34. Doucoure S, Mouchet F, Cournil A, Goff GL, Cornelia S, Roca Y, et al. Human Antibody Response to *Aedes aegypti* Saliva in an Urban Population in Bolivia: A New Biomarker of Exposure to Dengue Vector Bites. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2012 Sep 5;87(3):504–10.
35. Cardenas JC, Drame PM, Luque-Burgos KA, Berrío JD, Entrena-Mutis E, González MU, et al. IgG1 and IgG4 antibodies against *Aedes aegypti* salivary proteins and risk for dengue infections. *PLOS ONE*. 2019 Jan 2;14(1):e0208455.
36. Buezo Montero S, Gabrieli P, Montarsi F, Borean A, Capelli S, De Silvestro G, et al. IgG Antibody Responses to the *Aedes albopictus* 34k2 Salivary Protein as Novel Candidate Marker of Human Exposure to the Tiger Mosquito. *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Mar 18];10. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fcimb.2020.00377>
37. Heuveline P, Hong S. Household Structure and Child Education in Cambodia. *Int J Popul Stud*. 2017;3(2):10.18063/ijps.v3i2.309.
38. Boyer S, Marcombe S, Yean S, Fontenille D. High diversity of mosquito vectors in Cambodian primary schools and consequences for arbovirus transmission. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(6):e0233669.
39. Boyer S, Fontenille D, Chhuoy K, Yean S, Suor K, Chhum M, et al. Ecomore 2 project in Cambodia: Integrated vector management for dengue vectors in schools in an entomological/epidemiological approach. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2020 Dec 1;101:487.
40. Bowman LR, Donegan S, McCall PJ. Is Dengue Vector Control Deficient in Effectiveness or Evidence?: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2016 Mar 17;10(3):e0004551.

41. Verdonshot PFM, Besse-Lototskaya AA. Flight distance of mosquitoes (Culicidae): A metadata analysis to support the management of barrier zones around rewetted and newly constructed wetlands. *Limnologica*. 2014 Mar 1;45:69–79.
42. Fustec B, Phanitchat T, Hoq MI, Aromseree S, Pientong C, Thaewnongiew K, et al. Complex relationships between *Aedes* vectors, socio-economics and dengue transmission—Lessons learned from a case-control study in northeastern Thailand. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2020 Oct 1;14(10):e0008703.
43. Fustec B, Phanitchat T, Aromseree S, Pientong C, Thaewnongiew K, Ekalaksananan T, et al. Serological biomarker for assessing human exposure to *Aedes* mosquito bites during a randomized vector control intervention trial in northeastern Thailand. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2021 May;15(5):e0009440.
44. Ouédraogo S, Benmarhnia T, Bonnet E, Somé PA, Barro AS, Kafando Y, et al. Evaluation of Effectiveness of a Community-Based Intervention for Control of Dengue Virus Vector, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2018 Oct;24(10):1859–67.
45. Londono-Renteria B, Cardenas JC, Cardenas LD, Christofferson RC, Chisenhall DM, Wesson DM, et al. Use of Anti-*Aedes aegypti* Salivary Extract Antibody Concentration to Correlate Risk of Vector Exposure and Dengue Transmission Risk in Colombia. *PLOS ONE*. 2013 Dec 2;8(12):e81211.
46. Chikungunya Outbreak — Cambodia, February–March 2012 [Internet]. [cited 2022 Mar 18]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6137a2.htm>
47. Heang V, Yasuda CY, Sovann L, Haddow AD, Travassos da Rosa AP, Tesh RB, et al. Zika Virus Infection, Cambodia, 2010. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2012 Feb;18(2):349–51.

Table 1: Table of predictor variables and their descriptions. The main outcome variable in our regressions was exposure to *Aedes* bites, measured through individual level antibody response to *Ae. aegypti* salivary gland extract (SGE)

Variable	Description
Gender (ref: female, male)	Gender of the child, either male or female. Female is the reference group.
Age	Age of the child at the baseline visit.
Insecticide used (ref: no, yes)	An indicator for whether or not insecticide was used in or around the child's home. This data was collected at each visit. No insecticide use is the reference group.
Larvicide used (ref: no, yes)	An indicator for whether or not larvicide was used in or around the child's home. This data was collected at each visit. No larvicide use is the reference group.
Number of toilets	The number of toilets in the child's home. This data was collected at each visit.
Number of water containers	Number of domestic water containers in the child's home. This data was collected at each visit.
Modal land type (ref: urban, rice paddy, cropland)	Land cover data for study area were downloaded from Open Development Cambodia and come from the Regional Land Cover Monitoring System at 30 m by 30 m resolution. We checked the general accuracy of the land cover data using freely-available satellite imagery (from Google Earth). We created 250m buffers around each participant's house and then extracted the modal land around each house within that 250m radius using the Zonal Histogram function in QGIS. The land types were grouped into three categories: urban, rice paddy, and cropland, with urban as the reference group.
Distance to river	The minimum distance from a child's home to the closest point of the nearby river. This data was centered and scaled due to its range, so it is in units of standard deviations.
Wet season (ref: no, yes)	An indicator for if the measurement was collected during the wet season (approximately June-September), which coincides with visits one and three. The dry season is the reference group (October - May).
Flooding index (NFI)	An environmental index for surface water was extracted from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) products (MOD13Q1/MYD13Q1 250 meter AQUA/TERRA 16 day composites). The normalized flooding index (NFI) gives an indication of the surface water. The NFI data is for 16 day periods. In the models we used the NFI value from two periods prior to the sample collection for each child at each visit. The 1-month time period was selected because we hypothesized that it would take at least 1-month in order for there to be an immunological response from exposure to <i>Aedes</i> mosquitoes that had been spawned from flooding (time from juvenile stages, to adult, to feeding, to immunological response). A sensitivity analysis was performed to evaluate differences in results from using a buffer size of 250 versus 500 meters, lag between visit and NFI, and inclusion of other environmental indices (the normalized difference vegetation index and the enhanced vegetation index). The NFI provided the best model fit and most congruence with our

	hypothesized biological process.
Larval container index	The larval container index variable is the percent of surveyed water containers with mosquito larvae detected within a 250 meter radius of a child's home, around the time of each visit.
Ave. trapped mosquitos	The average trapped mosquitos variable is the average number of adult mosquitos trapped within a 250 meter radius of a child's home, around the time of visit 1.

Table 2: Summary of study cohort demographics by visit. The visit columns contain the mean and standard deviation or the count and percentage for quantitative or categorical data respectively.

	Visit 1	Visit 2	Visit 3	Visit 4
Gender				
Female	361 (50.49%)			
Male	354 (49.51%)			
Age	5.62 (2.23)			
Land type				
Urban	433 (60.56%)			
Rice paddy	28 (3.92%)			
Cropland	254 (35.52%)			
Distance to river (std.)	0 (1)			
Insecticide				
No	319 (44.62%)	340 (53.21%)	338 (51.52%)	270 (43.41%)
Yes	396 (55.38%)	299 (46.79%)	318 (48.48%)	352 (56.59%)
Larvicide				
No	580 (81.12%)	584 (91.39%)	583 (88.87%)	591 (95.02%)
Yes	135 (18.88%)	55 (8.61%)	73 (11.13%)	31 (4.98%)
Toilets	1.36 (0.78)	1.37 (0.95)	1.44 (0.9)	1.47 (1.1)
Water containers	3.45 (2.38)	3.27 (2.21)	3.49 (2.67)	3.29 (2.49)
Wet season				
No	0	639	0	622
Yes	715	0	656	0
Flooding index (NFI)	-0.11 (0.14)	-0.27 (0.05)	-0.19 (0.09)	-0.28 (0.05)

FIGURE CAPTIONS


Figure 1: Map of study area. Inset shows location of Chbar Mon in Cambodia. Underlying map shows location of participant houses (pink diamonds); the subset of the target area where larval surveys were conducted within households (dashed green outline); and the subset of the study area where adult mosquitoes were trapped (solid blue outline).

Figure 2: Diagram indicating data (blue letters) and analytic (green letters) steps. A.) Indicates the primary dataset used in this analysis, antibody responses among a cohort of children; B.) surface flooding data were taken from satellite imagery and merged to the cohort data based on study participant house location; C.) land type data were used to categorize participant households; D.) these data were used for the “Main model” (results in Figure 4); E.) the base model, using only the intercept, was used to generate prediction surfaces for each blood screening visit (results in Figure 3); F.) house surveys were conducted in a subset of the overall target area; G.) a geostatistical model was run, using all variables from the “Main model” but also including larvae infested containers in houses (larval model in Figure 4); H.) adult mosquitoes were trapped in a subset of the study area; I.) a geostatistical model was run, using all variables from the “Main model” but also including adult mosquito abundance (adult model in Figure 4).

Figure 3: Prediction surfaces for the mean log SGE antibody response for intercept only model, by visit, with credible bounds. Row one illustrates the lower credible bounds, row two the mean predictions, and row three the upper credible bounds.

Some areas consistently have higher predicted exposure (constant yellow shaded areas) relative to the rest of the study area. One area with consistently relatively high predicted exposure is located approximately within the longitudes 104.53 and 104.54 and within the latitudes 11.46 and 11.47. The lower and upper 95% Bayesian credible intervals show that these relative predicted differences in exposure are statistically significant.

Figure 4: Forest plots of results from the geostatistical model predicting exposure to *Aedes* bites. The effect size here can be interpreted as the estimated percent change in exposure to *Aedes* bites. The effect size is dependent on the unit of measurement for the respective predictor variable (Table 1).



- Adult mosquito trapping
- Larval absence/presence surveys
- Participant households
- Community hospital



A**Cohort data**

- 176 children ages 2 – 14 enrolled
- 4 speed cameras from 1st to 20th April 2007
- Geotagged responses to routine safety questions collected
- Demographic, data rounded
- House characteristics and geospatial address discretised (see figure)
- Census tractors recorded using GPS devices
- Study area of approximately 4 miles²

**Main model****D****F****House larval survey data**

- 128 houses entered in field survey
 - 200 to visit 1
 - 300 to visit 2
 - 300 to visit 3
- Surveys from July 2007 – February 2008
- Documented number of water containers used (drinks/containers of water in possession)
- House location is geotagged using GPS in each
- Study area of approximately 4.08km² roughly 80% of the total study area

**Larval model****G****H****Adult mosquito data**


- 10 traps set
- Continuous trapping from beginning of July 2008 – August 2008 (6 weeks)
- The locations recorded using GPS devices
- Study area of approximately 0.16km² roughly 40% of the total study area


**Adult model****I****B****Surface flooding data**

- Based on urban participant house locations
- Flooding maps (FMs) for the month prior to flood surveys were used for this analysis
- Accuracy for 2006 (all six around) participant houses

**C****Land type data**

- Based on urban participant house locations
- Land use/cover (LUC) data
 - Land cover classification (primarily urban, woodland, farmland) used
 - Classification type is the Urban Index around participant's house

**E****Prediction surfaces**



Covariate

