

Pilot Paper outline for *PLoS NTDs*

Full title:

Comparison of collection methods for *Phlebotomus argentipes* sand flies to use in a molecular xenomonitoring system for the surveillance of visceral leishmaniasis

Short title:

Collection methods for molecular xenomonitoring of sand flies

Shannon McIntyre-Nolan,^{1¶} Vijay Kumar,^{2¶} Miguella Mark Carew,¹ Kundan Kumar,² Emily Nightingale,³ Giorgia Dalla Libera Marchiori,¹ Matthew Rogers,¹ Mojca Kristan,¹ Susana Campino,⁴ Graham F. Medley,³ Pradeep Das,^{5&} Mary Cameron^{1&*}

¹ Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

² Rajendra Memorial Research Institute of Medical Sciences, Patna, India

³ Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

⁴ Department of Infection Biology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

⁵ Department of Molecular Parasitology, National Institute of Cholera and Enteric Diseases, Kolkata 10, India

*Corresponding author

Email: mary.cameron@lshtm.ac.uk

[¶]These authors contributed equally to this work

[&]These authors also contributed equally to this work

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background: The kala-azar elimination programme has resulted in a significant reduction in visceral leishmaniasis (VL) cases across the Indian Subcontinent. To detect any resurgence of transmission, a sensitive cost-effective surveillance system is required. Molecular xenomonitoring (MX), detection of pathogen DNA/RNA in vectors, provides a proxy of human infection in the lymphatic filariasis elimination programme. To determine whether MX can be used for VL surveillance in a low transmission setting, large numbers of the sand fly vector *Phlebotomus argentipes* are required. This study will determine the best method for capturing *P. argentipes* females for MX.

Methodology/Principal Findings: The field study was performed in two programmatic and two non-programmatic villages in Bihar, India. A total of 48 households (12/village) were recruited. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention light traps (CDC-LTs) were compared with Improved Prokopack (PKP) and mechanical vacuum aspirators (MVA) using standardised methods. Four 12x12 Latin squares, 576 collections, were attempted (12/house, 144/village, 192/method). Molecular analyses of collections were conducted to confirm identification of *P. argentipes* and to detect human and *Leishmania* DNA. Operational factors, such as time burden, acceptance to householders and RNA preservation, were also considered. A total of 562 collections (97.7%) were completed with 6,809 sand flies captured. Females comprised 49.0% of captures, of which 1,934 (57.9%) were identified as *P. argentipes*. CDC-LTs collected 4.04 times more *P. argentipes* females than MVA and 3.62 times more than PKP ($p < 0.0001$ for each). Of 21,735 mosquitoes in the same collections, no significant differences between collection methods were observed. CDC-LTs took less time to install and collect than to perform aspirations and their greater yield compensated for increased sorting time. CDC-LTs were favoured by householders.

Conclusions/Significance: CDC-LTs are the most useful collection tool of those tested for MX surveillance since they collected higher numbers of *P. argentipes* females without compromising mosquito captures or the preservation of RNA. However, capture rates are still low.

Author Summary

Molecular xenomonitoring, screening insects for pathogen DNA/RNA, may be used for surveillance of diseases transmitted by insects. Since the proportion of insects infected with pathogens is very low in areas targeted for disease elimination, large numbers of females need to be screened. We compared three different methods for collecting *Phlebotomus argentipes* sand fly females, the vector of parasites causing the disease visceral leishmaniasis in the Indian subcontinent, to determine which collected the largest number of females. Other factors that may also influence selection of a particular method of collection by a disease control programme, such as the time it takes to collect and sort samples, the acceptance of householders for a particular

collection method and whether RNA degradation in insect samples differed between collection methods, were also considered. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention light traps (CDC-LTs) proved to be more useful than two types of aspiration methods for collecting higher numbers of sand fly females and RNA preservation was retained. Furthermore, they took less time to install than to perform aspirations and were favoured by householders. Therefore, CDC-LTs were considered to be the most suitable collection method for molecular xenomonitoring of sand flies in India.

Keywords:

Molecular xenomonitoring, visceral leishmaniasis, neglected tropical diseases (NTDs), disease surveillance, disease elimination, *Phlebotomus argentipes*, *Leishmania donovani*

1 **Introduction**

2

3 **Visceral Leishmaniasis (VL) Epidemiology and Transmission in India**

4 Across the Indian Subcontinent (ISC) VL, also known as kala-azar, is an anthroponotic disease
5 caused by the parasite *Leishmania donovani*. It is vectored by only one incriminated sand fly
6 species, *Phlebotomus argentipes* (1). In 2005, Bangladesh, India and Nepal accounted for 70%
7 of the global VL burden but, given its epidemiology in the region, together with newer tools for
8 diagnosis and treatment, the prospect of elimination of VL as a public health problem became a
9 feasible goal. Consequently, a memorandum of understanding was signed by the three regional
10 members at the WHO Headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland to eliminate VL as a public health
11 problem with an agreed target to reduce incidence to below 1 case/10,000 population at the
12 country's appropriate administration level, upazila, block, or sub-district, by 2015 (2).

13

14 Since the implementation of the elimination strategy, consisting of rapid case detection, treatment
15 of VL cases and vector control using indoor residual spraying (IRS), and the accelerated plan for
16 elimination practiced by the National Vector Borne Disease Control Programme (NVBDCP) in
17 India (3), the number of reported VL cases in Bangladesh, India, and Nepal has declined sharply,
18 from 41,158 in 2005 to 4,692 in 2018, and the global burden of VL in the ISC has reduced from
19 70% in 2005 to an unprecedented low of 27% (4). Bangladesh and Nepal have reached the
20 elimination target in all endemic areas, while India has reached the target in 714/751 (95%)
21 endemic blocks (i.e. those deemed to have on-going transmission). In 2019, all 37 blocks that
22 were above target were located in two of four VL endemic states: Bihar and Jharkhand (21 and
23 16 blocks, respectively) (5).

24 This progress is welcomed, but it brings enormous challenges to the National Kala-azar
25 Elimination Programme since, as VL cases become scarce, it is crucial to have sensitive and
26 cost-effective surveillance systems in place to determine whether elimination targets have been
27 met and sustain control to prevent resurgence. Molecular xenomonitoring (MX) is a vector-based
28 pathogen surveillance system, detecting pathogen DNA/RNA in a vector as a proxy of human
29 infection, that may serve as a useful alternative to monitoring human infection and residual
30 transmission in this low-transmission context (6).

31 **Molecular Xenomonitoring (MX)**

32 Much of the previous literature on MX concerns its use in lymphatic filariasis (LF) elimination
33 programmes, where endpoints of transmission have been established through several decades
34 of research, to determine whether transmission is still occurring after mass drug administration
35 (MDA) (6). Establishing the appropriate sample size for a given MX system depends on its goal.

36 For elimination, endpoints of transmission are used to determine if elimination is nearing, has
37 been achieved, or has been sustained (6). Sample size calculations depend on estimates from
38 existing literature on vector abundance and infection prevalence (ideally from the same, nearby,
39 or characteristically similar sites). In areas where elimination activities are underway, and human
40 and vector infection prevalence have or can be assumed to have decreased, significantly more
41 vectors will be required to detect low infection levels than if infection levels were high (6). For
42 example, for LF elimination surveillance, the numbers of mosquitoes required to obtain accurate
43 filarial prevalence rates in different geographical settings post-MDA depends on vector efficiency
44 and may be as high as 5,000 - 7,500 *Culex quinquefasciatus*, 2,500 *Anopheles* and 22,000 *Aedes*
45 females (7).

46
47 Consequently, several studies were performed to obtain the large numbers of mosquitoes
48 required and to gain an understanding of their behaviour since this influences the ideal tool and
49 method of collection (6). In general, for *Cx. quinquefasciatus*, Centers for Disease Control (CDC)
50 and Prevention gravid traps (GTs) baited with odorous infusions, exploiting oviposition behaviour,
51 are placed outside of houses and are the preferred method for collecting gravid adult females.
52 However, a comparison of collection methods in Brazil found that large battery-powered
53 aspirators, exploiting host-seeking behaviour, collected 38 times more blood-fed and 5 times more
54 gravid *Cx. quinquefasciatus* than CDC light traps (LTs) placed inside houses (8). Furthermore,
55 residents preferred aspirators over fixed battery or AC powered traps (e.g., CDC-LTs) due to
56 lower risk of battery theft, power cuts, and the nuisance of light and noise in the bedroom at night
57 (8). Similarly, for arbovirus surveillance, common methods for collecting mosquitoes have known
58 advantages and disadvantages (9). However, the optimal collection method to use for *P.*
59 *argentipes*, to develop an MX system for *L. donovani* DNA surveillance, has not been explored.

60
61 **Rationale for MX system for VL surveillance in India**

62 A better understanding of the transmission dynamics of VL, in particular of how rates of infection
63 in humans and sand flies vary as functions of each other, is required to guide VL elimination
64 efforts and ensure sustained elimination in the ISC. By collecting contemporary entomological
65 and human data in the same geographical locations, more precise epidemiological models can
66 be produced allowing MX endpoints of VL transmission to be determined similar to those obtained
67 for LF. For example, the entomological inoculation rate (EIR), a product of the human bloodmeal
68 index (HBI) and the proportion of vectors that are infective, a useful proxy for human infection in
69 malaria control programmes, is unknown for VL (10). In order to calculate the EIR for VL in the
70 ISC, a suitable collection method to obtain large numbers of *P. argentipes* females is required.

71

72 Systematic longitudinal sampling of *P. argentipes* populations to monitor the impact of IRS on
73 their abundance, HBI, and the presence of *L. donovani* infection is not performed routinely in
74 India, Bangladesh or Nepal. Nevertheless, several research studies have captured *P. argentipes*
75 for different purposes, and the most common methods use either mouth aspirations or CDC-LTs
76 placed in human dwellings or in cattle sheds (11). Specific details concerning trap placement and
77 measures taken to standardize collections, which is a particularly important concern when mouth
78 aspirations are used, are often missing from surveys making comparisons between them difficult.
79 Furthermore, collections of blood-fed females are often limited, which adds to the potential bias
80 arising through sampling procedures and can lead to data misinterpretation (12). More recently,
81 studies in Bihar have improved the standardization of collections using CDC-LTs and found that
82 *P. argentipes* feed preferentially on humans and, a higher proportion of human-fed *P. argentipes*
83 are found in cattle enclosures (55%) compared with houses (31%) (13, 14).

84
85 The first study to examine natural infection rates of *P. argentipes* with *L. donovani* in Bihar
86 collected a total of 14,585 sand flies using CDC miniature light traps and mouth aspirators in the
87 Muzaffarpur district (15). Of these, a subset of 449 *P. argentipes* females were divided into pools
88 for molecular detection of the 18S rRNA gene using PCR, but the overall prevalence of infection
89 in *P. argentipes* for *L. donovani* DNA was over estimated as 4.90-17.37% because the number of
90 individual sand flies that may be positive in a single pool was not taken into account (15).
91 Subsequently, more reliable estimates were obtained using individual sand flies and infection
92 rates of *P. argentipes* with *L. donovani* DNA were found to vary according to season: 1.0% (4/384)
93 in summer, 0.9% (5/591) in the rainy season and 2.8% (12/422) in winter (16). However, this
94 study was performed over a single year, and morphological identifications were not confirmed
95 using molecular methods, so further work is required to examine seasonal trends. Since then,
96 studies have collected *P. argentipes* using CDC-LTs and/or mouth aspirators (14, 17) but no
97 natural infection rates of *P. argentipes* for *L. donovani* DNA were published in the last seven years
98 prior to the commencement of the present study.

99 The primary aim of the present study is to compare collection methods to determine which method
100 collects the largest number of *P. argentipes* females for use in subsequent epidemiological
101 studies where the EIR and endpoints for transmission will be calculated. CDC gravid traps (CDC-
102 GTs), baited with water rather than organic infusions for indoor use, were a method considered
103 for inclusion because of their widescale deployment in LF surveillance, but they were not selected
104 in the present trial since it was previously shown that collections of sand flies (including live as
105 well as dead females of different physiological stages), were higher in CDC-LTs than in CDC-GTs
106 in Odisha, India (18). Therefore, CDC-LTs, often considered a 'gold standard' for *P. argentipes*
107 (11), will be compared with two different types of battery-operated aspirators that were shown to

108 collect more mosquitoes resting indoors than CDC-LTs or CDC backpack aspirators in earlier
109 trials (8, 19). Although *P. argentipes* is the primary species of interest, incidental captures of
110 mosquito females will also be analysed. In addition to entomological indicators, including human
111 bloodmeal analysis and *L. donovani* infection rates, operational factors relating to the time burden
112 of different collection methods, and their acceptance to householders, will be examined.

113 Another important consideration when selecting an appropriate collection technique for MX is
114 whether pathogen RNA is preserved in the vector during collection and subsequent transportation
115 prior to storage at -80°C. RNA detection is required for screening vectors for the infective stages
116 of parasites, the metacyclic stages in the case of *Leishmania*, to measure EIR. To preserve the
117 integrity of samples, a cold chain is required during transport of samples to the laboratory where
118 they can be placed in RNA preservative media and frozen (9, 20). However, it is possible that the
119 different conditions experienced by sand flies between collection methods, where sand flies are
120 placed in a cool bag immediately after aspiration versus being trapped in a CDC-LT for possibly
121 12 or more hours before being placed in a cool bag, may compromise RNA preservation which
122 will be addressed through a laboratory experiment simulating field conditions.

123

124 **Methods**

125

126 **Study Sites**

127 The field study was performed in Bihar, the state in India with the highest incidence of VL. Two
128 villages each in Nalanda (Ruchanpura, also known as Kosiawan, in Ekangarsarai block and
129 Dharampur in Thartari block) and Saran (Bishambharpur and Rampur Jagdish, both in Dariapur
130 block) districts were selected for sand fly collection (Fig 1). Nalanda is located south of the Ganges
131 River (25° 12' 0" N, 85° 31' 12" E); the Ganges River forms the southern border of Saran (25° 55'
132 0" N, 84° 45' 0" E). Travel distance to the villages from Rajendra Memorial Research Institute of
133 Medical Sciences (RMRIMS), where the field team were based, ranged from 41-50 kilometres
134 (per Google Maps) and travel time was estimated to be between 1.5 to 2.5 hours depending on
135 traffic conditions.

136

137 **Fig 1.** Location of study villages and RMRIMS in Bihar, India.

138

139

140 Nalanda villages were defined as non-programmatic villages, i.e. at the time of sampling they met
141 and sustained the Government of India's elimination target of <1 VL case reported/10,000
142 population at the block level over a three-year period, and no IRS or other vector control activities

143 occurred in the five years preceding this study. Saran villages were defined as programmatic
144 villages, meaning that they were above the elimination target at the time of sampling and should
145 receive IRS twice during the calendar year.

146
147 Household sampling sites were identified in each village based on pre-study vector surveys. The
148 final selection of households included human-only and combined human-cattle dwellings.
149 Replacement was needed for three households over the course of the study.

150

151

152 **Collection Method Comparison (CMC)**

153 *Sample Size Calculation*

154 Prior to the start of the study, a sample size calculation using data collected during a previous
155 trial conducted in Bihar, where a mean of 1.9776 *P. argentipes* females, with a standard deviation
156 of 3.2512, were collected with CDC-LTs per trap night (21), determined that 166 trap
157 nights/collection method was sufficient to detect a difference of one sand fly in the mean number
158 of *P. argentipes* females collected by each of the three methods (where $\alpha = 0.05$; $\beta = 0.20$). To
159 determine the best practice for sampling female *P. argentipes* sand flies, CDC-LTs (John Hock)
160 were compared with improved Prokopack aspirators (PKP) (John Hock) and mechanical vacuum
161 aspirators (MVA) (Horst Armadilhas).

162

163 *Design*

164 A total of 48 households (12 from each of the four villages) were recruited for regular indoor
165 sampling four days a week over 12 weeks from 25 June to 14 September 2018. Using a Latin
166 Square design balanced for carryover effects, the three collection methods were rotated through
167 each household with four 12x12 Latin Squares (rounds) over the study period. A total of 576
168 collection events were expected (288 events per district, 144 events per village, 192 collection
169 events per collection method, and 12 collection events per household).

170

171 *CDC-LT Protocol*

172 When allocated, a CDC-LT was installed in each of participating households and turned on
173 between 18.00 hours and 06.00 hours based on the day of treatment according to the Latin square
174 design. Batteries (6V 12 amp) were charged at RMRIMS prior to installation. CDC-LTs were hung
175 in the room where most household residents slept at a distance 15cm from the wall of the house
176 with the base of the collection pot 5-10cm from the floor. A member of the field team connected
177 one receptor of the CDC-LT to the appropriate terminal of the battery and instructed a household
178 member on how to connect the second receptor between 18.00 and 19.00 on the installation day.

179 Householders were contacted via mobile phone near this time to ensure that traps were turned
180 on for the expected duration. The field team returned the next morning to collect the CDC-LTs.

181

182 *PKP and MVA Protocols*

183 At the time of recruitment, the internal area of the room where PKP and MVA aspirations were to
184 be performed was measured. The amount of time spent aspirating each room was calculated
185 based on this room-specific measurement and an aspiration speed of approximately of 1m² per
186 30 seconds. Two PKP (12V 12 amp) and two MVA (12 V 5 amp) batteries were charged overnight
187 prior to use the following morning. Aspirations began between 07:00 and 08:00 and continued
188 until all houses assigned to these collection methods on the day were completed.

189

190 Two field workers were needed to perform PKP and MVA aspirations: one to operate the PKP or
191 MVA and another to operate a timer and remove objects obstructing the aspiration path.
192 Aspirations always commenced on the wall immediately to the left of the doorway, on entering
193 the room, and were continued clockwise around the room. Space below furniture, such as beds
194 and tables, was also aspirated. In instances where the operator completed all walls before the
195 allocated time had expired, a second round commenced until the calculated aspiration time was
196 reached. Walls were aspirated to a height of up to approximately seven feet from the floor or to
197 the ceiling, whichever was lower. Aspiration occurred left to right across the wall, at a distance of
198 approximately 1cm from the surface, and gradually shifted downwards covering the entire area to
199 the bottom of the wall. Contents of collection tubes were observed after aspiration for the
200 presence of spiders, which if found were killed due to the risk of predation of sand flies.

201

202 *Post-Collection Storage, Transport, and Processing*

203 Specimens from all three collection methods were transported in holding containers placed in
204 insulated coolers, containing ice packs, to RMRIMS. Due to the limited number of capture bags
205 available for the MVAs, and collection containers for the PKP, aspirations were transferred to
206 universal tubes fitted with fine mesh and secured by a screw cap with a hole in it for transfer of
207 specimens using a small, handheld battery-operated aspirator. Holes were plugged with moist
208 cotton wool to retain humidity and were secured with autoclave tape immediately after transfer for
209 transport and storage. Universal tubes and CDC-LT collection pots were all stored at -20°C to
210 freeze kill specimens prior to processing. Tubes and collection pots were labelled with the date of
211 collection and a unique household number that also conferred geographic (district and village)
212 information.

213

214 Collections were sorted via microscopy. Sand flies were separated from other collected
215 arthropods and enumerated by sex and physiological status. Female and male sand flies were

216 placed in separate microcentrifuge tubes containing RNALater™ with a maximum of 25 sand flies
217 per tube. Specimens were stored in cryoboxes at -20°C.

218

219 *Data Collection and Analysis*

220 Data for each collection event (date of collection, district, village, sex and physiological state of
221 sand flies) were recorded in a Microsoft Excel database. Descriptive statistics included analysis
222 of total sand fly and total female mosquito data by collection method, district and village. The
223 number of female *P. argentipes* per collection was modelled using negative binomial regression,
224 with independent and identically distributed random effects to account for clustering induced by
225 multiple collections per household. Data for the fourth round of collections were excluded from
226 statistical analyses since specimens were lost during storage and species data were not
227 obtainable. The proportion of human blood-fed females out of all female *P. argentipes* caught
228 was compared between collection methods using logistic regression, also accounting for
229 household clustering. All statistical analyses were performed using R (version 3.6.3 (2020-02-
230 29)).

231

232 **Molecular Analyses**

233 *DNA Extraction*

234 DNA was extracted from all female sand flies using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit per
235 manufacturer's protocol. DNA samples were stored at -20°C. Molecular analyses were performed
236 to confirm microscopic species identification of *P. argentipes*, for human DNA detection and *L.*
237 *donovani* DNA detection in *P. argentipes* females.

238

239 *Species Identification via PCR*

240 All female sand flies were identified using a PCR-RFLP protocol targeting the 18S rRNA coding
241 genes for phlebotomine sandflies (22), which was adapted as described below. To differentiate
242 *P. argentipes* from *P. papatasi*, and members of the *Sergentomyia babu* complex, PCR products
243 underwent restriction enzyme digestion using *Hinfl* and *HpaII* separately for one hour at 37°C.
244 The total volume per reaction was 25µl, which include 12.5µl of Taq PCR master mix (Qiagen),
245 1.25 µl for each 10pmol/ µl primer (Forward 18S primer: 5'-TAGTGAAACCGCAAAGGCTCAG-
246 3'; Reverse 18S primer: 5'-CTCGGATGTGAGTCCTGTATT GT-3') and 10 µl of DNA sample.
247 Digested products were run on a 2% agarose gel followed by ethidium bromide staining to detect
248 bands of appropriate sizes corresponding to the three sandfly species.

249

250 *Human DNA analysis*

251 Female sand flies identified as *P. argentipes* by PCR-RFLP were analysed for the presence of
252 human DNA using a qPCR protocol with primers targeting the cytochrome b (cytb) gene as

253 described previously (23). Quantitative detection of human DNA was performed on an Applied
254 Biosystems 7500 Fast Real-Time PCR System according to the KAPA SYBR® FAST Universal
255 Master Mix recommended protocol. For standard curves, human DNA obtained from purchased
256 donor blood (Cambridge Bioscience) was serially diluted to provide a range of 1- 0.0001ng/µl.
257 DNA free water was used as No Template Control (NTC) in each assay. A total of 5µl of DNA
258 was used from each female *P. argentipes*. Samples were considered positive if Ct values were
259 lower than the lower limit of detection of the assay (Ct< 30). All samples and controls were run in
260 duplicate.

261

262 *Leishmania donovani* DNA analysis

263 Female sand flies identified as *P. argentipes* by PCR-RFLP were analysed for the presence of *L.*
264 *donovani* DNA using a qPCR protocol with Taqman primers and probes as previously described
265 and validated (24, 25). Quantitative detection of *Leishmania* DNA was performed on an Applied
266 Biosystems 7500 Fast Real-Time PCR System using the conditions recommended by the KAPA
267 Probe® FAST Universal kit protocol. For standard curves, *L. donovani* DNA from the reference
268 strain DD8 was serially diluted to provide a range of 1-10⁻⁵ ng/µl. DNA from non-infected and
269 experimentally infected sand flies from the LSHTM colony was used as negative and positive
270 control, respectively. DNA free water was used as NTC in each assay. A total of 10µl of DNA was
271 used from each female *P. argentipes*. Samples were considered positive if Ct values were lower
272 than the limit of detection of the assay (Ct< 31). All samples and controls were run in duplicate.

273

274 *Simulation of Leishmania donovani* RNA degradation

275 In order to simulate the conditions that infective sand flies may experience during collections,
276 sand flies were experimentally infected with *L. donovani* at high infection rates of 3x10⁶
277 amastigotes/ml heat-inactivated human blood through a chick skin (equivalent to 3000
278 amastigotes/sandfly) and maintained at 28 °C, 80% relative humidity on 10% (w/v) sucrose for 8
279 days to allow the parasites to colonise the anterior midgut and produce metacyclic promastigotes,
280 the infectious forms. Sand flies were then killed and kept at different treatment groups simulating
281 the conditions they would experience either during aspiration or collection by a CDC-LT and prior
282 to transportation to the laboratory for RNA extraction and analysis using *Leishmania*-specific
283 ssrRNA primers.

284

285 The four treatment groups considered relevant for aspirations, where sandflies are placed in a
286 cool bag shortly after collection at ambient temperatures of up to 40°C and then transported to
287 the laboratory, were RNA extraction at: T0 (immediately after killing), T1 (after 30 mins, kept at
288 40°C), T2 (after 3 h, kept in a cool bag) and T3 (after 7 h, kept in a cool bag). For CDC-LTs, where
289 sandflies are collected overnight prior to transportation to the laboratory, T1 was revised to after

290 13-16 h, kept at 40°C, as a ‘worst case scenario’ for possible RNA degradation, and this treatment
291 was repeated using sand flies infected with a low rate considered to be more representative to
292 field conditions (equivalent to <100 amastigotes/sandfly).

293

294 **Operational considerations**

295 *Time burden of sampling*

296 To assess logistical constraints when using CDC-LT, MVA or PKP in a field setting, 24 additional
297 trap-nights were attempted (8 per method) in a supplement study performed in the Saran villages
298 in February 2019. The total time burden required to carry out collections for each method was
299 recorded to the nearest minute for each household. For CDC-LTs, this was measured as the
300 installation time burden. Additionally, the total time required to sort the samples in each collection
301 pot according to the protocols implemented during the trapping comparison study was recorded
302 to the nearest second.

303

304 *Householder acceptance*

305 To understand acceptance of and preferences for the three collections methods, all 48
306 households were surveyed to determine their preferred collection method, the rationale for their
307 choice, and other considerations for the three methods. The investigators asked householders
308 the following questions:

- 309 1. Do you prefer collections performed by: CDC light traps, mechanical vacuum
310 aspirators, Prokopack aspirators or have no preference?
- 311 2. What is your reason for the answer given to question 1?
- 312 3. Do you have any additional comments/complaints relating to any of the collection
313 methods?

314

315

316 **Results**

317

318 **CMC descriptive analysis of global data set**

319 *Collection site*

320 Of a total of 576 attempted individual collection events, 562 (97.7%) were completed successfully.
321 Battery failure (for CDC-LTs left overnight) and inability to enter a household were the main
322 reasons for unsuccessful collection events. Failures occurred across the four study villages, with
323 one household having two failed collection events. A total of 6,809 sand flies were collected over
324 the study period. At least one sand fly was collected from each household with an outlier of 396
325 total sand flies reported from one household in Ruchunpura (Nalanda) over the study period. Over
326 82% of collection events yielded at least one sand fly (465/562).

327

328 Fig 2 shows the number of specimens by collection site. Almost half of the sand flies collected
329 were female (49.0%, n=3,339). Of 3,232 female sand flies identified to species by PCR, 1,934
330 (59.8%) were *P. argentipes*. *Sergentomyia babu* accounted for 37.0% (n=1,195) of females, and
331 *P. papatasi* accounted for 3.2% (n=103). The remaining 107 samples were unable to be identified
332 to species. Although the proportion of total female sand flies collected in the two districts was
333 roughly equal, the species composition differed. More *P. argentipes* females (n = 1,024, 52.9%
334 versus n = 910, 47.1%) and *P. papatasi* females (n = 102, 99.0% versus n = 1, 1.0%) were
335 collected in Saran than in Nalanda, respectively. Most of the *P. papatasi* females were collected
336 from Rampur Jagdish (n = 95, 92.2%). Of 21,735 mosquitoes collected, 8,174 (37.6%) were
337 female. Conversely, more mosquito females were collected in Nalanda (n = 5,728, 70.1%) than
338 in Saran (n = 2,446, 29.9%).

339

340 **Fig 2:** Specimens collected by sex and collection location over the study period. (A) displays sand
341 fly data, (B) displays mosquito data.

342

343

344 *Collection method*

345 The total numbers of specimens by collection method for all four rounds is given in supplementary
346 table S1. Fig 3 shows the mean number of sandflies collected by district, village and by collection
347 method. CDC-LTs collected the highest mean number of sandflies compared to MVA and PKP in
348 both districts. CDC-LTs accounted for 57.5% of total sand flies collected, followed by PKP and
349 MVA with 22.4% and 20.1%, respectively.

350

351

352 **Fig 3:** Mean female sand flies collected by method and village. Error bars indicate the 95%
353 confidence interval of the mean.

354

355

356 Fig 4 shows the mean number of female mosquitoes collected by district, village and by collection
357 method. Bishambharpur had the lowest mean number of mosquitoes for all three collection
358 methods. Collections in Dharampur using CDC-LTs had the highest overall mean female
359 mosquitoes by village and method (32.5). The overall mean number of female mosquitoes per
360 collection event was 14.5; CDC-LT yielded the greatest mean per collection event (16.96) while
361 PKP yielded the lowest (10.0).

362

363 **Fig 4:** Mean female mosquitoes collected by method and village. Error bars indicate the 95%
364 confidence interval of the mean.

365

366

367 Further descriptive and regression analyses focused on *P. argentipes* females in the sand fly
368 collections and were limited to the first three collection rounds due to post-collection loss of sand
369 fly specimens from round four.

370

371 **Statistical analyses for rounds 1-3 of CMC**

372 The total numbers of specimens by round and village, and by collection method, for the first three
373 rounds of collections are given in supplementary tables S2 and S3, respectively. Sampling round
374 2 yielded the highest mean for total sand flies, male sand flies, and female sand flies, with mean
375 collections double those of round 1. Round 3 yielded the highest mean *P. argentipes* (Fig 5), with
376 almost 2.5 times the collection of round 1, but the total mean sand flies collected was lower in
377 round 3 than for round 2 for both males and females.

378

379 **Fig 5:** Box plots showing the number of *P. argentipes* females/collection event by method of
380 collection. Medians indicated by horizontal line (at 0 for MVA and PKP) and outliers by black dots.

381

382

383 Logistic regression analysis comparing detection (presence) of sand flies, female sand flies, and
384 female *P. argentipes* showed CDC-LTs were significantly different from both MVA and PKP with
385 increased odds of detection from CDC-LT collection events ($p < 0.0001$). Of 511 collection events
386 (excluding missing data), 75.6% (124/164) CDC-LTs collections resulted in the capture of at least
387 one female *P. argentipes* compared to 43.2% (76/176) for MVA and 56.2% for PKP (87/171). Fig
388 6 shows the density of female *P. argentipes* by collection method. CDC-LTs captured the highest
389 density of female *P. argentipes* per trap-night compared with MVA or PKP. However, the greatest
390 number of female *P. argentipes* from a single collection event ($n=63$) was collected by PKP. After
391 adjusting for household clustering, CDC-LTs collected 3.41 times more female sand flies, 4.04
392 times more *P. argentipes*, and 8.23 more male sand flies than MVA ($p < 0.0001$ for each). CDC-
393 LTs also collected 3.08 times more female sand flies, 3.62 times more *P. argentipes*, and 7.21
394 more male sand flies than PKP ($p < 0.0001$ for each) (Table 1). PKP collected significantly more
395 female mosquitoes than MVA ($p = 0.0002$), but there were no significant differences between
396 CDC-LTs and PKP or MVA.

397

398 **Fig 6:** Mean sand flies collected per trap-night by collection round for the first three collection
399 rounds (with 95% CI).

400

401 **Table 1:** Number of female sand flies, male sand flies, *P. argentipes* females, and female
 402 mosquitoes by collection method including IRR and negative binomial regression analyses.

		N	IRR (95% CI)	Z	P-value
Total Female Sand Flies	MVA	685	0.293 (0.215 – 0.401)	-7.70	<0.0001
	PKP	745	0.325 (0.238 – 0.442)	-7.13	<0.0001
	CDC	1441	1	-	-
<i>P. argentipes</i> Females	MVA	426	0.247 (0.161 – 0.380)	-6.39	<0.0001
	PKP	468	0.276 (0.181 – 0.421)	0.51	<0.0001
	CDC	726	1	-	-
Male Sand Flies	MVA	371	0.121 (0.086 – 0.171)	-12.13	<0.0001
	PKP	435	0.138 (0.099 – 0.194)	-11.46	<0.0001
	CDC	2019	1	-	-
Female Mosquitoes	MVA	2097	1.22 (0.915 – 1.648)	1.37	0.172
	PKP	1440	0.791 (0.595 – 1.053)	-1.60	0.109
	CDC	1843	1	-	-

403

404

405

406 **Molecular Analyses**

407 *Detection of human and Leishmania donovani DNA*

408 Of 1,934 female *P. argentipes*, 1,932 were analysed for the presence of a human DNA derived
 409 from a bloodmeal, and 156 (8.1%) were positive. Almost 75% of *P. argentipes* with human DNA
 410 were collected from the two Saran villages. As a proportion of total female *P. argentipes* caught,
 411 MVA collected significantly more female sand flies with human DNA compared with CDC-LTs and
 412 PKP (12.97% versus 5.65% and 7.40%, respectively, p-value<0.003).

413

414 Of 1,934 *P. argentipes* analysed for the presence of *L. donovani* DNA, none were positive.

415

416 *Simulation of Leishmania donovani RNA degradation*

417 When the infection rate was low there was an increase in the number of cycles for amplification
 418 (Fig 7). However, even with low infection rates, most samples were amplified before 30 cycles

419 indicating good sensitivity. For the 'worst case scenario', simulating CDC-LT samples where sand
420 flies were collected overnight for 16h at 40°C and left in a cool bag for 7 hours, *L. donovani* RNA
421 was detected in sand flies with results comparable with conditions simulating aspirator collections.

422

423 **Fig 7:** Amplification curves for *Leishmania donovani* in sand flies at (A) high (3000
424 amastigotes/sandfly) or (B) low (<100 amastigotes/sandfly) infection rates maintained under
425 simulated conditions for aspirator (blue) or CDC collections (yellow) and kept in a cool bag for 7
426 hours.

427

428

429 **Operational considerations**

430 *Time burden of sampling*

431 On average, CDC-LTs took less time to install and to collect (6.29 mins) than the time taken to
432 perform aspirations when using either MVA or PKP by 10.14 and 12.85 mins, respectively. The
433 time taken to sort samples was influenced by the amount of material and number of target and
434 non-target specimens within the collections. Although the mean time taken to sort CDC-LT
435 collections (12.50 mins) was longer than for collections obtained using MVA or PKP by 1.29 and
436 7.19 mins, respectively, they also contained the highest number of female sand flies (n=3), male
437 sand flies (n=6) and female mosquitoes (n=157) than MVA (n=0,1,92) or PKP (n=1,0,3),
438 respectively. Therefore, proportionally, the time invested in sorting compensated for the yield
439 obtained.

440

441 *Householder acceptance*

442 Responses were received from all 48 householders who took part in the study. Amongst the
443 respondents, 36 (75%) indicated they had a preference for CDC-LTs, 6 (13%) for MVA, 2 (4%)
444 for PKP/MVA, and 4 (8%) had no preference. No householder indicated they had a preference
445 solely for PKP collections. The most common reason given for a preference for CDC-LTs was the
446 perception that fewer mosquitoes were present in their household following sampling. However,
447 it is interesting to note that amongst householders who indicated a preference for either MVA or
448 MVA/PKP, the most common explanation was also a perception that there were fewer mosquitoes
449 present in the household after sampling. Three householders indicated that they felt CDC-LTs
450 were the easiest collection technique, one considered it to be a less disruptive method, and two
451 were unable to justify their choice. One respondent preferred MVA collections because they felt
452 they had insufficient space in their home for a CDC-LT to be installed. When prompted for
453 additional comments or complaints about the collection techniques, five householders responded
454 that they found CDC-LTs to be too noisy at night and this caused disruption to their cattle. No
455 further comments or complaints were received for either the PKP or MVA.

456

457 **Discussion**

458 This is the first comprehensive field study that has made a direct comparison between CDC-LTs
459 and two types of large battery-powered aspirators used in mosquito surveillance for the capture
460 of *P. argentipes* females. Traditionally, CDC-LTs and mouth aspirators, rather than large battery-
461 powered aspirators, are used in field studies performed in India to capture *P. argentipes* females
462 (11, 17, 21, 26). However, a decision was made to avoid using mouth aspirators in the present
463 study due to health and scientific concerns. Firstly, even if mouth aspirators are equipped with
464 filters, the potential risk to the field team when making repeated aspirations over a long period of
465 time, inevitably involving ingestion of small particles of organic debris while gently sucking sand
466 flies from walls in a tube, was considered too high. Secondly, the degree of potential bias in
467 efficiency between and amongst collectors, as well as problems relating to standardisation of the
468 technique, was inappropriate for comparing collection methods. Instead, two different battery-
469 powered aspirators were compared using a standard operating procedure that was developed for
470 the study.

471

472 **Collection Method Comparison Study**

473 As expected, capture rates were highly variable given they are affected by several factors,
474 including site, seasonality and climatic variables, which highlights the importance for testing the
475 different collection methods at the same sites and within the same timeframe, and reducing
476 sampling bias by using a Latin Square design, as performed in the present study. It is possible
477 that capture rates using either type of aspirator may have been higher if collections were
478 performed at an earlier or later time of the day than the time window of 07.00 to 14.00 selected in
479 the present study which was consistent with working hours of operational field teams rather than
480 those that may be ideal for research purposes.

481

482 Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the mean capture rates of *P. argentipes* females/trap night
483 using CDC-LTs placed in human dwellings, of 4.2-4.8 or 6.0-6.1 *P. argentipes* females/trap night
484 in Nalanda and Saran villages, respectively, were consistent with a mean capture rate of 5.5 *P.*
485 *argentipes* females/trap night found in a previous study performed in Saran, but higher than the
486 mean capture rate of 2.0 *P. argentipes* females/trap night reported in Muzaffarpur, Bihar, another
487 VL endemic district bordering Saran (11, 21) and in other sentinel sites in India where, even during
488 the June-September peak, densities of *P. argentipes* females/trap night declined from 2014-2019
489 (27).

490

491 A complete data set, comprising speciation of *P. argentipes*, human DNA detection and *L.*
492 *donovani* DNA detection, was available for three rounds (three 12x12 Latin squares) of collections
493 (n=144 collection events/method), rather than for all four rounds performed, and these data were
494 used in statistical analyses. Significant differences between collection methods were detected for
495 the primary outcome, number of *P. argentipes* females, since the study was still sufficiently
496 powered to detect a mean difference of between 1.00-1.25 *P. argentipes* females using the data
497 used to perform the sample size calculation (18, 21). The main finding that CDC-LTs collected
498 an average of either 4.04 times or 3.62 times more *P. argentipes* females than either of the
499 battery-powered aspirators, MVA or PKP, respectively, supports their continued use in
500 entomological surveillance but other factors should be considered as described further below. It
501 is interesting to note that, for the purposes of integrated vector-borne disease surveillance and
502 multiplex pathogen screening, there were no significant differences between incidental captures
503 of female mosquitoes using CDC-LTs compared with PKP or MVA.

504
505 To determine which human pathogens are circulating within an area, some MX studies use
506 collection methods that specifically target blood-fed females to screen for infection. For studies
507 measuring transmission, when it is important to maximise the likelihood of obtaining vectors
508 infected with the human infectious stage of the parasite, then collection methods that target gravid
509 vectors are used. Methods that target host-seeking females, such as CDC-LTs, capture unfed
510 females which may be nulliparous (never blood-fed so will not be infected unless the pathogen is
511 transovarially/transstadially transmitted) or parous (previously blood-fed, has laid eggs and
512 seeking next bloodmeal so may also be infected/infectious). Some research groups include parity
513 as an entomological outcome in their studies, but parity was not examined in the present study
514 because it is time consuming, can be misclassified according to expertise, and is unlikely to be
515 incorporated routinely in programmatic use.

516
517 **Molecular analyses**
518 Even though CDC-LTs collected proportionally less *P. argentipes* females with human DNA than
519 MVA, there was no significant difference in the absolute number of *P. argentipes* females with
520 human DNA captured. In the present study, the mean rate of human DNA detected in *P.*
521 *argentipes* females for all three collection methods was 8.1% with a mean rate of 5.4% for CDC
522 traps placed inside houses. This rate is slightly higher than previously reported in Saran, where
523 bloodmeals were detected in 3.2% and 2.6% of *P. argentipes* collected in CDC-LTs placed inside
524 combined dwellings (where humans and cattle are in close proximity) and houses (with no cattle),
525 respectively (11). Previously, in Muzaffarpur, the mean percentage of blood-fed *P. argentipes*
526 captured in CDC-LTs was 30.2% pre-intervention and 2.4% post-intervention with untreated bed
527 nets (28). Although it is possible that low feeding rates in Saran may be due to IRS intervention,

528 there was no significant difference between the mean numbers of *P. argentipes* collected in
529 households between Saran (VL endemic) and Nalanda (non-programmatic) villages, and the
530 mean rate of human DNA detected in *P. argentipes* collected in Saran villages (11.4%) was
531 significantly higher than for the non-endemic Nalanda villages (4.4%). There are several factors
532 that may account for the differences, including: house construction (influencing sand fly entry
533 and/or providing optimal conditions for resting), number of human inhabitants/house, type/number
534 of livestock (either providing protection or increasing the risk of biting), and implementation of IRS
535 (excito-repellency effect of synthetic pyrethroids may increase the risk of outdoor biting).

536
537 Human DNA detected in the sand flies could derive from a bloodmeal taken solely from a human
538 host, or from a sand fly that had fed on multiple hosts since mixed bloodmeals have been reported
539 for *P. argentipes* captured previously in Saran where human DNA was detected using *cyt b* PCR
540 and reverse line blot in 164 of 288 (57%) blood-fed females (13). The same study showed that
541 the peak time to detect human DNA in *P. argentipes* in Saran villages was June-September which
542 coincided with the sampling period performed in the present study (13). In Muzaffarpur, the
543 Human Bloodmeal Index was 81% pre-intervention and 19% post-intervention with untreated bed
544 nets (28).

545
546 There are few studies measuring infection rates of *P. argentipes* with *L. donovani* DNA in India.
547 Previously, CDC-LT collections performed in 2010 in Muzaffarpur showed that infection rates vary
548 from 0.9% to 2.8% (12/422) according to the season (16). In the present study, no *L. donovani*
549 DNA was detected in each of the 1,934 sand flies individually tested from collections performed
550 in 2018 (0/1024 from Saran and 0/910 from Nalanda). The inability to detect *L. donovani* DNA in
551 *P. argentipes* in the Saran villages is surprising considering that VL and PKDL cases were
552 reported on the KAMIS system in months leading up to and after when the work was performed.
553 However, similar low infections rates in *P. argentipes* were also reported in eight VL sentinel sites
554 undergoing routine entomological and IRS surveillance in three VL endemic States in India (27).
555 Of 14,775 *P. argentipes* females tested, *L. donovani* DNA was detected in only four females
556 collected in the district of East Champaran, Bihar (3/991 and 1/704 females collected 2017 and
557 2018, respectively). No females were positive at any other of the sentinel sites suggesting that
558 active transmission is low (27). These data provide further evidence to support that efforts
559 implemented during the accelerated kala-azar control programme may have successfully reduced
560 the VL burden in endemic blocks.

561
562 It is important to note that differences in the sensitivity and specificity of the molecular assays
563 used may affect differences in results. Many assays have been developed with different molecular
564 targets with a specificity variation between 29.6–100% and sensitivity between 91.3–100% has

565 been reported (25). In addition, most assays used were developed to detect infections in human
566 patients or dogs, rather than sand flies, and may cross-react with common insect protozoan
567 parasites of the family Trypanosomatidae (e.g. *Leptomonas*). To avoid false positive or false
568 negative results, it is important to use assays with targets specific for *L. donovani* and also use
569 more than one target to confirm results, as performed in this study.

570

571 Also crucial for the purposes of MX, was the finding from the simulation experiment that the higher
572 yield of *P. argentipes* females in CDC-LTs was unlikely to be compromised by an inability to detect
573 *Leishmania* RNA in samples since RNA analysis may be required in future studies aiming to
574 detect the metacyclic infectious stage in sand flies.

575

576 **Operational considerations**

577 Firstly, it should be noted that battery procurement and availability can be a limiting factor for all
578 three methods used. It took a substantial effort to obtain the three different types of recommended
579 batteries for the collection methods in India, but a supplier for large numbers of 6V 12amp
580 batteries, as used for CDC-LTs, was later identified. Further evidence in favour for using CDC-
581 LTs was the lower time burden for collecting specimens than either method of aspiration. This
582 finding has some major implications for operational teams since it influences how many
583 households can be sampled in one day: roughly 20 households may be sampled/day using CDC-
584 LTs (including setting up and collecting traps) for every 9-10 or 10-11 aspirations using PKP or
585 MVA, respectively. Sorting samples, and accurate recording of data, in the laboratory needs to
586 be performed with precision and, although it took less time to sort samples collected using PKP
587 than for the other methods of collection in our supplementary study, they contained less target
588 material. It should be noted that the supplementary study performed to obtain time estimates took
589 place in February, when sand fly numbers tend to be lower than June to September when the
590 CMC study took place (11). However, results of the CMC indicate that although collections using
591 aspirators will contain less sand flies to process than collections using CDC-LTs, they will have
592 similar numbers of female mosquitoes during the June to September peak and mosquitoes
593 outnumber sand flies in the collections.

594

595 Importantly, more householders in the study expressed a preference for CDC-LTs than for the
596 battery-powered aspirators in contrast to residents in Brazil who preferred MVA over CDC-LTs
597 due to the nuisance of light and noise in the bedroom at night (8). Continued consent of
598 householders in India to allow indoor sampling using CDC-LTs in their homes should be
599 monitored especially in light of some complaints relating to disturbance to animals expressed in
600 the current study.

601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633

Recommendations

Based on the evidence obtained, CDC-LTs are the best method for collecting *P. argentipes* females in houses for transmission studies. However, capture rates are still low, and further research is required to increase collections of target species and to improve molecular methods. Specifically, in order to calculate the EIR of *P. argentipes*, a diagnostic test must be developed to identify the metacyclic stage of *L. donovani*. Although a laboratory protocol for detecting *L. mexicana* metacyclics in infected *Lutzomyia longipalpis* sand flies has been published (29), it has not yet been validated in the field nor modified for other *Leishmania*/sand fly models.

Presently, molecular methods used for MX require skilled technical staff and a well-equipped laboratory and the cost of screening large numbers of vectors may be prohibitive for programmatic use thus reducing the role of MX for research purposes only (6). To expand the flexibility of a MX system for programmatic use, and make it more cost-effective, integrating vector-borne disease surveillance should be considered. New multiplex methods for point-of-need use are under development which make the possibility of integrating vector-borne disease surveillance a realistic and cost-effective proposition.

Acknowledgements

The research team would like to thank the following individuals and organizations:

All householders in Nalanda and Saran who permitted access to their homes.

HMSC for providing permission for the study. The National Centre for Vector Borne Disease Control (formerly the Vector Borne Disease Control Programme) for their support and advice in placement of the research.

Field workers and project administration staff who participated in this research.

Dr Tom Walker for advice on molecular tests.

635 References

636

- 637 1. Chowdhury R, Kumar V, Mondal D, Das ML, Das P, Dash AP, et al. Implication of vector
638 characteristics of *Phlebotomus argentipes* in the kala-azar elimination programme in the Indian
639 sub-continent. *Pathogens and Global Health*. 2016;110(3):87-96.
- 640 2. WHO. Regional strategic framework for elimination of kala-azar from the South-East
641 Asia region (2005-2015). New Delhi: Regional Office for South-East Asia SEA-VBC-85 (Rev-1).
642 2005.
- 643 3. Programme NVBDC. Accelerated plan for kala-azar elimination. Delhi, India: NVBDCP;
644 2017.
- 645 4. WHO. Global leishmaniasis surveillance, 2017–2018, and first report on 5 additional
646 indicators. 2020. Contract No.: 95.
- 647 5. WHO. Report of Meeting of the Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG) on Visceral
648 Leishmaniasis and the National Visceral Leishmaniasis Programme Managers of endemic
649 Member States Regional Office for South-East Asia; 2020. 2020.
- 650 6. Cameron MM, Ramesh A. The use of molecular xenomonitoring for surveillance of
651 mosquito-borne diseases. *Phil Trans R Soc B* 2020;20190816.
- 652 7. Subramanian S, Jambulingam P, Chu BK, Sadanandane C, Vasuki V, Srividya A, et al.
653 Application of a household-based molecular xenomonitoring strategy to evaluate the lymphatic
654 filariasis elimination program in Tamil Nadu, India. *Plos Neglected Tropical Diseases*.
655 2017;11(4).
- 656 8. Ramesh A, Cameron M, Spence K, Spaans RH, Melo-Santos MAV, Paiva MHS, et al.
657 Development of an urban molecular xenomonitoring system for lymphatic filariasis in the Recife
658 Metropolitan Region, Brazil. *Plos Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2018;12(10).
- 659 9. Ramirez AL, van den Hurk AF, Meyer DB, Ritchie SA. Searching for the proverbial
660 needle in a haystack: advances in mosquito-borne arbovirus surveillance. *Parasit Vectors*.
661 2018;11(1):320.
- 662 10. Ready PD. Biology of phlebotomine sand flies as vectors of disease agents. *Annual*
663 *Review of Entomology*. 2013;58:227-50.
- 664 11. Poche D, Garlapati R, Ingenloff K, Remmers J, Poche R. Bionomics of phlebotomine
665 sand flies from three villages in Bihar, India. *Journal of Vector Ecology*. 2011;36:S106-S17.
- 666 12. Cameron MM, Acosta-Serrano A, Bern C, Boelaert M, den Boer M, Burza S, et al.
667 Understanding the transmission dynamics of *Leishmania donovani* to provide robust evidence
668 for interventions to eliminate visceral leishmaniasis in Bihar, India. *Parasites & Vectors*. 2016;9.
- 669 13. Garlapati RB, Abbasi I, Warburg A, Poche DM, Poché RM. Identification of Bloodmeals
670 in Wild Caught Blood Fed *Phlebotomus argentipes* (Diptera: Psychodidae) Using Cytochrome b
671 PCR and Reverse Line Blotting in Bihar, India. *Journal of Medical Entomology*. 2012;49(3):515-
672 21.
- 673 14. Poché DM, Garlapati RB, Mukherjee S, Torres-Poche Z, Hasker E, Rahman T, et al.
674 Bionomics of *Phlebotomus argentipes* in villages in Bihar, India with insights into efficacy of IRS-
675 based control measures. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018;12(1):e0006168.
- 676 15. Tiwary P, Kumar D, Singh RP, Rai M, Sundar S. Prevalence of Sand Flies and
677 *Leishmania donovani* Infection in a Natural Population of Female *Phlebotomus argentipes* in
678 Bihar State, India. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*. 2012;12(6):467-72.
- 679 16. Tiwary P, Kumar D, Mishra M, Singh RP, Rai M, Sundar S. Seasonal Variation in the
680 Prevalence of Sand Flies Infected with *Leishmania donovani*. *Plos One*. 2013;8(4).
- 681 17. Sardar AA, Chatterjee M, Jana K, Saha P, Maji AK, Guha SK, et al. Seasonal variation
682 of sand fly populations in Kala-azar endemic areas of the Malda district, West Bengal, India.
683 *Acta Trop*. 2020;204:105358.
- 684 18. Mondragon-Shem K. Efficacy of CDC light and gravid traps for the collection of sandflies
685 in Bhubaneswar, Orissa (India). London, UK: London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine;
686 2013.
- 687 19. Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Galvin WA, Kelly R, Kitron U. A new, cost-effective, battery-
688 powered aspirator for adult mosquito collections. *J Med Entomol*. 2009;46(6):1256-9.

- 689 20. Torres MG, Weakley AM, Hibbert JD, Kirstein OD, Lanzaro GC, Lee Y. Ethanol as a
690 potential mosquito sample storage medium for RNA preservation. *F1000Res*. 2019;8:1431.
- 691 21. Picado A, Das ML, Kumar V, Kesari S, Dinesh DS, Roy L, et al. Effect of Village-wide
692 Use of Long-Lasting Insecticidal Nets on Visceral Leishmaniasis Vectors in India and Nepal: A
693 Cluster Randomized Trial. *Plos Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2010;4(1).
- 694 22. Tiwary P, Kumar D, Rai M, Sundar S. PCR-RFLP based method for molecular
695 differentiation of sand fly species *Phlebotomus argentipes*, *Phlebotomus papatasi*, and
696 *Sergentomyia babu* found in India. *J Med Entomol*. 2012;49(6):1515-8.
- 697 23. Sales KG, Costa PL, de Moraes RC, Otranto D, Brandão-Filho SP, Cavalcanti Mde P, et
698 al. Identification of phlebotomine sand fly blood meals by real-time PCR. *Parasit Vectors*.
699 2015;8:230.
- 700 24. Vallur AC, Duthie MS, Reinhart C, Tutterrow Y, Hamano S, Bhaskar KR, et al.
701 Biomarkers for intracellular pathogens: establishing tools as vaccine and therapeutic endpoints
702 for visceral leishmaniasis. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2014;20(6):O374-83.
- 703 25. Adams ER, Schoone G, Versteeg I, Gomez MA, Diro E, Mori Y, et al. Development and
704 Evaluation of a Novel Loop-Mediated Isothermal Amplification Assay for Diagnosis of
705 Cutaneous and Visceral Leishmaniasis. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2018;56(7).
- 706 26. Dinesh DS, Das P, Picado A, Davies C, Speybroeck N, Boelaert M, et al. The efficacy of
707 indoor CDC light traps for collecting the sandfly *Phlebotomus argentipes*, vector of *Leishmania*
708 *donovani*. *Med Vet Entomol*. 2008;22(2):120-3.
- 709 27. Deb R, Singh RP, Mishra PK, Hitchins L, Reid E, Barwa AM, et al. Impact of IRS: Four-
710 years of entomological surveillance of the Indian Visceral Leishmaniasis elimination
711 programme. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2021;15(8):e0009101.
- 712 28. Picado A, Kumar V, Das M, Burniston I, Roy L, Suman R, et al. Effect of untreated bed
713 nets on blood-fed *Phlebotomus argentipes* in kala-azar endemic foci in Nepal and India.
714 *Memorias Do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz*. 2009;104(8):1183-6.
- 715 29. Giraud E, Martin O, Yakob L, Rogers M. Quantifying *Leishmania* Metacyclic
716 Promastigotes from Individual Sandfly Bites Reveals the Efficiency of Vector Transmission.
717 *Communications Biology*. 2019;2(1):84.
718

719 **CRedit authorship contribution statement**

720

721 **Shannon McIntyre-Nolan:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - Original
722 Draft Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Vijay Kumar:** Project Administration, Resources,
723 Writing - Review & Editing. **Miguella Mark Carew:** Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing -
724 Original Draft Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Kundan Kumar:** Investigation, Writing -
725 Review & Editing. **Emily Nightingale:** Formal Analysis, Methodology, Writing - Original Draft
726 Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Giorgia Dalla Libera Marchiori:** Investigation,
727 Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing. **Matthew Rogers:** Investigation, Supervision, Writing -
728 Review & Editing. **Mojca Kristan:** Investigation, Writing - Review & Editing. **Susana Campino:**
729 Investigation, Supervision, Methodology, Validation, Writing - Original Draft Preparation Writing -
730 Review & Editing. **Graham F. Medley:** Formal Analysis, Funding Acquisition, Supervision, Writing
731 - Review & Editing. **Pradeep Das:** Conceptualization, Resources, Supervision, Writing - Review
732 & Editing. **Mary Cameron:** Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Project
733 Administration, Supervision, Writing - Original Draft Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing.

734

735 **Financial Disclosure Statement**

736 This project was kindly supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation OPP1183986. The
737 funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
738 preparation of the manuscript. The project also received resources, sand fly samples to optimise
739 the PCR identification protocol, from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation
740 programme under grant agreement No 731060 (Infravec2).

741

742 **Declaration of competing interest**

743 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

744

745 **Informed Consent, Confidentiality, and Ethical Approval**

746 The study was approved by the Ethics committee of the GOI Health Ministry's Screening
747 Committee (Ref: 2017-4126), RMRIMS (Ref: 39/RMRI/EC/2017) and the London School of
748 Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (Ref: 1463). Members of each household were provided with an
749 information sheet in Hindi explaining the purpose of the study, their involvement, and any potential
750 adverse outcomes prior to commencement of sampling at each site. Information sheets were read
751 to participants if they identified themselves as illiterate. Participants met with the investigators to
752 answer any questions about the study. The household head or a nominated proxy provided written
753 or oral informed consent for recruitment to the study. Signed consent forms and audio consent
754 recordings were stored securely to protect participant confidentiality.

755 **Supplemental Tables**

756

757 **S1** Specimens collected by collection method for all four rounds of the study.

Rounds1-4	Collection Method			Total
	CDC	MVA	PKP	
Total sand fly females	1621 (48.5)	810 (24.3)	908 (27.0)	3,339
<i>P. argentipes</i> females	866 (44.8)	501 (25.9)	567 (29.3)	1,934
<i>P. papatasi</i> females	24 (23.3)	47 (45.6)	32 (31.1)	103
<i>Sergentomyia babu</i> females	704 (58.9)	224 (18.7)	267 (22.3)	1195
Other/Unknown females	27 (25.2)	38 (35.5)	42 (39.3)	107
Total sand fly males	2293 (66.1)	558 (16.1)	619 (17.8)	3,470
Total sand flies	3914 (57.5)	1368 (20.1)	1527 (22.4)	6,809
Total female mosquitoes	3085 (37.7)	3193 (39.1)	1896 (23.2)	8174

758

759

760 **S2. Specimens collected by round and village.**

Collection Round	<i>P. argentipes</i>	<i>S. babu</i>	Female Flies	Sand	Female Mosquitoes	Total Flies	Sand
Round 1 (June 25 – July 12)	294	293	641		969	1207	
<i>Bishambharpur</i>	144	76	230		198	459	
<i>Dharampur</i>	77	104	196		186	348	
<i>Rampur Jagdish</i>	41	69	131		451	255	
<i>Rachanpura</i>	32	44	84		134	145	
Round 2 (July 16 – Aug 2)	633	516	1220		1825	2528	
<i>Bishambharpur</i>	95	116	229		120	580	
<i>Dharampur</i>	200	154	372		657	743	
<i>Rampur Jagdish</i>	167	85	279		641	529	
<i>Rachanpura</i>	171	161	340		407	676	
Round 3 (Aug 6 – Aug 24)	693	263	1010		2586	1961	
<i>Bishambharpur</i>	229	26	257		247	644	
<i>Dharampur</i>	188	87	280		1099	462	
<i>Rampur Jagdish</i>	162	36	243		391	442	
<i>Rachanpura</i>	114	114	230		849	413	
Total	1620	1072	2871		5380	5696	

761

762

763 **S3.** Numbers and percentages of sandflies and mosquitoes collected by species, sex, and
 764 collection method during the first three collection rounds used in logistic regression analysis.

Rounds 1-3	Collection Method			Total
	CDC-LT	MVA	PKP	
Total sand fly females	1441 (50.2)	685 (23.9)	745 (25.9)	2871
<i>P. argentipes</i> females	726 (44.8)	426 (26.3)	468 (28.9)	1620
<i>P. papatasi</i> females	24 (28.2)	34 (40.0)	85 (31.8)	85
<i>Sergentomyia babu</i> females	664 (61.9)	187 (17.4)	221 (20.6)	1072
Other/Unknown females	27 (28.7)	38 (40.4)	29 (30.9)	94
Total sand fly males	2019 (71.5)	371 (13.1)	435 (15.4)	2825
Total sand flies	3460 (60.7)	1056 (18.5)	1180 (20.7)	5696
Total female mosquitoes	1843 (34.3)	2097 (39.0)	1140 (26.8)	5380

765

766




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.28.23286557>; this version posted March 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Figure 5

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.28.23286557>; this version posted March 1, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).





Figure 6

A



B




Figure 7