

1 **Tracking SARS-CoV-2 seropositivity in rural communities using blood-fed mosquitoes**

2 Benjamin J. Krajacich^{1*}, Djibril Samaké², Adama Dao^{2*}, Moussa Diallo², Zana Lamissa Sanogo², Alpha
3 Seydou Yaro², Amatigué Ziguimé², Josué Poudiougou², Kadiatou Cissé², Mamadou Traoré², Alassane dit
4 Assitoun², Roy Faiman¹, Irfan Zaidi³, Woodford, John³, Patrick Duffy³, and Tovi Lehmann¹

5 ¹ Laboratory of Malaria and Vector Research, NIAID, NIH, Rockville, Maryland, USA

6 ² Malaria Research and Training Center (MRTC)/ Faculty of Medicine, Pharmacy and Odonto-
7 stomatology, University of Sciences, Techniques and Technologies, Bamako, Mali

8 ³ Laboratory of Malaria Immunology and Vaccinology, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
9 Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

10 * Authors contributed equally

11 **Corresponding author:** Tovi Lehmann (tlehmann@nih.gov)

12

13 **Abstract:**

14 The spread of SARS-CoV-2 cannot be well monitored and understood in areas without capacity
15 for effective disease surveillance. Countries with a young population will have disproportionately large
16 numbers of asymptomatic or pauci-symptomatic infections, further hindering detection of infection in
17 the population. Sero-surveillance on a country-wide scale by trained medical professionals may be
18 limited in scope in resource limited setting such as Mali. Novel ways of broadly sampling the human
19 population in a non-invasive method would allow for large-scale surveillance at a reduced cost. Here we
20 evaluate the collection of naturally bloodfed mosquitoes to test for human anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies
21 in the laboratory and at five field locations in Mali. Immunoglobulin-G antibodies were found to be
22 readily detectable within the mosquito bloodmeals by a bead-based immunoassay at least through 10
23 hours post-feeding with high sensitivity (0.900 ± 0.059) and specificity (0.924 ± 0.080), respectively,
24 indicating that most blood-fed mosquitoes collected indoors during early morning hours (and thus, have
25 likely fed the previous night) are viable samples for analysis. We find that reactivity to four SARS-CoV-2
26 antigens rose during the pandemic from pre-pandemic levels. Consistent with other sero-surveillance
27 studies in Mali, crude seropositivity of blood sampled via mosquitoes was 6.3% in October/November
28 2020 over all sites, and increased to 25.1% overall, with the town closest to Bamako reaching 46.7% in
29 February of 2021. Mosquito bloodmeals a viable target for conventional immunoassays, and therefore
30 country-wide sero-surveillance of human diseases (both vector-borne and non-vector-borne) is
31 attainable in areas where human-biting mosquitoes are common, and is an informative, cost-effective,
32 non-invasive sampling option.


33 **Keywords:** Africa, COVID-19, population-based epidemiology, mosquito blood meal, sero-surveillance,

34 **Introduction:**

35 The speed, scope, and impact of the SARS-CoV-2 virus on all corners of the globe is
36 unprecedented in the last 100 years, with over 662 million cases and 6.7 million deaths through 2022.¹
37 As of February 2022, Mali had 30,303 RT-PCR-confirmed cases of COVID-19 across four waves of
38 infection for a population of 20.8 million (Figure 1)², with most cases reported from the capital, Bamako.
39 Due to the limited testing capacity across the country, this is almost certainly a gross underestimation of
40 the true number of infections. The use of sero-surveillance in which blood samples are broadly screened

41 for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, is a promising tool to discover the rate of spread of a disease through a
42 population even from individuals without known current or past infection.

43 **Figure 1:** SARS-CoV-2 7-day smoothed case numbers per million people in Mali. Mosquito sampling
44 dates across all villages marked by vertical blue lines. Data from Our World In Data.^{1,2} As of 2022-02-17,
45 30303 cases total in population of 20.8 million.



Case Data from Our World in Data

46
47 Enzyme-linked immunosorbence assays (ELISAs) for detection of immunoglobulin-G antibodies
48 specific for SARS-CoV-2 have been rapidly developed in response to the pandemic.³⁻⁵ However, samples
49 of African origin tested with these assays were associated with a higher background reactivity than has
50 been seen with North American and European serum panels, though this varied depending on the assay
51 used and antigen targeted.⁶⁻⁸ The origins of the background reactivity have not been fully explained,
52 though donors in some of the African panels had higher reactivity to 'common-cold' coronaviruses such
53 as OC43⁶ and previous infections with Dengue virus or malaria-causing parasites may also exacerbate
54 this problem⁹. Within Mali, background reactivity in pre-pandemic sera was common compared to US
55 controls (43.4% spike, 22.8% for receptor-binding domain (RBD), and 33.9% for nucleocapsid protein),
56 with no obvious neutralization ability present in these samples.⁸ Specificity could be improved with
57 reasonable sensitivity by using multiple antigen targets with conservative cutoffs, though the degree to
58 which this background signal may impact other immunoassays is unclear.

59 Previous work with this dual-antigen ELISA method in Mali has indicated a sharp increase in the
60 adjusted seroprevalence from 10.9% in July-October 2020 to 54.7% in December 2020-January 2021 in
61 three villages/townships.¹⁰ This absolute increase appeared to be more limited in the relatively rural
62 village of Doneguebougou (from 5.0 to 37.0%), in comparison to the Sotuba township nearby to Bamako
63 (from 19.0 to 70.4%), but was still dramatic. Although sampling in this study included the township of
64 Bancoumana, 50 km from Bamako, it was not performed in rural areas further from the capital, so the
65 representation of the country and the relationship between distance from Bamako and rate of

66 seropositivity remained unclear. Expansion of sero-surveillance into more remote and rural areas of Mali
67 may be difficult due to requirements of trained health professionals for blood-collection and analysis.

68 Reflecting on our experience in medical entomology, we considered the blood sampling
69 potential present in human-seeking mosquitoes. In many areas of Mali, the mosquito density indoors is
70 high, especially of a few species such as certain members the *Anopheles gambiae* and *Culex pipiens*
71 complexes, which have a strong preference for blood-feeding from humans, and a tendency to rest
72 indoors after imbibing a bloodmeal.¹¹ With these numbers and behaviors, they present a suitable
73 potential source for an assay-sized, roughly 1-5 μ l¹², volume of blood. Previous work in this realm has
74 found mosquito bloodmeals to have sufficient volume to detect blood-borne human pathogens,¹³ and
75 various antibodies of human disease including *Trypanosoma*, *Plasmodium*, Dengue virus, and Japanese
76 Encephalitis antibodies.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ However, leveraging these insects has never, to our knowledge, been
77 performed as a broad epidemiological sero-surveillance tool.

78 In this study we evaluate the potential for anthropophilic biting mosquitoes as non-invasive
79 blood sampling tools to measure population seroprevalence patterns, using naturally acquired SARS-
80 CoV-2 antibodies as a proof of concept. Owing to a relatively small amount of blood drawn via a
81 mosquito bite, we favored a multiplex, bead-based immunological assay to characterize four antigens
82 simultaneously. We characterize the durability of antibodies in the digestive environment of the
83 mosquito midgut and evaluate the methodology in natural settings using mosquitoes caught in five
84 different communities in Mali, West Africa.

85 **Methods**

86 *Mosquito rearing:*

87 *Anopheles coluzzii* mosquitoes were reared as previously described.¹⁷ Briefly, colonized, disease-
88 free mosquitoes were reared in plastic trays (30 x 25 x 7 cm) with 1.5L of dechlorinated water. Larvae
89 were fed with yeast supplement in the first 24 hours post after larval emergence and fish food until
90 emergence as adults. These adult mosquitoes were held until 3-5 days old, at which point they were
91 starved overnight and allowed to feed upon human volunteers and stored as described below.

92 *Pre-pandemic mosquito collection and multiplex bead-based immunoassay reactivity:*

93 To develop a baseline cutoff from historic samples, bloodfed mosquitoes collected as part of
94 mosquito surveillance from the Sahelian villages Thierola and M'Piabougou, Mali in 2017 and 2018, that
95 had been stored on silica gel desiccant were evaluated for immunoreactivity to SARS-CoV-2 antigens.
96 Abdomens of individual mosquitoes were separated from the thorax under magnification using fine-
97 tipped forceps. These abdomens were ground individually in 120ul of sample buffer of the bead-based
98 kit (Bio-Plex Pro Human IgG SARS-CoV-2, Bio-Rad, Irvine, CA) using 5-6 2.0 mm zirconia beads in a Mini-
99 BeadBeater-96 (BioSpec Products, Inc, Bartlesville, OK, USA) at max speed for 25 seconds. This slurry
100 was spun at 13,000 g for 10 minutes to clear solids, and 50ul of the supernatant was used in the assay
101 according to manufacturer instructions. This assay uses anti-human IgG as detection antibody and
102 magnetic capture beads coupled with SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid, receptor-binding domain, spike subunit
103 1 (hereafter spike1), and spike subunit 2 (hereafter spike2) viral proteins. Volume of sera per bloodmeal
104 is difficult to quantify with the mosquito due to variability in feeding amounts and the concentration of
105 blood via diuresis. For each antigen, we developed cutoffs from pre-pandemic samples based on the
106 time period's mean value of sample median fluorescence intensity (MFI) plus 5 standard deviations, and
107 samples were considered positive if two or more antigens exceeded these cutoffs.

108 *Human blood feeding on SARS-CoV-2 recovered individuals and computation of sensitivity and specificity:*

109 *Disclaimer:* All aspects of the work involving human volunteers were approved by the Ethics Committee
110 in the University of Bamako as part of IRB protocol: N°2020/78/CE/FMOS/FAPH.

111 Two volunteers who had recovered from a PCR-diagnosed SARS-CoV-2 infection, and one volunteer with
112 no known SARS-CoV-2 infection were fed upon by groups of 100 laboratory-reared, disease-free *An.*
113 *coluzzii*. Mosquitoes were kept under normal insectary conditions for set time points post feed (0, 2, 4,
114 8, and 30 hours) to analyze the effect of digestion on recoverability of the antibodies. At each time
115 point, mosquitoes were killed and stored on top of a small piece of cotton ball in a 1.7 ml Eppendorf
116 tubes with silica gel desiccant (#13767, Millipore Sigma, Burlington, MA). Mosquitoes were kept on
117 desiccant for one week at room temperature before storage at -80 °C until analysis. A larger cohort of 12
118 residents of the rural village of Thierola of unknown SARS-CoV-2 status were subsequently analyzed. Of
119 this cohort, two (C and K) had worked in a mine during several months prior to the experiment and two
120 lived in cities ('H' in Bamako and 'M' in Kita). An additional volunteer, a resident of Bamako, was
121 vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 three months prior to the experiment. Each volunteer was fed upon by
122 groups of 50 laboratory-reared, disease-free *An. coluzzii* mosquitoes. Mosquitoes were held for 0, 5, 10,
123 and 30 hours post-feed and stored as described above before analysis. Using the 'rsample' R package¹⁸,
124 we created 100 sample splits for each timepoint using bootstrapping. From these splits, we estimated
125 test sensitivity and specificity from the putative positivity of the volunteers using with the 'yardstick' R
126 package.¹⁹ Overall test sensitivity and specificity were set based on 5 and 10 hr timepoints as these are
127 the most-likely range of time periods post-feeding to capture mosquitoes (i.e. morning after likely
128 feeding window).

129 *Wild-caught mosquito based sero-surveillance in Mali and evaluation of changes in crude prevalence:*

130 Indoor resting mosquitoes were collected by aspiration from 40 sentinel houses in each of five
131 communities (latitude and longitude are in parentheses): Bancoumana (12.20862, -8.2646), Berian
132 (11.4197, -7.9351), Nionina (12.9873, -5.997231), Sitokoto (13.637307, -10.818615), and Sotuba
133 (12.66181, -7.91915), Mali. The sentinel houses were chosen to have at least one occupied bedroom, to
134 have given permission for sampling via the homeowners, and to be spread across the community with a
135 minimum of 50 m between them (20 m in the smaller villages). Sampling of blood-fed mosquitoes was
136 performed during October/November 2020 and February 2021 with handheld aspirators in the morning
137 (07:00-10:00). Mosquitoes were desiccated on silica gel and stored at -20 °C until shipment where they
138 were stored at -80 °C until analysis. Samples of ~60 blood-fed mosquitoes per village per timepoint
139 were analyzed via the below described immunoassay. Where possible, mosquitoes were sampled from
140 the same houses across time periods to assess the progression of seropositivity in a semi-matched
141 population. These are semi-matched due to an uncertainty whether the individual the mosquito fed on
142 is a member of that house, and if so which individual it was.

143 To test the difference between quantiles of pre-pandemic and pandemic distributions, we used quantile
144 regression implemented by Proc Quantreg²⁰, which extends the general linear model for estimating
145 conditional change in the response variable across its distribution as expressed by quantiles, rather than
146 its mean (though the median is similar to the mean in symmetric distributions). Quantile regression does
147 not assume parametric distribution (e.g., normal) of the random error part of the model, thus it is
148 considered semi-parametric. The benefit of this analysis is that it addresses changes in reactivity to
149 antigens that could be detected in the higher quantiles even when the mean or the median are less
150 affected, without imposing cutoffs. In fact, it can be used to estimate if there is a monotonic increase
151 over time (and over quantiles) and estimate the sero-prevalence change (from the pre-pandemic
152 baseline) per antigen. The parameter estimates in linear quantile regression models are interpreted as in

153 typical GLM, as rates of change adjusted for the effects of the other variables in the model for a
154 specified quantile²¹.

155 *Seropositivity adjustments*

156 The definition of seropositive blood meal (hereafter also seropositive mosquito) is explained in the
157 Results (below). Estimated seropositivity at the human population was adjusted in three ways, to
158 account the assay sensitivity and specificity (calculated from 5hr and 10hr time-points of laboratory
159 feed), for human-blood meal proportion, and to account for the possibility that multiple mosquitoes fed
160 on the same person. Specifically, standard error around crude seropositivity measures per village per
161 timepoint were generated using the ‘yardstick’, ‘infer’, and ‘rsample’ packages^{18,19,22} with 1,000
162 bootstrap replicates. The test sensitivity and specificity adjustment was done as in Sempos and Tian
163 (2021)²³ using the sensitivity and specificity estimates from the 5hr and 10hr time-points of laboratory
164 feed, with the following formula:

$$165 \quad \text{Adjusted Seroprevalence} = \frac{\text{crude seroprevalence} + \text{specificity} - 1}{\text{sensitivity} + \text{specificity} - 1}$$

166 Second, we adjusted seroprevalence estimates accounting for the non-human bloodmeal proportion
167 found in mosquito samples collected during the matched village and time periods (methodology
168 described in section below), adjusting the numbers of total individuals tested (denominator) by the
169 corresponding fraction of non-human bloodmeals found. Uncertainty around these estimates were
170 taken by generating 1000 draws stratified by sample group size, and 1000 bootstrap replicate from
171 these groups as above. Finally, seroprevalence when sampling a single mosquito per house was
172 estimated across 1,000 random draws of one mosquito per house per time period. Standard errors
173 surrounding both these adjusted values was generated as described above with 1000 bootstrap
174 replicates.

175 *Blood-meal host determination: human vs. animal blood*

176 Mosquito host feeding sources were determined through a qPCR high resolution melt-curve
177 analysis targeting cytochrome B gene fragment, following published protocols.²⁴ Briefly, DNA was
178 extracted from 5ul of the above mosquito slurry by combining with 20ul of QuickExtract solution
179 (Lucigen), and incubated for 65°C at 15min with a final inactivation of 98°C for 2 minutes. From this, 2ul
180 of extract was combined with 5ul SsoAdvanced Universal SYBR Green Supermix, 2ul water, and 1ul of
181 10uM CytB primers, and analyzed with the published amplification/melt conditions in a Mic qPCR Cycler
182 (Bio Molecular Systems, Australia). Bloodmeal discrimination for the purposes of this paper were
183 classified as human if the melting temperature of the amplified product fell between 85.75°C +/- 2°C,
184 and otherwise considered non-human if melt rate (-dF/dT) peaks fell outside this range.


185 **Results:**

186 *Pre-pandemic mosquito background reactivity:*

187 Due to the variable nature of mosquito bloodmeal size, a potential range of digestion time per
188 individual mosquito, and high rate of pre-pandemic background reactivity presented in other serological
189 studies,^{3,4} we developed assay cutoffs based on background reactivity from silica gel stored, pre-
190 pandemic, blood-fed mosquito samples ($n=90$). Median Fluorescent Intensity (MFI) values per antigen
191 were non-normally distributed (Shapiro-Wilk normality test, p -value < 0.001 for all antigens).
192 Manufacturer suggested MFI cutoffs for 1:100 dilution of serum (N:450, RBD:250, S1:250, S2:750), were
193 adjusted for this assay using the mean + 5 standard deviations of pre-pandemic mosquitoes to maximize
194 detectability and limit multi-antigen false positivity. These cutoffs (N:116.7, RBD:48.3, S1:78.0, S2:89.4)
195 showed low single antigen positivity ($n=2$, 2.2%) in these mosquitoes during the pre-pandemic period

196 (Figure 2 and Supplemental table 1). Due to this low level of single-antigen positivity and that no pre-
197 pandemic mosquitoes were seropositive based on 2 or more antigens; we chose to classify a mosquito
198 positive only if two or more antigens crossed their specific thresholds.
199

200 **Figure 2:** Background reactivity of 90 blood-fed mosquitoes collected via indoor aspiration prior to SARS-
201 CoV-2 emergence and stored desiccated on silica gel until analysis. Per antigen cutoffs are marked via
202 line. The two points above cutoff were single antigen positive mosquitoes
203




204
205

206 *Durability of antibody-detectability in mosquito midguts*

207 In an initial proof-of-concept time-course experiment, mosquitoes were held for set time points
208 after blood-feeding to assess the detectability of the antibodies in the blood meal during mosquito
209 digestion under normal insectary conditions. Consistent with previous studies on antibodies against
210 other pathogens^{13-16,25,26}, antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 remained detectable at least to 10 hours, with a
211 loss of signal seen between that timepoint and 24 hours later (data not shown). Following this pilot, a
212 larger trial was then undertaken with 13 volunteers of unknown SARS-CoV-2 infection history. One
213 volunteer (VAT) had been vaccinated three months prior to the experiment (with an additional
214 suspected infection with SARS-CoV-2 based on high titer against the nucleocapsid antigen, below). VAT
215 had a clear antibody response across all time-points analyzed with 3 or more antigens positive in every
216 mosquito held up to 30 hours post blood-feeding (Supplemental Figure 3). Other volunteers with
217 unknown status were classified based on the positivity rate of mosquitoes in time points 0, 5, and 10
218 hours, where overall antibody positivity rates were highest (Figure 3). VBT and VDT had all mosquitoes
219 positive with 2 or more antigens through these time points (11/11 and 11/12 mosquitoes, respectively).
220 VFT, VIT, VLT, and VMT each had all but one mosquito positive in these times post-feeding (10/11, 9/10,
221 4/5, 9/10 total positive mosquitoes, respectively). VGT had two mosquitoes as negative (8/10 positive).
222 These 8 individuals were assumed then to be true positives, with negative mosquitoes being false
223 negatives. On the other hand, volunteers VHT, VCT, VET, and VJT were considered negative due to only 1
224 or fewer antigen positive mosquitoes at any time point. VKT was also considered negative due to 11/12
225 mosquitoes having <2 antigens positive but does have one 2-antigen positive mosquito at the 10 hours
226 time-point (Figure 3), indicating this is a false positive (or as an individual with antibody levels very near
227 the limit of detection). Accordingly, misclassification varied between antigens (in time points 0, 5, and 10
228 hours), being highest in nucleocapsid with 12% false positive and 34% false negative (N=132

229 mosquitoes), followed by spike1 (2% false positive and 30% false negative, N=132), RBD (0% false
230 positive and 17% false negative, N=132), and spike2 (10% false positive and 6% false negative, N=132).
231 Although the diagnostic values appear to vary among antigens, the small sample size of volunteers
232 available in the present study may have confounded these estimates. Thus, using reactivity against
233 multiple antigens for a diagnosis of a suspected sero-positive is needed to overcome these rates of
234 misclassification based on a single antigen.

235 **Figure 3:** Antibody detectability above antigen-specific cutoffs (dotted line) with the four-antigen
236 multiplex immunoassay after set periods of digestion post-bloodfeeding on human volunteers.
237 Suspected Covid had 2+ antigens over pre-pandemic cutoffs at multiple time points, suspected negative
238 had a maximum of one antigen positive at any time point. Inconclusive (based on a single mosquito
239 blood meal) had 1 mosquito with 2 antigens positives at various time points (See also Supplemental
240 Figure 1 and Supplemental Figure 2).
241



242
243 Based on these classifications of volunteer infection status and the requirement that reactivity
244 above cutoff must be observed for two or more antigens, we estimated the sensitivity and specificity of
245 our assay throughout these time points using bootstrapping to determine confidence intervals (Table 1).

246 **Table 1:** Sensitivity and specificity estimations during each time-point post feeding a total of 159
247 mosquitoes on 13 volunteers (Figures3 and S1). Standard deviations were calculated using

248 bootstrapping. A 5 and 10 hour merged time-point estimate (5 and 10Hr) was calculated as these are
249 the more likely time-points for collection of blood-fed wild mosquitoes post-feeding than 0 or 30 hours.

Time post feed	Mean Sensitivity	Std. Dev. Sensitivity	Mean Specificity	Std. Dev. Specificity
0Hr	0.932	0.052	1	0
5Hr	0.871	0.075	1	0
10Hr	0.954	0.04	0.942	0.057
30Hr	0.288	0.102	1	0
5and10Hr	0.925	0.033	0.975	0.027

250

251 We find that while sensitivity is high in 0-10 hours timepoints (0.871-0.954), it drops at 30 hours to
252 0.288, with only mosquitoes from two of the previously infected volunteers with the highest overall MFI
253 values showing positivity at this time point (Supplemental Figure 2).


254 *Sero-surveillance of Malian communities*

255 A total of 579 blood-fed mosquitoes (252 were *An. gambiae* s.l. and 327 were *Culex* spp.)
256 collected indoors in five Malian communities by aspiration were subjected to analysis. Numbers of
257 analyzed mosquitoes were randomly subsampled to be largely consistent between sampling periods
258 (284 in October—November 2020, 295 in February 2021), villages (118, 108, 115, 118, 120 mosquitoes
259 analyzed from Bancoumana, Berian, Nionina, Sitokoto, and Sotuba, respectively), and total houses
260 sampled per village (44, 35, 35, 34, 33 in Bancoumana, Berian, Nionina, Sitokoto, and Sotuba,
261 respectively).

262 An increase in reactivity from the pre-pandemic baseline was apparent across all four SARS-CoV-
263 2 antigens (Figure4). Because we suspected that only a fraction of the population would be seropositive,
264 we used quantile regression to evaluate which quantiles have changed and if the change was consistent
265 across quantiles. An advantage of this approach is that it does not assume cutoffs (Methods), yet it can
266 be used to estimate the quantiles of the population that exhibits crude reactivity changes over the
267 pandemic for each antigen. Considering nucleocapsid and spike-1, an increase over the pre-pandemic
268 was significant at October-November 2020, starting from the 80th and 75th quantiles, respectively
269 (quantile regression, $t_{df=1}=2.74$ and 2.14 , $P=0.006$ and $P=0.033$, respectively) and increasing in
270 significance at higher quantiles, whereas at Feb-Mar 2021 a significant increase was detected from the
271 65th and 70th quantiles, respectively (quantile regression, $t_{df=1}=2.71$ and 2.49 , $P=0.007$ and $P=0.013$,
272 respectively, Figure4b). In RBD, an increase over the pre-pandemic was significant at October-November
273 2020, starting from the 50th quantile ($t_{df=1}=3.17$ $P=0.002$) and increasing in significance at higher
274 quantiles, whereas at Feb-Mar 2021 a significant increase was detected from the 30th quantile ($t_{df=1}=2.89$
275 $P=0.035$, Figure4b) and increased thereafter. In spike-2, an increase over the pre-pandemic was
276 significant at October-November 2020, starting from the 70th quantile ($t_{df=1}=2.53$ $P=0.012$) and
277 increasing in significance at higher quantiles, whereas at Feb-Mar 2021 a significant increase was
278 detected from the 50th quantile ($t_{df=1}=2.43$ $P=0.016$, Figure4b) and increased thereafter. These results, at
279 the single antigen level, exhibited relative change over time, and thus, support a consistent increase
280 from the pre-pandemic baseline. On average across antigens and the five communities, these estimates
281 support 31% crude sero-prevalence in October-November 2020 that increased to 46% in Feb-Mar 2021.
282 Moreover, the increase in the magnitude of the reactivity (Figure4) indicates that a fraction of the
283 population has experienced multiple exposure events resulting in elevated titers among sero-positives
284 (aside from the greater fraction of the population showing an increase over the pre-pandemic levels).

285 The crude daily rate of infection estimated by the difference in mean prevalence (across antigens in the
 286 whole population) between time points divided by the median number of days between samples was
 287 0.13%/d between October-November 2020 and February 2021. Assuming that COVID-19 started
 288 spreading in the country one week before the discovery of the first case(s) in Mali (March 25, 2020:
 289 http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-03/25/c_138916218.htm), the crude daily infection rate
 290 between this and the October sample was 0.15%/d.

291 **Figure 4:** Distributions of the median fluorescence intensity (MFI) per antigen comparing pre-pandemic
 292 (N=90) and pandemic mosquitoes (October-November 2020, N=284; and February 2021, N=295) and
 293 quantile regression results showing quantile specific changes in reactivity over time for each antigen. (a)
 294 Reactivity distribution of each antigen and time period overlaid with box-whisker plots. The cutoffs are
 295 shown by the horizontal lines. (b) Results of quantile regression models fitted to each antigen with period
 296 as the independent variable, showing the intercept and the effect of each pandemic time period relative
 297 to the pre-pandemic baseline with 95% confident interval (blue band). Line segments above zero
 298 indicate quantiles in which the effect is positive and statistical significance is indicated if the CI range
 299 does not overlap with the zero baseline.
 300
 301



302
 303 Assuming each blood fed mosquito fed on a randomly selected person in the community, crude
 304 seroprevalence was estimated based the number of bloodfed mosquitoes with reactivity above cutoff
 305 for two or more SARS Cov-2 antigens (above) over the total tested, suggesting a significant increase in
 306 four of the five communities between October-November 2020 and February 2021 (Figures5A, S3).
 307 Notably, no change or even a trend showing a loss of sero-positivity was recorded for the village
 308 Sitokoto, which had very minimal sero-prevalence (1.8%) in October-November 2020 (Figure 5A).

309 The crude serological data indicates marked heterogeneity over time as well as in space (Table
 310 2). Considering a house “positive” if it had at least one positive mosquito, seroprevalence at the house
 311 level was typically, higher than that at the mosquito level, yet the differences over time and across
 312 villages were consistent as were the statistically significant differences between periods and across
 313 villages (Table 2). Significant differences between villages were detected only at the February 2021

314 period (Table 2). At the range of seroprevalence measured, there was consistent relationship with house
 315 seroprevalence 50% higher than that at the mosquito level (Supplementary Figure 4, Discussion).

316

317 Table 2. Crude seroprevalence (N) over time across spatial scales and sampling units.


Spatial scale	Unit	Oct-Nov 2020	February 2021	P (Homogeneity test over time)	P (Homogeneity test across villages)
Overall	Mosquito	4% (284)	20% (295)	0.0001, $\chi^2_{df=1}=35.4$	
Overall	House	6.7% (119)	30.1 (143)	0.0001, $\chi^2_{df=1}=22.6$	
Bancoumana	Mosquito	5% (60)	31% (58)	0.0002, $\chi^2_{df=1}=13.6$	
Berian	Mosquito	8% (49)	12% (59)	0.5, $\chi^2_{df=1}=0.4$	
Nionina	Mosquito	2% (56)	17% (59)	0.006, $\chi^2_{df=1}=7.6$	Breslow-Day Test for Homogeneity
Sitokoto	Mosquito	2% (59)	0% (59)	0.3, $\chi^2_{df=1}=1$	
Sotuba	Mosquito	3% (60)	40% (60)	0.0001, $\chi^2_{df=1}=23.7$	0.006, $\chi^2_{df=4}=14.4$
Cross villages	Mosquito	P=0.4, $\chi^2_{df=4}=4.1$	P=0.0001, $\chi^2_{df=4}=36.9$		
Bancoumana	House	10% (30)	50% (32)	0.0002, $\chi^2_{df=1}=11.7$	
Berian	House	5% (20)	19% (31)	0.15, $\chi^2_{df=1}=2.1$	
Nionina	House	4% (23)	29 (28)	0.024, $\chi^2_{df=1}=5.1$	Breslow-Day Test for Homogeneity
Sitokoto	House	5% (20)	0% (29)	0.41, Fisher Exact Tst	
Sotuba	House	8% (26)	57% (23)	0.0002, $\chi^2_{df=1}=13.7$	0.023, $\chi^2_{df=4}=11.3$
Cross villages	House	P=0.91, $\chi^2_{df=4}=0.95$	P=0.0001, $\chi^2_{df=4}=27.9$		

318

319 Although these indoor resting mosquitoes are known to feed predominantly on humans^{11,27-30}
 320 we assessed the variation among villages and time points in this trait, which could confound our results
 321 because our secondary antibody was anti-human IgG (Methods). Blood meal analysis to identify human
 322 and nonhuman hosts (Methods) was performed on 221 mosquitoes. Overall, 88% fed on human blood
 323 including 9% which fed on human and other animal blood (mixed, Supplementary Figure 5). The overall
 324 human feeding rate was lower in *Anopheles* (79%, N=109) than in *Culex* (97%, N=112, P=0.001 $\chi^2_{df=1}$
 325 =18.1), was similar between time points (86% in OctNov2020 vs. 91% in February 2021, $\chi^2_{df=1} = 1.83$,
 326 P=0.17) and varied between 66% (Sitokoto) and 97% (Sotuba) among villages ($\chi^2_{df=4} = 27.3$, P=0.0001,
 327 Supplementary Figure 4). With the other villages blood-feeding rate on humans equal or above 91%
 328 ($\chi^2_{df=4} = 1.6$, P=0.6), only the mosquitoes from Sitokoto exhibited an exceptionally low human feeding
 329 rate. To accommodate variation in blood feeding rate on our seroprevalence rates, we adjusted the
 330 seroprevalence data in each village and time point to the fraction of mosquitoes that fed on humans
 331 (Figure5B).

332 Numbers of mosquitoes collected and analyzed per house across the five villages in each time
 333 period varied (Medians=2 and 3, Maximum=11 and 49, respectively, Supplementary Figure 6), and thus
 334 we calculated human seroprevalence per village using bootstrap subsampling of one mosquito per
 335 house per village per time period (Figure 5C). This led to similar point estimates of prevalence, though
 336 with a wider standard deviation.

337 **Figure 5:** Crude (A) and adjusted seroprevalence per sampling village. Adjusted seroprevalence for test
 338 sensitivity and bloodmeal composition (B), and test sensitivity with one mosquito per sampling period
 339 per household (C).



340

341

342

343 Discussion:

344 This is the first study evaluating the use of serological data derived from blood-fed mosquitoes
345 to measure the spread of a non-vector borne disease, namely COVID-19, at a country scale. This
346 approach has a high potential to fill the gap where capacity to effectively sample the target human
347 (host) population directly is low, but where mosquitoes that feed on people are abundant – settings that
348 are common in many developing countries. As this was a proof-of-concept evaluation of this approach,
349 rather than a full-scale investigation (in preparation), we have limited the number of communities, time
350 periods, and samples analyzed. Yet, the results reveal a sharp increase in exposure to SARS-CoV-2
351 between October 2020 and February 2021, albeit not across all communities. Furthermore, a
352 comparison of key patterns detected here with those established using the classic sero-surveillance
353 study in some of the same Malian communities⁸ suggests high congruency (below). Overall, our results
354 demonstrate that this approach provides valuable insights as to the magnitude of human exposure and
355 its variation over space and time, which can inform epidemiological assessments and decisions.

356 However, this approach does not convey individual patient exposure status (or seroconversion
357 in repeated sampling) because the individual person the blood came from remains unknown as is the
358 information about their age, gender, etc. Uncertainties regarding the exact volume of the sera a
359 mosquito imbibes, the exact time since blood-feeding, and especially whether a mosquito fed on a
360 human or animal host, and the fraction of mosquitoes that fed on the same people preclude
361 interpreting “mosquito seroprevalence” as identical to the human population’s seroprevalence, without
362 accommodating additional information. Finally, the small volume of blood available in a mosquito
363 (typically 1-5 μl ¹²) limits the number of serological assays that can be performed on a single sample.
364 Below, we consider these factors in the analysis and interpretation of the results on the spread of SARS-
365 CoV-2 in Mali and in similar application of this approach in the future for this or other diseases.

366 Prerequisites for using blood-fed mosquitoes for serological studies include establishing the
367 dynamics of antibody detection over time since blood feeding (using the same preservation method and

368 conditions used in the field) and reactivity cutoffs that are validated using direct feed on local volunteers
369 or blood from seropositive and seronegative individuals from the target populations⁶⁻⁸. Early
370 experiments to evaluate the effect of time post feeding on antibody detection revealed that mosquitoes
371 preserved in 80% ethanol indicated rapid reactivity degradation compared with those desiccated on
372 silica gel (not shown). Both laboratory experiments in NIH and field studies in Mali confirmed earlier
373 studies^{13,15,16,25,26} that antibody detection persisted with minimal degradation until at least 10 hours and
374 degradation was evident at later time points (24-36 hours post feeding, e.g., Figure3). Since most
375 *Anopheles spp.* and *Culex spp.* bite late at night: 22:00 to 04:00^{29,31-35} and mosquito collection took place
376 from 07:00 to 10:00, most mosquitoes were killed and preserved 3-11 hours post feeding. Moreover, we
377 separated freshly fed mosquitoes which were subjected to serological analysis from later stages of blood
378 digestion including semi-gravid and gravid or non-fed mosquitoes. We established reactivity cutoffs per
379 antigen with wide margin based on the mean and 5 standard deviations, using pre-pandemic, silica gel
380 stored blood-fed mosquito samples from the target population that represent natural background
381 reactivity (Figure2). The low single antigen positivity (2.2%) in the pre-pandemic mosquitoes (Figure2
382 and Supplemental Table 1) was further minimized by requiring that seropositive mosquitoes exhibit
383 reactivity above cutoffs in two or more antigens. These cutoffs were tested in a trial with 13 volunteers,
384 whose infection history with SARS-CoV-2 was unknown (except for one). Based on highly consistent
385 sero-positivity of the mosquitoes that fed on them (mosquitoes/volunteer >10), the volunteers were
386 readily classified into putative positive and negative states using high consensus among mosquitoes (in
387 time points 0, 5, and 10 hrs Figures3, S1 and S2). Likewise, despite moderate misclassification by single
388 antigens (up to 12% false positive and 34% false negative among $N=132$ mosquitoes in NC)^{8,36},
389 considering the two-antigen definition at the 5 and 10 hours post feeding time point (above), only 2.5%
390 were false positive mosquitoes and only 7.5% were false negative mosquitoes, assuming the
391 classification of individuals was correct (Table 1).

392 Overall, results based on 669 blood-fed mosquitoes collected indoors across five Malian communities
393 (Bancoumana, Berian, Nionina, Sitokoto, and Sotuba following collection in two pre-pandemic villages)
394 revealed an increase in reactivity from the pre-pandemic baseline across all four SARS-CoV-2 antigens
395 (Figure 4). This increase was significant between the pre-pandemic and the early (October-November
396 2020) and late (February 2021) pandemic time periods (Figures 4 and 5), but also between the early and
397 late pandemic time periods (quantile regressions, $P<0.01$ and Table 2). Assuming minimal change in
398 confounders such as human feeding rate, this trend presents a compelling proof for the utility of
399 mosquito-based analysis of disease spread especially because it does not depend on cutoff values. This
400 analysis indicated a steady increase of the fraction of the population exhibiting elevated reactivity over
401 the pre-pandemic level as well as elevated intensity of the reactivity across the higher quantiles
402 (Figure4), suggesting higher titers among putative positives, as expected if people are repeatedly
403 infected when more individuals carry the virus. Assuming these five, mostly rural communities represent
404 the whole of Mali, the crude daily rate of infection (estimated by the difference in mean prevalence
405 across antigens between time points divided by the median number of days between samples as
406 explained above) was 0.13%/d between October-November 2020 and February 2021. Assuming that
407 COVID-19 started spreading in the country one week before the discovery of the first case(s) in Mali
408 (above), the crude daily infection rate between this and the October sample was 0.15%/d. Albeit lower
409 than those reported from Mali⁸, the difference may reflect the more remote and rural settings of the
410 communities sampled here. Indeed, at Doneguebougou, the most rural community sampled by Sagara
411 et al. (2021¹⁰, which is located ~15 km from Bamako, their estimate for the same time period was
412 similar (0.19%/d), and unlike our estimate, their rate included persons who were positive at the first
413 time point and negative in the second time point.

414 Following the definition of sero-positive mosquito's bloodmeal (reactivity > cutoff in two or
415 more SARS Cov-2 antigens), we estimated the crude population seroprevalence of each community and
416 time point, assuming each mosquito fed on a randomly selected resident (Figures 5 and S3). That the
417 seroprevalence at the house level was 50% higher than that at the mosquito level (Table 2,
418 Supplementary Figure 4) reflecting the combined effects of the clustering of seropositive persons
419 between houses in a village, the number of mosquitoes analyzed per house, and the fraction
420 mosquitoes that blood fed in one house overnight and moved into another by morning^{37,38}. Because of
421 this and the quicker saturation of the house seroprevalence (defined as having at least one seropositive
422 mosquito in a house at a given time period), we suggest that the crude seropositivity at the mosquito
423 level provides more accurate estimate of the community true seroprevalence. Additionally, blood-fed
424 mosquitoes should be sampled from at least 25 houses in the community, and possibly from a larger
425 number based on its total size, spatial organization, and heterogeneity with respect to relevant factors,
426 e.g., proximity to school, market, etc. Overall, the crude seroprevalence rate at October-November
427 2020 was 6.5% (Sitokoto: 1.8%—Berian: 12.2%, Figure5A, Table 2), representing seven months after the
428 discovery of the first case of COVID-19 in Mali. However, three and a half months later (February 2021),
429 the overall crude seroprevalence was dramatically higher: 25.0% (Sitokoto: 0%—Sotuba: 46.5%,
430 Figure5A, Table 2). This rise corresponds to the first peak of elevated transmission in Mali (November
431 2020—January 2021, Figure1).

432 Our crude seroprevalence may underestimate actual human population seroprevalence because the
433 assay's sensitivity was lower than its specificity (Table 1) while the majority of the population would be
434 still sero-negative and because some of the mosquitoes had taken their blood meal on non-human hosts
435 (which our ELISA cannot detect even if that host had antibodies against SARS-Cov-2). The adjusted
436 seroprevalence values were typically 2% higher than the crude seroprevalence across communities and
437 in each one, except in Sotuba during February 2021, where the adjusted seroprevalence was 4.5%
438 higher than the crude value (Figure 5). Overall, 12% mosquitoes fed on non-human blood (N=221), aside
439 from 9% that fed on human and other animal blood, proportions that are consistent with previous
440 studies^{11,27,29,32,33}. None of the mosquitoes that fed on animal blood were seropositive (N=26; 1 mosquito
441 was reactive to a single antigen). Minor difference was detected between October-November 2020
442 (86%) and February 2021 (91%, above) and feeding on human blood was above 91% in all villages except
443 in Sitokoto (66%), which also had the lowest crude seroprevalence. Incorporating a bead that indicates
444 human IgG or other human-specific antigen into a single ELISA would be helpful in future studies,
445 especially in areas where feeding on non-human hosts is more common. Finally, to consider the
446 possibility that mosquitoes collected in the same house fed on the same person, we also estimated the
447 human seroprevalence by resampling one mosquito from each household (Figure 5C). Because most
448 houses had >3 occupants, and the number of mosquitoes analyzed from the same house at each time
449 point was small (median=2, Supplementary Figure 4), the expected effect of this adjustment was small.
450 A large-scale analysis of sampling of mosquitoes across ~20 communities in Mali is currently underway,
451 with investigation of ELISA-based techniques better suited to lower resource laboratories to further
452 elucidate the temporal and spatial spread of the virus across the country using this approach.

453 **Conclusions:**

454 The congruence of our results based on serological analysis of blood-fed mosquito with conventional
455 serological studies⁸ and with active infection records based on PCR carried out in Bamako (Fig 1) lend
456 strong support for the utility of this approach. Akin to wastewater-based epidemiology³⁹ this non-
457 invasive blood sampling is a promising tool to monitor populations in areas where robust serological
458 data from human subjects is unlikely to be available and where human biting mosquitoes are common,
459 as is the case in many tropical remote communities. While these population-targeted techniques should

460 be thought of as complementary to and distinct from direct serological studies on human populations,
461 they have been proven to be relevant and useful for public health (community-wide) decision
462 making^{39,40}. Understanding exposure rates to pathogens in remote communities as well as changes in
463 reactivity over time are important components of an early warning system targeting remote tropical
464 communities, especially for rare and emerging conditions where conventional surveillance may be
465 considered too costly. Combined with the identification of the blood source, blood-fed mosquito
466 analysis may also be useful to monitor pathogen exposure rates in both human and animal hosts, even if
467 these hosts are poorly characterized (i.e. spillover into an intermediate unknown hosts). Thus, this
468 technique and other future interrogations of the mosquito blood meal could fit well in a one-health
469 paradigm surrounding disease transmission throughout the home or screening across a diverse set of
470 potential reservoirs.

471

472 **Acknowledgements:** We are grateful to the residents of the Malian villages for their permission to work
473 at and near their homes and for their wonderful assistance and hospitality. We thank Drs. Thomas
474 Wellems and Carolina Barillas-Murry, Ms. Wendy Hamm, Ms. Fatoumata Bathily, and Mr. Sam Moretz
475 for the support of our program at NIH and the ICER Mali. This study was supported by the Division of
476 Intramural Research, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health,
477 Bethesda MD, USA (Grant ID: AI001328)


478

479 **Supplementary Materials**

480

481 **Supplemental Figure 1:** Numbers of mosquitoes positive for 1-4 anti-SARS-CoV-2 antigens per volunteer
 482 at 0, 5, 10, and 30 hours post-feed. Only VAT had known covid status with a SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. All
 483 other volunteers had unknown SARS-CoV-2 infection history. Per antigen positivity is defined by pre-
 484 pandemic collected wild mosquitoes that fed naturally on Malian individuals. Individuals VAT, VBT, VDT,
 485 VFT, VGT, VIT, VLT, and VMT are considered positive by having multiple 2+ antigen positive mosquitoes
 486 across multiple time points. VHT, VCT, VET, and VJT are considered negative due to only 1 or fewer
 487 antigen positive mosquitoes at any time point. VKT is considered negative due to 11/12 mosquitoes
 488 having <2 antigens positive, but does have one 2-antigen-positive mosquito at the 10 hours time-point.

489



490


491

492 **Supplemental Table 1:** Number mosquitoes with the listed number of SARS-CoV-2 antigens above
 493 cutoffs per time period.

Time Period	# Antigens Positive	Total tested
Pre-pandemic	0	88
Pre-pandemic	1	2

494

495 **Supplemental figure 2:** Per antigen log₂(MFI) values for each volunteer with pre-pandemic cutoffs
 496 shown as dashed line per antigen. Number of mosquitoes per positive per antigen/volunteer per time
 497 point labeled above boxplots.




498

499

500

501 **Supplemental figure 3:** Changes in seropositivity over time measured by the number of antigens to
 502 which reactivity exceeded cutoff by village




503

504

505

506


507 **Supplemental Figure 4:** Relationship between seroprevalence at the mosquito and the house levels
508 (across villages and time points).



509


510

511 **Supplemental Figure 5:** Blood meal composition across villages and time periods (N=221).
 512



513
 514

515 **Supplemental figure 6:** Distribution of the number of mosquitoes collected (green) and analyzed (gold)
 516 per house across the five villages by time period (occasionally multiple collection days per time period).
 517 Note: the X-axis is not continuous.



518

519 References

- 520 1. Hasell J, Mathieu E, Beltekian D, et al. A cross-country database of COVID-19 testing. *Sci Data*
521 2020; **7**(1): 345.
- 522 2. Exchange MCC-CI-HD. Humanitarian Data Exchange. . 2023.
- 523 3. Amanat F, Stadlbauer D, Strohmeier S, et al. A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2
524 seroconversion in humans. *Nat Med* 2020; **26**(7): 1033-6.
- 525 4. Klumpp-Thomas C, Kalish H, Drew M, et al. Standardization of ELISA protocols for serosurveys of
526 the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic using clinical and at-home blood sampling. *Nat Commun* 2021; **12**(1): 113.
- 527 5. Stadlbauer D, Amanat F, Chromikova V, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion in Humans: A Detailed
528 Protocol for a Serological Assay, Antigen Production, and Test Setup. *Curr Protoc Microbiol* 2020; **57**(1):
529 e100.
- 530 6. Emmerich P, Murawski C, Ehmen C, et al. Limited specificity of commercially available SARS-CoV-
531 2 IgG ELISAs in serum samples of African origin. *Trop Med Int Health* 2021; **26**(6): 621-31.
- 532 7. Nkuba Ndaye A, Hoxha A, Madinga J, et al. Challenges in interpreting SARS-CoV-2 serological
533 results in African countries. *Lancet Glob Health* 2021; **9**(5): e588-e9.
- 534 8. Woodford J, Sagara I, Dicko A, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
535 Seroassay Performance and Optimization in a Population With High Background Reactivity in Mali. *J*
536 *Infect Dis* 2021; **224**(12): 2001-9.
- 537 9. Woodford J, Sagara I, Kwan J, Zaidi I, Dicko A, Duffy PE. Assessing and minimizing the effect of
538 malaria on SARS-CoV-2 serodiagnostics. *Frontiers in Tropical Diseases* 2021; **2**.
- 539 10. Sagara I, Woodford J, Kone M, et al. Rapidly increasing Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
540 Coronavirus 2 seroprevalence and limited clinical disease in 3 Malian communities: a prospective cohort
541 study. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2021; **74**(6): 1030-8.
- 542 11. Tandina F, Doumbo O, Yaro AS, Traore SF, Parola P, Robert V. Mosquitoes (Diptera: Culicidae)
543 and mosquito-borne diseases in Mali, West Africa. *Parasit Vectors* 2018; **11**(1): 467.
- 544 12. Hall MH, Dutro SM, Klowden MJ. Determination by near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy of
545 mosquito (Diptera: Culicidae) bloodmeal size. *J Med Entomol* 1990; **27**(1): 76-9.
- 546 13. Grubaugh ND, Sharma S, Krajacich BJ, et al. Xenosurveillance: a novel mosquito-based approach
547 for examining the human-pathogen landscape. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2015; **9**(3): e0003628.
- 548 14. Barbazan P, Palabodeewat S, Nitatpattana N, Gonzalez JP. Detection of host virus-reactive
549 antibodies in blood meals of naturally engorged mosquitoes. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis* 2009; **9**(1): 103-
550 8.
- 551 15. Contreras CE, Beier JC. Detection of human antibodies against Plasmodium falciparum antigens
552 in blood meals of anopheline mosquitoes. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc* 1992; **8**(3): 252-5.
- 553 16. Cunningham MP, Harley JM, Southon HA, Lumsden WH. Detection of antibodies in blood meals
554 of hematophagous Diptera. *Science* 1962; **138**(3536): 32-3.
- 555 17. Krajacich BJ, Sullivan M, Faiman R, Veru L, Graber L, Lehmann T. Induction of long-lived potential
556 aestivation states in laboratory An. gambiae mosquitoes. *Parasit Vectors* 2020; **13**(1): 412.
- 557 18. Frick H, Chow F, Kuhn M, Mahoney M, Silge J, Wickham H. rsample: General Resampling
558 Infrastructure. 2022.
- 559 19. Kuhn M, Vaughan D, Hvitfeldt E. yardstick: Tidy Characterizations of Model Performance. 2022.
- 560 20. SAS software. SAS Institute Inc. Cary, NC, USA; 2019.
- 561 21. Cade BS, Noon BR. A gentle introduction to quantile regression for ecologists. *Frontiers in*
562 *Ecology and the Environment* 2003; **1**(8): 412-20.
- 563 22. Couch SP, Bray AP, Ismay C, Chasnovski E, Baumer BS, Çetinkaya-Rundel M. infer: An {R} package
564 for tidyverse-friendly statistical inference. 2021.

- 565 23. Sempos CT, Tian L. Adjusting Coronavirus Prevalence Estimates for Laboratory Test Kit Error. *Am*
566 *J Epidemiol* 2021; **190**(1): 109-15.
- 567 24. Ouso DO, Otiende MY, Jeneby MM, et al. Three-gene PCR and high-resolution melting analysis
568 for differentiating vertebrate species mitochondrial DNA for biodiversity research and complementing
569 forensic surveillance. *Sci Rep* 2020; **10**(1): 4741.
- 570 25. Gyawali N, Murphy AK, Hugo LE, Devine GJ. A micro-PRNT for the detection of Ross River virus
571 antibodies in mosquito blood meals: A useful tool for inferring transmission pathways. *PLoS One* 2020;
572 **15**(7): e0229314.
- 573 26. Komar N, Panella NA, Young GR, Basile AJ. Methods for detection of West Nile virus antibodies
574 in mosquito blood meals. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc* 2015; **31**(1): 1-6.
- 575 27. Krajacich BJ, Huestis DL, Dao A, et al. Investigation of the seasonal microbiome of *Anopheles*
576 *coluzzii* mosquitoes in Mali. *PLoS One* 2018; **13**(3): e0194899.
- 577 28. Antonio-Nkondjio C, Simard F, Awono-Ambene P, et al. Malaria vectors and urbanization in the
578 equatorial forest region of south Cameroon. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 2005; **99**(5): 347-54.
- 579 29. Fontenille D, Lochouarn L, Diatta M, et al. Four years' entomological study of the transmission of
580 seasonal malaria in Senegal and the bionomics of *Anopheles gambiae* and *A. arabiensis*. *Trans R Soc Trop*
581 *Med Hyg* 1997; **91**(6): 647-52.
- 582 30. Beier JC, Perkins PV, Wirtz RA, et al. Bloodmeal identification by direct enzyme-linked
583 immunosorbent assay (ELISA), tested on *Anopheles* (Diptera: Culicidae) in Kenya. *J Med Entomol* 1988;
584 **25**(1): 9-16.
- 585 31. Dambach P, Schleicher M, Korir P, et al. Nightly Biting Cycles of *Anopheles* Species in Rural
586 Northwestern Burkina Faso. *J Med Entomol* 2018; **55**(4): 1027-34.
- 587 32. Mburu MM, Mzilahowa T, Amoah B, et al. Biting patterns of malaria vectors of the lower Shire
588 valley, southern Malawi. *Acta Trop* 2019; **197**: 105059.
- 589 33. Mendis C, Jacobsen JL, Gamage-Mendis A, et al. *Anopheles arabiensis* and *An. funestus* are
590 equally important vectors of malaria in Matola coastal suburb of Maputo, southern Mozambique. *Med*
591 *Vet Entomol* 2000; **14**(2): 171-80.
- 592 34. Mahanta B, Handique R, Dutta P, Narain K, Mahanta J. Temporal variations in biting density and
593 rhythm of *Culex quinquefasciatus* in tea agro-ecosystem of Assam, India. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med*
594 *Public Health* 1999; **30**(4): 804-9.
- 595 35. Pipitgool V, Watee P, Sithithaworn P, Limviroj W. Studies on biting density and biting cycle of
596 *Culex quinquefasciatus*, say in Khon Kaen City, Thailand. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health* 1998;
597 **29**(2): 333-6.
- 598 36. Van Elslande J, Oyaert M, Ailliet S, et al. Longitudinal follow-up of IgG anti-nucleocapsid
599 antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 infected patients up to eight months after infection. *J Clin Virol* 2021; **136**:
600 104765.
- 601 37. Norris LC, Fornadel CM, Hung WC, Pineda FJ, Norris DE. Frequency of multiple blood meals taken
602 in a single gonotrophic cycle by *Anopheles arabiensis* mosquitoes in Macha, Zambia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*
603 2010; **83**(1): 33-7.
- 604 38. Tedrow RE, Rakotomanga T, Nepomichene T, et al. *Anopheles* mosquito surveillance in
605 Madagascar reveals multiple blood feeding behavior and *Plasmodium* infection. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*
606 2019; **13**(7): e0007176.
- 607 39. Ahmed W, Angel N, Edson J, et al. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated
608 wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the
609 community. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; **728**: 138764.
- 610 40. Prado T, Fumian TM, Mannarino CF, et al. Wastewater-based epidemiology as a useful tool to
611 track SARS-CoV-2 and support public health policies at municipal level in Brazil. *Water Res* 2021; **191**:
612 116810.

