

1 **The role of *Anopheles arabiensis* and *Anopheles funestus* in malaria transmission within**
2 **houses with different characteristics in South-eastern Tanzania**

3 Alex J. Limwagu^{1,2*}, Betwel J. Msugupakulya^{1,3}, Halfan S. Ngowo¹, Yohana A. Mwelugelo^{1,4},
4 Masoud S. Kilalangongono¹, Fredros O. Okumu^{1,5,6§}, Bill E. Ngasala^{1,2§}, and Issa N. Lyimo^{1,5§}

5 1. Environmental Health and Ecological Science Department, Ifakara Health Institute, P. O.
6 Box 53, Morogoro, Tanzania

7 2. Parasitology and Medical Entomology Department, Muhimbili University of Health and
8 Allied Science, P.O. Box 65015 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

9 3. Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool,
10 United Kingdom

11 4. Department of Biomedical Sciences, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and
12 Technology, P.O Box 210-40601, Bondo, Kenya

13 5. School of Life Science and Bioengineering, Nelson Mandela Africa Institution of
14 Science & Technology, Arusha, Tanzania

15 6. School of Biodiversity, One Health, and Veterinary Medicine, G128QQ, University of
16 Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

17 § The three authors made equal contributions and share the role of joint last authors.

18 * Correspondence: alimwagu@ihi.or.tz

19 **Email addresses:**

20 1. Alex J. Limwagu: alimwagu@ihi.or.tz

21 2. Betwel John: jbetwel@ihi.or.tz

22 3. Halfan Ngowo: hngowo@ihi.or.tz

23 4. Yohana Mwelugelo ymwalugelo@ihi.or.tz

24 5. Masoud Kilalangongono mkilalangongono@ihi.or.tz

25 6. Fredros Okumu: fredros@ihi.or.tz

26 7. Bill Ngasala: bngasala70@yahoo.co.uk

27 8. Issa Lyimo: ilyimo@ihi.or.tz

28

29 **Abstract**

30 **Background:**

31 Malaria vectors persist predominantly in houses lacking screened windows, doors, and eave
32 space, leading to ongoing transmission. Some other vectors adapt their feeding behavior to
33 sustain reproduction. This study evaluates the role of primary malaria vectors on malaria
34 transmission in relation to house characteristics in Kilombero Valley.

35 **Methods:**

36 Mosquito data collection was done using three methods: a CDC light trap, a miniaturized double
37 net trap (DN-Mini trap), and a Prokopack aspirator through 222 households that were randomly
38 selected in the three villages, namely Ebuyu, Chirombora, and Mzelezi. The houses are
39 characterized during mosquito collections, and the Geographical Position System (GPS) was
40 used to geolocate the sampled houses. Morphological identification was done on the collected
41 sample (i.e., fed, part-fed, gravid, and unfed), and a sub-sample was sent to the laboratory to
42 assess the sibling species, blood meal, and sporozoite.

43 **Results:**

44 A total of 1542 Anopheline mosquitoes were collected, of which 79.1% (n= 1219) were *An.*
45 *funestus* and 20.3% (n= 313) were *An. arabiensis* as primary malaria vectors, while the
46 secondary malaria vector was 0.6% (n = 10). Out of 487 anopheline mosquitoes assayed for
47 *plasmodium falciparum* sporozoite, 92.8% (n = 13) of *An. funestus* was reported to be dominant
48 while *An. arabiensis* was dominant by 7.2% (n = 1). While *An. funestus* was the only species that
49 had a blood meal and was found to feed on humans (88.16%, n = 134), dogs (11.18% n = 17),
50 and a mixture of both human and chicken blood meal. In addition to that, the house with
51 screened eave space had fewer *An. funestus* compared to the house with open eave space (RR =
52 0.978, p =0.864), while the house with a brick wall had a higher *An. funestus* compared with the
53 house with a mud wall (RR = 0.690, p =0.107).

54 **Conclusion**

55 *Anopheles funestus* remained the dominant malaria vector responsible for all transmissions in the
56 villages. The human population is at risk due to their preference for *An. funestus*, which
57 contributes about 92.8% of infections in the village. Additionally, the house design appears to
58 play a significant role in facilitating malaria vectors to continue transmitting malaria.

59 **Keywords:** Blood meal, CDC light trap, DN-Mini trap, Eave space, Indoor and Outdoor host-
60 seeking mosquitoes, Prokopack aspirator, Malaria transmission, Sporozoite.

61

62 **Background**

63 Malaria continues to be a major global public health concern, with an estimated 2 billion cases
64 and 11.7 million deaths worldwide, particularly affecting Sub-Saharan African countries [1].
65 Malaria is primarily transmitted through the bites of infected female mosquitoes belonging to the
66 *Anopheles* species. Four plasmodium species, namely *Plasmodium falciparum*, *Plasmodium*
67 *malariae*, *Plasmodium vivax*, and *Plasmodium ovale*, are responsible for causing malaria [2].
68 *Plasmodium falciparum* was reported as the causative agent in 96% of malaria infections in
69 Tanzania, particularly in malaria-endemic regions, while *Plasmodium malariae* and *Plasmodium*
70 *ovale* accounted for the remaining 4% [3]. Tanzania has made commendable progress in
71 reducing the malaria transmission rate, with prevalence dropping from 18.1% to 7.3% between
72 2007 and 2017 [3, 4]. However, during the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a slight increase of
73 1% in malaria cases due to healthcare system priorities and individual precautions [6]. Low- and
74 middle-income countries, including Tanzania and Uganda, faced challenges in treating malaria
75 during the pandemic [6, 7].

76 Furthermore, the persistence of malaria transmission in villages is influenced by various factors,
77 including migratory farming. Families residing in temporary, semi-open shacks (shamba huts)
78 for extended periods while working on distant farms are at higher risk of malaria due to
79 inadequate mosquito protection [9]. Additionally, many houses in Kilombero Valley lack proper
80 screening of eave spaces, windows, and doors, potentially allowing mosquitoes to enter homes
81 [10–12]. Several studies suggest that modern house features are favored by residents due to the
82 perception that these features reduce mosquito bites [13], However, in rural settings, concerns

83 about the cost of maintaining these features have been raised. House improvement has been
84 identified as an intervention that provides protection to all individuals in the house without
85 involving insecticides [14]. In a study conducted by Bofu et al. in Kilombero in 2023, the
86 community expressed the need for house improvement to protect families [13]. Despite reports
87 of improved houses reducing malaria risk, there has been limited effort in national and
88 international malaria strategies to prioritize housing improvement as part of malaria control.

89 The success in reducing malaria prevalence in Tanzania can be attributed to various
90 interventions, such as the widespread use of long-lasting insecticide Nets (LLINs), indoor
91 residual spraying (IRS), improvements in healthcare standards, and socio-economic
92 enhancements, including better housing, education, income levels, and overall wealth [15].
93 Despite these efforts, residual malaria transmission persists in some rural areas of Tanzania [16].
94 One significant challenge contributing to malaria persistence is the insecticide resistance
95 observed in *Anopheles funestus* mosquitoes, partly influenced by improper agricultural pesticide
96 use [10, 11] Other factors, including malaria vectors, exhibit diverse behaviors that affect
97 transmission[16]. Another important factor is the resting behavior of mosquitoes that are not
98 resting on the targeted surfaces for indoor residual spraying [19].

99 In the 2000s, Kilombero and Ulanga districts primarily had *An. arabiensis* as the dominant
100 malaria vector, despite *An. funestus* being more important [20]. Recent years have witnessed a
101 significant shift in malaria transmission dynamics in Kilombero Valley, where *An. funestus* has
102 become the predominant vector, responsible for over 85% of malaria transmission[21]. Both
103 malaria vectors are developing resistance to commonly used chemicals [17,18,22].

104 Addressing malaria control in Kilombero Valley requires a multifaceted approach that targets
105 *Anopheles funestus*, the current dominant primary vector, and addresses factors like healthcare
106 access, housing conditions, and environmental management including appropriate applications of
107 agricultural pesticide. This study aims to evaluate the role of malaria vectors in malaria
108 transmission in regarding to house characteristics in Kilombero Valley.

109

110 **Material and Methods**

111 **Study area**

112 The study was carried out in Ulanga district, located in the south-eastern region of Tanzania (Fig
113 1). Mosquitoes were collected from three villages: Ebuyu (-8.979 S, 36.760 E), Chirombola (-
114 8.926 S, 36.753 E) and Mzelezi (-8.898 S, 36.735 E). Average annual rainfall ranging between
115 1200 -1800mm and a mean annual temperature were 20–32 °C, as reported by Ngowo et al. in
116 2017 [23]. The primary economic activities in this area are rice and maize cultivation. Currently,
117 Ulanga district faces the prevalence of two major malaria vectors, namely, *Anopheles arabiensis*
118 and *Anopheles funestus*.

119 The typical housing structures in this region feature clay brick walls, open eaves (the space
120 between the roof and walls), and open windows. *Plasmodium falciparum* stands as the
121 predominant malaria parasite species in this area, while its transmission is primarily attributed to
122 *Anopheles funestus* [21].

123

124 **Figure 1:** Map of the study area, showing study villages in Ulanga district, south-eastern
125 Tanzania.

126

127 **Study design**

128 **Mosquito sampling**

129 Adult anopheline mosquitoes were collected from March 2022 and July 2022. The host-seeking
130 and resting mosquitoes were collected indoors and outdoors by using three methods: the double
131 net trap (DN-mini trap) [24], CDC light trap [25], and Prokopack aspirator [26]. Mosquito data
132 were collected for three days a week for four months. Here, the DN-Mini trap was used to
133 sample mosquitoes indoors and outdoors, CDC-Light trap were used to collect host-seeking
134 mosquitoes indoors, while a Prokopack was used to collect resting mosquitoes both indoors and
135 outdoors. Mosquito collections were done from 6pm to 6am. The CDC light trap with a lid was
136 hung about 1-1.5 m above the ground under occupied bed net. The DN-Mini trap was allocated
137 in the sitting room, with volunteers inside acting as bait and collecting mosquitoes after every
138 one-hour interval. Along with mosquito sampling, the sampled houses were also characterized,

139 and variables such as eaves status, roof type, wall type, window status, presence of animals shed,
140 latrine location inside or outside, and presence of poultry inside the house were collected from
141 each sampled house. Geographical positioning system (Garmin Extrex 20, GPS) coordinates
142 were also collected during household characterization.

143 **Sibling Specie Identification of and Detection of Plasmodium Infection in Malaria Vectors**

144 Female Anopheline mosquito collected were killed each morning using petroleum fumes, then
145 sorted by taxa and physiological states [27], while the abdominal status of each female
146 *Anopheles* mosquitoes was recorded as blood fed, unfed, partially fed or semi-gravid or gravid.
147 Additionally, *An. arabiensis* and *An. funestus* were packed individually of one mosquito and in
148 batches of ten mosquitoes in 1.5 ml microcentrifuge (Eppendorf®) tubes filled with silica gel as
149 a preservative, then submitted to the laboratory for species identification by using multiplex
150 polymerase chain reaction (PCR), sibling species of *An. gambiae s.l* [28] and *An. funestus*
151 Koekemoer et al. [27]. and Cohuet *at al* [29]. Moreover, the head and thorax from *An. gambiae*
152 *s.l* and *An. funestus* were separated from abdomen and tested for the presence of *Plasmodium*
153 *falciparum* circum-sporozoite protein (*Pf* CSP) in their salivary glands, using the enzyme-linked
154 immunosorbent assay (ELISA) method [27].

155 **House characterization**

156 After collecting mosquitoes from traps placed both indoors and outdoors within the houses,
157 participants recorded various house characteristics. These details included the house type,
158 construction materials, and the overall condition of the house, encompassing factors like the
159 presence of eave spaces, and the status of window and door screening. Additionally, precise
160 house data was collected using a Global Positioning System (GPS) device and concurrently
161 saved in a data collection form, which contained more information than what was initially stored
162 in the GPS device.

163 **Blood meal analysis for Malaria vectors**

164 Anopheline blood meal content analysis was conducted through an enzyme-linked
165 immunosorbent assay (ELISA) using the abdomens of all blood-fed malaria vectors [30,31] to
166 investigated for their blood meal sources, whether they were human, dog, chicken, or bovine. To
167 prevent false positives, the ELISA lysate underwent heating to 100°C for 10 minutes, ensuring

168 complete elimination of heat-labile non-*Plasmodium falciparum* antigens. Blood meal
169 information from malaria-transmitting mosquitoes is crucial for understanding host preferences,
170 transmission dynamics, and vector behavior.

171 **Data analysis**

172 All data were analyzed using open-source statistical software, R program language version
173 4.2.11[32]. A generalized linear mixed model using template model builder (GlimmTMB) [32],
174 was used to analyze mosquito count data. Here, we opted for GlimmTMB because of its ability to
175 directly incorporate negative binomial and zero-inflated approaches. Mosquito counts were
176 modeled as response variables, while house characteristics were modeled as fixed terms. On the
177 other hand, household ID and sampling date were included in the model as random terms to
178 account for any unexplained variations between houses and pseudo-replicates. Significance
179 levels were considered at $p < 0.05$.

180 **Ethical considerations**

181 The research was conducted following the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical
182 approval was obtained from the Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences Review
183 Board (MUHAS-REC-12-2021-910), and permission to publish the work was granted by NIMR
184 (Ref: NIMR/HQ/P.12VOL.XXXVI/35). Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the
185 district medical officer of Ulanga district and the local government leadership in the selected
186 villages. Before commencing the study, meetings were held with local government leaders to
187 explain the study's aim and procedures. Verbal and written informed consent were obtained from
188 individual house occupants and human volunteers involved in mosquito collection. Participants
189 were fully informed of potential benefits and risks, and their voluntary participation was assured.
190 Respondents were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without
191 consequences, and confidentiality was maintained to ensure anonymity of participants

192

193 **Results**

194 **Mosquito population and composition**

195 Overall, a total of 19,841 female mosquitoes were collected indoors and outdoors between
 196 March and July 2022 using the CDC-light trap, DN-Mini trap, and Prokopack aspirator. *An.*
 197 *funestus* s.l. were 17.0% (n = 1219), *An. gambiae* s.l. were 1.6% (n = 313), and 0.1% (n = 10)
 198 were other anopheline mosquitoes. On the hands, *Culex* species were 99.8% (n = 18268)
 199 *Mansonia* were 0.2 %, (n = 29) and 0.0 % (n = 2) were *Aedes* species.

200 Sporozoite Rate Infections of malaria vectors

201 Out of the 487 *Anopheles* mosquitoes submitted to the molecular laboratory for ELISA, 14 were
 202 confirmed to be infected with *Plasmodium falciparum* sporozoites. Among these infected
 203 mosquitoes, 92.8% (n = 13) were identified as *An. funestus* s.s., while only one mosquito,
 204 constituting 7.2% (n = 1), was classified as *An. arabiensis*.

205 Effects of household characteristics on vector density

206 Regarding the mosquito collected in the house with different characteristics, the results show
 207 that, the house with metal roof material had fewer *An. funestus* mosquitoes with higher *An.*
 208 *arabiensis* compared to those constructed with grass roof material (RR= 0.646, p <0.05), (RR=
 209 0.1600, p =0.5871), the house with ceilings had fewer number of *An. funestus* compared with
 210 those with ceilings (RR= 0.780, p =0.454), In addition to that, the house with screened eave
 211 space had fewer *An. funestus* compared to the house with open eave space (RR= 0.978, p
 212 =0.864) but not statistical significant, the house made by brick wall had higher *An. funestus*
 213 compared with the house made with mud wall (RR = 0.690, p =0.107) while the house with
 214 house with animals inside had fewer number of *An. funestus* compared to the houses no animals
 215 (RR= 0.672, p <0.01) Table 1.

216

217 **Table 1. Effect of household characteristics on malaria vectors densities**

218

Species	Variable (Household Characteristics)	Type	Mean ± 2SE	RR [95% CI]	p-values
<i>Anopheles funestus</i>	Roof Materials	Grass	2.24 ± 0.972	1	<0.05
		Metal	2.10 ± 0.276	0.646 [0.418, 0.998]	
	Ceiling	No	2.12 ± 0.272	1	=0.454
		Yes	2.00 ± 1.20	0.780 [0.407, 1.495]	

	Eaves	Open	2.02 ± 0.314	1	=0.864	
		Screened	2.39 ± 0.498	0.978 [0.761, 1.258]		
	Wall Materials	Brick	2.15 ± 0.285	1	=0.107	
		Mud	1.76 ± 0.717	0.690 [0.439, 1.083]		
	Animal (100)	No	2.47 ± 0.402	1	<0.01	
		Yes	1.71 ± 0.331	0.672 [0.534, 0.847]		
	<i>Anopheles arabiensis</i>	Roof Materials	Grass	0.206 ± 0.199	1	=0.587
Metal			0.203 ± 0.083	1.600 [0.294, 8.715]		
Ceiling		Open	0.203 ± 0.079	1	=0.575	
		Screened	0.2 ± 0.392	0.526 [0.055, 4.993]		
Eaves		Open	0.231 ± 0.096	1	<0.01	
		Screened	0.120 ± 0.108	0.108 [0.022, 0.536]		
Wall Materials		Brick	0.206 ± 0.084	1	=0.225	
		Mud	0.176 ± 0.154	0.351 [0.065, 1.899]		
Animal (100)		No	0.115 ± 0.080	1	=0.254	
		Yes	0.301 ± 0.135	0.385 [0.074, 1.986]		

219

220 Blood meal analysis

221 A total of 304 blood-fed *An. funestus* (identified by PCR) that were collected indoors and
 222 outdoors for both host-seeking and resting mosquitoes collection were tested for vertebrate host
 223 blood source (human, bovine, dog and chicken) from all three villages. Overall, the proportion of
 224 *An. funestus* that fed on humans was 88.16% (134/152), with dog blood being the most common
 225 non-human source Fig 2.

226

227 **Fig 2.** Showing a blood meal of *An. funestus* from different blood sources identified by ELISA
 228 method from the sample collected in Ulanga district, Mzelezi, Ebuyu and Chirombora villages.

229 Ethical clearance and informed consent

230 The study was conducted following the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical
 231 approval for conducting this study was obtained from the Muhimbili University of Health and
 232 Allied Sciences Review Board (MUHAS-REC-12-2021-910). while the permission to publish
 233 the work was approved by NIMR (Ref: NIMR/HQ/P.12VOL.XXXVI/27). Permission to conduct
 234 this study was secured through the approval of the District Medical Officer of Ulanga district and
 235 the cooperation of local government authorities in the chosen villages. Prior to commencing the

236 study, comprehensive meetings were convened with local government leaders to elucidate the
237 study's objectives and methodologies.

238 Informed consent, both verbal and written, was diligently obtained from all individual residents
239 of the households and the human volunteers engaged in mosquito collection. Participants were
240 provided with detailed information regarding the potential benefits and risks associated with their
241 participation, and their voluntary involvement was emphasized and respected. Participants were
242 also assured of their right to withdraw from the study at any point without facing any adverse
243 consequences, and strict measures were in place to maintain confidentiality, ensuring the
244 anonymity of all participants.

245

246 **Discussion**

247 This study shows that both *An. funestus* and *An. arabiensis* were the most prevalent mosquito
248 species among the anopheline population in the study villages. Notably, *Anopheles funestus*
249 predominated over to *An. arabiensis* in the rural Ulanga villages. However, a recent study
250 revealed that, despite the lower population of *An. funestus* in comparison to *An. arabiensis* in the
251 area, it accounted for over 85% of malaria transmission [21].

252 This study uncovered that *Anopheles funestus* mosquitoes not only carried the majority of
253 malaria parasites but were also present in high numbers in all three villages. A previous study by
254 Lwetoijera et al. in the Kilombero district also highlighted the increasing significance of
255 *Anopheles funestus* in malaria transmission, particularly in the context of high resistance [33].
256 Furthermore, studies conducted in the Kilombero valley by Pinda et al, and Urrio et al
257 demonstrated that also *Anopheles arabiensis* also exhibited significant resistance to pyrethroid
258 chemicals[18,22].

259 Based on our research findings, *Anopheles funestus* emerged as the predominant vector in terms
260 of both malaria parasites and population density. In a prior study conducted by Kaindoa et al,
261 [34], *Anopheles arabiensis* was identified as more abundant species. However, *Anopheles*
262 *funestus* reported to harbor the majority of residual malaria parasites, even though it was in the
263 minority compared to *Anopheles arabiensis* [34]. it seems that, *An. funestus* is increasing their

264 dominance both in terms of abundance and transmission of malaria, which could be attributed to
265 their resistance to insecticides used in malaria control.

266 Furthermore, our study revealed that *An. funestus* exhibited a strong preference for human blood
267 meals over other potential hosts such as dogs and chickens. This anthropophilic behavior is
268 consistent with the species known tendencies [35]. In recently study conducted in Kilombero
269 valley in 2022, Katusi et al. revealed that, *An. arabiensis* and other secondary malaria vectors
270 showed a preference for bovine blood over human blood. However, in another study conducted
271 in the Kilombero valley, it was observed that *An. arabiensis* and *An. gambiae s.s.* exhibited a
272 preference for feeding on chicken hosts over other available hosts [36]. Additionally, a separate
273 study conducted in Kenya reported that mosquitoes deviated from the feeding on humans and
274 opted for hosts other than humans, particularly in areas where livestock herding is prevalent [37],
275 while other studies suggest that animal keeping may influence mosquito densities and potentially
276 pose a risk to humans, while others argue that it could reduce malaria transmission risk [38].

277 In this study, we observed a relatively small number of *An. funestus* specie with the capability to
278 feed on two different hosts as described in Table 1. where as *An. arabiensis* also have been
279 commonly reported to have multiple feeding outdoor [16]. The tendence of mosquitoes feeding
280 to various hosts has also been observed in neighbouring countries [39].

281 Our findings also indicate that dogs and chickens were the second most common sources of
282 blood meals for *An. funestus* mosquitoes, following humans. This finding is in line with the
283 prevalence of these animals in rural households, where dogs and chickens are commonly kept
284 [35]. Studies by Katusi et al 2022 and Lyimo et al [35,36], reported that in Kilombero valley
285 availability of cows influence the blood meal for *An. arabiensis* and *An. funestus*, like in Kenya
286 found that, human blood were seems to be the most vulnerable to these species [40]. The
287 preference for human blood meals by *An. funestus* is of particular concern for malaria control, as
288 it increases the risk of malaria transmission to humans and underscores the importance of
289 targeting this species in control strategies. Furthermore, it's the observed that, higher *An.*
290 *funestus* compared than *An. arabiensis*, suggest that *An. funestus* is the most responsible for
291 malaria transmission in the area.

292 The study conducted by Lyimo et al 2013 [36], demonstrated that *An. arabiensis* was more likely
293 to be affected by ivermectin, primarily applied to cattle, ivermectin affects the survival and egg

294 production of *Anopheles* mosquitoes, consequently, this intervention appeared to have a
295 controlling effect on *An. arabiensis* due to their behavior of feeding on other vertebrate blood
296 including cows. On the other hand, there is limited knowledge regarding the impact of
297 ivermectin on *An. funestus*, which exhibits a stronger preference for feeding on humans rather
298 than cattle. *An. funestus*, being an indoor-biting species, is expected to be more susceptible to
299 indoor interventions such as Long-Lasting Insecticide Nets (LLINs) and Indoor Residual
300 Spraying (IRS), unfortunately, resistance to these interventions has been reported in this species.

301 This study also revealed that a substantial number of households had eave gaps and unscreened
302 windows and doors Table 1, conditions that can facilitate mosquito entry and increase the risk of
303 malaria transmission. These findings align with previous research which also emphasize the
304 importance of addressing related factors in malaria control efforts [41].

305 Our study, also found that houses with eave space harbors more of *An. funestus* than those with
306 no eave space, similar findings were reported by Mburu et al 2018, where more Anopheline
307 mosquitoes were caught in the houses with open eaves than other houses with small or single
308 eave [14]. Many houses in the villages prefer to have eave space for air accelerations [42], but in
309 other hands it poses a threat to malaria transmission risks, as mosquitoes are more likely to enter
310 in the house through eave space. Several interventions on house screening have been introduced,
311 this including the idea of eave tube treated with conventional insecticides plus house
312 modification with eave tubes installed with physical barrier inside [42], treated curtains [43] and
313 treated eave ribbons [35, 36], treated chair [46], treated sandals [47], all these tools introduced as
314 structural interventions, in and around the houses, which may impact vector feeding,
315 survivorship, population density and overall vectorial capacity and thus ability to transmit
316 malaria and other pathogens.

317 This study has a limitation, where by a include small sample sizes was used from all three
318 villages, therefore, further study is needed to study the major malaria vectors in the area,
319 additionally, to investigate the factors that contribute to the rebounded of *An. gambiae* while they
320 were eradicated by frontline interventions in Kilombero valley in 2000's.

321 **Conclusion**

322 *Anopheles funestus* is the prevalent malaria vector in the region and a significant 98% of this
323 species were found to carry sporozoites. Additionally, *Anopheles funestus* is one of the two
324 species known to exhibit resistance to insecticides [17,18]. Several concurrent approaches
325 [21,33,44,46–50], are required to complementary existing interventions like LLINs and IRS for
326 effective malaria vector control specifically focus on targeting *An. funestus* specie.

327 House improvement and screening have also been contributing to malaria vector control in many
328 developed countries [49]. Despite low quality evidence, the direction and consistence of effects
329 indicate that housing is an important risk factor for malaria [51].

330

331 **Acknowledgements**

332 We extend our heartfelt appreciation to the village leaders and communities of Ulanga district for
333 their invaluable cooperation and permission, which enabled the successful execution of this
334 study. Our sincere gratitude goes to all the dedicated volunteers who played a crucial role in
335 collecting the data. We offer special thanks to our project administrator, Rukiya Mohamed, for
336 her exceptional support with logistical arrangements. We are deeply grateful to Marceline Finda
337 for reviewing our manuscript, Najat Kahamba and Mohamed Jumanne for their valuable
338 contributions during fieldwork. Additionally, we acknowledge the diligent efforts of Said Abbasi
339 and Francis Tumbo in processing laboratory samples.

340 **Abbreviations**

341 **DN** - Double Net

342 **CDC**- Centre for Disease Control

343 **LLINs**- Long Lasting Insecticides Nets

344 **IRS**- Indoor Residual Spray

345 **GLMM**- Generalized Linear mixed model

346 **EMM**- Estimated Marginal Means

347 **ELISA**- Enzyme linked immunosorbent assays

348 **PCR-** Polymerase Chain Reaction

349 **GPS-** Geographic Position System

350 **Availability of data and materials**

351 Relevant data are within the paper. Also, data are available at: (DOI):

352 **Competing interest**

353 The author declare that they have no competing interest

354 **Authors contributions**

355 AJL was involved in DN-Mini trap design, study design, preparing the map of the study area,
356 data collection, interpretations of the results, and drafting the manuscript. BJ was involved in the
357 study design, data collection, and manuscript writing; MK was involved in the data collection;
358 HN was involved in data analysis and manuscript review; FO was involved in the DN-Mini trap
359 design, study design, supervision, and manuscript revision; BN was involved in the overall study
360 design, supervision, and manuscript revision and IL was involved in the study design,
361 supervision, and manuscript revision. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

362

363 **Funding**

364 This study received funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, granted through the
365 Pan-African Mosquito Control Association (PAMCA) (Grant No. OPP 1214408, Ifakara Health
366 Institute).

367

368 **Reference:**

369 1. WHO. World Malaria Report 2022 - World | ReliefWeb. World Health Organization.
370 2022.

- 371 2. Mekonnen SK, Aseffa A, Medhin G, Berhe N, Velavan TP. Re-evaluation of microscopy
372 confirmed *Plasmodium falciparum* and *Plasmodium vivax* malaria by nested PCR
373 detection in southern Ethiopia. *Malar J.* 2014;13: 1–8.
- 374 3. PMI. U.S. President’s Malaria Initiative Tanzania Zanzibar Malaria Operational Plan FY
375 2022.
- 376 4. TACAIDS Z, OCGS, ICF N. HIV/AIDS and Malaria Indicator Survey 2011–12. ... ,
377 Tanzania Dar es Salaam, Tanzania 2013; 103–110.
- 378 5. (NBS), National Bureau of Statistics D es S. Tanzania Malaria Indicator Survey (TMIS):
379 Key Indicators 2017. 2017; 1–37.
- 380 6. TDHS. Demographic and Health Survey and Malaria Indicator Survey. Pap Knowl Towar
381 a Media Hist Doc. 2022; 1–23.
- 382 7. Hogan A, Jewell B, Sherrard-smith E, et al. The Potential Impact of the COVID-19
383 Epidemic on HIV, TB and Malaria in Low- and Middle-Income Countries - MyBioGate
384 Global COVID-19 Resources Platform. *Imp Coll London.* 2020; 1–29.
- 385 8. Namuganga JF, Briggs J, Roh ME, Okiring J, Kisambira Y, Sserwanga A, et al. Impact of
386 COVID-19 on routine malaria indicators in rural Uganda: an interrupted time series
387 analysis. *Malar J.* 2021;20: 1–11.
- 388 9. Swai JK, Finda MF, Madumla EP, Lingamba GF, Moshi IR, Rafiq MY, et al. Studies on
389 mosquito biting risk among migratory rice farmers in rural south-eastern Tanzania and
390 development of a portable mosquito-proof hut. *Malar J.* 2016;15.
- 391 10. Kirby MJ, Njie M, Dilger E, Lindsay SW. Importance of eaves to house entry by
392 anopheline, but not culicine, mosquitoes. *J Med Entomol.* 2009;46: 505–510.
- 393 11. Lindsay SW, Jawara M, Paine K, Pinder M, Walraven GEL, Emerson PM. Changes in
394 house design reduce exposure to malaria mosquitoes. *Trop Med Int Heal.* 2003;8: 512–
395 517.
- 396 12. Lindsay SW, Snow RW. The trouble with eaves; house entry by vectors of malaria. *Trans*
397 *R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 1988;82: 645–646.

- 398 13. Bofu RM, Santos EM, Msugupakulya BJ, Kahamba NF, Swilla JD, Njalambaha R, et al.
399 The needs and opportunities for housing improvement for malaria control in southern
400 Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2023;22: 1–15.
- 401 14. Mburu MM, Juurlink M, Spitzen J, Moraga P, Hiscox A, Mzilahowa T, et al. Impact of
402 partially and fully closed eaves on house entry rates by mosquitoes. *Parasites and Vectors.*
403 2018;11: 1–9.
- 404 15. Degarege A, Fennie K, Degarege D, Chennupati S, Madhivanan P. Improving
405 socioeconomic status may reduce the burden of malaria in sub Saharan Africa: A
406 systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2019;14: 1–26.
- 407 16. Killeen GF, Govella NJ, Lwetoijera DW, Okumu FO. Most outdoor malaria transmission
408 by behaviourally - resistant *Anopheles arabiensis* is mediated by mosquitoes that have
409 previously been inside houses. *Malar J.* 2016; 1–10. doi:10.1186/s12936-016-1280-z
- 410 17. Matowo NS, Tanner M, Munhenga G, Mapua SA, Finda M, Utzinger J, et al. Patterns of
411 pesticide usage in agriculture in rural Tanzania call for integrating agricultural and public
412 health practices in managing insecticide-resistance in malaria vectors. *Malar J.* 2020;19:
413 1–16.
- 414 18. Urrio NH, Pinda PG, Ngonzi AJ, Muyaga LL, Msugupakulya BJ, Finda M, et al. Effects of
415 agricultural pesticides on the susceptibility and fitness of malaria vectors in rural south-
416 eastern Tanzania. *Parasites and Vectors.* 2022;15: 1–14.
- 417 19. Msugupakulya BJ, Kaindoa EW, Ngowo HS, Kihonda JM, Kahamba NF, Msaky DS, et
418 al. Preferred resting surfaces of dominant malaria vectors inside different house types in
419 rural south-eastern Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2020;19: 1–15.
- 420 20. Okumu FO, Moore SJ. Combining indoor residual spraying and insecticide-treated nets
421 for malaria control in Africa: a review of possible outcomes and an outline of suggestions
422 for the future. *Malar J.* 2011;10: 208.
- 423 21. Kaindoa EW, Mkandawile G, Ligamba G, Kelly-Hope LA, Okumu FO. Correlations
424 between household occupancy and malaria vector biting risk in rural Tanzanian villages:
425 implications for high-resolution spatial targeting of control interventions. *Malar J.*

- 426 2016;15: 199.
- 427 22. Pinda PG, Eichenberger C, Ngowo HS, Msaky DS, Abbasi S, Kihonda J, et al.
428 Comparative assessment of insecticide resistance phenotypes in two major malaria
429 vectors, *Anopheles funestus* and *Anopheles arabiensis* in south-eastern Tanzania. *Malar J.*
430 2020;19: 1–11.
- 431 23. Ngowo HS, Kaindoa EW, Matthiopoulos J, Ferguson HM, Okumu FO. Variations in
432 household microclimate affect outdoor-biting behaviour of malaria vectors. *Wellcome*
433 *Open Res.* 2017;2.
- 434 24. Limwagu AJ, Kaindoa EW, Ngowo HS, Hape E, Finda M, Mkandawile G, et al. Using a
435 miniaturized double-net trap (DN-Mini) to assess relationships between indoor–outdoor
436 biting preferences and physiological ages of two malaria vectors, *Anopheles arabiensis*
437 and *Anopheles funestus*. *Malar J.* 2019;18: 282.
- 438 25. Mboera LE, Knols BG, Kihonda J, Braks MA. Short report: Influence of centers for
439 disease control light trap position, relative to a human-baited bed net, on catches of
440 *Anopheles gambiae* and *Culex quinquefasciatus* in Tanzania. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.*
441 1998;59: 595–596.
- 442 26. Maia MF, Robinson A, John A, Mgando J, Simfukwe E, Moore SJ. Comparison of the
443 CDC Backpack aspirator and the Prokopack aspirator for sampling indoor- and outdoor-
444 resting mosquitoes in southern Tanzania. *Parasit Vectors.* 2011;4.
- 445 27. Koekemoer LL, Kamau L, Hunt RH, Coetzee M. A cocktail polymerase chain reaction
446 assay to identify members of the *Anopheles funestus* (Diptera: Culicidae) group. *Am J*
447 *Trop Med Hyg.* 2002;66: 804–811.
- 448 28. Scott JA, Brogdon WG, Collins FH. Identification of single specimens of the *Anopheles*
449 *gambiae* complex by the polymerase chain reaction. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 1993;49: 520–
450 529.
- 451 29. Cohuet A, Simard F, Toto J, Kengne P, Coetzee M. Species Identification within the
452 *Anopheles funestus* group of malaria vectors in Cameroon and evidence for new a new
453 species. 2003;69: 200–205.

- 454 30. Ponlawat A, Harrington LC. Blood feeding patterns of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes*
455 *albopictus* in Thailand. *J Med Entomol.* 2005;42: 844–849.
- 456 31. Lardeux F, Loayza P, Bouchité B, Chavez T. Host choice and human blood index of
457 *Anopheles pseudopunctipennis* in a village of the Andean valleys of Bolivia. *Malar J.*
458 2007;6: 1–14.
- 459 32. R Development Core Team R. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.
460 R Foundation for Statistical Computing. 2011.
- 461 33. Lwetoijera DW, Harris C, Kiware SS, Dongus S, Devine GJ, McCall PJ, et al. Increasing
462 role of *Anopheles funestus* and *Anopheles arabiensis* in malaria transmission in the
463 Kilombero Valley, Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2014;13: 331.
- 464 34. Kaindoa EW, Matowo NS, Ngowo HS, Mkandawile G, Mmbando A, Finda M, et al.
465 Interventions that effectively target *Anopheles funestus* mosquitoes could significantly
466 improve control of persistent malaria transmission in south–eastern Tanzania. Brooke B,
467 editor. *PLoS One.* 2017;12: e0177807. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0177807
- 468 35. Katusi GC, Hermy MRG, Makayula SM, Ignell R, Govella NJ, Hill SR, et al. Seasonal
469 variation in abundance and blood meal sources of primary and secondary malaria vectors
470 within Kilombero Valley, Southern Tanzania. *Parasites and Vectors.* 2022;15: 1–14.
471 doi:10.1186/s13071-022-05586-z
- 472 36. Lyimo IN, Haydon DT, Russell TL, Mbina KF, Daraja AA, Mbehela EM, et al. The
473 impact of host species and vector control measures on the fitness of African malaria
474 vectors. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci.* 2013;280: 1–10. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2823
- 475 37. Service MW. Agricultural development and arthropod-borne diseases: a review. *Rev*
476 *Saude Publica.* 1991;25: 165–178. doi:10.1590/S0034-89101991000300002
- 477 38. Iwashita H, Dida GO, Sonye GO, Sunahara T, Futami K, Njenga SM, et al. Push by a net,
478 pull by a cow: Can zooprophylaxis enhance the impact of insecticide treated bed nets on
479 malaria control? *Parasites and Vectors.* 2014;7: 1–15. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-7-52
- 480 39. Mbewe RB, Keven JB, Mzilahowa T, Mathanga D, Wilson M, Cohee L, et al. Blood-
481 feeding patterns of *Anopheles* vectors of human malaria in Malawi: implications for

- 482 malaria transmission and effectiveness of LLIN interventions. *Malar J.* 2022;21: 1–11.
483 doi:10.1186/s12936-022-04089-7
- 484 40. Yan G. Blood-meal analysis for anopheline mosquitoes sampled along the kenyan coast.
485 2003;19: 371–375.
- 486 41. Msugupakulya BJ, Kaindoa EW, Ngowo HS, Kihonda JM, Kahamba NF, Msaky DS, et
487 al. Preferred resting surfaces of dominant malaria vectors inside different house types in
488 rural south-eastern Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2020;19: 1–15. doi:10.1186/s12936-020-3108-0
- 489 42. Knols BGJ, Farenhorst M, Andriessen R, Snetselaar J, Suer RA, Osinga AJ, et al. Eave
490 tubes for malaria control in Africa: an introduction. *Malar J.* 2016;15: 1–7.
491 doi:10.1186/s12936-016-1452-x
- 492 43. LINES JD, MYAMBA J, CURTIS CF. Experimental hut trials of permethrin-impregnated
493 mosquito nets and eave curtains against malaria vectors in Tanzania. *Med Vet Entomol.*
494 1987;1: 37–51. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2915.1987.tb00321.x
- 495 44. Mmbando AS, Ngowo H, Limwagu A, Kilalangongono M, Kifungo K, Okumu FO. Eave
496 ribbons treated with the spatial repellent, transfluthrin, can effectively protect against
497 indoor-biting and outdoor-biting malaria mosquitoes. *Malar J.* 2018;17: 368.
498 doi:10.1186/s12936-018-2520-1
- 499 45. Kaindoa EW, Finda M, Kiplagat J, Mkandawile G, Nyoni A, Coetzee M, et al. Housing
500 gaps , mosquitoes and public viewpoints : a mixed methods assessment of relationships
501 between house characteristics , malaria vector biting risk and community perspectives in
502 rural Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2018; 1–16. doi:10.1186/s12936-018-2450-y
- 503 46. Masalu JP, Finda M, Killeen GF, Ngowo HS, Pinda PG, Okumu FO. Creating mosquito-
504 free outdoor spaces using transfluthrin-treated chairs and ribbons. *Malar J.* 2020;19: 1–13.
505 doi:10.1186/s12936-020-03180-1
- 506 47. Sangoro OP, Gavana T, Finda M, Mponzi W, Hape E, Limwagu A, et al. Evaluation of
507 personal protection afforded by repellent-treated sandals against mosquito bites in south-
508 eastern Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2020;19: 1–12. doi:10.1186/s12936-020-03215-7
- 509 48. Finda MF, Moshi IR, Monroe A, Limwagu AJ, Nyoni AP, Swai JK, et al. Linking human

510 behaviours and malaria vector biting risk in south-eastern Tanzania. PLoS One. 2019;14:
511 e0217414. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0217414

512 49. Steve lindsay2002_Reducing_malaria_by_mosquito_proofing_ho.pdf.

513 50. Mapua SA, Hape EE, Kihonda J, Bwanary H, Kifungo K, Kilalangongono M, et al.
514 Persistently high proportions of plasmodium-infected *Anopheles funestus* mosquitoes in
515 two villages in the Kilombero valley, South-Eastern Tanzania. Parasite Epidemiol
516 Control. 2022;18: e00264. doi:10.1016/j.parepi.2022.e00264

517 51. Tusting LS, Ippolito MM, Willey BA, Kleinschmidt I, Dorsey G, Gosling RD, et al. The
518 evidence for improving housing to reduce malaria: A systematic review and meta-
519 analysis. Malar J. 2015;14. doi:10.1186/s12936-015-0724-1

520

521

522 **List of figures**

523 **Fig 1.** Map of the study area, showing study villages in Ulanga district, south-eastern Tanzania.

524 **Fig 2.** Showing a blood meal of *An. funestus* from different blood sources identified by ELISA
525 method from the sample collected in Ulanga district, Mzelezi, Ebuyu and Chirombora villages.

526 **List of Tables**

527 **Table 1.** Effect of household characteristics on malaria vectors densities.

528




Figure 1. Map of study area




Figure 2. Blood meal sources