

1 **Societal Uses of the Main Water Bodies Inhabited by Malaria Vectors** 2 **and Implications for Larval Source Management**

3 Najat F. Kahamba^{1,2*}, Felista Tarimo^{1,3}, Khamisi Kifungo¹, Winifrida Mponzi¹, Siaba A.
4 Kinunda¹, Alfred Simfukwe¹, Salum Mapua¹, Betwel Msugupakulya^{1,4}, Francesco
5 Baldini^{1,2}, Heather M. Ferguson², Fredros O. Okumu^{1,2,3,5#}, and Marceline F. Finda^{1#}

6
7 ^{1.} Environmental Health and Ecological Sciences, Ifakara Health Institute, P O Box
8 53, Ifakara, Tanzania

9 ^{2.} School of Biodiversity, One Health, and Veterinary Medicine, G128QQ, University
10 of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

11 ^{3.} School of Life Science and Bioengineering, The Nelson Mandela African
12 Institution of Science and Technology, P. O. Box 447, Arusha, Tanzania

13 ^{4.} Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool,
14 United Kingdom

15 ^{5.} School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the
16 Witwatersrand, 1 Smuts Avenue, Braamfontein 2000, South Africa

17
18
19 *Corresponding author: nkahamba@ihi.or.tz

20 #Equal contribution

22 **Abstract**

23 **Introduction:** Larval source management (LSM) can effectively suppress mosquito
24 populations at source and provides an opportunity to address major challenges such as
25 insecticide resistance that undermine primary interventions like insecticide-treated
26 nets (ITNs). While mostly implemented in urban and arid settings, emerging research
27 indicates its potential in some rural settings in east and southern Africa, where the main
28 malaria vector, *Anopheles funestus*, prefers permanent and semi-permanent water
29 bodies that support year-round transmission. Targeting these unique habitats could
30 amplify effectiveness of LSM but requires careful considerations of local societal
31 practices and expectations - particularly since mosquito breeding sites often also serve
32 as community water resources. The aim of this study was therefore to explore how the
33 societal uses of aquatic habitats by local communities in rural south-eastern Tanzania
34 might influence LSM strategies, focusing on habitats frequented by *An. funestus*.

35 **Methods:** This study was conducted in three villages in the Ulanga and Malinyi districts
36 of southeastern Tanzania using a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative data were
37 collected through a cross-sectional surveillance of all aquatic habitats, while
38 qualitative data were gathered via a combination of individual unstructured interviews,
39 focus group discussions with various community groups and field observations of
40 community practices and activities. Data analysis employed weaving and inferencing
41 techniques to integrate findings from both quantitative and qualitative components,
42 thereby developing a comprehensive understanding from the respondents'
43 perspectives.

44 **Results:** A survey of 931 aquatic habitats revealed that 73% contained mosquito larvae,
45 with late instar *An. funestus* identified in 23% of these habitats. River streams segments
46 were the most common habitat type, accounting for 41%, followed by ground pools at
47 4%; other types included pits, rice fields, ditches, and puddles. Community use was
48 noted for 90% of these habitats, including 95% of those with *An. funestus* larvae, for
49 activities such as domestic chores such as cooking, washing utensils, washing clothes
50 and bathing, agriculture, livestock rearing, brickmaking, and fishing. Focus group
51 discussions indicated community readiness to implement LSM, favoring larviciding and

52 habitat manipulation over habitat removal. Community concerns regarding LSM
53 centered on the safety of larvicides for animal and human health and their
54 environmental impact. The discussions proved the need for LSM interventions to
55 integrate seamlessly with daily activities; and for community education on LSM safety
56 and efficacy.

57 **Conclusion:** This study offers valuable insights into community perspectives on LSM
58 for malaria control in rural settings, emphasizing the dual role of aquatic habitats as
59 both mosquito breeding sites and community water sources. This presents a set of
60 unique challenges and opportunities – suggesting that LSM strategies must address
61 both the biological aspects of mosquito control and the socio-economic realities of
62 local communities. Notably, there was a marked preference for larviciding and habitat
63 manipulation over habitat removal, with a strong emphasis on health and
64 environmental safety. Overall, the study highlights the critical importance of educating
65 communities, adopting culturally sensitive approaches to LSM, and aligning LSM
66 strategies with the needs, perspectives, and daily lives of local communities.

67

68 **Keywords:** *Anopheles funestus*, Malaria control, Aquatic habitats, Community
69 practices, Vector control, Larviciding, Habitat manipulation, Habitat modification,
70 Southeastern Tanzania, Ifakara Health Institute (IHI)

71 **Introduction**

72 Over the past two decades, significant progress has been made in the fight against
73 malaria, primarily due large-scale deployment of preventative and therapeutic
74 measures (Bhatt *et al.*, 2015; Hemingway *et al.*, 2016; World Health Organisation, 2021).
75 Vector control strategies, notably insecticide-treated bed nets (ITNs) and indoor
76 residual spraying (IRS), have been at the forefront; accounting for over 70% of the
77 progress achieved (Bhatt *et al.*, 2015). Despite these advancements, malaria remains a
78 public health concern in sub-Saharan Africa, with some areas seeing unchanged or
79 increasing case numbers (World Health Organisation, 2021). Among other challenges,
80 malaria control efforts are being complicated by the rise of drug-resistant parasites, the
81 spread of insecticide resistance in mosquitoes, and mosquito behavior adaptations
82 that reduce the effectiveness of existing controls (Russell *et al.*, 2011; Govella and
83 Ferguson, 2012; Matowo *et al.*, 2017).

84 In response to these ongoing challenges, the World Health Organization (WHO)
85 recommends, among other strategies, larval source management (LSM) as a
86 supplementary intervention in malaria-endemic countries across Africa (World Health
87 Organization, 2022). This approach is increasingly recognized for its potential in the
88 malaria control arsenal, though there are still multiple uncertainties and conflicting
89 statements about its viability (Fillinger and Lindsay, 2011).

90 *Anopheles funestus*, one of the most efficient malaria vectors, has contributed
91 significantly to the persistence of malaria due to its adaptability and widespread
92 presence (Coetzee and Fontenille, 2004; Lwetoijera *et al.*, 2014; Msugupakulya *et al.*,
93 2023). Understanding the mosquito life cycle is crucial for appreciating the relevance of
94 LSM. The mosquito life cycle includes four stages: egg, larva, pupa, and adult, with the
95 first three stages being aquatic (Rejmánková *et al.*, 2013; Jacques Derek Charlwood,
96 2020).

97 LSM disrupts the mosquito lifecycle through three primary approaches: i.) habitat
98 modification, which involves the complete removal of breeding sites, for example,
99 filling the breeding habitat with sand or constructing structures to eliminate it entirely;
100 ii.) habitat manipulation, involving routine activities to make environments less
101 conducive to mosquito breeding, for example flushing streams, removing vegetation

102 and debris, and exposing habitats to the sun; and iii.) larviciding, the application of
103 biological or chemical insecticides to water to halt larval development (Organization,
104 2013).

105 By targeting the mosquito populations at its source, LSM can be particularly relevant for
106 overcoming challenges such as insecticide resistance that diminish the efficacy of
107 conventional vector control measures like insecticide-treated nets (ITNs). Additionally,
108 the strategic use of LSM offers a way to manage mosquito populations effectively,
109 without solely relying on chemical interventions (Fillinger and Lindsay, 2011). Indeed,
110 microbial larvicides, like *Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis (bti)* and *Bacillus sphaericus*
111 (*bs*), have been effective and can overcome problems like insecticide resistance and
112 environmental damage often associated with other chemical treatments (Kandyata *et*
113 *al.*, 2012; Tusting *et al.*, 2013). At its core, the approach reduces mosquito populations
114 and, as a result, can effectively suppress malaria transmission (Fillinger and Lindsay,
115 2011; Tusting *et al.*, 2013; Derua *et al.*, 2019), and reduced incidence of malaria (Fillinger
116 *et al.*, 2008; Tusting *et al.*, 2013).

117 While LSM holds significant promise in the fight against malaria, its adoption by global
118 funding bodies has encountered several obstacles. For example, the World Health
119 Organization (WHO) recommends LSM for areas where suitable mosquito breeding
120 sites are few, fixed and findable (FFF) (Hemingway *et al.*, 2016; World Health
121 Organisation, 2021). Because of these guidelines, LSM is currently mostly implemented
122 in urban and arid settings. However, in many malaria-endemic regions, these larval
123 habitats are abundant, widespread, and often located in areas that are difficult to
124 access, making the implementation of LSM strategies difficult. Additionally, larviciding,
125 one of the key components of LSM, is often costly and labor-intensive (Dambach *et al.*,
126 2019; Berlin Rubin *et al.*, 2020). Another challenge facing larviciding is the diversity
127 nature of malaria vectors and their unique aquatic habitat usage, making it difficult to
128 address all vectors simultaneously and effectively with this approach (Nambunga *et al.*,
129 2020; Kahamba *et al.*, 2024).

130 In southeastern Tanzania and other regions of the country, *An. funestus* has emerged as
131 a major vector in malaria transmission, accounting for about 90% of the overall
132 entomological inoculation rate (EIR) (Kaindoa *et al.*, 2017; Matowo *et al.*, 2021). This trend

133 is also seen across other parts of east and southern Africa, where the species
134 contributes majority of ongoing transmission (Msugupakulya *et al.*, 2023). Given the
135 unique traits of *An. funestus*, such as its breeding in fixed permanent and semi-water
136 bodies, which persist into dry months and can help sustain year-round malaria
137 transmission (Kahamba geospatial paper), LSM is argued to be a potential strategy
138 against this vector. On account of this unique ecological suitability, and the fact that
139 the adults, despite being highly resistant to insecticides, remain mostly endophilic and
140 endophagic, a combined approach of LSM and adulticides such as dual-active ITNs or
141 non-pyrethroid IRS, has been suggested as particularly valuable for not only reducing
142 *An. funestus*-mediated malaria transmission but potentially even crushing the local
143 populations this this species (Kahamba *et al.*, 2022).

144 Targeting these unique habitats could be significantly magnify the impact of LSM in
145 these rural settings, but it requires an indepth understanding of the interactions
146 between communities in malaria-endemic areas and the aquatic habitats of malaria
147 vectors. Insights into how communities use these habitats, and their overall opinions
148 can shape the way larval source management (LSM) strategies are designed and
149 implemented (Lupenza *et al.*, 2021). For example, if communities regularly use the same
150 habitats for drinking, bathing, or other daily activities, they may be strongly against
151 habitat removal but supporting larviciding, especially if they report a biting nuisance
152 from these habitats and have information on the safety of the approach.

153 Many studies from different locations have demonstrated the correlation between
154 community engagement and LSM success (van den Berg *et al.*, 2018; Berlin Rubin *et al.*,
155 2020; Gowelo, 2020; Lupenza *et al.*, 2021; Hakizimana *et al.*, 2022; Gowelo *et al.*, 2023),
156 indicating the need for strategies that are adapted to meet community experiences and
157 needs. Efforts should therefore be made to ensure that LSM practices adequately
158 account for local societal experiences, needs and expectations, especially since the
159 same water bodies where mosquitoes breed tend to be the same as those used by
160 communities for other purposes.

161 The aim of this study was therefore to explore how the use of aquatic habitats by local
162 communities in rural south-eastern Tanzania might influences LSM strategies, focusing
163 on habitats frequented by *An. funestus*. To achieve this, we first identified and

164 quantified the main aquatic habitats used by local malaria vector species, and
165 assessed if and how these habitats were being used by local communities. Lastly, we
166 assessed community perspectives and recommendations on LSM approaches for
167 malaria vector control.

168 **Methods**

169 **Study area**

170 This study was conducted in three malaria endemic communities in south-eastern
171 Tanzania, namely Ikungua and Chikuti villages in Ulanga district, and Sofi Majiji village
172 in Malinyi district (Fig. 1). Detailed description of these communities is provided by
173 Kahamba *et al* 2024 (Kahamba et al., 2024). The residents primarily engage in
174 subsistence farming and pastoralism, with small groups involved in artisanal mining,
175 brick making, fishing, and small-scale business like food vendors, general stores, and
176 market. Rice cultivation occurs year-round, depending on natural rainfall during the
177 rainy season and irrigation during the dry season (Peel, Finlayson and McMahon, 2007).
178 Other food crops include maize, beans, sesame seeds, and cassava. These villages are
179 situated at an altitude of approximately 300-450 m above sea level, with major rivers
180 like the Ruli river providing essential water sources for irrigation and daily use. Access
181 to electricity and clean water is limited, so most residents depend on shallow wells for
182 domestic water needs. Cooking is mostly done using wood or charcoal. The
183 environmental features, including the presence of major rivers and low-altitude
184 settings, contribute to mosquito ecology by providing abundant breeding sites, thus
185 influencing malaria transmission dynamics in these areas.

186




Figure 1: A map showing study villages in Ulanga and Malinyi districts.

Study design

This study used a sequential mixed-method research design for the main study objectives. Quantitative data was collected first during the dry season (July - November 2022), which included assessment of aquatic habitats, respective densities of *An. funestus* larvae or pupae, and domestic uses for the aquatic habitats. Subsequently, the qualitative component included a series of focus group discussions (FGDs) to explore communities' perspectives and recommendations on how the LSM approaches can be integrated to their daily practices was conducted in November 2022. Additionally, field visits and direct observations were made to assess the actual community practices and uses of these habitats.

Habitat characterization and entomological surveys

Quantitative data collection followed the procedure detailed in Kahamba *et al* 2024 (Kahamba *et al.*, 2024). A cross-sectional larval survey was done to identify and characterize aquatic habitats containing *An. funestus*. This process involved recording

203 various environmental characteristics such as habitats type, size, watercolour,
204 permanence of water, water movement, water source, presence of shades, presence of
205 vegetation, and the presence of algae (Fig. 3). Immature mosquitoes were collected
206 using either 350ml dippers in small habitats or 10L buckets in larger habitats, and the
207 mosquitoes were identified based on their morphological characteristics using
208 established taxonomic keys by Gillies and De Meillon and Gillies and Coetzee (Gillies and
209 de Meillon, 1968; Gillies and Coetzee, 1987). Larvae were identified into taxonomic groups
210 of *Anopheles funestus sensu lato (sl)*, *Anopheles gambiae sl*, and *Culex*, and others.
211 Pictorial data was also collected for all the habitats.

212 **Assessment of how communities use the water bodies occupied by *Anopheles*** 213 **mosquitoes.**

214 Once the main habitats occupied by the dominant malaria vectors, *An. funestus* were
215 identified, follow-up observations were done identify and estimate proportion of those
216 habitats that were being used for domestic activities. This was done by directly
217 observing and recording environmental indicators such as footprints, hoof prints, and
218 signs of human and livestock waste within 10m around the habitats, using a prepared
219 checklist. Additionally, we conducted several unstructured interviews with consenting
220 community members living near the habitats to understand how they use them. During
221 these interviews, we gathered information on both the frequency of use, and type of use
222 activities conducted.

223 Following these initial assessments, we conducted focus group discussions (FGDs)
224 with community members to gain deeper insights into their perceptions of malaria
225 transmission risks within their homes and communities, the connection between local
226 water sources and malaria, and their methods for mitigating transmission risks.
227 Additionally, participants' attitudes towards the potential and practicality of three LSM
228 approaches were evaluated.

229 The discussions were structured into three main sections: Initially, participants shared
230 their understanding of malaria transmission, factors contributing to its persistence, and
231 their efforts to mitigate these risks. The second part focused on identifying different
232 sources of mosquito larval habitats and strategies for their control. Finally, participants
233 evaluated the feasibility and effectiveness of the three LSM strategies; larviciding,

234 habitat manipulation (source reduction), and habitat modification (habitat removal) in
235 their community contexts. To foster meaningful dialogue, facilitators provided
236 definitions of each LSM strategy and addressed participant questions before
237 discussions commenced. Participants then shared their perspectives on the
238 appropriateness and potential implementation of these approaches, offering specific
239 recommendations on the contexts and conditions under which each method could be
240 effectively applied.

241 Altogether, a total of nine FGD sessions were conducted; six with community members
242 (three with males and three with females separately) and one each with local
243 fishermen, pastoralists, and brick-makers. These groups were selected to represent
244 major uses of the water bodies. Each session consisted of eight to ten participants and
245 lasted between one and two hours. Most discussions took place within the participants'
246 communities (at the village leader's offices) and discussion with fishermen and
247 brickmakers, participants were invited at Ifakara Health Insistute's offices. All
248 discussions were audio-recorded for further processing, and detailed notes were taken
249 by at least two facilitators during each session.


250 **Data processing and analysis**

251 We integrated the analysis of quantitative survey data (done in R statistical software
252 version 4.2.3 (R Core Team, 2019) and qualitative analysis using NVivo software version
253 12 (NVivo - Lumivero, no date). Throughout the analysis process, data weaving and
254 inferencing techniques were employed, integrating information from both components
255 of the study to develop a comprehensive understanding from the viewpoint of the
256 respondents.

257 For the quantitative data, descriptive statistics were used to summarize the mosquito
258 aquatic habitats and the proportion of those utilized by communities. This included the
259 proportions of all surveyed habitats, those containing mosquito larvae, and specifically,
260 those containing *An. funestus*. The descriptive analysis was extended to categorize the
261 habitats based on their usage by community members for different purposes.

262 For the qualitative data on the other hand, the audio recordings of the FGDs were
263 transcribed by SK and AS, then reviewed by NFK and FT. During analysis, thematic

264 coding was employed to identify key themes and patterns. Prior to analysis, a code
265 book was developed using both deductive and inductive methods; whereby deductive
266 codes were developed from the objectives of the study and the discussion guide, and
267 inductive codes were developed through a thorough review of the transcripts. Similar
268 codes were subsequently grouped into broader themes and categories that emerged
269 from the data. The coding process was done by NFK and FT. Main themes identified
270 included: i) community understanding about mosquito ovipositing behaviour and their
271 aquatic habitats., ii) participants' views of the applicability, effectiveness and
272 challenges associated with the three LSM approaches. Direct quotations from the
273 participants were used to support and provide context to the themes



274
275 **Figure 2:** Mixed-Methods Approaches for data collection and analysis of how the
276 societal uses of aquatic habitats by local communities in rural south-eastern Tanzania
277 might influence LSM strategies, focusing on habitats frequented by *An. funestus*

278 **Ethical considerations**

279 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Ifakara Health Institute
280 Institutional Review Board (Ref: IHI/ IRB/No: 26-2020) and the Medical Research
281 Coordinating Committee (MRCC) at the National Institute for Medical Research-NIMR
282 (Ref: NIMR/HQ/R.8a/Vol. IX/3495). Before commencing data collection, permission was
283 obtained from the District Medical Officers (DMO) and subsequently from each village
284 executive officer (VEO). The VEOs assisted in selecting participants for the focus group
285 discussions (FGDs) based on our established criteria. Written informed consent was
286 obtained from all participants prior to their involvement in the FGDs. Additionally,
287 consent for taking pictures of the community members during the observations,
288 surveys and FGDs were obtained.

289 **Results**

290 **Survey of aquatic habitats in the study areas**

291 The entomological survey identified 931 aquatic habitats, of into six categories, namely:
292 river streams, ground pools, dug pits, rice fields, ditches, and puddles (Figure 3 and
293 Table 2). Nearly three quarters (73%, n = 612) of all the habitats contained mosquito
294 larvae or pupae, and among these 23% (n = 213) contained *An. funestus*.

295 In the survey conducted, river streams were identified as the most prevalent aquatic
296 habitats, accounting for 41% (n = 376) of the total, with 37% (n = 226) of these streams
297 serving as larval habitats, and 52% (n = 112) of these larval habitats containing *An.*
298 *funestus* larvae. Ground pools and ponds represented a smaller fraction, constituting
299 4% (n = 37) of all identified habitats, with 7% (n = 15) found to be containing *An.*
300 *funestus* larvae. Human-made pits constituted 22% (n = 208) of aquatic habitats, with
301 22% of these (n = 135) being larval sites, and 7% (n = 14) of which contained *An.*
302 *funestus* larvae. On the other hand, rice fields comprised 7% (n = 65) of habitats, with
303 8% (n = 53) identified as larval sites and 6% (n = 12) harboring *An. funestus* larvae.
304 Another common habitat type was ditches, which accounted for 22% (n = 208) of all
305 habitats and 23% (n = 139) of all larval habitats. More than half of the mosquito-infested
306 ditches (57% (n = 78)) were found to have of these containing *An. funestus* larvae.
307 Lastly, puddles formed 4% (n = 37) of habitats, with 5% (n = 28) serving as larval



308

309

Figure 3: Common types of aquatic habitat found in the study areas.

310

Community uses of the different water resources- results of the unstructured interviews and direct observations

311

312

The community uses of the different water bodies, which were also found to be

313

containing mosquito larvae are presented in Table 1. The community members used

314

the water from these aquatic habitats for various purposes – of the 931 surveyed, our

315

observations revealed that 90% (n = 837) were being used by community members for

316

one or more purposes (Table 1). Some of the common community uses for the habitats

317

included: source of water for domestic activities such as drinking, cooking, washing

318

dishes and clothes, and bathing, which accounted for 37% (n = 306) of uses; crop

319

irrigation, representing 27% (n = 223); watering livestock, 60% (n = 505); fishing at 37%

320

(n = 311); and brick making at 16% (n = 132) (Figure 4).

321

Nearly half of the river streams were used for activities such as fishing, cattle grazing,

322

and domestic needs. The ground pools, including those with *An. funestus* larvae, were

323

commonly used for fishing and cattle grazing. On the other hand, human-made pits


324

served multiple purposes, primarily domestic water uses and brick making.

325 Approximately 30% (n = 154) of ditches were actively used by community members for
 326 cattle grazing and agriculture (Figure 4).

327 **Table 1:** Distribution of total habitat surveyed and habitats that had at least mosquito
 328 larvae and habitats that had atleast one *An. funestus* mosquitoes.

Habitat type	Water bodies surveyed	Water identified used by community	Larval habitats	Habitats with <i>An. funestus</i>
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
River streams	376 (41)	353 (42)	226 (37)	112 (52)
Ground pools	37 (4)	33 (4)	31 (5)	15 (7)
Dug pits	208 (22)	188 (22)	135 (22)	14 (7)
Rice fields	65 (7)	64 (8)	53 (8)	12 (6)
Ditches	208 (22)	178 (21)	139 (23)	57 (27)
Puddles	37 (4)	21 (3)	28 (5)	3 (1)
Totals	931 (100)	837 (100)	612 (100)	213 (100)



329
 330 **Figure 4:** Distribution of different habitat types and those utilized by both *An. funestus*

331 and the community. This figure provides a quantitative summary of the use of different
332 aquatic habitats serving the community for various needs.



333
334 **Figure 5:** Community dependence on the water bodies identified as also being aquatic
335 habitats. This figure depicts various communal activities conducted in different aquatic
336 environments, illustrating the interplay between daily life and potential mosquito
337 breeding sites. Examples include (A) washing dishes beside river streams, (B) cleaning
338 dishes within flooded rice fields, (C) laundering clothes by riverbanks, (D) fetching
339 drinking water from dug pits, (E) providing water for livestock at river streams, and (F)
340 collecting water from dug pits for household use.

341 **Results of the Focus Group Discussions regarding community dependance on the**
342 **different water sources**

343 The focus group discussions comprised a total of 85 participants, consisting of 54
344 males and 31 females. The age range (determined for 80 of the 85 participants) was 19
345 to 71 years, with a mean age of 37.92. The majority of respondents had primary
346 education (74%, n=63), while smaller groups had secondary education (19%, n=16) or

347 no formal education (7%, n=6). In terms of marital status, 56% (n=45) were married,
348 followed by 27% (n=23) who were not married, with smaller proportions being divorced
349 (5%, n=4), widowed (7%, n=6), or unidentified (8%, n=7). In terms of occupation, 55%
350 (n=47) were farmers, with others engaged as fishermen (12%, n=10), brick makers
351 (12%, n=10), pastoralists (10.5%, n=9), and various other occupations (10.5%, n=9). The
352 focus group discussions (FGDs) confirmed patterns of community dependence on
353 various water sources, consistent with observations from direct observation and
354 unstructured interviews. During the FGDs, in the community members explained that
355 they relied largely on river streams, dug pits and, in some cases, large pools to obtain
356 water for different purposes including drinking, cooking, watering animals, bathing, and
357 economic activities such as agriculture and construction activities. This dependence
358 on specific water sources was driven by necessity and availability, as one participant
359 voiced the lack of choice in their water source options:

360 *"We use what we use because we must, not because it is what we would choose*
361 *if we had other better and safer options."* (Female farmer)

362 The availability and type of water sources varied by location, as revealed by participants
363 in different areas. In some regions, community members utilized groundwater pumps,
364 locally referred to as "*Mdundiko*," installed by the government, to meet some of their
365 water needs. In contrast, other areas predominantly relied on natural water sources
366 such as rivers, streams and spring-fed wells for most domestic requirements.
367 Participants noted that a key factor determining the type of water source used was
368 proximity to the village center or main roads. Communities closer to these areas
369 generally accessed more reliable and cleaner water compared to more marginalized
370 ones. One participant described their situation, stressing these disparities:

371 *"Our lives in the remote farming area are different from those in the town [here*
372 *referred to small towns], we in the interior village we dig our wells, and we rely on*
373 *stream channels, but those in urban areas have pumped water "Mdudindiko"*
374 *which they use for their domestic needs."* (Female farmer)

375 **Community understanding of mosquito reproduction and larval sites.**

376 The majority of FGD participants understood that mosquito reproduction involves
377 mating between males and females, followed by females laying eggs in water where
378 they hatch into larvae, developing in aquatic habitats before emerging as adult
379 mosquitoes. Most were familiar with common larval sites such as pits, river streams,
380 and large water bodies. However, some participants lacked such understanding, and
381 sometimes they would mention other unlikely places such as areas with dense
382 vegetation like bushes, pit latrines (that are often not used by malaria vectors), dark and
383 moist places, and corners of the houses. This confusion indicated a mix-up between
384 mosquito breeding sites and the areas where adult mosquitoes are commonly found,
385 as explained by a participant:

386 *"From what I know, mosquitoes prefer dark and damp places, particularly those*
387 *with vegetation. When we clear these areas, the mosquitoes find their preferred*
388 *habitats disturbed, so they tend to move away, often relocating away from our*
389 *homes"* (Male, farmer).

390 The majority of participants reported observing mosquito larvae in water bodies and
391 associated the presence of larvae with adult mosquitoes. Many respondents noted that
392 they frequently spotted larvae while performing daily chores and were able to identify
393 them as mosquito larvae due to the abundance of adult mosquitoes around water
394 sources, as explained by one of the participants:

395 *"I've seen mosquito larvae while fetching water from the river. I've seen them*
396 *attached to grasses along the river's edge, when you disturb the grasses, a group*
397 *of mosquitoes will fly, these are the same mosquitoes that come to our homes to*
398 *look for blood."* (Female farmer)

399 **Perceptions and recommendations on LSM for malaria control**

400 Discussions on the potential of LSM for malaria control focused on the participants'
401 views of the applicability, effectiveness, challenges, and recommendations associated
402 with the three LSM approaches. Generally, the participants expressed varying levels of
403 interest for the different LSM approaches (Table 2).

404 ***Larviciding***

405 Regarding larviciding, the majority of participants expressed enthusiasm, viewing it as a
406 practical option for their communities. They recognized its potential benefits in
407 reducing malaria by linking the use of larvicides to a decrease in mosquito populations.
408 Participants understood that fewer mosquitoes would likely lead to reduced malaria
409 transmission. This proactive approach to lowering malaria risk was widely
410 acknowledged, as said by one of the participants:

411 *"Now, there are many puddles and mosquitoes, suppose we apply the larvicide*
412 *in this area and then we decide to promote its use in other areas too, as we*
413 *continue to do this, the number of mosquitoes will decrease, and then there will*
414 *be a reduction in malaria cases."* (Male farmer)

415 Many participants believed that addressing the mosquito problem at its source, by
416 preventing larvae from emerging as adults, would be more effective way of controlling
417 malaria compared to ITNs. This viewpoint was commonly relayed in association with
418 the phrase of "*prevention is better than cure*"; highlighting that stopping mosquitoes
419 from maturing into adults, is a preferable strategy. Community members deemed
420 larviciding to be an appropriate approach for targeting mosquito in their habitats,
421 provided that the chemicals used were safe for humans and animals as this participant
422 said:

423 *"In my opinion, it is suitable, indeed suitable, to treat mosquito habitats and that*
424 *is how we could benefit. The mosquito will not be able to emerge, and we will not*
425 *have malaria, as people say, 'prevention is better than cure', it is just like that."*
426 (Female farmer)

427 During the discussions, participants expressed concerns about managing larval
428 habitats in remote or forested areas that are often hard to reach and overlooked in
429 community cleaning efforts, such as those organized by local government authorities.
430 This shows the need for strategies that can identify and treat all habitats, including
431 those that are inaccessible. Participants also noted the limitations of localized
432 measures in addressing all larval habitats and emphasized the potential of larviciding to
433 cover more extensive geographic areas.

434 *"If we apply the larvicide here, but in the forest, there is another unseen pond!*
435 *What do we do? The chemical's efficacy will end, but then the mosquitoes will*
436 *move and start new habitats there, right? so, the advantage of chemical can be*
437 *applied in every habitat at the same time."* (Female farmer)

438 Participants preferred larviciding partly because they viewed complete removal of
439 mosquito habitats (source reduction) and habitat manipulation as impractical, given
440 the community reliance on these water sources. They appreciated larviciding for its
441 ability to control mosquito populations while maintaining access to essential water
442 resources, highlighting this balance as a significant advantage, as described by one of
443 the participants:

444 *"Some of these water habitats we created ourselves because we need them for*
445 *our daily livelihood, if they keep the mosquito, that was not our intention and so*
446 *the mosquitoes have to be killed while ensuring the water remains safe and*
447 *usable for our various purposes."* (Female farmer)

448 Despite the general acceptance of larviciding, the focus group discussions (FGDs)
449 revealed some concerns among participants, particularly regarding the use of
450 chemicals to control mosquitoes. First, they questioned whether treated water would
451 still be safe for domestic use and agricultural activities, or their livestock or fish as
452 these participants said:

453 *"In our current environment, I don't think it's possible because that's a chemical,*
454 *but those same water bodies we mentioned are the primary water sources for*
455 *the community, and then the same water bodies are oviposition sites for the*
456 *mosquitoes. If the larvicide harms livestock, people might refuse to use it."*
457 (Female, farmer).

458 *"Because we don't know if the chemicals, even if they are brought to target*
459 *mosquito breeding sites, will kill the fish or pose risks to humans, because we*
460 *lack knowledge and understanding."* (Male fishermen).

461 Secondly, expressed concerns about the feasibility of implementing larviciding in low-
462 income communities due to the required technical expertise and financial resources. In

463 particular, they noted that where multiple larviciding treatments are required, this
464 would be challenging due to lack of continuous financial resources:

465 *"The method of applying chemicals is technical and requires financial resources,*
466 *this method is more realistic, even the larvae of mosquitoes would decrease very*
467 *fast. However, consistent application is essential, as mosquito populations*
468 *grow, and the power of the chemical diminishes over time. To prevent*
469 *mosquitoes from returning, regular reapplication of the chemical is necessary,*
470 *which needs funds."* (Male farmer).

471 Lastly, the discussions also revealed a general skepticism towards larvicides brought
472 from outside the country, especially fueled as a result of the aftermath of COVID-19,
473 and the skepticism towards COVID vaccine. The participants wondered how
474 communities would be convinced to accept this intervention, as this participant said:

475 *"Just like with the coronavirus vaccine, many of us, including myself, were*
476 *hesitant... How will communities accept these chemicals in the water we*
477 *drink?"* (Male, farmer).

478 **Habitat manipulation**

479 Habitat manipulation for controlling larval habitats received mixed reactions from study
480 participants. Some saw it as a practical measure, particularly getting rid of useless
481 stagnant water near residential areas, while others raised concerns about its feasibility
482 and legality, especially near protected natural water bodies. Supporters of this
483 approach suggested initiatives like clearing tall grass around water sources and homes,
484 noting these actions were practical in their communities and offered additional benefits
485 beyond mosquito control:

486 *"We can manage to clear the stagnant water around our homes. It's something*
487 *within our power to do, and it helps reduce the mosquito problem in our*
488 *immediate surroundings."* (Female farmer)

489 *"When you clean and remove the grass, even snakes do not stay, thereby*
490 *creating a safer environment."* (Female farmer)

491 The primary concern regarding habitat manipulation, as voiced by most participants,
492 centered on the inaccessibility of certain water bodies, especially those in government-
493 protected areas or regions with land development restrictions. Participants note that
494 there were legal prohibitions against altering vegetation within 60 meters of a river
495 stream to avoid ecological disturbances, emphasizing the regulatory challenges
496 associated with this approach:

497 *"We have a nearby river Luli. It has reeds and dense vegetation. Now, that*
498 *vegetation hosts numerous organisms like snakes, chameleons, and lizards.*
499 *Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) cannot allow you to clear vegetation*
500 *60 meters around the river streams because it will chase away these animals*
501 *from their natural habitats."* (Male farmer)

502 Moreover, habitat manipulation was also considered impractical during the rainy
503 season when there was often flooding and water everywhere, making it impossible to
504 clear the water or to keep up with vegetation growth as this participant elaborated:

505 *"During the rainy season vegetation grows fast around water bodies, if you clear*
506 *it today, it quickly grows back in just days.* (Female farmer)

507 This approach was especially opposed by fishermen who feared that it could disrupt
508 breeding habitats for the fish. The fishermen explained that vegetation alongside
509 riverbanks provided calm waters and safe havens for fish to lay their eggs. Disrupting
510 this, therefore, could interfere with their livelihoods as this fisherman explained:

511 *"Fish prefer to lay their eggs in parts of the river that are calm and have plenty of*
512 *vegetation. You won't find fish eggs in fast-flowing waters. If you tell me to clear*
513 *the grass along the riverbanks today, I will also be disturbing breeding habitats*
514 *for the fish. This will likely reduce fish reproduction and ultimately harm our*
515 *income."* (Male fishermen)

516 One particular exception was that the pastoralists who participated in these
517 discussions expressed their support for this approach as they deemed it would not
518 have negative impact on their livestock. Reducing vegetation alongside water sources
519 was also perceived as beneficial as it opened up the water for their livestock. However,

520 they too were concerned about whether or not they would have time to do such work,
521 given their nomadic nature and busy schedules as this participant said:

522 *"I wonder when we, as pastoralists, would find the time for this task. Every day*
523 *we're up early to go grazing and don't return until evening. If the government*
524 *decides to undertake this exercise, we will agree, because our animals only go to*
525 *these places for water."*

526 **Source reduction through habitat modification or removal.**

527 This approach was the least favored due to multiple reasons: i) most water bodies are
528 utilized for domestic or livelihood purposes, ii) concerns that filling these water bodies
529 would require creating other pits to obtain sand, which could potentially become new
530 larval habitats, and iii) the impracticality of altering natural water bodies (Table 2).
531 Participants noted that it might be feasible for smaller, unused breeding sites like
532 puddles within the community. The potential for habitat modification to completely
533 eliminate water sources was a significant concern, especially given the multifunctional
534 nature of these resources in the community. Consequently, participants deemed this
535 approach both impractical and inapplicable.

536 Another concern raised regarding habitat modification was that some habitats are too
537 large to modify or remove without creating new potential breeding sites. Other than the
538 river streams and large ponds, other examples of these were the pit holes resulting from
539 brickmaking and mining activities; study participants explained that it would be
540 impossible to find landfills to cover these without creating more pits in the process as
541 this participant elaborated. Participants noted the impracticality of finding adequate
542 landfill materials to fill these large pits without the need to excavate additional areas.
543 Additionally, the approach was deemed unsuitable during the rainy season due to
544 frequent flooding that enlarges water bodies, complicating any efforts to control
545 habitats.

546 Furthermore, participants emphasized the practical challenges and the effort required
547 to engage in habitat modification amidst their busy agricultural schedules.
548 Brickmakers, in particular, opposed this strategy because it threatened their livelihood.
549 They rely on pits filled with water for brickmaking and create new pits annually,

550 suggesting that filling these would directly impact their income. Similarly, pastoralists
551 expressed concerns about the adverse effects on their livestock, emphasizing their
552 reliance on these water sources and preferring to maintain them for animal use.

553 **Table 2:** Community perspectives on different approaches to larval source management, for malaria vector control.

Approach	Perceived Benefits	Concerns	Specific recommendations
Larviciding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduces mosquito populations and malaria cases, ▪ Targets roots of the problem, ▪ Can provide broad area coverage, ▪ Balances mosquito control with water needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May have health and environmental safety concerns, ▪ May affect aquatic life and livestock, ▪ Requires significant cost and labour, ▪ Could be limited by community scepticism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Educate and engage the community, ▪ Involve locals ▪ Provide safe use guidelines, ▪ Plan and monitor strategically, ▪ Ensure effective communication between authorities, communities, and scientists.
Habitat Manipulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Directly controls mosquito breeding sites, ▪ Practical and enhances cleanliness, ▪ Deters dangerous animals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There may be legal and environmental concerns, ▪ Is impractical during rainy seasons, ▪ Might impact the livelihoods of specific groups, e.g. fishermen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promote community education and participation, ▪ Collaborate with government agencies, ▪ Establish specific cleanup times and calendar of activity, ▪ Adapt methods to seasons and geographical areas, for feasibility.
Source Reduction/ Habitat Removal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduces mosquito populations sustainably ▪ Leads to a cleaner environment, ▪ Decreases malaria cases, ▪ Can be implemented in designated areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is a challenge because the water bodies also serv other purposes, ▪ Risks of new breeding sites, ▪ There might be community resistance, ▪ It is time and labor-intensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promote education and active community involvement ▪ Designate activity areas and provide alternatives ▪ Implement regulations and get local leaders to participate ▪ Consider and preserve beneficial habitats.

Table 3: Community concerns regarding source reduction through habitat modification or removal

Theme	Key Concerns	Example Quotes
Domestic uses of the water	Water bodies are essential for domestic and livelihood activities.	<i>"Most of our water bodies are used for various purposes, from fishing to laundry. Removing them completely isn't just about mosquitoes; it affects our daily lives."</i> (Male farmer)
Feasibility and practicality	Natural water bodies cannot easily be altered. Large habitats are difficult to modify without creating new ones.	<i>"Where would you even start to fill a natural water body? It is there because it has to be there, it's natural, even if mosquitoes are present, a different approach should be used, and not this one."</i> (Male, fisherman) <i>"The main challenge in filling the pits [is that it is] is difficult during the rainy season. You might say you'll fill a pit, but when it rains, not all places will drain off the water; there are many areas where water will accumulate... preventing water from stagnating during the rainy season is difficult".</i> (Female farmer) <i>"For me, this approach is not possible because there are mining activities by small-scale miners in the village here. They dig large pits in the forests, when it rains, these pits fill with water. So, you can't ask people to go to those places and fill up those pits."</i> (Male farmer) <i>"Another challenge I see is time, these pits are present during the rainy season, and we farmers are usually busy in the fields, so we don't have time to rest and fill these pits. Time is a real issue because as soon as we wake up, we are going to the fields, and by the time the rainy season ends, and the water is everywhere".</i> (Male farmer)
Impact on livelihoods	Modifying habitats could negatively impact livelihoods such as by hindering brickmaking.	<i>"In our area, brickmaking is an annual activity. Every year, we need to dig new pits for this purpose. So, if we fill the old ones, we will just end up creating new ones the following year."</i> (Male, brick maker) <i>"I think that filling the pits we use for brickmaking would be economically counterproductive for us. We need the health institutions to work with us and the community to find other ways to control mosquitoes and manage malaria, without disrupting our brickmaking activities. If the government decides to fill these pits, we will have to dig new ones for making bricks and we will create new mosquito breeding sites".</i> (Male, brick maker)
Water resources for livestock	Modifying habitats could negatively impact resources for livestock.	<i>"If I'm told to fill up a pit that I regularly use, it would for sure affect me. Yes, there might be benefits, but on the other hand, I'll face consequences. For example, if that pit has enough water for my livestock and there's no alternative, then filling it up would significantly affect me and my livestock."</i> (Male, pastoralist)

557 **Broad recommendations by community members regarding LSM**

558 Key recommendations made by participants during this study are summarized in Table
559 4. To ensure effectiveness of LSM strategies in the study communities, the participants
560 members emphasized the importance of raising awareness about the techniques for
561 malaria control. They suggested awareness campaigns, e.g. through community
562 meetings, to address potential impacts that LSM might have on people, livestock, and
563 the environment. Participants also advocated for clear understandable guidelines on
564 the use of larvicides, including their frequency and safe application timing, as relevant
565 to specific settings. Thirdly, they emphasized the importance of involving locals in
566 program implementation to foster trust and ownership, noting that community support
567 would increase if implementation were led by familiar faces.

568 There was a consensus on the need for careful planning of the deployment and timing
569 of LSM to align with seasonal variations and readiness. Participants suggested that
570 different LSM strategies might have different calendars of activities. For instance, while
571 larviciding may be desirable during the rainy season when water sources are plentiful
572 and vector populations are highest, habitat manipulation would be more feasible in the
573 dry season when water bodies are fewer and also reduced in size. To enhance the
574 impact, participants suggested that local governments should mandate regular LSM
575 activities, such as environmental clean-ups – for example, they suggested bi-weekly
576 community cleaning days to encourage broad participation.

577 Additionally, if water sources are modified or removed, there was a strong
578 recommendation for the government agencies to provide alternative sources and to
579 reallocate activities like brickmaking to minimize environmental risks. The community
580 emphasized that habitat modification should be limited to unused water sources to
581 avoid disrupting local needs. This holistic approach highlights the community's concern
582 for careful planning and local involvement in LSM initiatives.

583

584 **Table 4:** Recommendations from community members regarding larval source management

Theme	Recommendations	Example Quotes
Awareness and Education	Conduct awareness campaigns to educate and answer questions about the impacts of LSM on people, livestock, and the environment.	<i>"Community members might reject [the idea] initially due to a lack of understanding. Education should be provided first, then once people understand, they will accept it."</i> (Female farmer)
Guidelines for Larviciding	Provide clear guidelines on the dosage and timing of larvicides to ensure safe usage.	<i>"We need guidance to inform us on the appropriate time for spraying and the correct dosage to avoid unintentional harm to other beings."</i> (Male farmer)
Local Involvement	Train and involve local community members in LSM implementation to build trust and ensure program ownership.	<i>"If I see a local person, someone from our own village, doing the larviciding, I will have more faith than if it were strangers who I don't know their intentions."</i> (Male farmer)
Timing of Implementation	Carefully plan the timing of LSM to align with seasonal variations and community readiness.	<i>"The rainy season is the best time for spraying chemical, as many puddles and mosquito breeding places are at its peak. That's when the larvicide should be applied."</i> (Female farmer)
Government Mandate	Advocate for government-mandated LSM activities, including environmental cleaning and removal of stagnant water.	<i>"In my view, for people to engage in this exercise, the government should set a specific day for cleaning, like the 'Magufuli Saturday', where everyone knows they should be cleaning around their premises."</i> (Male farmer)
Alternative Water Sources	If water sources are modified or removed, provide alternative sources for community use.	<i>"Abandoned pits near homes can be filled, but those used for community activities, like domestic purposes, watering animals, construction activities like building clinics or schools, can be difficult for the community to agree."</i> (Female farmer)

585

586 Discussion

587 Effective larval source management (LSM) necessitates a nuanced understanding and
588 targeted approach to water bodies that are essential for mosquito larval development.
589 However since local communities often depend on the same water bodies for various
590 other purposes, targeting these habitats for vector control requires careful
591 considerations of local societal practices and expectations. The overall goal of this
592 project was to explore how local communities in rural southeastern Tanzania use these
593 water bodies and how this might influence LSM strategies. We focused primarily on
594 habitats frequented by *An. funestus*, first because this is the primary malaria vector in
595 rural south-eastern Tanzania, and second, because the vector species prefers a set of
596 unique habitats that often remain as the sole water supplies during the dry season.
597 Overall, our results illustrate a dual challenge: the critical need for water resources for
598 various community purposes on one hand, and the simultaneous need to effectively
599 manage these resources effectively to limit mosquito breeding.

600 It was observed that a vast majority of aquatic habitats used by malaria vectors, notably
601 river streams, ground pools, dug pits, rice fields, ditches, and puddles, are integral to
602 the daily lives of local communities; where they are used for washing, fishing, cattle
603 grazing, and even as sources of drinking water. This linking of community life with
604 potential mosquito vector larval habitats underlines the importance of engaging with
605 communities to tailor LSM approaches that will respect their reliance on these habitats
606 (van den Berg *et al.*, 2018). While the community members acknowledged the need for
607 effective malaria vector control measures, there was a clear call for these measures to
608 be applied thoughtfully considering the multiple uses of aquatic habitats by local
609 communities. The need for more information about the safety and impact of LSM
610 approaches on daily life was emphasized, pointing towards a gap in communication
611 and education regarding LSM strategies.

612 The survey revealed that aquatic habitats, such as river streams, ground pools, and
613 human-made pits, play crucial multifunctional roles in community life, serving as
614 essential resources for domestic and agricultural activities as well as breeding grounds
615 for *An. funestus* larvae. This complexity presents significant challenges for malaria

616 control efforts, such as habitat manipulation or larviciding, which must balance
617 ecological impacts with community needs. Community interactions with these water
618 sources varied widely, including uses for drinking, irrigation, brick making, and livestock
619 watering. Notably, river streams and ground pools were frequently used for washing
620 dishes and clothes, reflecting their accessibility and utility, which aligns with findings
621 from Kenya highlighting similar dependencies on aquatic habitats for daily chores
622 (Imbahale *et al.*, 2010). Dug pits and ditches were commonly associated with brick
623 making and agriculture, indicating their importance in economic and food production
624 activities. This diverse use cases underline the significance of water bodies to
625 community livelihood and underscores the need for LSM strategies that effectively
626 control malaria vectors while being culturally and practically acceptable to the
627 communities they serve (Walker and Lynch, 2007; Fillinger *et al.*, 2009; Fillinger and
628 Lindsay, 2011).

629 Building on the varied use of aquatic habitats, it was noted that community members
630 had a solid understanding of the mosquito lifecycle including ability to distinguish
631 between aquatic stages and adult life stages. They could identify mosquito larvae and
632 understood the direct relationship between the presence of larvae and the subsequent
633 increase in adult mosquito populations. This level of awareness is supported by
634 findings from other research, which has consistently shown a considerable
635 understanding of malaria transmission dynamics within malaria endemic communities
636 (Imbahale *et al.*, 2010). For example, research conducted in similar settings have
637 reported that, local communities are often aware of mosquito breeding sites and their
638 link to the risk of malaria (Finda *et al.*, 2019; Tarimo *et al.*, 2023). However, these studies
639 also indicate variation in the depth of knowledge and its application towards preventive
640 practices; suggesting that while awareness is widespread, its effective interpretation to
641 reduce malaria risk may differ from one community to another.

642 The study underscored significant challenges in LSM strategies, particularly habitat
643 manipulation and source reduction, due to their potential to disrupt community
644 livelihoods. Modifying water bodies used for brick making and livestock could adversely
645 affect local economies and animal welfare, emphasizing the need for a careful balance
646 between effective vector control and community sustainability. Larviciding, although

647 favored for its perceived straightforwardness and effectiveness in controlling mosquito
648 populations, raised concerns about the safety of water post-treatment, impacting
649 livestock and aquatic life. These concerns about the safety of larvicides and their
650 potential impact on human, animal, and environmental health, including aquatic life,
651 echo broader challenges previously documented (Gowelo *et al.*, 2020; Hakizimana *et al.*,
652 2022). However, studies in regions with similar living conditions indicate that people
653 generally accept the use of larvicides, provided they do not negatively impact the
654 environment or their way of life (Berlin Rubin *et al.*, 2020; Gowelo *et al.*, 2023).
655 Nonetheless, the persistence of environmental and health safety concerns, which have
656 also been observed in other studies highlights the importance of community education
657 and involvement in LSM to ensure acceptance and understanding of these methods
658 (Geissbühler *et al.*, 2009; Berlin Rubin *et al.*, 2020; Hakizimana *et al.*, 2022; Gowelo *et al.*,
659 2023).

660 Habitat manipulation, recognized under initiatives like the "*Jumamosi ya Magufuli*"
661 campaign in Tanzania, an initiative started by Tanzania former President, which
662 promotes environmental cleanliness, was also seen as a viable LSM approach
663 (Mvomero, 2023). This highlights how existing policy and government information
664 campaigns can be harnessed to promote LSM based on habitat management.
665 However, its application is limited near natural water sources that are legally protected,
666 stressing the need to consider environmental regulations in LSM planning (Walker and
667 Lynch, 2007). Moreover, concerns from some sections of the communities, for example
668 fishermen who were concerned about the potential negative impact on fish breeding
669 habitats, illustrate additional complexities in applying LSM approaches to river streams,
670 which comprise a significant water source in rural communities. These findings suggest
671 that while LSM strategies are essential, they must be adaptable and sensitive to both
672 ecological and community contexts.

673 While source reduction approaches are considered the most effective strategy for
674 mosquito control because it completely removes larval habitats (Killeen, Seyoum and
675 Knols, 2004; Tusting *et al.*, 2013), this study suggests it was also the least preferred
676 method among community members. The main concern was its potential impact on
677 livelihoods and daily activities. Nearly all identified larval habitats were also used by

678 community members for different purposes. Farmers rely on these water sources for
679 both irrigation and domestic purposes; pastoralists need them for their livestock; brick
680 makers use them in their brick-making processes, and fishermen depend on them for
681 their catch. Similar patterns were observed in Malawi, where community dependence
682 on mosquito larval habitats for various activities was reported (Gowelo *et al.*, 2020). This
683 highlights the need for a careful balance between implementing public health
684 measures to combat malaria and ensuring the well-being of communities, especially in
685 areas where livelihood and daily activities are connected to the environment (Walker
686 and Lynch, 2007; Koenraad, 2021).

687 Community members emphasized the importance of raising awareness and providing
688 education about the potential risks and benefits of all LSM approaches. They advocated
689 for open communication and active community engagement in mosquito control efforts
690 to ensure broad understanding and involvement in the implementation process (Walker
691 and Lynch, 2007). Additionally, they pointed out the need of carefully scheduling these
692 activities, selecting time periods for implementation both when the intervention will be
693 more effective and when the majority of the community can actively participate. This
694 highlights the necessity of adapting interventions to the dynamic nature of mosquito
695 larval habitats and human activities This concurs with the wider body of evidence
696 indicating that vector control initiatives are more successful and relevant to local
697 needs when the community is well-informed and directly involved in the mosquito
698 control efforts (van den Berg *et al.*, 2018). One challenge that could rise with regard to
699 this is balancing the timing of LSM implementation.

700 Most importantly, community members voiced that if habitat manipulation or
701 modification-based LSM would be pursued as part of mosquito control efforts, the
702 government should ensure the provision of alternative water sources. This demand
703 highlights the communities' concern over the potential negative impacts such
704 interventions could have on their daily lives, stressing the importance of mitigating
705 these effects through thoughtful planning and the establishment of support systems. It
706 is increasingly recognized that environmental management for malaria control must be
707 integrated with local development needs (Berlin Rubin *et al.*, 2020; Koenraad, 2021;
708 Hakizimana *et al.*, 2022). Our findings add to this by proving the importance of not only

709 addressing the public health aspects of malaria control but considering the broader
710 implications on community access to water, agricultural practices, and overall
711 economic well-being. Successful LSM interventions require a holistic understanding of
712 local ecosystems and socio-economic dynamics; ensuring that efforts to combat
713 malaria do not inadvertently compromise the resources upon which communities
714 depend.

715 Therefore, a trade-off between mosquito control measures and community use of
716 water sources can be significantly mitigated through better investment in water
717 infrastructure. Improving water infrastructure could create a "win-win" scenario by
718 simultaneously addressing malaria control and enhancing other areas of health, such
719 as Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH), while supporting economic livelihoods
720 (World Health Organization, 2023). By providing reliable and safe alternative water
721 sources, communities would be less dependent on natural habitats that serve as
722 mosquito breeding grounds, allowing for more effective LSM strategies without
723 compromising community needs (van den Berg *et al.*, 2018; Gowelo *et al.*, 2020).
724 Moreover, better water infrastructure can improve overall public health by reducing
725 waterborne diseases and providing essential resources for agriculture and livestock,
726 thus boosting local economies (Batterman *et al.*, 2009). Integrating LSM efforts with
727 broader development initiatives focused on enhancing water infrastructure would not
728 only facilitate sustainable malaria control but also promote long-term community well-
729 being and resilience (Whittaker and Smith, 2015; Hakizimana *et al.*, 2022).

730 While this study has been the first to extensively explore the interaction between
731 mosquito aquatic habitats and community needs in south-eastern Tanzania, it has
732 some limitations in the methodological approach. The study primarily collected data
733 through direct observations and FGDs with communities from selected villages,
734 purposely chosen for their observable use of water sources that also serve as mosquito
735 larval habitats. This approach was taken to facilitate understanding of the importance
736 of aquatic habitats for human activities would impact the acceptance of mosquito
737 control measures. However, by focusing on these specific settings, the study may have
738 overlooked areas where such habitats play a lesser role in the community's daily life.
739 Future research should therefore include a more diverse locations, especially those

740 where reliance on mosquito larval habitats for water is not a significant aspect for daily
741 living.

742 **Conclusions**

743 This study provides valuable insights into community perspectives on LSM for malaria
744 control and elimination efforts. Additionally, it shows the complexities that might arise
745 during the planning and implementation of LSM given the dual role of aquatic habitats
746 as both important community resources and breeding sites for malaria vectors. In
747 settings such as south-eastern Tanzania, where the dominant malaria vector, *An.*
748 *funestus*, primarily breeds in permanent and semi-permanent habitats such as river
749 streams, large pond and spring-fed pools, our study reveals a clear preference for
750 strategies like larviciding and habitat manipulation, which can more easily be aligned to
751 daily activities and have minimal disruption to local livelihoods. These findings
752 emphasize the importance of community engagement and the need for LSM strategies
753 to be both culturally and environmentally sensitive to achieve community acceptance
754 and sustainability. Furthermore, findings emphasize the need for balanced approaches
755 that respects community practices and environmental considerations. Indeed,
756 engaging communities in the design and implementation of LSM, along with providing
757 education on the safety and efficacy of such interventions, is vital to ensure these
758 strategies do not negatively impact local water resources. Finally, it is important to
759 consider the socio-economic and regulatory constraints, especially regarding
760 protected natural water sources. This calls for adaptable, community-informed
761 strategies that maximize public health benefits while preserving community well-being
762 and environmental integrity. Ultimately, vector control approaches should be designed
763 in a holistic manner, ensuring to integrate the needs, perspectives, and daily lives of the
764 communities it aims to protect.

765 **Acknowledgements**

766 We express our gratitude to the community leaders and residents in all the study
767 villages for granting us permission to carry out our work in their localities. We thank
768 Ramadhani Bofu, Christina Makungu, and Bosco Chinkonda, for advising the qualitative
769 aspects of this work. We also extend our thanks to the technicians and volunteers who
770 actively contributed to the successful execution of this comprehensive survey.

771 **Authors' contributions**

772 Conceptualization of study and design the research framework: FOO, NFK, FT, and MF.
773 Leading in producing the initial and subsequent drafts: NFK, and FT. Data collection:
774 NFK, KK, FT, LF, SK, and WM. Audio transcription: SK, AS, reviewing the transcripts NFK
775 and FT. Data analysis and interpretation of results: NFK, FT, FOO, and MF. Critical
776 reviewed the manuscript drafts: MF, FOO, HMF, FB, SM, BJM. Supervision throughout
777 the study period: HMF, FOO, FB, MF. All authors read and approved the final
778 manuscript.

779 **Funding**

780 This work was supported in whole by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation [Grant No.
781 INV-002138 to Ifakara Health Institute]. Under the grant conditions of the Foundation, a
782 Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Generic License has already been assigned to the
783 Author Accepted Manuscript version that might arise from this submission.

784

785 **Availability of data and material.**

786 Upon reasonable request

787 **Competing interests**

788 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

789

790 References

- 791 Batterman, S. *et al.* (2009) 'Sustainable control of water-related infectious diseases: a
792 review and proposal for interdisciplinary health-based systems research', *Environmental*
793 *health perspectives*, 117(7), pp. 1023–1032.
- 794 van den Berg, H. *et al.* (2018) 'Community-based malaria control in southern Malawi: a
795 description of experimental interventions of community workshops, house improvement
796 and larval source management', *Malaria Journal*, 17(1), p. 266. Available at:
797 [https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med15&A](https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med15&AN=30012147)
798 [N=30012147](https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med15&AN=30012147).
- 799 Berlin Rubin, N. *et al.* (2020) 'Process evaluation of a community-based microbial
800 larviciding intervention for malaria control in rural Tanzania', *International journal of*
801 *environmental research and public health*, 17(19), p. 7309.
- 802 Bhatt, S. *et al.* (2015) 'The effect of malaria control on Plasmodium falciparum in Africa
803 between 2000 and 2015', 526(7572), pp. 207–211. Available at:
804 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15535>.
- 805 Coetzee, M. and Fontenille, D. (2004) 'Advances in the study of Anopheles funestus, a
806 major vector of malaria in Africa', *Insect biochemistry and molecular biology*, 34(7), pp.
807 599–605.
- 808 Dambach, P. *et al.* (2019) 'Reduction of malaria vector mosquitoes in a large-scale
809 intervention trial in rural Burkina Faso using Bti based larval source management', *Malaria*
810 *Journal*, 18(1), p. 311. Available at:
811 [https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med16&A](https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med16&AN=31521176)
812 [N=31521176](https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med16&AN=31521176).
- 813 Derua, Y.A. *et al.* (2019) 'Bacterial larvicides used for malaria vector control in sub-Saharan
814 Africa: review of their effectiveness and operational feasibility', *Parasites & Vectors*, 12(1).
815 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-019-3683-5>.
- 816 Fillinger, U. *et al.* (2008) 'A tool box for operational mosquito larval control: preliminary
817 results and early lessons from the Urban Malaria Control Programme in Dar es Salaam,
818 Tanzania', *Malaria journal*, 7(1), pp. 1–25.
- 819 Fillinger, U. *et al.* (2009) 'Identifying the most productive breeding sites for malaria
820 mosquitoes in The Gambia', *Malaria journal*, 8(1), pp. 1–14.
- 821 Fillinger, U. and Lindsay, S.W. (2011) 'Larval source management for malaria control in
822 Africa: myths and reality', *Malaria Journal*, 10(1), p. 353. Available at:
823 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-10-353>.
- 824 Finda, M.F. *et al.* (2019) "'The mosquitoes are preparing to attack us": knowledge and
825 perceptions of communities in south-eastern Tanzania regarding mosquito swarms',
826 *Malaria journal*, 18(1), p. 56.

- 827 Geissbühler, Y. *et al.* (2009) 'Microbial larvicide application by a large-scale, community-
828 based program reduces malaria infection prevalence in urban Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania',
829 *PLoS ONE*, 4(3). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0005107>.
- 830 Gillies, M.T. and Coetzee, M. (1987) 'A supplement to the Anophelinae of Africa South of the
831 Sahara', *Publ S Afr Inst Med Res*, 55, pp. 1–143.
- 832 Gillies, M.T. and De Meillon, B. (1968) 'The Anophelinae of Africa south of the Sahara
833 (Ethiopian zoogeographical region).', *The Anophelinae of Africa south of the Sahara*
834 (*Ethiopian Zoogeographical Region*). [Preprint].
- 835 Govella, N.J. and Ferguson, H. (2012) 'Why use of interventions targeting outdoor biting
836 mosquitoes will be necessary to achieve malaria elimination', *Frontiers in Physiology*, 3.
837 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2012.00199>.
- 838 Gowelo, S. *et al.* (2020) 'Community factors affecting participation in larval source
839 management for malaria control in Chikwawa District, Southern Malawi', *Malaria Journal*,
840 19, pp. 1–11.
- 841 Gowelo, S. *et al.* (2023) 'Community Participation in Habitat Management and Larviciding
842 for the Control of Malaria Vectors in Southern Malawi', *The American Journal of Tropical*
843 *Medicine and Hygiene*, 108(1), p. 51.
- 844 Gowelo, S.A. (2020) 'A participatory approach for malaria control in southern Malawi:
845 Effects of the environment and community on larval source management'. Wageningen
846 University and Research.
- 847 Hakizimana, E. *et al.* (2022) 'Community-based control of malaria vectors using *Bacillus*
848 *thuringiensis* var. *israelensis* (Bti) in Rwanda', *International Journal of Environmental*
849 *Research and Public Health*, 19(11), p. 6699.
- 850 Hemingway, J. *et al.* (2016) 'Tools and strategies for malaria control and elimination: what
851 do we need to achieve a grand convergence in malaria?', *PLoS biology*, 14(3), p. e1002380.
- 852 Imbahale, S.S. *et al.* (2010) 'An exploratory survey of malaria prevalence and people's
853 knowledge, attitudes and practices of mosquito larval source management for malaria
854 control in western Kenya', *Acta Tropica*, 115(3), pp. 248–256. Available at:
855 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2010.04.005>.
- 856 Jacques Derek Charlwood (2020) *The Ecology of Malaria Vectors*, *Journal of Chemical*
857 *Information and Modeling*.
- 858 Kahamba, N.F. *et al.* (2022) 'Using ecological observations to improve malaria control in
859 areas where *Anopheles funestus* is the dominant vector', *Malaria Journal*, 21(1), pp. 1–15.
- 860 Kahamba, N.F. *et al.* (2024) 'Geospatial modelling of dry season habitats of the malaria
861 vector, *Anopheles funestus*, in south-eastern Tanzania', *Parasites & Vectors*, 17(1), p. 38.
- 862 Kaindoa, E.W. *et al.* (2017) 'Interventions that effectively target *Anopheles funestus*
863 mosquitoes could significantly improve control of persistent malaria transmission in

- 864 south-eastern Tanzania', *PLOS ONE*. Edited by B. Brooke, 12(5), p. e0177807. Available at:
865 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177807>.
- 866 Kandyata, A. *et al.* (2012) 'Impacts of *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *israelensis* and *Bacillus*
867 *sphaericus* insect larvicides on mosquito larval densities in Lusaka, Zambia', *Medical*
868 *Journal of Zambia*, 39(4), pp. 33–38.
- 869 Killeen, G.F., Seyoum, A. and Knols, B.G.J. (2004) 'Rationalizing Historical Successes of
870 Malaria Control in Africa in Terms of Mosquito Resource Availability Management'.
871 Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK3756/> (Accessed: 31 March 2024).
- 872 Koenraadt, C.J.M. (2021) 'Larval source management for malaria control: prospects for new
873 technologies and community involvement', in *Ecology and Control of Vector-borne*
874 *Diseases*. Wageningen Academic Publishers, pp. 683–693.
- 875 Lupenza, E.T. *et al.* (2021) 'Using pastoralist community knowledge to locate and treat dry-
876 season mosquito breeding habitats with pyriproxyfen to control *Anopheles gambiae* s.l. and
877 *Anopheles funestus* s.l. in rural Tanzania', *Parasitology Research*. [Preprint]. Available at:
878 [https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=emexc&A](https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=emexc&AN=2010123358)
879 [N=2010123358](https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=emexc&AN=2010123358).
- 880 Lwetoijera, D.W. *et al.* (2014) 'Increasing role of *Anopheles funestus* and *Anopheles*
881 *arabiensis* in malaria transmission in the Kilombero Valley, Tanzania', *Malaria journal*,
882 13(1), pp. 1–10.
- 883 Matowo, N.S. *et al.* (2017) 'Fine-scale spatial and temporal heterogeneities in insecticide
884 resistance profiles of the malaria vector, *Anopheles arabiensis* in rural south-eastern
885 Tanzania.', *Wellcome open research*, 2, p. 96. Available at:
886 <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.12617.1>.
- 887 Matowo, N.S. *et al.* (2021) 'An increasing role of pyrethroid-resistant *Anopheles funestus* in
888 malaria transmission in the Lake Zone, Tanzania', *Scientific reports*, 11(1), pp. 1–13.
- 889 Msugupakulya, B.J. *et al.* (2023) 'Changes in contributions of different *Anopheles* vector
890 species to malaria transmission in east and southern Africa from 2000 to 2022', *Parasites &*
891 *Vectors*, 16(1), p. 408.
- 892 Mvomero, H. ya wilaya ya (2023) *Siku ya USafi Kitaifa*.
- 893 Nambunga, I.H. *et al.* (2020) 'Aquatic habitats of the malaria vector *Anopheles funestus* in
894 rural south-eastern Tanzania', *Malaria Journal*, 19(1), pp. 1–11.
- 895 *NVivo - Lumivero* (no date). Available at: <https://lumivero.com/products/nvivo/> (Accessed:
896 10 November 2023).
- 897 Organization, W.H. (2013) 'Larval source management: a supplementary malaria vector
898 control measure: an operational manual'.
- 899 Peel, M.C., Finlayson, B.L. and McMahon, T.A. (2007) 'Updated world map of the Köppen-
900 Geiger climate classification', *Hydrology and earth system sciences*, 11(5), pp. 1633–1644.

- 901 Pinheiro, J. *et al.* (2019) 'R Core Team. 2019 linear and nonlinear mixed effects models. R
902 package version 3.1-141', Available at [http://CRAN.R-Project. Org/Package= Nlme](http://CRAN.R-project.org/Package=Nlme)
903 [Preprint].
- 904 R Core Team (2019) 'R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing'. Vienna,
905 Austria.
- 906 Rejmánková, E. *et al.* (2013) 'Ecology of larval habitats', *Anopheles mosquitoes-New*
907 *insights into malaria vectors*, pp. 397–446.
- 908 Russell, T.L. *et al.* (2011) 'Increased proportions of outdoor feeding among residual malaria
909 vector populations following increased use of insecticide-treated nets in rural Tanzania',
910 *Malaria Journal*, 10. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2875-10-80>.
- 911 Tarimo, F.S. *et al.* (2023) 'Community perception of the autodissemination of pyriproxyfen
912 for controlling malaria vectors in south-eastern Tanzania', *Malaria Journal*, 22(1), p. 333.
- 913 Tusting, L.S. *et al.* (2013) 'Mosquito larval source management for controlling malaria',
914 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* [Preprint], (8). Available at:
915 <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008923.pub2>.
- 916 Walker, K. and Lynch, M. (2007) 'Contributions of Anopheles larval control to malaria
917 suppression in tropical Africa: Review of achievements and potential', *Medical and*
918 *Veterinary Entomology*, 21(1), pp. 2–21. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2915.2007.00674.x)
919 [2915.2007.00674.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2915.2007.00674.x).
- 920 Whittaker, M. and Smith, C. (2015) 'Reimagining malaria: five reasons to strengthen
921 community engagement in the lead up to malaria elimination', *Malaria Journal*, 14(1), p.
922 410. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-015-0931-9>.
- 923 World Health Organisation (2021) *World malaria report 2021*. Available at:
924 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240040496> (Accessed: 26 January 2022).
- 925 World Health Organization (2022) *WHO Guidelines for malaria, 18 February 2022*. World
926 Health Organization.
- 927 World Health Organization (2023) *Burden of disease attributable to unsafe drinking-water,*
928 *sanitation and hygiene*. World Health Organization.
- 929
- 930