

1 Real-World Effectiveness of Deltamethrin-Clothianidin (FLUDORA FUSION) in Indoor 2 Residual Spraying in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Systematic Review Protocol

3 Moses Ocan^{1,2*}, Nakalembe Loyce^{1,3}¶, Kevin Ouma Ojiambo^{1,4}¶, Geoffrey Kinalwa², Alison
4 A. Kinengyere^{1,5}, Sam Nsobya⁶, Emmanuel Arinaitwe⁶, Henry Maweje⁶

5 Author affiliations

- 6 1. Africa Center for Systematic Reviews and Knowledge Translation, Makerere
7 University College of Health Sciences
- 8 2. Department of Pharmacology, School of Biomedical Sciences, College of Health
9 Sciences, Makerere University
- 10 3. Department of Pharmacology, College of Health Sciences, Soroti University, Soroti,
11 Uganda
- 12 4. Clinical Epidemiology Unit, Department of Medicine, College of Health Sciences,
13 Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda
- 14 5. Albert Cook Library, College of Health Sciences, Makerere University, Kampala,
15 Uganda
- 16 6. Infectious Disease Research Collaboration (IDRC), P. O. Box 7475 Kampala, Uganda

17 ***Correspondence:** Dr. Moses Ocan, Africa Center for Systematic Reviews and Knowledge
18 Translation, Makerere University College of Health Sciences & Department of
19 Pharmacology, School of Biomedical Sciences, College of Health Sciences, Makerere
20 University, P.O Box 7072, Kampala, Uganda. Email: moses.ocan@mak.ac.ug

21 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

22 **Funding**

23 This study is supported by Environmental Science ZA PTY Limited ("Envu")
24 Johannesburg, South Africa. The funder has no role in the design, conduct and publication
25 of the findings of this review.

26 **Competing interests**

27 None declared

28 **Data Availability**

29 The data from this study will be publicly available from the published studies included in
30 the review

31 **ABSTRACT**

32 **Background:** Indoor residual spraying (IRS) is a core insecticide-based vector control tool
33 employed in most malaria-affected settings globally. However, mosquito vectors have
34 developed resistance to nearly all the insecticides currently used in IRS. This has
35 necessitated a transition to new classes of insecticides from mostly using
36 Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) and pyrethroids from 1997 to 2010, to carbamates
37 from 2011 and organophosphates from 2013. In addition, other vector control measures
38 like the use of long-lasting insecticide-treated bed nets (LLINs) have also been employed
39 for malaria control. Despite the implementation of these mosquito vector control
40 interventions, malaria remains a disease of public health concern especially in sub-Saharan
41 Africa which bears over 90% of the disease burden. This review will thus collate evidence
42 on the effectiveness of IRS for malaria control in sub-Saharan Africa.

43 **Methods and analysis:** The systematic review will be done following *a priori* criteria
44 developed using PRISMA guidelines. Articles will be obtained through a search of Medline
45 via PubMed, Scopus, and Embase databases. The Mesh terms and Boolean operators
46 (“AND,” “OR”) will be used in the article search. Additionally, websites of malaria research
47 institutions will be searched. Article search will be done by two independent librarians
48 (AAK and RS). All identified articles will be transferred to Epi-reviewer v6.15.1.0 software.
49 Article screening and data abstraction will be done in duplicate by four reviewers (KO, LN,
50 GK and MO) and any further disagreements will be resolved through discussion and
51 consensus. Data analysis will be done using STATA v17.0. Heterogeneity in the articles will
52 be assessed using the I² statistic. Publication bias will be assessed using a funnel plot.

53 **Results:** The findings of this review will help generate evidence on the effectiveness of
54 indoor residual spraying using WHO pre-qualified insecticides in malaria control in sub-
55 Saharan Africa.

56 This protocol was registered in PROSPERO (<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/>)
57 registration number CRD42024517119

58 **Key Words:** *Indoor residual Spraying; insecticides; Malaria, Vector control; Sub-Saharan*
59 *Africa; Systematic Review; Meta-Analysis; Protocol*

60 **INTRODUCTION**

61 Indoor residual spraying (IRS) is one of the current WHO-recommended insecticide-based
62 vector control strategies which is intended to reduce and, ultimately, interrupt malaria
63 transmission (1). According to WHO, IRS is the application of a long-lasting, residual
64 insecticide to potential malaria vector resting surfaces such as internal walls, eaves and

65 ceilings of all houses or structures (1). Indoor residual spraying aims at i) reducing the
66 vector's lifespan to less than the time it takes for the malaria sporozoites to develop, ii)
67 reducing vector density by immediate killing, and iii) reducing human–vector contact
68 through a repellent effect, thereby reducing the number of mosquitoes that enter sprayed
69 rooms (1). In 2010 and 2013, approximately 185 and 124 million people were protected by
70 the IRS representing 6% and 4% of the global population at risk respectively (1). In the WHO
71 African region, the number of people protected by the IRS increased from 10 million in
72 2005 to 78 million in 2010 (1).

73 Some of the commonly recommended classes of insecticides used as active ingredients for
74 IRS include pyrethroids (such as alpha-cypermethrin, deltamethrin, lambda-cyhalothrin),
75 organophosphates (e.g. malathion, pirimiphos-methyl), carbamates (i.e. bendiocarb and
76 propoxur), neonicotinoids such as clothianidin and organochlorines e.g.
77 (dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane, DDT) (2). These insecticide classes have different
78 residual activity, cost and efficacy in the field (3). Among these, pyrethroids are the most
79 frequently used insecticides due to their relatively low toxicity to humans, fast knockdown
80 effect and cost-effectiveness (2, 4, 5).

81 The IRS is however affected by the high costs, complex implementation logistics, and
82 community acceptance (6). Additionally, the emergence of resistance to most insecticides
83 used for IRS has also been reported in most sub-Saharan African countries (7, 8).
84 Resistance of malaria vectors to pyrethroids and other classes of insecticides is widespread
85 in sub-Saharan Africa (5, 7, 8). Resistance to IRS is driven by selection pressure placed on
86 resistance genes, heavy reliance on one class of insecticides for vector control and
87 continued use of the same chemical classes as agricultural pesticides (2).

88 Several strategies have been used to delay the development of resistance to the already
89 existing insecticides including; regularly changing insecticides (rotations), use of a
90 combination of insecticides with different modes of action, deployment of insecticides of
91 different modes of action in neighbouring geographical areas (mosaic spraying) and co-
92 deployment of different interventions in the same place (8, 9). Combination insecticide
93 mixtures have the dual potential to improve malaria vector control in addition to managing
94 resistance (10). One of the recently WHO-approved insecticide mixtures is a formulation of
95 a wettable powder product containing 500 g/kg of clothianidin and 62.5 g/kg of
96 deltamethrin (Fludora® Fusion) (10).

97 Despite the widespread application of indoor residual spraying and other mosquito vector
98 control measures, malaria remains a disease of public concern especially in sub-Sahara
99 Africa. This is further worsened by emerging and widespread resistance to insecticides
100 used in IRS and bed nets. The introduction of interventions such as combination insecticide
101 preparations could potentially improve the effectiveness of insecticide-based mosquito
102 vector control interventions including IRS. Individual studies have assessed the efficacy of
103 insecticides used in IRS in most malaria-affected regions. With malaria prevalence
104 remaining high in sub-Saharan Africa there is a need to establish the real-world
105 effectiveness of recently approved combination and single insecticide preparations used
106 in IRS. However, this remains unknown in most high malaria endemic settings of sub-
107 Saharan Africa which affects decision-making on insecticide rotation strategies for
108 mitigating resistance development. This review will collate context-specific evidence on
109 the efficacy of WHO pre-qualified combination and single-agent insecticide preparations
110 in indoor residual spraying for malaria control in sub-Sahara Africa. This will help inform

111 policy and decision-making on insecticide rotation strategies in the fight against
112 widespread insecticide resistance development.

113 **Rationale**

114 Recently, WHO pre-qualified insecticides for IRS including FLUDORA FUSION
115 (Deltamethrin-Clothianidin), Clothianidin, and Broflanilide. Together with other
116 insecticides their use in insecticide-based interventions has contributed to approximately
117 78% of the reduction in malaria burden in sub-Saharan Africa since 2000 (11). However, the
118 implementation of the IRS is currently faced with the challenge of the emergence and
119 spread of insecticide resistance (11). The emergence of insecticide resistance
120 in *Anopheles* mosquitoes in sub-Saharan Africa has implications for vector control
121 interventions. This has led to the transition to different classes of insecticides used in IRS.
122 Several reviews have recently synthesized evidence on the effectiveness of IRS on malaria
123 transmission however, these have several limitations ((12-14). Most of these reviews
124 focused on measuring effectiveness with the majority assessing only the effect of IRS in
125 reducing the malaria burden (12-14). A review by Giming et al., (2023) focused only on
126 reactive IRS application in the control of malaria (13). However, malaria remains prevalent
127 in most countries in sub-Saharan Africa which commonly use proactive IRS application (13).
128 Another systematic review by Pryce et al, (2022) focused on the effect on malaria of
129 additionally implementing IRS, using non-pyrethroid-like or pyrethroid-like insecticides, in
130 communities currently using ITNs, hence results may not directly provide evidence on the
131 actual effect of IRS when used alone (14). In a review by Zhou et al., (2022), pyrethroids
132 were identified to show the greatest performance in malaria control while Pryce et al.,
133 2022 showed that adding non-pyrethroid insecticide to bed nets had the greatest effect

134 on malaria burden. The review by Pryce et al., (2022) did not find a significant effect of
135 adding pyrethroid insecticide to bed nets in malaria control. Additionally, a review by Zhou
136 et al., 2022 included only studies that used DDT, methylcarbamate and primiparous-methyl
137 insecticides only (12). There is thus still an evidence gap on the effectiveness of other WHO
138 pre-qualified insecticides for IRS including combination products. Additionally, the WHO
139 recently approved combination/mixed insecticide preparations for use in IRS such as
140 Fludora fusion a combination of Clothianidin-Deltamethrin and single insecticide
141 preparations including Broflanilide and Clothianidin. However, no review has evaluated the
142 available evidence of their impact on the malaria burden in sub-Saharan Africa. The current
143 review therefore seeks to collate evidence on the efficacy of recent WHO pre-qualified
144 single and combination insecticide preparations used in IRS for malaria control in sub-
145 Saharan Africa. The review will focus on the IRS effect on mosquito vector-related
146 outcomes such as density, mortality/susceptibility, knockdown rate, resistance genes and
147 malaria indices in communities.

148 **How the intervention might work**

149 Indoor residual spraying is one of the preventive measures aimed at eliminating malaria
150 globally. It involves the use of insecticides which reduce the number and longevity of
151 mosquito vectors, thereby decreasing malaria transmission (13). Compared to long-lasting
152 insecticide nets which provide a barrier for mosquito vectors, IRS acts in multiple ways
153 including repellent, reducing malaria transmission and vector mortality. Furthermore, the
154 current introduction of combination insecticide preparation improved the efficacy and
155 potentially reduced the risk of widespread resistance development. Resistance to
156 insecticides remains the greatest risk to IRS especially in high burden settings common in

157 sub-Saharan Africa. The introduction of new insecticide classes in addition to combination
158 agents could potentially be responsible for the recent gains in malaria control.

159 **Primary review question**

160 1. What is the real-world effectiveness of Deltamethrin-Clothianidin (FLUDORA
161 FUSION) insecticide used in indoor residual spraying in sub-Saharan Africa?

162 **Secondary review question (s)**

163 1. What is the prevalence of mosquito vector genotypic resistance to combination
164 and single-agent insecticides in sub-Saharan Africa?

165 2. What is the prevalence of kdr resistance genes among mosquito vectors in settings
166 using combination and single-agent insecticides in sub-Saharan Africa?

167 3. What are the species of malaria mosquito vectors in settings using combination and
168 single-agent insecticides in sub-Saharan Africa?

169 4. What factors are the factors associated with the real-world effectiveness of
170 combination and single-agent insecticides used in indoor residual spraying in sub-
171 Sahara Africa?

172 **MATERIALS & METHODS**

173 **Protocol Registration**

174 We shall follow Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis
175 Guidelines (15) to perform this systematic review. This protocol is written according to
176 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-

177 P) (16) and was registered in PROSPERO (<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/>) with
 178 registration number CRD42024517119

179 **Table 1: Key elements of the systematic review question**

Element of review question	Description
P: Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All people living in malaria-affected settings of sub-Saharan Africa. • All malaria mosquito vectors in malaria-affected settings in sub-Saharan Africa.
I/E: Exposure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of combination insecticide Deltamethrin-Clothianidin in indoor residual spraying
C: Comparator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
O: Outcome	<p><u>Primary outcome</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real-world effectiveness of Deltamethrin-Clothianidin in indoor residual spraying <p><u>Secondary outcomes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mosquito vector knock-down rate • Prevalence of kdr gene • Mosquito vector mortality rate • Type and class of insecticide used in IRS. • Residuality of the insecticide on different wall surfaces

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mosquito vector insecticide susceptibility (phenotypic resistance) • Mosquito vector insecticide resistance genes (molecular resistance) • Mosquito vector (s) (species) • Community acceptability and feasibility • Nature of indoor residual spraying (proactive, reactive, and focal IRS)
Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Randomized control trials (RCTs), case-control studies, Cohort studies, Interrupted time series, Before-and-after design, and cross-section studies/surveys.
Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studies done from 1990 to date

180 **Eligibility criteria**

181 **Inclusion**

182 • Articles that report the impact of IRS using WHO pre-qualified insecticides.

183 • Articles published in peer-reviewed journals.

184 • Articles published in all languages (no language restriction)

185 **Exclusion**

186 • Articles that do not segregate the effect of multiple mosquito vector control
187 measures on malaria burden in sub-Saharan African countries.

188 • Articles that report on vector insecticide susceptibility outside the context of the

189 IRS

- 190 • Articles not reporting ethical review and approval.

191 **Identification of Primary Studies**

192 An experienced librarian (AAK) and the principal investigator (OM) will independently
193 search for the articles from established databases. The articles from two independent
194 searches will then be merged in EndNote software and duplicates removed.

195 **Information Sources**

196 Articles published in peer-reviewed journals reporting on the effectiveness of indoor
197 residual spraying (IRS) vector intervention for malaria control will be searched from;
198 Google Scholar, and MEDLINE via PubMed, Scopus, and Embase databases. The search will
199 cover a period from 1990 to date and will include sub-Saharan African countries.
200 Furthermore, we will conduct a hand search on institutional websites for any relevant grey
201 literature. We will also screen through reference lists of included studies for additional
202 eligible articles.

203 **Search strategy**

204 The scoping literature search was finished on January 18, 2024 however, the full article
205 search has not yet been carried out. To find relevant articles based on PICOST, the search
206 terms listed below will be used in the full article search. Boolean operator "OR" will be
207 used to combine terms that relate to the same PICOST element, while "AND" will be used
208 to join terms that relate to separate concepts or PICO categories.

209 **Search terms.**

210 The following search terms will be used; ‘Fludora Fusion’, ‘deltamethrin’, ‘bendiocarb’,
211 ‘primiphos-methyl’, ‘DDT’, ‘dichlorodiphenyl-trichloroethane’, ‘malathion’, ‘temephos;,
212 ‘fenitrothion’, ‘cypermethrin’, ‘chlothianidin’, ‘insecticide’, ‘Actellic’, ‘chlorfenapyr’,
213 ‘propoxur’, ‘pyrethroid’, ‘neonicotinoid’, ‘Sumishield’, ‘*Anopheles gambiae s.l.*’, ‘*Anopheles*
214 *funestus*’, ‘*Anopheles arabiensis*’, ‘*Anopheles stephensi*’, ‘*Anopheles pharoensis*’, ‘mosquito’,
215 ‘malaria vector mosquito’, ‘mosquitoes’, ‘susceptibility’, ‘efficacy’, ‘sensitivity’, ‘knock-
216 down’, ‘mortality’, ‘delayed mortality’, ‘residuality’, ‘residual life’, ‘Indoor residual spraying’,
217 ‘IRS’, ‘spray technique’, ‘malaria transmission’, ‘season’, ‘rainfall season’, ‘rebound malaria
218 epidemics’, ‘malaria epidemics’, ‘insecticide resistance’, ‘insecticide tolerance’, ‘resistance’,
219 ‘resistance genes’, ‘molecular marker’, ‘resistance alleles’, ‘sub-Saharan Africa’. The search
220 string will be developed using the above terms.

221 **Data Management and Study Selection**

222 For the initial management of references from search results, EndNote v20 software will
223 be used. The articles will then be exported to Epi-reviewer v6.15.1.0 software. The articles
224 will then be screened in duplicate using predetermined eligibility criteria. The screening
225 will be done independently in duplicate by the review team (MO, GK, KOO and LN) in EPPI-
226 Reviewer v6.15.1.0, using a screening tool developed *a priori* and piloted using 10% of the
227 search yield. Kappa agreement of 80% will be used and any disagreements between the
228 reviewers resolved through discussion and consensus. Any further disagreements will be
229 referred to the tiebreaker (OM).

230 **Data Abstraction and Coding**

231 The data abstraction tool will be created in Microsoft Excel spreadsheet 2007 and piloted
232 using 10% of the eligible studies. The final tool will then be uploaded in EPPI-Reviewer
233 v6.15.1.0. The coding process will be carried out independently in pairs by research team
234 members (MO, GK, KOO and LN). Kappa agreement of 80% will be used and any
235 disagreements resolved through discussion and consensus. The data will later be validated
236 for quality control by an independent senior reviewer (OM) to ensure completeness and
237 correctness.

238 Data Items

239 The following data categories will be abstracted: administrative information (author, year
240 of publication, DOI, country/region, funding source), methods (study design, population,
241 sample size), and results (insecticide efficacy, resistance, knockdown effect, susceptibility)
242 (Table 2).

243 **Table 2: Review results items/areas**

Item	Description
1. Administrative data	This will collect data to identify the articles including author, citation, funding, and country
2. Method	Data will be collected on; study design, insecticide (name, formulation, and strength), combination, season, susceptibility procedure used, vector control interventions, population

3. Results	Malaria incidence, malaria prevalence, insecticide efficacy, susceptibility (phenotypic resistance), genotypic resistance, vector mortality and knockdown effect
4. Setting	Countries in sub-Saharan Africa

244 Outcomes and Prioritization

245 Dependent variable

- 246 • Prevalence of malaria in communities following indoor residual spraying (IRS) using
247 Deltamethrin-Clothianidin, and other insecticides for mosquito vector control in
248 sub-Saharan Africa.

249 Independent variables

- 250 • Mosquito vectors knockdown effect.
- 251 • Residuality (residual efficacy).
- 252 • Types of mosquito vectors
- 253 • Mosquito vector insecticide molecular resistance genes
- 254 • Insecticides used in indoor residual spraying for mosquito vector control in sub-
255 Sahara Africa.
- 256 • Type of insecticide (single or combination compound).
- 257 • Factors associated with the efficacy of insecticides in indoor residual spraying in
258 SSA.

259 **Risk of bias assessment**

260 Two research team members (MO, GK, LN and KOO) will independently assess the
261 methodological quality of included observational studies using a modified version of the
262 Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) (17). The tool includes seven domains rated from 0 (high
263 risk of bias) to 3 (low risk of bias); the mean of the domains is considered to result in a
264 score between 0 and 3, with a higher score indicating a lower risk of bias. Consensus on
265 any disagreements in the quality assessment will be reached after discussion and
266 consultation with an independent senior reviewer.

267 For randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and non-randomized trials of interventions, we will
268 use the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool and Risk of Bias in Non-Randomized Studies - of
269 Interventions (ROBINS-I) tool to assess the potential risk of bias (18-20). Bias is measured
270 as a rating (high, low, or unclear) for individual elements from five domains (selection bias,
271 attrition bias, performance bias, reporting bias, detection bias, and other biases such as
272 conflict of interest). In addition, the tools provide for the assessment of concerns for the
273 applicability of the study to the systematic review which will also be assessed. The Kappa
274 agreement of 80% will be used and any disagreement resolved through discussion and
275 consensus. Any further unresolved disagreements will be referred to the tiebreaker (MO).

276 **Publication bias**

277 The included articles will be evaluated for publication bias using the asymmetry of funnel
278 plots and Egger's test, as appropriate (21, 22). These rank-based data augmentation
279 techniques are reliable for detecting publication bias caused by missing data/studies. We
280 will create funnel plots and use their symmetry to determine the likelihood of publication

281 bias among the articles included in the review. In the absence of missing studies, the
282 scatter plot looks like a symmetrical inverted funnel with a wide base and a narrow top.
283 The presence of large "holes" or asymmetry in the plot suggests publication bias, but this
284 could also be explained by other factors such as study heterogeneity.

285 **Assessment of strength and confidence of cumulative evidence**

286 A modified GRADE approach will be used to evaluate the overall strength of evidence. We
287 will assign certainty of evidence ratings for the aforementioned outcome variables using a
288 method developed by the GRADE Working Group (23) and we will do this in duplicate. Any
289 disagreements will be resolved through consensus

290 **Heterogeneity**

291 The I^2 statistic will be used to determine the degree of statistical heterogeneity in the
292 included articles. The I^2 statistic will display the percentage (%) of heterogeneity due to
293 between-study variation (24-26). Heterogeneity will be classified as low ($I^2=25\%$), moderate
294 ($I^2=50\%$), or high ($I^2>75\%$). Subgroup analysis will be performed on articles with low to
295 moderate heterogeneity (27).

296 **Criteria for determination of independent findings**

297 Dependency may arise at the study or intra-study levels. At the study level, the most
298 complete and latest report, where available, will be selected in case of multiple reports of
299 a single study. However, an integrative method will be used to treat the data from all of
300 these reports as a single case if they cover various sub-groups or outcomes (28). Each
301 meta-analysis will contain only one effect at the intra-study level from every investigation.

302 Studies that report more than one effect for distinct outcome types will be synthesized
303 independently. Before including "synthetic effects" in a meta-analysis, we will use them to
304 create a sample-weighted average in cases when studies report numerous dependent
305 effects for a given outcome type.

306 **Missing data**

307 The study authors will be contacted if there is missing data in the published articles. When
308 the author cannot be contacted or there is no response from the authors, we will report
309 the study's characteristics but will exclude it from the meta-analysis.

310 **Data Analysis and synthesis**

311 Data analysis for this review will be performed using STATA v17. Standardized mean
312 differences (SMDs) for continuous outcome variables and odds ratios (OR) or prevalence
313 ratios (PR) for dichotomous outcome variables will be analyzed separately. Effect sizes will
314 be statistically pooled using inverse variance weighted random effects meta-analysis (29,
315 30). The random effects model will be used to calculate the pooled mean effect size as the
316 effect size is likely to vary between the different studies (30). Additionally, Random effects
317 models enable statistical inferences to be made to a population of studies other than those
318 included in the meta-analysis (31).

319 Pooled effects will be expressed using a relevant metric, such as a percentage change in
320 odds or a mean difference measured in natural units of outcome. In studies where multiple
321 effect sizes are reported from the same sample the mean of the combined effect sizes will
322 be calculated. In cases where studies use overlapping samples, an overall estimate will be

323 calculated and those that report effect sizes from independent subgroups, each subgroup
324 will be treated as a separate sample in the meta-analysis.

325 The synthesis will be presented in the form of a summary of findings tables, simple graphs,
326 and forest plots. This will follow the format of the Cochrane Consumer and Communication
327 Review Group (32). We will describe the included articles, group them based on the study
328 design and type of intervention, organize, and tabulate the results to identify patterns and
329 convert the results into a common descriptive format. These will take the form of outcome
330 data tables, simple graphs, and forest plots, as appropriate. These will be incorporated
331 into the summary of findings tables, which will inform the syntheses for dissemination. We
332 will therefore use both narrative and quantitative synthesis.

333 **Sensitivity analysis**

334 The sensitivity analysis will be performed by removing studies from the meta-analysis one
335 at a time to determine whether the meta-analysis results are sensitive to any individual
336 study (33). We will also investigate the sensitivity of findings to the level of bias (low risk,
337 some concerns, and high risk).

338 **Ethics and Dissemination**

339 Ethical approval is not required for this systematic review and meta-analysis as only a
340 secondary analysis of data publicly available in scientific databases will be conducted. The
341 results of this review will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.
342 Additionally, the findings will be presented at relevant conferences.

343 **DISCUSSION**

344 The review will generate findings on the effectiveness of indoor residual spraying for
345 mosquito vector control. The prevalence of malaria in communities following the
346 implementation of the IRS will be reported in this review. Additionally, we shall report on
347 the extent of resistance to WHO pre-qualified insecticides including combination
348 preparations used in IRS for mosquito vector control in sub-Sahara Africa. The prevalence
349 of molecular markers of insecticide resistance among mosquito vectors in SSA will also be
350 reported. We shall also report the factors associated with the effectiveness of indoor
351 residual spraying (IRS) mosquito vector intervention for malaria control in SSA.

352 This study will systematically collate the evidence available on the effectiveness of WHO
353 pre-qualified insecticides used in indoor residual spraying for malaria mosquito vector
354 control in sub-Saharan Africa. Despite the long-term use of IRS for malaria control, there
355 is limited information on the effectiveness of this vector intervention especially in the
356 presence of other interventions such as LLINs. By collating information about the
357 knockdown effect, susceptibility, residuality (residual efficacy) and moderating factors like
358 types of mosquito vectors, molecular resistance among malaria mosquito vectors, types
359 of insecticides used for IRS and other factors associated with the efficacy of insecticides
360 used in indoor residual spraying in SSA; the findings from this study will provide guidance
361 on the selection of insecticides for use in IRS. This is critical especially due to the current
362 stalling of malaria eradication efforts in most malaria-affected countries.

363 The effectiveness of mosquito vector control interventions including IRS and LLINs is
364 threatened by the reported emergence and spread of insecticide resistance. This is
365 especially the case as evidenced by the current resurgence of malaria especially in sub-
366 Saharan Africa despite the implementation of multiple vector control interventions. Thus,

367 quality evidence is needed to guide the selection of insecticides to use in mosquito vector
368 control interventions such as IRS and LLINs, especially in high malaria-burdened settings.

369 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

370 In this review there is no language restriction hence all articles published in all languages
371 will be included if they are eligible. We shall use the GRADE Framework to assess the
372 strength and confidence of commutative evidence. The study evaluates the real-world
373 effectiveness of Deltamethrin-Clothianidin (FLUDORA FUSION) insecticide used in indoor
374 residual spraying in sub-Sahara Africa as an intervention for Malaria control in sub-Saharan
375 Africa hence any findings not in the context of IRS but reporting outcomes related to the
376 use of insecticides will not be considered this will enable pure assessment of the effect of
377 IRS. The review is limited to studies conducted in sub-Saharan Africa and will not account
378 for evidence in studies conducted in other malaria-affected countries

379 **Amendments**

380 This protocol may be subject to amendments in case of any issues arising in the due course
381 of the review process, should such adjustments be made, they will be reported in the
382 review manuscript and published as deviations from the protocol.

383 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

384 We would like to thank the team from Infectious Disease Collaboration (IDRC) and Africa
385 Centre for Systematic Reviews and Knowledge Translation, Makerere University College
386 of Health Sciences for their assistance in critically reviewing the content of the protocol.

387 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

388 Conceptualization of the study was done by (MO, NL, KOO). MO, NL, SN, EA, HM and KOO
389 drafted the protocol, Critical review (MO, NL, KOO, AAK, RA, KG, SN, EA & HM), and
390 approval of the final version (MO, NL, KOO, AAK, RA, KG, SN, EA & HM).

391 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

392 **S1:** PRISMA_P checklist

393 **REFERENCES**

- 394 1. World Health Organization. Indoor residual spraying: an operational manual for
395 indoor residual spraying (IRS) for malaria transmission control and elimination: World
396 Health Organization; 2015.
- 397 2. Organization. WH. Global Malaria Programme. Global plan for insecticide resistance
398 management in malaria vectors. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2012.
- 399 3. Tangena J-AA, Hendriks CM, Devine M, Tamaro M, Trett AE, Williams I, et al.
400 Indoor residual spraying for malaria control in sub-Saharan Africa 1997 to 2017: an adjusted
401 retrospective analysis. *Malaria journal*. 2020;19(1):1-15.
- 402 4. Mint Mohamed Lemine A, Ould Lemrabott MA, Niang EHA, Basco LK, Bogreau H,
403 Faye O, et al. Pyrethroid resistance in the major malaria vector *Anopheles arabiensis* in
404 Nouakchott, Mauritania. *Parasites & vectors*. 2018;11(1):1-8.
- 405 5. Abeku TA, Helinski ME, Kirby MJ, Ssekitooleko J, Bass C, Kyomuhangi I, et al.
406 Insecticide resistance patterns in Uganda and the effect of indoor residual spraying with
407 bendiocarb on *kdr* L1014S frequencies in *Anopheles gambiae* ss. *Malaria Journal*. 2017;16:1-
408 11.
- 409 6. Epstein A, Maiteki-Sebuguzi C, Namuganga JF, Nankabirwa JI, Gonahasa S, Opigo J,
410 et al. Resurgence of malaria in Uganda despite sustained indoor residual spraying and
411 repeated long lasting insecticidal net distributions. *PLOS Global Public Health*.
412 2022;2(9):e0000676.
- 413 7. Coleman M, Hemingway J, Gleave KA, Wiebe A, Gething PW, Moyes CL. Developing
414 global maps of insecticide resistance risk to improve vector control. *Malaria journal*.
415 2017;16:1-9.
- 416 8. Organization WH. Global plan for insecticide resistance management in malaria
417 vectors: World Health Organization; 2012.
- 418 9. Syme T, Fongnikin A, Todjinou D, Govoetchan R, Gbegbo M, Rowland M, et al.
419 Which indoor residual spraying insecticide best complements standard pyrethroid long-
420 lasting insecticidal nets for improved control of pyrethroid resistant malaria vectors? *PloS*
421 *one*. 2021;16(1):e0245804.
- 422 10. Fongnikin A, Houeto N, Agbevo A, Odjo A, Syme T, N'Guessan R, et al. Efficacy of
423 Fludora® Fusion (a mixture of deltamethrin and clothianidin) for indoor residual spraying
424 against pyrethroid-resistant malaria vectors: laboratory and experimental hut evaluation.
425 *Parasites & Vectors*. 2020;13:1-11.

- 426 11. Kafy HT, Ismail BA, Mnzava AP, Lines J, Abdin MSE, Eltahir JS, et al. Impact of
427 insecticide resistance in *Anopheles arabiensis* on malaria incidence and prevalence in
428 Sudan and the costs of mitigation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
429 2017;114(52):E11267-E75.
- 430 12. Zhou Y, Zhang W-X, Tembo E, Xie M-Z, Zhang S-S, Wang X-R, et al. Effectiveness of
431 indoor residual spraying on malaria control: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
432 *Infectious Diseases of Poverty*. 2022;11(04):29-42.
- 433 13. Gimnig JE, Steinhardt LC, Awolola TS, Impoinvil D, Zohdy S, Lindblade KA. Reducing
434 Malaria Transmission through Reactive Indoor Residual Spraying: A Systematic Review.
435 *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2023:tpmd220745-tpmd.
- 436 14. Pryce J, Medley N, Choi L. Indoor residual spraying for preventing malaria in
437 communities using insecticide-treated nets. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
438 2022(1).
- 439 15. Page MA-O, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al.
440 PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting
441 systematic reviews. 2021(1756-1833 (Electronic)).
- 442 16. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
443 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015
444 statement. *Systematic Reviews*. 2015;4(1):1.
- 445 17. Wells G. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of
446 nonrandomised studies in meta-analysis. 2004.
- 447 18. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The
448 Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Bmj*. 2011;343.
- 449 19. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al.
450 ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *bmj*.
451 2016;355.
- 452 20. Thomson H, Craig P, Hilton-Boon M, Campbell M, Katikireddi SV. Applying the
453 ROBINS-I tool to natural experiments: an example from public health. *Systematic reviews*.
454 2018;7(1):1-12.
- 455 21. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and
456 adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. 2000(0006-341X (Print)).
- 457 22. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Schneider M, Minder C, Minder C.
458 Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. 1997(0959-8138 (Print)).
- 459 23. Schünemann HJ, Cuello C, Akl EA, Mustafa RA, Meerpohl JJ, Thayer K, et al. GRADE
460 guidelines: 18. How ROBINS-I and other tools to assess risk of bias in nonrandomized
461 studies should be used to rate the certainty of a body of evidence. 2013(1878-5921
462 (Electronic)).
- 463 24. Higgins JP. Commentary: Heterogeneity in meta-analysis should be expected and
464 appropriately quantified. 2009(1464-3685 (Electronic)).
- 465 25. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics
466 in medicine*. 2002;21(11):1539-58.
- 467 26. Borenstein M, Cooper H, Hedges L, Valentine J. Heterogeneity in meta-analysis. *The
468 handbook of research synthesis and meta-analysis*. 2019;3:453-70.
- 469 27. Huedo-Medina TB, Sánchez-Meca J, Marín-Martínez F, Botella J. Assessing
470 heterogeneity in meta-analysis: Q statistic or I² index? *Psychological methods*.
471 2006;11(2):193.

- 472 28. López-López JA-O, Page MJ, Lipsey MW, Higgins JPT. Dealing with effect size
473 multiplicity in systematic reviews and meta-analyses. LID - 10.1002/jrsm.1310 [doi]. (1759-
474 2887 (Electronic)).
- 475 29. Hunter JE, Schmidt FL. *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in*
476 *research findings*; Sage; 2004.
- 477 30. Gegenfurtner A. Comparing Two Handbooks of Meta-Analysis: Review of Hunter &
478 Schmidt, *Methods of Meta-Analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings*, and
479 Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, and Rothstein, *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. Springer; 2011.
- 480 31. Basu A. An Introduction to Meta-Analysis. *A Guide to the Scientific Career: Virtues,*
481 *Communication, Research and Academic Writing*. 2019:615-38.
- 482 32. Ryan R. Cochrane Consumers and Communication Review Group. 'Cochrane
483 Consumers and Communication Review Group: data synthesis and analysis'. 2013.
- 484 33. Copas J, Shi JQ. Meta-analysis, funnel plots and sensitivity analysis. *Biostatistics*.
485 2000;1(3):247-62.

486