

1 **Exploring measures to increase detection of malaria cases through reactive case detection**
2 **in a Southern Province of Zambia-like Setup: A modelling study**

3 Chilochibi Chiziba^{1*}, Sheetal Silal^{1,2}

4

5 ¹ Modelling and Simulation Hub, Africa, Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Cape
6 Town, Cape Town, South Africa

7 ² Centre for Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, Oxford University, Oxford, United
8 Kingdom

9 * To whom correspondence should be addressed: chzchi003@myuct.ac.za

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 **Introduction**

33 In Zambia, malaria prevalence varies spatially, posing challenges for intervention strategies.
34 Asymptomatic and clinical carriers not accessing healthcare further complicate efforts,
35 necessitating reactive case detection (RCD) to target undetected infections. However, operational
36 hurdles, such as resource shortages and logistical complexities—including shortages of
37 community health workers (CHWs), difficulties reaching residents, and limitations in malaria
38 rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs)—hinder RCD’s effectiveness. Identifying effective improvement
39 measures given circumstances that may lead to deficient intervention outcomes may improve the
40 situation.

41 **Methods**

42 A mathematical model of malaria transmission conforming to Zambia’s low transmission areas
43 defined as areas with an incidence of fewer than 200 malaria cases per 1,000 population per year
44 was developed to simulate RCD using parameters and data from published articles. We explored
45 the impact of literature-identified challenges on RCD performance in malaria detection and
46 potential strategies to enhance detection rates. The examined factors and improvement measures
47 included increasing CHWs, adjusting reaction time, RDT sensitivity, and implementing focal
48 mass drug administration (fMDA).

49 **Results**

50 Simulation findings suggest that a shortage of CHWs and limited availability of RDTs have the
51 highest negative impact on RCD compared to other challenges. In scenarios where CHWs or
52 RDT availability for RCD were reduced by 50%, annual malaria cases were predicted to increase
53 by approximately 17%. Only the incorporation of fMDA as an improvement measure succeeded
54 in countering the situation. Increasing CHWs to offset RCD inefficiencies caused by limited
55 RDT sensitivity or difficulties in finding individuals resulted in fewer cases than improving
56 reaction time or increasing the screening radius.

57 **Conclusions**

58 Participation of CHWs is voluntary and primarily motivated by informal incentives, often
59 provided by donors. Finding sustainable means to ensure the sufficient availability of CHWs
60 may guarantee continued RCD contributions towards maintaining stable malaria prevalence and
61 elimination. More research is required to explore the application of RCD in archetypical
62 transmission areas suitable for RCD as improvement measures to the identified challenges
63 hindering RCD. Furthermore, archetype-based targeting of interventions, including RCD, may
64 also be explored to inform the optimisation of intervention resource allocation to overcome the
65 widening gap in malaria funding.

66

67 **Introduction**

68 Malaria has proved difficult to eradicate despite being treatable, likely due to its complex
69 transmission dynamics [1]. Although some countries have successfully eliminated malaria,
70 countries in sub-Saharan Africa still carry the highest burden, accounting for over 90% of the
71 247 million cases reported globally [2]. Furthermore, the malaria burden varies significantly
72 across sub-Saharan Africa and within countries, including Zambia [2,3]. Complicating the
73 implementation of intervention strategies are the complexities of transmission and heterogeneity
74 as well as the presence of individuals who fail to seek treatment despite exhibiting symptoms and
75 those who remain asymptomatic yet capable of transmitting the disease [4,5].

76 Although Zambia is not among the top contributors to global malaria cases, as of 2021, 57% of
77 its population lived in regions classified as having low to very low malaria risk (less than 200
78 cases per 1,000 people per year) [3]. However, malaria risk and malaria parasite prevalence
79 exhibit spatial heterogeneity across smaller spatial boundaries, such as health facility catchment
80 areas (HFCAs)[3,6]. From 2017 to 2021, the distribution of cases per 1000 people per year at
81 HFCA level remained relatively stable, except for a notable increase in high-risk areas (> 500
82 cases per 1000 per year) from 24% in 2019 to 47% in 2020 [3]. As Zambia works to increase the
83 number of low malaria-risk HFCAs and “to increase malaria-free HFCAs from 10 to at least 250
84 by 2026” through various interventions, the potential for a resurgence of cases in these regions
85 remains high [5]. This is because the proportion of asymptomatic individuals with low parasite
86 densities among the infected population rises, as malaria transmission rates decrease [5]. Despite
87 being less infectious than symptomatic cases, these individuals form an asymptomatic reservoir
88 capable of transmitting parasites in areas where vectors are present [5]. To combat the
89 resurgence of cases, interventions including reactive case detection (RCD) are strategically
90 implemented to target asymptomatic infections and symptomatic individuals not seeking
91 treatment offering treatment to halt transmission without the need for universal testing or
92 treatment [3,5,7].

93 The existing Zambia-specific research indicates that RCD is effective in several ways but also
94 impeded by various challenges. A mathematical modelling study conducted by Gerardin et al.
95 (2017) used household locations, demographics, and malaria prevalence data to train an agent-
96 based model to assess the effectiveness of RCD based on different transmission profiles, which

97 included, “low-transmission, high household density; high-transmission, low household density;
98 and high-transmission, high household density [8].” The simulation findings estimated that RCD
99 is only effective in areas that have newly become low transmission areas [8]. Also, Chitnis et al.
100 (2019), in a theoretical modelling paper that used Zambian data found that it is more important to
101 increase the number of index cases followed than to increase the number of neighbours tested per
102 index case, if RCD is to be effective [9]. Similarly, Reiker et al.’s (2019) mathematical
103 modelling study suggests that RCD is ideal in areas where transmission is initially low, and that
104 increasing radius yields relatively better case detection [10]. Furthermore, Larsen et al. (2017)
105 and Bhondoekhan et al. (2020) suggest that prioritizing locations with high environmental
106 susceptibility to malaria transmission during RCD operations is crucial in detecting cases in low
107 transmission areas [4,11]. Additionally, all studies on RCD in Zambia agree that RCD’s efficacy
108 can be improved and that, on its own, it may not lead to malaria elimination in low transmission
109 areas. However, if complemented with other interventions such as reactive focal drug
110 administration (fMDA), it may realistically lead to elimination [4,9–14]. Most importantly,
111 Chitnis et al. (2019) and Reiker et al. (2019) conclude that prevalence reduction due to RCD is
112 mainly determined by the proportion of all infections identified within a specific timeframe
113 [9,10].

114 While the studies on RCD in Zambia provide valuable insights, recent advancements in malaria
115 interventions will affect RCD outcomes differently, such as advancements in malaria rapid
116 diagnostic test (RDT) sensitivity. Some of these studies also compare the circumstances/settings
117 in which RCD is most efficient. However, their applicability for informing operational decision-
118 making may be limited, considering the operational challenges that impede RCD implementation
119 in resource-constrained settings. These challenges frequently result in relatively fewer detections
120 by RCD, further reducing its effectiveness [5]. An evaluation conducted by Searle et al. (2016) in
121 the low-transmission regions of the Southern Province of Zambia highlighted several operational
122 hurdles hindering the implementation of RCD. These hurdles included inadequate supplies of
123 RDTs, a shortage of community health workers (CHWs), logistical complexities, difficulties in
124 reaching residents in designated households, and the limited sensitivity of RDTs. [5]. These
125 challenges directly impact the proportion of all undetected infections identified through RCD [5].
126 Given the competing priorities faced by implementers of malaria interventions, including RCD,

127 knowing which improvement measures to undertake given circumstances that may lead to
128 deficient outcomes of an intervention may be improve the situation.

129 The purpose of this study was to use mathematical modelling to investigate the impact of various
130 literature-informed challenges affecting RCD to reduce malaria cases. This investigation also
131 considered their respective potential improvement measures. These measures include increasing
132 the CHW workforce, improving reaction time, changing diagnostics tests, or pivoting fMDA.
133 These are targeted for the most common situations that lead to inefficient implementation of
134 RCD in low transmission areas in Zambia to relatively better inform operational decisions.

135 Our study is based on hypothesized RCD conditions that most low transmission HFCA
136 experience in Zambia, using data from the Southern Province. Hence, the study bears the
137 'Zambia-like' conceptualization, meaning it can generally represent any area with similar
138 conditions [5].

139 **Methods**


140 *Study site*

141 In this study, we simulate a single hypothetical low-transmission HFCA. Specifically, the study
142 used parameters from randomized control trials and cross-sectional studies conducted in low
143 transmission areas of the Southern Province in the years 2014 to 2018 [4,5,10,11,13–16]. In
144 Zambia, RCD is currently implemented in low transmission areas as stratified by HFCA [3]. In
145 such areas, a positive malaria case at the health facility or post triggers an RCD investigation,
146 which is carried out by CHWs assigned to the health post near the index case. One HFCA serves
147 approximately 10,000 people, while a health post, a subset of the HFCA, serves between 500 to
148 1,000 people [4,5,15]. The

149 *Malaria reactive case detection model*

150 To mimic the operation of RCD at the HFCA level, a deterministic non-linear ordinary
151 differential equation (ODE) model was developed to simulate malaria transmission and RCD
152 implementation visualized in Figure 1. The figure provides an overview of the RCD malaria
153 transmission model, generalises susceptible \square exposed \square infected \square recovered (SEIR) model format
154 with added treatment compartments. The model includes the human population only with vector
155 dynamics folded into the human force of infection. In this model (Figure 1), individuals progress

156 through distinct compartments representing various stages of infection and treatment. Initially,
 157 individuals are categorized as susceptible (S), signifying their vulnerability to malaria
 158 acquisition. Following exposure to the malaria parasite, individuals transition to the exposed (E)
 159 compartment, indicative of infection without immediate infectiousness. Subsequently,
 160 individuals may progress to either the asymptomatic (A) or symptomatic (C) compartments,
 161 contingent on the manifestation of malaria symptoms. Those symptomatic individuals may
 162 undergo therapeutic intervention at a health facility, leading them to the treatment (X) at the
 163 health facility or treatment through RCD (V) compartments. Furthermore, some of the
 164 asymptomatic (A) individuals may also receive treatment through the screening compartment of
 165 RCD compartment V or recover naturally. Ultimately, individuals in the treatment compartments
 166 V and X and asymptomatic individuals not treated through RCD advance to the recovered (R)
 167 compartment, reflecting either clearance of the infection or the establishment of partial
 168 immunity. Tables 1 summarize the parameter definitions that govern the transitions between
 169 compartments depicted in Figure 1.



170
 171 **Figure 1:** RCD model flow diagram with compartments S (Susceptible), E (Exposed), A
 172 (asymptomatic), C (Symptomatic/clinical), V (treatment through RCD), X (treatment at health
 173 facility), and R (recovered). The description of parameters governing movements through the
 174 compartments are described in Table 1.

175 In this study, we assume that mosquito dynamics are static [17]. Consequently, they have a
 176 relatively rapid generation turnover and are highly responsive to changes in the proportion of
 177 infected humans. Hence, we simplify the vector equations and determine the number of humans
 178 who become infected under the prevailing model conditions by focusing on a single force of
 179 infection. That way, it allows us to run our simulation without considering the changes in vector

180 dynamics. We derived the force of infection and model equations in the supplementary file 1.
 181 Furthermore, we introduced a seasonal forcing equation (described in the supplementary file) to
 182 mimic Zambia’s seasonal transmission pattern using rain data from the Climate Hazards Group
 183 InfraRed Precipitation with Station data.

184 *Table 1 Model parameters, values, descriptions, and sources*

Symbol	Definition	Value	Range	Source
a	Human feeding rate per mosquito (per day)	0.33	(0.10, 1)	[18]
b	Transmission efficiency from mosquito to human (per day)	0.022	(0.010,0.27)	[18]
c	Transmission efficiency human to mosquito (per day)	0.24	(0.072, 0.64)	[18]
pa	Proportion of asymptomatic infections	0.395	(0.2,0.49)	[15]
da	Proportion of asymptomatic infections that get screened and treated through RCD	0.22	(0.15,0.3)	[5]
ga	Proportion of clinical infections that get treatment at health facility	0.97	(0.84,0.99)	[19]
γ	Rate of onset of infectiousness in humans (Incubation rate; per day)	0.071	(0.06,0.08)	[20,21]
τ_{RCD}	Rate at which infectious population is screened and treated via RCD (per day)	Estimated during analysis		
λ	Force of infection	Estimated during analysis		
τ	Treatment seeking rate (per day)	0.97	(0.84,0.99)	[19]
δ	Natural recovery rare (per day)	0.0035	(0.0014, 0.017)	[20,22]
r	Recovery rate after antimalarial treatment (AL; per day)	0.167	(0.125, 0.25)	[20,23]
ρ	Loss of immunity (per day)	0.0027	(0.000055,0.011)	[18]
θ	Relative infectiousness of asymptomatic infections	0.467	(0,0.50)	[17,24]
ζ	Relative infectiousness of treated infections	0.04	(0.0,0.25)	[17]
γ_m	Rate of onset of infectiousness in mosquitoes (per day)	0.1	(0.07, 0.2)	[17,18]
μ_m	Mosquito mortality rate (per day)	0.033	(0.0010,0.10)	[18]

185
 186 ***Reactive case detection rate***
 187 The rate of detecting cases τ_{RCD} was defined based on Njau and Silal et al. (2021) as equation 1,
 188 where cov_{RCD} is the proportion of index cases that are followed up, *incidence* is the number of

189 new index cases at the health centre, while *sample* is the number of people screened that are
190 within the proximity of the index case [17]. Furthermore, the *pop* and *RDTsensitivity* are
191 population in the model and the sensitivity of RDTs used during the intervention, respectively
192 [17].

$$\tau_{RCD} = \left(cov_{RCD} * incidence \left(1 + \frac{1.5sample}{pop} \right) \right) * RDTsensitivity \quad (1)$$

193 To incorporate CHWs, we define cov_{RCD} as a function of CHWs and index cases as presented in
194 equation 2, where we estimated the numerator as the average number of index cases investigated
195 by a single CHW per day based on the information provided by Larsen et al. (2017) [4]. Here,
196 333 CHWs investigated approximately 854 index cases in one year in some low transmission
197 areas of Zambia. Therefore, we divided the total number of index cases investigated by the
198 number of CHWs and then by the number of days in a year, which gives us equation 2.

$$cov_{RCD} = \frac{0.007CHWs}{Index\ cases} \quad (2)$$

199 ***Incorporating reactive Focal Mass Drug Administration***

200 We additionally explore reactive fMDA as one of the measures to reduce malaria cases by
201 interrupting transmission in the HFCA. Thus, all individuals within the proximity of the index
202 case receives treatment, implying that, infections individuals with low levels of parasitaemia who
203 would not have been detected by RDT gets cleared of parasite [16,22,24,25]. Similarly, the
204 susceptible and exposed individuals are prevented from transitioning to the infectious category
205 to transmit, thereby interrupting the transmission cycle with the HFCA [16,22,24,25].
206 Mathematical equations describing the incorporation are described by supplementary file
207 equation 21.

208 ***Reactive case detection improvement scenarios***

209 Supplementary Table 1 presents a summary of simulated scenarios compared to the baseline.
210 These scenarios were formulated to address common situations that often result in inefficient
211 implementation of RCD. The purpose of formulating these scenarios was to assess their potential
212 to achieve results similar to or better than the baseline. In these simulations, we assume that other
213 interventions implemented to keep the low transmission status in the HFCA remain consistent
214 and that situations only affected RCD implementation.

215 The baseline configuration assumed 20 community health workers per health centre dedicated to
216 RCD, with each CHW representing a health post serving 500 individuals. This configuration was
217 based on the estimated population of 10,000 in the HFCA, with an area coverage radius of 140
218 meters per index case [4,5,15]. The reaction time, which refers to the time taken to respond to
219 reported cases, was set at three days. No fMDA was implemented, and RDTs had a sensitivity of
220 84% (Sup. Table 1).

221 In the “Increased number of CHWs” scenario, the number of CHWs per HFCA was increased to
222 30, while all other parameters remained unchanged from the baseline scenario (Table 2). This
223 adjustment aimed to improve coverage and response capabilities within the same coverage radius
224 (Sup. Table 1). In the Increased Radius (250 meters) scenario, the coverage area was expanded
225 by increasing the radius to 250 meters, while keeping the number of community health workers
226 and other parameters constant (Table 2). Similarly, in the “Increased radius (450 meters)”
227 scenario, the coverage radius was further increased to 450 meters (Table 2).

228 Furthermore, we explored scenarios that combined an increase in the number of CHWs (30) with
229 an increase in the coverage radius, both for 250 and 450 meters (Sup. Table 1). These scenarios
230 aimed to improve both personnel and coverage area to improve intervention outcomes. Also, we
231 simulated fMDA with the assumption that acceptance, coverage and drug efficacy all remain
232 constant. The scenarios “Improved reaction time” (IRT) and “Increased RDT Sensitivity” had
233 the same parameters as the baseline, except for changes in the reaction time (2 days) and RDT
234 sensitivity (99%) (Sup. Table 1). The RDT sensitivity was set at this level, with the potential to
235 be replaced by polymerase chain reaction as the testing option (Sup. Table 1).

236 *Challenges/situations affecting reactive case detection and potential improvement scenarios*

237 Table 2 summarizes the common situations mentioned elsewhere that may lead to reduced
238 efficacy of implementation of RCD. It also presents simulated improvement scenarios to assess
239 their potential for maintaining or improving the effectiveness of RCD when faced with potential
240 impediments. Here, we assumed that if the health facility is faced with a situation such as a
241 shortage of CHWs, it is unable to immediately replenish them but requires conducting a different
242 improvement measure that may maintain or improve the results of RCD.

243 *Table 2 Situations and potential improvement scenarios*

Situation	Improvement scenarios simulated
Shortage of community health workers (50% less CHWs)	Increased reaction time (from three to two days)
	Increased RDT sensitivity (from 84 to 99%)
	Incorporating fMDA
Limited availability of RDTs (50% less RDTs)	Incorporating fMDA
	Increased reaction time (from three to two days)
Limited sensitivity of RDTs (70% sensitivity)	Increased radius 250m (from 140 to 250m)
	Increased radius 450m (from 140 to 450m)
	Increased reaction time (from three to two days)
	Increased number of CHWs (50% more CHWs)
	Increased radius 250 + 50% more CHWs
	Increased radius 450 + 50% more CHWs
Difficulties in finding residents in designated households (50% availability)	Increased reaction time
	Increased RDT sensitivity
	Increased number of CHWs (50% more CHWs)

244

245 *Malaria risk stratification*

246 In Zambia, there is an annual program that stratifies each HFCA based on malaria transmission
 247 intensity levels. These levels are categorized as "no malaria" (level 0), "very low" (level 1,
 248 between 0 and 50 cases per 1000 population/year), "low" (level 2, between 50 and 200 cases per
 249 1000 population/year), "moderate" (level 3, between 200 and 500 cases per 1000
 250 population/year), and "high" (level 4, with over 500 cases per 1000 population/year [3,26]. In
 251 this study, we used the same stratification as thresholds to ascertain that our model outputs are
 252 within the malaria risk classifications and to inform the impact of RCD hurdles and their
 253 respective improvement measures while assuming that all other interventions remain
 254 implemented at a constant rate. Our model was run at a HFCA level (10,000 individuals) and
 255 day as the unit of change. Therefore, for the HFCA to qualify as a low transmission area (less
 256 200 cases per year), it is required to have approximately less than 5.48 cases per day, thus, a sum
 257 of 2000 cases per 365 days. The total of 2,000 cases per 365 days is derived from each HFCA
 258 consisting of 10 populations of 1,000 people each, which, when multiplied by 200, results in
 259 2,000.


260 *Uncertainty intervals for model results*

261 To account for model uncertainty, we generated uncertainty intervals for all the results. We did
262 this by running 100 simulations using randomly generated parameter values within the lower and
263 upper bounds for all parameters in each model scenario. After generating results from 100
264 simulations for each scenario, we grouped daily malaria case values and obtained the median,
265 5th, and 95th quantile values for each day. The median value was used as the central value for
266 each day, while the 5th and 95th quantile values were used as the lower and upper uncertainty
267 values, respectively. This process was repeated for all model scenarios.

268 **Results**

269 *Impact predictions for key challenges affecting the efficiency of reactive case detection.*

270 Figure 2 shows daily malaria cases for a hypothetical HFCA. In the figure, the baseline (*purple*
271 *trend line*) represents a scenario in which all interventions including RCD are being implemented
272 in accordance with recommended guidelines for low transmission areas, while the red horizontal
273 dotted line represents the threshold at which the HFCA ceases to be classified as a low
274 transmission area (Figure 2). Overall, simulating a 50% reduction in the literature-identified
275 challenges affecting the effectiveness of RCD and reducing RDT sensitivity to 70% did not
276 result in the HFCA completely exiting its low transmission status, indicated by the red dotted
277 line (Figure 2). Nevertheless, a 50% reduction in the number of CHWs (*red*) and availability of
278 RDTs (*blue*) for RCD resulted in the highest deviation of malaria cases from the baseline
279 compared to the use of less sensitive RDTs (*light blue*) and not reaching 50% of individuals in
280 their households (*green*), which had the least impact (Figure 2).




281
282 **Figure 2:** Impact prediction of key challenges impacting the efficiency of RCD. In this
283 simulation, the four scenarios are compared to baseline and ability to influence malaria risk
284 stratification status. In this figure, the red horizontal dotted line represents the threshold at
285 which the HFCA remains a low-risk area. “50% < available RDTs” indicates a 50% reduction
286 in the availability of RDTs, “50% < CHWs” represents a 50% shortage of CHWs, “50% <
287 residents” denotes that only 50% of residents are available in designated households, and “70%
288 RDT sens.” represents the use of RDTs with 70% sensitivity.

289 **Impact predictions of RCD improvement measures for shortage of community health workers**

290 In the scenario of a 50% shortage of CHWs, as shown in Figures 2 and 3, results in the HFCA to
291 near exiting the low-risk strata, with approximately 1914 cases per year (approximately 191.4
292 cases per 1000 population per year). The simulation results shown in Figure 3 demonstrate that
293 incorporating fMDA (*light green*) as an improvement measure results in relatively fewer cases
294 compared to all other measures, including the baseline (*purple*). Increasing RDT sensitivity
295 (*red*), even up to 99%, as an improvement measure made the least difference compared to the
296 50% CHW shortage scenario (Figure 3). However, improving the reaction time (*light blue*) from

297 the recommended three days to two days resulted in relatively fewer cases but not less or equal
 298 to the number of in the baseline scenario (Figure 3).




299
 300 **Figure 3:** Impact predictions of improvement measures for shortage of CHWs. In this
 301 simulation, the number of CHWs was reduced by 50%, represented by “50% < CHWs,” i.e.,
 302 from 20 to 10 CHWs per 10,000 population. The “50% < CHWs + RDT sens.” scenario depicts
 303 the use of more sensitive (99%) RDTs as an improvement measure to counter the impact of
 304 reduced CHWs. Similarly, “50% < CHWs + fMDA” and “50% < CHWs + IRT” represent using
 305 fMDA and improving the reaction time from three to two days, respectively as countermeasures.

306 **Impact predictions of RCD improvement measures for the limited availability and sensitivity of**
 307 **RDTs**

308 Similar to the impact of a 50% shortage of CHWs, a 50% limited availability of RDTs, as
 309 depicted in Figures 2 and 4a, suggests that this scenario almost results in the HFCA exiting the
 310 low-risk strata, with approximately 1903 cases per year (approximately 190.3 cases per 1000
 311 population per year).. The simulation results presented in Figure 4a indicate that the limited

312 availability of RDTs (*blue*) is better improved by incorporating fMDA (*red*) rather than
313 improving the reaction time (*green*) from three to two days.


314 On the other hand, the scenario of limited sensitivity of RDTs (*blue obscured by green*) is best
315 improved when an increase in the number of CHWs dedicated to RCD and an expanded radius
316 (*red*) as shown in Figure 4b. Thus, combining “increased the number of CHWs” by 50%, from
317 20 per HFCA to 30, and “expanding the radius to 450 meters” results in relatively fewer cases
318 than the baseline (*orange*). However, augmenting the CHW workforce alone also leads to an
319 approximately similar trend (Figure 4b). Notably, increasing the radius and reaction time
320 independently had a negligible impact (Figure 4b), suggesting that the increase in CHWs is the
321 main contributor to case reduction in the increased CHWs and radius “combined” scenario.
322 Furthermore, uncertainty intervals for the baseline, reduction in RDT sensitivity and the
323 improvement measures overlap signifying, potential for non-difference among (Figure 4b).



324
325 **Figure 4:** Impact predictions of RCD improvement measures for the limited availability and
326 sensitivity of RDTs: (A) 50% of the secondary cases were tested, while fMDA (50% < available
327 RDTs + fMDA) and a two-day reaction time (50% < available RDTs + IRT) were simulated as
328 improvement measures. (B) Simulation of RDT sensitivity reduced to 70% and increase of radius
329 (70% RDT sens. + radius 450), reaction time (70% RDT sens. + IRT), and 50% more CHWs
330 (70% RDT sens. + 50% > CHWs) as improvement measures. Furthermore, in B, the blue, light
331 blue and green share a similar trend, therefore obscuring each other, indicating negligible effect
332 from the reduced RDT sensitivity.

333 ***Impact predictions of RCD improvement measures for difficulties in finding residents in***
334 ***designated households***

335 Impact predictions of all investigated improvement measures for difficulties in finding residents
336 in designated households resulted in relatively fewer cases than the baseline (*purple*) as depicted
337 in Figure 5. The success of the improvement measure is attributed to the impact of not finding
338 individuals in households (*blue almost sharing the same trend as purple baseline*) had negligible
339 effect on the overall number of cases (Figure 5). Among the simulated improvement measures,
340 improving the reaction time (*light blue*) from three to two days and increasing the number of
341 CHWs by 50% (*green*), had the most impact at addressing the issue, as observed in Figure 5.
342 Conversely, increasing RDT sensitivity (*red*), even up to 99%, had the least improvement but
343 showed slightly lower infections than baseline (Figure 5). Similar to the RDT sensitivity
344 reduction scenarios in Figure 4b, the difficulties in reaching residents scenarios show in Figure 5
345 the uncertainty intervals for the baseline and the improvement measures overlap signifying,
346 potential for non-difference among them.



347

348 *Figure 5: Impact predictions of improvement measures for difficulties in finding residents in*
349 *designated households. In this simulation, residents' availability was reduced by 50% (50% <*
350 *residents), while a two-day reaction time (50% < residents + IRT), 99% RDT sensitivity (50% <*
351 *residents + RDT sens.), and 50% CHWs increase (50% < residents + 50 > CHWs) were*
352 *simulated separately as improvement measures.*

353 **Discussion**

354 We simulated an RCD focused model using parameters and data conforming to Zambia's low
355 transmission areas using a deterministic non-linear ordinary differential equation (ODE) model.
356 Our primary objectives were to assess the impact of various literature-informed challenges
357 affecting RCD to reduce malaria cases and their potential improvement measures. The analysis
358 was undertaken with the purpose of informing the order for prioritizing the RCD challenges and
359 guiding the appropriate improvement measures for each respective challenge. Considering that
360 Zambia's malaria risk stratification is done at a HFCA level and RCD is only conducted in low
361 transmission HFCAs, the study was set up at this level.

362 The simulated impact of RCD challenges on malaria cases within a HFCA revealed that a
363 shortage of CHWs and RDTs was predicted to have the most negative impact on RCD. In
364 contrast, not finding individuals in households was predicted to have least impact. In scenarios
365 where the availability of CHWs and RDTs was reduced by 50%, while keeping other parameters
366 constant, annual malaria cases increased by approximately 17%. In both cases, the only effective
367 countermeasure was the incorporation of fMDA, which resulted in an approximate 37%
368 reduction in annual cases within the HFCA. However, using more sensitive RDTs and reducing
369 the response time to counter the 50% shortage in CHWs resulted in only two and seven percent
370 reductions in annual cases, respectively. Furthermore, in scenarios where RDT sensitivity was
371 reduced to 70%, annual cases increased by 5%, while reducing the availability of individuals for
372 testing by 50% led to approximately 0.8% increase in annual cases within the HFCA. In both
373 scenarios, increasing the number of CHWs by 50% to offset their negative effects on RCD
374 resulted in approximately 12% and 14% decreases in annual cases when using 70% sensitive
375 RDTs and when availability of individuals was reduced by 50%, respectively. Additionally, in
376 both scenarios, increasing CHWs by 50% as a countermeasure led to relatively fewer cases
377 compared to adjusting the reaction time from three to two days or increasing the screening radius
378 from an index case up to 450m from the initial 140m. However, combining an increase in radius
379 with a 50% increase in CHWs only reduced the number of annual cases by 13%, compared to the

380 12% reduction observed when only CHWs were increased to counter a 70% reduction in RDT
381 sensitivity.

382 Considering that RCD operations in settings like Zambia are primarily conducted by CHWs, the
383 number of index cases investigated directly depends on the number of CHWs, as set up in our
384 model[4,27]. Our findings suggest that having more CHWs available for RCD results in more
385 index case follow-ups. As such, our finding that the number of CHWs has the most substantial
386 effect on the effectiveness of RCD aligns with Chitnis et al. (2019), who suggested that RCD is
387 only successful in low transmission areas if many index cases are followed up [9]. However,
388 Reiker et al. (2019) added that it is important to assess follow-up capacity rather than merely
389 considering the actual number of cases. They argued that the potential number of index cases is
390 limited by those who either do not seek official care or are asymptomatic, suggesting that the
391 number of investigated index cases should be adjusted based on treatment-seeking behaviour
392 [9,10].

393 Consistent with several studies, our research also indicates that MDA interventions may be the
394 most effective alternative in various situations where RCD's effectiveness is limited. For
395 instance, Ntunku et al. (2022) noted that RCD requires notably more personnel time compared to
396 fMDA and therefore uses fewer resources [28]. Additionally, even though we modelled our
397 baseline scenario with assumption that RCD was conducted perfectly, it did not result in zero
398 infections in the HFCA over time. This supports findings from other studies that highlight that
399 the ability of RCD to eliminate malaria depends on multiple factors, such as environmental risks
400 and other archetypical factors, which our model may not have considered [5,9,10,14].
401 Nevertheless, our model results demonstrated that RCD managed to maintain the number of
402 cases within the low transmission strata, and when we reduced the number of CHWs by half, the
403 number of cases nearly surpassed the low transmission threshold.

404 The study offers valuable insights into the challenges that impact the effectiveness of RCD and
405 potential countermeasures. Implementers can utilize these insights to evaluate their resource
406 capacity and combinations to suit an ideal RCD programme. For example, if the ratio of CHWs
407 dedicated to RCD to the catchment population exceeds 1:1000 or if the health centre frequently
408 experiences stockouts of RDTs, it might be necessary to consider fMDA as an alternative
409 measure to interrupt infections in the HFCA. Otherwise, other improvements are likely to be

410 ineffective. In situations where only less sensitive RDTs are available, the health facility may
411 consider recruiting more CHWs to increase the number of index cases followed up as an
412 improvement measure. However, failing to find secondary individuals should have relatively less
413 priority compared to addressing other RCD challenges. In Zambia, the COVID-19 pandemic
414 period poses a good example where the shortage of RDTs scenario is more applicable. In the
415 same period, the Zambian healthcare system had 16,000 CHWs trained to undertake community-
416 focused malaria interventions, but a number of them were inactive [3]. Reasons for the inactivity
417 included the limited supply of antimalarial drugs (ACTs) and RDTs caused by COVID-19-
418 induced supply chain interruptions [3].

419 It is worth noting that, the context governing the setup of how RCD is conducted may vary the
420 outcomes of the results presented in this study. Furthermore, it is essential to note that this study
421 faces certain limitations, including the assumption that CHWs possess “perfect” knowledge of
422 how to conduct RCD. This is contrary to the evaluation by Searle et al. (2016), where it was
423 established that the operational challenges for inadequate implementation of RCD may have also
424 been due to various CHWs’ related inadequate technical capacity, such as the inability to
425 distinguish the houses within the prescribed radius from the index case's house [5,29].
426 Additionally, our model assumed that RCD was conducted daily, which is somewhat unrealistic
427 given that CHWs have roles other than conducting RCD in the HFCA. Also, certain operational
428 qualifiers/disqualifiers for RCD/MDA, such as travel history, season, and risk for drug
429 resistance, were ignored. Furthermore, the study assumed that antimalarial drugs were in
430 abundant supply despite the shortage of RDTs, which may be unlikely, as alluded to earlier that
431 both were in short supply during the peak of COVID-19 [3]. As such, our model may be
432 overstating the number of secondary cases that may be treated via MDA if RDTs are in short
433 supply. Moreover, the model was not calibrated to any real data; therefore, all findings remain
434 hypothetical and do not necessarily represent any true HFCA. Nevertheless, the outcome trends
435 for the generated scenarios and the approach may be extended to other low-transmission
436 catchment areas of Zambia with similar characteristics.

437 Based on results from [11,12,14–16,25,29–34] and this study, it is evident that the success of an
438 RCD program in a Zambia-like setup highly depends on CHWs. However, their involvement is
439 voluntary and primarily influenced by non-formal incentives, often provided by donors [29,35].

440 Finding sustainable means such as following World Health Organization's 2018 guidelines for
441 CHWs remuneration to ensure the sufficient availability of CHWs may guarantee continued
442 RCD contributions towards maintaining stable malaria prevalence and ultimately contributing to
443 achieving elimination [35]. The current CHWs' contribution towards malaria programming and
444 incentive situation warrants detailed research to optimize RCD implementation while
445 considering potentially sustainable motivating incentives and monitoring and evaluation to
446 maintain an optimal RCD programme. Furthermore, the coming of COVID-19, which
447 interrupted several supply chain mechanisms including that for malaria supplies is a wake-up call
448 to further look into improvement measures for other interventions other than RCD. The
449 interventions of interest may include interruption of case management (antimalarial supplies and
450 test kits), bednets, and IRS insecticides.

451 Lastly, considering the complexity of malaria transmission and several assumptions that were
452 imposed on this study's model. To make the modelling results more applicable across different
453 contexts, we have research plans to stratify regions such as HFCA into transmission archetypes
454 based on malaria risk profiles, ecological, environmental, health system, and socioeconomic
455 factors, and tailoring interventions to suit specific archetypes may improve the outcomes and
456 expedite the contribution to malaria elimination. The archotyping approach may guide which low
457 transmission areas will benefit most from RCD instead of alternative interventions or a
458 combination of interventions. Conversely, interventions requiring fewer resources than RCD to
459 avert the same number of malaria cases in certain archetypes may be opted for in place of RCD
460 or a combination of interventions. Furthermore, the archetype-based targeting approach can also
461 inform the optimization of interventions, including RCD. This way, the potential resources
462 required to achieve elimination can be identified and planned for effectively.

463 **Conclusion**

464 This study contributes to the existing research literature by examining the impact of challenges
465 faced by RCD on malaria cases at an HFCA level. It also highlights the effectiveness of potential
466 improvement measures for these challenges. The study used mathematical modelling to simulate
467 several scenarios to mimic RCD challenges and their respective potential improvement measures
468 in a Southern province of Zambia-like setting.

469 The exploration of improvement measures for RCD provided in this study offers opportunities to
470 focus on measures that yield relatively better outcomes in specific situations. This approach may
471 enhance the effectiveness of RCD in resource-constrained settings. Consequently, the
472 contribution of RCD to malaria elimination may remain substantial, despite any challenges that
473 may arise during its implementation.

474 **Acknowledgements**

475 The authors acknowledge the National Malaria Control Centre and the Modelling and Simulation
476 Hub, Africa team for the contribution to ideas and feedback and code review.

477 **Funding**

478 This work was supported, in whole or in part, by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation [INV
479 047-048]. Under the grant conditions of the Foundation, a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
480 Generic License has already been assigned to the Author Accepted Manuscript version that
481 might arise from this submission.

482 **Author Contributions**

483 Conceptualization, C.C., S.S.; Methodology, C.C and S.S; Software, C.C.; Formal analysis, C.C.;
484 Investigation, C.C.; Resources, SS.; Writing—original draft, C.C.; Writing—review & editing,
485 S.S.; Visualization, C.C.; Supervision, S.S.; Funding acquisition, S.S. All authors have read and
486 agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

487 **Institutional Review Board Statement**

488 Not applicable.

489 **Informed Consent Statement**

490 Not applicable.

491 **Data Availability Statement**

492 Not applicable.

493 **Conflicts of Interest**

494 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

495 **References**

- 496 1. Bertozzi-Villa A, Bever CA, Gerardin J, Proctor JL, Wu M, Harding D, et al. An archetypes approach
497 to malaria intervention impact mapping: a new framework and example application. *Malaria*
498 *Journal* 2023 22:1. 2023;22: 1–22. doi:10.1186/S12936-023-04535-0
- 499 2. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2022. 2022. Available:
500 <https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2022>
- 501 3. National Malaria Elimination Programme. National Malaria Elimination Strategic Plan 2022-2026.
502 2022. Available:
503 [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58d002f017bffcf99fe21889/t/632a4cb0fcd87c13d016537](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58d002f017bffcf99fe21889/t/632a4cb0fcd87c13d0165372/1663716530614/ZNMESP+2022+to+2026_SIGNED+120722.pdf)
504 [2/1663716530614/ZNMESP+2022+to+2026_SIGNED+120722.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/58d002f017bffcf99fe21889/t/632a4cb0fcd87c13d0165372/1663716530614/ZNMESP+2022+to+2026_SIGNED+120722.pdf)
- 505 4. Larsen DA, Ngwenya-Kangombe T, Cheelo S, Hamainza B, Miller J, Winters A, et al. Location,
506 location, location: Environmental factors better predict malaria-positive individuals during
507 reactive case detection than index case demographics in Southern Province, Zambia. *Malar J.*
508 2017;16: 1–9. doi:10.1186/S12936-016-1649-Z/TABLES/4
- 509 5. Searle KM, Hamapumbu H, Lubinda J, Shields TM, Pinchoff J, Kobayashi T, et al. Evaluation of the
510 operational challenges in implementing reactive screen-and-treat and implications of reactive
511 case detection strategies for malaria elimination in a region of low transmission in southern
512 Zambia. *Malar J.* 2016;15: 1–14. doi:10.1186/S12936-016-1460-X/FIGURES/8
- 513 6. Zambia National Malaria Indicator Survey 2021.
- 514 7. Aidoo EK, Aboagye FT, Botchway FA, Osei-Adjei G, Appiah M, Duku-Takyi R, et al. Reactive Case
515 Detection Strategy for Malaria Control and Elimination: A 12 Year Systematic Review and Meta-
516 Analysis from 25 Malaria-Endemic Countries. *Trop Med Infect Dis.* 2023;8: 180.
517 doi:10.3390/TROPICALMED8030180/S1
- 518 8. Gerardin J, Bever CA, Bridenbecker D, Hamainza B, Silumbe K, Miller JM, et al. Effectiveness of
519 reactive case detection for malaria elimination in three archetypal transmission settings: A
520 modelling study. *Malar J.* 2017;16. doi:10.1186/S12936-017-1903-Z
- 521 9. Chitnis N, Pemberton-Ross P, Yukich J, Hamainza B, Miller J, Reiker T, et al. Theory of reactive
522 interventions in the elimination and control of malaria. *Malar J.* 2019;18: 1–13.
523 doi:10.1186/S12936-019-2882-Z/FIGURES/5
- 524 10. Reiker T, Chitnis N, Smith T. Modelling reactive case detection strategies for interrupting
525 transmission of *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria. *Malar J.* 2019;18: 1–13. doi:10.1186/S12936-
526 019-2893-9/TABLES/3
- 527 11. Bhondoekhan FRP, Searle KM, Hamapumbu H, Lubinda M, Matoba J, Musonda M, et al.
528 Improving the efficiency of reactive case detection for malaria elimination in southern Zambia: A
529 cross-sectional study. *Malar J.* 2020;19: 1–13. doi:10.1186/S12936-020-03245-1/TABLES/4

- 530 12. Stuckey EM, Miller JM, Littrell M, Chitnis N, Steketee R. Operational strategies of anti-malarial
531 drug campaigns for malaria elimination in Zambia's southern province: A simulation study. *Malar*
532 *J.* 2016;15: 1–14. doi:10.1186/S12936-016-1202-0/FIGURES/7
- 533 13. Molly DF, Hamapumbu H, Lubinda J, Musonda M, Katowa B, Searle KM, et al. Efficiency of a
534 Malaria Reactive Test-and-Treat Program in Southern Zambia: A Prospective, Observational
535 Study. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2018;98: 1382–1388. doi:10.4269/AJTMH.17-0865
- 536 14. Gerardin J, Bever CA, Bridenbecker D, Hamainza B, Silumbe K, Miller JM, et al. Effectiveness of
537 reactive case detection for malaria elimination in three archetypical transmission settings: A
538 modelling study. *Malar J.* 2017;16: 1–17. doi:10.1186/S12936-017-1903-Z/FIGURES/8
- 539 15. Larsen DA, Chisha Z, Winters B, Mwanza M, Kamuliwo M, Mbwili C, et al. Malaria surveillance in
540 low-transmission areas of Zambia using reactive case detection. *Malar J.* 2015;14: 1–9.
541 doi:10.1186/S12936-015-0895-9/FIGURES/4
- 542 16. Yukich J, Bennett A, Yukich R, Stuck L, Hamainza B, Silumbe K, et al. Estimation of malaria parasite
543 reservoir coverage using reactive case detection and active community fever screening from
544 census data with rapid diagnostic tests in southern Zambia: A re-sampling approach. *Malar J.*
545 2017;16: 1–13. doi:10.1186/S12936-017-1962-1/TABLES/2
- 546 17. Njau J, Silal SP, Kollipara A, Fox K, Balawanth R, Yuen A, et al. Investment case for malaria
547 elimination in South Africa: a financing model for resource mobilization to accelerate regional
548 malaria elimination. *Malar J.* 2021;20: 1–16. doi:10.1186/S12936-021-03875-Z/TABLES/7
- 549 18. Chitnis N, Hyman JM, Cushing JM. Determining important parameters in the spread of malaria
550 through the sensitivity analysis of a mathematical model. *Bull Math Biol.* 2008;70: 1272–1296.
551 doi:10.1007/S11538-008-9299-0/METRICS
- 552 19. National Malaria Elimination Programme. Zambia National Malaria Indicator Survey 2021. 2021.
- 553 20. Silal SP, Little F, Barnes KI, White LJ. Hitting a Moving Target: A Model for Malaria Elimination in
554 the Presence of Population Movement. *PLoS One.* 2015;10: e0144990.
555 doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0144990
- 556 21. Miller MJ. Observations on the natural history of malaria in the semi-resistant west african. *Trans*
557 *R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 1958;52: 152–168. doi:10.1016/0035-9203(58)90036-1/2/52-2-152.PDF.GIF
- 558 22. Lin JT, Saunders DL, Meshnick SR. The role of submicroscopic parasitemia in malaria transmission:
559 What is the evidence? *Trends Parasitol.* 2014;30: 183–190. doi:10.1016/J.PT.2014.02.004
- 560 23. Makanga M, Krudsood S. The clinical efficacy of artemether/lumefantrine (Coartem®). *Malar J.*
561 2009;8: 1–12. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-8-S1-S5/TABLES/4
- 562 24. Lindblade KA, Steinhardt L, Samuels A, Kachur SP, Slutsker L. The silent threat: asymptomatic
563 parasitemia and malaria transmission. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther.* 2013;11: 623–639.
564 doi:10.1586/ERI.13.45

- 565 25. Steketee RW, Miller JM, Kawesha C. Implications of the MDA Trial in Southern Province, Zambia,
566 for Malaria Control and Elimination. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;103: 98. doi:10.4269/AJTMH.19-
567 0673
- 568 26. Presidents Malaria Initiative U. U.S. President's Malaria Initiative Zambia Malaria Profile. 2022.
- 569 27. Searle KM, Hamapumbu H, Lubinda J, Shields TM, Pinchoff J, Kobayashi T, et al. Evaluation of the
570 operational challenges in implementing reactive screen-and-treat and implications of reactive
571 case detection strategies for malaria elimination in a region of low transmission in southern
572 Zambia. *Malar J.* 2016;15: 1–14. doi:10.1186/S12936-016-1460-X/FIGURES/8
- 573 28. Ntuku H, Smith-Gueye C, Scott V, Njau J, Whittemore B, Zelman B, et al. Cost and cost
574 effectiveness of reactive case detection (RACD), reactive focal mass drug administration (rfMDA)
575 and reactive focal vector control (RAVC) to reduce malaria in the low endemic setting of Namibia:
576 an analysis alongside a 2x2 factorial design cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open.*
577 2022;12: e049050. doi:10.1136/BMJOPEN-2021-049050
- 578 29. Chipukuma HM, Halwiindi H, Zulu JM, Azizi SC, Jacobs C. Evaluating fidelity of community health
579 worker roles in malaria prevention and control programs in Livingstone District, Zambia-A
580 bottleneck analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2020;20: 1–14. doi:10.1186/S12913-020-05458-
581 1/TABLES/8
- 582 30. Eisele TP, Bennett A, Silumbe K, Finn TP, Porter TR, Chalwe V, et al. Impact of Four Rounds of
583 Mass Drug Administration with Dihydroartemisinin–Piperaquine Implemented in Southern
584 Province, Zambia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;103: 7. doi:10.4269/AJTMH.19-0659
- 585 31. Eisele TP, Bennett A, Silumbe K, Finn TP, Porter TR, Chalwe V, et al. Impact of Four Rounds of
586 Mass Drug Administration with Dihydroartemisinin–Piperaquine Implemented in Southern
587 Province, Zambia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;103: 7. doi:10.4269/AJTMH.19-0659
- 588 32. Molly DF, Hamapumbu H, Lubinda J, Musonda M, Katowa B, Searle KM, et al. Efficiency of a
589 Malaria Reactive Test-and-Treat Program in Southern Zambia: A Prospective, Observational
590 Study. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2018;98: 1382. doi:10.4269/AJTMH.17-0865
- 591 33. Larsen DA, Bennett A, Silumbe K, Hamainza B, Yukich JO, Keating J, et al. Population-Wide
592 Malaria Testing and Treatment with Rapid Diagnostic Tests and Artemether-Lumefantrine in
593 Southern Zambia: A Community Randomized Step-Wedge Control Trial Design. *Am J Trop Med
594 Hyg.* 2015;92: 913–921. doi:10.4269/AJTMH.14-0347
- 595 34. Larsen DA, Bennett A, Silumbe K, Hamainza B, Yukich JO, Keating J, et al. Population-Wide
596 Malaria Testing and Treatment with Rapid Diagnostic Tests and Artemether-Lumefantrine in
597 Southern Zambia: A Community Randomized Step-Wedge Control Trial Design. *Am J Trop Med
598 Hyg.* 2015;92: 913–921. doi:10.4269/AJTMH.14-0347
- 599 35. Colvin CJ, Hodgins S, Perry HB. Community health workers at the dawn of a new era: 8. Incentives
600 and remuneration. *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2021;19: 1–25. doi:10.1186/S12961-021-00750-
601 W/TABLES/17

602

603 **Supporting Information**

604 **S1 File: Supplementary appendix**

605

606