

# 1 Socioeconomic Factors and Human Knowledge and Behaviours 2 Associated with *Aedes aegypti* abundance in Ouagadougou, Burkina 3 Faso.

4  
5 Wendegoudi Mathias Ouédraogo<sup>1,2,7</sup>, Aboubacar Sombié<sup>1</sup>, Federica Guglielmo<sup>3,4</sup>, Mamadou  
6 Sermé<sup>2,7</sup>, Hyacinthe Toé<sup>1</sup>, Luca Facchinelli<sup>4</sup>, Fernand Bationo<sup>5</sup>, Léa Paré<sup>6</sup>, Hamed S. Ouedraogo<sup>7</sup>,  
7 Mafalda Viana<sup>8</sup>, Antoine Sanon<sup>1</sup>, David Weetman<sup>4</sup>, Philip J. McCall<sup>4</sup> and Athanase Badolo<sup>1#</sup>

8 <sup>1</sup>Laboratoire d'Entomologie Fondamentale et Appliquée, Université Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso

9 <sup>2</sup>Programme National de Lutte contre les Maladies Tropicales Négligées, Ministre de la Santé et de  
10 l'hygiène publique, Burkina Faso

11 <sup>3</sup>Department of Public Health, Policy and Systems, University of Liverpool, UK

12 <sup>4</sup>Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK.

13 <sup>5</sup>Département de Sociologie, Université Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso

14 <sup>6</sup>Institut de recherche des sciences de la santé (IRSS/Bobo), Burkina Faso

15 <sup>7</sup>Direction de la protection de la santé de la population, Ministre de la Santé, Burkina Faso

16 <sup>8</sup>School of Biodiversity, One Health and Veterinary Medicine, University of Glasgow, UK

17 <sup>#</sup>Corresponding author: Athanase Badolo, [a.badolo@gmail.com](mailto:a.badolo@gmail.com), [+226 70264194](tel:+22670264194)

## 18 E-mail addresses and ORCID

19 WMO: [math40x@gmail.com](mailto:math40x@gmail.com) 0000-0001-9480-8841.

20 AS: [aboubacarsombie@yahoo.fr](mailto:aboubacarsombie@yahoo.fr) 0000-0003-2833-4718

21 FG : [f.guglielmo@liverpool.ac.uk](mailto:f.guglielmo@liverpool.ac.uk) 0000-0003-1434-2194

22 MS: [sermemamadou@yahoo.fr](mailto:sermemamadou@yahoo.fr)

23 HKT: [toe\\_kob@yahoo.fr](mailto:toe_kob@yahoo.fr) 0000-0002-3212-5903

24 LF: [luca.facchinelli@lstmed.ac.uk](mailto:luca.facchinelli@lstmed.ac.uk) 0000-0002-8987-1472

25 FB: [bationof02@gmail.com](mailto:bationof02@gmail.com)

26 LP: [lea\\_toe@yahoo.com](mailto:lea_toe@yahoo.com) 0000-0002-7314-4000

27 HWO: [hamsid2001@yahoo.fr](mailto:hamsid2001@yahoo.fr)

28 MV: [mafalda.viana@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:mafalda.viana@glasgow.ac.uk) 0000-0001-5975-6505.

29 AS: [sanonant@gmail.com](mailto:sanonant@gmail.com) 0000-0002-2046-8503

30 DW: [david.weetman@lstmed.ac.uk](mailto:david.weetman@lstmed.ac.uk) 0000-0002-5820-1388

31 PJM: [philip.mccall@lstmed.ac.uk](mailto:philip.mccall@lstmed.ac.uk) 0000-0002-0007-3985

32 AB: [a.badolo@gmail.com](mailto:a.badolo@gmail.com) 0000-0002-6652-4240

## 33 **Abstract**

34 **Background:** Since 2013, Burkina Faso has experienced regular dengue outbreaks, especially in  
35 Ouagadougou, the capital city, and Bobo-Dioulasso. Insufficient knowledge of the disease and some  
36 daily practices and attitudes of the human population may contribute to the proliferation of the vector  
37 and subsequently to dengue transmission. The objective of this study was to assess the levels of  
38 population knowledge of dengue and its primary vector, *Aedes aegypti*, and to elucidate the  
39 behavioural and environmental factors associated with the proliferation of this species.

40 **Methods:** A cross-sectional Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) survey was conducted among  
41 514 individuals, in 514 houses concurrently with a survey on *Ae. aegypti* larval sites, between  
42 September and October 2021 in three health districts (HDs) of Ouagadougou. Compound  
43 characteristics, including building materials, annual income, presence of waste, and water storage  
44 practices, were also documented.

45 **Results:** A proportion of 94.36% of the respondents demonstrated knowledge of dengue, with 50%  
46 recognizing primary symptoms like fever and headaches, and 70.52% knowing about its transmission  
47 mode. Only 53.51% could identify *Aedes* larval containers, while 14.04% were familiar with  
48 mosquito immature stages. Certain practices were linked to increased dengue vector proliferation or  
49 biting, including water storage, open water containers, water-holding waste, and the absence of  
50 mosquito screens. The study noted a high number and diversity of potential *Aedes* larval sites with  
51 elevated *Stegomyia* indices (Container Index >47%, House Index >86%, and Breteau Index >230)  
52 across all HDs. Moreover, compound infestation by immature mosquitoes was correlated with tap  
53 water presence, resident count, and construction type.

54 **Conclusion:** Despite the dengue outbreaks in the city of Ouagadougou over the past decade and the  
55 resulting awareness campaigns, population knowledge of dengue and its vector remains limited.  
56 Therefore, there is a critical need to enhance awareness activities through campaigns aimed at  
57 changing practices and attitudes, and improving the population's knowledge regarding the disease  
58 and its vector.

59 **Key words:** Dengue, knowledge, practices and attitudes (KAP), *Aedes*, larval sites, *Stegomyia*  
60 indices.

## 61 **Introduction**

62 Dengue fever, primarily transmitted by *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* mosquitoes in tropical  
63 regions, is considered the most significant arboviral disease. Despite being underreported, the

64 incidence of reported dengue cases has increased tenfold from 500,000 cases in 2000 to 5.2 million  
65 in 2019 over the past two decades, with the disease spreading to 129 countries worldwide during the  
66 same period [1]. Currently, several African countries, including Burkina Faso, are considered  
67 endemic for dengue [2], with the rapid expansion of dengue since the 1980s attributed to  
68 urbanization, globalization, and ineffective vector control [3–5].

69 West Africa has been identified as a potential dengue transmission hotspot [6], yet few West African  
70 nations are adequately resourced or prepared for outbreaks [7]. Burkina Faso experienced its first  
71 documented dengue outbreak in 1925, but subsequent underreporting occurred until significant  
72 contemporary outbreaks in 2016, resulting in 2,600 cases and 21 deaths [8]. In 2023, Burkina Faso  
73 witnessed one of its deadliest outbreaks ever, with 154,867 cases (70,433 confirmed) and 709 deaths  
74 (a 1% lethality rate) [9,10]. However, dengue epidemiology remains poorly investigated and  
75 documented in Burkina Faso and the West African region generally [7].

76 Most studies conducted in Ouagadougou on dengue vector breeding sites have consistently observed  
77 abundant and varied artificial larval containers resulting from human activities [11–13]. The  
78 typology of these breeding containers varies according to the level of urbanization, with tires and  
79 small containers being prevalent in urban areas where piped water is available but intermittent, while  
80 drums and barrels are commonly used for water storage in rural and peri-urban settings [11,12].

81 Household water management practices and other sociodemographic factors may serve as predictors  
82 associated with the risk of dengue vector proliferation [14,15]. Furthermore, several studies have  
83 highlighted respondents' poor knowledge of vector breeding sites and mosquito immature stages'  
84 presence [16,17]. It is likely that socioeconomic factors linked to the locality affect the abundance  
85 and diversity of breeding containers. However, few studies have been conducted in the same area on  
86 socioeconomic and demographic aspects, as well as on knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding  
87 dengue and its vector.

88 While vector control is jeopardized by widespread resistance to insecticides in *Ae. aegypti*  
89 populations throughout Africa, community-based larval source management is emerging as a  
90 sustainable control strategy [18]; however, this remains dependent also on the population's  
91 knowledge of dengue and its vector.

92 Several KAP (Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices) studies on dengue and its vector have been  
93 conducted in South America and Asia, but remain a critical gap in research within Africa. These data  
94 are crucial for informing the development of effective dengue communication and control strategies.  
95 Research in India and Sri Lanka has revealed low levels of knowledge and awareness regarding  
96 dengue, its transmission, and preventive measures [19,20]. A multi-country investigation in urban

97 and peri-urban areas of Asia, as well as a study in Bangladesh, found that participants exhibited  
98 inadequate knowledge of dengue vector breeding sites and mosquito immature stages [16,17].  
99 One of the most relevant investigations on the population vulnerability to dengue in Ouagadougou by  
100 Tougma [21] showed that only 65% of the respondents had heard of dengue and 62% were aware  
101 that the disease is transmitted by a mosquito vector. In East Africa, specifically in Ethiopia, a KAP  
102 study on dengue showed that a significant proportion (95.1%) of the population had heard of dengue  
103 [22]. However, people's understanding of dengue transmission, its vector, and prevention methods  
104 remain inadequate. Additionally, a KAP study conducted in the same country revealed that even  
105 among healthcare workers, the level of knowledge about dengue transmission mode and vectors  
106 remains limited [23].  
107 Our study aimed to address this knowledge gap for Burkina Faso and was conducted in three Health  
108 Districts (HDs) of Ouagadougou to provide an overview of the socio-economic, demographic, and  
109 entomological factors affecting dengue epidemiology, its vector and its transmission in the city.  
110 More specifically, it maps out (i) the population's knowledge of dengue and the dengue vector; (ii)  
111 the population's reported practices and attitudes towards dengue, its transmission, and its vector; (iii)  
112 the associated factors involved in the knowledge, practices, and proliferation of *Ae. aegypti* and  
113 transmission of dengue in the study area; (iv) the types of potential larval containers and their  
114 prevalence in the HDs; and, finally (v), the *Stegomyia* indices (*Stegomyia* refers to a subgenus of  
115 *Aedes* that includes *Ae aegypti* and *Ae albopictus*) in the study area.

## 116 **Method**

### 117 **Study area and period.**

118 A survey was conducted in August 2021, coinciding with the period of high mosquito density, in  
119 three out of five HDs in Ouagadougou (N: 12° 22' 07.64", W: 001° 31' 35.63", Figure 1). The three  
120 HDs, Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom, are situated in the central, northern, and south-eastern  
121 parts of the city, and encompass urban and peri-urban areas.

### 122 **Study design and field study**

123 A house-to-house cross-sectional socio-entomological survey was conducted to evaluate the  
124 population's knowledge of dengue and dengue vectors, their perceptions, and attitudes towards the  
125 risk of dengue. Data collection took place in both urban and peri-urban areas of the HDs of

126 Bogodogo and Nongremassom, while the HD of Baskuy is entirely urban. We selected 10, 13, and  
127 11 neighbourhoods in the HDs of Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom, respectively, based on the  
128 geographical extent of the HDs. In each neighbourhood, the characteristics of the visited houses were  
129 also documented. Houses classified as modern type have constructions entirely made of cement or  
130 concrete, also referred to as “solid construction” with metallic roof. The traditional type consists of  
131 constructions made entirely of mud and mud bricks with mud or straw roof. Houses constructed with  
132 both types (cement and mud) and metallic roof are categorized as semi-modern or mixed  
133 construction.

134 In each compound, after a detailed study introduction, a questionnaire was provided to a male or  
135 female resident who was at least 11 years old, following the acquisition of informed consent from  
136 adult respondents and assent from parents or guardians for minors (ages 11 to 20). Residents under  
137 20 years of age (the required minimum age for consent) were also included in the study to explore  
138 the variation in knowledge about dengue and its vectors among different age groups.

139 The study questionnaire was designed to collect socio-demographic, economic, and entomological  
140 information of the household. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to dengue and its vector  
141 were also addressed by the questionnaire. The knowledge on dengue vectors included a practical  
142 exercise with Petri dishes containing adults of *Ae. aegypti*, *Anopheles gambiae*, and *Culex*  
143 *quinquefasciatus*; Falcon tubes (50 mL) containing living larvae and pupae of mosquitoes were also  
144 prepared. The exercise involved the morphological identification of adult *Ae. aegypti* among *Culex*  
145 and *Anopheles*, as well as the recognition of larvae and pupae as mosquito’s immature stages.

146 Questionnaires about dengue and its vector were organized to allow the questionnaire to progress to  
147 the next question or stop, depending on the answer. For example, respondents who had never heard  
148 of dengue fever were not asked questions about disease’s symptoms or its vector. Similarly, only  
149 respondents aware of dengue as a mosquito-borne disease were questioned about mosquito breeding  
150 sites, biting periods, and so on. The responses were converted into quantitative numerical data by  
151 scoring one point for a correct answer and zero for an incorrect one [24]. Then, we proceeded to sum  
152 up the total score for each individual as the level of knowledge about dengue and its vector.

153 After administering the questionnaire, we conducted a thorough inspection of the entire compound to  
154 identify potential *Ae. aegypti* larval sites. These containers were categorized as handwashing stations  
155 (HWS) containers, tires, Barrel/Drums (BD), Buckets/cans/pots (BCP), Water feeder (WF), Small

156 containers (SC) (less than 5 litres), and others. We also documented the presence of *Ae. aegypti*  
157 immatures (larvae and/or pupae) in the positive water-holding containers.

158 The questionnaire and breeding site record forms were implemented on tablets using the  
159 KoBoCollect 2021 software[25].

## 160 **Statistical analysis**

161 All data analysis were done in R 3.2.1. Comparison among proportions were conducted using chi-  
162 square tests with significance level set at  $p < 0.05$ . The results of responses to the questionnaire were  
163 expressed as proportions, Odd Ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI). Three generalized  
164 linear mixed models (glmm) with a negative binomial link function utilising the glmmTMB package  
165 [26] were fitted to the data with total number of water containers, number of positive containers, and  
166 number of productive containers used as response variables. The predictors included HDs, month of  
167 collection, type of house, the level of knowledge of the interviewee, the socio-economic and  
168 demographic data (number of residents, the type of construction, annual income, water supply), the  
169 HDs, and water container type with day of inspection as random effect.

170 Simple linear models were fitted to knowledge data with dengue and dengue vector knowledge  
171 scores as response variables and HDs, month of collection, type of house, socio-economic and  
172 demographic data (number of residents, the type of construction, annual income, water supply), sex  
173 and age of respondent, the instruction level and the occupation, the annual income, the house type  
174 and their interactions (age\*sex, age\*instruction level\*sex, occupation\*instruction level).

175 Minimal models were selected using a stepwise backward procedure based on the lowest AIC values  
176 by removing the factors with the highest p-value in the model. If the removal of a variable resulted in  
177 a change in the AIC value of more than 2 and the resulting model remained parsimonious, e.g. after  
178 the diagnosis of residuals and overdispersion in the R package DHARMA.

179 The traditional *Stegomyia* indices[27,28] were assessed: (i) House Index (HI), calculated as the  
180 number of houses (or compounds) with at least one *Ae. aegypti* immature positive container  $\times 100/$   
181 number of houses visited; (ii) Container Index (CI), calculated as the number of *Ae. aegypti* positive  
182 containers  $\times 100/$  number of water-holding containers inspected; (iii) Breteau Index (BI), calculated  
183 as the number of *Ae. aegypti* positive containers  $\times 100/$  number of houses visited.

## 184 **Ethical considerations**

185 This study was approved by the Ethical Research Committee of the Ministry of Health (Deliberation  
186 n° 2021-08-206 du 04/08/2021). Signed informed consent or assent (for minors) were obtained from

187 all householders included in the study before introducing the questionnaire and commencing the  
188 household entomological inspection.

## 189 **Results**

### 190 **Characteristics of populations, compounds, and study areas**

191 A total of 514 individuals from various compounds were interviewed (S1Table). The age range of  
192 the respondents was from 11 to 86 years, with an average of 35.49 years and a median of 31 years  
193 across the study area. Among the participants, 226 (43.97%) were male and 288 (56.03%) were  
194 female. The average number of inhabitants per household was 9.36 for the entire study area, with a  
195 significantly higher density in Baskuy (11.60) compared to the other two HDs ( $p < 0.05$ ), and a  
196 statistically lower density in the peri-urban neighbourhoods (6.28) compared to the urban ones  
197 (10.46) ( $p < 0.05$ ).

198 In the entire study area, 47.5% (244/514) of respondents had not received education beyond the  
199 primary school level, with proportions of 42.5% in urban areas and 63.0% in peri-urban areas.  
200 Conversely, the percentage of individuals who had attended secondary school was higher in urban  
201 areas (57.5%) compared to peri-urban areas (36.1%) (S1Table).

202 The respondents' occupations included housewives, government employees, traders, students,  
203 artisans, and others. The proportions varied among HD, but in the entire study area students (25.47%,  
204 131/514), traders (21.60%, 111/514), craftsmen (18.68%, 96/514) and housewives/unemployed  
205 (15.56%, 80/514) were the most abundant (S1Table).

206 The surveyed compounds were classified into three types based on building materials. In the HDs of  
207 Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom, 9.27%, 17.95%, and 23.81% of the compounds are of the  
208 traditional type, entirely made of mud bricks. The majority of compounds in the study area are  
209 entirely made of cement (modern) (ranging from 41.07% to 65.56%), followed by those of mixed  
210 materials (i.e., mud and cement) (ranging from 24.1% to 35.12%) and traditional ones. In the urban  
211 area, a similar trend was observed, with cement-based compounds being the most common, followed  
212 by those constructed with mixed materials. In contrast, a reverse trend is observed in the peri-urban  
213 zone, where compounds made of mud bricks, mixed, and cement were 57.14%, 31.93%, and  
214 10.92%, respectively (S1Table).

215 The classification of compounds according to income revealed that more than half of the surveyed  
216 compounds in all HDs have an annual income of at least 2,400 USD (approximately 1,200,000  
217 FCFA), except for the Nongremassom HD, where only 39.29% of the compounds fall into this

218 category. In the urban area, 54.68% of the compounds have an annual income of at least 2,400 USD  
219 (1,200,000 FCFA), while in the peri-urban area, only 30.25% are in this category (S1Table).

220 In Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom, 81.46% (123/151), 67.18% (131/195), and 60.71%  
221 (102/168) of the compounds had access to piped water, respectively, compared to 84.05% (332/395)  
222 and 20.17% (24/119) in urban and peri-urban areas (S1Table).

## 223 **Knowledge of dengue**

224 The respondents' knowledge level regarding dengue, including its symptoms and transmission mode,  
225 indicated that 94.36% (485/514) were familiar with dengue fever (Table 1). Specifically, 97.35%  
226 (147/151), 90.26% (176/195), and 96.43% (162/168) of respondents in the HDs of Baskuy,  
227 Bogodogo, and Nongremassom fell into this category. These proportions were found to be  
228 statistically different ( $p = 0.007$ ) (Table 1). When comparing types of settlement, 95.19% (376/395)  
229 of urban respondents and 91.60% (109/119) of peri-urban respondents had heard of dengue fever,  
230 with no significant difference between these proportions ( $p = 0.207$ ).

231 Most respondents heard about dengue fever through radio (42.27%), television (46.39%), and friends  
232 or relatives (53.40%). Among them, 12.93% (19/147), 2.84% (5/176), and 8.02% (13/162) of the  
233 respondents in the HDs of Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom reported having contracted  
234 dengue, showing a significant difference in proportions ( $p = 0.003$ ) (Table 1). In the urban and peri-  
235 urban categories, 8.51% (32/376) and 4.59% (5/109) of the respondents declared having contracted  
236 dengue, with no significant difference between the two areas ( $p = 0.214$ ) (Table 1). Regarding  
237 dengue symptoms, roughly half of those aware of dengue (50.34% in Baskuy, 49.64% in Bogodogo,  
238 and 50.62% in Nongremassom) linked it to fever. Additionally, 55.10%, 49.43%, and 43.21% of the  
239 respondents in Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom, respectively mentioned headaches as a  
240 symptom. Across the three HDs, 30.61% (45/147), 43.75% (77/176), and 36.42% (59/162) of  
241 individuals from Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom, respectively, did not know any dengue  
242 symptoms, with a significant difference among HDs ( $p < 0.05$ ) (Table 1). These proportions were  
243 34.31% (129/376) and 48.62% (53/109) in the urban and peri-urban areas, respectively, with a  
244 significant difference between the two areas ( $p = 0.009$ ) (Table 1). In the overall study area, 37.53%  
245 (182/485) of respondents aware of dengue were unfamiliar with any symptoms of the disease.

246 Knowledge of the dengue vectors varied among respondents in different health districts. In Baskuy,  
247 76.19% (112/147) knew that dengue transmission occurred through a mosquito bite, while in  
248 Bogodogo and Nongremassom, the percentages were 69.32% (122/176) and 66.67% (108/162)  
249 respectively. Comparatively, 71.28% (268/376) of urban respondents and 67.89% (74/109) of peri-



250 urban respondents were aware of the mosquito vector. Overall, 70.52% (342/485) of all respondents  
251 in the study area understood that dengue is transmitted by mosquitoes (Table 1).

252 **Table 1** : Population knowledge of dengue, its symptoms and its transmission mode.

	Baskuy N (%)	Bogodogo N (%)	Nongremassom N (%)	$\chi^2$ (p)	Urban areas N (%)	Peri-urban areas N (%)	$\chi^2$ (p)
Dengue knowledge / channels of information (514)							
Heard about dengue	147 (97.35)	176 (90.26)	162 (96.43)	10.06 (0.007)	376 (95.19)	109 (91.60)	1.59 (0.207)
Has been infected by dengue	19 (15.93)	5 (2.84)	13 (8.02)	11.61 (0.003)	32 (8.51)	5 (4.59)	1.53 (0.214)
Health worker	46 (31.29)	32 (18.18)	55 (33.95)		101 (26.86)	32 (29.36)	
Friends/Relatives	65 (44.22)	111 (63.07)	83 (51.23)		207 (55.05)	52 (47.71)	
Community message announcer	3 (2.04)	4 (2.27)	2 (1.23)		6 (1.60)	3 (2.75)	
Newspapers	14 (9.52)	5 (2.84)	3 (1.85)		20 (5.32)	2 (1.83)	
Radio	70 (47.62)	80 (45.45)	55 (33.95)		157 (41.76)	48 (44.04)	
Television	86 (58.50)	74 (42.05)	65 (40.12)		191 (50.80)	34 (31.19)	
Other	26 (17.69)	12 (6.82)	37 (22.84)		63 (16.76)	12 (11.01)	
Knowledge of dengue symptoms (485)							
Anorexia	2 (1.36)	2 (1.14)	4 (2.47)		6 (1.60)	2 (1.83)	
Diarrhea	4 (2.72)	8 (4.55)	6 (3.70)		13 (3.46)	5 (4.59)	
Muscle pain	10 (6.80)	14 (7.95)	9 (5.56)		27 (7.18)	6 (5.50)	
Joint pain	36 (24.49)	12 (6.82)	24 (14.81)		61 (16.22)	11 (10.09)	
Skin rash	0 (0.00)	1 (0.57)	2 (1.23)		1 (0.27)	2 (1.83)	
Overall tiredness	14 (9.52)	0 (0.00)	16 (9.88)		24 (6.38)	6 (5.50)	
Fever	74 (50.34)	87 (49.43)	82 (50.62)	0.05 (0.974)	195 (51.869)	48 (44.04)	1.77 (0.184)
Sore throat	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (1.23)		1 (0.27)	1 (0.92)	
Headaches	81 (55.10)	87 (49.43)	70 (43.21)	4.38 (0.112)	199 (52.93)	39 (35.78)	9.26 (0.002)
Stomach ache	5 (3.40)	7 (3.98)	4 (2.47)		15 (3.99)	1 (0.92)	
Don't know	45 (30.61)	77 (43.75)	59 (36.42)	5.99 (0.049)	129 (34.31)	53 (48.62)	6.79 (0.009)
Bleeding	4 (2.72)	1 (0.57)	5 (3.09)		9 (2.39)	2 (1.83)	
Vomiting/Nausea	22 (14.97)	9 (5.11)	26 (16.05)		51 (13.56)	6 (5.50)	
Other	21 (14.29)	4 (2.27)	22 (13.58)		41 (10.90)	6 (5.50)	
Knowledge of dengue mode of transmission (485)							
Food	1 (0.68)	6 (3.41)	1 (0.62)		6 (1.60)	2 (1.83)	
Direct contact	2 (1.36)	8 (4.55)	6 (3.70)		14 (3.72)	2 (1.83)	
Fly	1 (0.68)	0 (0.00)	2 (1.23)		1 (0.27)	2 (1.83)	
Mosquito	112 (76.19)	122 (69.32)	108 (66.67)	3.55 (0.169)	268 (71.28)	74 (67.89)	0.32 (0.573)
Don't know	26 (17.22)	30 (17.05)	42 (25.93)	4.96 (0.083)	71 (18.88)	27 (24.77)	1.47 (0.225)
Dust	0 (0.00)	2 (1.14)	0 (0.00)		1 (0.27)	1 (0.92)	
Dirt	4 (2.72)	10 (5.68)	2 (1.23)		13 (3.46)	3 (2.75)	
Other	5 (3.40)	9 (5.11)	1 (0.62)		13 (3.46)	2 (1.83)	

## 253 **Knowledge of the dengue vectors**

254 The questions on the knowledge of the vector were selectively submitted to those who knew that  
255 dengue is transmitted by a mosquito and, of them, 80.12% (274/342) knew that the dengue vector  
256 needs water to breed (Table 2). This proportion varied between HDs, with 91.80% (112/122) in  
257 Bogodogo 73.21% (82/112) to 74.07% (80/108) in Baskuy and Nongremassom respectively with a  
258 significant difference between the HDs ( $P < 0.001$ ). The difference between proportions from the  
259 urban and the peri-urban areas respectively of 79.10% (212/268) and 83.78% (62/74) was not  
260 statistically significant ( $p = 0.466$ ) (Table 2).

261 Regarding dengue vector breeding places, the respondents cited clean stagnant water containers  
262 (47.45%, 130/274), water storage containers (35.40%, 97/274), tires (7.30%, 20/274), flower pots  
263 (6.93%, 19/274), and animal water feeders (5.47%, 15/274). Many respondents (85.58%, 229/274)  
264 across the HDs also mentioned dirty water (Table 2).

265 With regards to the dengue vector biting period, 74.11% (83/112), 85.25% (104/122), and 66.67%  
266 (72/108) in the HDs of Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom, respectively, associated the dengue  
267 vector with daytime biting activity ( $p = 0.004$ ). In comparison, these proportions in the urban and  
268 peri-urban areas were 75.37% (202/268) and 77.03% (57/74) respectively, with no significant  
269 differences ( $p = 0.888$ ) (Table 2).

270 Regarding morphological recognition of the adult mosquito of *Ae. aegypti*, 40.17% (45/112), 23.77%  
271 (29/122) and 32.41% (35/108) of the respondents in the HDs of Baskuy, Bogodogo and  
272 Nongremassom, recognised the adult stage of *Ae. aegypti*, among *An. gambiae* and *Cx.*  
273 *quinquefasciatus* adult mosquitoes, with significant differences ( $p = 0.027$ ) between HDs (Table 2).  
274 In the urban and peri-urban areas, the proportion of those capable of identifying *Ae. aegypti* from the  
275 two other species was 35.07% (94/268) and 21.62% (16/74) respectively, with a statistically  
276 significant difference between urban and peri-urban areas ( $p = 0.024$ ). Across the study area, 32.16%  
277 (110/342) of respondents were able to morphologically identify the dengue vector among other non-  
278 *Aedes* mosquito species (Table 2).

279 In terms of recognition of mosquito larvae in general, fewer than 15% of respondents in the study  
280 area could make a link between larvae and adult mosquito in general (Table 2). Only 16.07%  
281 (18/112), 10.66% (13/122), and 16.67% (18/108) of respondents in the HDs of Baskuy, Bogodogo,  
282 and Nongremassom, respectively, could recognize a mosquito larva, compared to 15.42% (42/268)  
283 and 9.46% (7/74) in the urban and peri-urban areas, respectively, with no significant statistical  
284 difference either among HDs ( $p = 0.350$ ) or among urban and peri-urban areas ( $p = 0.245$ ) (Table 2).

285

286 **Table 2** : Population knowledge and practices about the dengue vector, its breeding places, its biting activity periods, its morphological aspects

287 (adult) and ability to recognize mosquito larvae (of mosquitoes in general)

	Baskuy N (%)	Bogodogo N (%)	Nongremassom N (%)	$\chi^2$ (p)	Urban areas N (%)	Peri-urban areas N (%)	$\chi^2$ (p)
Knowledge of the breeding places of dengue mosquitoes (342)							
Does mosquito need water to breed?	82 (73.21)	112 (91.80)	80 (74.07)	16.26 (<0.001)	212 (79.10)	62 (83.78)	0.53 (0.466)
Knowledge on dengue mosquitoes breeding site types (274)							
Animal water feeders	5 (6.10)	5 (4.46)	5 (6.25)		9 (4.25)	6 (9.68)	
Drainage channels	14 (17.07)	20 (17.86)	14 (17.25)		41 (19.34)	7 (11.29)	
Waste	24 (29.27)	55 (49.11)	40 (50.)		89 (41.98)	30 (48.39)	
Stagnant clean water	38 (46.34)	61 (54.46)	31 (38.75)		102 (48.11)	28 (45.16)	
Dirty water	65 (79.27)	107 (95.54)	57 (71.25)		173 (81.60)	56 (90.32)	
Don't know	1 (1.22)	0 (0)	1 (1.25)		2 (0.94)	0 (0.0)	
Tires	3 (3.66)	9 (8.06)	8 (10)		16 (6755)	4 (6.45)	
Flower pot	6 (7.32)	4 (3.57)	9 (11.25)		15 (7.08)	4 (6.45)	
Water storage containers	18 (21.95)	57 (50.89)	22 (27.50)		79 (37.26)	18 (29.03)	
Other	17 (20.73)	4 (3.57)	20 (25.00)		37 (17.45)	4 (6.45)	
Knowledge of Dengue Mosquito Biting Periods (342)							
Sunrise	9 (8.04)	10 (8.20)	13 (12.04)	1.34 (0.512)	25 (9.33)	7 (9.46)	0.00 (0.999)
Sunset	21 (18.75)	16 (13.11)	18 (16.67)	1.41 (0.493)	43 (16.04)	12 (16.22)	0.00 (0.999)
Daytime/Sunrise/Sunset	83 (74.11)	104 (85.25)	72 (66.67)	11.00 (0.004)	202 (75.37)	57 (77.03)	0.02 (0.888)
Nighttime	30 (26.79)	66 (54.10)	37 (34.26)		92 (34.33)	41 (55.41)	
Daytime	69 (61.61)	93 (76.23)	61 (56.48)		171 (63.81)	52 (70.27)	
Don't know	20 (17.86)	10 (8.20)	18 (16.67)		41 (15.30)	7 (9.46)	
Knowledge of the characteristics of the dengue vector mosquito (342)							
Black	10 (8.93)	38 (31.15)	8 (7.41)		35 (13.06)	21 (28.38)	
Brown	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.93)		1 (0.37)	0 (0.00)	
Black with white spots	45 (40.18)	29 (23.77)	35 (32.41)	7.26 (0.027)	95 (35.45)	15 (20.27)	5.45 (0.020)
Don't know	56 (50.00)	55 (45.08)	64 (59.26)		137 (51.12)	38 (51.35)	
Recognizes dengue mosquito vector	45 (40.18)	29 (23.77)	35 (32.41)	7.26 (0.027)	95 (35.45)	15 (20.27)	5.45 (0.020)
Recognizes mosquito larvae (in general)	18 (16.07)	13 (10.66)	18 (16.67)	2.10 (0.350)	42 (15.67)	7 (9.46)	1.35 (0.245)

## 288 **People's practices and attitudes regarding dengue transmission and prevention**

### 289 ***Practices that may increase mosquito breeding or biting***

290 Practices that may create favourable conditions for dengue vector mosquito breeding and promote  
291 human-vector contact are outlined in Table 3. At health districts (HDs) level as well as in urban  
292 *versus* peri-urban areas, rainwater harvesting containers were present in over 90% of households  
293 (Table 3A). Some of these containers already contained water and were potential larval sites for  
294 *Aedes* mosquitoes. In the three HDs, 17.22% to 38.10% of the compounds received water from  
295 public fountains, with a statistically significant difference between these proportions in the HDs ( $p <$   
296 0.001). The difference was particularly marked between compounds in the urban and peri-urban  
297 areas that relied on water from public fountains, 14.18% (56/395) and 79.83% (95/119), respectively,  
298 also, showing a significant difference between these proportions ( $p < 0.001$ ).

299 Water storage for later use was relatively common, as noted among 40.40% to 72.82% of the  
300 compounds in the HDs (Table 3B), with statistically significant variation ( $p < 0.001$ ); this proportion  
301 increased to 47.85% (189/395) and 80.67% (96/119) in the urban and peri-urban areas, with  
302 statistical significance ( $p < 0.001$ ), making a total of 55.45% in the entire study area. The presence of  
303 uncovered water storage containers was reported in 70.43% (362/514) of the compounds.

304 It was observed that in more than half of the compounds in all HDs (ranging from 54.76% to  
305 84.10%), waste materials were present, which could accumulate rainwater and potentially serve as  
306 larval sites for mosquitoes. Furthermore, the lack of a habit among the population to empty water  
307 from unused containers (during the rainy season) that could become larval sites was noted in 73.35%  
308 of compounds. Moreover, 3.89% and 66.15% of compounds had no curtains on doors and/or  
309 windows, and no mosquito screens on house windows, respectively.

### 310 ***Practices to protect against mosquito bites***

311 Protective practices against dengue vector bites are detailed in Table 3C. Specifically, 72.85%  
312 (110/151), 91.28% (178/195), and 80.95% (136/168) of respondents in the HDs of Baskuy,  
313 Bogodogo, and Nongremassom respectively use bed nets at night. A significant difference was noted  
314 between HDs ( $p < 0.001$ ). However, 81.27% (321/395) and 86.55% (103/119) of respondents in  
315 urban and peri-urban areas use bed nets at night, with no statistically significant difference observed  
316 ( $p = 0.232$ ). In contrast, less than 20% of individuals in all HDs, urban, and peri-urban areas declared  
317 using bed nets during daytime.

318 Several other practices are utilized by respondents to protect themselves from mosquito bites,  
319 including anti-mosquito fumigants, anti-mosquito bombs, anti-mosquito lotions, fans, and others.

320 Mosquito fumigants and mosquito bombs are the most commonly used, with 84.8% (432/514) and  
321 46.69% (240/514) of respondents employing these practices in the entire study area, respectively.

### 322 ***Respondents' attitudes on dengue and mosquito bites prevention***

323 Attitudes towards protection from dengue vector bites are outlined in Table 3D. In the Health  
324 Districts of Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom, 57.82% (85/147), 92.61% (163/176), and  
325 72.84% (118/162) of respondents believed that sleeping under a mosquito bed net could prevent  
326 mosquito bites and dengue. The difference in these percentages across the HDs is statistically  
327 significant ( $p < 0.001$ ). However, there was no statistically significant distinction between urban and  
328 peri-urban areas, where 73.94% (278/376) and 80.73% (88/109) respectively, viewed bed nets as a  
329 form of protection against mosquitoes ( $p = 0.184$ ).

330 In the entire study area, some respondents reported preventive attitudes against dengue and its vector,  
331 including the use of insecticides and repellents (52.58%; 255/485), emptying small water-holding  
332 containers (45.15%; 219/485), destroying mosquito breeding sites (19.38%; 94/485), and covering  
333 water-holding containers (14.85%; 72/485). Conversely, other respondents believed that maintaining  
334 a clean environment (9.28%, 45/485) and wearing long-sleeved clothing (5.15%, 25/485) were also  
335 protective measures against dengue and its vector.

336 **Table 3: Population practices and attitudes that may have an effect on dengue transmission in the study area.**

	Baskuy N (%)	Bogodogo N (%)	Nongremassom N (%)	$\chi^2$ (p)	Urban areas N (%)	Peri-urban areas N (%)	$\chi^2$ (p)
<b>A- Presence of potential <i>Aedes aegypti</i> breeding sites (514)</b>							
Presence of containers	138 (91.39)	181 (92.82)	152 (90.48)	0.66 (0.718)	359 (90.87)	112 (94.12)	0.86 (0.354)
Presence of containers with water	129 (85.43)	174 (89.23)	145 (86.31)	0.13 (0.533)	341 (86.33)	107 (89.92)	0.76 (0.384)
Presence of containers / <i>Aedes aegypti</i> pupae	74 (49.01)	59 (30.26)	109 (64.88)	43.74 (<0.001)	196 (49.62)	46 (38.66)	3.98 (0.045)
<b>B- Practices that favour mosquito breeding or biting (514)</b>							
Water supply at public fountain	26 (17.22)	61 (31.28)	64 (38.10)	17.26 (<0.001)	56 (14.18)	95 (79.83)	186.85 (0.001)
Presence of open storage container	80 (52.98)	160 (82.05)	122 (72.62)	35.11 (<0.001)	262 (66.33)	100 (84.03)	12.93 (<0.001)
Water storage practice	61 (40.40)	142 (72.82)	82 (48.81)	40.67 (<0.001)	189 (47.85)	96 (80.67)	38.57 (<0.001)
Presence of waste that can hold water	89 (58.94)	164 (84.10)	92 (54.76)	41.69 (0.001)	251 (63.54)	94 (78.99)	9.20 (0.002)
Do not overturn water from unused containers	85 (56.29)	170 (87.18)	122 (72.62)	41.60 (0.001)	297 (75.19)	80 (67.23)	2.57 (0.109)
Absence of curtains/doors & windows	5 (3.31)	4 (2.05)	11 (6.55)	-	13 (3.29)	7 (5.88)	-
Absence of mosquito screens	78 (51.66)	154 (78.97)	108 (64.29)	28.75 (0.001)	234 (59.24)	106 (89.08)	35.03 (<0.001)
<b>C- Practices to protect against mosquito bite (514)</b>							
Bed net use/ night-time	110 (72.85)	178(91.28)	136 (80.95)	20.43 (0.001)	321 (81.27)	103 (86.55)	1.42 (0.233)
Bed net use/ daytime	27 (17.88)	28 (14.36)	32 (19.05)	1.55 (0.461)	66 (16.71)	21 (17.65)	0.01 (0.921)
Use of anti-mosquito lotion	38 (25.16)	15 (7.69)	54 (32.14)	35.18 (<0.001)	99 (25.06)	8 (6.72)	17.53 (<0.001)
Use of anti-mosquito fumigant	116 (76.82)	178 (91.28)	138 (82.14)	13.95 (0.001)	322 (82.52)	110 (92.43)	7.34 (0.007)
Use of anti-mosquito spray	73 (48.34)	103 (52.88)	64 (38.10)	8.09 (0.022)	187 (47.34)	53 (43.54)	0.19 (0.663)
Use of fan	3 (1.99)	1 (0.51)	9 (5.36)	-	012 (3.04)	1 (0.84)	-
Others anti-mosquito means	5 (3.31)	2(1.03)	20 (11.90)	-	22 (5.57)	5 (4.20)	-
<b>D- Respondents' attitudes toward mosquito bite and dengue prevention methods (485)</b>							
Destroy larvae breeding sites	27 (18.37)	22 (12.50)	45 (27.78)	12.74 (0.002)	83 (22.07)	11 (10.09)	7.71 (0.006)
Empty containers with water	63 (42.86)	75 (42.61)	81 (50.00)	3.58 (0.167)	187 (49.73)	32 (29.36)	14.82 (<0.001)
Cover water storage containers	21 (14.29)	34 (19.32)	17 (10.49)	4.01 (0.135)	62 (16.49)	10 (9.17)	3.02 (0.082)
Sleep under a mosquito bed net	85 (57.82)	163 (92.61)	118 (72.84)	53.27 (<0.001)	278 (73.94)	88 (80.73)	1.76 (0.185)
Use insecticide/repellent	59 (40.13)	132 (75.00)	64 (39.51)	55.72 (<0.001)	196 (49.62)	59 (45.38)	0.07 (0.795)
Don't know	20 (13.61)	5 (2.84)	13 (8.02)	-	30 (7.98)	8 (7.34)	-
Cleanliness	25 (17.01)	7 (3.98)	13 (8.02)	-	36 (9.57)	9 (8.26)	-
Long-sleeved clothes	13 (8.84)	2 (1.14)	10 (6.17)	-	24 (6.38)	1 (0.92)	-
Other	6 (4.08)	2 (1.14)	23 (14.20)	-	26 (6.91)	5 (4.59)	-





### 338 **Factors associated with knowledge of dengue, its symptoms and transmission**

339 Levels of knowledge and awareness about dengue, its symptoms, and transmission modes were  
 340 evaluated among individuals in the study area to explore their association with socio-demographic  
 341 factors including education, gender, age, respondent status, and residential area (urban or peri-urban)  
 342 using odds ratio (OR) analyses (Table 4).

343 Gender and age were key factors associated with different degrees of knowledge of dengue  
 344 symptoms and transmission. The results indicated that a lack of knowledge about dengue fever,  
 345 specifically never having heard of it, was associated with the respondent's gender and age. Female  
 346 respondents (OR = 2.59; 95% CI = 1.08 - 6.18; p = 0.032) and those younger than 30 years old (OR  
 347 = 4.40; 95% CI = 1.75 - 11.00; p = 0.001) were more likely to have lower knowledge about dengue  
 348 fever.

349 When it comes to understanding the main symptoms of dengue, such as fever and headache,  
 350 individuals with an education level below primary school (OR = 0.43; 95% CI = 0.26 - 0.68; p <  
 351 0.001) and females (OR = 0.66; 95% CI = 0.45 - 0.96; p = 0.028) were found to be less likely to be  
 352 aware of these symptoms.

353 Factors such as having an educational level below primary school (OR = 2.70; 95% CI = 1.70 - 4.27;  
 354 p < 0.001), residing in a peri-urban area (OR = 1.73; 95% CI = 1.12 - 2.66; p = 0.013), and being  
 355 female (OR = 1.67; 95% CI = 1.14 - 2.43; p = 0.008) were associated with a lack of awareness of all  
 356 dengue symptoms. Knowledge of dengue transmission modes was linked to the educational level and  
 357 gender of the respondent. Individuals with less than a primary education (OR = 0.47; 95% CI = 0.29  
 358 - 0.75; p = 0.001) and females (OR = 0.60; 95% CI = 0.40 - 0.90; p = 0.012) were less likely to  
 359 recognize that dengue is a mosquito-borne disease.

360

361 **Table 4:** Knowledge of dengue, symptoms, transmission and associated factors

Characteristics		Don't know about dengue				
		Yes	No	OR	95% CI	$\chi^2$ (p)
Education level	< Primary	8	95			
	Primary and more	21	390	1.56	0.67 - 3.64	1.04 (0.299)
Areas	Peri-urban	10	109			
	Urban	19	376	1.82	0.82 - 4.02	1.47 (0.141)
Gender	Female	22	266			
	Male	7	219	2.59	1.08 - 6.18	2.14 (0.032)
Age (years)	[11; 30]	23	226			
	[31; 88]	6	259	4.40	1.75 - 11.00	3.17 (0.001)
Characteristics		Knowledge of dengue major symptoms (Fever and headaches)				

		Yes	No	OR	95% CI	$\chi^2$ (p)
Education level	< Primary	40	55			
	Primary and more	246	144	0.43	0.26 - 0.68	3.67 (< 0.001)
Areas	Peri-urban	56	53			
	Urban	230	146	0.67	0.43 - 1.04	1.82 (0.068)
Gender	Female	145	121			
	Male	141	78	0.66	0.45 - 0.96	2.19 (0.028)
Age (years)	[11; 30]	132	94			
	[31; 88]	154	105	0.96	0.66 - 1.38	0.23 (0.814)
Characteristics		Don't know any symptoms				
		Yes	No	OR	95% CI	$\chi^2$ (p)
Education level	< Primary	54	41			
	Primary and more	128	262	2.70	1.70 - 4.27	4.25 (< 0.001)
Areas	Peri-urban	52	57			
	Urban	130	246	1.73	1.12 - 2.66	2.48 (0.013)
Gender	Female	114	152			
	Male	68	151	1.67	1.14 - 2.43	2.66 (0.008)
Age (years)	[11; 30]	82	143			
	[31; 88]	100	160	0.92	0.63 - 1.33	0.46 (0.647)
Characteristics		Know dengue transmission mode				
		Yes	No	OR	95% CI	$\chi^2$ (p)
Education level	< Primary	54	41			
	Primary and more	288	102	0.47	0.29 - 0.75	3.22 (0.001)
Areas	Peri-urban	74	35			
	Urban	268	108	0.85	0.53 - 1.35	0.68 (0.495)
Gender	Female	175	91			
	Male	167	52	0.60	0.40 - 0.90	2.51 (0.012)
Age (years)	[11; 30]	154	72			
	[31; 88]	188	71	0.81	0.54 - 1.20	1.07 (0.284)

362

363 According to the glmm (Table 5), general knowledge of dengue fever was positively correlated with  
364 respondent age and education level. Populations from Bogodogo have a better knowledge of dengue  
365 compared to the reference locality (Baskuy) and Nongremasson. Men appear to have lower  
366 knowledge of dengue than women, but all occupational categories show better knowledge of dengue  
367 than housewives who also belong to the less educated category. The interaction between sex and  
368 instruction level is negatively associated with dengue knowledge for male x no formal schooling.  
369 Government employees exhibited better general knowledge of dengue fever compared to other  
370 occupations. Knowledge of dengue is correlated to education level with people with university  
371 education having better knowledge of dengue. Additionally, the economic status and type of  
372 construction of the respondents' compound were found to be associated with the level of general  
373 knowledge about dengue fever.

374

375 **Table 5:** Associations between the dengue knowledge level and different characteristics of the  
 376 visited compound, respondents' socioeconomic status and health district following a Generalized  
 377 Linear Model analysis (glm). Significant predictors are bolded.

Predictors	Knowledge of dengue		
	Estimates	CI	p
<b>(Intercept)</b>	<b>6.69</b>	<b>5.83 – 7.54</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>HD [Baskuy]</b>	-	-	-
<b>Bogodogo</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.62 – 1.15</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Nongremassom	0.18	-0.09 – 0.45	0.193
<b>Sex [F]</b>	-	-	-
<b>M</b>	<b>-0.38</b>	<b>-0.61 – -0.14</b>	<b>0.002</b>
<b>Age</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.01 – 0.02</b>	<b>0.001</b>
<b>Instruction level [no education]</b>	-	-	-
<b>No formal schooling</b>	<b>-0.80</b>	<b>-1.43 – -0.17</b>	<b>0.013</b>
<b>Primary school</b>	<b>-0.51</b>	<b>-0.89 – -0.12</b>	<b>0.009</b>
Secondary	0.09	-0.30 – 0.48	0.638
<b>University</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>0.66 – 1.59</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Occupation [Craftsmen]</b>	-	-	-
<b>Other</b>	<b>-0.78</b>	<b>-1.26 – -0.29</b>	<b>0.002</b>
<b>Trader</b>	<b>-0.69</b>	<b>-1.04 – -0.35</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Government employees</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.50 – 1.27</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Housewife</b>	<b>-1.17</b>	<b>-1.58 – -0.76</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Student</b>	<b>-0.50</b>	<b>-0.86 – -0.14</b>	<b>0.006</b>
<b>Annual income [I]</b>	-	-	-
<b>II</b>	<b>-0.64</b>	<b>-1.20 – -0.09</b>	<b>0.023</b>
III	-0.43	-0.99 – 0.14	0.140
<b>IV</b>	<b>-0.89</b>	<b>-1.47 – -0.31</b>	<b>0.002</b>
<b>House type [Mixed]</b>	-	-	-
<b>Modern</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.32 – 0.86</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>

Traditional -0.80 -1.15 - -0.44 <0.001<sup>378</sup>

379 **Factors associated with dengue vector knowledge and breeding sites' presence**

380 Following the OR analysis, Table 6 showed associations between knowledge of the dengue vector  
 381 (biting periods, mosquito larvae) and socio-demographic characteristics such as the respondent's age  
 382 and residential area (urban or peri-urban). Individuals residing in peri-urban areas were more likely  
 383 to be unaware of the dengue vector biting period (OR = 1.87; 95% CI = 1.09 - 3.20; p = 0.021)  
 384 compared to those in urban areas. Also, compound which annual income < 1,200,000 FCFA are  
 385 more likely to be infested with Aedes positive container (OR = 0.53; 95% CI = 0.36 - 0.76; p <  
 386 0.001). Respondents aged 11-30 were less likely to be aware of mosquito larvae (OR = 0.39; 95% CI  
 387 = 0.19 - 0.76; p = 0.006) than older respondents.

388

389 **Table 6:** Knowledge of dengue vector and presence of positive Aedes larval sites and their  
 390 associated factors

Characteristics		Don't know any biting period of the dengue vector				
		Yes	No	OR	95% CI	$\chi^2$ (p)
Level of education	< Primary	34	20			
	Primary and more	147	141	1.63	0.89 - 2.97	1.60 (0.109)
Areas	Peri-urban	48	26			
	Urban	133	135	1.87	1.09 - 3.20	2.31 (0.021)
Gender	Female	87	88			
	Male	94	73	0.77	0.50 - 1.18	1.22 (0.223)
Age (years)	[11; 30]	86	68			
	[31; 88]	95	93	1.27	0.81 - 1.90	1.08 (0.328)
Characteristics		Knowledge of mosquito larvae				
		Yes	No	OR	95% CI	$\chi^2$ (p)
Education level	< Primary	6	48			
	Primary and more	43	245	0.71	0.28 - 1.77	0.73 (0.464)
Areas	Peri-urban	7	67			
	Urban	42	226	0.56	0.24 - 1.31	1.34 (0.182)
Gender	Female	22	153			
	Male	27	140	0.75	0.40 - 1.37	0.95 (0.344)
Age (years)	[11; 30]	13	141			
	[31; 88]	36	152	0.39	0.19 - 0.76	2.74 (0.006)
Characteristics		Presence of positive Aedes larval breeding sites				
		Yes	No	OR	95% CI	$\chi^2$ (p)
Type of construction	Traditional & semi-modern	171	62			
	Modern	159	122	2.12	1.45 - 3.08	3.93 (<0.001)

### Knowledge of the vector

Areas	Peri-urban	80	39	1.12	0.77 - 1.84	0.79 (0.433)
	Urban	250	145			
Annual income	< 1,200,000 FCFA	187	75	0.53	0.36 - 0.76	3.44 (<0.001)
	≥ 1,200,000 FCFA	143	109			
Water supply source	Public fountain	102	49	1.23	0.82 - 1.85	1.02 (0.307)
	Tap water/Well	228	135			
Residents/concession	[11; 38]	113	40	1.88	1.23 - 2.85	2.95 (0.003)
	[1; 10]	217	144			

391

392 The glmm analysis displayed in Table 7 shows that knowledge of the dengue vector was better in the  
 393 HD of Bogodogo than in the reference HD of Baskuy, and in Nongremasson. Knowledge of the  
 394 dengue vector was also associated with respondent age, sex, and occupation. Finally, the economic  
 395 level and type of construction of respondents' compound were found to be associated with the level  
 396 of general knowledge about dengue fever.

397 Building materials used in the construction of the compound and the number of residents were  
 398 associated with the presence of potential larval containers, while the presence of immature positive  
 399 containers is affected only by the number of residents (S3Table, S4Table). Traditional and semi-  
 400 modern type compounds had a higher likelihood of containing positive breeding sites with immature  
 401 forms of *Ae. aegypti* (OR = 2.12; 95% CI=1.45 - 3.08;  $p < 0.001$ ) compared to modern type  
 402 compounds (Table 5). Similarly, compounds with more than 10 residents were more likely to  
 403 harbour positive breeding sites (OR = 1.88; 95% CI=1.23 - 2.85;  $p = 0.003$ ) compared to those with  
 404 ten or fewer residents.

405

406 **Table 7:** Associations between the dengue vector knowledge level and different characteristics of the  
 407 visited compound, respondents' socioeconomic status and health district following a Generalised  
 408 Linear Model (glm). Significant predictors are bolded.

Predictors	Estimates	CI	p
<b>(Intercept)</b>	<b>5.78</b>	<b>5.16 – 6.41</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>HD [Baskuy]</b>	-	-	-
<b>Bogodogo</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.80 – 1.18</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Nongremassom	0.13	-0.06 – 0.33	0.186
<b>Sex [F]</b>	-	-	-
<b>M</b>	<b>-0.32</b>	<b>-0.49 – -0.15</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Age</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.00 – 0.02</b>	<b>0.002</b>
<b>Instruction level [No education]</b>	-	-	-
No formal schooling	-0.33	-0.79 – 0.13	0.158
<b>Primary school</b>	<b>-0.32</b>	<b>-0.60 – -0.03</b>	<b>0.028</b>
Secondary	-0.21	-0.49 – 0.07	0.147
University	0.27	-0.07 – 0.62	0.115
<b>Occupation [Craftsmen]</b>			
<b>Other</b>	<b>-0.79</b>	<b>-1.15 – -0.44</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Trader</b>	<b>-0.87</b>	<b>-1.12 – -0.61</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Government employees	-0.06	-0.34 – 0.23	0.702
<b>Housewife</b>	<b>-1.05</b>	<b>-1.35 – -0.75</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Student</b>	<b>-1.05</b>	<b>-1.31 – -0.78</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Annual income [I]</b>	-	-	-
<b>II</b>	<b>-0.85</b>	<b>-1.26 – -0.45</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>III</b>	<b>-0.75</b>	<b>-1.16 – -0.33</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>IV</b>	<b>-0.87</b>	<b>-1.29 – -0.45</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>House type [Mixed]</b>	-	-	-
<b>Modern</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.16 – 0.56</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
<b>Traditional</b>	<b>-0.64</b>	<b>-0.90 – -0.39</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>

410 A wide variety of water-holding containers (potential larval sites) were identified in the compounds  
 411 during our entomological survey. These containers were categorized by type based on their similarity  
 412 or purpose (Table 8 and 9). The most commonly found larval sites were tires and buckets/cans/pots  
 413 (BCP), followed by drums/barrels (DB) (Table 8 and 9). Out of a total of 2290 potential larval sites  
 414 documented in the study area, 29.69% were tires and 28.86% were BCP. Tires accounted for  
 415 between 26% and 34.25% of the potential breeding sites in each HD, while BCP accounted for  
 416 between 27% and 30.37% (Table 8). These containers were the most commonly found in both urban  
 417 and peri-urban areas (Table 9). In the urban area, tires were prevalent in 31.13% of cases, compared  
 418 to 24.76% in the peri-urban area. Similarly, BCP, accounted for 27.98% in the urban area and  
 419 31.91% in the peri-urban area as potential larval breeding sites.

420

421 **Table 8 :** Distribution of containers, potential larval breeding sites and larval breeding sites by type  
 422 and according to health district.

Health districts	Houses		Containers					P
			N	With water	Aedes positive	Presence of pupae	Proportion potential breeding sites	
	Visited	Positive	Tires					
Baskuy	151	134	212	171	127	51	26.23%	0.004
Bogodogo	195	173	365	272	195	66	28.75%	
Nongremassom	168	146	282	237	195	70	34.25%	
HDs	Visited	Positive	Buckets/Cans/Pots (BCP)					
Baskuy	151	134	317	198	79	37	30.37%	0.464
Bogodogo	195	173	478	274	108	44	28.96%	
Nongremassom	168	146	302	189	82	40	27.31%	
HDs	Visited	Positive	Drums/Barrels (DB)					
Baskuy	151	134	165	117	41	17	17.94%	0.281
Bogodogo	195	173	237	179	61	21	18.92%	
Nongremassom	168	146	162	110	58	28	15.90%	
HDs	Visited	Positive	Handwashing stations (HWS)					
Baskuy	151	134	25	13	1	0	1.99%	0.794
Bogodogo	195	173	32	15	1	1	1.59%	
Nongremassom	168	146	22	11	3	1	1.59%	
HDs	Visited	Positive	Water feeders (WF)					
Baskuy	151	134	28	23	12	9	3.53%	0.850
Bogodogo	195	173	38	29	13	6	3.07%	
Nongremassom	168	146	29	24	9	4	3.47%	
HDs	Visited	Positive	Small containers (SC)					
Baskuy	151	134	64	28	14	3	4.29%	0.109
Bogodogo	195	173	107	64	31	5	6.77%	
Nongremassom	168	146	81	43	24	10	6.21%	

HDs	Visited	Positive	Other				
Baskuy	151	134	125	102	75	26	15.64%
Bogodogo	195	173	151	113	41	17	11.95%
Nongremassom	168	146	116	78	45	16	11.27%

423

424 **Table 9** : Distribution of containers, potential larval sites and larval sites by type and according to  
 425 type of areas

Areas	Houses		Containers					P
	Visited	Positive	N	With water	Aedes positive	Presence of pupae	Proportion potential breeding sites	
Urban areas	395	346	689	552	425	152	31.13%	0.006
Peri-urban areas	119	107	170	128	92	35	24.76%	
Urban areas	395	346	819	496	212	98	27.98%	0.092
Peri-urban areas	119	107	278	165	57	23	31.91%	
Urban areas	395	346	439	307	121	54	17.32%	0.371
Peri-urban areas	119	107	125	99	39	12	19.15%	
Urban areas	395	346	59	24	3	2	1.35%	0.028
Peri-urban areas	119	107	20	15	2	0	2.90%	
Urban areas	395	346	68	54	25	16	3.05%	0.226
Peri-urban areas	119	107	27	22	9	3	4.26%	
Urban areas	395	346	201	103	49	12	5.81%	0.828
Peri-urban areas	119	107	51	32	20	6	6.19%	
Urban areas	395	346	323	237	132	49	13.37%	0.149
Peri-urban areas	119	107	69	56	29	10	10.83%	

426

427 *Stegomyia* indices for the HDs and zones (urban and peri-urban) are reported in Table 8. The HDs of  
 428 Baskuy, Bogodogo, and Nongremassom displayed house indices (HIs) of 88.7%, 88.7%, and 86.9%  
 429 respectively, along with container indices (CI) of 53.5%, 47.6%, and 60.1%. Regarding the Breteau  
 430 indices (BI), 231.1, 230.8, and 247.6 were recorded respectively in the HDs of Baskuy, Bogodogo,  
 431 and Nongremassom.

432 In the urban and peri-urban areas, the HIs were 87.6% and 89.9%, respectively, the CIs were 54.5%  
 433 and 48.0%, and the BIs were 244.8 and 208.4 (Table 10).



434 The recorded HIs showed no significant difference between HDs ( $p = 0.835$ ) and between the urban  
 435 and peri-urban areas ( $p = 0.599$ ). However, CIs were significantly different not only between HDs ( $p$   
 436  $< 0.001$ ) but also between urban and peri-urban areas ( $p = 0.009$ ).

437

438 **Table 10:** Entomological (*Stegomyia*) indices according to health districts (HD) and type of areas  
 439 (Urban and Peri-urban)

HDs and areas	Houses		Containers		HI (%)	CI (%)	BI
	Visited	Positive	With water	Aedes positive			
HD Baskuy	151	134	652	349	88.7	53.5	231.1
HD Bogodogo	195	173	946	450	88.7	47.6	230.8
HD Nongremassom	168	146	692	416	86.9	60.1	247.6
Urban areas	395	346	1773	967	87.6	54.5	244.8
Peri-urban areas	119	107	517	248	89.9	48.0	208.4
Total	514	453	2290	1215	88.1	53.1	236.4

#### 440 **Risk factors for dengue vector proliferation**

441 Based on the glmm analyses (S2Table, S3Table, and S4Table), the occurrences of *Aedes* potential  
 442 breeding containers, *Aedes* immature-positive breeding containers, and *Aedes* pupae-positive  
 443 containers are associated with various factors. Compounds with type II, III, and IV levels of annual  
 444 income were negatively correlated with the presence of *Aedes* pupae-positive containers (S2Table),  
 445 *Aedes* larvae-positive containers (S3Table), and *Aedes* potential breeding sites containers compared  
 446 to the reference type I. The presence of *Aedes* potential breeding containers and *Aedes* immature-  
 447 positive breeding sites containers is linked to the number of residents per compound (S3Table and  
 448 S4Table). Our findings suggest a connection between the population's knowledge level of dengue  
 449 vectors and the presence of potential larval containers and pupae-positive containers (S2Table and  
 450 S3Table). However, this association is slightly positive with potential breeding site containers and  
 451 negative with pupae-positive containers.

452 Finally, our GLMM analysis demonstrates a positive association between the presence of pupae-  
 453 positive breeding sites in the HD of Nongremassom compared to the reference, Baskuy (S2Table).

## 454 **Discussion**

455 Since 2013, Burkina Faso has experienced outbreaks of dengue cases, especially in the city of  
456 Ouagadougou where the main vector of this arbovirus, *Ae. aegypti*, is well established [29,30]. This  
457 socio-entomological study has helped identifying the level of knowledge and practices of the  
458 population regarding dengue and its vector in the health districts of Baskuy, Bogodogo, and  
459 Nongremassom. It also highlighted the level of dengue vector infestation in the compounds, as well  
460 as the types of larval containers and associated factors. The *Stegomyia* indices were also recorded for  
461 all HDs.

### 462 **Respondents' knowledge of dengue**

463 A significant proportion (94.36%) of the surveyed population in the HDs reported having heard of  
464 dengue, echoing results from similar studies conducted in endemic regions. Studies conducted in  
465 Delhi [31] and Dhaka, Bangladesh [16,32] also revealed that over 90% of respondents were familiar  
466 with dengue. Quintero *et al.* [33] noted in a multi-country study in Latin America that more than  
467 97% of participants had knowledge of dengue and a recent study in Bangladesh by Hossain *et al.*  
468 [34] reported a similar awareness rate of 93.8%, comparable with Burkina Faso where dengue  
469 emergence is recent.

470 The recent outbreaks in Burkina Faso have likely contributed to spreading information about dengue  
471 among our study population [35,36]. Increased awareness about the disease would explain why  
472 respondents reported having heard about dengue through radio (42.27%), television (46.39%),  
473 relatives and friends (53.40%), and at health centres (27.42%). These information channels were also  
474 recognized as major information source in other studies [34,37]. Moreover, our study revealed  
475 significant associations between the knowledge level of dengue and characteristics such as gender  
476 and age. Female respondents and those younger than 30 years were the most likely to be unaware of  
477 dengue. This aligns with the findings of Selvarajoo *et al.* [38] who also observed that dengue  
478 knowledge was associated with age.

479 Although the respondents had heard of dengue fever, many were still unaware of certain aspects of  
480 this infection, such as the symptoms and mode of transmission. Fever and headaches were known by  
481 roughly half of the respondents as dengue symptoms. In many similar studies, response rates towards  
482 these two major symptoms (fever and headache) are very high [37,39]. The odds ratios revealed a  
483 positive association between the level of education and knowledge of dengue symptoms and mode of  
484 transmission. Our results align with other studies showing that knowledge about dengue transmission  
485 and symptoms is linked to the respondent's education level [15,39]. However, Kumaran *et al.* [39]

486 found that, unlike our results, female respondents were more likely to have knowledge about dengue  
487 symptoms.

488 A thorough understanding of dengue transmission among the population is essential for disease  
489 prevention and control efforts. Approximately 70% of the respondents were aware that dengue is  
490 transmitted by mosquitoes. However, a study on population vulnerability to dengue in Ouagadougou  
491 revealed that only 62% of respondents knew about dengue transmission by a mosquito [21]. This  
492 discrepancy could be attributed to the timing of the study in Ouagadougou, conducted shortly after  
493 the first dengue outbreak, indicating lower knowledge levels compared to our study in 2021. Recent  
494 studies in endemic regions of South America and Asia have shown that a significant percentage of  
495 respondents (90 - 100%) were knowledgeable about dengue transmission by mosquito vectors  
496 [34,38]. Disparities in the effectiveness of health and public hygiene systems among countries,  
497 responsible for information dissemination, education, and communication activities, along with  
498 health education strategies, are likely to influence the population's understanding of diseases and  
499 their modes of transmission [40,41].

## 500 **Respondents' knowledge of the dengue vector**

501 Only 36.55% (125/342) of the respondents aware of dengue transmission modes knew of at least one  
502 breeding site of the vector. This low rate poses a significant obstacle to dengue control. Studies  
503 conducted in Cambodia and Yemen have reported a higher level of knowledge of breeding sites, with  
504 rates ranging from 86.1 to 95.5% [39,42].

505 Knowledge of a vector's host-seeking periods is essential for bite prevention. Our study revealed that  
506 75.73% of respondents had knowledge of the vector host-seeking time. This finding is consistent  
507 with previous reports by Udayanga et al. [20] in Colombo, Sri Lanka but lower than the level found  
508 by Rahman et al. [43,44] in Thailand, country that has experienced multiple dengue outbreaks since  
509 the 1950s [45]

510 If knowledge of the adult dengue vector may have implications for mosquito bite control or  
511 prevention, understanding the larval stages in breeding sites would be even more crucial. The lack of  
512 knowledge of the mosquito larval stage is likely to contribute to the proliferation of breeding sites  
513 and, consequently, adult mosquitoes. Our results revealed that only 32.16% and 14.16% of the  
514 respondents could recognize the adult mosquito of the dengue vector and mosquito larvae,  
515 respectively. In Brazil and Colombia, a study by Laurentino [46] reported a significantly higher  
516 (88%) level of knowledge about dengue vector compared to our study which was based on visual  
517 recognition of the mosquitoes. Similarly, a multi-country study in urban and peri-urban Asia (India,  
518 Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Thailand) on the eco-bio-social determinants of

519 dengue vector reproduction, found a much higher level of knowledge about mosquito larvae (47% to  
520 97%) than our study [17], that may again be related to the methodology based on survey, compared  
521 to visual recognition of mosquito larvae.

### 522 **Practices that may affect dengue transmission**

523 Some of the population's practices may favour vector proliferation and disease transmission. For  
524 example, over 50% of sampled compounds have water storage containers, particularly in peri-urban  
525 areas where this is observed in 80% of the compounds. This is influenced by the water supply  
526 system in cities [47,48], more prevalent in peri-urban areas with scarce tap water: year-round water  
527 storage in compounds poses a risk for dengue vector proliferation and potential disease transmission  
528 [49]. However, many individuals are unaware that water storage containers can serve as a breeding  
529 site for the dengue vector [16].

530 In addition, 73.35% of respondents reported not habitually emptying containers with unused water.  
531 This suggests that few respondents adhere to proper practices by emptying non-useful water  
532 containers, which can serve as larval sites for *Aedes* mosquitoes, particularly in the rainy season.  
533 This percentage is lower compared to results from other studies and contributes to the spread of the  
534 dengue vector [42,50]

### 535 **Knowledge of mosquito bite prevention**

536 Knowledge and practices of mosquito bite prevention are crucial for individuals to protect  
537 themselves from vector-borne diseases such as malaria and dengue. Our study revealed that two-  
538 thirds of the sampled compounds lacked mosquito screens on their windows. Although the  
539 effectiveness of installing window screens in preventing mosquito bites has been proven [27,50], it is  
540 important to note that, this effectiveness is closely related to contextual mosquito behaviour and may  
541 not have a significant impact on the exophilic and exophagous mosquito population of Ouagadougou  
542 [12].

543 As for protection against mosquito bites, over 80% of our respondents reported sleeping under a bed  
544 net at night, while only about 17% did so during the day. In a KAP study on the dengue vector in  
545 Thailand, Koenraadt *et al.* [15] reported a similar proportion (18%) of respondents slept under bed  
546 nets during the day. The use of other prevention strategies against mosquito bites, such as mosquito  
547 repellents, lotions, fog, spray cans, fans, long-sleeved clothing, destroying breeding sites, emptying  
548 water containers, covering water storage containers, and others, was reported in lower proportions  
549 but has been reported in various studies [20,34].

## 550 *Aedes aegypti* mosquito larval sites

551 Significant domestic infestation, with a wide variety of potential larval breeding containers, was also  
552 observed. The types of potential larval containers in both the HDs and the urban and peri-urban areas  
553 were found to be similar. The primary breeding sites identified were used tires, followed by BCP and  
554 water storage containers [11,51]. The increasing global use of cars has led to a rise in tire trade  
555 between countries and continents [21]. When these used tires are exposed to rain, they become  
556 potential larval sites for *Aedes* breeding due to the conducive environment they provide [52]

557 Larval containers contribute not only to increasing the population density of vector mosquitoes but  
558 also to the risk of arbovirus transmission. Our results, as indicated, show a negative association  
559 between the type of construction and the presence of positive breeding sites, while a positive  
560 association was found with the number of people living in the compound surveyed, a phenomenon  
561 also documented by Walker et al. [53]. The greater the number of residents, the more waste would be  
562 produced, some of which may act as rainwater containers and become potential larval containers in  
563 the compound. Furthermore, our findings reveal that households with higher income levels were less  
564 likely to host potential mosquito larval containers and even less likely to have positive containers for  
565 larvae or pupae. These results align with those of Walker et al. [53], who also demonstrated a  
566 negative association between compound income and infestation with mosquito larval containers.

567 The *Stegomyia* indices calculated in our study were notably higher compared to those in other  
568 studies [53,54]. The purpose of water storage in this context is not solely for immediate use but  
569 rather to supplement unpredictable water shortages. Across all three HDs in the study area, the  
570 *Stegomyia* indices, including HI, CI, and BI (Tables 9), exceeded the threshold values recognized by  
571 the Pan American Health Organization and WHO [55,56]. These values strongly indicate the  
572 population's limited knowledge about recognizing particularly *Aedes* larval sites and recognising  
573 mosquito larvae, and the associated diseases, pointing towards a heightened risk of arbovirus  
574 transmission when the pathogen is present in the study area [28].

## 575 **Conclusion**

576 In spite of the multiple sensitizations through messages on television, radio and news journals on  
577 dengue and its transmission, following the outbreaks that the country has experienced, our findings  
578 showed that knowledge about certain aspects of dengue, especially its vector is still partial. Our  
579 findings also indicate practices and attitudes that could favour the proliferation of dengue vectors. In  
580 addition, these findings highlight a high number of potential larval containers of various types, and

581 very high *Stegomyia* indices in the study area, suggesting a significant infestation of the compounds  
582 by the dengue vector. It is essential to increase communication and awareness activities on dengue  
583 through campaigns or other channels aimed at improving practices and attitudes towards prevention  
584 and also to enhance the level of knowledge of the population on the disease and its transmission.  
585 This could ultimately enhance the community's knowledge and awareness and help better involve  
586 the population in the control of dengue and other mosquito-borne diseases in general.

## 587 **References**

- 588 1. WHO. Dengue - Global situation. Who. 2023; 1–16. Available:  
589 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/disease-outbreak-news/item/2023-DON498>
- 590 2. Weetman D, Kamgang B, Badolo A, Moyes CL, Shearer FM, Coulibaly M, et al. *Aedes*  
591 mosquitoes and *Aedes*-borne arboviruses in Africa: Current and future threats. *Int J Environ*  
592 *Res Public Health*. 2018;15. doi:10.3390/ijerph15020220
- 593 3. Gubler DJ. Dengue, Urbanization and globalization: The unholy trinity of the 21 st century.  
594 *Tropical Medicine and Health*. 2011. pp. 3–11. doi:10.2149/tmh.2011-S05
- 595 4. Mordecai EA, Ryan SJ, Caldwell JM, Shah MM, LaBeaud AD. Climate change could shift  
596 disease burden from malaria to arboviruses in Africa. *Lancet Planet Heal*. The Author(s).  
597 Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an Open Access article under the CC BY 4.0 license;  
598 2020;4: e416–e423. doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30178-9
- 599 5. Ryan SJ, Carlson CJ, Mordecai EA, Johnson LR. Global expansion and redistribution of  
600 *Aedes*-borne virus transmission risk with climate change. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018;13.  
601 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007213
- 602 6. Stoler J, al Dashti R, Anto F, Fobil JN, Awandare GA. Deconstructing “malaria”: West Africa  
603 as the next front for dengue fever surveillance and control. *Acta Trop*. 2014;134: 58–65.  
604 doi:10.1016/j.actatropica.2014.02.017
- 605 7. Dadzie SK, Akorli J, Coulibaly MB, Ahadji-Dabla KM, Baber I, Bobanga T, et al. Building  
606 the capacity of West African countries in *Aedes* surveillance: inaugural meeting of the West  
607 African *Aedes* Surveillance Network (WAASuN). *Parasites and Vectors*. BioMed Central Ltd;  
608 2022;15: 381. doi:10.1186/s13071-022-05507-0
- 609 8. WHO. WHO | Dengue Fever – Burkina Faso. WHO. World Health Organization; 2016;  
610 Available: <https://www.who.int/csr/don/18-november-2016-dengue-burkina-faso/en/>
- 611 9. Manigart O, Ouedraogo I, Ouedraogo HS, Sow A, Lokossou VK. Dengue epidemic in

- 612 Burkina Faso: how can the response improve? [Internet]. *The Lancet*. Elsevier B.V.; 2024. pp.  
613 434–435. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02803-9
- 614 10. WHO. Health Emergency Information and Risk Assessment: weekly Bulletin on outbreaks  
615 and other emergencies. 2024.
- 616 11. Ouédraogo WM, Toé KH, Sombié A, Viana M, Bougouma C, Sanon A, et al. Impact of  
617 physicochemical parameters of *Aedes aegypti* breeding habitats on mosquito productivity and  
618 the size of emerged adult mosquitoes in Ouagadougou City, Burkina Faso. *Parasites and  
619 Vectors*. BioMed Central Ltd; 2022;15. doi:10.1186/s13071-022-05558-3
- 620 12. Badolo A, Sombié A, Yaméogo F, Wangrawa DW, Sanon A, Pignatelli PM, et al. First  
621 comprehensive analysis of *Aedes aegypti* bionomics during an arbovirus outbreak in west  
622 Africa: Dengue in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, 2016–2017. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. Public  
623 Library of Science; 2022;16. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PNTD.0010059
- 624 13. Ouédraogo WM, Zanré N, Rose NH, Zahouli JZB, Djogbenou LS, Viana M, et al. Dengue  
625 vector habitats in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, 2020: an unintended consequence of the  
626 installation of public handwashing stations for COVID-19 prevention [Internet]. *The Lancet  
627 Global Health*. Elsevier Ltd; 2024. pp. e199–e200. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00565-X
- 628 14. Vannavong N, Seidu R, Stenström TA, Dada N, Overgaard HJ. Effects of socio-demographic  
629 characteristics and household water management on *Aedes aegypti* production in suburban  
630 and rural villages in Laos and Thailand. *Parasites and Vectors*. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2017;10:  
631 170. doi:10.1186/s13071-017-2107-7
- 632 15. Koenraadt CJM, Tuiten W, Sithiprasasna R, Kijchalao U, Jones JW, Scott TW. Dengue  
633 knowledge and practices and their impact on *Aedes aegypti* populations in Kamphaeng Phet,  
634 Thailand. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2006;74: 692–700. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2006.74.692
- 635 16. Dhar-chowdhury P, Haque CE, Driedger SM, Hossain S. Community perspectives on dengue  
636 transmission in the city of Dhaka , Bangladesh. *Int Health*. 2014;6: 306–316.  
637 doi:10.1093/inthealth/ihu032
- 638 17. Arunachalam N, Tana S, Espino F, Kittayapong P, Abeyewickreme W, Wai KT, et al. Eco-  
639 bio-social determinants of dengue vector breeding: A multicountry study in urban and  
640 periurban Asia. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2010;88: 173–184. doi:10.2471/BLT.09.067892
- 641 18. McCann RS, Kabaghe AN, Moraga P, Gowelo S, Mburu MM, Tizifa T, et al. The effect of  
642 community-driven larval source management and house improvement on malaria transmission  
643 when added to the standard malaria control strategies in Malawi: a cluster-randomized  
644 controlled trial. *Malar J*. BioMed Central Ltd; 2021;20: 232. doi:10.1186/s12936-021-03769-0
- 645 19. Sakthivadivel M, Mukhilan RR, Jeevitha G, Sakthivadivel J, Narayanan K, Tennyson S.

- 646 Knowledge, attitude and practice of vectors and vector-borne diseases with special reference  
647 to dengue at metropolitan Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India. *Int J Community Med Public Heal.*  
648 *Medip Academy*; 2020;7: 2337. doi:10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20202495
- 649 20. Udayanga L, Gunathilaka N, Iqbal MCM, Lakmal K, Amarasinghe US, Abeyewickreme W.  
650 Comprehensive evaluation of demographic, socio-economic and other associated risk factors  
651 affecting the occurrence of dengue incidence among Colombo and Kandy Districts of Sri  
652 Lanka: A cross-sectional study. *Parasites and Vectors.* BioMed Central Ltd.; 2018;11: 478.  
653 doi:10.1186/s13071-018-3060-9
- 654 21. Tougma A. Vulnérabilité de la population de la ville de Ouagadougou face à la dengue.  
655 Normandie Université, 2020. Français. NNT□: 2020NORMR073 . tel-03169122. 2020.
- 656 22. Kebede T, Tesema B, Mesfin A, Getachew D. A Community-Level Knowledge, Attitude, and  
657 Practice about Dengue Fever and the Identification of Mosquito Breeding Containers in Dire  
658 Dawa City of Ethiopia: A Cross-Sectional Study. Marasini BP, editor. *Can J Infect Dis Med*  
659 *Microbiol.* Hindawi Limited; 2023;2023: 1–15. doi:10.1155/2023/4349078
- 660 23. Yusuf AM, Ibrahim NA. Knowledge, attitude and practice towards dengue fever prevention  
661 and associated factors among public health sector health-care professionals: In Dire Dawa,  
662 eastern Ethiopia. *Risk Manag Healthc Policy.* Dove Medical Press Ltd; 2019;12: 91–104.  
663 doi:10.2147/RMHP.S195214
- 664 24. Oche O, Yahaya M, Oladigbolu R, Ango J, Okafoagu C, Ezenwoko Z, et al. A cross-sectional  
665 survey of knowledge, attitude, and practices toward dengue fever among health workers in a  
666 tertiary health institution in Sokoto state, Nigeria. *J Fam Med Prim Care.* Medknow; 2021;10:  
667 3575. doi:10.4103/jfmprc.jfmprc\_327\_21
- 668 25. KoBoToolbox. Data Collection on KoboCollect App (Older Version) — KoboToolbox  
669 documentation [Internet]. 2022. Available:  
670 [https://support.kobotoolbox.org/kobocollect\\_on\\_android\\_latest.html](https://support.kobotoolbox.org/kobocollect_on_android_latest.html)
- 671 26. Brooks ME, Kristensen K, Van Benthem KJ, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, et al.  
672 glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility Among Packages for Zero-inflated Generalized  
673 Linear Mixed Modeling.
- 674 27. Bowman LR, Donegan S, McCall PJ. Is Dengue Vector Control Deficient in Effectiveness or  
675 Evidence?: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2016;10: 1–24.  
676 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004551
- 677 28. Lutomiah J, Barrera R, Makio A, Mutisya J, Koka H, Owaka S, et al. Dengue Outbreak in  
678 Mombasa City , Kenya , 2013 – 2014□: Entomologic Investigations. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.*  
679 2016; 1–16. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004981



- 680 29. Tarnagda Z, Congo M, Sagna T, Ouédraogo C, Nikiéma V, Cissé A, et al. Outbreak of dengue  
681 fever in Ouagadougou , Burkina Faso, 2013. *Int J Microbiol Immunol Res.* 2014;2: 101–108.
- 682 30. Organization WH. WHO | Dengue fever – Côte d’Ivoire. WHO. 2017: 1–15. Available:  
683 <https://www.who.int/csr/don/04-august-2017-dengue-cote-d-ivoire/en/>. Accessed 13 Oct 2020.
- 684 31. Daudé É, Mazumdar S, Solanki V. Widespread fear of dengue transmission but poor practices  
685 of dengue prevention: A study in the slums of Delhi, India. Codeço CT, editor. *PLoS One.*  
686 *Public Library of Science*; 2017;12: e0171543. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0171543
- 687 32. Dhar-Chowdhury P, Haque CE, Driedger SM. Dengue Disease Risk Mental Models in the  
688 City of Dhaka, Bangladesh: Juxtapositions and Gaps Between the Public and Experts. *Risk*  
689 *Anal.* 2016;36: 874–891. doi:10.1111/risa.12501
- 690 33. Quintero J, Brochero H, Manrique-Saide P, Barrera-Pérez M, Basso C, Romero S, et al.  
691 Ecological, biological and social dimensions of dengue vector breeding in five urban settings  
692 of Latin America: a multi-country study. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2014;14: 38. doi:10.1186/1471-  
693 2334-14-38
- 694 34. Hossain MI, Alam NE, Akter S, Suriea U, Aktar S, Shifat SK, et al. Knowledge, awareness  
695 and preventive practices of dengue outbreak in Bangladesh: A countrywide study. *PLoS One.*  
696 2021;16: 1–17. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252852
- 697 35. Tarnagda Z, Congo M, Sagna T, Ouédraogo C, Nikiéma V, Cissé A, et al. Outbreak of dengue  
698 fever in Ouagadougou , Burkina 2013. *Int J Microbiol Immunol Res.* 2014;2: 101–108.
- 699 36. Tarnagda Z, Cissé A, Bicaba BW, Diagbouga S, Sagna T, Ilboudo AK, et al. Dengue fever in  
700 Burkina faso, 2016. *Emerging Infectious Diseases.* 2018. doi:10.3201/eid2401.170973
- 701 37. Elsinga J, Schmidt M, Lizarazo EF, Vincenti-Gonzalez MF, Velasco-Salas ZI, Arias L, et al.  
702 Knowledge, attitudes, and preventive practices regarding dengue in maracay, Venezuela. *Am*  
703 *J Trop Med Hyg.* 2018;99: 195–203. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.17-0528
- 704 38. Selvarajoo S, Liew JWK, Tan W, Lim XY, Refai WF, Zaki RA, et al. Knowledge, attitude and  
705 practice on dengue prevention and dengue seroprevalence in a dengue hotspot in Malaysia: A  
706 cross-sectional study. *Sci Rep. Springer US*; 2020;10: 1–13. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-66212-5
- 707 39. Kumaran E, Doum D, Keo V, Sokha L, Sam BL, Chan V, et al. Dengue knowledge, attitudes  
708 and practices and their impact on community-based vector control in rural Cambodia. *PLoS*  
709 *Negl Trop Dis.* 2018;12. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0006268
- 710 40. Wang M, Han X, Fang H, Xu C, Lin X, Xia S, et al. Impact of Health Education on  
711 Knowledge and Behaviors toward Infectious Diseases among Students in Gansu Province,  
712 China. *Biomed Res Int.* 2018;2018. doi:10.1155/2018/6397340
- 713 41. Cofie P, De Allegri M, Kouyaté B, Sauerborn R. Effects of information, education, and

- 714 communication campaign on a community-based health insurance scheme in Burkina Faso.  
715 *Glob Health Action*. 2013;6: 20791. doi:10.3402/gha.v6i0.20791
- 716 42. Saied KG, Al-Taiar A, Altaire A, Alqadsi A, Alariqi EF, Hassaan M. Knowledge, attitude and  
717 preventive practices regarding dengue fever in rural areas of Yemen. *Int Health*. 2015;7: 420–  
718 425. doi:10.1093/inthealth/ihv021
- 719 43. Rahman MS, Ekalaksananan T, Zafar S, Poolphol P, Shipin O, Haque U, et al. Ecological,  
720 social and other environmental determinants of dengue vector abundance in urban and rural  
721 areas of Northeastern Thailand. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18.  
722 doi:10.3390/ijerph18115971
- 723 44. Rahman MS, Overgaard HJ, Pientong C, Mayxay M, Ekalaksananan T, Aromseree S, et al.  
724 Knowledge, attitudes, and practices on climate change and dengue in Lao People’s  
725 Democratic Republic and Thailand. *Environ Res. Elsevier Inc.*; 2021;193.  
726 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2020.110509
- 727 45. Rojanapithayakorn W. Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever in Thailand Situation and trends of DHF  
728 in Thailand Dengue haemorrhagic fever was first. *Dengue Bull*. 1998;22: 60–72.
- 729 46. Laurentino S, Parra-henao G, Betânia M, Giraldo L. Short Communication Dengue in Brazil  
730 and Colombia: a study of knowledge , attitudes , and practices. *Rev Soc Bras Med Trop*.  
731 2014;47: 783–787. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0037-8682-0048-2014
- 732 47. Bhat MA, Krishnamoorthy K. Entomological investigation and distribution of *Aedes*  
733 mosquitoes in Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci*. 2014;3: 253–  
734 260.
- 735 48. Wong LP, AbuBakar S, Chinna K. Community Knowledge, Health Beliefs, Practices and  
736 Experiences Related to Dengue Fever and Its Association with IgG Seropositivity. *PLoS Negl*  
737 *Trop Dis*. 2014;8. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0002789
- 738 49. Fournet F, Rican S, Vaillant Z, Roudot A, Meunier-Nikiema A, Kassié D, et al. The Influence  
739 of Urbanization Modes on the Spatial Circulation of Flaviviruses within Ouagadougou  
740 (Burkina Faso). *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2016;13: 1226. doi:10.3390/ijerph13121226
- 741 50. Herbuela VRDM, de Guzman FS, Sobrepeña GD, Claudio ABF, Tomas AC V., Reyes  
742 CMAD, et al. Knowledge, attitude, and practices regarding dengue fever among pediatric and  
743 adult in-patients in metro Manila, Philippines. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019;16: 1–15.  
744 doi:10.3390/ijerph16234705
- 745 51. Bonnet E, Fournet F, Benmarhnia T, Ouedraogo S, Dabiré R, Ridde V. Impact of a  
746 community-based intervention on *Aedes aegypti* and its spatial distribution in Ouagadougou,  
747 Burkina Faso. *Infect Dis Poverty*. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2020;9. doi:10.1186/s40249-020-

- 748 00675-6
- 749 52. González MA, Rodríguez-Sosa MA, Vásquez-Bautista YE, Rosario EDC, Durán-Tiburcio JC,  
750 Alarcón-Elbal PM. Estudio de mosquitos (Diptera: Culicidae) que se desarrollan en  
751 neumáticos en República Dominicana: consideraciones sobre un problema acuciante.  
752 Biomedica. Instituto Nacional de Salud; 2020;40: 507–515. doi:10.7705/biomedica.5200
- 753 53. Walker KR, Williamson D, Carrière Y, Reyes-Castro PA, Haenchen S, Hayden MH, et al.  
754 Socioeconomic and human behavioral factors associated with *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera:  
755 Culicidae) immature habitat in Tucson, AZ. *J Med Entomol.* 2018;55: 955–963.  
756 doi:10.1093/jme/tjy011
- 757 54. Ferede G, Tiruneh M, Abate E, Kassa WJ, Wondimeneh Y, Damtie D, et al. Distribution and  
758 larval breeding habitats of *Aedes* mosquito species in residential areas of northwest Ethiopia.  
759 *Epidemiol Heal.* 2018;40: 1–7. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4178/epih.e2018015>
- 760 55. PAHO. Dengue and Dendue hemorrhagic fever in the Americas: Guidelines for prevention  
761 and control. 1994.
- 762 56. Focks DA. A review of entomological sampling methods and indicators for dengue vectors.  
763 Geneva WHO. 2003; Available: [http://searo.who.int/LinkFiles/Dengue\\_book\\_review\\_1.pdf](http://searo.who.int/LinkFiles/Dengue_book_review_1.pdf)  
764

**Supplementary Table 4:** Table showing the associations between the presence of potential larval containers and different characteristics of the visited compound and respondents knowledge level following the Generalized Linear Mixed Model analysis (GLMM).

<b>Predictors</b>	<b>Incidence Rate Ratios</b>	<b>CI</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>(Intercept)</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.37 – 0.99</b>	<b>0.047</b>
Annual income [I]	-	-	-
<b>II</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.42 – 0.97</b>	<b>0.036</b>
III	0.76	0.50 – 1.16	0.200
<b>IV</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.42 – 1.00</b>	<b>0.050</b>
House type [Semi-traditional]	-	-	-
<b>Modern</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.58 – 0.89</b>	<b>0.002</b>
Traditional	1.02	0.77 – 1.34	0.903
<b>Residents per house</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.01 – 1.03</b>	<b>0.003</b>
<b>Population knowledge on dengue vector</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.02 – 1.11</b>	<b>0.003</b>

**Supplementary Table 3:** Table showing the associations between the presence of positive Aedes mosquito immature breeding sites containers and different characteristics of the visited compound and respondents knowledge level following Generalized Linear Mixed Model analysis (GLMM).

Predictors	Incidence Rate Ratios	CI	p
(Intercept)	0.38	0.24 – 0.60	<0.001
Annual income [I]	-	-	-
II	0.73	0.46 – 1.17	0.190
III	0.64	0.40 – 1.02	0.060
IV	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.25 – 0.61</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Residents per house	1.03	1.01 – 1.05	<b>0.001</b>

**Supplementary Table 2:** Table showing the associations between the presence of pupae positive breeding sites containers and different characteristics of the visited compound, its location and respondents knowledge level following Generalized Linear Mixed Model analysis (GLMM).

<b>Predictors</b>	<b>Incidence Rate Ratios</b>	<b>CI</b>	<b>p</b>
(Intercept)	0.29	0.14 – 0.61	<b>0.001</b>
HD [Baskuy]	-	-	-
Bogodogo	0.83	0.55 – 1.24	0.356
<b>Nongremassom</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>1.06 – 2.22</b>	<b>0.024</b>
Annual income [I]	-	-	-
<b>II</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>0.25 – 0.84</b>	<b>0.013</b>
<b>III</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.23 – 0.79</b>	<b>0.007</b>
<b>IV</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.16 – 0.51</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Residents per house	1.02	1.00 – 1.04	0.103
<b>Population knowledge on dengue vector</b>	0.92	0.85 – 1.00	<b>0.047</b>

**Supplementary Table 3:** Table showing the associations between the presence of positive Aedes mosquito immature breeding sites containers and different characteristics of the visited compound and respondents knowledge level following Generalized Linear Mixed Model analysis (GLMM).

<b>Predictors</b>	<b>Incidence Rate Ratios</b>	<b>CI</b>	<b>p</b>
(Intercept)	0.38	0.24 – 0.60	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Annual income [I]	-	-	-
II	0.73	0.46 – 1.17	0.190
III	0.64	0.40 – 1.02	0.060
<b>IV</b>	<b>0.39</b>	<b>0.25 – 0.61</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Residents per house	1.03	1.01 – 1.05	<b>0.001</b>

**Supplementary Table 4:** Table showing the associations between the presence of potential larval containers and different characteristics of the visited compound and respondents knowledge level following the Generalized Linear Mixed Model analysis (GLMM).

<b>Predictors</b>	<b>Incidence Rate Ratios</b>	<b>CI</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>(Intercept)</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.37 – 0.99</b>	<b>0.047</b>
Annual income [I]	-	-	-
<b>II</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.42 – 0.97</b>	<b>0.036</b>
III	0.76	0.50 – 1.16	0.200
<b>IV</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.42 – 1.00</b>	<b>0.050</b>
House type [Semi-traditional]	-	-	-
<b>Modern</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.58 – 0.89</b>	<b>0.002</b>
Traditional	1.02	0.77 – 1.34	0.903
<b>Residents per house</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>1.01 – 1.03</b>	<b>0.003</b>
<b>Population knowledge on dengue vector</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.02 – 1.11</b>	<b>0.003</b>

**Supplementary Table 1:** Socio-demographic and economic characteristics of the respondents and compounds surveyed.

Characteristics		HD Baskuy N (%)	HD Bogodogo N (%)	HD Nongre- massom N (%)	Urban areas N (%)	Peri-urban areas N (%)
		151 (100)	195 (100)	168 (100)	395 (100)	119 (100)
<b>Gender</b>	Female	84 (55.63)	122 (62.56)	82 (48.81)	225 (57)	63 (52.94)
	Male	67 (44.37)	73 (37.44)	86 (51.19)	170 (43)	56 (47.06)
<b>Age group</b>	[11-20]	29 (19.21)	45 (23.08)	50 (29.76)	99 (25.06)	25 (21.01)
	[21-30]	31 (20.53)	50 (25.64)	44 (26.19)	95 (24.05)	30 (25.21)
	[31-40]	24 (15.89)	40 (20.51)	34 (20.24)	68 (17.22)	30 (25.21)
	[41-50]	20 (13.25)	16 (8.21)	15 (8.93)	38 (9.62)	13 (10.92)
	[51-60]	20 (13.25)	21 (10.77)	12 (7.14)	43 (10.89)	10 (8.40)
	≥61	27 (17.88)	23 (11.79)	13 (7.74)	52(13.16)	11 (9.24)
<b>Mean of age</b>	-	39.66	35.35	31.90	35.84	34.33
<b>Residents</b>	Residents/compound	11.60	8.90	8.29	10.46	6.28
<b>Type of construction</b>	Traditional (I)	14 (9.27)	35 (17.95)	40 (23.81)	21 (5.32)	68 (57.14)
	Semi modern (II)	38 (25.17)	47 (24.10)	59 (35.12)	106 (26.84)	38 (31.93)
	Modern (III)	99 (65.56)	113 (57.95)	69 (41.07)	268 (67.85)	13 (10.92)
<b>Level of education</b>	No education	21 (13.91)	47 (24.10)	18 (10.71)	51 (12.91)	35 (29.41)
	No formal schooling	3 (1.99)	12 (6.15)	2 (1.19)	13 (3.29)	4 (3.36)
	Primary school	32 (21.19)	57 (29.23)	52 (30.95)	104 (26.33)	37 (31.09)
	Secondary school	63 (41.72)	57 (29.23)	73 (43.45)	159 (40.25)	34 (28.57)
	Graduate school	32 (21.19)	22 (11.28)	23 (13.69)	68 (17.22)	9 (7.56)
<b>Occupation</b>	Housewife	26 (17.22)	34 (17.44)	20 (11.90)	62 (15.70)	18 (15.13)
	Government employees	25 (16.56)	10 (5.13)	26 (15.48)	54 (13.67)	7 (5.88)
	Trader	33 (21.85)	52 (26.67)	26 (15.48)	77 (19.49)	34 (28.57)
	Craftsman	13 (8.61)	47 (24.10)	36 (21.43)	63 (15.95)	33 (27.73)
	Student (School/University)	36 (23.84)	47 (24.10)	48 (28.57)	111 (28.10)	20 (18.35)
	Other	18 (11.92)	5 (2.56)	12 (7.14)	28 (7.09)	7 (5.88)
<b>Household annual income</b>	□ 300,000 FCFA (I)	6 (3.97)	6 (3.08)	17 (10.12)	18 (4.56)	11 (9.24)
	[300,000-600,000]FCFA (II)	31 (20.53)	27 (13.85)	52 (30.95)	75 (18.99)	35 (29.41)
	[600,000-1,200,000]FCFA (III)	38 (25.17)	52 (26.67)	33 (19.64)	86 (21.77)	37 (31.09)
	▣1,200,000 FCFA (IV)	76 (50.33)	110 (56.41)	66 (39.29)	216 (54.68)	36 (30.25)
<b>Water supply sources</b>	Public fountains	26 (17.22)	61 (31.28)	64 (38.10)	57 (14.43)	94 (78.99)
	Well in the compound	2 (1.32)	3 (1.54)	2 (1.19)	6 (1.52)	1 (0.84)
	Tap water	123(81.46)	131 (67.18)	102 (60.71)	332 (84.05)	24 (20.17)



