

1 Gaps in protection to *Anopheles* exposure in high malaria endemic regencies of Papua

2 Province, Indonesia

3

4 Ismail E Rozi <sup>1,2</sup>, Lepa Syahrani <sup>1,3</sup>, Dendi H Permana <sup>1,4</sup>, Puji B S Asih <sup>1</sup>, Maria E Sumiwi

5 <sup>5</sup>, Neil F Lobo <sup>6</sup>, William A Hawley <sup>5</sup>, Din Syafruddin <sup>1, 7, 8, \*</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Eijkman Research Center for Molecular Biology, National Research and Innovation Agency

8 (BRIN), Cibinong, Indonesia.

9 <sup>2</sup> Doctoral Program in Faculty of Medicine, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia.

10 <sup>3</sup> Doctoral Program in Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Indonesia,

11 Depok, Indonesia

12 <sup>4</sup> Doctoral Program in Faculty of Medicine, University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

13 <sup>5</sup> United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), Jakarta, Indonesia

14 <sup>6</sup> Eck Institute for Global Health, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, USA.

15 <sup>7</sup> Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Medicine, Hasanuddin University, Makassar,

16 Indonesia.

17 <sup>8</sup> Hasanuddin University Medical Research Center, Makassar, Indonesia

18

19 \* Correspondent author

20 E-mail: [dinkarim@yahoo.com](mailto:dinkarim@yahoo.com)

21 Hasanuddin University Medical Research Center, Makassar, Indonesia

22

## 23 ABSTRACT

24 **Background:** Malaria in eastern Indonesia remains high despite significant reductions  
25 and local elimination in other parts of the country. Malaria control activities that have been  
26 implemented include early diagnosis and prompt treatment, provision of Long-lasting  
27 insecticide-treated nets (LLINs), and indoor residual spraying (IRS). To expedite malaria  
28 elimination in this region, a rapid entomological assessment combined with human behaviour  
29 observations (HBOs) were conducted in eight high malaria endemic regencies in Papua  
30 Province, Indonesia. The present study focuses on identifying gaps in protection against  
31 mosquito biting indoors and outdoors that may contribute to the sustained transmission and  
32 persistently high endemicity.

33 **Methods:** This study was conducted alongside a rapid entomologic assessment,  
34 including human landing catches (HLCs) of adult mosquitoes. Human behavior was  
35 documented by direct observations during HLCs. HBO data focused on temporal (over the  
36 night) and spatial (domestic or peri-domestic) presence, alongside bed net usage and sleeping  
37 patterns. Household questionnaires, also conducted during entomological collections,  
38 documented data on house structure materials, practices against mosquito bites, livestock  
39 presence, as well as intervention usage.

40 **Results:** Analysis of human behaviors in each regency identified several indoor and  
41 outdoor gaps in protection against mosquito biting. Human exposure to mosquito bites was  
42 driven by ITN usage, IRS coverage, indoor presence without protection prior to sleeping,  
43 absence of mosquito house screens, and outdoor presence without protection.

44 **Conclusions:** Data demonstrates multiple gaps in protection against mosquito exposure  
45 in all eight regencies of Papua evaluated. Indoor interventions require optimization, while  
46 current vector control activities do not presently address outdoor exposure. Measured spatial

47 and temporal exposure may be utilized to understand protective vector interventions that may  
48 function in these spaces while also pointing to continued exposure. Additional interventions,  
49 such as community-based larval source management, may reduce exposure overall, while novel  
50 interventions like spatial repellents may fill some gaps in protection – alongside optimized case  
51 detection and treatment. Results suggest that the present strategy may be insufficient to  
52 eliminate malaria in the region, and a rethought evidence-based and adaptive strategy is  
53 required.

54

55 **Key Words:** Human behavioural observation, gaps in protection against mosquito bite,  
56 malaria, Papua Province, Indonesia.

57

## 58 INTRODUCTION

59 Malaria incidence in Indonesia has been successfully brought down in many parts of the  
60 country except for some Provinces in the east, namely Papua, West Papua, and East Nusa  
61 Tenggara [1]. Of the 443,530 Indonesia malaria cases reported in 2022, 393,801 cases, or more  
62 than 88%, were from Papua. There are eight regencies in Papua Province, all of which have an  
63 Annual Parasite Incidence (API) of more than 100 [1–3]. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic  
64 in 2019 negatively affected healthcare services, including malaria control activities, at the  
65 primary health center level across Indonesia [4], resulting in concerns of increased incidence,  
66 outbreaks as well as reintroduction of malaria in areas where it had been eliminated.

67 As a response, the government of Indonesia has, within the last few years, intensified  
68 malaria control activities in Papua. These enhanced activities include better malaria case  
69 detection and treatment based on reviving village malaria cadres that enable early detection  
70 and prompt treatment of cases [5,6]. Vector interventions that supplement these  
71 epidemiological strategies include the targeted full coverage with both Insecticide-treated nets  
72 (ITNs) and indoor residual spraying (IRS) [7] in malaria-endemic regencies.

73 Indonesia has set an ambitious goal to eliminate malaria by 2030 [8], targeting  
74 eradication district by district. As of 2022, 72.37% of districts (equivalent to 372 districts)  
75 across the country have been declared free of malaria transmission [1,2]. However, none of the  
76 districts in Papua have achieved this status. Papua faces the most significant challenge in  
77 meeting the 2030 malaria elimination target due to its current high endemicity. In 2023, eight  
78 districts in Papua—Jayapura, Yapen Islands, Mimika, Boven Digoel, Asmat, Sarmi, Keerom,  
79 and Waropen—were reported to have high malaria incidence [3]. These regencies have  
80 implemented the three pillars of malaria control: early diagnosis and prompt treatment,  
81 distribution of ITNs, and IRS. Despite these efforts, the annual malaria parasite incidence has

82 remained high, seen even before the COVID-19 pandemic.

83 To accelerate the reduction of malaria cases and achieve the 2030 elimination goal, rapid  
84 entomological assessments, household surveys, and observations of human behavior toward  
85 understanding the transmission system were conducted in five districts in 2019 and three more  
86 in 2021. "Gaps in protection" are situations where individuals or households are potentially  
87 exposed to malaria due to the absence or inadequacy of effective protective or preventive  
88 measures [9,10]. These gaps can be identified by assessing how interventions interact with  
89 local human and vector populations. In this study, identifying and characterizing these gaps in  
90 protection includes examining the presence and use of ITN, IRS coverage, housing conditions,  
91 and spatial and temporal human activities and presence [10]. By analyzing data from human  
92 behavior and household surveys in these eight districts, the study aims to pinpoint the gaps in  
93 protection against mosquito bites, indoors and outdoors, that may contribute to the persistently  
94 high malaria cases in Papua.

95

## 96 **METHODS**

### 97 **Ethical statement**

98 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Research in Health, Medical  
99 Faculty of Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia No: 281/UN4.6.4.5.31/PP36/2019 and  
100 (29 January 2021) No: 40/UN4.6.4.5.31/PP36/2021

101

### 102 **Site selection**

103 This study was conducted as part of the Rapid Entomological Assessments program  
104 across eight regencies in Papua province, Indonesia (Fig 1). In each regency, three health  
105 centers were selected, and within each health center's jurisdiction, two villages were chosen for  
106 the study. A total of 48 villages were included, comprising 10 transmigrant communities and  
107 38 resident settlements. The entomological assessments and household surveys were carried  
108 out across all eight regencies over 150 days.

109

### 110 **Adult mosquito collections**

111 Adult mosquito collections were performed using HLCs and indoor night resting  
112 collection [11]. HLCs were conducted in four sentinel houses in each area and performed from  
113 1800 to 0600 to evaluate *Anopheles*' indoor and outdoor landing densities in the houses. Human  
114 biting rate (HBR) indoors and outdoors were calculated as bite per person per hour (bph). The  
115 indoor and outdoor HBRs were used to calculate the periodicity of *Anopheles* biting activities  
116 per site and utilized to estimate human behavior-adjusted biting rates [12].

117 Meanwhile, indoor night resting collections were performed using manual aspiration  
118 every two hours from 1800 to 0600 in the four houses without HLC activities per site. The

119 indoor resting density (IRD) was calculated as the total *Anopheles* collected per sentinel house  
120 per night. The estimated IRS effectiveness for potential protection in each study site, when  
121 applied, was calculated by comparing the total *Anopheles* captured per house from HLC  
122 divided by IRD [13]. This calculation was also carried out for each species of *Punctulatus*  
123 group collected. HLCs and indoor night resting collections were conducted by trained local  
124 human volunteers, along with signed informed consent regarding the possible effects and risks  
125 of participating in the study [12,14].

126

## 127 **Human behavior observations (HBOs)**

128 HBOs were conducted at the same time as HLCs. At the end of every HLC hour, the  
129 HLC volunteer documented the number of people indoors and whether they were using an ITN.  
130 Similarly, the outdoor HLC volunteer documented the number of people within a 5 m radius  
131 of the house (the peridomestic area) with the same spatial and temporal behavioral endpoints  
132 (S1 File Part A). Analysis to determine human behavior-adjusted exposure was based on the  
133 overlap between spatial and temporal presence alongside ITN use and parallel vector data [15–  
134 18]. The proportions of HBOs were calculated separately using 48 HBOs data of each study  
135 site location. The potential risk of exposure to *Anopheles* vectors was only calculated in  
136 locations where a high number of *Anopheles* species were found.

137

## 138 **Household survey**

139 A community-based household survey was conducted with the assistance of local health  
140 workers during household enrollment near mosquito breeding site sampling locations. The  
141 survey aimed to enroll 20 to 30 households per village across 48 villages. The survey gathered  
142 information on building materials, socio-economic status, nighttime human behavior,

143 protection against mosquito bites, and the presence of malaria cases in the households (refer to  
144 S1 File Part B). Data collection was facilitated using ODK Collect, a mobile platform that  
145 operates on the Open Data Kit (ODK) system [19]. Quantitative data was analyzed using basic  
146 functions in Microsoft Office Excel and open-source software, RStudio version 1.3.1056,  
147 based on R version 4.0.2 [20,21]. The k-means algorithm from the klaR package was employed  
148 to cluster house types based on material structures [22]. The analysis primarily involved  
149 calculating percentages and proportions. ITN access was determined by dividing the total  
150 number of potential ITN users by the total number of individuals who spent the previous night  
151 in the surveyed households [23–25].

152 To assess the socioeconomic status of the households in the study area, a wealth index  
153 (WI) was calculated using a principal component analysis (PCA) in R [20,21]. This approach  
154 was based on the methods used in demographic and health surveys (DHS) for wealth index  
155 calculations [26–28]. A total of 23 key asset ownership variables, including house amenities  
156 and household productive and non-productive assets, were collected from the household survey  
157 and combined into proxy WI indicators using a PCA. The resulting wealth index was then used  
158 to rank households into five quintiles, which were prepared for cross-tabulation with other  
159 variables in the dataset.

160

## 161 **Gaps in protection**

162 Gaps in protection [9] were represented by HBO-adjusted biting rate, i.e. exposure to  
163 mosquito bites, house structures including materials and protection from mosquitoes entering  
164 the house (installment of window screens and the use of indoor repellents), the distribution and  
165 use of ITNs, the coverage of IRS, and individual human night time behaviors related to  
166 exposure to mosquito bites including sleeping behaviors [9,10]. The magnitude of gaps in



167 protection was indicated by symbols "+," "++," and "+++", representing minor, moderate, and  
168 major issues, respectively. These were calculated based on the proportion of related  
169 circumstances within the entire population. A chi-square test was employed to determine  
170 whether the gaps in protection were statistically significantly associated (using a critical p-  
171 value of 0.05) with clustered house types and the socioeconomic status of households in the  
172 study area.

173

## 174 **RESULTS**

### 175 **Human behavior observations during HLC**

176 The presence and activities of all inhabitants of the sentinel houses during the HLC period  
177 is shown in Fig 2a. Human activities were divided into four behavioral groups: indoor under  
178 ITNs, indoor not under ITNs, outdoor-awake, and outdoor-sleep. Both outdoor behavioral  
179 groups did not use ITNs. Many data points were missed during the HBOs, particularly in the  
180 early hours (18:00-19:00) and the final periods (04:00-06:00) of the HLC observations.  
181 Moreover, additional missing data was identified from five villages in Yapen Islands Regency,  
182 which were represented as zero values in stacked area charts. HBOs conducted between 19:00  
183 and 20:00 indicated limited outdoor activity, with over 70% of observed activities occurring  
184 indoors. More than 65% of the people indoors were not under ITNs. Gradually, the proportion  
185 of individuals using ITNs increased, peaking after midnight. From midnight to 06:00, the  
186 percentage of people indoors remained steady between 30% and 40%, suggesting that most  
187 slept indoors without ITNs. Since the proportion of individuals sleeping outdoors was minimal,  
188 it was combined with the proportion of those awake outdoors in subsequent analyses, referred  
189 to as the proportion of humans outdoors.

190 Fig 2b illustrates box-and-whisker plots showing the total proportions of human behavior  
191 across all sites and within each regency. Data from the Yapen Islands was excluded, and the  
192 categories "outdoor awake" and "outdoor sleeping" were combined into a single "outdoors"  
193 category. The HBO results showed that the proportions of people indoors under ITNs, indoors  
194 without ITNs, and outdoors across all regencies were 38.2%, 47.7%, and 14.1%, respectively.  
195 Among the regencies, Sarmi had the highest percentage of people indoors under ITNs and the  
196 lowest percentage indoors without ITNs. In contrast, the overall outdoor population was low,  
197 with Waropen and Asmat regencies recording the smallest outdoor populations.

198

## 199 **Human behavior adjusted mosquito biting rate**

200 S2 File presents the total proportion of human behavior, the proportion of human  
201 behavior overlaid with indoor and outdoor mosquito biting rates, and the human behavior-  
202 adjusted biting rate for an unprotected individual's exposure to *Anopheles* bites. This data is  
203 derived from the 12 villages with high human biting rates per night from HLC, including nine  
204 villages from inland areas and three from coastal regions. Additionally, data from two more  
205 villages—Migiwia, a coastal village in Mimika, and Yasiuw, a riverside village in Asmat—are  
206 also included.

207 Table 1 displays the directly measured mosquito biting as well as the proportions of  
208 behavior-adjusted exposure for ITN users and unprotected individuals in these 14 villages.  
209 Assuming that individuals under ITNs are fully protected from *Anopheles* bites, villages with  
210 a high proportion of the population using ITNs during peak biting times would experience  
211 greater protection (e.g., villages in Sarmi Regency such as Samanente, Konderjan, and Webrau,  
212 with 74.4%, 68.5%, and 68.2% of the population under ITNs, respectively).

213 The behavior-adjusted exposure rate for unprotected individuals revealed different

214 characteristics across the villages, influenced not only by observed human behavior but also by  
215 geographical factors and the predominant *Anopheles* species' biting behavior in the area. In  
216 most of the 12 villages, *An. koliensis* was the dominant species, with peak biting occurring after  
217 midnight. However, in two inland villages in Mimika Regency - Mwarei and Kaugapu - *An.*  
218 *farauti* was found in significant numbers during the early evening, with fewer *An. koliensis*  
219 collected at that time (Figs S2-9b and S2-10b). The presence of this species and their biting  
220 behaviors increased the risk of exposure to *Anopheles* bites for populations not yet under ITNs.  
221 The proportions of vector bites occurring indoors and outdoors in Mwarei and Kaugapu were  
222 52.3% and 69.9%, respectively. Minimal outdoor activity after 18:00-19:00 in Mwarei resulted  
223 in a relatively low adjusted exposure rate for unprotected individuals (Fig S2-9d). This pattern  
224 was also observed in other sites where *Anopheles* began seeking blood meals indoors early in  
225 the evening.

226 In Migiwia, a coastal village in Mimika Regency, *An. farauti* was the predominant  
227 species, with blood-seeking activity peaking in the early evening, shortly after midnight, and  
228 again toward the end of the night (HBR indoors and outdoors was 4.8 bpn and 9.8 bpn,  
229 respectively; Fig S2-13b). In Yasiuw, a riverside village in Asmat Regency, high blood-seeking  
230 activity early in the night was primarily due to *An. koliensis* (HBR indoors and outdoors were  
231 1.8 bpn and 12.3 bpn, respectively; Fig S2-14b).

232 Overall, in most villages, there was a high risk of exposure to *Anopheles* bites before  
233 midnight, when most of the population was not yet under ITNs. In villages with extremely high  
234 HBR, such as Skofro and Hanggey Among, even though a large portion of the population was  
235 under ITNs during observation, the remaining indoor and outdoor populations were still highly  
236 exposed to *Anopheles* bites throughout the night, with proportions of vector bites occurring  
237 indoors and outdoors at 50.7% and 69.2%, respectively (Figs S2-1d and S2-3d). Moreover,

238 villages with a lower proportion of the population under ITNs, such as Wanagon, Sukanggo,  
239 and Yasiuw, were also highly exposed to *Anopheles* bites (Figs S2-11d, S2-12d, and S2-14d),  
240 with proportions of vector bites occurring indoors and outdoors at 91.4%, 79.7%, and 91.9%,  
241 respectively.

242

## 243 **Demographic characteristics**

244 The results of the household questionnaire, conducted across 1,255 households in 47  
245 villages, are presented in Supplementary File 3, Tables S3-1 to S3-5. Data from one village in  
246 Yapen Islands Regency was missing due to the loss of the mobile device used for data  
247 collection before it could be uploaded. The gender ratio of interviewees across the eight  
248 regencies was not significantly different, with 86.2% of respondents being the head of the  
249 household or their spouse (Table S3-1). The remaining 10.8% were primarily other primary  
250 family members, such as children, grandchildren, parents, or parents-in-law. The average age  
251 of respondents was 40.7 years ( $\pm 14.1$ ), with ages ranging from 12 to 83 years. Regarding  
252 education levels, 39.8% of respondents had completed senior high school or higher, 47.0% had  
253 finished primary or junior high school, and the remainder either had no formal education or did  
254 not complete elementary school.

255 The average number of households surveyed per village was 26.7 ( $\pm 4.7$ ) (Table S3-2),  
256 with an average household size of 5.6 ( $\pm 3.5$ ) members. The majority of surveyed households  
257 fell into the lower socioeconomic categories, primarily in the second and first quantiles,  
258 classified as poorer quantiles. Regarding housing structure, 61% of the homes in the eight  
259 regencies were constructed from wooden planks (with full or half-walls made of wooden  
260 planks) and had zinc roofs (Figs 3a, 3c, and 3d). Another 37% of the houses were built with  
261 brick, cement, or stone walls (Fig 3b). Almost 93% of the houses in the study areas had zinc

262 roofs, while the remaining roofs were made from asbestos, ceramic tiles, or thatch.

263 Notably, in Asmat Regency, 96.2% of the houses were made from wooden planks,  
264 wooden blocks, and bamboo (Fig 3a). These homes were typically elevated more than 50 cm  
265 above the ground along riversides or river mouths, making them susceptible to tides and  
266 temporary water pooling. In contrast, 39% of houses in Yapen Islands, 45% in Mimika, and  
267 61% in Sarmi were also made from wooden planks, but only 41% in Mimika and Sarmi and  
268 22% in Yapen Islands were elevated more than 50 cm above the ground.

269 A clustering analysis based on wall and floor materials revealed four main house types.  
270 The largest category, 43%, consisted of houses made entirely from wooden planks for both  
271 walls and floors. The second largest category, 29.5%, included houses with cement or concrete  
272 walls and cement or ceramic floors. The third type, 16.9%, featured walls made from a mix of  
273 cement and wood or stone, with floors of cement or ceramic. The remaining 10.4% of houses  
274 had wooden plank walls and floors made from cement, ceramic, or dirt. On average, houses  
275 had 2.4 ( $\pm 0.8$ ) doors and 4.8 ( $\pm 2.5$ ) windows.

276 The majority of houses lacked mosquito-proofing features such as screened windows or  
277 doors. While 88.8% of houses had eaves, only about 25% (ranging from 15.0% to 35.4%) used  
278 mosquito nets to block eaves. Mosquito screens on doors, windows, and vents were observed  
279 across all four house types. Electricity was available in 91.3% of the surveyed houses, with  
280 73.9% connected to the State Electricity Company (Perusahaan Listrik Nasional, PLN), and  
281 12.6% and 13.5% powered by solar cells and generators, respectively.

282 Approximately 80.0% of interviewees reported that at least one member of their  
283 household had experienced a malaria infection (Table S3-3), with the highest incidence  
284 reported in Sarmi and Mimika (94.9% and 92.3%, respectively). Additionally, 25.5% of those  
285 interviewed mentioned having personally suffered from malaria. The prevalence of diagnosed

286 malaria infections within the two weeks preceding the interview, or ongoing at the time of the  
287 interview, was also significant across the regions, averaging 13.1% and ranging from 5.8% to  
288 20.3%. Furthermore, the average rate of malaria-related deaths within the last two years among  
289 surveyed households was 2.1%, with a range from 0.6% to 5.7%.

290

## 291 **Community practices for preventing mosquito bites**

292 Based on the household survey results, malaria vector control interventions, particularly  
293 targeting adult mosquitoes through IRS spraying and ITN distribution, were implemented  
294 across the eight regencies (Fig 4 and Table S3-4). On average, IRS spraying covered 28.4% of  
295 the study areas, but it was not uniformly or simultaneously conducted in all locations. For  
296 example, in Keerom, 67.3% of the area was sprayed, with some villages fully covered, others  
297 partially, and one not sprayed at all. Over 60% of households in Jayapura, Mimika, and Yapen  
298 Islands that received IRS had been sprayed within three months prior to the survey. In contrast,  
299 in Keerom, Sarmi, and Waropen, a significant portion of the spraying occurred more than six  
300 months earlier. In Boven Digoel and Asmat, IRS was carried out 3–6 months and over six  
301 months before the survey, with similar percentages across both time frames. Most of the IRS  
302 activities had been conducted by health workers.

303 Table 2 shows the estimated IRS effectiveness for potential protection in 14 villages that  
304 have mentioned in Table 1. Overall IRS effectiveness ranged from zero to no more than 25%,  
305 meaning that more than 75% of the *Anopheles* in these villages did not rest indoor, even though  
306 after took blood feeding indoor. This overall *Anopheles* behavior reflected similarly to the *An.*  
307 *koliensis* IRS effectiveness. Moreover, *An. punctulatus* mostly had less IRS effectiveness than  
308 *An. koliensis*, but in Konderjen and Mwarei the IRS effectiveness were 66.7% and 50.0%  
309 respectively. Meanwhile, *An. farauti* that tended to bite outdoors in the early evening [11,29],

310 also had less IRS effectiveness, except in Sunum/Yamna village (36.4%).

311 The interview results regarding implementing insecticide-treated nets (ITNs), as  
312 presented in Fig 4 and Table S3-4, indicate that ITNs were generally distributed evenly and  
313 used appropriately. The average ITN coverage closely matched the number of bedrooms per  
314 house, suggesting that nearly every bedroom could have an ITN installed. Additionally, the  
315 average ITN access was 75.8% (ranging from 63.1% to 84.0%), meaning that three out of four  
316 people had access to an ITN, with one ITN typically shared by up to two people.

317 The proportion of household members using ITNs was quite high, with 70.3% of all  
318 individuals in the household (including adult males, adult females, and children) reported to be  
319 using ITNs. Furthermore, 72.7% of household members (an average of 3.9 persons per  
320 household) slept under an ITN the night before the survey. However, reasons for not using  
321 ITNs varied, with the most common being discomfort due to heat inside the net. Other  
322 frequently cited reasons included the belief that there was no need to use ITNs because the area  
323 had already been sprayed with mosquito repellent. Approximately half of the surveyed  
324 households used indoor insect repellents, with mosquito coils and sprays being the most  
325 common methods to prevent mosquito bites.

326

## 327 **Nighttime habits and usage of mosquito repellent**

328 Questions about nighttime activities were asked to assess the risk of exposure to mosquito  
329 bites, with the results presented in Fig 5 and Table S3-5. The majority of evening meal activities  
330 (77.1%) occurred between 19:00 and 21:00, and most people ate at home. However, on  
331 average, 3.3% of interviewees reported having their evening meal outside the house.  
332 Additionally, 21.9% of respondents mentioned resting outside the house after eating.

333 Outdoor nighttime activities were common, with 46.1% of interviewees engaging in such

334 activities, and the percentage was fairly consistent across the study sites, ranging from 36.3%  
335 to 59.9%. These activities primarily included sitting around in the house yard or visiting friends  
336 and relatives in the neighborhood (71.6%) and going fishing or hunting (16.3%). Among those  
337 who engaged in nighttime outdoor activities, 68.3% reported that these activities lasted for  
338 more than an hour. However, only 10.9% of interviewees used mosquito repellent while outside  
339 at night.

340 Most respondents (73.4%) reported going to sleep after 21:00, and 67.5% woke up before  
341 06:00. A significant majority (81.6%) stated that they slept under an ITN. Only a small  
342 percentage of interviewees (0.4%) reported sleeping outside the house.

343

## 344 **Gaps in protection**

345 Table 3 presents gaps in protection identified from the household survey and examines  
346 their correlations with calculated house types and household socioeconomic status in the study  
347 area. The house mosquito screen and IRS coverage were included as major gaps in protection,  
348 meanwhile ITN coverage and usage was included as minor to moderate gaps. Moreover,  
349 although nighttime activities that exposed to mosquito bites were not included as major gaps  
350 in protection, because of resided in the malaria endemic area these activities could increase  
351 malaria transmission. The analysis correlations revealed that, with p-values greater than 0.05,  
352 most gaps in protection did not show a significant correlation with either house types or  
353 household socioeconomic status.

354

## 355 **DISCUSSION**

356 This study highlights several gaps in protection [9] against mosquito bites, both indoors



357 and outdoors, which may contribute to the recent stagnation in reducing malaria incidence in  
358 Papua. To achieve malaria elimination by 2030, decision-makers in Papua Province must  
359 accelerate efforts to reduce malaria cases to zero. This will require addressing both indoor and  
360 outdoor transmission through enhanced and targeted mitigation strategies targeting both  
361 vectors and humans. The utilization of multiple types of data (human behavior and  
362 entomology) enables a direct understanding of where and when transmission events occur –  
363 outputs that enable the mapping of specific interventions and how they function onto these  
364 spatial and temporal gaps in protection.

365 To effectively combat malaria transmission, both indoor and outdoor gaps in mosquito  
366 bite protection must be addressed simultaneously. This study identified the *Punctulatus* group  
367 as the primary malaria vector across Papua, which bites humans both indoors and outdoors  
368 with equal frequency [11,30]. The current malaria control program by the Ministry of Health  
369 focuses on early diagnosis and treatment, ITN distribution, and indoor residual spraying (IRS)  
370 [1,2]. However, this approach predominantly targets indoor transmission and does not address  
371 the outdoor transmission component.

372 To enhance indoor protection, identified gaps such as the suboptimal use of ITNs, the  
373 absence of house mosquito screens [31–33], and insufficient IRS coverage need to be  
374 addressed. Improving these measures will optimize indoor protection during nighttime.

375 For mitigating outdoor transmission, it may be crucial to reduce larval habitats,  
376 particularly those near residential areas, through larval source management [11,34]. This  
377 approach has the potential to significantly decrease the local *Anopheles* population, thereby  
378 reducing overall malaria transmission. Additionally, integrating health education (Social and  
379 Behavior Change Communication (SBC)) for local inhabitants to minimize mosquito exposure  
380 during nighttime activities is recommended [10], and may increase ITN use. Human behavior

381 observations (HBO) conducted during HLC in Papua [15,18,35–37] have highlighted these  
382 gaps in the protection and local drivers of malaria transmission.

383 The distribution of ITNs across the eight regencies in this study demonstrated nearly  
384 complete coverage, with each household having approximately three ITNs. Despite this, the  
385 household survey revealed that while over 70% of household members used ITNs and more  
386 than 72% slept under them the night before the interview, gaps in protection remain due to  
387 human behavior.

388 Even with widespread ITN coverage, the issue of people being indoors at night without  
389 bed net protection persists. To address this, options include regular IRS or the installation of  
390 mosquito screens on doors and ventilation openings. Additionally, innovative vector control  
391 tools like spatial repellents could be used. These tools offer protection for indoor spaces and  
392 have been shown to effectively reduce malaria transmission in various field settings [38–40].

393 The habit of people in Papua engaging in nighttime outdoor activities significantly  
394 contributes to malaria infection [9,10,15,41,42], irrespective of house type or socioeconomic  
395 status. Survey results indicate that these activities often take place in the neighborhood, such  
396 as visiting friends or attending cultural and religious events. Nighttime activities like hunting  
397 and fishing pose an even higher risk than mere socializing in the neighborhood. To address this  
398 protection gap, health education on malaria transmission and the use of household insecticides  
399 and repellents is recommended. Educating the community about the risks associated with  
400 outdoor activities and promoting protective measures can help reduce exposure to mosquito  
401 bites and, consequently, malaria transmission.

402

## 403 **Limitations of the study**

404 Given that this study was a cross-sectional survey conducted over a short period of time,

405 several limitations should be noted. A larger sampling frame would have provided more  
406 representative data. Sampling at monthly intervals throughout the year would have offered a  
407 more comprehensive understanding of vector and human behaviors across different seasons  
408 and variations in human activities. Additionally, the data collected from selected sentinel sites  
409 may not fully represent the entire regency, potentially affecting the generalizability of the  
410 findings. Furthermore, missing data from both the HBO and household questionnaire datasets  
411 may have influenced the accuracy and reliability of site-specific analyses.

412

## 413 **CONCLUSIONS**

414 The evidence underscores the shortcomings of existing malaria control efforts in Papua  
415 Province and emphasizes the need to address both indoor and outdoor mosquito bite protection  
416 gaps. To improve protection, it is recommended to enhance indoor measures while also  
417 implementing strategies to reduce outdoor transmission, such as community-driven larval  
418 source management to eliminate mosquito breeding sites near dwellings. Novel strategies such  
419 as spatial repellents may also be evaluated in scaled studies. In conclusion, this study identified  
420 several gaps in protection against mosquito bites both indoors and outdoors across eight  
421 regencies in Papua Province. Key issues include inadequate ITN usage, insufficient IRS  
422 coverage, limited indoor protection before sleeping, absence of house screening, and the habit  
423 of engaging in outdoor activities without protection. These findings highlight the need to  
424 optimize indoor protection measures to effectively mitigate indoor malaria transmission.  
425 However, current malaria control activities have not sufficiently addressed outdoor mosquito  
426 exposure.

427

## 428 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

429 We extend our sincere appreciation to UNICEF for supporting this activity in Papua. Our  
430 heartfelt thanks go to the laboratory and field study teams for their efforts in sample and data  
431 collection. We are also deeply grateful to the Eijkman Research Center for Molecular Biology  
432 and the National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) for their ongoing support. We  
433 express our profound gratitude to the residents in the study area for their time, patience, and  
434 participation in this study. Special thanks are extended to the Health Departments of the  
435 Keerom, Boven Digul, Mimika, Sarmi, Jayapura, Yapen Islands, Waropen, and Asmat  
436 regencies, as well as the Primary Health Departments, for their invaluable support. We also  
437 acknowledge the dedication of the entomology team, local field workers, data entry clerks, and  
438 the numerous local volunteers who contributed tirelessly to ensure the quality of the data and  
439 the success of this project.

440

## 441 **Author Contribution**

442 IER, LS, DHP, PBSA, NFL, and DS were responsible for the study design, supervised  
443 the data collection, and contributed to the first draft writing of the manuscript. IER, LS, DHP,  
444 PBSA, MES, NFL, WAH, and DS performed the data collection, laboratory work, and analysis.  
445 IER, PBSA, NFL, and DS drafted the manuscript. All authors are main contributors who have  
446 read and approved the final manuscript.

447

## 448 **Funding**

449 The study was supported by the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund  
450 (UNICEF) and the government of Indonesia National Research and Innovation Agency

451 (BRIN), Republic of Indonesia, through funding from Health Research Organizations. The  
452 funders had no role in study design, data collection, and interpretation.

453

#### 454 **Availability of data and materials**

455 All datasets generated and analyzed during this study are included in the manuscript.

456

#### 457 **Declarations**

458

#### 459 **Consent for publication**

460 Not applicable.

461

#### 462 **Competing interests**

463 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

464

## 465 REFERENCES

- 466 1. Kementrian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. Profil Kesehatan Indonesia Tahun 2022.  
467 Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. 2023. Available:  
468 <https://kemkes.go.id/id/profil-kesehatan-indonesia-2022>
- 469 2. Prameswari HD. Annual Malaria Report 2022. Elyazar I, Ekawati LL, editors.  
470 Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. 2022. Available:  
471 [https://p2p.kemkes.go.id/wp-](https://p2p.kemkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/FINAL_231123_Layout_Malaria_Bahasa-Inggris_compressed.pdf)  
472 [content/uploads/2023/12/FINAL\\_231123\\_Layout\\_Malaria\\_Bahasa-](https://p2p.kemkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/FINAL_231123_Layout_Malaria_Bahasa-Inggris_compressed.pdf)  
473 [Inggris\\_compressed.pdf](https://p2p.kemkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/FINAL_231123_Layout_Malaria_Bahasa-Inggris_compressed.pdf)
- 474 3. BPS - Statistics of Papua Province. Papua Dalam Angka 2023 - Papua Province in  
475 Figures 2023. BPS - Statistics of Papua Province, editor. BPS - Statistics of Papua  
476 Province; 2023. Available:  
477 [https://papua.bps.go.id/publication/2023/02/28/68b848a54207a64d0c42ddb6/provinsi-](https://papua.bps.go.id/publication/2023/02/28/68b848a54207a64d0c42ddb6/provinsi-papua-dalam-angka-2023.html)  
478 [papua-dalam-angka-2023.html](https://papua.bps.go.id/publication/2023/02/28/68b848a54207a64d0c42ddb6/provinsi-papua-dalam-angka-2023.html)
- 479 4. Basri HH. Percepatan Eliminasi Malaria di Indonesia: Revisi Rencana Aksi dan  
480 Menjembatani Kesenjangan. In: WHO Indonesia [Internet]. 2023 [cited 13 Feb 2024].  
481 Available: [https://www.who.int/indonesia/id/news/detail/24-07-2023-accelerating-](https://www.who.int/indonesia/id/news/detail/24-07-2023-accelerating-malaria-elimination-in-indonesia--revised-action-plan-and-bridging-the-gap)  
482 [malaria-elimination-in-indonesia--revised-action-plan-and-bridging-the-gap](https://www.who.int/indonesia/id/news/detail/24-07-2023-accelerating-malaria-elimination-in-indonesia--revised-action-plan-and-bridging-the-gap)
- 483 5. UNICEF. Village Malaria Cadres and Consultants Role on Malaria Control and  
484 Elimination in Eastern Indonesia. 2022. Available:  
485 [https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/reports/village-malaria-cadres-and-consultants-role-](https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/reports/village-malaria-cadres-and-consultants-role-malaria-control-and-elimination-eastern)  
486 [malaria-control-and-elimination-eastern](https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/reports/village-malaria-cadres-and-consultants-role-malaria-control-and-elimination-eastern)
- 487 6. Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. Peraturan Menteri Kesehatan Republik  
488 Indonesia Nomor 41 Tahun 2018 Tentang Pelaksanaan Deteksi Dini Dan Pemberian  
489 Obat Anti Malaria Oleh Kader Malaria Pada Daerah Dengan Situasi Khusus. 2018.
- 490 7. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect  
491 of malaria control on *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa between 2000 and 2015.  
492 *Nature*. 2015;526: 207. doi:10.1038/NATURE15535
- 493 8. Menteri Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. Keputusan Menteri Kesehatan Republik  
494 Indonesia Nomor 293/MENKES/SK/IV/2009 Tentang Eliminasi Malaria Di Indonesia.  
495 2009.
- 496 9. Paaijmans KP, Lobo NF. Gaps in protection: the actual challenge in malaria  
497 elimination. *Malar J*. 2023;22: 1–4. doi:10.1186/S12936-023-04473-X/FIGURES/1
- 498 10. Monroe A, Moore S, Olapeju B, Merritt AP, Okumu F. Unlocking the human factor to  
499 increase effectiveness and sustainability of malaria vector control. *Malar J*. 2021; 1–6.  
500 doi:10.1186/s12936-021-03943-4
- 501 11. Rozi IE, Permana DH, Syahrani L, Asih PBS, Zubaidah S, Risandi R, et al. Rapid  
502 entomological assessment in eight high malaria endemic regencies in Papua Province  
503 revealed the presence of indoor and outdoor malaria transmissions. *Scientific Reports*  
504 2024 14:1. 2024;14: 1–14. doi:10.1038/s41598-024-64958-w
- 505 12. World Health Organization. Training module on malaria control: Malaria entomology  
506 and vector control. Guide for participants. 2013. Available: <http://www.who.int/malaria>
- 507 13. Alafo C, Martí-Soler H, Máquina M, Malheia A, Aswat AS, Koekemoer LL, et al. To  
508 spray or target mosquitoes another way: focused entomological intelligence guides the  
509 implementation of indoor residual spraying in southern Mozambique. *Malar J*.  
510 2022;21: 1–15. doi:10.1186/S12936-022-04233-3/TABLES/3

- 511 14. WHO Division of Malaria and Other parasitic Diseases. Manual on Practical  
512 Entomology in Malaria. Part 1: Vector Bionomics and Organization of Anti-Malaria  
513 Activities. Geneva; 1975.
- 514 15. Rozi IE, Syahrani L, Permana DH, Asih PBS, Hidayati APN, Kosasih S, et al. Human  
515 behavior determinants of exposure to Anopheles vectors of malaria in Sumba,  
516 Indonesia. *PLoS One*. 2022;17: e0276783. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0276783
- 517 16. Monroe A, Moore S, Okumu F, Kiware S, Lobo NF, Koenker H, et al. Methods and  
518 indicators for measuring patterns of human exposure to malaria vectors. *Malaria*  
519 *Journal* 2020 19:1. 2020;19: 1–14. doi:10.1186/s12936-020-03271-z
- 520 17. Monroe A, Moore S, Okumu F, Kiware S, Lobo NF, Koenker H, et al. Erratum:  
521 Methods and indicators for measuring patterns of human exposure to malaria vectors  
522 (*Malar J* (2020) 19: 207 DOI: 10.1186/s12936-020-03271-z). *Malar J*. 2020;19: 12936.  
523 doi:10.1186/s12936-020-03308-3
- 524 18. Monroe A, Msaky D, Kiware S, Tarimo BB, Moore S, Haji K, et al. Patterns of human  
525 exposure to malaria vectors in Zanzibar and implications for malaria elimination  
526 efforts. *Malar J*. 2020;19: 212. doi:10.1186/s12936-020-03266-w
- 527 19. Hartung C, Anokwa Y, Brunette W, Lerer A, Tseng C, Borriello G. Open data kit:  
528 Tools to build information services for developing regions. *ACM International*  
529 *Conference Proceeding Series*. 2010 [cited 5 Sep 2023].  
530 doi:10.1145/2369220.2369236
- 531 20. Posit team. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. Boston, MA: Posit  
532 Software, PBC; 2023. Available: <http://www.posit.co/>
- 533 21. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,  
534 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021. Available: [https://www.r-](https://www.r-project.org/)  
535 [project.org/](https://www.r-project.org/)
- 536 22. Weihs C, Ligges U, Luebke K, Raabe N. *klaR Analyzing German Business Cycles.*  
537 *Data Analysis and Decision Support*. Springer-Verlag; 2005. pp. 335–343.  
538 doi:10.1007/3-540-28397-8\_36
- 539 23. ITN Access and Use Report. [cited 10 Jan 2024]. Available:  
540 <https://breakthroughactionandresearch.org/resources/itn-use-and-access-report/>
- 541 24. Koenker H, Kilian A. Recalculating the Net Use Gap: A Multi-Country Comparison of  
542 ITN Use versus ITN Access. *PLoS One*. 2014;9: e97496.  
543 doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0097496
- 544 25. Kilian A, Koenker H, Paintain L. Estimating population access to insecticide-treated  
545 nets from administrative data: Correction factor is needed. *Malar J*. 2013;12: 1–10.  
546 doi:10.1186/1475-2875-12-259/FIGURES/6
- 547 26. Rutstein S. The DHS: Approaches for Rural and Urban Areas. DHS Working Papers  
548 series. 2008; 1–22. Available:  
549 <https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/WP60/WP60.pdf>
- 550 27. Filmer D, Pritchett L. Estimating Wealth Effects without Expenditure Data or Tears.  
551 *Policy Research Working Paper*. 1994.
- 552 28. Rutstein SO, Staveteig S. Making the demographic and health surveys wealth index  
553 comparable. DHS methodological reports 9. ICF International, Rockville, Maryland,  
554 USA. 2014. Available: <https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/MR9/MR9.pdf>
- 555 29. Bugoro H, Cooper RD, Butafa C, Iro’Ofa C, MacKenzie DO, Chen CC, et al.  
556 Bionomics of the malaria vector *Anopheles farauti* in Temotu Province, Solomon  
557 Islands: Issues for malaria elimination. *Malar J*. 2011;10: 1–11. doi:10.1186/1475-  
558 2875-10-133/TABLES/5

- 559 30. Sandy S, Litbang B, Papua B, Kesehatan J, 10 N. Bionomy of Anopheles Punctulatus  
560 Group (Anopheles Farauti, Anopheles Koliensis, Anopheles Punctulatus) Malaria  
561 Vector in Papua Province. *Jurnal Litbang Pengendalian Penyakit Bersumber Binatang*  
562 *Banjarnegara*. 2014;10: 47–52. doi:10.22435/BALABA.V10I1
- 563 31. Chisanga B, Bulte E, Kassie M, Mutero C, Masaninga F, Sangoro OP. The economic  
564 impacts of house screening against malaria transmission: Experimental evidence from  
565 eastern Zambia. *Soc Sci Med*. 2023;321: 115778.  
566 doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2023.115778
- 567 32. Lindsay SW, Jawara M, Paine K, Pinder M, Walraven GEL, Emerson PM. Changes in  
568 house design reduce exposure to malaria mosquitoes. *Tropical Medicine and*  
569 *International Health*. 2003;8: 512–517. doi:10.1046/j.1365-3156.2003.01059.x
- 570 33. Furnival-Adams J, Olanga EA, Napier M, Garner P. House modifications for  
571 preventing malaria. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2020;2020.  
572 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013398.PUB2/MEDIA/CDSR/CD013398/REL0002/CD013  
573 398/IMAGE\_T/TCDD013398-CMP-001.06.PNG
- 574 34. World Health Organization. Larval source management: a supplementary malaria  
575 vector control measure: an operational manual. 2013. Available:  
576 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/85379>
- 577 35. Ávila MI, Vajda ÉA, Jeffrey Gutiérrez E, Gibson D, Renteria MM, Presley N, et al.  
578 Entomological Surveillance Planning Tool (ESPT)-generated actionable evidence on  
579 human and vector behaviours optimizes present interventions and reduces exposure to  
580 Anopheles vectors in two communities of Guna Yala, Panamá. *Malar J*. 2023;22: 1–  
581 11. doi:10.1186/S12936-023-04453-1/FIGURES/3
- 582 36. Odero JI, Abong’o B, Moshi V, Ekodir S, Harvey SA, Ochomo E, et al. Early morning  
583 anopheline mosquito biting, a potential driver of malaria transmission in Busia County,  
584 western Kenya. *Malaria Journal* 2024 23:1. 2024;23: 1–13. doi:10.1186/S12936-024-  
585 04893-3
- 586 37. Mwema T, Lukubwe O, Joseph R, Maliti D, Iitula I, Katokele S, et al. Human and  
587 vector behaviors determine exposure to Anopheles in Namibia. *Parasit Vectors*.  
588 2022;15. doi:10.1186/S13071-022-05563-6
- 589 38. Syafruddin D, Asih PBS, Rozi IE, Permana DH, Hidayati APN, Syahrani L, et al.  
590 Efficacy of a Spatial Repellent for Control of Malaria in Indonesia: A Cluster-  
591 Randomized Controlled Trial. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2020;103: 344.  
592 doi:10.4269/AJTMH.19-0554
- 593 39. Permana DH, Zubaidah S, Syahrani L, Asih PBS, Syafruddin D, Rozi IE, et al. Impact  
594 of a spatial repellent product on Anopheles and non-Anopheles mosquitoes in Sumba,  
595 Indonesia. *Malar J*. 2022;21: 1–13. doi:10.1186/S12936-022-04185-8/TABLES/7
- 596 40. Syafruddin D, Bangs MJ, Sidik D, Elyazar I, Asih PBS, Chan K, et al. Impact of a  
597 spatial repellent on malaria incidence in two villages in Sumba, Indonesia. *American*  
598 *Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2014;91: 1079–1087.  
599 doi:10.4269/ajtmh.13-0735
- 600 41. Moshi IR, Manderson L, Ngowo HS, Mlacha YP, Okumu FO, Mnyone LL. Outdoor  
601 malaria transmission risks and social life: A qualitative study in South-Eastern  
602 Tanzania. *Malar J*. 2018;17: 1–11. doi:10.1186/s12936-018-2550-8
- 603 42. Rodríguez-Rodríguez D, Katusele M, Auwun A, Marem M, Robinson LJ, Laman M, et  
604 al. Human Behavior, Livelihood, and Malaria Transmission in Two Sites of Papua  
605 New Guinea. *J Infect Dis*. 2021;223: S171. doi:10.1093/INFDIS/JIAA402
- 606



607

## 608 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

609 **Fig 1. Location of study sites.** Location of the study sites in eight regencies of Papua  
610 Province: Keerom, Jayapura, Sarmi, Mimika, Boven Digoel, Yapen Islands, Waropen, and  
611 Asmat

612 **Fig 2a. Human behavior proportions from all study sites.** Stacked area charts in blue  
613 showed proportions from indoor under ITNs, orange for indoor not under ITNs, grey for  
614 outdoor-awake dan green for outdoor-sleep.

615 **Fig 2b. Total proportions of human behavior for each regency.**

616 **Fig 3. Type of houses in household survey.** (a) and (b) full and half wooden wall with iron  
617 roof, (c) and (d) cement wall with iron roof.

618 **Fig 4. Mosquito bites prevention efforts.**

619 **Fig 5. Human behavior during night time.**

620

621 **TABLES**622 **Table 1. Behavior-adjusted *Anopheles* exposure of 14 villages**

Village	Skofro	Pikere	Hanggey Among	Sunum / Yamna	Samanente	Konderjan	Arbais	Webrau	Mwarei	Kaugapu	Wanagon	Sukanggo	Migiwia	Yasiuw	All Villages
<b>Directly Measured Biting and Resting</b>															
• HBR (bpn)	58.0	39.6	66.9	30.0	11.5	9.5	21.0	25.0	38.3	28.4	12.9	10.3	7.3	7.0	8.4
• Indoor HBR (bpn)	50.0	42.3	49.3	19.0	4.3	11.8	12.0	23.0	14.3	26.0	2.8	7.5	4.8	1.8	6.1
• Outdoor HBR (bpn)	66.0	37.0	84.5	41.0	18.8	7.3	30.0	27.0	62.3	30.8	23.0	13.0	9.8	12.3	10.8
• Proportion biting indoors	43.1%	53.3%	36.8%	31.7%	18.5%	61.8%	28.6%	46.0%	18.6%	45.8%	10.7%	50.0%	32.8%	12.5%	36.1%
<b>Behavior- Adjusted Exposure for ITN-User</b>															
• Proportion of ITN-user	48.3%	47.0%	34.1%	58.3%	74.4%	68.5%	56.2%	68.2%	58.3%	34.1%	17.4%	44.6%	41.1%	10.1%	38.2%
• Proportion of all vector bites prevented by using an ITN	49.3%	64.5%	30.8%	73.8%	42.1%	91.4%	54.3%	75.3%	47.7%	30.1%	8.6%	20.3%	37.4%	8.1%	48.3%
<b>Behavior-Adjusted Exposure for unprotected individual</b>															
• Proportion of vector bites occurring outdoor	38.9%	11.0%	36.9%	13.9%	0.0%	3.7%	20.0%	0.0%	22.1%	39.6%	54.3%	10.4%	34.7%	24.3%	25.5%
• Proportion of vector bites occurring Indoor	11.7%	24.5%	32.3%	12.2%	57.9%	4.9%	25.6%	24.7%	30.3%	30.3%	37.2%	69.3%	27.9%	67.6%	26.2%

- Proportion of vector bites occurring indoor and outdoor

50.7% 35.5% 69.2% 26.2% 57.9% 8.6% 45.7% 24.7% 52.3% 69.9% 91.4% 79.7% 62.6% 91.9% 51.7%

---

623

624 **Table 2. The estimated IRS effectiveness for potential protection in 14 villages**

Village	Skofro	Pikere	Hanggey Among	Sunum / Yamna	Samanente	Konderjan	Arbais	Webrau	Mwarei	Kaugapu	Wanagon	Sukanggo	Migiwia	Yasiuw	All Villages
<b>Total Anopheles</b>															
<i>Anopheles</i> indoor per house	50.0	42.3	49.3	19.0	4.3	11.8	12.0	23.0	14.3	26.0	2.8	7.5	4.8	1.8	6.1
<i>Anopheles</i> outdoor per house	66.0	37.0	84.5	41.0	18.8	7.3	30.0	27.0	62.3	30.8	23.0	13.0	9.8	12.3	10.8
<i>Anopheles</i> per house	116.0	79.3	133.8	60.0	23.0	19.0	42.0	50.0	76.5	56.8	25.8	20.5	14.5	14.0	16.9
IRD for total <i>Anopheles</i>	6.3	0.0	14.0	12.8	1.5	3.5	8.8	10.3	17.0	5.0	0.0	2.3	0.3	1.0	2.1
Potential of IRS	5.4%	0.0%	10.5%	21.3%	6.5%	18.4%	20.8%	20.5%	22.2%	8.8%	0.0%	11.0%	1.7%	7.1%	12.5%
<b>Total <i>An. koliensis</i></b>															
<i>An. koliensis</i> indoor per house	38.3	16.0	39.3	14.3	2.3	11.0	11.5	18.0	12.5	21.8	2.3	4.3	0.3	1.8	4.3
<i>An. koliensis</i> outdoor per house	49.0	12.3	73.0	32.8	11.8	6.0	24.5	22.0	51.3	25.5	18.3	9.8	0.3	11.8	8.0
<i>An. koliensis</i> per house	87.3	28.3	112.3	47.0	14.0	17.0	36.0	40.0	63.8	47.3	20.5	14.0	0.5	13.5	12.3
IRD for <i>An. koliensis</i>	5.0	0.0	12.3	10.8	1.0	3.0	8.3	8.5	13.0	4.8	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.0	1.5
Potential of IRS	5.7%	0.0%	10.9%	22.9%	7.1%	17.6%	22.9%	21.3%	20.4%	10.1%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%	7.4%	12.6%
<b>Total <i>An. punctulatus</i></b>															
<i>An. punctulatus</i> indoor per house	10.8	24.0	9.5	3.3	1.8	0.5	0.5	3.5	0.5	2.5	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
<i>An. punctulatus</i> outdoor per house	13.0	22.3	11.0	6.3	6.0	0.3	5.3	3.5	3.0	1.8	1.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.7
<i>An. punctulatus</i> per house	23.8	46.3	20.5	9.5	7.8	0.8	5.8	7.0	3.5	4.3	1.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	3.0
IRD for <i>An. punctulatus</i>	0.8	0.0	1.8	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.2
Potential of IRS	3.2%	0.0%	8.5%	10.5%	0.0%	66.7%	8.7%	14.3%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	NA	NA	5.5%
<b>Total <i>An. farauti</i></b>															
<i>An. farauti</i> indoor per house	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.3
<i>An. farauti</i> outdoor per house	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.0	6.5	2.8	3.5	1.0	9.3	0.5	0.7
<i>An. farauti</i> per house	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	7.0	4.3	3.5	1.0	13.5	0.5	1.0
IRD for <i>An. farauti</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1
Potential of IRS	NA	0.0%	NA	36.4%	0.0%	NA	NA	11.1%	14.3%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	7.9%

625 Note: NA in potential of IRS means “not applicable”, due to the calculation was divided by zero.

626

627 **Table 3. Gaps in protection and correlations with house type and socioeconomic status**

Gaps in protection		House Type				Chi-Square Test (p-value)	Socioeconomic status (Wealth Index)					Chi-Square Test (p-value)
		n = 542 type one (%)	n = 212 type two (%)	n = 370 type three (%)	n = 131 type four (%)		n = 323 1 <sup>st</sup> quintile (%)	n = 524 2 <sup>nd</sup> quintile (%)	n = 175 3 <sup>rd</sup> quintile (%)	n = 179 4 <sup>th</sup> quintile (%)	n = 54 5 <sup>th</sup> quintile (%)	
<b>Protection from mosquitoes entering house</b>												
Screened door	+++	24 (1.9%)	9 (0.7%)	15 (1.2%)	4 (0.3%)	0.9155	11 (0.9%)	25 (2.0%)	10 (0.8%)	6 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0.3233
Screened window	+++	30 (2.4%)	12 (1.0%)	28 (2.2%)	5 (0.4%)	0.3947	16 (1.3%)	31 (2.5%)	12 (1.0%)	14 (1.1%)	2 (0.2%)	0.6578
Screened eave (n=1115)	+++	114 (10.2%)	56 (5.0%)	76 (6.8%)	32 (2.9%)	0.2993	67 (6.0%)	120 (10.8%)	39 (3.5%)	48 (4.3%)	4 (0.4%)	0.03364
<b>Mosquito bites preventions</b>												
IRS												
All house sprayed < 3 months	+++	74 (5.9%)	22 (1.8%)	54 (4.3%)	15 (1.2%)	0.4654	42 (3.3%)	64 (5.1%)	27 (2.2%)	26 (2.1%)	6 (0.5%)	0.7913
All house sprayed < 6 months	+++	102 (8.1%)	30 (2.4%)	73 (5.8%)	20 (1.6%)	0.2845	61 (4.9%)	87 (6.9%)	40 (3.2%)	30 (2.4%)	7 (0.6%)	0.3099
ITN access	+	76.6%	74.5%	75.9%	74.1%	-	74.6%	77.3%	78.6%	71.9%	72.8%	-
Everybody using ITNs	++	383 (30.5%)	145 (11.6%)	266 (21.2%)	87 (6.9%)	0.6171	225 (17.9%)	365 (29.1%)	130 (10.4%)	118 (9.4%)	43 (3.4%)	0.2508
ITN age (n=1001)												
> 3 years	+	32 (3.2%)	14 (1.4%)	28 (2.8%)	6 (0.6%)	0.4815	9 (0.9%)	38 (3.8%)	9 (0.9%)	16 (1.6%)	8 (0.8%)	0.001005
ITN conditions (n=999)												
Lots of holes	+	58 (5.8%)	23 (0.0%)	36 (0.0%)	7 (0.0%)	0.4164	29 (0.0%)	55 (0.0%)	18 (0.0%)	17 (0.0%)	5 (0.0%)	0.9791
NOT using indoor repellent	++	263 (21.0%)	105 (8.4%)	190 (15.1%)	66 (5.3%)	0.8661	167 (13.3%)	252 (20.1%)	92 (7.3%)	89 (7.1%)	24 (1.9%)	0.6928
<b>Outdoor activities at night</b>												
Going outside at night	++	247 (19.7%)	103 (8.2%)	164 (13.1%)	64 (5.1%)	0.6923	146 (11.6%)	239 (19.0%)	84 (6.7%)	84 (6.7%)	25 (2.0%)	0.9774
Going outside at night (n=578)												
Time progress > 1 hour	+	159 (27.5%)	74 (12.8%)	115 (19.9%)	50 (8.7%)	0.1428	110 (19.0%)	162 (28.0%)	54 (9.3%)	53 (9.2%)	19 (3.3%)	0.2222

NOT using repellent outside	+++	216 (37.4%)	91 (15.7%)	150 (26.0%)	58 (10.0%)	0.6043	134 (23.2%)	213 (36.9%)	76 (13.1%)	71 (12.3%)	21 (3.6%)	0.4445
<b>Sleeping behavior</b>												
Sleeping time												
After 21.00	++	397 (31.6%)	167 (13.3%)	267 (21.3%)	95 (7.6%)	0.3312	245 (19.5%)	390 (31.1%)	137 (10.9%)	119 (9.5%)	35 (2.8%)	0.04318
Waking up time												
Before 06.00	++	366 (29.2%)	144 (11.5%)	249 (19.8%)	91 (7.3%)	0.9733	220 (17.5%)	358 (28.5%)	118 (9.4%)	124 (9.9%)	30 (2.4%)	0.4102
Sleep outdoor	+	3 (0.2%)	2 (0.2%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0.5735	1 (0.1%)	4 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0.6966
Sleep NOT under ITNs	+	89 (7.1%)	42 (3.3%)	68 (5.4%)	31 (2.5%)	0.2486	73 (5.8%)	92 (7.3%)	25 (2.0%)	35 (2.8%)	5 (0.4%)	0.05619

628 Note:

629 Gaps in protection column: “+”, “++” and “+++” mean gaps in protection with different magnitude of the problems, i.e. minor,  
630 moderate and major respectively.

631



632 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

633 **S1 File Part A. Human behavior observation (HBO).**

634 **S1 File Part B. Household survey.**

635 **S2 File. Human behavior observations and adjusted-human biting rates in 14 villages.**

636 **S3 File. Household survey results.**




Figure 1




Figure 2a




Figure 2b



Figure 3a



Figure 3b



Figure 3c



Figure 3d






Figure 4




Figure 5