

1 **Comparison of Fine-Scale Malaria Strata Derived from Population** 2 **Survey Data Collected Using mRDTs, Microscopy and qPCR in South-** 3 **Eastern Tanzania**

4 Issa H. Mshani^{1, 2*}, Frank M. Jackson¹, Elihaika G Minja^{1,3,4}, Said Abbas¹, Nasoro S.
5 Lilolime⁵, Faraja E. Makala¹, Alfred B. Lazaro¹, Idrisa S. Mchola¹, Linda N. Mukabana^{1,6},
6 Najat Kahamba^{1,2}, Alex Limwagu¹, Rukia. M. Njalambaha¹, Halfan S. Ngowo¹, Donal
7 Bisanzio^{1, 8}, Francesco Baldini^{1, 2†}, Simon A. Babayan^{2†} and Fredros Okumu^{1, 2, 7, 9†*}

- 8 1. Ifakara Health Institute, Environmental Health, and Ecological Sciences
9 Department, Morogoro, United Republic of Tanzania.
- 10 2. The University of Glasgow, School of Biodiversity, One Health and Veterinary
11 Medicine, Glasgow, UK.
- 12 3. University of Basel, Petersplatz, 4001 Basel, Switzerland.
- 13 4. Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Kreuzstrasse 2, CH-4123 Allschwil,
14 Switzerland.
- 15 5. Ifakara Health Institute, Interventions and Clinical Trials Department, Pwani,
16 Bagamoyo, United Republic of Tanzania.
- 17 6. Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, School of Public
18 Health, Juja, Kenya.
- 19 7. The University of the Witwatersrand, School of Public Health, Park Town, South
20 Africa.
- 21 8. RTI International, Washington, District of Columbia, USA
- 22 9. Nelson Mandela African Institution of Science and Technology, School of Life
23 Sciences and Biotechnology, Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania.

25 †Fredros Okumu, Simon A. Babayan and Francesco Baldini are equally co-supervised
26 this work.

27 *Correspondence:

28 1. Issa H. Mshani: imshani@ihi.or.tz & fredros@ihi.or.tz

29 **Abstract**

30 **Introduction:** Malaria-endemic countries are increasingly adopting data-driven risk
31 stratification, often at district or higher regional levels, to guide their intervention
32 strategies. The data typically comes from population-level surveys collected by rapid
33 diagnostic tests (RDTs), which unfortunately perform poorly in low transmission
34 settings. Here, we conducted a high-resolution survey of *Plasmodium falciparum*
35 prevalence rate (PfPR) in two Tanzanian districts and compared the fine-scale strata
36 obtained using data from RDTs, microscopy and quantitative polymerase chain reaction
37 (qPCR) assays.

38 **Methods:** A cross-sectional survey was conducted in 35 villages in Ulanga and
39 Kilombero districts, south-eastern Tanzania between 2022 and 2023. We screened
40 7,628 individuals using RDTs (SD-BIOLINE) and microscopy, with two thirds of the
41 samples further analyzed by qPCR. The data was used to categorize each district and
42 village as having very low (PfPR<1%), low (1%≤PfPR<5%), moderate (5%≤PfPR<30%),
43 or high (PfPR≥30%) parasite prevalence. A generalized linear model was used to
44 analyse infection risk factors. Other metrics, including positive predictive value (PPV),
45 sensitivity, specificity, parasite densities, and Kappa statistics were computed for RDTs
46 or microscopy using qPCR as reference.

47 **Results:** Significant fine-scale variations in malaria risk were observed within and
48 between districts, with village prevalence ranging from 0% to >50%. Prevalence varied
49 by testing method: Kilombero was low risk by RDTs (PfPR=3%) and microscopy
50 (PfPR=2%) but moderate by qPCR (PfPR=9%); Ulanga was high risk by RDTs
51 (PfPR=39%) and qPCR (PfPR=54%) but moderate by microscopy (PfPR=26%). RDTs
52 and microscopy classified majority of the 35 villages as very low to low risk (18 - 21
53 villages). In contrast, qPCR classified most villages as moderate to high risk (29
54 villages). Using qPCR as the reference, PPV for RDTs and microscopy ranged from
55 <20% in very low transmission villages to >80% in moderate to high transmission
56 villages. Sensitivity was 62% for RDTs and 41% for microscopy; specificity was 93%
57 and 96%, respectively. Kappa values were 0.58 for RDTs and 0.42 for microscopy.
58 School-age children (5-15years) had higher malaria prevalence and parasite densities

59 than adults ($P < 0.001$). High-prevalence villages also had higher parasite densities
60 (Spearman $r = 0.77$, $P < 0.001$ for qPCR; $r = 0.55$, $P = 0.003$ for microscopy).

61 **Conclusion:** This study highlights significant fine-scale variability in malaria risk within
62 and between districts and emphasizes the variable performance of the testing methods
63 when stratifying risk. While RDTs and microscopy were effective in high-transmission
64 areas, they performed poorly in low-transmission settings; and classified most villages
65 as very low or low risk. In contrast, qPCR classified most villages as moderate or high
66 risk. While we cannot conclude on which public health decisions would be subject to
67 change because of these differences, the findings suggest the need for improved
68 testing approaches that are operationally feasible and sufficiently sensitive, to enable
69 precise mapping and effective targeting of malaria in such local contexts. Moreover,
70 public health authorities should recognize the strengths and limitations of their available
71 data when planning local stratification or making decisions.

72 **Key words:** Malaria; Fine scale stratifications; Prevalence rate, Rapid diagnostic tests
73 (RDTs), Polymerase chain reaction (PCR); Microscopy; Population surveys; Micro-
74 stratification; Malaria screening.

75

76 **Background**

77 Precise mapping of malaria prevalence is crucial for the eventual elimination of the
78 disease from different localities. In line with World Health Organization (WHO)
79 guidelines, National Malaria Control Programs (NMCPs) in Africa are increasingly
80 adopting data-driven stratification of malaria risk, in most cases at either district or
81 higher regional levels [1–3]. These stratifications involve assessing risk levels in
82 geographical areas at the subnational level (e.g. zones, regions, and districts) [2,4,5],
83 and can include fine scale mapping (down to wards and villages levels) as countries
84 progress towards elimination [6–8]. The data for such stratification may come from
85 health facilities, active malaria screening during population surveys, or proxy data
86 sources such as antenatal care clinic visits [6,9,10].

87 When developing country-level malaria strategies, the prevalence of malaria,
88 representing the proportion of confirmed positive cases of *Plasmodium falciparum* (or
89 other *Plasmodium* sp.) among all individuals tested [11,12], can be classified into
90 various transmission categories. The WHO has previously used the following cutoff
91 points for malaria endemicities: below 1% as very low, 1-10% as low, 10-35% as
92 moderate, and above 35% as high risk malaria stratum [12]. Different NMCPs may
93 adapt these criteria with slight adjustments based on local epidemiological insights. For
94 instance, some countries, including Tanzania and Kenya, have used the parasite
95 prevalence data to categorize their geographic zones as either very low risk (PfPR <
96 1%), low risk ($1\% \leq \text{PfPR} < 5\%$), moderate risk ($5\% \leq \text{PfPR} < 30\%$), or high risk strata
97 (PfPR $\geq 30\%$) [2,13]. Another measure that can be used for generating these strata is
98 the annual parasite incidence (API), which is the number of diagnostically confirmed
99 malaria cases per 1000 individuals per year and is usually obtained from health facilities
100 data [12,14]. API offers precise malaria stratifications, though it fails to account for sub-
101 clinical malaria infections, which can contribute to transmission and impede malaria
102 elimination efforts [15].

103 National malaria programs usually rely on different actively and passively collected data
104 to inform malaria burden and monitor the effectiveness of control measures [16–18]. For
105 instance, Tanzania employs multiple platforms, including the District Health Information

106 software (DHIS2) populated with data from routine health facility visits, the Malaria
107 Indicator Surveys (MIS) and Tanzania Demographic and Health Surveys (TDHS), which
108 are done every 4-5 years through household surveys, and the school malaria parasite
109 surveillance targeting kids aged 5-16 years during (SMPS) [2,19–21]. A common
110 feature of these established systems is that most rely primarily on rapid diagnostic tests
111 (RDTs) and microscopy [13,22,23], though samples are sometime also preserved for
112 PCR assays.

113 Microscopy, long used in malaria diagnosis, can quantify parasite loads and identify
114 different *Plasmodium* species, which are essential for precise treatment choices [24,25].
115 However, its effectiveness depends significantly on the skill and experience of the
116 microscopist, making it unreliable in some contexts, and it can miss a substantial
117 number of true infections due to sub-optimal accuracy [26–28]. In contrast, Rapid
118 Diagnostic Tests (RDTs) offer a consistent and user-friendly option, enabling quick, on-
119 site diagnosis without specialized skills or equipment. RDTs have become widely used
120 in both point-of-care settings and population surveys due to their operational simplicity
121 and cost-effectiveness [29–33]. While the technique enhances access to diagnostics,
122 especially in remote areas, RDTs have lower sensitivity for detecting low-level infections
123 and cannot quantify parasite density or distinguish between *Plasmodium* species.
124 Additionally, current RDTs may detect antigens for over three weeks post-treatment,
125 leading to poor specificity and potential overestimation of malaria cases in high
126 transmission areas [30,33,34].

127 In contrast, polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assays are known for their high sensitivity
128 and specificity [35]. While conventional PCR assays typically provide qualitative
129 information on malaria infections, quantitative PCR (qPCR) can offer additional
130 quantitative measures of malaria parasite density [36,37]. Unfortunately, the widespread
131 use of PCR assays for population surveys is hindered by cost constraints and the need
132 for specialized expertise and infrastructure for implementation [35,38,39].

133 The increased focus on evidence-based strategies in malaria control also includes a
134 transition from broad subnational stratifications to more granular, fine-scale approaches
135 [6,10]. However, although current methods like RDTs and microscopy are favored for

136 their operational simplicity, their effectiveness in detailed risk stratification, which are
137 critical for targeting both clinical and sub-clinical infections for malaria elimination,
138 remains poorly understood. Some authors have also suggested that RDTs may have
139 vastly reduced performance in settings where the malaria burden has been significantly
140 reduced [40]. This calls for a rigorous evaluation and comparison of these methods
141 against highly sensitive techniques such as qPCR to refine malaria stratification
142 approaches for malaria elimination. Indeed, available evidence, including data from
143 Kenya and Tanzania, suggest that PCR assays are generally better at pinpointing main
144 malaria hotspots in communities than RDTs and microscopy [41,42]. The study from
145 Tanzania further showed that in subsequent treatment campaigns relying on RDT-
146 based screening, ~45% of infections remain untreated, even if treatment is offered to all
147 members of households with an infected individual [42]. In the Kenyan study, the
148 authors went further to suggest that since detection of hotspots depends on the
149 sensitivity of diagnostic tools, health authorities working in malaria elimination settings
150 should consider using PCR to guide detection of the residual hotspots, as this provides
151 greatest opportunities to find asymptomatic individuals and sub-patent parasite
152 reservoirs in the communities [41].

153 All these studies clearly show that while sub-national stratification may be the most
154 effective approach to decide on how to allocate resources, the type of data used for
155 such epidemiological profiling matters significantly; especially when the stratification is
156 done at local-sub-district levels. In places like southeastern Tanzania, which has
157 experienced decades of sustained malaria interventions and progress, and where
158 robust entomological surveillance already exists [43], addition of detailed parasite
159 prevalence data from population-level surveys is required to enable more precise, fine-
160 scale stratifications at both district and sub-district levels.

161 The aim of this study was therefore to generate a high-resolution population-level
162 survey map of *P. falciparum* prevalence in two districts in south-eastern Tanzania, and
163 compare the fine scale malaria risk strata obtained when using data from different test
164 methods, namely RDTs, microscopy and qPCR. The study also examined the
165 association between population-level parasite prevalence and the parasite densities as
166 determined by both qPCR and microscopy in the different study villages. Lastly, we


167 investigated the malaria detection capacity of RDTs and microscopy across villages with
168 varying parasite prevalences and densities.

169 **Methods**

170 **Study site**

171 The study was conducted in Morogoro region, in south-eastern Tanzania (Figure 1), in
172 the two districts of Kilombero (population: ~583,000; 8.2414°S, 36.3349°E; elevation:
173 ~270m) and Ulanga (population: ~233,000; 8.9889°S, 36.6133°E; elevation: ~800m).
174 The average malaria prevalence in the Morogoro region has previously been estimated
175 to exceed 10%, with *P. falciparum* as the dominant malaria species [19,20,44]. The
176 main economic activities for residents include rice farming, sugarcane farming and
177 maize farming, though the area also has other food crops and large commercial tree
178 plantations (teak). The known annual rainfall range is 1200-1400 mm in the lower-lying
179 plains of Kilombero district, and 1400-2100 mm in the higher areas in Ulanga district
180 [45]. Approximately 90% of the rainfall occurs during the wet seasons between
181 December to April, with dry seasons typically lasting from June through September [45].
182 The annual mean daily temperature is around 27°C in the lowlands and approximately
183 23°C in the highlands. Relative humidity averages from 75% in the lowlands to 80% in
184 the highlands.

185



186

187 **Figure 1:** Study villages in Kilombero and Ulanga districts, south-eastern Tanzania.

188

189 **Study design, procedures and survey tools**

190 The cross-sectional surveys were conducted over two consecutive years, from 2022 to
191 2023, covering the transition from the end of rainy seasons to the peak of dry seasons.

192 Villages were randomly selected from each district, and sample sizes were

193 proportionately determined based on the population of each village using the Cochran

194 formula adjusted for finite populations [46–48]. The expected prevalence varied

195 depending on the village and was derived from previous surveys and health centers

196 within each village. Based on the estimated sample size mentioned above,

197 representative households were selected by systematically randomizing the names of

198 all households obtained from the respective village administrations.

199 The screening criteria included individuals aged 5-60 years who had not taken malaria
200 medications in the preceding two weeks. This precaution aimed to prevent potential
201 overestimation by RDTs, as they may detect residual traces post-treatment [49].
202 Individuals needing special medical attention, such as pregnant women, were excluded
203 from the study. Each consenting individual undergoing malaria screening was assigned
204 a unique identity number that was also linked to their corresponding household ID. On-
205 site malaria diagnosis was conducted using: 1) RDTs via finger prick, 2) creating thick
206 and thin blood smears, and 3) collecting 3-5 dried blood spots (cycles) on Whatman™
207 filter paper cards. Subsequently, these samples were transported to the reference
208 laboratory for microscopy and qPCR analysis. For children under five years, only
209 screening with RDTs was done for prevalence estimations and not used for strata
210 comparisons.

211 **Ethical considerations, survey team, and trainings**

212 Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the Ifakara Health Institute Review
213 Board (Ref: IHI/IRB/No: 1/2021) and the National Institute for Medical Research-NIMR
214 (NIMR/HQ/R.8a/Vol. 1X/3735). Additionally, approvals were obtained from regional,
215 district, ward, and respective selected village authorities before commencing the
216 surveys, given the screening was done at centralized location in each village. Written
217 informed consent was obtained from individual adult participants (and parents or
218 guardians of those aged below 18) on the day before the actual testing. The study team
219 consisted of 11 members, including three molecular laboratory technologists, four
220 licensed medical laboratory microscopists, two licensed clinical officers, and two social
221 scientists. Prior to the survey commencement, a five-day training session was
222 conducted at the Ifakara Health Institute laboratory. This training covered explanations
223 of the study protocols, pilot implementations, procedures for protecting human
224 participants, quality assurance and training on data collection tools.

225 **Tests using malaria rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs)**

226 A small blood drop obtained through a finger prick was collected onto the RDTs (SD
227 Bioline Ag Pf/Pan), following the manufacturer's instructions. The buffer solution was
228 applied according to standard RDTs procedures and left on the bench surface for up to

229 20 minutes. The type RDT used were capable of detecting *P. falciparum* infections by
230 targeting histidine-rich proteins 2, which react on the Pf-line. Additionally, they could
231 detect *P. malariae* and *P. ovale* by targeting glycolytic lactate dehydrogenase,
232 expressed by the Pan-line on RDTs [30]. The RDT results were recorded on a paper
233 form, and any individuals who tested positive for malaria were promptly treated with
234 Artemether Lumefantrine (ALu), following Tanzania's national malaria treatment
235 guidelines [50].

236 **Tests using microscopy**

237 Thick and thin blood smears were created in the field, stained with 10% Giemsa for 15
238 minutes then examined for the presence of malaria parasites under oil immersion at
239 100X magnification [47,51,52]. Two experienced microscopists independently read the
240 slides, and discrepancies between them were resolved by a third, more experienced
241 microscopist. They read the thick smear first, and if an infection was detected, the thin
242 smear was read to identify parasite species. The presence of both asexual and sexual
243 malaria parasite stages discriminating *P. falciparum*, *P. malariae*, and *P. ovale* was
244 recorded. Asexual stage parasites were counted per 200 white blood cells and
245 assuming 8000 WBC/ μ L [53]. The mean count of malaria parasite by microscopy
246 between the two readers was calculated and confirmed by the third reader.

247 **Tests using real-time qPCR assays**

248 A representative sample of approximately two thirds of all samples was randomly
249 selected from each village and screened further by quantitative polymerase chain
250 reaction (qPCR) i.e. 4905 samples out of the total 7628 samples. Out of five spots
251 created on the WhatmanTM filter paper card, three spots of DBS were used for DNA
252 extraction using Quick-DNATM Miniprep plus kit (Zymo Research,USA) [54], and eluted
253 with 50 μ L of elution buffer, stored at -20°C for further detection and quantification of *P.*
254 *falciparum* infections using probe-level allele-specific quantification (PlasQ)-multiplex
255 qPCR assays protocols [37,55,56]. The detection and quantification of *P. falciparum*
256 parasites were performed using the Bio-Rad CFX96 real-time PCR system (Bio-Rad
257 Laboratories, USA) [55] and analyzed with Bio-Rad CFX maestro software. The qPCR
258 reaction, PlasQ primers and probes mix, are summarized in supplementary online table

259 1& 2. DNA amplification processes included: activation at 95°C for 1 min, denaturation
260 at 95°C for 15 seconds, and annealing and elongation at 57°C for 45 seconds for 45
261 cycles, followed by melting [55].

262 The qPCR assays were run with positive controls (samples with confirmed *P.*
263 *falciparum*) and a non-template control (samples with no *P. falciparum* as negative
264 control). For absolute parasite quantification, the WHO international standard for *P.*
265 *falciparum* nucleic acid amplification techniques were used (WHO reference from
266 NIBSC#04/176) [37]. The standard was reconstituted following the manufacturer's
267 instructions and serially diluted in the range of 100,000 parasites/ μ L to 0.01 and
268 analyzed in triplicates.

269 During the qPCR assay, the prepared standards were run together with unknown
270 samples, and at the end of the assay, the standard curve and samples were normalized
271 and analyzed with Bio-Rad CFX maestro software. The obtained normalized Ct values
272 of the samples and the linear regression equation derived from the standard curve were
273 used to calculate the parasites density of the unknown samples, expressed as parasites
274 per microlitre (parasites/ μ L) of blood.

275 **Data analysis**

276 All results from RDTs, microscopy, and qPCR were entered into the Open Data Kit
277 (ODK) system [57], and subsequently downloaded as an excel file for further cleaning.
278 The datasets for RDTs, microscopy, and qPCR results were merged based on the
279 participant's ID using the Pandas Python package [58].

280 Generalized linear models (GLM) were used to evaluate the association between
281 malaria infection risk and the variables of age and gender in a univariate analysis, run in
282 Python using the stats model package [59]. Additionally, to evaluate the performance of
283 RDTs and microscopy in fine-scale malaria stratifications compared to qPCR, their
284 agreement was tested using Kappa statistic [60], and the resulting Kappa values
285 interpreted as follows: $\kappa < 0.20$ as poor agreement, 0.21–0.40 as fair, 0.41–0.60 as
286 moderate, 0.61–0.80 as substantially good and 0.81–1 as almost perfect agreement
287 [61]. In addition, the positive predictive value (PPV) for RDTs and microscopy was
288 computed, using qPCR results as the reference, per village, as (proportion of positive

289 test results that are actually true positives, estimated as $PPV = \text{True Positives} / (\text{True}$
290 $\text{Positives} + \text{False Positives})$). Fine-scale stratification by villages using data from qPCR,
291 RDT, and microscopy were used to generate the prevalence maps using quantitative
292 Geographic Information System (qGIS) software, allowing visualization of malaria
293 prevalence across villages. Additionally, the risk maps were created using inverse
294 distance weighting (IDW) interpolation techniques. This method helped to estimate
295 malaria risk by spatially interpolating the prevalence data, which provided a continuous
296 surface of malaria risk across the study area.


297 The geometric mean of parasite density estimated by microscopy and qPCR was
298 computed, and statistically compared the parasite densities between gender and age
299 groups. The non-parametric Mann-Whitney statistics were used to compare the parasite
300 densities between two categorical groups, while Kruskal-Wallis statistical tests were
301 used to compare more than two categorical groups [62,63]. For example, differences in
302 parasite densities between age groups were tested using Kruskal-Wallis statistics, and if
303 statistically significant, the Mann-Whitney statistics were applied for pairwise statistical
304 significance tests. All analyses that compared parasite densities excluded the negative
305 class and focused solely on investigating parasite density distribution among malaria-
306 positive patients. Lastly, to test for statistical correlations between parasite prevalence
307 and parasite densities estimated by both qPCR and Microscopy, non-parametric
308 Spearman's rank correlation tests were employed [64]. Additionally, logistic regression
309 model was also used to assess the probability of diagnostic tools to detect malaria
310 infections at various parasite densities.

311 **Results**

312 **Baseline study population.**

313 This survey covered 35 villages and 93 sub-villages across Ulanga and Kilombero
314 districts. A total of 7,628 participants (>5 years) were recruited upon consent and tested
315 for malaria using RDTs and microscopy, with 64.3% (4,905) of them also tested by
316 qPCR (Figure 2). Males comprised 38% of the study population, while females made up
317 62%. Among the participants, 35% were school-aged children (5-15 years), and 65%
318 were aged 16 years and above (Table 1). For children under five years, for whom

319 screening was conducted with only RDTs to estimate the burden, the results are not
 320 reported here.



321

322

Figure 2: Schematic representation of the study sampling procedures

323 **Table 1:** Baseline characteristics of the study populations

	Kilombero District	Ulanga District	Total
	n (%)	n (%)	N (%)
Villages	19 (54.3)	16 (45.7)	35.0
Sub Villages	48 (51.6)	45 (48.4)	93.0
Gender			
Female	2164 (67.4)	2573 (58.3)	4737 (62.1)
Male	1047 (32.6)	1844 (41.7)	2891 (37.9)
Total	3211	4417	7628
Age Group			
5-10 years	519 (16.2)	935 (21.2)	1454 (19.1)
11-15 years	400 (12.5)	802 (18.2)	1202 (15.8)
16-20 years	198 (6.2)	333 (7.5)	531 (7.0)
>20 years	2094 (65.2)	2347 (53.1)	4441 (58.2)
Total	3211	4417	7628

324
325 **Malaria prevalence by RDTs, Microscopy and qPCR**
326 In the Ulanga district, malaria transmission was found to be high by both qPCR and
327 RDTs, with *P. falciparum* prevalence rates of 53.89% [95% CI, 52.06-55.72] and
328 38.35% [95% CI, 36.92-39.79] respectively. However, microscopy categorized it as
329 moderate, with a prevalence rate of 26.07% [95% CI: 24.77-27.36] (Table 2). Within this
330 moderate to high transmission strata in Ulanga, males had a significantly higher
331 prevalence of malaria compared to females. The odds of malaria infection in males
332 compared to females were estimated as 1.54 [95% CI: 1.36-1.74] ($P < 0.001$) by RDTs,
333 1.45 [95% CI: 1.27-1.66] ($P < 0.001$) by microscopy, and 1.54 [95% CI: 1.36-1.74] ($P <$
334 0.001) by qPCR (Table 2). All tests - RDTs, microscopy, and qPCR - indicated that
335 school-age children (5-15 years) had a significantly higher prevalence of malaria
336 infections than the other age groups (Table 2).

337 In Ifakara council, within the Kilombero district, both RDTs and microscopy categorized
338 the area as a low risk stratum, with observed prevalence rates of 2.68 [95% CI: 2.12-
339 3.24] and 1.84 [95% CI: 1.37 – 2.30], respectively (Table 3). However, qPCR classified
340 Kilombero district as a moderate risk stratum with a prevalence rate of 8.77 [95% CI:
341 7.55-9.99] (Table 3). Notably, there were no statistically significant differences in
342 malaria infection risk between males and females in this low to moderate transmission
343 setting, as indicated by both RDTs (Odds prevalence 1.51% [95% CI; 0.97, 2.33],

344 P=0.065) and microscopy (Odds prevalence 1.33% [95% CI; 0.78, 2.25], P=0.293), as
345 well as qPCR (Odds prevalence 1.09% [95% CI: [0.80-5.67], P = 0.567). Additionally,
346 school age children (5-15 years) exhibited a significantly higher risk of malaria infections
347 compared to those above 15 years old, as demonstrated by both RDTs, microscopy,
348 and PCR (Table 3).

349 **Micro-stratification of malaria risk using data collected by qPCR, RDTs, and** 350 **microscopy**

351 Significant variability in malaria infections was observed at the individual village level,
352 with prevalence rates ranging from 0% to over 50% across the study area (Figure 3 &
353 Table 4). Additionally, the method used to test for malaria significantly impacted the risk
354 categorization of villages. Among the 35 villages surveyed, qPCR data indicated that
355 only one village (1.2% of all villages) had very low malaria prevalence (PfPR < 1%). In
356 contrast, RDTs identified 12 villages (34.3% of all villages) and microscopy identified 11
357 villages (31.4% of all villages) as having very low prevalence. For moderate
358 transmission, qPCR, RDTs, and microscopy categorized 15, 9, and 8 villages,
359 respectively. For high transmission, qPCR identified 14 villages, RDTs identified 8, and
360 microscopy identified 6. Notably, qPCR detected more malaria infections than RDTs
361 and microscopy, resulting in many villages being classified into higher transmission
362 categories.

363 Overall, using qPCR data, over 80% of the villages were classified as moderate to high
364 risk, significantly higher than the 48% classified by RDTs and 40% by microscopy.
365 Conversely, while only 17% of the villages were classifiable as having low or very low
366 malaria risk based on qPCR data, as high as 51% and 60% of the villages were
367 classified into these same categories based on RDT and microscopy data (Table 4 and
368 Figure 4)

369 **Table 2:** Malaria prevalence in Ulanga district by sex and age groups, as measured using RDTs, microscopy and qPCR

370

Attribute	RDTs				Microscopy				qPCR			
	Positive/ Total tested	Prevalence (%) [95% CI]	Odds of infection [95% CI]	P-value	Positive/ Total tested	Prevalence (%) [95% CI]	Odds of infection [95% CI]	P-value	Positive/ Total tested	Prevalence (%) [95% CI]	Odds of infection [95% CI]	P-value
Overall prevalence	1689/4404	38.4 [36.9-39.8]	-	-	1148/4404	26.1 [24.8 – 27.4]	-	-	1531/2841	53.9 [52.1-55.7]	-	-
Sex												
Female	874/2566	34.1 [32.2-35.9]	Ref		593/2566	23.1 [21.5 – 24.7]	Ref	-	830/1659	50.0 [47.6-52.4]	Ref	-
Male	815/1838	44.3 [42.1-46.6]	1.5 [1.4-1.7]	<0.001	555/1838	30.2 [28.1-32.3]	1.4 [1.3-1.6]	<0.001	701/1182	59.3 [56.5-62.1]	1.5 [1.4-1.8]	<0.001
Age group												
5-10 years	497/933	53.3 [50.1-56.5]	Ref		341/933	36.6 [33.5-39.6]	Ref	-	338/622	54.3 [50.4-58.3]	Ref	-
11-15 years	479/801	59.8 [56.4-63.2]	1.3 [1.1-1.6]	0.006	358/801	44.7 [41.3-48.1]	1.4 [1.2-1.7]	<0.001	355/534	66.5 [62.5-70.5]	1.3 [1.1-1.6]	0.006
16-20 years	154/332	46.4 [41.0-51.8]	0.8 [0.6-1.0]	0.031	109/332	32.8 [27.9-37.9]	0.9 [0.7-1.1]	0.224	127/210	60.5 [53.9-67.1]	0.8 [0.6-1.0]	0.031
>20 years	559/2338	23.9 [22.2-25.6]	0.3 [0.2-0.4]	<0.001	340/2338	14.5 [13.1-16.0]	0.3 [0.3-0.4]	<0.001	711/1475	48.2 [45.7-50.8]	0.3 [0.2-0.3]	<0.001

371

372

373 **Table 3:** Malaria prevalence in the Kilombero district by sex and age groups, as measured using RDTs, microscopy and
 374 qPCR

375


Attribute	RDTs				Microscopy				qPCR			
	Positive/ Total tested	Prevalence (%) [95% CI]	Odds of infection [95% CI]	P-value	Positive/ Total tested	Prevalence (%) [95% CI]	Odds of infection [95% CI]	P-value	Positive/ Total tested	Prevalence (%) [95% CI]	Odds of infection [95% CI]	P-value
Overall prevalence	86/3211	2.7 [2.1-3.2]	-	-	59/3211	1.8 [1.4 – 2.3]	-	-	181/2064	8.8 [7.6-10.0]	-	-
Sex												
Female	50/2164	2.3 [1.7-2.9]	Ref	-	36/2164	1.2 [1.1-2.2]	Ref	-	118/1385	8.5 [7.1-10.0]	Ref	-
Male	36/1047	3.4 [2.3-4.5]	1.5 [0.9-2.3]	0.065	23/1047	2.2 [1.3 – 3.1]	1.3 [0.8-2.3]	0.293	63/679	9.3 [7.1-11.5]	1.1 [0.8-1.5]	0.567
Age group												
5-10 years	21/519	4.1 [2.4-5.7]	Ref	-	16/519	3.1 [1.6-4.6]	Ref	-	33/343	9.6 [6.5-12.7]	Ref	-
11-15 years	17/400	4.3 [2.3-6.2]	1.1 [0.6-2.0]	0.877	10/400	2.50 [1.0-4.03]	0.8 [0.4-1.8]	0.597	28/256	10.9 [7.1-14.8]	1.2 [0.7-2.0]	0.59
16-20 years	9/198	4.6 [1.6-7.5]	1.1 [0.5-2.5]	0.765	4/198	2.02 [0.1-3.4]	0.6 [0.2-2.0]	0.443	16/123	13.0 [7.1-19.0]	1.4 [0.7-2.7]	0.295
>20 years	39/2094	1.9 [1.3-2.4]	0.5 [0.3-0.8]	0.003	29/2094	1.38 [0.88-1.89]	0.4 [0.2-0.8]	0.009	104/1342	7.8 [6.3-9.2]	0.8 [0.5-1.2]	0.259

376

377

378

379




380

381 **Figure 3:** Fine-scale malaria mapping of 35 surveyed villages in the Ulanga and
382 Kilombero districts using qPCR, RDTs, and microscopy data is shown in the top panel.
383 The bottom panel indicates malaria risk generated by interpolating prevalence data
384 obtained for each surveyed village by qPCR, RDTs, and Microscopy.

385 **Table 4:** Number of villages categorized into different risk strata based on the *P.*
 386 *falciparum* prevalence rate (PfPR) data from qPCR, RDTs and microscopy.

Risk strata	Prevalence	Number of villages					
		qPCR		RDTs		Microscopy	
		Count	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very low	PfPR < 1%	1	2.9	12	34.3	11	31.4
Low	1% ≤ PfPR < 5%	5	14.3	6	17.1	10	28.6
Moderate	5% ≤ PfPR < 30%	15	42.9	9	25.7	8	22.9
High	PfPR ≥ 30%	14	40.0	8	22.9	6	17.1
Total		35	100.0	35	100.0	35	100.0

387



388

389 **Figure 4:** Percentage of villages categorized by different testing methods as either very
 390 low risk, low risk, moderate risk or high risk (total number of villages = 35).

391 **Comparison of the performance of RDTs and microscopy relative to qPCR.**

392 In this comparative analysis, only samples tested by all three methods—PCR, RDTs,
 393 and microscopy—were included, totaling 64.3% (n = 4905) of the samples (Table 5).


394 Among these, qPCR identified 1712 (34.9%) as positive, whereas RDTs and
 395 microscopy classified 1289 (26.3%) and 843 (17.2%) positives, respectively (Table 5).

396 A substantial number of positive samples, otherwise detectable by qPCR, were missed
 397 by both RDTs and microscopy, suggesting the existence of subpatent infections (table 5
 398 and Figure 5). Of all samples analyzed by qPCR, RDTs, and microscopy, 647 out of
 399 4,905 (13.2%) were categorized as positive by all three methods (Figure 5).
 400 Interestingly, qPCR classified 56 out of 4,905 (1.1%) samples as negative, while both
 401 RDTs and microscopy agreed they were positive (Figure 5). Similarly, the same
 402 proportion was agreed upon by qPCR and microscopy as positive, while RDTs
 403 classified them as negative. Microscopy classified 415 out of 4,905 (8.5%) samples as
 404 negative, while both RDTs and qPCR agreed they were positive.

405 **Table 5:** Overall prevalence in the 35 surveyed villages estimated using qPCR, RDTs,
 406 and microscopy. Additionally, the table summarizes the proportion of malaria positive
 407 samples missed by RDTs and microscopy when qPCR is used as the reference.

	No. tested	Pf. Positive	Prevalence
qPCR	4905	1712	34.9%
RDTs	4905	1289	26.3%
Microscopy	4905	843	17.2%
Proportion of missed positives when qPCR is the reference			
	Total Positive by PCR	Sample missed	(%) of missed Positive
RDTs	1712	650	37.9%
Microscopy	1712	1009	58.9%

408
 409 Both RDT and microscopy missed several infections otherwise identified by qPCR. This
 410 category of false negatives included cases where qPCR identified a sample as positive,
 411 but microscopy identified it as negative, cases classified as positive by qPCR but
 412 negative by RDTs, and cases where RDTs indicated positive results while microscopy
 413 indicated negative result. Out of the 1712 positives detected by qPCR, RDTs missed
 414 650 (37.97%) and microscopy missed 1009 (58.9%) (Table 5). Additionally, when
 415 comparing microscopy to RDTs, microscopy failed to detect 45.46% (586/1289) of
 416 malaria infections detected by RDTs. RDTs correctly identified 1062 (62.03%) samples
 417 as true positives, while microscopy identified 703 (41.06%) as true positives (Table 6).
 418 Furthermore, RDTs misclassified 227 (7.10%) samples as false positives, while
 419 microscopy misclassified 140 (4.38%) (Table 6).



420

421 **Figure 5:** The Venn diagram illustrates positive samples detected exclusively by a
422 specific tool while the other two missed them (qPCR only: 594 positive, RDT only: 171
423 positive, Microscopy only: 84 positive). Additionally, it shows intersections indicating
424 positive detection by two tools when one detects negative (qPCR & RDT: 415 positive;
425 qPCR & Microscopy: 56 positive; RDT & Microscopy: 56 positive). It also indicates
426 intersections where all tools detect positive samples (qPCR, RDT, & Microscopy: 647
427 positive).

428 **Table 6:** Evaluation metrics for assessing the performance of RDTs and microscopy relative to qPCR during the fine-scale
 429 stratification of malaria risk in Ulanga and Kilombero districts, south-eastern Tanzania.

Test characteristics	RDTs		Microscopy (Thick smear)	
	Evidence from Published studies	Evidence from this study	Evidence from Published studies	Evidence from this study
True Positives (PCR positive=1712)	-	1062	-	703
False Positives (PCR negative)	-	227	-	140
True Negatives (PCR negative=3193)	-	2966	-	3057
False Negatives (PCR positive)	-	650	-	1009
Sensitivity [95% CI]	56 - 78% [55,65–68]	62.0% [95 CI: 60.0-64.2]	31-63% [55,65–68]	41.0% [95 CI: 38.8-43.4]
Specificity [95% CI]	91-99% [55,65–68]	92.9% [95 CI: 92.0-93.7]	82-100% [55,65–68]	95.6% [95 CI: 94.9-96.3]
Positive Predictive Value [95% CI]	75 -100 [69,70]	82.4% [95 CI: 80.3 -84.4]	70 -100 [66,69]	83.4% [95 CI: 80.8-86.0]
Negative Predictive Value [95% CI]	75-99 [66,68,71]	82.0% [95 CI: 80.7-83.2]	66-99 [66,68]	75.2% [95 CI: 73.8-76.4]
Kappa value [95% CI]	50-77 [55,65–68]	0.6 [95 CI: 0.6-0.6]	54% [48-60] [55,65–68]	0.4 [95 CI: 0.4-0.40]
Accuracy	-	82.1%	-	76.57%

430 **Positive predictive values (PPVs), sensitivity, specificity, and agreement of RDTs**
431 **and microscopy when compared to qPCR**


432 Considering qPCR as the benchmark, the sensitivity (the proportion of actual positives
433 which were correctly identified as such) of RDTs was 62.0% [95% CI: 60.0-64.2], while
434 that of microscopy was 41.0% [95% CI: 38.8 - 43.4]. The specificity (proportion of actual
435 negatives which were correctly identified as such) was 92.9% [95% CI: 92.00-93.7] for
436 RDTs and 95.6% [95% CI: 94.9- 96.3] for microscopy (Table 6). Overall, the positive
437 predictive value (PPV), i.e. the probability that individuals with a positive test result
438 actually have the disease, was 82.4% [95% CI: 80.3 -84.4] for RDTs and 83.4% [95%
439 CI: 80.8-86.0] for microscopy (Table 6). Importantly however, the PPV for both RDTs
440 and microscopy varied with malaria endemicity, generally increasing with prevalence,
441 ranging from less than 20% in very low transmission areas to over 80% in high
442 transmission areas (Figure 06).

443
444 When considering the micro-strata generated using qPCR data, the PPV of RDTs and
445 microscopy started at 0% in very low risk strata and gradually increased to >80% as
446 villages shifted towards high risk strata (Figure 6A). However, when referring to the
447 strata generated using RDTs data (Figure 6B), the PPV of both RDTs and microscopy
448 started at 20% in very low risk strata and gradually increased to >80% in high-risk
449 strata. The agreement between RDTs and qPCR was good (Kappa value = 0.58 [95%
450 CI: 0.56-0.61]), while the agreement between microscopy and qPCR showed fair
451 agreement (Kappa value = 0.42 [95%CI: 0.39-0.44]), (Table 6).

452
453 The sensitivity of both RDTs and microscopy varied by age, where RDTs sensitivity was
454 higher for school-aged children (>80%) and dropped to 75% and 60% for 16-20 years
455 and >20 years, respectively (Figure 6C). A similar trend of sensitivity was observed for
456 microscopy (Figure 6C), indicating that RDTs and microscopy perform better in
457 detecting malaria in school-aged children compared to adults.

458 The relationship between parasite density and the malaria detection probability by RDTs
459 and microscopy was also examined. In this analysis, the probability of RDTs detecting

460 positive malaria infections was maximized reaching 1 at 100 parasites/ μ L, where the
 461 logistic regression (logit (p)) model saturated (Figure 6D). At this density in contrast, the
 462 probability of microscopy to detect malaria infections was only 0.85% (Figure 6D),
 463 suggesting higher sensitivity of RDTs vs microscopy.



464
 465 **Figure 6:** Estimates of the positive predictive values (PPVs) of RDTs and microscopy at
 466 different malaria endemicities across the study villages, defined based on either qPCR
 467 data (A) or RDT data (B). Panel C) illustrates the trend of sensitivity of both RDTs and
 468 microscopy relative to age groups. Panel D) displays the detection probability of both
 469 RDTs and microscopy relative to the parasite density estimated by qPCR.

470 **Parasites density estimates and their correlations with *Plasmodium* prevalence**

471 Further, asexual parasite densities estimated by both microscopy and qPCR were
472 investigated and compared across different sex and age groups using Mann-Whitney
473 statistics for two categories and the Kruskal-Wallis statistical test for more than two
474 categories. Overall, PCR was capable of detecting approximately 100 fold lower
475 parasite densities compared to microscopy. The geometric mean asexual parasite
476 density estimated by microscopy was 2206.4 parasites/ μ L (95% CI: 1976.7-2462.8),
477 while that estimated by PCR was 27.07 parasites/ μ L (95% CI: 23.23-31.54) (Table 7).

478
479 The asexual parasite density of infected individuals significantly differed between males
480 and females as estimated by qPCR ($P < 0.001$), with males harboring a higher parasite
481 density compared to females, though similar trend was observed by microscopy, this
482 sex difference was not statistically detectable by microscopy ($P = 0.11$). Importantly, the
483 geometric mean parasite density estimated by both microscopy and qPCR per village
484 demonstrated a significant positive correlation with the parasite prevalence of the
485 respective village. Thus, villages with high malaria prevalence also had high malaria
486 parasite densities compared to villages with lower prevalence (Figure 7C-F).

487 Considering qPCR-estimated geometric mean parasite densities, the Spearman rank
488 correlation score was 0.77 ($P < 0.001$) and 0.76 ($P < 0.001$) when the malaria
489 prevalence of the villages was estimated by qPCR and RDTs, respectively (Figure 7C &
490 7E). On the other hand, the Spearman rank correlation for the parasite density
491 estimated by microscopy was 0.55 ($P < 0.003$) and 0.48 ($P < 0.012$) for qPCR and
492 RDTs estimated prevalence of the villages, respectively (Figure 7D & 7F).


493 When parasite density by age groups were analyzed, both microscopy and qPCR
494 revealed a significant difference in estimated malaria parasite densities between age
495 groups based on Kruskal-Wallis statistics ($P < 0.001$) (Table 7). Pairwise tests by Mann-
496 Whitney statistics revealed that school-aged children (5-15 years old) harbored a higher
497 parasite density than those 16 years old and above ($P < 0.001$) as indicated by both
498 microscopy and qPCR (Figure 7A & 7B).

499 **Table 7:** Parasite densities by gender and age as estimated using Microscopy slides and quantitative PCR assays
 500

	Microscopy			qPCR		
	Geometric mean (/μL)	95% CI (/μL)	P-value	Geometric mean (/μL)	95% CI (/μL)	P-value
Overall parasite density	2206.39	1976.68-2462.81	-	27.07	23.23-31.54	-
Sex						
Female	2085.06	1775.94-2447.98	0.11^a	20.48	16.76-25.02	<0.001^a
Male	2341.22	2014.74-2720.61		38.32	30.33-48.41	
Age group						
5-10 years	3715.39	3040.63-4534.91	<0.001^b	108.32	74.55-157.42	<0.001^b
11-15 years	2398.92	2017.28— 2852.75		76.83	55.26-106.83	
16-20 years	2117.02	1443.62-3104.53		30.22	17.47-52.25	
>20 years	1182	968.15-1444.34		9.05	7.59-10.79	

501 **a=** Mann-Whitney Test

502 **b=** Kruskal-Wallis Test



503

504 **Figure 7:** Geometric mean parasite densities per age group estimated by A) qPCR and
505 B) microscopy, and correlations with parasite prevalence (C-F).

506 Discussion

507 In malaria-endemic countries, data-driven risk stratification is increasingly used at
508 district or higher regional levels to guide intervention strategies and optimize resource
509 allocation. Additionally, the geographical variations in levels of endemicities and the shift
510 towards elimination in some settings necessitates finer resolution for optimal resource
511 allocation [6,10,72]. In most settings in Africa, the data used for epidemiological
512 stratification of malaria typically comes from rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) or
513 microscopy-based testing, which despite wide scale availability and low operational
514 costs, often perform poorly in low transmission settings [41,73,74]. While direct
515 comparisons of these diagnostic tools for fine-scale stratification are currently limited,
516 selecting the most appropriate data sources and testing methods is crucial, as different
517 methods can yield significantly different results depending on endemicity, particularly in
518 elimination settings. Even without alternative testing methods, data users and decision-
519 makers need to understand the limitations of their selected approaches, especially the
520 weaknesses of current dominant data sources like RDTs or microscopy. In this study,
521 we conducted a high-resolution survey of *P. falciparum* malaria in two Tanzanian
522 districts, comparing fine-scale strata obtained using RDTs, microscopy, and qPCR
523 assays. The findings will provide the necessary evidence to the malaria programs at
524 national and district levels on how RDTs, microscopy, and qPCR compare when used at
525 local levels. Moreover, the findings demonstrate that selection of appropriate test
526 methods is essential for more precise resource allocation and improved understanding
527 of disease patterns.

528 The findings highlight significant variability in malaria risk at a fine scale. Within less
529 than 150 kilometers, malaria prevalence estimates ranged from 0% to over 50% across
530 contiguous villages in an area broadly classified as moderate risk (~17% PfPR) by
531 recent government stratification [44]. Such fine-scale variability is not uncommon and
532 has been observed in several other settings [75]. In one study in Madagascar, there
533 was a tenfold difference of malaria prevalence within a radius of less than 50 kilometers
534 [76]. For precise micro-stratifications, this study emphasizes the importance of carefully
535 selecting diagnostic tools, especially for local malaria elimination efforts. Our findings
536 indicate that RDTs and microscopy have poor positive predictive values, which can be

537 even less than 20% in villages with very low and low transmission as the proportion of
538 truly infected individuals is very small compared to non-infected persons. There were
539 also significant discrepancies in the resulting micro-strata depending on the test method
540 used. For instance, among the 35 surveyed villages, RDTs and microscopy classified
541 12 and 11 as very low and 6 and 10 as low risk strata, respectively, while qPCR
542 identified only 1 village as very low and 5 as low transmission. This means RDTs and
543 microscopy classified majority of the villages as very low to low risk while qPCR
544 classified most villages as moderate to high risk (Table 4).

545 Clear demarcation of areas with very low to low risk versus those with moderate to high
546 risk is essential, particularly in the push towards elimination. As countries increasingly
547 adopt data-driven decision-making for malaria control, there is a risk of improper
548 resource allocation or premature withdrawal of effective interventions from localities
549 erroneously deemed as nearing elimination. Local authorities need to decide which data
550 to use for local-level micro-stratification and whether RDTs, commonly used for broader-
551 scale sub-national stratification, suffice for fine-scale local decision-making. Previous
552 evidence has shown that hotspots identified by RDTs are less stable than those
553 identified by microscopy and PCR [41]. Hotspots of febrile malaria infections are also
554 generally unstable and variable over geographical spaces, while hotspots of
555 asymptomatic cases tend to be more permanent and can be more practically targeted
556 for transmission control [77]. In this current study, we also found significant positive
557 correlations between malaria parasite densities and malaria prevalence in southeastern
558 Tanzania, emphasizing the need to incorporate tests that depict sub-microscopic
559 infections into malaria stratification and decision making to better target the hotspots. As
560 already reported in other studies, villages in our study area, which were classified as
561 low transmission areas had lower geometric mean parasite density compared to those
562 with higher transmission rates.

563 Our findings, benchmarked against qPCR, reveal limited detection capabilities of RDTs
564 and microscopy in overall fine-scale stratifications, especially in low transmission
565 settings. Previous studies have emphasized the usefulness of routine hospital data for
566 micro-stratifications [8,10,78,79]. However, evidence indicates that both microscopy and
567 RDTs are less effective in identifying stable febrile malaria hotspots, except for

568 asymptomatic hotspots, which are reliably identified by microscopy [77], however still
569 not stable when transmission is low [80]. Our research underscores the importance of
570 identifying subclinical infections using sensitive tools to advance malaria elimination,
571 particularly through fine-scale population surveys. Additionally, there is evidence
572 suggesting potential benefits from integrating hospital and school-age children survey
573 data or even antenatal care centers [2,9]. Nevertheless, these approaches heavily rely
574 on rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs) as the primary tool for malaria detection. While the
575 World Health Organization (WHO) recommends monitoring RDT performance alongside
576 microscopy, our study is particularly relevant as we have directly compared the fine-
577 scale stratification capabilities of RDTs, microscopy, and qPCR at a fine scale.

578 This study demonstrated overall good agreement between RDTs and qPCR, while
579 microscopy showed fair agreement. However, RDTs missed over 38% of malaria
580 infections, particularly among adults over twenty years old, who were found to harbor
581 lower parasite densities compared to those under twenty years old. However, RDTs
582 remain useful in testing fever-positive malaria cases in hospitals and are widely
583 employed in population surveys due to their cost-effectiveness and ease of
584 implementation [32]. As evidenced in this study, carefully re-consideration of using
585 RDTs for finer-scale mapping and intervention planning at sub-district level should be a
586 priority. Similarly, microscopy missed >50% of the malaria infections detected by qPCR,
587 which is consistent with previous studies, including a meta-analysis of 42 studies, which
588 showed that microscopy misses over 50% of malaria infections [26,66]. Operational
589 challenges, such as the level of expertise required for accurate detection and the need
590 for electricity and precise sample handling procedures, contribute to these limitations.
591 Interestingly, microscopy underestimated malaria risk by classifying more villages as
592 low strata compared to qPCR. Nonetheless, microscopy still plays a crucial role when
593 used in conjunction with tools like RDTs, providing valuable information about malaria
594 parasite densities [81–83]. Here, we estimate a 100-fold higher parasite density when
595 measured by microscopy compared to densities measured by qPCR, consistent with
596 similar trends observed in previous studies [55]. The findings of this study also indicate
597 that the false-negative rate of microscopy decreases with increasing parasite density, a
598 pattern observed in other studies too [81].

599 The analysis also revealed variations in parasite densities across different age groups,
600 with school-age children (5-15 years old) exhibiting higher parasite densities compared
601 to individuals aged 16 and above. Notably, our study identified a reduced sensitivity of
602 both RDTs and microscopy among adults aged over 16 years, consistent with findings
603 from prior studies conducted before 2015 in various regions [84–91]. It is possible this
604 pattern is driven by the age-related differences in malaria parasite prevalence, which
605 was also observed (Table 3). Furthermore, our findings suggest that this trend may be
606 attributed to the lower parasite density estimates observed in adults within the study
607 (Figure 7A & 7B). Significantly, our research provides valuable insights, highlighting the
608 potential implications of these trends, particularly in fine-scale mapping scenarios,
609 where RDTs and microscopy may underestimate stratifications at very low and low
610 transmission strata, with qPCR serving as the reference standard in this study.

611 Ultimately, this study underscores the potential need to expand the use of molecular
612 approaches such as qPCR to achieve more precise mapping of malaria infections,
613 which could reduce false negatives and facilitate more precise resource allocations.
614 However, qPCR has operational challenges, including the need for well-designed
615 infrastructure, high costs, and expertise, and it is not portable for remote areas [82].
616 Efforts are underway to develop portable qPCR technologies, but cost and expertise
617 remain significant barriers. To address these gaps, NMCPs should develop innovative
618 plans, which might include: a) centralized facilities receiving and processing qPCR
619 samples and then doing such surveys only infrequently, say every 3 years; b) partnering
620 with local research organizations to support the high accuracy evaluations with nucleic
621 acid based tests. A related point to emphasize is the overall need for highly-sensitive,
622 cost-effective, and potentially reagent-free tools that align with the economic context of
623 malaria-endemic settings. Recent innovations such as the saliva-based tests [92] or the
624 use of Infrared spectroscopy (IR) and machine learning (ML) [82,93] have shown
625 promise in detecting malaria infections at sensitivities equivalent to PCR, but further
626 research are needed before these technologies can be routinely deployed. Such
627 reagent-free assays like the IR-AI based approaches would be particularly
628 transformative for scaling up effective micro stratification of malaria risk in Africa.

629 This study also raised some important new questions. For example, it is baffling to

630 observe that areas with low transmission also have persistently low parasite densities
631 despite individuals having low immunity compared to those in higher transmission
632 settings who acquire immunity and become protective. Studies have demonstrated that
633 in low transmission areas, highly virulent parasites are more exposed to facilitate
634 malaria transmission by mosquitoes compared to low virulent ones [26,94–96].
635 Consequently, high virulent parasites are detected and treated, leading to their removal
636 from the population [26,94–96]. This leaves behind low virulent parasites that are less
637 exposed and maintain low densities, becoming symptomatic, undetectable, and
638 untreated [26,94–96]. This phenomenon may contribute to long-term parasite
639 transmission strategies, highlighting the importance of using highly sensitive tools for
640 screening [55,97,98].

641 One limitation of this study is its failure to consider factors that may contribute to the
642 broader heterogeneity of malaria infections in southeastern Tanzania. Future
643 investigations should delve into potential environmental, geographical, immunological or
644 genetic diversity of the parasite influences underlying this variability. Additionally, the
645 biological significance of missed infections by both RDTs and microscopy was not
646 explored. Consequently, the study did not estimate the transmission burden associated
647 with these undetected positive samples, nor assess the parasite densities necessary to
648 sustain transmission in the population.

649 **Conclusion**

650 As countries progress towards malaria elimination, fine-scale mapping of malaria risk
651 becomes increasingly important. This study highlights significant variability in village-
652 level malaria risk within and between districts in southeastern Tanzania, an area where
653 the scale-up of effective interventions has led to substantial progress, yet cases persist
654 despite high intervention coverage. Secondly, the study underscores the variable
655 performance of different testing methods in stratifying risk. While RDTs and microscopy,
656 the primary test methods used in low-income endemic settings and the main sources of
657 data for ongoing epidemiological stratification efforts, were effective in high-transmission
658 areas, they performed poorly in low-transmission settings, often classifying most
659 villages as very low or low risk. In contrast, qPCR classified most villages as moderate

660 or high risk. These findings demonstrate the importance of using appropriate testing
661 methods for data-driven, fine-scale risk stratification to enhance targeted interventions
662 aimed at reducing and eliminating malaria. The study underscores the need for
663 improved testing approaches that are both operationally feasible and sufficiently
664 sensitive to enable precise mapping and effective targeting of malaria in local contexts.
665 More importantly, public health authorities must recognize the strengths and limitations
666 of their available data when planning local stratification or making decisions. While
667 innovation for more effective strategies is ongoing, sensitive molecular tools like qPCR,
668 despite their operational challenges, will be crucial for accurate malaria risk mapping
669 and intervention planning, especially in settings with significantly reduced risk. Going
670 forward, developing new tools that balance operational costs and sensitivity, particularly
671 in low transmission settings, will be essential for effective malaria control and eventual
672 elimination.

673 **Acknowledgements**

674 We extend our sincere gratitude to the dedicated team of the Deep Diagnostics Project
675 at Ifakara Health Institute for their invaluable support throughout this survey. Special
676 recognition is due to Abigael W. Magesa, Tumpe G. Mwandya, Magreth C. Magoda,
677 Scolastica N. Hangu, Alex T. Ngonyani, Magreth I. Henry, Jiddah A. Ally, Alfred J.
678 Simfukwe, Amisa N. Rajabu, Scolastica A. Ndonge, Rahma S. Kikweo, Benson D.
679 Makua, Jacob J. Nyooka, Festo I. Tangaliola, Stephen J. Magasa, Joyce Y. Jackson,
680 Fidelis D. Mbena, Slyakus V, Mlembe, and Agnes Kimaro for their invaluable
681 contributions to conducting the surveys, administering questionnaires, screenings, and
682 laboratory procedures. We also express our gratitude to Judith Mshumbusi and the
683 procurement team for their assistance in procuring materials, often on short notice.
684 Additionally, we extend our thanks to Faraji Abilahi, the Ifakara laboratory manager, and
685 fellow scientists, students and staff at Ifakara Health institute and University of Glasgow,
686 who contributed direct or indirectly to this study.

687 **Author contributions**

688 Conceptualization: I.H.M., F.O., F.B., and S.A.B. Data curation: I.H.M., F.M., E.G.M.,
689 I.M., and F.E.M. Formal analysis: I.H.M., S.A.B., F.O.O., D.B., H.S.N., F.B. Funding

690 acquisition: F.O.O, S.A.B., F.B., and I.H.M. Investigation: I.H.M., F.M., E.G.M., I.M.,
691 N.S.L, S.A, and F.E.M. Methodology: I.H.M., A.B.L., S.A.B., F.O.O., F.B. Project
692 administration: I.H.M., R.M.N., F.M., Resources: I.H.M., F.M.,H.S.N S.A.B., F.O.O., and
693 F.B. Supervision: S.A.B., F.O.O., and F.B. Validation: S.A.B., F.O.O., and F.B.
694 Visualization: I.H.M., S.A.B., F.O.O., F.B., N.F.K, A.L. D.B. Writing original draft: I.H.M.,
695 S.A.B., F.O.O., and F.B. Writing review & editing: All authors.

696 **Funding**

697 This work was supported in part by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (Grant number
698 Grant No. OPP 1217647 and Grant No. INV-002138 to Ifakara Health Institute). Under
699 the grant conditions of the Foundation, a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Generic
700 License has already been assigned to the Author Accepted Manuscript version that
701 might arise from this submission. Support was also received from Rudolf Geigy
702 Foundation through Swiss Tropical & Public Health Institute (to Ifakara Health Institute),
703 Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) and Gates Foundation (Grants: OPP1099295)
704 awarded to FOO and HMF, Royal Society (Grant No ICA/R1/191238 to SAB University
705 of Glasgow and Ifakara Health Institute). Academy Medical Science Springboard Award
706 (ref: SBF007\100094) to FB.

707 **Ethics approvals**

708 This work was approved under Ifakara Health Institute Review Board (Ref: IHI/IRB/No:
709 1 2021) and the National Institute for Medical Research-NIMR (NIMR/HQ/R.8a/Vol.
710 1X/3735). Permission to publish this work has been granted with reference No: BD.
711 242/437/01C/6.

712 **Data availability**

713 The dataset supporting the findings is available upon a reasonable request, which can
714 be directed to either the corresponding author, the Ifakara Health Institute ethical review
715 board in Tanzania or National Health Research Ethics Committee in Tanzania with
716 reference to ethical clearance certificate of NIMR/HQ/R.8a/Vol. 1X/3735.

Reference

1. World Health Organization (WHO). Malaria policy advisory group (MPAG) meeting report, 18–20 April 2023. Geneva PP - Geneva: World Health Organization;
2. Thawer SG, Chacky F, Runge M, Reaves E, Mandike R, Lazaro S, et al. Sub-national stratification of malaria risk in mainland Tanzania: a simplified assembly of survey and routine data. *Malar J.* 2020;19: 1–12.
3. Mategula D, Mitambo C, Sheahan W, Masingi Mbeye N, Gumbo A, Kwizombe C, et al. Malaria Burden Stratification in Malawi- A report of a consultative workshop to inform the 2023-2030 Malawi Malaria Strategic Plan. *Wellcome open Res.* 2023;8: 178. doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.19110.1
4. Djaskano MI, Cissoko M, Diar MSI, Israel DK, Clément KH, Ali AM, et al. Stratification and adaptation of malaria control interventions in Chad. *Trop Med Infect Dis.* 2023;8: 450.
5. Cissoko M, Magassa M, Sanogo V, Ouologuem A, Sangaré L, Diarra M, et al. Stratification at the health district level for targeting malaria control interventions in Mali. *Sci Rep.* 2022;12: 8271. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-11974-3
6. Thawer SG, Golumbeanu M, Munisi K, Aaron S, Chacky F, Lazaro S, et al. The use of routine health facility data for micro-stratification of malaria risk in mainland Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2022;21: 345. doi:10.1186/s12936-022-04364-7
7. Rijal KR, Adhikari B, Adhikari N, Dumre SP, Banjara MS, Shrestha UT, et al. Micro-stratification of malaria risk in Nepal: implications for malaria control and elimination. *Trop Med Health.* 2019;47: 21. doi:10.1186/s41182-019-0148-7
8. Thawer SG, Golumbeanu M, Lazaro S, Chacky F, Munisi K, Aaron S, et al. Spatio-temporal modelling of routine health facility data for malaria risk micro-stratification in mainland Tanzania. *Sci Rep.* 2023;13: 10600. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-37669-x
9. Kitojo C, Gutman JR, Chacky F, Kigadye E, Mkude S, Mandike R, et al. Estimating malaria burden among pregnant women using data from antenatal care centres in Tanzania: a population-based study. *Lancet Glob Heal.* 2019;7: e1695–e1705.
10. Alegana VA, Suiyanka L, Macharia PM, Ikahu-Muchangi G, Snow RW. Malaria micro-stratification using routine surveillance data in Western Kenya. *Malar J.* 2021;20: 1–9.
11. Buring JE. *Epidemiology in medicine.* Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 1987.
12. World Health Organization (WHO). *A framework for malaria elimination.* World Health Organization; 2017.
13. Alegana VA, Macharia PM, Muchiri S, Mumo E, Oyugi E, Kamau A, et al. *Plasmodium falciparum* parasite prevalence in East Africa: Updating data for

- malaria stratification. *PLOS Glob Public Heal.* 2021;1: e0000014.
14. Ssempiira J, Kissa J, Nambuusi B, Kyoziira C, Rutazaana D, Mukooyo E, et al. The effect of case management and vector-control interventions on space–time patterns of malaria incidence in Uganda. *Malar J.* 2018;17: 1–11.
 15. Yekutieli P. Problems of epidemiology in malaria eradication. *Bull World Health Organ.* 1960;22: 669–683.
 16. Brooker S, Kolaczinski JH, Gitonga CW, Noor AM, Snow RW. The use of schools for malaria surveillance and programme evaluation in Africa. *Malar J.* 2009;8: 1–9.
 17. Smith Gueye C, Newby G, Tulloch J, Slutsker L, Tanner M, Gosling RD. The central role of national programme management for the achievement of malaria elimination: a cross case-study analysis of nine malaria programmes. *Malar J.* 2016;15: 1–21.
 18. Bakar S, Holzschuh A, Ross A, Stuck L, Abdul R, Al-Mafazy A-WH, et al. Risk of imported malaria infections in Zanzibar: a cross-sectional study. *Infect Dis Poverty.* 2023;12: 80. doi:10.1186/s40249-023-01129-5
 19. ICF. Tanzania demographic and health survey 2022 - final report . Rockville, Maryland, USA : ICF ; 2023.
 20. Chacky F, Runge M, Rumisha SF, Machafuko P, Chaki P, Massaga JJ, et al. Nationwide school malaria parasitaemia survey in public primary schools, the United Republic of Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2018;17: 452. doi:10.1186/s12936-018-2601-1
 21. Ashton RA, Bennett A, Al-Mafazy A-W, Abass AK, Msellem MI, McElroy P, et al. Use of routine health information system data to evaluate impact of malaria control interventions in Zanzibar, Tanzania from 2000 to 2015. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2019;12: 11–19.
 22. Bastiaens GJH, Bousema T, Leslie T. Scale-up of malaria rapid diagnostic tests and artemisinin-based combination therapy: challenges and perspectives in sub-Saharan Africa. *PLoS Med.* 2014;11: e1001590.
 23. Noor AM, Gething PW, Alegana VA, Patil AP, Hay SI, Muchiri E, et al. The risks of malaria infection in Kenya in 2009. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2009;9: 1–14.
 24. World Health Organization (WHO), Regional Office for the Western Pacific. Giemsa Staining of Malaria Blood Films. *Malaria Microscopy Standard Operating Procedure – Mm-Sop-07a 1.* 2016.
 25. Tangpukdee N, Duangdee C, Wilairatana P, Krudsood S. Malaria diagnosis: a brief review. *Korean J Parasitol.* 2009;47: 93. doi:10.3347/kjp.2009.47.2.93
 26. Okell LC, Bousema T, Griffin JT, Ouédraogo AL, Ghani AC, Drakeley CJ. Factors determining the occurrence of submicroscopic malaria infections and their relevance for control. *Nat Commun.* 2012;3: 1–9. doi:10.1038/ncomms2241

27. Manjurano A, Okell L, Lukindo T, Reyburn H, Olomi R, Roper C, et al. Association of sub-microscopic malaria parasite carriage with transmission intensity in north-eastern Tanzania. 2011; 1–8.
28. Payne D. Use and limitations of light microscopy for diagnosing malaria at the primary health care level. *Bull World Health Organ.* 1988;66: 621.
29. UNITAID. 2015 Malaria Diagnostics Landscape Update. 2015.
30. Moody A. Rapid diagnostic tests for malaria parasites. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 2002;15: 66–78.
31. Shillcutt S, Morel C, Goodman C, Coleman P, Bell D, Whitty CJM, et al. Cost-effectiveness of malaria diagnostic methods in sub-Saharan Africa in an era of combination therapy. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2008;86: 101–110. doi:10.2471/BLT.07.042259
32. Cunningham J, Jones S, Gatton ML, Barnwell JW, Cheng Q, Chiodini PL, et al. A review of the WHO malaria rapid diagnostic test product testing programme (2008-2018): Performance, procurement and policy. *Malar J.* 2019;18. doi:10.1186/s12936-019-3028-z
33. Drakeley C, Reyburn H. Out with the old, in with the new: the utility of rapid diagnostic tests for malaria diagnosis in Africa. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2009;103: 333–337.
34. World Health Organization (WHO). Universal access to malaria diagnostic testing: An operational manual. WHO Press. 2011;12: 31A.
35. Roth JM, Korevaar DA, Leeflang MMG, Mens PF. Molecular malaria diagnostics: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci.* 2016;53: 87–105.
36. Snounou G, Viriyakosol S, Jarra W, Thaithong S, Brown KN. Identification of the four human malaria parasite species in field samples by the polymerase chain reaction and detection of a high prevalence of mixed infections. *Mol Biochem Parasitol.* 1993;58: 283–292. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-6851(93)90050-8
37. Kamau E, Alemayehu S, Feghali KC, Saunders D, Ockenhouse CF. Multiplex qPCR for detection and absolute quantification of malaria. *PLoS One.* 2013;8: e71539.
38. Snounou G. Detection and identification of the four malaria parasite species infecting humans by PCR amplification. *Methods Mol Biol.* 1996;50: 263–291. doi:10.1385/0-89603-323-6:263
39. Perandin F, Manca N, Calderaro A, Piccolo G, Galati L, Ricci L, et al. Development of a real-time PCR assay for detection of *Plasmodium falciparum*, *Plasmodium vivax*, and *Plasmodium ovale* for routine clinical diagnosis. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2004;42: 1214–1219.
40. Moonen B, Cohen JM, Snow RW, Slutsker L, Drakeley C, Smith DL, et al. Operational strategies to achieve and maintain malaria elimination. *Lancet*

- (London, England). 2010;376: 1592–1603. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61269-X
41. Mogeni P, Williams TN, Omedo I, Kimani D, Ngoi JM, Mwacharo J, et al. Detecting Malaria Hotspots: A Comparison of Rapid Diagnostic Test, Microscopy, and Polymerase Chain Reaction. *J Infect Dis*. 2017;216: 1091–1098. doi:10.1093/infdis/jix321
 42. Mosha JF, Sturrock HJW, Greenhouse B, Greenwood B, Sutherland CJ, Gadalla N, et al. Epidemiology of subpatent *Plasmodium falciparum* infection: implications for detection of hotspots with imperfect diagnostics. *Malar J*. 2013;12: 1–9.
 43. Finda MF, Limwagu AJ, Ngowo HS, Matowo NS, Swai JK, Kaindoa E, et al. Dramatic decreases of malaria transmission intensities in Ifakara, south-eastern Tanzania since early 2000s. *Malar J*. 2018;17: 1–18.
 44. MoHCDGEC. Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children (MoHCDGEC). The 2021 school malaria and nutrition survey (SMNS) report Mainland Tanzania. 2022.
 45. Ruth EP, Kashaigili JJ, Majule AE. Availability, Access and Use of Weather and Climate Information by Smallholder Farmers in the Kilombero River Catchment, Tanzania. *Clim Impacts Agric Nat Resour Sustain Africa*. 2020; 489–506.
 46. Kasiulevičius V, Šapoka V, Filipavičiūtė R. Sample size calculation in epidemiological studies. *Gerontologija*. 2006;7: 225–231.
 47. Arya R, Antonisamy B, Kumar S. Sample size estimation in prevalence studies. *Indian J Pediatr*. 2012;79: 1482–1488.
 48. Cochran WG. *Sampling Techniques*. Wiley; 1977.
 49. Mouatcho JC, Goldring JPD. Malaria rapid diagnostic tests: challenges and prospects. *J Med Microbiol*. 2013;62: 1491–1505.
 50. National guidelines for malaria diagnosis and treatment, 2006 / United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. [Dar es Salaam]: National Malaria Control Programme, [2006].
 51. Bailey JW, Williams J, Bain BJ, Parker-Williams J, Chiodini PL, Haematology GHTF of the BC for S in. Guideline: the laboratory diagnosis of malaria. *Br J Haematol*. 2013;163: 573–580.
 52. World Health Organization (WHO). Basic malaria microscopy. World Health Organization; 2010.
 53. World Health Organization (WHO). Malaria parasite counting. World Health Organization; 2016.
 54. Quick-DNA™ Miniprep Kit, Rapid and simple isolation of ultra-pure DNA from biological liquids and cells.
 55. Hofer LM, Kweyamba PA, Sayi RM, Chabo MS, Maitra SL, Moore SJ, et al. Malaria rapid diagnostic tests reliably detect asymptomatic *Plasmodium*

- falciparum infections in school-aged children that are infectious to mosquitoes. *Parasit Vectors*. 2023;16: 217.
56. Hofmann N, Mwingira F, Shekalaghe S, Robinson LJ, Mueller I, Felger I. Ultra-Sensitive Detection of *Plasmodium falciparum* by Amplification of Multi-Copy Subtelomeric Targets. *PLOS Med*. 2015;12: e1001788.
 57. Hartung C, Lerer A, Anokwa Y, Tseng C, Brunette W, Borriello G. Open data kit: tools to build information services for developing regions. Proceedings of the 4th ACM/IEEE international conference on information and communication technologies and development. 2010. pp. 1–12.
 58. McKinney W. Python for data analysis: Data wrangling with Pandas, NumPy, and IPython. “ O’Reilly Media, Inc.”; 2012.
 59. Seabold S, Perktold J. statsmodels: Econometric and statistical modeling with python. 9th Python in Science Conference. 2010.
 60. Landis JR, Koch GG. The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data Published by: International Biometric Society Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2529310>. 1977;33: 159–174.
 61. Munoz SR, Bangdiwala SI. Interpretation of Kappa and B statistics measures of agreement. *J Appl Stat*. 1997;24: 105–112.
 62. McKight PE, Najab J. Kruskal-wallis test. *Corsini Encycl Psychol*. 2010; 1.
 63. McKnight PE, Najab J. Mann-Whitney U Test. *Corsini Encycl Psychol*. 2010; 1.
 64. Sedgwick P. Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient. *Bmj*. 2014;349.
 65. Berzosa P, de Lucio A, Romay-Barja M, Herrador Z, González V, García L, Fernández-Martínez A, Santana-Morales M, Ncogo P, Valladares B, Riloha M BA. Comparison of three diagnostic methods (microscopy, RDT, and PCR) for the detection of malaria parasites in representative samples from Equatorial Guinea. *Malar J*. 2018;17: 1–12.
 66. Mfuh KO, Achonduh-Atijegbe OA, Bekindaka ON, Esemu LF, Mbakop CD, Gandhi K, et al. A comparison of thick-film microscopy, rapid diagnostic test, and polymerase chain reaction for accurate diagnosis of *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria. *Malar J*. 2019;18: 1–8.
 67. Ngasala B, Mutemi DD, Mwaiswelo RO. Diagnostic performance of malaria rapid diagnostic test and microscopy compared with PCR for detection of *Plasmodium falciparum* infections among primary schoolchildren in Kibiti District, Eastern Tanzania: an area with moderate malaria transmission. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2019;101: 809.
 68. Opoku Afriyie S, Addison TK, Gebre Y, Mutala A-H, Antwi KB, Abbas DA, et al. Accuracy of diagnosis among clinical malaria patients: comparing microscopy, RDT and a highly sensitive quantitative PCR looking at the implications for submicroscopic infections. *Malar J*. 2023;22: 76. doi:10.1186/s12936-023-04506-


5

69. Abdalla ZA, Rahma NA, Hassan EE, Abdallah TM, Hamad HE, Omer SA, et al. The diagnostic performance of rapid diagnostic tests and microscopy for malaria diagnosis in eastern Sudan using a nested polymerase chain reaction assay as a reference standard. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2019;113: 701–705.
70. Galatas B, Mayor A, Gupta H, Balanza N, Jang IK, Nhamussua L, et al. Field performance of ultrasensitive and conventional malaria rapid diagnostic tests in southern Mozambique. *Malar J.* 2020;19: 1–15.
71. Fransisca L, Kusananto JH, Satoto TBT, Sebayang B, Supriyanto , Andriyan E, et al. Comparison of rapid diagnostic test Plasmotec Malaria-3, microscopy, and quantitative real-time PCR for diagnoses of *Plasmodium falciparum* and *Plasmodium vivax* infections in Mimika Regency, Papua, Indonesia. *Malar J.* 2015;14: 1–11.
72. Ozodiegwu ID, Ogunwale AO, Surakat O, Akinyemi JO, Bamgboye EA, Fagbamigbe AF, et al. Description of the design of a mixed-methods study to assess the burden and determinants of malaria transmission for tailoring of interventions (microstratification) in Ibadan and Kano metropolis. *Malar J.* 2023;22: 255. doi:10.1186/s12936-023-04684-2
73. Sumari D, Mwingira F, Selemani M, Mugasa J, Mugittu K, Gwakisa P. Malaria prevalence in asymptomatic and symptomatic children in Kiwangwa, Bagamoyo district, Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2017;16: 1–7.
74. Jiram AI, Ooi CH, Rubio JM, Hisam S, Karnan G, Sukor NM, et al. Evidence of asymptomatic submicroscopic malaria in low transmission areas in Belaga district, Kapit division, Sarawak, Malaysia. *Malar J.* 2019;18: 1–12.
75. Amratia P, Psychas P, Abuaku B, Ahorlu C, Millar J, Oppong S, et al. Characterizing local-scale heterogeneity of malaria risk: a case study in Bunkpurugu-Yunyoo district in northern Ghana. *Malar J.* 2019;18: 1–14.
76. Rice BL, Golden CD, Randriamady HJ, Rakotomalala AANA, Vonona MA, Anjaranirina EJJ, et al. Fine-scale variation in malaria prevalence across ecological regions in Madagascar: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health.* 2021;21: 1018.
77. Bejon P, Williams TN, Liljander A, Noor AM, Wambua J, Ogada E, et al. Stable and unstable malaria hotspots in longitudinal cohort studies in Kenya. *PLoS Med.* 2010;7: e1000304.
78. Alegana VA, Okiro EA, Snow RW. Routine data for malaria morbidity estimation in Africa: challenges and prospects. *BMC Med.* 2020;18: 1–13.
79. Oduro AR, Bojang KA, Conway DJ, Corrah T, Greenwood BM, Schellenberg D. Health centre surveys as a potential tool for monitoring malaria epidemiology by area and over time. *PLoS One.* 2011;6: e26305.

80. Kangoye DT, Noor A, Midega J, Mwongeli J, Mkabili D, Mogeni P, et al. Malaria hotspots defined by clinical malaria, asymptomatic carriage, PCR and vector numbers in a low transmission area on the Kenyan Coast. *Malar J.* 2016;15: 1–13.
81. Oyibo W, Latham V, Oladipo O, Ntadom G, Uhomoibhi P, Ogbulafor N, et al. Malaria parasite density and detailed qualitative microscopy enhances large-scale profiling of infection endemicity in Nigeria. *Sci Rep.* 2023;13: 1599. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-27535-1
82. Mshani IH, Siria DJ, Mwangi EP, Sow BBD, Sanou R, Opiyo M, et al. Key considerations, target product profiles, and research gaps in the application of infrared spectroscopy and artificial intelligence for malaria surveillance and diagnosis. *Malar J.* 2023;22: 346. doi:10.1186/s12936-023-04780-3
83. Bejon P, Andrews L, Hunt-Cooke A, Sanderson F, Gilbert SC, Hill AVS. Thick blood film examination for *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria has reduced sensitivity and underestimates parasite density. *Malar J.* 2006;5: 1–4.
84. Swarthout TD, Counihan H, Senga RKK, Van den Broek I. Paracheck-Pf® accuracy and recently treated *Plasmodium falciparum* infections: is there a risk of over-diagnosis? *Malar J.* 2007;6: 1–6.
85. Reyburn H, Mbakilwa H, Mwangi R, Mwerinde O, Olomi R, Drakeley C, et al. Rapid diagnostic tests compared with malaria microscopy for guiding outpatient treatment of febrile illness in Tanzania: randomised trial. *Bmj.* 2007;334: 403.
86. Abeku TA, Kristan M, Jones C, Beard J, Mueller DH, Okia M, et al. Determinants of the accuracy of rapid diagnostic tests in malaria case management: evidence from low and moderate transmission settings in the East African highlands. *Malar J.* 2008;7: 1–10.
87. Hopkins H, Kambale W, Kanya MR, Staedke SG, Dorsey G, Rosenthal PJ. Comparison of HRP2-and pLDH-based rapid diagnostic tests for malaria with longitudinal follow-up in Kampala, Uganda. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2007;76: 1092–1097.
88. Harris I, Sharrock WW, Bain LM, Gray K-A, Bobogare A, Boaz L, et al. A large proportion of asymptomatic *Plasmodium* infections with low and sub-microscopic parasite densities in the low transmission setting of Temotu Province, Solomon Islands: challenges for malaria diagnostics in an elimination setting. *Malar J.* 2010;9: 1–8.
89. Laurent A, Schellenberg J, Shirima K, Ketende SC, Alonso PL, Mshinda H, et al. Performance of HRP-2 based rapid diagnostic test for malaria and its variation with age in an area of intense malaria transmission in southern Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2010;9: 1–9.
90. Mtove G, Nadjm B, Amos B, Hendriksen ICE, Muro F, Reyburn H. Use of an HRP2-based rapid diagnostic test to guide treatment of children admitted to hospital in a malaria-endemic area of north-east Tanzania. *Trop Med Int Heal.*

2011;16: 545–550.

91. Fryauff DJ, Gomez-Saladin E, Sumawinata I, Sutamihardja MA, Tuti S, Subianto B, et al. Comparative performance of the ParaSight F test for detection of *Plasmodium falciparum* in malaria-immune and nonimmune populations in Irian Jaya, Indonesia. *Bull World Health Organ.* 1997;75: 547.
92. Tao D, McGill B, Hamerly T, Kobayashi T, Khare P, Dziedzic A, et al. A saliva-based rapid test to quantify the infectious subclinical malaria parasite reservoir. *Sci Transl Med.* 2019;11: eaan4479.
93. Mshani I, Jackson F, Mwanga R, Kweyamba P, Mwanga E, Tambwe M, et al. Using AI-Powered Mid-Infrared Spectroscopy for Malaria Screening Under Varying Parasite Densities and Anaemic Conditions. 2024.
94. Okell LC, Ghani AC, Lyons E, Drakeley CJ. Submicroscopic infection in *Plasmodium falciparum*-endemic populations: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Infect Dis.* 2009;200: 1509–1517. doi:10.1086/644781
95. Bousema T, Okell L, Felger I, Drakeley C. Asymptomatic malaria infections: detectability, transmissibility and public health relevance. *Nat Rev Microbiol.* 2014;12: 833–840. doi:10.1038/nrmicro3364
96. Slater HC, Ross A, Felger I, Hofmann NE, Robinson L, Cook J, et al. The temporal dynamics and infectiousness of subpatent *Plasmodium falciparum* infections in relation to parasite density. *Nat Commun.* 2019;10: 1433. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-09441-1
97. Nguyen T-N, von Seidlein L, Nguyen T-V, Truong P-N, Do Hung S, Pham H-T, et al. The persistence and oscillations of submicroscopic *Plasmodium falciparum* and *Plasmodium vivax* infections over time in Vietnam: an open cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2018;18: 565–572.
98. Björkman AB. Asymptomatic low-density malaria infections: a parasite survival strategy? *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2018;18: 485–486.



■ Study Villages

— Roads


□ Kilombero and Ulanga district

□ Game reserve boundary

Elevation

> 600m

< 200m



Eligible participants (> 5 years)

Informed consent obtained

n = 7628

Screened at village centers via RDTs also created BS, and DBS

n = 7628

Removed duplications, missed ID and mislabeled samples

n = 13

C P.f Pan


RDTs

n = 7615

C P.f Pan

RDTs

n = 7615



DBS

n = 7615



>50% per village randomly selected for qPCR

n = 4905



Microscopy

n = 7615



2 readers, and 3rd for discrepancy
n = 7615

Compared with qPCR as the reference

RDTs

n = 4905

Positive = 1289
Negative = 3616

TP = 1062
FP = 227

qPCR as reference

n = 4905



Positive = 1712
Negative = 3193


Microscopy

n = 4905

Positive = 843
Negative = 4062


TP = 703
FP = 140





qPCR

RDTs



Microscopy

