# *Anopheles* mosquitoes exposed to long-acting antimalarials via drug-spiked bloodmeal absorb drug but do not suffer fitness costs

Morgan M. Goheen[1,2]*, Alessandra Orfanó[2], S. Rodrigue Dah[3], Brian D. Foy[4], Doug E. Brackney[5], Fangyong Li[6], Jean-Bosco Ouédraogo[7], Dari F. Da[3], Roch K. Dabiré[3], A. Fabrice Somé[3], Amy K. Bei[2]¶, Sunil Parikh[1,2]¶

[1]Section of Infectious Diseases, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America

[2]Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America

[3]Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé, Direction Regionale de l'Ouest, Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso

[4]Department of Microbiology, Immunology, and Pathology, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, United States of America

[5]Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America

[6]Yale Center for Analytical Sciences, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, United States of America

[7]Institut des Sciences et Techniques, Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso

*Corresponding author

Email: morgan.goheen@yale.edu (MMG)

¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

# Abstract

The World Health Organization's recommendations regarding the use of antimalarials for the prevention of malaria in endemic areas have greatly expanded, allowing more flexibility in the demographic groups and regions where chemoprevention and mass treatment are acceptable. An overlooked aspect of expanding human population-level drug exposure is the downstream impact of ingested drug on the mosquito vector. Data suggest both infected and uninfected *Anopheles* mosquitoes re-feed often with ≥4 blood meals during their lifespan. This provides repeated opportunities for mosquitoes to ingest drug via bloodmeals taken from people with antimalarials in the bloodstream and raises questions as to whether exposure may impact the mosquito itself, and/or parasites developing within the infected mosquito. We investigated the impact of exposure to physiologic levels of commonly used long-acting human antimalarials in the *Anopheles* mosquito via drug-spiked blood feeds. We did not observe any significant differences in mosquito feeding, behavior, fertility, or viability after ingestion of amodiaquine, desethylamodiaquine, piperaquine, and sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine in either lab-reared *An. gambiae* or field-derived *An. coluzzii* mosquitoes. Interrogating drug distribution within mosquitoes utilizing LC-MS/MS, desethylamodiaquine, the longer-acting active metabolite of amodiaquine, was fed at 2 concentrations (1/2X and 2X $C_{max}$) with drug subsequently detected in a dose-dependent manner in pooled whole mosquitoes, midguts and hemolymph. This was significant for whole mosquitoes harvested at 24hrs and 120hrs, and midguts harvested at 24hrs. Between 24 to 120 hrs, drug decreased in midguts but increased in hemolymph. Our results show biochemical evidence of antimalarial absorption into *Anopheles* hemolymph following bloodmeal

50    ingestion. These studies lay the foundation for future work to assess the impact of

51    vector-stage antimalarial drug exposure on parasite progression throughout

52    development in the mosquito, which could in turn have important implications for

53    transmission dynamics and drug resistance spread.

## 55   Author summary

Drug resistance to first-line antimalarials has emerged in multiple African countries. A

better understanding of antimalarial drug resistance emergence and spread is critical in

preventing further morbidity and mortality. Millions regularly receive antimalarials for

prophylaxis and mass treatment that are purposefully long-acting. *Anopheles*

mosquitoes re-feed frequently, and these malaria vectors (both infected and uninfected)

routinely feed on people whose blood contains these long-acting antimalarials.

Parasites take approximately 10 days to develop within the mosquito. There is

published precedent that several antimalarials can act upon vector-stage parasites, yet

any potential impact of antimalarials on mosquitoes and/or parasites developing within

has been largely overlooked. We questioned whether antimalarials ingested in mosquito

bloodmeals could influence parasite development and drug resistance selection. As

initial investigations, we exposed uninfected *Anopheles* mosquitoes to commonly used

long-acting antimalarials via drug-spiked bloodmeals, mimicking predicted physiologic

drug exposure. Investigated drugs did not impact mosquito viability. However, mass

spectrometry confirmed drug absorption in whole mosquitoes, as well as within midguts

and circulatory fluid, several days after feeding, demonstrating that mosquitoes can

ingest key drugs without suffering fitness costs, and these drugs can persist in

mosquitoes. This highlights the potential for antimalarials to impact parasite

development and drug resistance selection within the mosquito.

# Introduction

Despite gains in detection, treatment, and prevention strategies over previous decades, including recent approval of the first malaria vaccines, malaria remains a human pathogen of significant consequence, causing 597,000 deaths and 263 million cases in 2023 [1]. Unfortunately, formerly decreasing morbidity and mortality trends have now flatlined – particularly worrisome as insecticide resistance in the *Anopheles* mosquito vector and drug resistance in the predominant *Plasmodium falciparum* parasite species rapidly emerges and spreads [2–5]. Malaria control efforts are necessarily multipronged and include the widespread use of long-acting antimalarials for both chemoprevention and treatment. In the West African Sahel region, seasonal malaria chemoprevention (SMC) has been deployed to children under 5 years old as prevention during high transmission periods since ~2014. Thus far, administration of the long-acting drugs sulfadoxine (SDX)-pyrimethamine (PYR) (referred to as SP together) plus amodiaquine (AQ) (SP-AQ combined for SMC) has been the sole SMC regimen, and was administered to 53 million children per monthly cycle in 2023 [1,6–8] in countries with seasonal malaria transmission. SP-AQ for SMC is now also being considered for use in older children. Other WHO-endorsed long-acting prophylaxis and disease reduction strategies include intermittent preventative treatment in pregnancy (IPTp; all pregnant women in malaria endemic areas), which also employs SP (though dihydroartemisinin (DHA) + piperaquine (PPQ) (DP in combination) is also being considered), and mass

drug administration (MDA; community wide treatment in moderate-high transmission areas to reduce disease burden), which typically involves DP. First-line antimalarial treatment typically combines a short-acting artemisinin derivative with a long-acting partner (e.g. artesunate-AQ (ASAQ), artemether-lumefantrine (AL), or DP [6].

Recommendations for community antimalarial dosing in the context of prophylaxis and mass treatment are now expanding, which is a "paradigm shift" according to the WHO because its guidelines no longer specify strict age groups, transmission intensity thresholds, numbers of doses or cycles, or specific drugs [6]. Given the intentional long-acting nature of many antimalarials, with expanded use, it is anticipated that large proportions of a population could have drugs in their circulatory system for a majority of the transmission season(s). In fact, there is already abundant evidence of widespread circulating levels of human antimalarials in malaria endemic areas. Our group demonstrated that 90% of Ugandan children treated with DP had PPQ detectable in plasma at their next malaria episode, even those occurring up to 126 days post-treatment [9]. A Tanzanian study found that 74% of people had ≥1 antimalarial detectable despite no reported intake for 28 days prior [10]. The impact of such high levels of extended drug presence in human populations raises inevitable questions regarding how such exposure could facilitate drug resistance emergence and/or spread.

Malaria drug resistance is generally thought to arise through mutation and selection during symptomatic human blood stage infection, when both parasite replication and drug pressure are greatest [11]. In contrast, mass drug intervention is thought to reduce

symptomatic cases and transmission, and in turn, pose a lower risk of resistance

emergence and selection [12,13]. However, very little is known about how drugs

ingested by mosquitoes during bloodmeals could impact susceptible parasite forms in

the mosquitoes, as well as parasite resistance selection within the vector [14].

Revisiting the nuances of vector feeding habits and parasite development within the

vector (known as sporogony) is central to this question. *Anopheles spp.* mosquitoes

become infected after feeding on a person harboring gametocytes (the *Plasmodium*

sexual stage); in the vector midgut parasites undergo sexual replication, with

subsequent oocysts beginning to form within ~24 hours. Oocysts then further develop

under the mosquito midgut epithelium for ~9-14 days before releasing thousands of

sporozoites which migrate via hemolymph (circulatory fluid) to salivary glands for entry

into a new host upon next feed [15–17]. However, mosquitoes do not only feed twice

during their lifetime [18–21]. The *Anopheles* vector can survive up to ~20 days and have

multiple egg laying cycles in the wild. They re-feed during each gonadotrophic cycle and

sometimes within a single gonadotrophic cycle (particularly given nutrient demands and

feeding disruptions) [18,21,22] – thus it would be common to have ≥4 blood meals per

lifetime [23]. Molecular analyses of bloodmeal DNA confirm multiple host feeds on

capture [21,22,24,25]. In fact, re-feeding in the lab accelerates oocyst growth [18,19]

and sporozoite development time, thereby shortening the incubation period and

potentially increasing transmission risk [18].

With population-level drug deployment, infected mosquitoes would frequently be

exposed to antimalarial-containing bloodmeals. Evidence from others supports that

mosquitoes can absorb drugs during feeding. Duthaler, et al. demonstrated that the

endectocide ivermectin can be absorbed in *Aedes* mosquitoes [26]. However, the

question as to whether exposure to antimalarials within bloodmeals could significantly

impact parasite development during sporogony has largely been unexplored. A seminal

study on antimalarial activity across parasite life cycle stages supported potential anti-

oocyst activity of several current antimalarials [27]. Although these data were indirectly

inferred via eventual oocyst counts following drug exposure in gametocyte cultures,

results support the theoretical potential for drugs to act during sporogonic stages. The

authors reported that AQ, sulfamethoxazole, PYR, lumefantrine, mefloquine,

pyronaridine, and an 8-aminoquinoline analog NPC1161B have potential activity against

either gametocyte/exflagellation, ookinete, or oocyst stages [27]. Others have also

reported incorporating drug exposure into infectious feeds can impact resultant

mosquito oocysts and sporozoites [28–31], although much of this work utilized

antibiotics or antimalarials not commonly used for mass prevention and treatment.

Specific attention to antimalarials in widespread use and deployed with the goal of

maximizing population coverage has not been examined.

To address this, we first investigated whether bloodmeal exposure to AQ, SP, and PPQ

have direct impacts upon the *Anopheles* malaria vector at levels expected to be present

in human blood. If so, such drug exposure would complicate further exploration of the

effect of ingested antimalarials on parasite development within the mosquito, since the

parasites require mosquitoes to survive for at least 9 days to complete sporogony and

be transmitted onward. We focused on AQ/desethylamodiaquine (DEAQ), SP, and PPQ

because of their relevance in prophylaxis and treatment, long half-lives, and literature

supporting possible vector-stage activity [27]. We next examined whether these key

chemoprophylactic antimalarials could be absorbed beyond the mosquito midgut, as

such data would support the potential for them to act on parasites developing within the

mosquito.

## Results

To investigate effects of mosquito ingestion of commonly used long-acting human

antimalarials, we spiked drug into mosquito bloodmeals. We focused on AQ and DEAQ,

the longer-acting metabolite of AQ that has potent anti-parasitic activity [32,33], as well

as PPQ and SP. We used ivermectin (IVM) as a control due to its endectocidal

properties [34] and related trials of mass distribution for malaria control [35–39]. The PK

of these drugs are well characterized in humans by our group and others [33,40–46],

informing relevant exposure concentrations in experiments performed here.

## Ingestion of drug solvents did not impact vector fitness of *Anopheles* mosquitoes.

183 We first examined whether the solvents used to dissolve drug compounds had any

184 impact on mosquito fitness at concentrations used with subsequent planned drug-

185 spiked blood feeds. Solvents included acetonitrile (ACN):$H_2O$ 1:9 v/v with 0.5% formic

186 acid (for AQ, DEAQ, PPQ), ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 v/v with 0.1% hydrochloric acid (SDX),

ACN:H2O 1:1 v/v/ with 0.5% formic acid (PYR), and DMSO (IVM). We calculated a

maximum possible solvent exposure to involve a 1:833 plasma dilution, based on a

modest drug dissolving target of 1 mg/ml, a standard example $C_{max}$ of 300 ng/ml, plans

to use drug concentrations up to twice the reported $C_{max}$, and conservative estimates of

pipetting variability. Feeding our lab colony *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes solvent

diluted into plasma at 1:833 combined with packed RBCs to 40% hematocrit did not

affect mosquito feeding behavior, survival, or fertility globally (S1 Fig and S1-S5 Tables).

Survival curves were significantly different when comparing a few conditions (ACN 1:1 +

0.1% HCl lower survival than ACN 1:1 (p=0.01) and ACN 1:1 + FA 0.5% (p=0.0046); and

HCl 0.1% alone lower survival than ACN 1:1 (p=0.0032), ACN 1:1 + FA 0.5%

(p=0.0014), and FA 0.5% (p=0.0381)) but no solvent condition trialed was significantly

different from the un-spiked blood only control (S4 Table). Subsequent drug stocks were

made at 10 mg/ml for each compound, further reducing solvent concentration in drug-

spiked bloodmeals. Given these results, DMSO (solvent for IVM) was not tested as a

separate solvent control condition in subsequent experiments for lab mosquitoes.

## Ingestion of antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, and SP has no significant impact on multiple measures of long-term lab-adapted *Anopheles gambiae* mosquito fitness

The malaria parasite's ability to complete sporogony is significantly impacted by

mosquito behavior and meal seeking, nutrient expenditure on ovulation, and overall

vector lifespan [47]. To assess these effects, we next investigated the impact of drug

ingestion on *Anopheles gambiae* mosquitoes from our laboratory colony. Drugs stocks

of 10 mg/ml were diluted into plasma and combined with packed RBCs at 40%

hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Target drug concentrations were selected based on

literature reported $C_{max}$ values following standard dosing ($C_{max}$ approximated as 20

ng/ml for AQ [42], 500 ng/ml for DEAQ [42], 300 ng/ml for PPQ [41,43,44], 100 µg/ml for

SDX [40,45], 400 ng/ml for PYR [40,45], 50 ng/ml for IVM [46]). Each drug was tested at

concentrations ranging from one-half to twice $C_{max}$. For SDX and PYR, given these

components are dosed together, the SP combination was also tested. Negative controls

included un-spiked blood and blood spiked with the relevant solvent at the equivalent

volume and concentration. In addition, IVM served as a positive control given expected

endectocidal activity upon ingestion.

Spiking drug into bloodmeals did not produce significant differences in mosquito feeding

behavior when comparing control un-spiked blood feeds to each drug-spiked bloodmeal

condition, as measured by percentage of female mosquitoes offered bloodmeal that fed

(blood visible in abdomen) (Fig 1 A-C and S1 Table). Using an alternative chi-squared

based analysis of fed versus unfed mosquitoes under each condition yielded some

statistical differences. However, these differences were not consistent between drug

concentrations nor even within the same control conditions (e.g. IVM across

experimental groups) (S1 Supporting text and S2 Table).

**Fig 1. Tested antimalarials do not significantly impact lab-adapted *An. gambiae***

**behavior, viability, or fertility.**

Human plasma was spiked with antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels ranging

from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average reported $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing,

or with the endectocide IVM (at 1X $C_{max}$), and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit

for mosquito feeds. Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or blood

spiked with drug solvent alone ("Solvent"). Solvents were: ACN:H2O 1:9 + 0.5% FA for

AQ, DEAQ, PPQ; ACN 1:1 H2O + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN 1:1 H2O + 0.5% FA for PYR

(for SP experiments, "Solvent" represents the combination of both SDX and PYR

solvents). Approximately 50 mosquitoes were fed per group. A-C) Mosquito feeding

behavior plotted as percent taking a bloodmeal. D-F) Mosquito survival post drug

ingestion plotted in a Kaplan-Meier survival curve (monitored for 14 days). G-I)

Mosquito fertility assessed by total eggs laid per condition (n=5 mosquitoes monitored

per experiment). Each graph represents combined data from 3 independent

experiments (with 3 data points per condition/time, except for a few data points for

survival monitoring resulting in fewer than triplicate observations for AQ and DEAQ Day

12-14, SP Day 9, 10, and PPQ D9 (2 data points each); and PPQ D 11, 13 (1 data point

each)). In A-C and G-I, means are plotted with error bars representing SD.

Fed mosquitoes were monitored up to 14 days, towards the longer end of average

expected duration of *P. falciparum* sporogony [17]. In activity monitoring experiments,

consistent differences in behavior were not observed for any experimental condition

other than following IVM feeds, which reliably led to loss of mobility notable within ~24

hours (data not graphed). While survival rates naturally vary by individual experimental

blood feed, particularly depending on age of mosquitoes at time of feed (ranging from 5-

10 days), we also did not observe consistent negative impacts of drug ingestion on

mosquito survival compared to control un-spiked or solvent-spiked bloodmeals other

than expected effects from IVM (Fig 1 D-F, S1 Supporting text, and S3 Table). (Amongst

multiple comparison analyses of all conditions, there were very limited conditions where

survival curves were significantly different (S1 Supporting text, S4 Table).) Finally, there

were also no significant differences in fertility measures following ingestion of any of the

compounds compared to unaltered blood as indicated both by total egg counts per

mosquitoes monitored (Fig 1 G-I; S5-S6 Tables) and egg counts per individual

mosquitoes or percent of mosquitoes laying eggs (S2 Fig; S5-S6 Tables).

In contrast, IVM control feeds were consistently lethal, confirming successful target drug

dilution precision and relevance of this experimental drug-spiked blood feeding system,

Notably, while feeding behavior was unaltered in the presence of IVM, within 24 hours,

the majority of mosquitoes lost mobility with significant numbers dying by 48 hours (see

below and S3 Table). Because of this rapid alteration in behavior, IVM-fed mosquitoes

were not subjected to individual fertility monitoring (otherwise drowning in forced egg

laying conditions). When IVM-fed mosquitoes were allowed access to a communal egg

laying water cup, they did not lay eggs (though dissections indicated eggs had formed,

suggesting the reason for fertility absence was likely due to the neurologic and

behavioral impacts of IVM). This is consistent with the known mechanism of action of

IVM being a neurotoxin that binds to invertebrate-specific glutamate-gated chloride

channels, causing hyperpolarization and paralysis [48].

## Ingestion of long-acting antimalarials did not significantly impact mosquito fitness of *Anopheles coluzzii* mosquitoes in Burkina Faso

Over many generations of lab adaptation, mosquito behavior and metabolism could be altered in ways that affect the impact of drug ingestion on fitness. Thus, we next investigated antimalarial feeding in field-derived mosquitoes from a routinely outbred *Anopheles coluzzii* colony in Burkina Faso. The same experimental design was employed, although the blood source differed, dissolving drug into commercial AB serum before mixing with donor packed RBCs from a community blood bank at 40% hematocrit. Field mosquito feeding rates using membrane feeders and stored blood components were significantly lower than for lab-adapted *Anopheles gambiae* tested at the Yale insectary (mean 51.6% of field mosquitoes feeding versus 84.1% of lab mosquitoes across all feeding experiments and conditions, p<0.0001), even with pre-feeding starvation for 24hrs. However, feeding rates did not differ by condition (percentage of female mosquitoes offered bloodmeal that fed, with blood visible in abdomen (Fig 2 A-C; S1 Table)). As above, using an alternative chi-squared based analysis of fed versus unfed mosquitoes under each condition yielded some statistical differences comparing mosquitoes fed spiked bloodmeals to those fed an unaltered bloodmeal or relevant solvent-spiked bloodmeal (S1 Supporting text, S2 Table). However, similar to the *An. gambiae* feeds, these differences were not consistent between drug concentrations nor even within the same control conditions across different feeding groups.

**Fig 2. Tested antimalarials do not significantly impact field *An. coluzzii* behavior or viability.**

Human serum was spiked with antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels ranging from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average reported $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing, or with the endectocide IVM (at 1X $C_{max}$), and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or that spiked with drug solvent alone ("Solvent"). Solvents were: ACN:H2O 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ, DEAQ, PPQ; ACN 1:1 H2O + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN 1:1 H2O + 0.5% FA for PYR (for SP experiments, "Solvent" represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents). DMSO (as solvent control for IVM drug) was also tested in AQ and DEAQ feeding experiments. Approximately 50 mosquitoes were fed per group. A-C) Mosquito feeding behavior plotted as percent taking a bloodmeal as percent taking a bloodmeal. Means are plotted with error bars representing SD. D-F) Mosquito survival post drug ingestion plotted in a Kaplan-Meier survival curve (monitored for 14 days). Each graph represents combined data from 3 independent experiments (with 3 data points per condition/time), unless otherwise specified: For AQ and DEAQ feeding and survival, experiments were repeated 4 times, but there were missing data points amounting to only triplicate survival observations for Day 5, 9, 11. For one SP experimental replicate, no mosquitoes fed for the SP1/2X condition (hypothesized due to physical feeder positioning), thus there were only duplicate observations for SP1/2X survival Day 1-14.

Nor were there consistent differences between control un-spiked versus drug-spiked

blood feeds for any compound regarding routine daily behavior and survival, other than

for IVM (Fig 2 D-F; S1 Supporting text, S3-S4 Tables). DMSO solvent was also

confirmed to have no impact on field mosquito fitness measures when included as a

separate control parameter (S3-S4 Tables). Between IVM feeds for all field mosquito

experiments, mean 63.0% remained alive on D2 (SD 28.8), 32.1% on D3 (SD 27.7),

and 15.8% on D4 (SD 23.4). These overall mortality rates were similar to lab-adapted

*An. gambiae* IVM data (mean 70.8% alive on D2 (SD 29.7), 31.5% on D3 (SD 28.8),

and 10.6% on D4 (SD 10.4)). However, for the *An. coluzzii* field mosquitoes, mean

11.5% remained alive by D7 (SD 21.9) and 3.1% by D14 (SD 4.9) after IVM feed,

whereas for the *An. gambiae* lab mosquitoes, <1% remained alive by D6 after IVM feed

(D6 mean 0.5% alive (SD 0.9)) (S3 Fig, S3 Table). Differences in overall survival curves

comparing IVM-fed *An. gambiae* and *An. coluzzii* mosquitoes were also statistically

significant (p<0.0001) (S3 Fig, S4 Table). For fertility assessments, field mosquitoes did

not routinely lay eggs during each experimental replicate. However, these egg laying

deficits also manifested following control un-spiked blood feeds. Of limited available

data, no fertility differences were noted upon ingestion of any drug in terms of number of

eggs laid per total mosquitoes, nor percent of mosquitoes laying eggs or number of

eggs per laying mosquito (S4 Fig and S5-S6 Tables).

## 342     DEAQ is absorbed after ingestion and distributed into

## 343     *Anopheles gambiae* circulation and tissues

We hypothesized that ingested antimalarials could be absorbed from the midgut and

circulate more widely, demonstrating the potential of drug exposure to later parasite

stages in development. As a model system to assess this, we assayed the distribution

of DEAQ in the mosquito using liquid chromatography with tandem mass spectrometry

(LC-MS/MS) following drug-spiked blood feeds. Drug feeding conditions included DEAQ

at one-half and twice $C_{max}$ (of 500 ng/ml) as well as IVM at $C_{max}$ (50 ng/ml), with

mosquito tissue harvest occurring at 24 hrs and 120 hrs post feed (analyzing drug

presence before and after completion of bloodmeal digestion at ~72 hrs). We compared

concentrations in 3 sample types: 1) whole mosquitoes, 2) midguts only, and 3)

harvested hemolymph. We hypothesized midguts would contain the majority of drug

following a bloodmeal, and that any drug presence in hemolymph would be indicative of

drug absorption across the midgut into mosquito circulation. Whole mosquitoes or other

target compartments were pooled (n=5) and collected in triplicate for each condition,

with the overall experiment replicated twice.

Hemolymph collected via capillary perfusion of the mosquito thorax with PBS was

assayed directly, whereas whole mosquitoes and midguts were harvested into an

extraction solvent [26] and pulverized prior to mass spectrometry analysis. DEAQ had a

limit of quantification of 0.5 ng/ml and was detected in a dose-dependent manner based

on feeding at 2X or 1/2X $C_{max}$ at 24 hrs in whole mosquitoes (mean 42.4 ng/ml or 6.7

ng/ml, respectively, p<0.0001), midguts (mean 33.2 ng/ml or 3.2 ng/ml, respectively,

p=0.0082), and also hemolymph (mean 0.51 ng/ml for 2X $C_{max}$; undetected at 1/2X $C_{max}$

condition). DEAQ was also dose dependently detected based on feeding at either 2X or

1/2X $C_{max}$ concentration at 120 hours in all compartments: whole mosquitoes (mean

33.1 ng/ml or 5.7 ng/ml, respectively, p=0.0001), midguts (mean 4.4 ng/ml or 0.6 ng/ml,

respectively), and hemolymph (mean 0.9 ng/ml or 0.2 ng/ml, respectively). Between 24

to 120 hrs, DEAQ drug levels decreased in midguts but increased in hemolymph (trends

present for both fed concentrations), providing evidence of absorption beyond midgut

epithelium and prolonged circulation within hemolymph (Fig 3, Table 1, S7-S8 Tables).

IVM had a limit of quantification of 1 ng/ml and was not detected other than in a few

samples (detected in all three whole mosquito replicates in one experiment at average

of 4.8 ng/ml). However, despite lacking extensive demonstration of biochemical drug

absorption for IVM, mosquito behavior changed drastically upon IVM feed resulting in

minimal movement and flaccid paralysis, highlighting the technical difficulties in

capturing drug detection in individual mosquitoes even when it is clearly present.

Harvest at 120 hr was not conducted for IVM because mosquitoes died before that time

point was reached.

**Fig 3. DEAQ is absorbed dose-dependently and detectable beyond midgut**

**epithelium up to 5 days following bloodmeal ingestion.**

A) Cartoon depiction of mosquito anatomy upon bloodmeal ingestion. B) Mosquitoes

were fed 1μg/ml or 250 ng/ml DEAQ to represent twice (2X) and half (1/2X) reported

$C_{max}$, respectively. Mosquitoes were harvested 24 hrs and 120 hrs post-feed, either

collected whole or used for hemolymph collection and midgut dissection. For each

condition, 5 of each mosquito sample type were pooled, with triplicates of pooled

samples submitted to NorthEast BioLab (Hamden, CT) for LC-MS/MS analysis. Data

represents average values from 2 separate experiments. Significant differences

highlighted as **** = $p<0.0001$ and ** = $p<0.01$.

**Table 1. DEAQ is absorbed and detectable in mosquito compartments up to 5 days beyond bloodmeal ingestion.**

| DEAQ detected in mosquitoes after spiked bloodmeal in ng/ml | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DEAQ fed concentration** (relative to reported $C_{max}$) | **24h post feed** | | **120h post feed** | |
| | **2X** | **1/2X** | **2X** | **1/2X** |
| **Whole mosquitoes** | 42.42 (13.48) | 6.67 (7.17) | 33.14 (8.30) | 5.71 (4.91) |
| **Midgut alone** | 33.22 (28.79) | 3.24 (3.96) | 4.37 (4.06) | 0.57 (0.88) |
| **Hemolymph alone** | 0.51 (0.76) | 0.00 (0.00) | 0.93 (0.83) | 0.21[a] (0.33) |

Mosquitoes were fed 1ɥg/ml or 250 ng/ml DEAQ to represent twice (2X) and half (1/2X) reported $C_{max}$, respectively. Mosquitoes were harvested 24 hrs and 120 hrs post-feed, either collected whole or used for hemolymph collection and midgut dissection. For each condition, 5 of each mosquito sample type were pooled, with triplicates of pooled samples submitted to NorthEast BioLab (Hamden, CT) for LC-MS/MS analysis. Data represents average values from 2 separate experiments (with Standard Deviation). [a]The mean reported drug concentration at 120 hours for 1/2 $C_{max}$ condition was lower than the LOQ for hemolymph conditions due to some replicates with no detectable drug.

# Discussion

*Anopheles* mosquitoes, the vector for malaria transmission, are widely exposed to antimalarials by virtue of feeding on human hosts with long-acting drugs circulating in

their blood. We fed *Plasmodium*-uninfected mosquitoes drug-spiked bloodmeals

mimicking real-world drug concentrations of the antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, and SP.

We initially investigated uninfected mosquitoes to determine if drugs had any impact on

mosquito viability which could in turn impact parasite transmission dynamics. We did not

identify any consistent significant effects of these antimalarials on mosquito feeding

behavior, activity levels, fertility, or survival up to 14 days following a drug-spiked blood

meal (the time scale required to complete sporogony) in either a lab-adapted *Anopheles*

*gambiae* mosquito strain or a field-maintained *Anopheles coluzzii* strain. Using DEAQ

as a model due to its widespread use in SMC, we next assessed whether we could

demonstrate absorption of long-acting antimalarials via blood-feeds using LC-MS/MS.

We were able to detect drug present in whole mosquitoes, as well as within isolated

midguts and hemolymph, 5 days post ingestion in a dose-dependent manner. The fact

that drug levels decreased over time in midguts, while increasing in hemolymph, further

supports that drugs present in mosquito bloodmeals can be absorbed beyond the

midgut into the mosquito circulation and remain present in the circulation days after

bloodmeals have been digested. To our knowledge, this is the first report of human

antimalarial biochemical quantitative detection within *Anopheles* mosquito tissues

following bloodmeal exposure.

With evidence that human antimalarials can be absorbed and persist in mosquito

hemolymph, we hypothesize that drugs present in the bloodmeal have the potential to

impact malaria parasite development and resistance selection during sporogony.

Antimalarial resistance potentiation during mosquito stages has largely been overlooked

compared to studies focused on the human blood stage. One area that has been

examined is whether certain antibiotics can impact parasite development in the

mosquito when ingested via blood meal [30,31]. The authors investigated penicillin-

streptomycin, doxycycline, azithromycin, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole. In some

instances, antibiotics in feeds enhanced susceptibility of *An. gambiae* to *P. falciparum*

infection (antibiotic exposure occurring at time of mosquito infection) and positively

impacted vector lifespan and fecundity (postulated to be from mosquito gut microbiota

disturbances, or possibly reduced levels of mosquito innate immune activation post

blood feed) [30], though effects varied by antibiotic [31]. In particular, trimethoprim-

sulfamethoxazole, an anti-folate similar to SP, reduced *P. falciparum* oocyst intensity.

Recent work also has shown exposing mosquitoes to atovaquone starting at 48 hrs

post-infection (via spiked sugar meal) significantly reduces oocyst size and sporozoite

counts [29].

Antimalarial resistance develops primarily during symptomatic human blood-stage

infection when replication rates and drug pressure are highest [11]. However, mosquito-

level drug exposure could still impact already-developing parasites and contribute to

strain selection at different points during sporogony. Studies investigating bottlenecks

during sporogony emphasize the relevance of parasite oocyst and sporozoite numbers

on overall transmission success, yet the specific determinants that impact parasite

progression through vector-stage bottlenecks remain poorly understood [49,50]. Some

research assessing infection of mosquitoes fed on gametocyte carriers with multiclonal

infections has suggested both preferential transmission of minority clones to mosquitoes

and propagation of minority clones through the mosquito, with significant implications for

potential onward transmission of minority alleles including those that confer drug

resistance [51,52].

While the DEAQ concentration we detected was low, our methods would underestimate

drug levels given significantly diluted analyte and limited sampling times. The reported

DEAQ $IC_{50}$ of ~60 nM [53,54] (~24 ng/ml) is on par with levels we detected in whole

mosquitoes and midguts at 24 hrs and whole mosquitoes at 120 hrs. Oocysts,

developing between the mosquito midgut epithelium and basal lamina [55], could

conceivably be exposed to ingested drug either directly via midgut bloodmeal contents

(noting additional feeds stress and damage the midgut epithelial layer [21]) or via drug

absorption into hemolymph (and subsequent tissue distribution). While oocysts are

often portrayed as relatively "walled off" and thus potentially more protected from drug

activity, atovaquone studies show that oocyst development can be impacted by either

tarsal surface exposure (tissue absorption) or feeding [29]. Furthermore, drug present in

midgut or circulation could impact pre-oocyst stages or sporozoites that travel via

hemolymph to the salivary glands. We offer strong proof-of-concept data that support

extensive drug distribution in mosquitoes for prolonged periods. Given 30-50% of some

communities may be taking long-acting antimalarials, even rare selection events or low-

level drug activity in mosquitoes could have large implications for malaria transmission

dynamics in endemic areas.

There are several limitations to our present study. Although we only tested two

*Plasmodium*-susceptible *Anopheles* species, we did compare lab and field mosquitoes,

providing further evidence that the three antimalarials studied do not have an impact on

mosquito fitness and viability. The IVM survival data highlights the relevance of testing

field mosquitoes, given some were able to resist the endectocidal effect of IVM control

feeds compared to lab mosquitoes (where <1% remained alive by D6). Future work

would be bolstered by increasing the replicates/sample sizes from our field study, as we

were not able to collect more fertility data given that mosquitoes did not lay eggs

following feeds from some blood bank samples. We suspect this may be due to stored

blood bank products suffering from breakdown of nutrients required for egg

development. Despite this limitation, when egg laying did result from a feed, our data

were consistent between control un-spiked vs. spiked drug feeds.

While some statistically significant differences in feeding behavior were present in

alternative individual chi-squared analyses between individual spiked bloodmeal

conditions in comparison to un-spiked blood or matching solvent-spiked blood, these

differences were not consistent in direction between drug concentrations, mosquito

species, nor between the same control conditions (e.g. IVM feeds) across different

experimental groups. Thus, we believe they are more reflective of general variability

between bloodmeal ingestion during any given experiment – particularly with the field

mosquitoes that are less adapted to artificial membrane feeding. Similarly, isolated

survival curves with significant differences are likely more reflective of one-off

technically significant results that arise in the myriad multiple comparisons done within

each drug or solvent feeding group and mosquito species, as there was no consistency

in significance across drug concentration and mosquito species. Minimally, our results

show that drug presence did not negatively impact survival, with most of the significant

curve differences showing the lower concentration of drug or drug-absent blood only

condition had reduced survival.

We focused our initial drug detection analyses on DEAQ given its widespread use in

both treatment and prevention, with the primary goals of determining whether we could

1) detect drug in various mosquito compartments, and 2) observe any concentration

changes over time. Our time- and labor-intensive design was successful in achieving

these objectives, and we are not surprised that there was variability in terms of the

number of samples with detectable drug, particularly since concentrations were often

near the limit of LC-MS/MS quantification. This is true for IVM, which was undetectable

in our study with a LOQ of 1 ng/ml. However, IVM was clearly absorbed, as evidenced

by mosquito death following ingestion. Given these experimental limitations, the fact

that we could successfully detect DEAQ in individual mosquitoes days after ingestion,

even in isolated hemolymph, supports that antimalarial absorption occurs, and can

potentially interface with different stages of sporogonic development. Furthermore, our

DEAQ detection results were highly specific (with no drug detection in any negative

controls fed solvent-spiked blood or unaltered blood) and concentration dependent (in

terms of initial fed drug amount).

Having demonstrated mosquito drug exposure occurs but does not itself negatively

impact the vector, the next question will be investigating the impact of antimalarial

exposure on infected mosquito oocyst and sporozoite output, as well as assessing

whether drugs could impact the success of strains developing in the mosquito,

particularly in mixed infections where less resistant strains may have a developmental

advantage. Given rapidly expanding drug resistance to artemisinin based antimalarials

now in Africa [4], concern about partner drug resistance that could contribute to failure

of first-line treatment, and stagnating progress on reducing the global malaria burden in

recent years, the malaria community needs to consider all avenues of possible

contribution to drug-resistance spread. This includes the possibility that human

antimalarials could impact vector stage transmission dynamics. Better understanding of

mosquito drug exposure and its impact could also help in developing strategies to target

the parasite within the mosquito.

# Materials and methods

## Mosquito colonies

Two species of mosquitoes were used in this study: 1) *An. gambiae* "G3" strain, a highly

lab-adapted, insecticide-susceptible strain of African origin (obtained from the

Catteruccia lab, Harvard University) reared at Yale lab facilities in New Haven, CT under

standard conditions (27 ± 2°C, 70% humidity, 12 hour light cycle with access to 10%

glucose solution); referred to as "lab mosquitoes;" and 2) *Anopheles coluzzii* outbred

mosquitoes (established in 2023 and repeatedly replenished with F1 from wild-caught

female mosquitoes collected in Bama, Burkina Faso (coordinates 12.0395° N, 4.4010°

W; ~60km north of Bobo-Dioulasso); field-collected female mosquitoes morphologically

identified as belonging to the *An. gambiae* complex further identified by PCR before

pooling) and maintained either in the Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé

(IRSS) laboratory in Bobo Dioulasso under standard conditions (27 ± 2°C, 70%

humidity, 12 hour light cycle with access to 10% glucose solution) or in the Bama

malaria sphere under semi-natural conditions (exposed to all environmental factors

including temperature and relative humidity). These mosquitoes (maintained in either

Bama malaria sphere or Bobo-Dioulasso lab conditions) are collectively referred to as

"field mosquitoes."

## Drug-spiked blood feeds

Fresh human blood was routinely obtained from healthy O+ donors in New Haven, CT

or via hospital blood bank in Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso. For human donors at Yale,

plasma was removed and packed RBCs were separated and washed with un-

supplemented RPMI media. Blood products in Burkina Faso were obtained as packed

RBCs and used as is. Drugs of interest were dissolved into relevant solvent at 10mg/ml

and stored at -20°C. Briefly, amodiaquine (AQ; Sigma), desethylamodiaquine (DEAQ;

Cayman), and piperaquine (PPQ; Sigma) were dissolved into 1:9 v/v acetonitrile:H2O

with 0.5% formic acid; sulfadoxine (SDX; Cayman) was dissolved into 1:1 v/v

acetonitrile:H2O with 0.1% hydrochloric acid; pyrimethamine (PYR: Cayman) was

dissolved into 1:1 v/v acetonitrile:H2O with 0.5% formic acid; and ivermectin (IVM;

Sigma) was dissolved into DMSO. Drug stocks were diluted into either plasma (Yale

donors from above) or commercial non-immune AB serum (Sigma; used for Burkinabé

experiments) to achieve physiologic concentrations in the range of one-half to two times

the average reported $C_{max}$ after a standard human oral dose as per available literature

($C_{max}$ approximated as 20 ng/ml for AQ [42], 500 ng/ml for DEAQ [42], 300 ng/ml for

PPQ [41,43,44], 100 ųg/ml for SDX [40,45], 400 ng/ml for PYR [40,45], 50 ng/ml for IVM

[46]). Drug-spiked plasma/serum was then combined with packed RBCs at 40%

hematocrit and fed for up to 60 minutes to 5-10 day old *Anopheles* mosquitoes via

standard membrane feeding practice with pre-warmed glass feeders and parafilm

membrane.

## Mosquito viability assessments

50 female mosquitoes per condition were placed in individual containers for drug-spiked

blood feeds, after which fed mosquitoes were manually separated and maintained at

standard conditions. For all experiments, mosquitoes were only offered one singular

feeding opportunity and never refed. Feeding behavior was determined by the

percentage of female mosquitoes present that imbibed a bloodmeal. Post feeding,

viability was monitored for each condition for up to 14 days, to span the typical amount

of time sporozoites develop in a mosquito. Daily mosquito behavior was also monitored

by gently blowing on the cartons of mosquitoes and assessing flight activity. Finally, 2

days after feeding, 5 randomly selected individual mosquitoes per condition were placed

in individual containers for forced egg laying, with the number of eggs per mosquito

recorded, as well as the number of laying mosquitoes. (Fertility assessments did not

take place for the ivermectin condition because by this time post feed, these mosquitoes

were notably unhealthy and not able to withstand forced egg laying conditions.)

Experiments were repeated in triplicate. Statistical comparisons between mosquito

fertility were assessed via ordinary one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple

comparisons test to compare each condition to "blood only" control (performed in

GraphPad Prism version 10.5.0). Statistical comparisons between mosquito feeding

behavior were assessed both via ordinary one-way ANOVA of percent of mosquitoes

feeding with Dunnett's multiple comparisons test to compare each condition to "blood

only" or control, as well as using contingency table analyses of total fed and unfed

mosquitoes combining the data from multiple experiments for each drug feeding group

and comparing a given experimental condition to the control "blood only" or "solvent"

condition (both performed in GraphPad Prism version 10.5.0). Survival was assessed

via stratified log-rank test of Kaplan Meier analysis combining the data from multiple

experiments for each drug feeding group and using the Tukey-Kramer adjustment for

multiple comparisons (performed in SAS 9.4, Cary, NC).

## Biochemical drug detection in the mosquito

We analyzed drug absorption within individual mosquitoes using IVM (at 24 hours post

feed) and DEAQ (at 24 hours and 120 hours post feed). 120 mosquitoes were fed per

condition (control blood only, IVM 1X, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA solvent, DMSO solvent,

DEAQ 2X, DEAQ 1/2X). Fed mosquitoes were manually separated and maintained at

standard conditions. Per condition, 5 mosquitoes were pooled into 100 µl "extraction

solvent" (70% MeOH + 0.1% formic acid, per others' reported methods [26]), 5 mosquito

midguts were harvested into 50 µl of extraction solvent, and hemolymph was pooled

from 5 mosquitoes; these were all collected in triplicate. To collect hemolymph,

mosquitoes were immobilized on ice under a dissecting microscope. The last segment

of the abdomen was removed. A glass capillary tube made to fine needle point attached

to 1 mm diameter silicone tubing and a 100 μl Hamilton syringe mounted on an

automated microdispenser (PB600 Repeating Syringe Dispenser, Hamilton) filled with

PBS was used to puncture the thorax underneath the wings, with 2 μl of PBS injected in

increments. Resultant hemolymph expelled out of the dissected abdomen was collected

via p10 pipette (approximately 2-5 μl of hemolymph diluted into PBS collected per

mosquito). Hemolymph-PBS solutions were not further processed other than high speed

centrifugation at 16.1g for 10 minutes with supernatant submitted for analysis. Whole

mosquitoes and midguts were pulverized using the pellet pestle grinder (DWK Life

Sciences), vortexed for 30 sec, sonicated for 10 min, and centrifuged at 16.1g for 10

min with supernatants submitted for LC-MS/MS drug detection (similar to described

[26]). Drug detection was performed by NorthEast BioLabs (Hamden, CT) with

appropriate standard calibration using control matrix consisting of sugar-fed whole

mosquitoes in extraction solvent. Reported limits of quantification were 1 ng/ml for

ivermectin and 0.5 ng/ml for desethylamodiaquine. Data represents results from

triplicate pooled samples for each harvest parameter, averaged between two identical

repeated experiments. Statistical comparisons between drug levels detected in different

mosquito compartments were assessed via one-way ANOVA followed by pairwise

comparisons of interest using Holm-Šídák's multiple comparisons test (calculated using

GraphPad Prism version 10.5.0).

## Ethics statement

634 Human subjects work involving use of blood from U.S. donors was approved by the Yale

635 University Institutional Review Board (IRB 2000034487). Formal verbal consent was

636 obtained for all subjects involved. Blood from Burkina Faso donors was obtained via

637 local hospital blood bank in Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso (IRB exempt de-identified

638 blood products).

# Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the larger insectary team at IRSS in Burkina Faso (Hien

Dombagniro Raymond, Somda Mouonyr Stéphane, Helène Somé, and Somda

Gninéabéka Béranger Eustache) for helping rear mosquitoes and assist with

experimental feeds. We would also like to acknowledge the team at NorthEast

BioAnalytical Laboratories for their willingness to work with us to pursue drug detection

analyses in a novel mosquito matrix. Finally, we would also like to thank all of the blood

donors both at Yale and in Burkina Faso. Cartoon representations in all figures were

created in BioRender (https://BioRender.com).

# References

1. World malaria report 2024. [cited 3 Feb 2025]. Available:

https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-

2024

2. Hemingway J, Ranson H, Magill A, Kolaczinski J, Fornadel C, Gimnig J, et al.

Averting a malaria disaster: will insecticide resistance derail malaria control?

Lancet Lond Engl. 2016;387: 1785–1788. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00417-1

3.  Balikagala B, Fukuda N, Ikeda M, Katuro OT, Tachibana S-I, Yamauchi M, et al.

Evidence of Artemisinin-Resistant Malaria in Africa. N Engl J Med. 2021;385: 1163–

1171. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2101746

4.  Rosenthal PJ, Asua V, Bailey JA, Conrad MD, Ishengoma DS, Kamya MR, et al.

The emergence of artemisinin partial resistance in Africa: how do we respond?

Lancet Infect Dis. 2024;0. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(24)00141-5

5.  Daily JP, Parikh S. Malaria. N Engl J Med. 2025;392: 1320–1333.

doi:10.1056/NEJMra2405313

6.  WHO guidelines for malaria. [cited 6 Nov 2025]. Available:

https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/guidelines-for-malaria

7.  ACCESS-SMC Partnership. Effectiveness of seasonal malaria chemoprevention at

scale in west and central Africa: an observational study. Lancet Lond Engl.

2020;396: 1829–1840. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32227-3

8.  Updated WHO recommendations for malaria chemoprevention among children and

pregnant women. [cited 15 Apr 2023]. Available: https://www.who.int/news/item/03-

06-2022-Updated-WHO-recommendations-for-malaria-chemoprevention-among-

children-and-pregnant-women

9.  Creek DJ, Bigira V, McCormack S, Arinaitwe E, Wanzira H, Kakuru A, et al.

Pharmacokinetic Predictors for Recurrent Malaria After Dihydroartemisinin-

Piperaquine Treatment of Uncomplicated Malaria in Ugandan Infants. J Infect Dis.

2013;207: 1646–1654. doi:10.1093/infdis/jit078

10. Hodel EM, Kabanywanyi AM, Malila A, Zanolari B, Mercier T, Beck H-P, et al.

Residual Antimalarials in Malaria Patients from Tanzania – Implications on Drug

Efficacy Assessment and Spread of Parasite Resistance. PLoS ONE. 2009;4:

e8184. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0008184

11. Blasco B, Leroy D, Fidock DA. Antimalarial drug resistance: linking Plasmodium

falciparum parasite biology to the clinic. Nat Med. 2017;23: 917–928.

doi:10.1038/nm.4381

12. White NJ. Does antimalarial mass drug administration increase or decrease the

risk of resistance? Lancet Infect Dis. 2017;17: e15–e20. doi:10.1016/S1473-

3099(16)30269-9

13. Nguyen TD, Tran TN-A, Parker DM, White NJ, Boni MF. Antimalarial mass drug

administration in large populations and the evolution of drug resistance. PLOS

Glob Public Health. 2023;3: e0002200. doi:10.1371/journal.pgph.0002200

14. Moss S, Mańko E, Krishna S, Campino S, Clark TG, Last A. How has mass drug

administration with dihydroartemisinin-piperaquine impacted molecular markers of

drug resistance? A systematic review. Malar J. 2022;21: 186. doi:10.1186/s12936-

022-04181-y

15. Kamiya T, Paton DG, Catteruccia F, Reece SE. Targeting malaria parasites inside

mosquitoes: ecoevolutionary consequences. Trends Parasitol. 2022;38: 1031–

1040. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2022.09.004

16. Dong S, Dong Y, Simões ML, Dimopoulos G. Mosquito transgenesis for malaria

control. Trends Parasitol. 2022;38: 54–66. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2021.08.001

17. Guissou E, Waite JL, Jones M, Bell AS, Suh E, Yameogo KB, et al. A non-

destructive sugar-feeding assay for parasite detection and estimating the extrinsic

incubation period of Plasmodium falciparum in individual mosquito vectors. Sci

Rep. 2021;11: 9344. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-88659-w

18. Shaw WR, Holmdahl IE, Itoe MA, Werling K, Marquette M, Paton DG, et al. Multiple

blood feeding in mosquitoes shortens the Plasmodium falciparum incubation period

and increases malaria transmission potential. PLoS Pathog. 2020;16: e1009131.

doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1009131

19. Kwon H, Simões ML, Reynolds RA, Dimopoulos G, Smith RC. Additional Feeding

Reveals Differences in Immune Recognition and Growth of Plasmodium Parasites

in the Mosquito Host. mSphere. 2021;6: e00136-21. doi:10.1128/mSphere.00136-

21

20. Lapp Z, Obala AA, Abel L, Rasmussen DA, Sumner KM, Freedman E, et al.

Plasmodium falciparum Genetic Diversity in Coincident Human and Mosquito

Hosts. mBio. 2022;13: e0227722. doi:10.1128/mbio.02277-22

21. Brackney DE, LaReau JC, Smith RC. Frequency matters: How successive feeding

episodes by blood-feeding insect vectors influences disease transmission. PLOS

Pathog. 2021;17: e1009590. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1009590

22.   Norris LC, Fornadel CM, Hung W-C, Pineda FJ, Norris DE. Frequency of multiple

blood meals taken in a single gonotrophic cycle by Anopheles arabiensis

mosquitoes in Macha, Zambia. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2010;83: 33–37.

doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2010.09-0296

23.   Cecilio P, Iniguez E, Huffcutt P, Ribeiro SP, Kamhawi S, Valenzuela JG, et al. The

impact of blood on vector-borne diseases with emphasis on mosquitoes and sand

flies. Trends Parasitol. 2025;41: 196–209. doi:10.1016/j.pt.2025.01.009

24.   Das S, Muleba M, Stevenson JC, Pringle JC, Norris DE. Beyond the entomological

inoculation rate: characterizing multiple blood feeding behavior and Plasmodium

falciparum multiplicity of infection in Anopheles mosquitoes in northern Zambia.

Parasit Vectors. 2017;10: 45. doi:10.1186/s13071-017-1993-z

25.   Tedrow RE, Rakotomanga T, Nepomichene T, Howes RE, Ratovonjato J,

Ratsimbasoa AC, et al. Anopheles mosquito surveillance in Madagascar reveals

multiple blood feeding behavior and Plasmodium infection. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.

2019;13: e0007176. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0007176

26.   Duthaler U, Weber M, Hofer L, Chaccour C, Maia M, Müller P, et al. The

pharmacokinetics and drug-drug interactions of ivermectin in Aedes aegypti

mosquitoes. PLOS Pathog. 2021;17: e1009382. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1009382

27.   Delves M, Plouffe D, Scheurer C, Meister S, Wittlin S, Winzeler EA, et al. The

activities of current antimalarial drugs on the life cycle stages of Plasmodium: a

comparative study with human and rodent parasites. PLoS Med. 2012;9:

e1001169. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001169

28.  Paton DG, Childs LM, Itoe MA, Holmdahl IE, Buckee CO, Catteruccia F. Exposing

Anopheles mosquitoes to antimalarials blocks Plasmodium parasite transmission.

Nature. 2019;567: 239–243. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-0973-1

29.  Paton DG, Probst AS, Ma E, Adams KL, Shaw WR, Singh N, et al. Using an

antimalarial in mosquitoes overcomes Anopheles and Plasmodium resistance to

malaria control strategies. PLoS Pathog. 2022;18: e1010609.

doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1010609

30.  Gendrin M, Rodgers FH, Yerbanga RS, Ouédraogo JB, Basáñez M-G, Cohuet A, et

al. Antibiotics in ingested human blood affect the mosquito microbiota and capacity

to transmit malaria. Nat Commun. 2015;6: 5921. doi:10.1038/ncomms6921

31.  Gendrin M, Yerbanga RS, Ouedraogo JB, Lefèvre T, Cohuet A, Christophides GK.

Differential Effects of Azithromycin, Doxycycline, and Cotrimoxazole in Ingested

Blood on the Vectorial Capacity of Malaria Mosquitoes. Open Forum Infect Dis.

2016;3: ofw074. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofw074

32.  Churchill FC, Patchen LC, Campbell CC, Schwartz IK, Nguyen-Dinh P, Dickinson

CM. Amodiaquine as a prodrug: importance of metabolite(s) in the antimalarial

effect of amodiaquine in humans. Life Sci. 1985;36: 53–62. doi:10.1016/0024-

3205(85)90285-1

33. Ali AM, Penny MA, Smith TA, Workman L, Sasi P, Adjei GO, et al. Population

Pharmacokinetics of the Antimalarial Amodiaquine: a Pooled Analysis To Optimize

Dosing. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2018;62: 10.1128/aac.02193-17.

doi:10.1128/aac.02193-17

34. Chaccour CJ, Kobylinski KC, Bassat Q, Bousema T, Drakeley C, Alonso P, et al.

Ivermectin to reduce malaria transmission: a research agenda for a promising new

tool for elimination. Malar J. 2013;12: 153. doi:10.1186/1475-2875-12-153

35. Foy BD, Alout H, Seaman JA, Rao S, Magalhaes T, Wade M, et al. Efficacy and risk

of harms of repeat ivermectin mass drug administrations for control of malaria

(RIMDAMAL): a cluster-randomised trial. The Lancet. 2019;393: 1517–1526.

doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32321-3

36. Somé AF, Somé A, Sougué E, Ouédraogo COW, Da O, Dah SR, et al. Safety and

efficacy of repeat ivermectin mass drug administrations for malaria control

(RIMDAMAL II): a phase 3, double-blind, placebo-controlled, cluster-randomised,

parallel-group trial. Lancet Infect Dis. 2025; S1473-3099(24)00751–5.

doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(24)00751-5

37. Dabira ED, Soumare HM, Conteh B, Ceesay F, Ndiath MO, Bradley J, et al. Mass

drug administration of ivermectin and dihydroartemisinin–piperaquine against

malaria in settings with high coverage of standard control interventions: a cluster-

randomised controlled trial in The Gambia. Lancet Infect Dis. 2022;22: 519–528.

doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00557-0

38.  Hutchins H, Pretorius E, Bradley J, Silva ET da, Vasileva H, Ndiath MO, et al.

Adjunctive ivermectin mass drug administration for malaria control on the Bijagos

Archipelago of Guinea-Bissau (MATAMAL): a quadruple-blinded, cluster-

randomised, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet Infect Dis. 2025;25: 424–434.

doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(24)00580-2

39.  Chaccour C, Nicolas P, Martinho S, Mundaca H, Elobolobo E, Ruiz-Castillo P, et al.

Ivermectin to Reduce Malaria Transmission - Safety and Efficacy Results from the

BOHEMIA Cluster Randomized Trial in Mozambique. Rochester, NY: Social

Science Research Network; 2025. doi:10.2139/ssrn.5264477

40.  Aubouy A, Bakary M, Keundjian A, Mbomat B, Makita JR, Migot-Nabias F, et al.

Combination of drug level measurement and parasite genotyping data for improved

assessment of amodiaquine and sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine efficacies in treating

Plasmodium falciparum malaria in Gabonese children. Antimicrob Agents

Chemother. 2003;47: 231–237. doi:10.1128/AAC.47.1.231-237.2003

41.  Hung T-Y, Davis TME, Ilett KF, Karunajeewa H, Hewitt S, Denis MB, et al.

Population pharmacokinetics of piperaquine in adults and children with

uncomplicated falciparum or vivax malaria. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2004;57: 253–

262. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2125.2003.02004.x

42.  Anyorigiya TA, Castel S, Mauff K, Atuguba F, Ogutu B, Oduro A, et al.

Pharmacokinetic profile of amodiaquine and its active metabolite

desethylamodiaquine in Ghanaian patients with uncomplicated falciparum malaria.

Malar J. 2021;20: 18. doi:10.1186/s12936-020-03553-6

43. Smit MR, Ochomo EO, Waterhouse D, Kwambai TK, Abong'o BO, Bousema T, et

al. Pharmacokinetics-Pharmacodynamics of High-Dose Ivermectin with

Dihydroartemisinin-Piperaquine on Mosquitocidal Activity and QT-Prolongation

(IVERMAL). Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2019;105: 388–401. doi:10.1002/cpt.1219

44. Hoglund RM, Workman L, Edstein MD, Thanh NX, Quang NN, Zongo I, et al.

Population Pharmacokinetic Properties of Piperaquine in Falciparum Malaria: An

Individual Participant Data Meta-Analysis. PLoS Med. 2017;14: e1002212.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002212

45. Barnes KI, Little F, Smith PJ, Evans A, Watkins WM, White NJ. Sulfadoxine-

pyrimethamine pharmacokinetics in malaria: Pediatric dosing implications. Clin

Pharmacol Ther. 2006;80: 582–596. doi:10.1016/j.clpt.2006.08.016

46. González Canga A, Sahagún Prieto AM, Diez Liébana MJ, Fernández Martínez N,

Sierra Vega M, García Vieitez JJ. The Pharmacokinetics and Interactions of

Ivermectin in Humans—A Mini-review. AAPS J. 2008;10: 42–46.

doi:10.1208/s12248-007-9000-9

47. Shaw WR, Catteruccia F. Vector biology meets disease control: using basic

research to fight vector-borne diseases. Nat Microbiol. 2019;4: 20–34.

doi:10.1038/s41564-018-0214-7

48. Campbell WC. Ivermectin: an update. Parasitol Today Pers Ed. 1985;1: 10–16.

doi:10.1016/0169-4758(85)90100-0

49. Graumans W, Jacobs E, Bousema T, Sinnis P. When Is a Plasmodium-Infected

Mosquito an Infectious Mosquito? Trends Parasitol. 2020;36: 705–716.

doi:10.1016/j.pt.2020.05.011

50. Andolina C, Graumans W, Guelbeogo M, van Gemert G-J, Ramijth J, Harouna S,

et al. Quantification of sporozoite expelling by Anopheles mosquitoes infected with

laboratory and naturally circulating P. falciparum gametocytes. Levashina EA,

Soldati-Favre D, editors. eLife. 2024;12: RP90989. doi:10.7554/eLife.90989

51. Berry A, Menard S, Nsango SE, Abate L, Concordet D, Tchioffo Tsapi M, et al. The

Rare, the Best: Spread of Antimalarial-Resistant Plasmodium falciparum Parasites

by Anopheles Mosquito Vectors. Microbiol Spectr. 9: e00852-21.

doi:10.1128/Spectrum.00852-21

52. Vanheer LN, Manko E, Mahamar A, Phelan J, Sanogo K, Sinaba Y, et al.

Preferential transmission of minority and drug-resistant clones in polyclonal

infections in Mali. Malar J. 2025;24: 111. doi:10.1186/s12936-025-05298-6

53. Childs GE, Boudreau EF, Milhous WK, Wimonwattratee T, Pooyindee N, Pang L, et

al. A comparison of the in vitro activities of amodiaquine and desethylamodiaquine

against isolates of Plasmodium falciparum. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 1989;40: 7–11.

doi:10.4269/ajtmh.1989.40.7

54. Sasi P, Abdulrahaman A, Mwai L, Muriithi S, Straimer J, Schieck E, et al. In vivo

and in vitro efficacy of amodiaquine against Plasmodium falciparum in an area of

continued use of 4-aminoquinolines in East Africa. J Infect Dis. 2009;199: 1575–

1582. doi:10.1086/598862

55.  Saab SA, Cardoso-Jaime V, Kefi M, Dimopoulos G. Advances in the dissection of

Anopheles-Plasmodium interactions. PLoS Pathog. 2025;21: e1012965.

doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1012965

## Supporting information

**S1 Supporting text.**

**S1 Fig. Solvents do not significantly impact lab-adapted *An. gambiae* behavior,**

**viability, or fertility.** Solvents used to dissolve drugs AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, SDX, PYR, and

IVM were diluted into plasma at 1:833 dilution and combined with RBCs at 40%

hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Un-spiked blood ("Blood only") served as control.

Abbreviations include: ACN – acetonitrile, used at either 1:1 or 1:9 v/v with $H_2O$; FA –

formic acid; HCl – hydrochloric acid. Approximately 50 mosquitoes were fed per group.

A) Mosquito feeding behavior plotted as percent taking a bloodmeal. B) Mosquito

survival post solvent ingestion plotted in a Kaplan-Meier survival curve (monitored for 14

days). C) Mosquito fertility assessed by total eggs laid per condition (all mosquitoes

monitored communally per experiment). Data are from experiments performed in

duplicate (except for only single survival data points available for D9 and D11 ACN:$H_2O$

1:1 + HCl 0.1% and HCl 0.1% conditions). In A and C, means are plotted with error bars

representing SD.

**S2 Fig. Tested antimalarials do not significantly impact percent of lab-adapted *An. gambiae* mosquitoes laying eggs.** Human plasma was spiked with antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels ranging from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average reported $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or blood spiked with drug solvent alone ("Solvent"). Solvents were: ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ, DEAQ, PPQ; ACN 1:1 $H_2O$ + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN 1:1 $H_2O$ + 0.5% FA for PYR (for SP experiments, "Solvent" represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents). Approximately 50 mosquitoes were fed per group, measuring effect of A) AQ and DEAQ, B) PPQ, and C) SP on mosquito fertility as measured by percent mosquitoes laying eggs (of n=5 mosquitoes monitored per experiment). Each graph represents combined data from 3 independent experiments. Means are plotted with error bars representing SD. There were no significant differences in percent of egg laying mosquitoes between groups.

**S3 Fig. Reduced IVM killing effects in field-derived *An. coluzzii* versus lab-derived *An. gambiae* mosquitoes.** Human plasma was spiked with the endectocide IVM (at 1X $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing) and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Un-spiked blood ("Blood only") served as control. Approximately 50 mosquitoes were fed per group. Mosquito survival post drug ingestion plotted in a Kaplan-Meier survival curve (monitored for 14 days). Data here is combined from multiple available independent feeding experiments (9 for *An. gambiae* and 10 for *An.*

*coluzzii*, except the "Blood only" condition for *An. gambiae* had 8 data points for D 10,

11, 12, 14, and 6 data points for D9, 13; and both conditions for *An. coluzzii* had 9 data

points for D 5, 9, 11). There were no significant differences in "Blood only" survival

between lab and field mosquitoes, however for "IVM 1X" the *An. coluzzii* mosquitoes

demonstrated significantly improved survival compared to *An. gambiae* mosquitoes

(p<0.0001).

**S4 Fig. Tested antimalarials do not significantly impact field-adapted *An. coluzzii***

**fertility.** Human serum was spiked with antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels

ranging from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average reported $C_{max}$ of standard human

dosing and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Negative

controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or blood spiked with drug solvent alone

("Solvent"). Solvents were: ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ, DEAQ, PPQ; ACN 1:1 $H_2O$

+ 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN 1:1 $H_2O$ + 0.5% FA for PYR (for SP experiments, "Solvent"

represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents). Approximately 50

mosquitoes were fed per group. Mosquito fertility (of n=5 mosquitoes monitored per

experiment) is depicted both by total eggs laid per condition (A-C) and percent of

mosquitoes laying eggs (D-F). Each graph represents combined data from 3

independent experiments, however for many experimental replicates, mosquitoes did

not routinely lay eggs – for AQ and DEAQ feeds, there was only egg laying data from 2

replicates (and the DEAQ 2X-fed group from one additional replicate); for PPQ feeds,

there was only egg laying data from 1 replicate (and the PPQ 2X-fed group from one

additional replicate). Means are plotted with error bars representing SD.

**S1 Table. Feeding rates for lab-derived *An. gambiae* and field-derived *An. coluzzii* offered bloodmeals spiked with solvents and tested antimalarials.** Data represents the percent of female mosquitoes that fed (abdomen with visible bloodmeal) under each condition, reported as the mean between experimental replicates (and Standard Deviation) (two replicates for initial solvent control feeding; three replicates for all drug feeding experiments). Plasma was spiked with solvents DMSO, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1, FA 0.5%, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.1% HCl, and 0.1% HCl all used at 1:833 dilution in plasma and mixed with RBCs to achieve 40% hematocrit in initial control experiments using lab-derived *An. gambiae*. In further experiments with both lab *An. gambiae* and field *An. coluzzii*, plasma or serum was spiked with the antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels ranging from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average reported $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing, or with the endectocide IVM (at 1X $C_{max}$), and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or for the drug feeding experiments, blood spiked with the relevant drug solvent alone ("Solvent"). Solvents used in the drug feeding experiments were: ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ, DEAQ, PPQ; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.5% FA for PYR (for SP experiments, "Solvent" represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents). Approximately 50 mosquitoes were fed per group.

**S2 Table. Raw feeding data and contingency analyses for lab-derived *An. gambiae* and field-derived *An. coluzzii* offered bloodmeals spiked with solvents and tested**

**antimalarials.** Data represents the number of female mosquitoes that fed (abdomen

with visible bloodmeal) or did not feed under each condition, reported as the total

between experimental replicates (two replicates for initial solvent control feeding; three

replicates for all drug feeding experiments). Contingency analyses comparing the rates

of fed to unfed mosquitoes for each experimental condition are included against the

blood only or relevant solvent controls, as well as for total lab *An. gambiae* and field *An.*

*coluzzii* feeding rates under all conditions (reported as p values, italicized if <0.05 with

direction of significance stated). Plasma was spiked with solvents DMSO, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1

v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1, FA 0.5%, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 +

0.1% HCl, and 0.1% HCl all used at 1:833 dilution in plasma and mixed with RBCs to

achieve 40% hematocrit in initial control experiments using lab-derived *An. gambiae*. In

further experiments with both lab *An. gambiae* and field *An. coluzzii*, plasma was spiked

with the antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels ranging from one half (1/2X) to

twice (2X) the average reported $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing, or with the endectocide

IVM (at 1X $C_{max}$), and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for mosquito feeds.

Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or for the drug feeding

experiments, blood spiked with the relevant drug solvent alone ("Solvent"). Solvents

used in the drug feeding experiments were: ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ, DEAQ,

PPQ; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.5% FA for PYR (for SP

experiments, "Solvent" represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents).

Approximately 50 mosquitoes were fed per group.

**S3 Table. Percent survival of lab-derived *An. gambiae* and field-derived *An. coluzzii* following ingestion of bloodmeal spiked with solvents and tested antimalarials.** Data represents percent survival of mosquitoes (approximately n=50 fed; unfed removed) over time after feeding on bloodmeals spiked with solvents and drugs of interest. Data are from 3 experimental replicates, with individual data for each time/condition shown, unless otherwise indicated (blank for few times/conditions when data was not captured; only 2 replicates for initial solvent control experiments; 4 replicates for *An. coluzzii* AQ/DEAQ feeds; 9 replicates combining all *An. gambiae* IVM feeding data and 10 replicates combining all *An. coluzzii* IVM feeding data). Means (and Standard Deviation) are also shown for each time/condition. Plasma was spiked with solvents DMSO, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1, FA 0.5%, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.1% HCl, and 0.1% HCl all used at 1:833 dilution in plasma and mixed with RBCs to achieve 40% hematocrit in initial control experiments using lab-derived *An. gambiae*. In further experiments with both lab *An. gambiae* and field *An. coluzzii*, plasma was spiked with the antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels ranging from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average reported $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing, or with the endectocide IVM (at 1X $C_{max}$), and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or for the drug feeding experiments, blood spiked with the relevant drug solvent alone ("Solvent"). Solvents used in the drug feeding experiments were: ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ, DEAQ, PPQ; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.5% FA for PYR (for SP experiments, "Solvent" represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents).

**S4 Table. Survival curve comparisons for lab-derived *An. gambiae* and field-derived *An. coluzzii* following ingestion of bloodmeal spiked with solvents and tested antimalarials.** Data represents Kaplan-Meier survival curve comparisons between specified groups, with Chi square results and p values (unadjusted and adjusted for multiple comparisons using Tukey-Kramer post-hoc analyses). Significant adjusted p values <0.05 are italicized for comparisons not involving IVM, with the direction of significance noted. Survival curves for each group are from 3 experimental replicates (other than only 2 replicates for initial solvent control experiments; 4 replicates for An. coluzzii AQ/DEAQ feeds). Data comparing survival curves for all blood only controls and IVM 1X feeds in *An. gambiae* versus *An. coluzzii* mosquitoes is also included. Plasma was spiked with solvents DMSO, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1, FA 0.5%, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.1% HCl, and 0.1% HCl all used at 1:833 dilution in plasma and mixed with RBCs to achieve 40% hematocrit in initial control experiments using lab-derived *An. gambiae*. In further experiments with both lab *An. gambiae* and field *An. coluzzii*, plasma was spiked with the antimalarials AQ, DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels ranging from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average reported $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing, or with the endectocide IVM (at 1X $C_{max}$), and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for mosquito feeds. Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or for the drug feeding experiments, blood spiked with the relevant drug solvent alone ("Solvent"). Solvents used in the drug feeding experiments were: ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ, DEAQ, PPQ; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1

999  + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN:H$_2$O 1:1 + 0.5% FA for PYR (for SP experiments, "Solvent"

1000  represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents).

1001

**S5 Table. *An. gambiae* and *An. coluzzii* mosquito fertility following ingestion of**

**bloodmeal spiked with solvents and tested antimalarials.** For initial solvent control

feeds in *An. gambiae*, data includes the total number of eggs laid and eggs laid per

mosquito (all fed mosquitoes monitored communally for egg laying; percent of

mosquitoes laying eggs unknown) from two experimental replicates. For all further drug

feeds, data includes the total eggs laid, number of eggs laid per mosquito, and percent

of mosquitoes laying eggs (n=5 mosquitoes monitored in egg laying conditions)

following bloodmeal ingestion under each condition between experimental replicates

(three replicates for *An. gambiae* and *An. coluzzii* DEAQ and SP feeds; 2 replicates for

*An. coluzzii* PPQ feeds excluding further replicates from analyses where no mosquitoes

laid eggs). Data is reported as the mean (with Standard Deviation). Plasma was spiked

with solvents DMSO, ACN:H$_2$O 1:1 v/v + 0.5% FA, ACN:H$_2$O 1:9 v/v + 0.5% FA,

ACN:H$_2$O 1:1, FA 0.5%, ACN:H$_2$O 1:1 + 0.1% HCl, and 0.1% HCl all used at 1:833

dilution in plasma and mixed with RBCs to achieve 40% hematocrit in initial control

experiments using lab-derived *An. gambiae*. In further experiments with both lab *An.*

*gambiae* and field *An. coluzzii*, plasma was spiked with the antimalarials AQ, DEAQ,

PPQ, or SP at levels ranging from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average reported

C$_{max}$ of standard human dosing, and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit for

mosquito feeds. Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only") or for the

drug feeding experiments, blood spiked with the relevant drug solvent alone ("Solvent").

Solvents used in the drug feeding experiments were: ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ,

DEAQ, PPQ; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.5% FA for PYR (for

SP experiments, "Solvent" represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents).

1025

**S6 Table. Lab-derived *An. gambiae* and field-derived *An. coluzzii* mosquito egg**

**laying data following ingestion of bloodmeal spiked with tested antimalarials.**

Data shown as the number of eggs laid per mosquito (n=5 mosquitoes monitored in

individual egg laying conditions) following bloodmeal ingestion under each condition in

three experimental replicates per group. Plasma was spiked with the antimalarials AQ,

DEAQ, PPQ, or SP at levels ranging from one half (1/2X) to twice (2X) the average

reported $C_{max}$ of standard human dosing and combined with RBCs at 40% hematocrit

for mosquito feeds. Negative controls included un-spiked blood ("Blood only"), or for the

drug feeding experiments, blood spiked with the relevant drug solvent alone ("Solvent")

(DMSO also included as a separate solvent in *An. coluzzii* AQ/DEAQ feeds). Solvents

used in the drug feeding experiments were: ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for AQ, DEAQ,

PPQ; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.1% HCl for SDX; ACN:$H_2O$ 1:1 + 0.5% FA for PYR (for SP

experiments, "Solvent" represents the combination of both SDX and PYR solvents).

1039

**S7 Table. Drug detection in isolated *An. gambiae* mosquito compartments.**

Mosquitoes were fed 1μg/ml or 250 ng/ml DEAQ to represent twice (2X) and half (1/2X)

reported $C_{max}$, respectively, or 50 ng/ml IVM to represent 1X reported Cmax. Controls

included un-spiked blood (Blood only), and solvent-spiked blood (ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5%

FA for DEAQ; DMSO for IVM). Mosquitoes were harvested 24 hrs (all conditions) and

120 hrs (Blood only, ACN+FA, DEAQ 2X, DEAQ 1/2X) post-feed, either collected whole

or used for hemolymph collection and midgut dissection. For each condition, 5 of each

mosquito sample type were pooled, with triplicates of pooled samples submitted to

NorthEast BioLab (Hamden, CT) for LC-MS/MS analysis. All data from 2 separate

experiments is shown. B=blank (no drug detected).

1050

**S8 Table. Drug detection comparisons in isolated *An. gambiae* mosquito**

**compartments over time.** Mosquitoes were fed 1 ʯg/ml or 250 ng/ml DEAQ to

represent twice (2X) and half (1/2X) reported $C_{max}$, respectively, or 50 ng/ml IVM to

represent 1X reported $C_{max}$. Controls included un-spiked blood (Blood only), and

solvent-spiked blood (ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5% FA for DEAQ; DMSO for IVM). Mosquitoes

were harvested 24 hrs (all conditions) and 120 hrs (Blood only, ACN:$H_2O$ 1:9 + 0.5%

FA, DEAQ 2X, DEAQ 1/2X) post-feed, either collected whole or used for hemolymph

collection and midgut dissection. For each condition, 5 of each mosquito sample type

were pooled, with triplicates of pooled samples submitted to NorthEast BioLab

(Hamden, CT) for LC-MS/MS analysis. Data is from 2 separate experiments. Results

are listed for one-way ANOVA analyzing drug levels detected in whole mosquitoes,

midguts, and hemolymph with pairwise comparisons of conditions of interest over time.

Significant p values ($p<0.05$) are italicized.

Figure 1

**Figure 2**

Figure 3