1 Running head: cluster randomised trial against leishmaniasis

2

3 **Sand fly synthetic sex-aggregation pheromone co-located with**
 4 **insecticide reduces canine Leishmania infantum infection incidence: a**
 5 **stratified cluster randomised trial**

6

7

8 Orin Courtenay^{1\$*}, Erin Dilger^{1\$}, Leo A. Calvo-Bado¹, Lidija Kravar-Garde¹, Vicky
 9 Carter², Melissa J. Bell¹, Graziella B. Alves², Raquel Goncalves¹, Muhammad
 10 M. Makhdoomi¹, Mikel A. González³, Caris M. Nunes⁴, Daniel P. Bray², Reginaldo
 11 P. Brazil⁵ & James G. C. Hamilton^{3\$*}.

12

13

- 14 1 Zeeman Institute and School of Life Sciences, University of Warwick,
15 Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK.
- 16 2 School of Life Sciences, Institute of Science & Technology in Medicine,
17 Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire, ST5 5BG, UK.
- 18 3 Division of Biomedical and Life Sciences, Faculty of Health and Medicine,
19 Lancaster University, Bailrigg, Lancaster, Lancashire, LA1 4YG, UK.
- 20 4 Faculdade de Medicina Veterinária, Universidade Estadual Paulista
21 (UNESP), Araçatuba, São Paulo, Brazil.
- 22 5 Laboratório de Doenças Parasitárias, Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, FIOCRUZ,
23 21040-360, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

24

25

26 **Current affiliations**

27 LAC-B: Micropathology Ltd, Venture Centre, University of Warwick Science
 28 Park, Sir William Lyons Road, Coventry, CV4 7EZ, United Kingdom.

29

30 DPB: Agriculture, Health and Environments Department, Natural Resources
 31 Institute, Faculty of Engineering and Science, University of Greenwich, Chatham
 32 Maritime, Kent, ME4 4TB, UK.

33

34 MAG: Department of Animal Health, NEIKER- Instituto Vasco de Investigación y
 35 Desarrollo Agrario, Berreaga 1, 48160 Derio, Bizkaia, Spain.

36

MMM: School of Veterinary Medicine, University of California Davis, 1 Garrod Drive, Davis, California 95776, USA

GBA: Department of Animal Health and Production - São Paulo State University (UNESP), School of Veterinary Medicine, Araçatuba, São Paulo, Brazil.

*corresponding authors

orin.courtenay@warwick.ac.uk

j.g.hamilton@lancaster.ac.uk

\$ author equal contributions

Key words: *Lutzomyia longipalpis*; 9-methyl-germacrene-B; sex/aggregation pheromone; insecticide-impregnated dog collars; Leishmaniasis; *Leishmania infantum*; vector control, cluster randomised trial; lure-and-kill; Brazil.

70 **Abstract**

71

72 **Objective**

73 To evaluate the efficacy of a synthetic sex-aggregation pheromone of the
74 sand fly vector *Lu. longipalpis*, co-located with residual insecticide, to reduce
75 the infection incidence of *Leishmania infantum* in the canine reservoir, and to
76 reduce sand fly vector abundance. To compare the outcomes to those
77 resulting from fitting deltamethrin-impregnated collars to the canine reservoir.

78 **Methods**

79 A stratified cluster-randomised trial was designed to detect a 50% reduction
80 in canine incident infection after 24 months in 42 recruited clusters, randomly
81 assigned to one of three intervention arms (14 cluster each): pheromone +
82 insecticide, insecticide-impregnated dog collars, or placebo control. Infection
83 incidence was measured by seroconversion to anti-*Leishmania* antibody,
84 *Leishmania* parasite detection and canine tissue parasite loads. Changes in
85 relative *Lu. longipalpis* abundance within households were measured by
86 setting three CDC light traps per household.

87 **Results**

88 A total 1,454 seronegative dogs were follow-up for a median 15.2 (95% C.I.s:
89 14.6, 16.2) months per cluster. The pheromone + insecticide intervention
90 provided 13% (95% C.I. 0%, 44.0%) protection against anti-*Leishmania*
91 antibody seroconversion, 52% (95% C.I. 6.2%, 74.9%) against parasite
92 infection, reduced tissue parasite loads by 53% (95% C.I. 5.4%, 76.7%), and
93 reduced household female sand fly abundance by 49% (95% C.I. 8.2%,
94 71.3%). Variation in the efficacy against seroconversion varied between trial

strata. Equivalent protection attributed to the impregnated-collars were 36% (95% C.I. 14.4%, 51.8%), 23% (95% C.I. 0%, 57.5%), 48% (95% C.I. 0%, 73.4%) and 43% (95% C.I. 0%, 67.9%), respectively. Comparison of the outcomes of the two interventions showed no statistically consistent differences in their efficacies; however, the errors were broad for all outcomes. Reductions in sand fly numbers were predominant where insecticide was located (chicken and dog sleeping sites), with no evidence of insecticide-induced repellency onto humans or dogs.

Conclusion.

The synthetic pheromone lure-and-kill approach provides protection particularly against *L. infantum* parasite transmission and sand fly vector abundance. The effect estimates are not dissimilar to those of the insecticide-impregnated collars, which are documented to reduce canine infection incidence, and human infection and clinical VL disease incidence, in different global regions. As a low-cost alternative or complimentary vector control tool, optimisation of best community deployment of the pheromone + insecticide are now underway.

Author summary

The sand fly vector of the intracellular parasite *Leishmania infantum* causing human and canine visceral leishmaniasis in the Americas is *Lutzomyia longipalpis*. Dogs are the proven reservoir. Vector control tools to reduce transmission suited to this predominantly exophilic vector are lacking. Insecticide-impregnated dog collars protect dogs against infectious bites from sand fly vectors, resulting in reductions of new infections in both dogs and

humans. However, collars are costly particularly for endemic communities, and alternative approaches are needed. Recent bulk synthesis of a sex-aggregation pheromone produced by male *Lu. longipalpis* was shown to attract large numbers of conspecific females to lethal pyrethroid insecticides. This study, conducted in Brazil, evaluated the efficacy of this novel lure-and-kill approach to reduce seroconversion and infection incidence with *L. infantum* in the canine reservoir, in addition to measuring its impact on household abundance of *Lu. longipalpis*. Deployed in 14 stratified clusters, the outcomes were compared to those resulting attributed to the collars fitted to dogs in another 14 clusters; each intervention was compared to the 14 clusters that received placebo treatments. The beneficial effects of the lure-and-kill method were most noticeable on confirmed infection incidence and clinical parasite loads, and in reducing sand fly abundance. The overall effect of the two interventions were not statistically dissimilar, though the confidence intervals were broad. We conclude that the novel low-cost lure-and-kill approach should be added to the vector control toolbox against visceral leishmaniasis in the Americas.

Introduction

Sustainable control of arthropod vectors to reduce infectious disease transmission represents a major challenge confronting public health programmes[1]. Standard approaches such as indoor residual spraying of insecticides (IRS) or insecticide treated nets (ITNs), are most effective against insecticide-susceptible vector populations that are endophilic and/or bite when hosts at risk are under ITNs e.g. as against *Anopheles gambiae*[2]. Suboptimal insecticide-based vector control occurs when contact rates with insecticide treated surfaces by susceptible vectors is less frequent[3], as expected following IRS/ITNs against exophilic vectors. One potential solution is to lure biting vectors to strategically placed insecticide using attractant semiochemicals (kairomones and pheromones). Specific insect pheromones mediate conspecific mating (sex), aggregation, oviposition or invitation behaviour[4]. In the agricultural sector, integrated pest management programs deploy pest pheromones to monitor and reduce pest populations and disrupt pest mating aggregations, with the aim to limit crop yield loss, environmental damage, and insecticide use[4-6]. In contrast, whilst some pheromones produced by vectors of public or veterinary health importance have been identified e.g.[7], they appear to be absent or not characterised in many of the most important human and animal disease vectors. Indeed, to our knowledge, there are no published studies that have tested the efficacy of a vector pheromone to reduce infection or disease incidence.

One important vector species that produces a large amount of sex-aggregation pheromone is *Lutzomyia longipalpis* (Diptera: Psychodidae). This is the principal vector of *Leishmania infantum* (Kinetoplastida: Trypanosomatidae) in the Americas, a protist parasite that causes human and canine zoonotic visceral leishmaniasis (ZVL)[8]. Domestic dogs are the proven reservoir host[9], though non-reservoir ("dead-end") hosts, such as chickens and other domestic livestock, are significant blood sources that are assumed to maintain sand fly populations[10].

The majority of incident human ZVL cases occur in Brazil[8], where the national ZVL control program include human case detection and treatment, and IRS of houses and animal sheds within 200m of a newly detected case[11, 12]. To reduce the canine reservoir population, the program recommends test-and-slaughter or chemotherapeutic treatment of *Leishmania* infected dogs, canine vaccination and/or application of topical insecticides[11]. Despite this extensive arsenal of control tools, there is no apparent decline in human case incidence[13-15]. On the contrary, ZVL has geographical expanded into new regions and into urban settings[15-17]. Thus, sustainable alternative or complimentary methods to combat transmission are still needed.

The recent bulk synthesis of the male *Lu. longipalpis* sex-aggregation pheromone[18] provides such an opportunity[19]. Male *Lu. longipalpis* release the pheromone from abdominal glands that attracts conspecific males and appetitive females. The resulting leks are formed on or near animal hosts, where the sand flies copulate and the females blood-feed, which results in *L. infantum* transmission[20-23]. In field experiments, the synthetic pheromone attracts significantly more *Lu. longipalpis* to experimental chicken sheds than to those without the synthetic pheromone[24]. And when co-located with pyrethroid insecticide applied to experimental sheds, it attracts and kills significantly more *Lu. longipalpis* compared to untreated control sheds[25]. In a long-lasting controlled release formulation, the pheromone is attractive for up to 3 months[19]. Field trials are now needed to evaluate the efficacy of this novel lure-and-kill approach to reduce *Leishmania* transmission.

Here we report the results of a stratified cluster randomised trial, conducted in Brazil, to test the efficacy of the synthetic pheromone co-located with a pyrethroid insecticide, to reduce (i) the incidence of *Leishmania* exposure and infection in the canine reservoir; (ii) the abundance of *Lu. longipalpis* around households; and (iii) to compare these outcomes in relation to parallel deployment of deltamethrin-impregnated Scalibor collars fitted to dogs.

Methods

Study location

The study was conducted between July 2012 and May 2016 in semi-urban towns and in suburban districts of Araçatuba city (21204011S; 50458883W), located in the administrative region of Araçatuba, N.W. São Paulo state, Brazil (Figure 1). ZVL expanded within the region over the last two decades, where it is now considered endemic[16, 26-29]. The human case incidence was 6.3 per 100,000 with a case fatality rate of 9% recorded in 2011 just prior to the study[27]. This represents the highest human VL incidence within São Paulo state which recorded 2,332 autochthonous cases between 1999 and 2013[28, 30]. Canine seroprevalences in the study region ranged from 12-45% (Superintendência de Controle de Endemias [SUCEN], unpublished data).

Study design

The trial was designed as a stratified cluster randomised trial (CRT) where the towns (municipalities), and Araçatuba subdistricts, were designated as independent clusters. Clusters, households and dogs were selected in a three-step procedure (Figure 2).

Recruitment

Clusters. Forty towns within the Araçatuba administrative region and 12 subdistricts of Araçatuba city, were listed for potential trial inclusion as independent intervention clusters. Cluster inclusion criteria included (i) evidence of recent transmission (at least one confirmed human or/and canine infection) within the 4 years prior to the intervention study by inspection of human case records[30], and canine testing records in 2006-2008 (SUCEN, unpublished data). (ii) That the location was within feasible driving time (1.5 hours) of the trial operations centre in Araçatuba; and (iii) that each cluster was geographically distinct, separated by ≥ 1 km to minimise any inter-cluster contamination by dispersing *Lu. longipalpis* sand fly vectors. Mark-release-recapture studies show $\geq 97\%$ of *Lu. longipalpis* recaptures are within 300m of the release location[21, 31, 32].

Thirty-three municipalities and 9 districts of Araçatuba (42 clusters in total) met these inclusion criteria (Figure 2), being located within an area of c. 11,250km² (Figure 1).

Houses and dogs. Local health authorities provided lists of households within clusters for potential recruitment based on inclusion criteria that (i) the household maintained at least one chicken (dead-end host) and at least one seronegative dog (defined below) at the time of recruitment; and (ii) the householder(s) and their animals were normally resident. Following consultation with local health authorities, and written permission provided by the municipality health officer, informed written consent was obtained from dog owners to test their dog(s) for anti-*Leishmania* antibodies (described below).

Cluster stratification

Clusters were then stratified, each assigned to one of three strata based on the initial pre-intervention canine seroprevalence within the cluster, of >50% (strata 1: “high” n=18 clusters), <50% (strata 2: “low” n=15 clusters), or Araçatuba location (strata 3: “mixed high and low” n=9 clusters) (Figure 2). Araçatuba clusters were placed in a separate strata as being the regional capital it was considered to have better resources to manage ZVL, knowledge, attitudes and practises (KAP) characteristics, and demographics that could affect transmission dynamics in ways different to in the towns[33].

Randomisation and treatment allocation

Clusters received one of three treatments, namely (i) synthetic pheromone lure co-located with pyrethroid insecticide; (ii) pyrethroid-impregnated collar fitted to dogs, or (iii) placebo control. These are described below. Within the three defined strata, clusters were ranked in descending order of pre-intervention seroprevalence, and then randomly assigned to one of the three interventions by random number generator in STATA software. All subsequent within-stratum triplet clusters were similarly assigned alternately to intervention groups, resulting in 14 clusters in each treatment arm.

The Interventions

Synthetic pheromone lures and insecticide arm

The synthetic pheromone formulation ($\pm$ -9-methylgermacrene-B [CAS RN: 183158-38-5]) was a copy of the (S)-9-methylgermacrene-B pheromone produced male *Lu. longipalpis*. 10mg of the pheromone was sealed in an 8 cm $\times$ 3 cm polythene sachet prototype dispenser designed for slow release (Russell-IPM Ltd. UK), and equivalent to natural pheromone release by 80,000 male *Lu. longipalpis* over a 3 month period[19]. Each household received a lure placed within 1m of the main chicken roosting site. Co-located with the pheromone, micro-encapsulated lambda-cyhalothrin (LC-ME) (®Demand 2.5cs, Syngenta, Brazil) was applied at 20mg a.i. m⁻² to surfaces close to chicken roosting sites using a GUARANY 441-10 compression sprayer (Guarany Industriae Comercio Ltda, Itu, SP). Sprayed sites included (i) all available surfaces in and on chicken coops (32.6% of sites), (ii) from ground level up to 3m of the roosting tree paying special attention to roosting branches (52.5%), or (iii) 3m² (1.5m x 2m) wall surfaces next to ground perches (7.7%), or similar unusual sites (7.2%). Pheromone lures and insecticide were replaced on 9 occasions at an average interval of 91 (S.D. 20.0) days (Supplementary S1).

Insecticide-impregnated collar arm

Scalibor collars (Intervet, MSD Saúde Animal, São Paulo, Brazil) impregnated with 40mg g⁻¹ deltamethrin, consisted of a 65cm white polyvinyl chloride strip weighing 25g. Collars were fitted to dogs $\geq$ 3 months old following the manufacturer's instructions. All seronegative dogs per houses were fitted with a Scalibor collar at baseline. At subsequent recruitment rounds, newly eligible dogs were fitted with a collar irrespective of serological status. The veterinary team fitted and replaced any lost collars, promoted their correct use to dog owners, and recorded any adverse reactions and reasons for collar losses. Scalibor collars have an activity period of 5-6 months against sand flies according to the product label, though longer durations of >10 months are experimentally demonstrated[34-36]. Collars were routinely replaced on 5 occasions at an average interval of 182 (S.D. 12.1) days (Supplementary S1).

Control arm

All dogs in control clusters received a placebo collar at recruitment, houses received an identical lure dispenser containing no pheromone, and chicken roosting sites were sprayed with water. For logistic reasons, spraying was limited to at baseline and 368 days later (Supplementary S1), whereas newly eligible dogs were fitted with a placebo collar. Losses of placebo collars or lures were replaced at subsequent dog recruitment rounds (Supplementary S2).

Blood sampling and sampling regime

Peripheral blood was collected from dogs by veterinarians by venepuncture onto two replicate Whatman 3MM Chromatography papers (GE Healthcare, 3030-614), which were then dried at ambient temperature, labelled, placed in individual zip plastic bags containing silica gel (Geejay Chemicals), and stored at 4°C until processing. Sera eluted from the filter papers were tested for anti-*Leishmania* antibodies by ELISA. Up to 5mls of blood was also collected into EDTA tubes to harvest leukocytes for molecular detection of *L. infantum* parasites by quantitative PCR (qPCR). The laboratory procedures are described in Supplementary S3.

At baseline clinical examination, veterinarians scored dogs for eight non-specific signs of canine leishmaniasis: alopecia, dermatitis, hyperkeratitis, skin lesions, conjunctivitis, onychogryphosis (excessive nail growth), lunettes, uveitis, and lymphadenopathy (enlarged popliteal lymph nodes). Each sign was scored on a semi-quantitative scale from 0 (absent) to 3 (severe), or 0 to 2 (for onychogryphosis and hyperkeratitis). Scores were then summed to give an overall clinical severity score.

Canine blood samples were collected at baseline to identify potential recruits, and recruited dogs then sampled again at their final follow-up.

Trial outcome measures

The primary outcome measure was cluster-level cumulative seroconversion incidence in naïve dogs in each intervention arm compared to in the control arm. The secondary canine outcome measures were *L. infantum* parasitological

infection cumulative incidence, and changes in blood parasite loads (*L. infantum* genome equivalents per ml blood buffy coat), confirmed by specific qPCR. The third outcome measure was relative changes in cluster-level household counts of *Lu. longipalpis* measured by setting CDC miniature light traps as described below.

Canine clinical condition is not considered a reliable marker of infection incidence following others[37]; signs of canine leishmaniasis are non-specific, thus positive diagnosis requires extensive differential diagnosis, and statistical power was insufficient in this study to rely on changes in advanced canine VL disease.

Sand fly catches

After the final canine follow-up sample in October 2015, the trial interventions as described above were continued following the same regime for an additional 7 months until the end of May 2016. Sand fly sampling was conducted in 40 of the 42 clusters in 6 approximate quarterly trapping rounds from January 2015 to May 2016 (January/February; April; July/August; October/November in 2015; and January/February; and April/May in 2016). Data from 2 clusters were incomplete and thus excluded from the analyses. The final dataset was generated from 209, 188 and 193 (n=590) trapping nights in 129, 121 and 113 (n=363) houses, in 14, 13, and 13 control, pheromone + insecticide and collar intervention clusters, respectively.

Miniature CDC light traps with the light bulb removed were positioned in three locations per household: inside the house, at the dog sleeping site or kennel entrance, and at the principal chicken roosting site, each trap associated with the respective host: humans, dogs and chickens. Captured sand flies were sexed and counted under a stereomicroscope. Specific identification was not performed as the vast majority (>98%) of peridomestic sand flies captured in the study locations during parallel entomological studies were confirmed to be *Lu. longipalpis* by dissection of spermathecae[38].

Data collection

Veterinary staff collected details of the dog's history, and information on any newly acquired dogs, host numbers, and losses of dogs, collars and pheromone lures, by verbal questionnaire to household heads by house-to-house visitation and/or by active phone contact at least every 3 months.

Sample size calculations

The sample size was calculated for the primary outcome measure (canine seroconversion incidence) for a two-treatment randomised control trial[39, 40], whereby cluster-level outcomes in collar and in pheromone treated clusters were each compared to the outcomes in the control clusters.

The trial was statistically powered to detect a 50% reduction in *L. infantum* seroconversion incidence in naïve dogs after 24 months follow-up with a baseline canine instantaneous annual incidence of 0.6, estimated from canine testing between 2006-2008 in the region (SUCEN, unpublished data) (see Table 2). Calculations were based on a surveyed harmonic mean of 24 dogs per cluster (assuming 1 negative dog recruit per household), with equal numbers of clusters per arm, and coefficient of variation between clusters $\kappa_m=0.40$. The latter value was more conservative than $\kappa_m=0.34$ estimated from the variation in cluster-level canine seroprevalences (1,701 dogs in 42 clusters) at initial trial recruitment. Under these design conditions, 12 clusters per arm were required per intervention arm to achieve a statistical power of 90% with 95% confidence to reject the null hypothesis.

To buffer effects of potential loss-to-follow-up (LTF) of clusters and dogs, the number of clusters enrolled was increased to 14 clusters per arm. By the end of the trial no LTF of clusters occurred, though substantial LTF of dogs and houses occurred (see Results). Recalculations at the end of the study, revealed a harmonic mean 35 dogs followed-up for an average 16.4 months per cluster, with a starting instantaneous incidence of 1.26 year^{-1} measured from age-prevalence data in all recruited dogs prior to being under intervention (Table

2). From these data, the trial design provided 90% statistical power to detect an equivalent 44% reduction in infection incidence between trial arms.

Statistical analysis

Analysis of the intervention effect on seroconversion and parasite detection incidence were computed using mixed effects binomial complimentary log-log models expressed as incident risk ratios (IRR). Random intercepts for trial clusters were fitted (trial cluster being the higher level of structuring in the data[41], and $\log_{10}$ normalised days under intervention set as the model offset. Similarly, negative binomial mixed effects models were used to test the intervention effects on $\log_{10} + 1$ transformed *Leishmania* parasite loads (ml^{-1}), and on sand fly numbers.

Complimentary log-log model fits were achieved by Gauss-Hermite numerical adaptive quadrature of the random-effects estimators (quadchk routine in STATA), validated using 16 integration points in model run comparisons to confirm quadrature fitting accuracy; model runs showed $\leq 0.01\%$ variation in resulting estimates, thus considered to be reliable[42].

For infection outcomes, models comprised variables included *a priori* on the basis that they could affect the trial balance, namely strata (3-levels), baseline canine exposure (baseline anti-*Leishmania* antibody titre), proportion of time (days) under intervention in the bimodally high (December-May) (*cf.* low June - November) sand fly season[43], and household mean numbers of dogs and chickens as surrogates of host odour intensity that may invoke a density-dependent or competing attractant[20, 31, 44]. For analyses of sand fly data, *a priori* covariates included strata, sand fly trapping period (6 levels) reflecting sand fly seasonality, and host abundance at the time of trapping i.e. numbers of people, dogs and chickens associated with each of the 3 trapping locations per household. The model incorporated a cluster term for trial clusters.

The outcomes from these models were considered “unadjusted” effect estimates. Unadjusted estimates were then adjusted on detection of significant

model improvement by individual inclusion of additional demographic variables in the model, namely, predominant chicken roosting site category (described above); month and sand fly season (as above) of dog recruitment; dog age at recruitment [median: 24m; IQR: 8-48m]; dog sex; property type [house or small holding]; general clinical condition score of dog at recruitment [median: 3.1; IQR: 2-4]. Each variable was evaluated for significance by log-likelihood ratio test (LRT) of nested models.

In a secondary analysis, the outcome $\times$ strata (3-level) interaction term was tested against the full model to evaluate differential intervention effects between trial strata. In the case that the interaction term was significant with $\geq 90\%$ probability, individual strata-level effect estimates were further investigated.

The equality of variances in cluster-level dog follow-up time (days) was tested using the Levene's robust test statistic adapted by Brown & Forsythe[45] to provide robust estimators of central tendency (median [W50] and 10% trimmed mean [W10]).

Data were analysed in STATA v.15 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX).

Force of Infection model estimation

The instantaneous incidence (force of infection, FOI) was calculated for dogs serologically tested prior to trial recruitment, by fitting the age-prevalence data to a standard age-incidence-recovery model[46, 47].

To evaluate changes in infection rates from c. 6-8 years earlier, the FOI was similarly calculated using historical data with age records for 2,304 dogs resident in 19 towns in the same region, sampled in 2006-2008 (SUCEN, unpublished data). Positives were identified on detection of "*L. major*-like" promastigote soluble antigens[48] by an ELISA-based kit (EIE-leishmaniose-visceral-canina-Bio-Manguinhos [EIE-LVC], Bio-Manguinhos/Fiocruz- RJ, Brazil). Seroprevalence in the same historical populations was estimated by inclusion of

an additional 7,882 dog results that did not have age records (n=10,186 dogs in total) (see Table 2).

Data management and masking

Diagnostic results and household questionnaire data were entered into data-checking entry forms designed in ACCESS 2007 relational database by a trained technician, and databases then checked for inconsistencies. Unblinding for final analysis was conducted independently after all dogs had been tested by laboratory staff who were blinded to the cluster treatments and to cluster and household identities through a bar-coding system; all tested sample tubes were bar-coded and results subsequently matched to dog ID bar-codes in the database.

Ethical considerations

The trial protocols for dogs were approved by the Committee for Ethical Use of Animals (CEUA [FOA-00124-2013]), UNESP, Brazil, and the Animal Welfare and Ethical Approval Body (AWERB, [48723]), University of Warwick, UK. Household questionnaire designs were approval by the Biomedical and Scientific Research Ethics Committee (BSREC, REGO-2015-1388), University of Warwick, UK. Informed written consent was obtained from dog owners to sample and fit collars to their dogs, and from the town and district health authorities to conduct the study within their administrative jurisdiction.

RESULTS

Pre-enrolment canine infection estimates

A total 4,918 dogs were serologically tested prior to trial recruitment, of which 2,971 dogs (60%) were seropositive (Table 2). Seroprevalence and FOI estimates were similar between dogs in the three trial arms to which they were subsequently allocated (Table 2; Figure 3). No statistical differences were detected in these infection measures between the trial arms, accounting for the trial structure, date of recruitment, dog age and trial cluster (mecloglog mixed effects model: $z < 0.89$, $P > 0.38$). Notably these pre-intervention infection rates were higher than equivalent estimates calculated from canine serosurvey

records in the same region conducted a number of years previous (Table 2; Figure 3).

Table 2. Serological infection estimates for dogs surveyed prior to trial recruitment, and canine historical testing records in the same region.

Sample period	Population sample	FOI estimates ¹		Seroprevalence ² (pos/n dogs)
		λ incidence/year (SD), n dogs	ρ recovery/year (SD)	
2012-2014 ^a	Control arm	1.14 (0.163), 1,558	1.48 (0.264)	0.610 (961/1575)
	Pheromone arm	1.47 (0.225), 1,693	1.82 (0.335)	0.584 (994/1702)
	Collar arm	1.14 (0.159), 1,631	1.52 (0.265)	0.619 (1016/1641)
	Trial arms combined	1.26 (0.151), 4,882	1.64 (0.235)	0.604 (2,971/4,918)
2006-2008 ^b	19 regional towns	0.61 (0.094), 2,304	0.63 (0.121)	0.422 (972/2,304)
2006-2008 ^c	20 regional towns			0.451 (4592/10,186)

¹ FOI estimates were calculated from fitting age-seroprevalence data to an incidence (λ)-recovery (ρ) model.

² Crude seroprevalences estimated including dogs without age records.

^a estimates calculated from dogs pre-recruitment resident in the 14 towns (= trial clusters) per intervention arm to which they were subsequently randomly allocated; serological infection detected using the ELISA described in this study.

^b FOI estimates calculated from canine samples accompanied by dog age data; serological infection detected using an ELISA kit (EIE-CVL, Bio Manguinhos/Fiocruz-RG, Brazil);

^c estimates for the same regional population as in (^b) but including also test data without dog age records.

Dog recruitment and follow-up

The initial enrolment included 630 seronegative dogs under intervention by July-November 2012 (Supplementary S2). The study experienced substantial LTF of dogs and houses primarily due to dogs being lost through mortality or unknown causes and/or households no longer maintaining chickens or eligible dogs. Thus, to fulfil the statistical power requirements, new dogs and houses were recruited between November 2012 and October 2014 (Supplementary S2). This resulted in a total 2,971 seronegative dogs recruited and placed under the trial interventions, of which, 1,454 (48.9%) dogs, resident in 789 houses across the 42 trial clusters, remained in the study for follow-up testing (Table 1). A

median 1 (95% C.I.: 1, 2) seronegative dogs was enrolled per house which did not differ between treatment arms (Poisson: $z < 0.34$, $P > 0.16$).

Table 1. Summary of the total dogs sampled, recruited and with follow-up sample, according to the trial intervention arm to which the dogs were subsequently allocated.

Intervention arm	Dogs initially sampled for potential recruitment	Seronegative dogs recruited (proportion of sampled)	Negative dogs with follow-up sample (proportion of recruits)
Control	1,575	961 (0.610)	455 (0.473)
Pheromone	1,702	994 (0.584)	480 (0.483)
Collar	1,641	1,016 (0.619)	519 (0.411)
Total	4,918	2,971 (0.604)	1,454 (0.489)

The follow-up cluster population was observed for a *per capita* median 17.1 (95% C.I.s: 15.2, 17.7, $n=455$ dogs), 14.7 (95% C.I.s: 14.0, 16.7, $n=480$), and 15.2 (95% C.I.s: 13.2, 15.5, $n=519$) months under control, pheromone and collar interventions, respectively (Supplementary S4). Similar fractions of the follow-up times (0.507, 0.454 and 0.416) fell within the seasonally high period of sand fly abundance (December to May) (LRT: $\chi^2_{(2)} = 1.08$, $P = 0.58$). The variance in cluster-level dog follow-up days were not dissimilar between intervention arms (Levene's W_{10} [df: 2,39]=1.78, $P=0.838$; W_{50} [df: 2,39]=1.60, $P=0.853$). The epidemiological data for the three intervention arms (Tables 1, Figure 3), indicated that the randomization process achieved good trial balance.

Intervention outcomes

Seroconversion incidence

Of the seronegative recruits, 225 (49.5%), 217 (45.2%), and 182 (35.1%) in control, pheromone and collar arms respectively, seroconverted by the end of the study. The annual cluster seroconversion incidence varied between the three trial strata within intervention arms (Figure 4; Supplementary S4).

Accounting for the variables describing the trial structure and follow-up intervals, the unadjusted seroconversion incident risk ratio (IRR) was 0.88 (95%

C.I. 0.66, 1.16) in the pheromone arm, and IRR= 0.65 (95% C.I. 0.48, 0.87) in the collar arm, each compared to the control arm (model fit: Wald χ^2 (8)=31.4, $P<0.0001$) (Table 2). The protection attributed to the interventions were therefore 12% (95% C.I. 0%, 33.8%), and 35% (95% C.I. 13.2%, 51.8%) respectively. Potential adjustment to these estimates was assessed by inclusion of additional demographic variables in the model. Only one significant covariate was identified: the location of the chicken principal roosting site i.e. where the pheromone + insecticide was co-located (LRT: χ^2 (3) =9.57, $P=0.023$). This led to slight modifications of the effect estimates (Table 2).

Table 2. Seroconversion incident rate ratio (IRR) amongst dogs under each intervention: unadjusted and adjusted estimates calculated relative to the control arm, by fitting to mixed-effect complimentary log-log models.

	Unadjusted IRR (95% C.I.s), n dogs	$P \leq$	Adjusted ¹ IRR (95% C.I.s), n dogs	$P \leq$
(A) Strata 1-3	N=1,443		N=1,322	
Pheromone	0.88 (0.662, 1.159)	0.353	0.87 (0.660, 1.152)	0.320
Collar	0.65 (0.482, 0.868)	0.004	0.64 (0.482, 0.856)	0.003

¹ effect modification adjusted by variables significant in LR test: chicken predominant roosting site where pheromone and insecticide were co-located.

Insecticide treatment of the two most common roosting site categories, low trees (53%), and chicken shelters (33%), were not dissimilar in intervention effect; the significant modification was associated with the third roosting site category, most commonly hollows in the ground, but which represented only 7% of all roost sites. In the latter case insecticide was sprayed on the nearest wall.

Neither intervention resulted in significant changes in the mean $\log_{10}$ anti-*Leishmania* antibody units in seroconverted dogs ($z<1.45$, $P>0.10$).

In a secondary analysis, potential differences in the intervention effects on seroconversion incidence between trial strata were examined. This provided evidence of strata-level variation (strata $\times$ treatment interactions, LRT test: χ^2 (4) =8.34, $P=0.078$), observed only in the pheromone arm, suggesting a negative impact in Aracatuba city (stratum 3, n= 3 clusters) (IRR=1.66 [95% C.I.s: 0.971,

2.849], $P=0.064$) (pheromone arm $\times$ stratum 3 interaction: $z=2.36$, $P=0.018$). In contrast, the pheromone effects in strata 1 and 2 ($n=11$ town clusters) suggested a protective effect of 27% (95% C.I.s: 0.02%, 46.8%) (IRR=0.73 [0.532, 0.998], $P=0.048$).

Parasitology

Buffy coat samples from 775 recruited dogs at follow-up were tested for the presence of *Leishmania* kDNA in peripheral blood by qPCR. Parasites were detected in 117 (15.1%) of dogs overall; including 20.8% (64/308) of dogs that seroconverted and 11.4% (53/467) of dogs that did not. The latter category of dogs was neither differentially associated with the date or season of recruitment, or their follow-up time, to suggest a predominance of prepatent dogs in the recruited sample.

The percent reduction in the crude number of parasite positive dogs attributed to pheromone and collar interventions at follow-up were 43.3% and 26.1%, respectively (Table 3). Accounting for the trial structure, follow-up periods and covariates as described above, the respective reductions in confirmed *Leishmania* infection incidence were 51.5% (95% C.I. 6.2%, 74.9%) and 22.5% (95% C.I. 0%, 57.5%) (Table 3). The intervention outcomes did not significantly vary between strata (test of treatment $\times$ strata interaction term: LRT: $\chi^2_{(4)}=4.10$, $P=0.393$), nor were effect modifications significant by inclusion of additional demographic variables (LRT: $\chi^2_{(3)} < 2.68$, $P > 0.444$).

Table 3. Confirmed *Leishmania* infection incidence, tissue parasite loads, and intervention effects in recruited dogs at follow-up.

Intervention arm	qPCR ¹ positive/dogs tested (%)	parasite infection incidence IRR (95% C.I.s)	geometric mean ² (95% C.I.) parasite load ml ⁻¹	parasite load ml ⁻¹ IRR (95% C.I.s)
control	48/231 (20.8)	referent	18.6 (7.18-47.96)	referent
pheromone	25/246 (10.2)	0.485 (0.251, 0.938) $P=0.032$	6.48 (0.85-49.35)	0.469 (0.233, 0.946) $P=0.034$

collars	44/298(14.8)	0.775 (0.425, 1.141) $P=0.404$	4.82 (1.72 - 13.54)	0.524 (0.266, 1.03) $P=0.062$
Total	117/775 (15.1)			

¹ quantification of *Leishmania* kDNA in canine peripheral blood leukocytes per ml⁻¹ by qPCR, standardised to the endogenous control.

² GM calculated in 117 positive dogs with qPCR counts

Leishmania parasite loads

The geometric mean *Leishmania* parasite loads per ml⁻¹ in the 117 qPCR positive dogs were highly variable (Table 3). Relative to control clusters, the intervention reduced parasite loads in the pheromone arm by an average 53.1% (95% C.I. 5.4%, 76.7%), and in the collar arm by an average 47.6% (95% C.I. 0%, 73.4%) (Table 3). The intervention effects did not significantly vary between strata (test of treatment $\times$ strata interaction term: LRT: $\chi^2_{(4)}=0.02$, $p=0.905$), nor were reductions in parasite loads related to the number of days under intervention (LRT: $\chi^2_{(4)}=0.39$, $P=0.532$), or modified by inclusion of additional demographic variables (LRT: $\chi^2_{(3)} < 0.21$, $P > 0.967$).

For the 308 dogs that seroconverted with parasite counts, the log₁₀ parasite loads were not correlated with corresponding log₁₀ IgG antibody units (Spearman's $r=0.074$, $P=0.20$); similar non-significant patterns were observed across treatment arms. For the dogs that failed to seroconvert, there were no associations between the fraction that were parasite positive and the date of recruitment, or between their log₁₀ follow-up time (fully adjusted model: $z > 0.049$, $P > 0.23$). The annual incidence of confirmed parasitological infection and seroconversion post intervention were also not correlated (Figure 5).

Sand fly abundance

Complete sand fly trapping records were available for 590 trap nights in 363 houses in 40 trial clusters (Supplementary S5). The number of trap nights (trapping effort) were similar between intervention arms ($t < 1.33$, $P > 0.19$) and between trial strata ($t < 1.57$, $P > 0.124$). Relatively few *Lu. longipalpis* were

captured per house, and only 46% of houses were positive for sand fly capture; which was similar under each intervention (Supplementary S5).

The pheromone intervention significantly reduced the numbers of female and male sand flies captured at households relative to controls, whereas the collar intervention tended to reduce only the number of females (Table 5). No consistent differences in sand fly captures were observed between the trial strata (test of intervention arm $\times$ strata interaction term: $z < 1.15$, $P > 0.248$). Inclusion of additional demographic variables did not significantly modify these effect estimates.

Table 5. Intervention effects¹ on household numbers of male and female *Lu. longipalpis* sand flies captured across 3 CDC lights traps per house.

Treatment arm	Female sand flies		Males sand flies	
	IRR (95% C.I.s)	$P \leq$	IRR (95% C.I.s)	$P \leq$
Pheromone	0.51 (0.287, 0.918)	0.03	0.44 (0.200, 0.974)	0.04
Collar	0.57 (0.321, 1.007)	0.05	0.94 (0.460, 1.918)	0.86

¹ estimated from negative binomial mixed effects models including *a priori* predictors.

Changes in the distributions of vectors at households

Changes in sand fly numbers in CDC traps placed at human, dog and chicken sleeping sites were further examined. In placebo clusters, the majority of *Lu. longipalpis* were captured at chicken sleeping sites, with fewer but similar numbers associated with dog sleeping sites, and humans (i.e. inside houses) (Table 6).

Table 6: Distribution of captured *Lu. longipalpis* at households¹.

Sand flies	Arm	No. on people (proportion of treatment total)	No. on dogs (proportion of treatment total)	No. on chickens (proportion of treatment total)	No. total
Females	Control	34 (0.23)	43 (0.29)	72 (0.48)	149
	Pheromone	20 (0.26)	28 (0.37)	28 (0.37)	76
	Collar	19 (0.22)	17 (0.20)	49 (0.58)	85

Males	Control	45 (0.16)	52 (0.18)	188 (0.66)	285
	Pheromone	31 (0.25)	46 (0.37)	46 (0.37)	123
	Collar	47 (0.15)	37 (0.12)	228 (0.73)	312
All	Control	79 (0.18)	95 (0.22)	260 (0.60)	434
	Pheromone	51 (0.26)	74 (0.37)	74 (0.37)	199
	Collar	66 (0.17)	54 (0.14)	277 (0.70)	397

¹ In each household, a single CDC light trap (excluding the bulb) was set inside the house (humans), and outside the house above the sleeping dog, and at the main chicken roosting site.

In the pheromone arm, reductions of 66% (95% C.I. 36%, 81.7%) and 69% (95% C.I. 43.6%, 82.6%) were observed in female and male sand flies captured at the chicken roosting site, being the site of pheromone + insecticide co-location (Table 7). In the collar arm, there was a mean 52% (95% C.I. 0%, 87.9%) reduction in female sand flies at dog trapping sites attributed to collars, although this narrowly failed to reach statistical significance (Table 7). These reductions were not mirrored by significant changes in sand fly numbers at the corresponding alternative trap locations (Table 7).

Table 7. Intervention effects on *Lu. longipalpis* abundance at host-associated CDC trap sites

Capture site	humans		dogs		chickens	
	IRR (95% C. I.s)	$P \leq$	IRR (95% C. I.s)	$P \leq$	IRR (95% C. I.s)	$P \leq$
Females						
Pheromone	0.72 (0.285, 1.814)	0.49	0.71 (0.385, 1.304)	0.27	0.34 (0.183, 0.640)	0.001
Collar	0.55 (0.268, 1.115)	0.10	0.48 (0.221, 1.052)	0.07	0.58 (0.296, 1.152)	0.12
Males						
Pheromone	1.12 (0.451, 2.758)	0.81	0.80 (0.329, 1.950)	0.62	0.31 (0.174, 0.564)	0.001
Collar	0.93 (0.446, 1.957)	0.86	0.76 (0.347, 1.641)	0.48	1.15 (0.564, 2.447)	0.71

Males made up the majority of captures which was not unexpected (Table 6). The number of female sand flies was positively associated with the number of male flies in the same trap ($z=7.24$, $P<0.0001$), but not with the prevailing mean numbers of household chickens or dogs ($z<0.49$, $P>0.26$). This relationship was not dissimilar across intervention arms (test of intervention arm $\times$ male fly number interaction term: $z<0.197$, $P>0.53$).

Comparison of the synthetic pheromone versus collar intervention effects

Direct statistical comparisons of the pheromone *versus* collar intervention outcomes (i.e. not compared to the control arm), did not provide evidence of substantial differences between the two interventions. Only in analysis of seroconversion incidence did collars provide an apparent 25.3% (95% C. I.s: 1.2%, 43.4%) additional protection over the pheromone intervention (IRR = 0.747 [0.566, 0.988], $P=0.041$). Whereas, the pheromone intervention resulted in a 49% (11%, 66.4%) greater reduction in male *Lu. longipalpis* at households compared to in the collar arm (IRR = 0.51 [0.336, 0.790], $P=0.002$). Otherwise, no other statistical differences were detected.

Discussion

The synthetic pheromone intervention reduced the incidence of confirmatory parasitological infection by 52%, and the geometric mean peripheral blood parasite loads by 53%. The same intervention also reduced the household numbers of female *Lu. longipalpis* by 49%. These promising outcomes were not mirrored in changes in seroconversion incidence across all trial strata. In the 11 semi-urban town clusters (strata 1 & 2) under this intervention, seroconversion was reduced by an average 27%, whereas among the three clusters in Araçatuba city (stratum 3), seroconversion incidence was increased rather than decreased. The latter result was specifically attributed to a single Araçatuba treated cluster, in which the annual seroconversion incidence was 0.0274, which was 2.2× the average (0.0126/year) for the three Araçatuba control clusters. The equivalent rates in the other two pheromone-treated clusters (0.0142 and 0.0139/year) were similar to that of controls (Supplementary S4). There was no further evidence of significant variation in intervention effects between strata in either the pheromone or collar arm. By design, all nine clusters recruited within the regional capital Araçatuba, were assigned to a separate stratum based on the perceived enhanced ZVL control activities and conditions in the city[33]. Compliance may have been lower in this stratum, but we did not detect significant differences in dog recruitment, the LTF of dogs, collars, or pheromone lures, or their replacement rates (data not shown).

Collars

In contrast, the deltamethrin-impregnated collar intervention reduced canine seroconversion incidence by 36% (95% C.I. 14.4%, 51.8%). The attributable reductions in tissue parasite loads of 48% (95% C.I. 0%, 73.4%), and in household female sand flies of 43% (95% C.I. 0%, 67.9%), were indicative, though failed to reach statistical significance ($P < 0.062$).

The collective studies of Scalibor collars in Brazil[49-53], Europe[54-57], North Africa[58], and central Asia[59], demonstrate their impact on *L. infantum* transmission, providing a median 56% (IQR: 48.9%- 85.9%; range: 46.9%- 100%) protection against canine seroinfection incidence. Community-wide collar interventions provided 43%-50% protection against human infantile seroconversion and clinical ZVL incidence[48, 59, 60]. Furthermore, reductions in *Lu. longipalpis* household abundance[61], and *Lu. longipalpis* infection rates with *L. infantum*[49] are associated with collar interventions. Thus, in the current study, the collar intervention arm acted as a positive control for the previously untested synthetic pheromone lure-and-kill trial method.

Despite this, the overall protection provided by the collar arm appeared somewhat inferior to that of the pheromone arm, when each was compared to the control arm. However, a consistent difference in their performance was not detected by direct statistical comparison of their effect estimates.

Household sand fly distributions

In control households, the majority of sand flies were captured at chicken roosting sites compared to at dog sleeping sites and inside houses. The pheromone intervention diminished female and male sand flies at chicken roosting sites by 49% and 56% respectively. The collar intervention reduced female, but not male, *Lu. longipalpis* numbers at dog sleeping locations by 43%. There was no evidence that sand flies were diverted from the treated trap sites to the two alternative untreated host trap sites within households. These results are consistent with the insecticidal effects of the associated interventions including the purposeful co-location of insecticide at chicken roosting sites.

Possible imprecision in the effect estimates arises if the synthetic pheromone recruited additional numbers of sand flies that circumvented traps e.g. through insecticide-induced knockdown or excito-repellency. In this case, it is likely that effect estimates reported here are an underestimate of the true intervention effect. Further experiments are needed to quantify these mechanisms.

Implications for ZVL control

ZVL control guidelines in Brazil recommends IRS of houses, but also of animal shelters[11], where the majority of *Lu. longipalpis* are typically captured[21, 22, 62]. Field studies in north Brazil show sand fly numbers in animals shelters to decrease more or less immediately after insecticide application, but, in parallel, with colonisation of nearby unsprayed sites e.g. household dining huts[63]. Evidenced by additional data[20], the authors of those studies proposed that this shift in vector distribution is a partial consequence of insecticide-induced mortality of male flies causing a decline in pheromone release and recruitment to treated sites, making untreated colonised sites more attractive. Based on this rationale therefore, the co-location of synthetic pheromone should maintain sand fly recruitment to insecticide-treated sites. Results supporting this hypothesis demonstrate that the synthetic pheromone can “restore” female and male recruitment to recently sprayed sheds[25]. Indeed, the synthetic pheromone lure tested in this study attracts approximately 24 times more *Lu. longipalpis* to chicken sheds compared to sheds without synthetic pheromone[19]. This novel lure-and-kill approach offers a potential improvement to the standard IRS practise against ZVL.

A single 10mg lure synthetic pheromone lure is active for 10-12 weeks[19], and attracts *Lu. longipalpis* over distances of 30m (Gonzalez et al., unpublished data), sufficient to cover the typical urban and more rural household vicinity. The attraction of female *Lu. longipalpis* is pheromone dose-dependent[23], in line with density-dependent associations between female and males numbers observed in natural leks / CDC light trap catches (this study; [64, 65]). Chickens are a dead-end (sink) host for *Leishmania*[10], and often the most abundant domestic host in endemic regions[33], hence an obvious location to place the

pheromone and insecticide. However, the need for synergistic effects between the synthetic pheromone and host odour to attract *Lu. longipalpis*[66] no longer appears critical as confirmed by on-going field studies, and opening the door for its wider deployment at households without animal hosts. Community-wide experiments are now needed to optimise pheromone doses in different demographic settings.

With respect to transmission dynamics, of particular relevance is the observed reductions in tissue *L. infantum* parasite loads. This is expected to diminish the canine population's infectiousness to *Lu. longipalpis*, since canine skin, blood, and bone marrow *L. infantum* loads correlate with the dogs' ability to transmit *L. infantum* to *Lu. longipalpis*[37, 67-70]. Dogs with the highest parasite loads are responsible for the majority of transmission events[37, 68], though not exclusively so[71]. Related to this is the proposal that variation in *Leishmania* metacyclic inoculum from sand fly bites contribute to an individual host's infection pathology, and subsequent onward transmission potential[72, 73]. Additional supporting data (Bell et al., unpublished data) show Scalibor collar protection to effectively lower the over-dispersion in canine population antibody responses to *Lu. longipalpis* salivary antigens delivered by sand fly bites, and indicative of the level of biting exposure. In simple terms, this predicts that a lower fraction of dogs would receive high density *L. infantum* challenge under this intervention.

The suggested increase in canine FOI from 2006-2008 to the trial period (Table 2) is supported by independent reports of the rise and spread of canine infection, and *Lu. longipalpis* abundance, across São Paulo state[13, 16]. Together with current trends in human ZVL burdens in Brazil[13-15], the need for sustainable vector control is clear. The MoH policy of culling seropositive dogs continues to be unpopular amongst dog owners[74], and in the Brazilian setting, dog collars, along with the registered canine vaccine Leish-Tec, and anti-*Leishmania* chemotherapy treatment options, may be too costly and/or perceived insufficiently effective to achieve community-level compliance[75, 76]. Scalibor collar labels indicate 5-6 months effective duration, though collar

losses from dogs are variably high (range: 0.6-8.2% per month)[50, 52-55, 57, 59, 60], necessitating replacement, particularly in regions of year-round transmission. In this trial, collar losses were 7.5% (95% C.I.: 6.5, 8.6) per month, compared to pheromone lure loss of 2.7% (95% C.I.: 0.26, 5.2) per month.

Conclusions

Manipulation of vector behaviour is an often overlooked but important component of effective vector control. The collective results of this study indicate a potential role of the lure-and-kill approach to combat *L. infantum* transmission in Brazil. The protective effects were not dissimilar to those of the insecticide-impregnated collars, although the confidence intervals around all effect estimates were broad. Notwithstanding, it is reasonable to consider that robustly designed deployment of the lure-and-kill strategy could result in public and veterinary health benefits similar to those globally reported for the Scalibor collars. In order to maximise the synthetic pheromone efficacy, complimentary studies are underway to inform best practice for community-level deployment.

Supporting information

Acknowledgements

We especially thank the veterinary and entomological technicians for their unflagging efforts to complete the fieldwork, and A. Picado for helpful discussions. We are indebted to B. Krishnakumari for synthesis of the pheromone, to Russell IPM for preparing the slow release dispensers, to Ann Underhill for laboratory validation of the lure activity, and to S. Gokool for field assistance. V. Yardley supplied the initial *Leishmania* cultures, S. Mason enabled electronic cross-talk between laboratory and desktop hardware, and V. Camargo-Neves helped obtain historical canine data records. We also thank four external experts invited by the Wellcome Trust to review the trial design and statistical procedures. Finally, we acknowledge the public health workers and study communities for their compliance and participation.

Authors' Contributions

Conceptualization: Orin Courtenay, James G.C. Hamilton
 Formal analysis: Orin Courtenay, Erin Dilger
 Funding acquisition: James G.C. Hamilton, Orin Courtenay
 Investigation: Erin Dilger, Leo A. Calvo-Bado, Lidija Kravar-Gard, Vicky Cooper, Melissa J. Bell, Raquel Goncalves, Muhammad M. Makhdoomi, Mikel A. González, Daniel P. Bray
 Methodology: Erin Dilger, James G.C. Hamilton, Orin Courtenay
 Project administration: Erin Dilger, Daniel P. Bray, Melissa J. Bell, Lidija Kravar-Gard, MJB, RPB, Caris M. Nunes, James G.C. Hamilton, Orin Courtenay
 Resources: Reginaldo P. Brazil, Orin Courtenay, Caris M. Nunes
 Supervision: Reginaldo P. Brazil, Caris M. Nunes, James G.C. Hamilton, Orin Courtenay
 Writing- original draft: Orin Courtenay, James G.C. Hamilton, Erin Dilger
 Writing- review & editing: James G.C. Hamilton, Orin Courtenay, Erin Dilger, Leo A. Calvo-Bado, Lidija Kravar-Gard, Vicky Cooper, Mikel A. González, Caris M. Nunes, Daniel P. Bray

Funding

The work was funded by a Wellcome Trust Strategic Translation Award (WT091689MF) <https://wellcome.ac.uk> The funding body played no role in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, or interpretation of the data, or in writing the manuscript or decision to submit the paper for publication.

Data sharing

The data supporting the conclusions of this article are included within the article and raw data will be available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Role of the funding source

The sponsors of the study and the companies providing the pheromone, insecticide and collars played no role in the design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, writing of the report, or decision to submit the paper for publication. The authors declare no commercial interests. The corresponding author confirm that they had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and material

Data are available from the corresponding authors on reasonable request to be used solely within the context of this study, following the ethical agreements, and with permission from the relevant authorities and co-authors.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Map of study region in Aracatuba, NW São Paulo state, administrative district. Spatial distribution of trial clusters under control (●) collar (△) and pheromone (■) interventions. Magnified section for clusters in Araçatuba city.

Figure 2 Study design and structure.

Figure 3. Canine age-seroprevalence data (symbols) fitted to an incidence-recovery model to provide the best fit (lines) from which annual FOI (incidence λ and recovery ρ) were estimated (results shown in Table 2). Data include 4,882 resident dogs in 42 trial clusters sampled prior to recruitment, categorised here according to the intervention arm to which the clusters were subsequently randomised: pheromone (■, ----, n=1693), collar (◇, ·····, n=1631), and control (●, - - - n=1558) arm. Data also shown for 2,304 dogs resident in 19 towns in the same region sampled in 2006-2008 (△, solid line).

Figure 4. Mean annual incidence (+/- SD) of seroconversion (grey bars) and confirmed parasitological infection (black bars), between trial strata (1 to 3) within control, pheromone and collar intervention arms.

Figure 5. Association between annual incidence estimates of confirmed parasite infection and seroconversion at follow-up in control (●) collar (△) and pheromone (■) intervention clusters.

Supplementary Information

- S1. Intervention dates and intervals for the three trial arms.
- S2. Numbers of dogs recruited to trial arms per period of the study.
- S3. Laboratory methods
- S4. Number of conversions to seropositive and parasite positive per cluster across strata and intervention arms amongst recruited dogs. Crude annual incidence shown for both measures.
- S5. Summary of sand fly trapping effort and capture success in the trial arms.

References

1. WHO. Global vector control response 2017–2030. Geneva: 2017 Contract No.: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.
2. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of malaria control on *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa between 2000 and 2015. *Nature*. 2015;526(7572):207-+. doi: 10.1038/nature15535. PubMed PMID: WOS:000362399000037.
3. Thomsen EK, Koimbu G, Pulford J, Jamea-Maiasa S, Ura Y, Keven JB, et al. Mosquito Behavior Change After Distribution of Bednets Results in Decreased Protection Against Malaria Exposure. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2017;215(5):790-7. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiw615. PubMed PMID: WOS:000398636500020.
4. Shani A. Chemical communication agents (pheromones) in integrated pest management. *Drug Development Research*. 2000;50(3-4):400-5. doi: 10.1002/1098-2299(200007/08)50:3/4<400::aid-ddr22>3.0.co;2-v. PubMed PMID: WOS:000089628000022.
5. Cook SM, Khan ZR, Pickett JA. The use of push-pull strategies in integrated pest management. *Annual Review of Entomology*. 2007;52:375-400. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ento.52.110405.091407. PubMed PMID: WOS:000243653800019.
6. Mansour R, Belzunces LP, Suma P, Zappala L, Mazzeo G, Grissa-Lebdi K, et al. Vine and citrus mealybug pest control based on synthetic chemicals. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*. 2018;38(4). doi: 10.1007/s13593-018-0513-7. PubMed PMID: WOS:000438242300001.
7. Logan JG, Birkett MA. Semiochemicals for biting fly control: their identification and exploitation. *Pest Management Science*. 2007;63(7):647-57. doi: 10.1002/ps.1408. PubMed PMID: WOS:000247958400006.
8. Alvar J, Velez ID, Bern C, Herrero M, Desjeux P, Cano J, et al. Leishmaniasis Worldwide and Global Estimates of Its Incidence. *Plos One*. 2012;7(5). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0035671. PubMed PMID: WOS:000305338500009.
9. Quinnell RJ, Courtenay O. Transmission, reservoir hosts and control of zoonotic visceral leishmaniasis. *Parasitology*. 2009;136(14):1915-34. doi: 10.1017/s0031182009991156. PubMed PMID: WOS:000273515200006.
10. Alexander B, de Carvalho RL, McCallum H, Pereira MH. Role of the domestic chicken (*Gallus gallus*) in the epidemiology of urban visceral leishmaniasis

975 in Brazil. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2002;8(12):1480-5. doi:
976 10.3201/eid0812.010485. PubMed PMID: WOS:000179834300019.

977 11. Ministério da Saúde B. Manual de vigilância e controle da leishmaniose
978 visceral In: *Epidemiológica SdVeSDdV*, editor. 1 ed. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde.;
979 2014. p. 120.

980 12. Camargo-Neves VLF, Glasser, C.M., Cruz, L.L., de Almeida, R.G. Manual de
981 Vigilância e Control da Leishmaniose Visceral Americana de Estado de Sao Paulo.
982 Sao Paulo: 2006.

983 13. Bezerra JMT, de Araujo VEM, Barbosa DS, Martins-Melo FR, Werneck GL,
984 Carneiro M. Burden of leishmaniasis in Brazil and federated units, 1990-2016:
985 Findings from Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Plos Neglected Tropical*
986 *Diseases*. 2018;12(9). doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006697. PubMed PMID:
987 WOS:000446054600011.

988 14. Shimozako HJ, Wu JH, Massad E. The Preventive Control of Zoonotic
989 Visceral Leishmaniasis: Efficacy and Economic Evaluation. *Computational and*
990 *Mathematical Methods in Medicine*. 2017. doi: 10.1155/2017/4797051. PubMed
991 PMID: WOS:000402296600001.

992 15. PAHO/WHO. Leishmaniasis: Epidemiological Report in the Americas 2018;
993 6:[7 p.]. Available from: <http://iris.paho.org/xmlui/handle/123456789/34856>.

994 16. Seva AD, Mao L, Galvis-Ovallos F, Lima JMT, Valle D. Risk analysis and
995 prediction of visceral leishmaniasis dispersion in Sao Paulo State, Brazil. *Plos*
996 *Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2017;11(2). doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005353.
997 PubMed PMID: WOS:000395741700028.

998 17. Harhay MO, Olliaro PL, Costa DL, Costa CHN. Urban parasitology: visceral
999 leishmaniasis in Brazil. *Trends in Parasitology*. 2011;27(9):403-9. doi:
1000 10.1016/j.pt.2011.04.001. PubMed PMID: WOS:000295207500007.

1001 18. Krishnakumari B, Sarita Raj, K., Hamilton, J.G.C. , editor Synthesis of 9-
1002 methylgermacrene from germacrone, an active analogue of (S)-9-methylgermacrene-
1003 B, sex pheromone of Phlebotomine sandfly, *Lutzomyia longipalpis*, from Lapinha
1004 Brazil. IUPAC International conference on Biodiversity and Natural Products:
1005 Chemistry and Medical Applications; 2004 26-31 January 2004; New Delhi (India).

1006 19. Bray DP, Carter V, Alves GB, Brazil RP, Bandi KK, Hamilton JGC.
1007 Synthetic Sex Pheromone in a Long-Lasting Lure Attracts the Visceral Leishmaniasis
1008 Vector, *Lutzomyia longipalpis*, for up to 12 Weeks in Brazil. *Plos Neglected Tropical*
1009 *Diseases*. 2014;8(3). doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002723. PubMed PMID:
1010 WOS:000337348800009.

1011 20. Kelly DW, Dye C. Pheromones, kairomones and the aggregation dynamics of
1012 the sandfly *Lutzomyia longipalpis*. *Animal Behaviour*. 1997;53:721-31. doi:
1013 10.1006/anbe.1996.0309. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1997WW45300005.

1014 21. Morrison AC, Ferro C, Pardo R, Torres M, Wilson ML, Tesh RB. Nocturnal
1015 activity patterns of *Lutzomyia longipalpis* (Diptera, Psychodidae) at an endemic focus
1016 of visceral leishmaniasis in Colombia. *Journal of Medical Entomology*.
1017 1995;32(5):605-17. doi: 10.1093/jmedent/32.5.605. PubMed PMID:
1018 WOS:A1995RT60800007.

1019 22. Quinnell RJ, Dye C. An experimental study of the peridomestic distribution of
1020 *Lyzomyia longipalpis* (Diptera, Psychodidae). *Bulletin of Entomological Research*.
1021 1994;84(3):379-82. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1994QA19700012.

1022 23. Bell MJ, Sedda L, Gonzalez MA, de Souza CF, Dilger E, Brazil RP, et al.
1023 Attraction of *Lutzomyia longipalpis* to synthetic sex-aggregation pheromone: Effect
1024 of release rate and proximity of adjacent pheromone sources. *Plos Neglected Tropical*

- Diseases. 2018;12(12). doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0007007. PubMed PMID: WOS:000455103100037.
24. Bray DP, Bandi KK, Brazil RP, Oliveira AG, Hamilton JGC. Synthetic Sex Pheromone Attracts the Leishmaniasis Vector *Lutzomyia longipalpis* (Diptera: Psychodidae) to Traps in the Field. *Journal of Medical Entomology*. 2009;46(3):428-34. doi: 10.1603/033.046.0303. PubMed PMID: WOS:000265803800003.
25. Bray DP, Alves GB, Dorval ME, Brazil RP, Hamilton JGC. Synthetic sex pheromone attracts the leishmaniasis vector *Lutzomyia longipalpis* to experimental chicken sheds treated with insecticide. *Parasites & Vectors*. 2010;3. doi: 10.1186/1756-3305-3-16. PubMed PMID: WOS:000276434700001.
26. Camargo-Neves VLF. American Visceral Leishmaniasis in the state of São Paulo: current situation. *Boletim Epidemiológico Paulista*. 2007;4(48):12-4.
27. Cardim MFM, Rodas LAC, Dibo MR, Guirado MM, Oliveira AM, Chiaravalloti-Neto F. Introduction and expansion of human American visceral leishmaniasis in the state of Sao Paulo, Brazil, 1999-2011. *Revista De Saude Publica*. 2013;47(4):691-700. doi: 10.1590/s0034-8910.2013047004454. PubMed PMID: WOS:000328944200006.
28. Rangel O, HiramotoI, R.M., Henriques, L.d.F., Taniguchi, H.H., CiaravoloI, R.M.d.C., TolezanoI, J.E., França, A.C.C., Yamashiro, J., Oliveira, S.S.d. Epidemiological classification of cities according to the Program of Surveillance and Control of American Visceral Leishmaniasis in the State of São Paulo, updated in 2013. *Boletim Epidemiológico Paulista*. 2013;10(111):3-14.
29. CiaravoloI RMC, Oliveira, S.S., HiramotoI, R.M., Henriques, L.F., Taniguchi, H.H., Junior, A.V., Spinola, R., Rangell, O., Tolezano, J.E. Classificação Epidemiológica dos Municípios Segundo o Programa de Vigilância e Controle da Leishmaniose Visceral no Estado de São Paulo, dezembro de 2014. *Boletim Epidemiológico Paulista*. 2015;12(143):9-22.
30. Ministério de Saúde.Sistema de informacao de agravos de notificacao (SINAN). [Internet]. 2019 [cited 25/01/19]. Available from: <http://portal.saude.sp.gov.br/cve-centro-de-vigilancia-epidemiologica-prof.-alexandre-vranjac/areas-de-vigilancia/doencas-de-transmissao-por-vetores-e-zoonoses/agravos/leishmaniose-visceral/dados-estatisticos>.
31. Dye C, Davies CR, Lainson R. Communication among Phlebotomine sandflies - a field study of domesticated *Lutzomyia longipalpis* populations in Amazonian Brazil *Animal Behaviour*. 1991;42:183-92. doi: 10.1016/s0003-3472(05)80549-4. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1991GE61300002.
32. Galvis-Ovallos F, Casanova C, Bergamaschi DP, Galati EAB. A field study of the survival and dispersal pattern of *Lutzomyia longipalpis* in an endemic area of visceral leishmaniasis in Brazil. *Plos Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2018;12(4). doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006333. PubMed PMID: WOS:000433487700016.
33. Sidhu S. Evaluation of social and economic factors affecting implementation of novel vector control in Brazil: University of Warwick; 2010.
34. Paulin S, Frenais R, Thomas E, Baldwin PM. Laboratory assessment of the anti-feeding effect for up to 12 months of a slow release deltamethrin collar (Scalibor (R)) against the sand fly *Phlebotomus perniciosus* in dogs. *Parasites & Vectors*. 2018;11. doi: 10.1186/s13071-018-3094-z. PubMed PMID: WOS:000445964400002.
35. David JR, Stamm LM, Bezerra HS, Souza RN, Killick-Kendrick R, Lima JWO. Deltamethrin-impregnated dog collars have a potent anti-feeding and insecticidal effect on *Lutzomyia longipalpis* and *Lutzomyia migonei*. *Memorias Do*

- 1074 Instituto Oswaldo Cruz. 2001;96(6):839-47. PubMed PMID:
1075 WOS:000170361700018.
- 1076 36. Killick-Kendrick R, Killick-Kendrick, M., Focheux, C., Dereure, J., Puech,
1077 M-P., Cadiergues, M.C. Protection of dogs from bites of phlebotomine sandflies by
1078 deltamethrin collars for control of canine leishmaniasis. Medical and Veterinary
1079 Entomology. 1997;(11):105-11.
- 1080 37. Borja LS, de Sousa OMF, Solca MD, Bastos LA, Bordoni M, Magalhaes JT,
1081 et al. Parasite load in the blood and skin of dogs naturally infected by Leishmania
1082 infantum is correlated with their capacity to infect sand fly vectors. Veterinary
1083 Parasitology. 2016;229:110-7. doi: 10.1016/j.vetpar.2016.10.004. PubMed PMID:
1084 WOS:000388549200019.
- 1085 38. Da Silva VG. Aspectos entomológicos e infecção natural dos flebotômíneos
1086 por Leishmania (Leishmania) infantum chagasi em municípios do estado de São
1087 Paulo com autoctonia de transmissão de leishmaniose visceral humana e/ou canina
1088 [Mestre em Ciências]2016.
- 1089 39. Hayes RJ, Moulton, L.H. Cluster randomized trials. Interdisciplinary Statistic
1090 Series. Florida: Chapman & Hall/CRC; 2009.
- 1091 40. Hayes RJ, Bennett S. Simple sample size calculation for cluster-randomized
1092 trials. International Journal of Epidemiology. 1999;28(2):319-26. doi:
1093 10.1093/ije/28.2.319. PubMed PMID: WOS:000079942800022.
- 1094 41. Bottomley C, Kirby MJ, Lindsay SW, Alexander N. Can the buck always be
1095 passed to the highest level of clustering? BMC Medical Research Methodology.
1096 2016;16. doi: 10.1186/s12874-016-0127-1. PubMed PMID: WOS:000371566400001.
- 1097 42. Naylor JC, Smith AFM. Applications of a method for the efficient
1098 computation of posterior distributions. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series
1099 C-Applied Statistics. 1982;31(3):214-25. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1982QC87400003.
- 1100 43. Camargo-Neves V. Aspectos epidemiológicos e avaliação das medidas de
1101 controle da Leishmaniose Visceral Americana no Estado de São Paulo, Brasil.:
1102 Universidade de São Paulo - USP; 2004.
- 1103 44. Dilger E. The effects of host-vector relationships and density dependence on
1104 the epidemiology of visceral leishmaniasis.: University of Warwick; 2013.
- 1105 45. Brown MB, Forsythe AB. Robust test for equality of variances. Journal of the
1106 American Statistical Association. 1974;69(346):364-7. doi: 10.2307/2285659.
1107 PubMed PMID: WOS:A1974T799200012.
- 1108 46. Courtenay O, Macdonald DW, Lainson R, Shaw JJ, Dye C. Epidemiology of
1109 canine leishmaniasis- a comparative serological study of dogs and foxes in Amazon
1110 Brazil. Parasitology. 1994;109:273-9. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1994PK02000002.
- 1111 47. Antoniou M, Messaritakis I, Christodoulou V, Ascoksilaki I, Kanavakis N,
1112 Sutton AJ, et al. Increasing Incidence of Zoonotic Visceral Leishmaniasis on Crete,
1113 Greece. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2009;15(6):932-4. doi:
1114 10.3201/eid1506.071666. PubMed PMID: WOS:000266539100014.
- 1115 48. Lira RA, Cavalcanti MP, Nakazawa M, Ferreira AGP, Silva ED, Abath FGC,
1116 et al. Canine visceral leishmaniosis: A comparative analysis of the EIE-leishmaniose-
1117 visceral-canina-Bio-Manguinhos and the IFI-leishmaniose-visceral-canina-Bio-
1118 Manguinhos kits. Veterinary Parasitology. 2006;137(1-2):11-6. doi:
1119 10.1016/j.vetpar.2005.12.020. PubMed PMID: WOS:000236657200002.
- 1120 49. Kazimoto TA, Amora SSA, Figueiredo FB, Magalhaes JME, Freitas YBN,
1121 Sousa MLR, et al. Impact of 4% Deltamethrin-Impregnated Dog Collars on the
1122 Prevalence and Incidence of Canine Visceral Leishmaniasis. Vector-Borne and

1123 Zoonotic Diseases. 2018;18(7):356-63. doi: 10.1089/vbz.2017.2166. PubMed PMID:
1124 WOS:000430622200001.

1125 50. Reithinger R, Coleman PG, Alexander B, Vieira EP, Assis G, Davies CR. Are
1126 insecticide-impregnated dog collars a feasible alternative to dog culling as a strategy
1127 for controlling canine visceral leishmaniasis in Brazil? International Journal for
1128 Parasitology. 2004;34(1):55-62. doi: 10.1016/j.ipara.2003.09.006. PubMed PMID:
1129 WOS:000188377300007.

1130 51. Lopes EG, Seva AP, Ferreira F, Nunes CM, Keid LB, Hiramoto RM, et al.
1131 Vaccine effectiveness and use of collar impregnated with insecticide for reducing
1132 incidence of Leishmania infection in dogs in an endemic region for visceral
1133 leishmaniasis, in Brazil. Epidemiology and Infection. 2018;146(3):401-6. doi:
1134 10.1017/s0950268817003053. PubMed PMID: WOS:000424741000019.

1135 52. Camargo-Neves V, Rodas LAC, Pauliquvis C Jr. Avaliao da efetividade da
1136 utilizao de coleiras impregnadas com deltametrina a 4% para o controle da
1137 leishmaniose visceral americana no Estado de Sao Paulo: resultados preliminares. So
1138 Paulo: Boletim Epidemiolgico Paulista. 2004;1(12):1-11.

1139 53. Oliveira-Lima JW, Nonato de Souza, R., Teixeira, M. J., Pompeu, M., Killick-
1140 Kendrick, R., & David, J. R., editor Preliminary results of a field trial to evaluate
1141 deltamethrin-impregnated collars for the control of canine leishmaniasis in northeast
1142 Brazil.2002; Seville, Spain: Intervet International bv.

1143 54. Maroli M, Mizzoni V, Siragusa C, D'Orazi A, Gradoni L. Evidence for an
1144 impact on the incidence of canine leishmaniasis by the mass use of deltamethrin-
1145 impregnated dog collars in southern Italy. Medical and Veterinary Entomology.
1146 2001;15(4):358-63. doi: 10.1046/j.0269-283x.2001.00321.x. PubMed PMID:
1147 WOS:000172903600002.

1148 55. Foglia Manzillo V, Oliva G, Pagano A, Manna L, Maroli M, Gradoni L.
1149 Deltamethrin-impregnated collars for the control of canine leishmaniasis: evaluation
1150 of the protective effect and influence on the clinical outcome of Leishmania infection
1151 in kennelled stray dogs. Vet Parasitol. 2006;142(1-2):142-5. doi:
1152 10.1016/j.vetpar.2006.06.029. PubMed PMID: 16884851.

1153 56. Manzillo VF, Oliva G, Pagano A, Manna L, Maroli M, Gradoni L.
1154 Deltamethrin-impregnated collars for the control of canine leishmaniasis: Evaluation
1155 of the-protective effect and influence on the clinical outcome of Leishmania infection
1156 in kennelled stray dogs. Veterinary Parasitology. 2006;142(1-2):142-5. doi:
1157 10.1016/j.vetpar.2006.06.029. PubMed PMID: WOS:000242232300017.

1158 57. Ferroglio E, Poggi M, Trisciuglio A. Evaluation of 65% permethrin spot-on
1159 and deltamethrin-impregnated collars for canine Leishmania infantum infection
1160 prevention. Zoonoses Public Health. 2008;55(3):145-8. doi: 10.1111/j.1863-
1161 2378.2007.01092.x. PubMed PMID: 18331517.

1162 58. Aoun K, Chouihi, E., Boufaden, I., Mahmoud, R., Bouratbine, A., Bedoui, K.
1163 Efficacy of Deltamethrin-impregnated collars Scalibor in the prevention of canine
1164 leishmaniasis in the area of Tunis. Arch Inst Pasteur Tunis. 2008;85(1-4):63-8.

1165 59. Gavgani ASM, Hodjati MH, Mohite H, Davies CR. Effect of insecticide-
1166 impregnated dog collars on incidence of zoonotic visceral leishmaniasis in Iranian
1167 children: a matched-cluster randomised trial. Lancet. 2002;360(9330):374-9. doi:
1168 10.1016/s0140-6736(02)09609-5. PubMed PMID: WOS:000177255600011.

1169 60. Courtenay O, Bazmani, A., Parvizi, P., Ready, P.D., Cameron, M.M.
1170 Insecticide-impregnated dog collars reduce infantile clinical visceral leishmaniasis
1171 under operational conditions in NW Iran: a community-wide cluster randomised trial.
1172 PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases. 2019.

- 1173 61. Silva RA, de Andrade AJ, Quint BB, Raffoul GES, Werneck GL, Rangel EF,
1174 et al. Effectiveness of dog collars impregnated with 4% deltamethrin in controlling
1175 visceral leishmaniasis in *Lutzomyia longipalpis* (Diptera: Psychodidae:
1176 Phlebotominae) populations. *Memorias Do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz*. 2018;113(5). doi:
1177 10.1590/0074-02760170377. PubMed PMID: WOS:000428693000002.
- 1178 62. Quinnell RJ, Dye C. Correlates of the peridomestic abundance of *Lutzomyia*
1179 *longipalpis* (Diptera, Psychodidae) in Amazon Brazil. *Medical and Veterinary*
1180 *Entomology*. 1994;8(3):219-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2915.1994.tb00502.x. PubMed
1181 PMID: WOS:A1994NV98200003.
- 1182 63. Kelly DW, Mustafa Z, Dye C. Differential application of lambda-cyhalothrin
1183 to control the sandfly *Lutzomyia longipalpis*. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*.
1184 1997;11(1):13-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2915.1997.tb00285.x. PubMed PMID:
1185 WOS:A1997WK47000004.
- 1186 64. Kelly DW, Mustafa Z, Dye C. Density-dependent feeding success in a field
1187 population of the sandfly, *Lutzomyia longipalpis*. *Journal of Animal Ecology*.
1188 1996;65(4):517-27. doi: 10.2307/5786. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1996UZ02700011.
- 1189 65. Jones TM, Quinnell RJ. Testing predictions for the evolution of lekking in the
1190 sandfly, *Lutzomyia longipalpis*. *Animal Behaviour*. 2002;63:605-12. doi:
1191 10.1006/anbe.2001.1946. PubMed PMID: WOS:000175391400022.
- 1192 66. Bray DP, Hamilton JGC. Host odor synergizes attraction of virgin female
1193 *Lutzomyia longipalpis* (Diptera : Psychodidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology*.
1194 2007;44(5):779-87. doi: 10.1603/0022-2585(2007)44[779:hosaov]2.0.co;2. PubMed
1195 PMID: WOS:000249179000008.
- 1196 67. Courtenay O, Quinnell RJ, Garcez LM, Shaw JJ, Dye C. Infectiousness in a
1197 cohort of Brazilian dogs: Why culling fails to control visceral leishmaniasis in areas
1198 of high transmission. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2002;186(9):1314-20. doi:
1199 10.1086/344312. PubMed PMID: WOS:000178577500014.
- 1200 68. Courtenay O, Carson C, Calvo-Bado L, Garcez LM, Quinnell RJ.
1201 Heterogeneities in *Leishmania infantum* Infection: Using Skin Parasite Burdens to
1202 Identify Highly Infectious Dogs. *Plos Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2014;8(1). doi:
1203 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002583. PubMed PMID: WOS:000337977300007.
- 1204 69. Vercosa BLA, Lemos CM, Mendonca IL, Silva S, de Carvalho SM, Goto H,
1205 et al. Transmission potential, skin inflammatory response, and parasitism of
1206 symptomatic and asymptomatic dogs with visceral leishmaniasis. *Bmc Veterinary*
1207 *Research*. 2008;4. doi: 10.1186/1746-6148-4-45. PubMed PMID:
1208 WOS:000262310000001.
- 1209 70. de Amorim IFG, da Silva SM, Figueiredo MM, Moura EP, de Castro RS,
1210 Lima TKD, et al. Toll Receptors Type-2 and CR3 Expression of Canine Monocytes
1211 and Its Correlation with Immunohistochemistry and Xenodiagnosis in Visceral
1212 Leishmaniasis. *Plos One*. 2011;6(11). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0027679. PubMed
1213 PMID: WOS:000298168100015.
- 1214 71. Laurenti MD, Rossi CN, da Matta VLR, Tomokane TY, Corbett CEP,
1215 Secundino NFC, et al. Asymptomatic dogs are highly competent to transmit
1216 *Leishmania (Leishmania) infantum* chagasi to the natural vector. *Veterinary*
1217 *Parasitology*. 2013;196(3-4):296-300. doi: 10.1016/j.vetpar.2013.03.017. PubMed
1218 PMID: WOS:000323864500008.
- 1219 72. Giraud E, Martin, O., Yakob, L., Rogers, M. Quantifying *Leishmania*
1220 Metacyclic Promastigotes from Individual Sandfly Bites Reveals the Efficiency of
1221 Vector Transmission. *Communications Biology*. 2019;In Press.

1222 73. Doehl JSP, Bright Z, Dey S, Davies H, Magson J, Brown N, et al. Skin
1223 parasite landscape determines host infectiousness in visceral leishmaniasis. *Nature*
1224 *Communications*. 2017;8. doi: 10.1038/s41467-017-00103-8. PubMed PMID:
1225 WOS:000404778800001.
1226 74. Costa DN, Codeco CT, Silva MA, Werneck GL. Culling dogs in scenarios of
1227 imperfect control: realistic impact on the prevalence of canine visceral leishmaniasis.
1228 *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2013;7(8):e2355. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0002355. PubMed
1229 PMID: 23951375; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3738479.
1230 75. Travi BL, Cordeiro-da-Silva A, Dantas-Torres F, Miro G. Canine visceral
1231 leishmaniasis: Diagnosis and management of the reservoir living among us. *Plos*
1232 *Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2018;12(1). doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006082.
1233 PubMed PMID: WOS:000424022700011.
1234 76. Dantas-Torres F, Otranto D. Best Practices for Preventing Vector-Borne
1235 Diseases in Dogs and Humans. *Trends in Parasitology*. 2016;32(1):43-55. doi:
1236 10.1016/j.pt.2015.09.004. PubMed PMID: WOS:000368206900009.
1237
1238