

1 **A Comparative Analysis of the Relative Efficacy of Vector-**
2 **Control Strategies against Dengue Fever**

3
4 *Marcos Amaku¹, Francisco Antonio Bezerra Coutinho², Silvia Martorano*
5 *Raimundo², Luis Fernandez Lopez^{2,3}, Marcelo Nascimento Burattini², Eduardo*
6 *Massad^{2,4,*}*

7
8 ¹School of Veterinary Medicine, University of São Paulo, Av.Prof. Orlando Marques
9 de Paiva, 87 – Cidade Universitária, São Paulo/SP – CEP 05508 270, Brazil

10 ²School of Medicine, University of Sao Paulo and LIM 01-HCFMUSP, Av. Dr. Arnaldo
11 455, São Paulo/SP – CEP 01246-903, Brazil

12 ³CIARA - Florida International University, Miami, USA

13 ⁴London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London University, Keppel Street,
14 London W1C 7HT, UK

15 * Corresponding author: edmassad@usp.br

16
17 **Short title: Relative Efficacy of Dengue Vectors Control**

18
19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background.** Dengue is considered one of the most important vector-borne infection,
22 affecting almost half the world population with 50 to 100 millions cases every year. In
23 this paper, we present one of the simplest models that can encapsulate all the important
24 variables related to vector control in dengue fever.

25 **Methodology.** The model considers the human population, the adult mosquito
26 population and the population of immature stages, which includes eggs, larvae and
27 pupae. The model also considers the vertical transmission of dengue in the mosquitoes
28 and the seasonal variation in the mosquito population. From this basic model describing
29 the dynamics of dengue infection, we deduce thresholds for avoiding the introduction of
30 the disease and for the elimination of the disease. In particular, we deduce a Basic
31 Reproduction Number for dengue that includes parameters related to the immature
32 stages of the mosquito. By neglecting seasonal variation, we calculate the equilibrium
33 values of the model's variables. We also present a sensitivity analysis of the impact of
34 four vector-control strategies on the Basic Reproduction Number, on the Force of
35 Infection and on the human prevalence of dengue. Each of the strategies was studied
36 separately from the others.

37 **Principal Findings.** The analysis presented allows us to conclude that of the available
38 vector control strategies, adulticide application is the most effective, followed by the
39 reduction of the exposure to mosquito bites, locating and destroying breeding places
40 and, finally, larvicides.

41 **Significance.** Current vector-control methods are concentrated in mechanical
42 destruction of mosquitoes' breeding places. Our results suggest that reducing the
43 contact between vector and hosts (biting rates) are as efficient as the logistically
44 difficult but very efficient adult mosquito's control.

45
46 **Keywords:** dengue, mathematical models, basic reproduction number, force of
47 infection, sensitivity analysis, vector control

48

49 **Author summary**

50 Dengue is a viral disease that affects almost half of the world population. There is no
51 specific treatment and the vaccine is still in its first trials and will not be available for
52 the next three or four years. Controlling the disease is therefore restricted to reduce the
53 number of its vector, mosquitoes from the genus *Aedes*. The available vector-control
54 strategies are the mechanical destruction of the mosquito breeding places (the vector
55 breeds in urban or peri-urban environment), larvicides and adulticides.
56 Here we propose a mathematical model that captures the essence of dengue
57 transmission, from which we derive the main parameters related to the intensity of
58 dengue transmission, namely the Basic Reproduction Number, on the Force of
59 Infection, and on the human prevalence of dengue. We analyze which the parameters of
60 the model these quantities are most sensitive to. We also analyzed the model's
61 sensitivity to the mosquitoes' biting rate and showed that reducing this parameter with
62 repellents and mosquitoes' shields (clothes impregnated with insecticides), along with
63 the increase in the adult mosquito mortality rate by the use of insecticides are the most
64 effective control strategies against dengue.

65 **Introduction**

66 The global expansion of dengue fever is a matter of great concern to public
67 health authorities around the world [1]. In terms of the population at risk, dengue is
68 considered the most important vector-borne disease worldwide. [2,3]. It is estimated
69 that approximately 3.6 billion people, one-half of the world's population, live in parts of
70 the world affected by dengue [4-6], and 120 million people are expected to travel to
71 dengue-affected areas every year [7]. Between 50 and 100 million people are infected
72 each year [8], and the World Health Organization states that the number is rising due to
73 human population growth and the increased spread of vector mosquitoes due to climate
74 change [9]. Recent studies suggest that the figures are much higher [10], with as many
75 as 230 million infections, tens of millions of cases of dengue fever (DF) and millions of
76 cases of dengue hemorrhagic fever DHF [6,11,12]. The number of disability-adjusted
77 life years (DALYs) worldwide is estimated to range between 528 and 621 per million
78 population [10, 13], and the total cost of dengue cases in the affected areas of the world
79 may be approximately 2 billion dollars annually [8].

80 Dengue viruses are transmitted by mosquitoes of the genus *Aedes*, subgenus
81 *Stegomyia* [10]. The principal vector, *Aedes Stegomyia aegypti*, is now well established
82 in much of the tropical and subtropical world, particularly in urban areas. It is a
83 domestic species, highly susceptible to dengue virus infection, feeding preferentially on
84 human blood during the daytime and often taking multiple blood meals during a single
85 gonotrophic cycle [13]. It typically breeds in clean stagnant water in artificial containers
86 and is, therefore, well adapted to urban life. A second species, *Aedes Stegoymia*
87 *albopictus*, is generally considered less effective as an epidemic vector because, unlike
88 *A. aegypti*, it feeds on many animals other than humans and is less strongly associated
89 with the domestic environment [14].

90 Several reasons have been proposed for the dramatic global emergence of
91 dengue as a major public health problem. Major global demographic changes have
92 occurred, the most important of which have been uncontrolled urbanization and
93 concurrent population growth. The public health infrastructure of many of the affected
94 countries has deteriorated. Increases in international travel provide an efficient
95 mechanism for the human transport of dengue viruses between urban centers, resulting
96 in the frequent exchange of dengue viruses. Climatic changes influence the mosquito's
97 survival and proliferation [15]. Finally, effective mosquito control is virtually
98 nonexistent in many dengue-endemic countries [16, 17].

99 Essentially, the control of dengue has been based on three strategies [18]: source
100 reduction (locating and destroying mosquitoes' breeding places), larvicides and ultra-
101 low volume (ULV) application of aerosol adulticides. The first two strategies have been
102 applied with varying degrees of success. However, there is still considerable
103 controversy over the efficacy of the current methods for controlling adult mosquitoes
104 [18]. At the time of the advent of DDT, *Aedes aegypti* was highly susceptible to this
105 agent [18]. The successful application of DDT resulted in the eradication of *Aedes*
106 *aegypti* from 22 countries in the Americas in 1962 and from all countries in the
107 Mediterranean region in 1972. However, the fate of DDT is well known. DDT was
108 abandoned due to the evolution of resistant insects and due to the environmental
109 impacts of the insecticide. Therefore, the control of dengue shifted to other approaches:
110 source reduction, larvicides and adulticides from other chemical families.

111 From a theoretical perspective, significant advances were made by Macdonald
112 [19], who proposed that the most effective control strategy against vector-borne
113 infections is to kill adult mosquitoes.

114 Recently, in a study for describing the dynamics of dengue, we showed that the
115 models describing infections transmitted by blood-sucking insects are indeed very
116 sensitive to the mosquitoes' mortality rate [20].

117 The current paper differs from the ones previously published [15, 20, 21] in the
118 following sense: In [21] the model's basic structure is presented, in particular it presents
119 a new seasonality factor. Thus, paper [21] was designed to test one hypothesis to
120 explain dengue's overwintering; in [20] the model presented in [21] was numerically
121 simulated in order to mimic Singapore data. In addition, an incomplete sensitivity
122 analysis was presented, which intended to show that killing adult mosquitoes was the
123 most effective strategy, as demonstrated numerically in that paper. The role of larvicide
124 as an important tool to avoid the resurgence of outbreaks was proposed based only in
125 numerical simulations. The paper by Massad et al. [15] is a review of the previous
126 papers and does not add anything new on control.

127 The current paper is an analysis of the basic model proposed in [21] and
128 numerically studied in [20].

129 In this paper, we present what we consider to be the simplest model that
130 encapsulates all the important variables related to dengue control, and we analyze four
131 control strategies for use against the vectors of dengue. All the relevant stages are
132 included and the ones not included (like larvae and pupae) can be trivially added to the

133 model and a complete analysis of the sensitivity of transmission to the parameters is
 134 presented.

135

136

137 **Methods**

138 **The basic model**

139 The basic model that is used to calculate the efficiency of control strategies can
 140 be found in [15, 20, 21].

141 The populations involved in the transmission are human hosts, mosquitoes and
 142 their eggs. For the purposes of this paper, the term “eggs” also includes the intermediate
 143 stages, such as larvae and pupae. Therefore, the population densities are divided into the
 144 following compartments: susceptible humans denoted S_H ; infected humans, I_H ;
 145 recovered (and immune) humans, R_H ; total humans, N_H ; susceptible mosquitoes, S_M ;
 146 infected and latent mosquitoes, L_M ; infected and infectious mosquitoes, I_M ; non-infected
 147 eggs, S_E ; and infected eggs, I_E . The variables appearing in the model are summarized in
 148 Table 1.

149 The model is defined by the following equations:

150

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dS_H}{dt} &= -abI_M \frac{S_H}{N_H} - \mu_H S_H + r_H N_H \left(1 - \frac{N_H}{\kappa_H}\right) \\
 \frac{dI_H}{dt} &= abI_M \frac{S_H}{N_H} - (\mu_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H) I_H \\
 \frac{dR_H}{dt} &= \gamma_H I_H - \mu_H R_H \\
 \frac{dS_M}{dt} &= pc_S(t) S_E - \mu_M S_M - acS_M \frac{I_H}{N_H} \\
 \frac{dL_M}{dt} &= acS_M \frac{I_H}{N_H} - \gamma_M L_M - \mu_M L_M \\
 \frac{dI_M}{dt} &= \gamma_M L_M - \mu_M I_M + pc_S(t) I_E \\
 \frac{dS_E}{dt} &= [r_M S_M + (1-g)r_M (I_M + L_M)] \left(1 - \frac{(S_E + I_E)}{\kappa_E}\right) - \mu_E S_E - pc_S(t) S_E \\
 \frac{dI_E}{dt} &= [gr_M (I_M + L_M)] \left(1 - \frac{(S_E + I_E)}{\kappa_E}\right) - \mu_E I_E - pc_S(t) I_E \\
 N_H &= S_H + I_H + R_H \\
 N_M &= S_M + L_M + I_M \\
 N_E &= S_E + I_E
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

151

152

153

154 where $c_s(t) = (d_1 - d_2 \sin(2\pi ft + \phi))$ is a factor mimicking seasonal influences in the
155 mosquito population [21,22].

156

157 *Remark: This model differs from the classical Ross-Macdonald model because the*
158 *extrinsic incubation period in the classical Ross-Macdonald model is assumed to last*
159 *τ days, whereas in model (1) we assumed an exponential distribution for the latency in*
160 *the mosquitoes. The classical Ross- Macdonald model can be obtained from system (1)*
161 *by replacing the fifth and sixth equations by*

162

$$\frac{dL_M}{dt} = acS_M \frac{I_H}{N_H} - \mu_M L_M - acS_M(t-\tau) \frac{I_H(t-\tau)}{N_H(t-\tau)} e^{-\mu_M \tau}$$
$$\frac{dI_M}{dt} = acS_M(t-\tau) \frac{I_H(t-\tau)}{N_H(t-\tau)} e^{-\mu_M \tau} - \mu_M I_M + pc_S(t) I_E$$

164

165 where τ is the extrinsic incubation period and μ_M is the mosquito mortality rate. The
166 expressions developed below in this paper with equations (1) can be replaced by the
167 corresponding expressions of the classical Ross-Macdonald model described above by

168 replacing $\frac{\gamma_M}{\gamma_M + \mu_M}$ by $e^{-\mu_M \tau}$. γ_M is related to τ by $\tau = \frac{1}{\mu_M} \ln \left[\frac{\gamma_M}{\gamma_M + \mu_M} \right]$.

169

170 **Equilibrium densities in the absence of seasonality**

171 The equilibrium densities of model (1) can be calculated exactly in the case
172 where seasonality can be neglected, i.e., with $c_s(t) = c_s = \text{constant}$.

173 We begin by examining the steady-state values with $\alpha_H = 0$, i.e., with no
174 disease-induced mortality in the human population. Because we set $\alpha_H = 0$, we denote
175 the model variables with a superscript zero. By setting the derivatives in system (1) and
176 α_H equal to zero, it is straightforward to solve the resulting system of nonlinear
177 equations. The results are:

178

$$179 \quad N_H^0 = \kappa_H \left(\frac{r_H - \mu_H}{r_H} \right) \quad (2)$$

180

181
$$N_M = N_M^0 = \frac{pc_S}{\mu_M} \kappa_E \left[1 - \frac{(\mu_M)(\mu_E + pc_S)}{r_M pc_S} \right] \quad (3)$$

182

183
$$N_E = N_E^0 = \kappa_E \left[1 - \frac{(\mu_M)(\mu_E + pc_S)}{r_M pc_S} \right] \quad (4)$$

184

185 Note that N_M and N_E do not depend on the disease mortality in the human population,

186 i.e., they do not depend on α_H .

187

188
$$I_H^0 = \frac{(\gamma_M + g\mu_M)a^2bcN_M - N_H^0(\mu_H + \gamma_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)\mu_M(1-g)}{(\gamma_M + g\mu_M)a^2bc \frac{N_M}{N_H^0} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H} \right) + ac(\mu_H + \gamma_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)} \quad (5)$$

189

190
$$R_H^0 = \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H} I_H^0 \quad (6)$$

191
$$S_H^0 = N_H^0 - I_H^0 - R_H^0 \quad (7)$$

192

193

194
$$S_M^0 = \frac{(1-g)r_M N_M (\kappa_E - N_E) pc_S}{\kappa_E \left(\mu_M + ac \frac{I_H^0}{N_H^0} \right) (\mu_E + pc_S) - gr_M pc_S (\kappa_E - N_E)} \quad (8)$$

195

196
$$I_M^0 = \frac{(\mu_H + \gamma_H) I_H^0}{ab \left(1 - \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H} \right) \frac{I_H^0}{N_H^0} \right)} \quad (9)$$

197

198
$$L_M^0 = \frac{ac \frac{I_H^0}{N_H^0} S_M^0}{\gamma_M + \mu_M} \quad (10)$$

199

200

201
$$S_E^0 = \frac{[r_M S_M^0 + (1-g)r_M (N_M - S_M^0)] (\kappa_E - N_E)}{\kappa_E (\mu_E + pc_S)} \quad (11)$$

202

203
$$I_E^0 = N_E^0 - S_E^0 \quad (12)$$

204

205

206

207 If $\alpha_H \neq 0$, the total numbers of mosquitoes and eggs do not change. The expression for
 208 N_H is complicated, but it is straightforward to calculate I_H as a function of N_H as
 209 follows:

$$211 \quad \frac{I_H}{N_H} = \frac{(\gamma_M + g\mu_M)a^2bc \frac{N_M}{N_H} - (\mu_H + \gamma_H + \alpha_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)\mu_M(1-g)}{(\gamma_M + g\mu_M)a^2bc \frac{N_M}{N_H} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H}\right) + ac(\mu_H + \gamma_H + \alpha_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)} \quad (13)$$

212
 213 Alternatively, we can write
 214

$$215 \quad \frac{I_H}{N_H} = -\frac{\mu_H}{\alpha_H} + \frac{r_H}{\alpha_H} \left(1 - \frac{N_H}{\kappa_H}\right) \quad (14)$$

216
 217
 218 If the disease induces mortality in the human population ($\alpha_H \neq 0$), N_H depends on α_H
 219 and is specified by a somewhat complicated expression. We will first obtain an
 220 expression for N_H as a function of α_H . This expression is based on perturbation theory.
 221 The exact expression for N_H is presented subsequently.

222
 223 **Estimating N_H by perturbation theory**

224 An expression for N_H can be obtained with perturbation theory. First, we sum the
 225 first three equations of system (1) to obtain

$$227 \quad \frac{dN_H}{dt} = r_H N_H \left(1 - \frac{N_H}{\kappa_H}\right) - \mu_H N_H - \alpha_H I_H \quad (15),$$

228
 229 At equilibrium, this expression yields
 230

$$231 \quad r_H N_H \left(1 - \frac{N_H}{\kappa_H}\right) - \mu_H N_H - \alpha_H I_H = 0 \quad (16)$$

232
 233 Next, we expand N_H and I_H in powers of α_H :

$$235 \quad N_H = N_H^0 + \alpha_H N_H^1 + \alpha_H^2 N_H^1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_H^3) \quad (17)$$

$$236 \quad I_H = I_H^0 + \alpha_H I_H^1 + \alpha_H^2 I_H^1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_H^3) \quad (18)$$

238

239 Neglecting the higher-order terms (because α_H is assumed to be very small) in (17) and
 240 (18) and substituting in (16), we obtain, after some algebraic manipulations:

241

$$242 \quad N_H = N_H^0 - \frac{\alpha_H I_H^0}{r_H - \mu_H} \quad (19)$$

243

244 where N_H^0 and I_H^0 are given by equations (2) and (5).

245

246

247 **The exact calculation of N_H**

248 The value of α_H for dengue is such that an individual who is sick for five days

249 has a probability of dying of the order of 0.2%, i.e., a negligible impact on human

250 demography. However, although it is reasonable to neglect α_H for dengue, it is not

251 reasonable to do so for other vector-borne infections, such as yellow fever or malaria.

252 We therefore need the exact expression for N_H given below.

253 First, we define:

254

$$255 \quad \Gamma = (\gamma_M + g\mu_M)a^2bcN_M \quad (20)$$

256

257 where N_M is given by equation (3), and

258

$$259 \quad \theta = (\mu_H + \gamma_H + \alpha_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M) \quad (21)$$

260

261 Next, we define:

262

$$263 \quad \Pi = acr_H\theta \quad (22),$$

$$264 \quad \Theta = -\left[ac\theta\kappa_H(r_H - \mu_H) - \Gamma r_H \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H}\right) + \theta\mu_M\alpha_H\kappa_H(1 - g)\right] \quad (23)$$

265 and

$$266 \quad \Omega = -\Gamma\kappa_H(r_H - \mu_H) \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H}\right) + \Gamma\alpha_H\kappa_H \quad (24)$$

267

268 Finally,

269

270
$$N_H = \frac{-\Theta + \sqrt{\Theta^2 - 4\Pi\Omega}}{2\Pi} \quad (25)$$

271

272 This expression reduces to equation (2) if $\alpha_H = 0$.

273

274

275 **Sensitivity of the variables to the parameters**

276 If seasonality is neglected (i.e., $c_s(t) = \text{constant}$), the variables attain steady
 277 states, as we have shown above. To estimate the sensitivity of a model variable in
 278 steady state, V_i , to a parameter θ_j , we consider the relative variation in the parameter,

279 $\frac{\Delta\theta_j}{\theta_j}$. This variation will correspond to a variation $\frac{\Delta V_i}{V_i}$ in the model variable V_i given

280 by:

281

282

283

284
$$\frac{\Delta V_i}{V_i} = \frac{\theta_j}{V_i} \frac{[V_i(\theta_j + \Delta\theta_j) - V_i(\theta_j)] \Delta\theta_j}{\Delta\theta_j \theta_j} \quad (26).$$

285

286

287 This expression can be approximated by [23,24]:

288

289

290
$$\frac{\Delta V_i}{V_i} = \frac{\theta_j}{V_i} \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial \theta_j} \frac{\Delta\theta_j}{\theta_j} + \frac{1}{2!} \frac{\theta_j^2}{V_i^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_i}{\partial \theta_j^2} \left(\frac{\Delta\theta_j}{\theta_j} \right)^2 + \dots \quad (27)$$

291

292 Usually, the second- and higher-order terms can be neglected provided that the relative

293 variation in the parameter, $\frac{\Delta\theta_j}{\theta_j}$, is sufficiently small.

294

295 **The sensitivity of the Basic Reproduction Number to the model's parameters**

296 Linearizing the second, the fifth, the sixth and the eight equations of model (1)

297 around the trivial solution (no-infection), we obtain the threshold normally denoted R_0

298 in the literature (details can be found in [21]).

299

300
$$R_0 = \frac{a^2bc(\bar{N}_M / \bar{N}_H)(g\mu_M + \gamma_M)}{(\mu_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)\mu_M(1-g)} \quad (28)$$

301

302 where \bar{N}_M and \bar{N}_H denote the density of mosquitoes and of humans in the absence of
 303 disease, respectively. Note that if $g = 0$, i.e., no vertical transmission, the expression

304 (28) for R_0 reduces to the classical Macdonald equation [25]. As mentioned above, to

305 obtain the classical Macdonald equation we replace $\frac{\gamma_M}{\gamma_M + \mu_M}$ by $e^{-\mu_M\tau}$. The case of

306 $g \rightarrow 1$ will be examined in the Discussion section.

307 Alternatively, we can deduce a threshold, T_h , for the existence of endemic
 308 equilibrium values for the human prevalence of the disease. This threshold is given by
 309 equation (13):

310

311

312
$$\frac{I_H}{N_H} = \frac{(\gamma_M + g\mu_M)a^2bc\frac{N_M}{N_H} - (\mu_H + \gamma_H + \alpha_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)\mu_M(1-g)}{(\gamma_M + g\mu_M)a^2bc\frac{N_M}{N_H}\left(1 - \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H}\right) + ac(\mu_H + \gamma_H + \alpha_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)}$$

313

314

315 If

316

317

318
$$\frac{I_H}{N_H} \geq 0 ,$$

319

320

321 then an endemic state exists. For this outcome, it suffices that

322

323

324
$$(\gamma_M + g\mu_M)a^2bc\frac{N_M}{N_H} - (\mu_H + \gamma_H + \alpha_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)\mu_M(1-g) \geq 0 \quad (29)$$

325

326

327 or

328

329
$$T_h = \frac{a^2bc(N_M / N_H)(g\mu_M + \gamma_M)}{(\mu_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H)(\mu_M + \gamma_M)\mu_M(1-g)} \geq 1 ,$$

330

331

332 which coincides with expression (28) if $T_h \leq 1$ because then $N_M = \bar{N}_M$ and $N_H = \bar{N}_H$.
 333 This result also holds if $\alpha_H = 0$, i.e., if the disease has no influence on the population
 334 size. Note that in our model, because the disease has no influence on the size of the
 335 mosquito population, $N_M = \bar{N}_M$ always holds.

336 We begin the sensitivity analysis by considering the impact of a form of control
 337 of dengue vectors that is still unusual, namely, reducing the contact of the population
 338 with mosquito bites. This form of control is represented by mosquito shields (repellent-
 339 impregnated cloths), repellents and the use of bed-nets. The use of bed-nets is very
 340 effective against malaria [26] because it reduces the amount of contact between the
 341 anopheline vectors and susceptible humans, the biting rate parameter a of model (1).
 342 We are aware that this strategy is effective against Anopheles mosquitoes because these
 343 vectors bite at twilight and early at night. In contrast, Aedes mosquitoes bite primarily
 344 during the day. We include this analysis here for the sake of generality and also because
 345 the use of repellents and mosquito shields can produce the same reduction in the biting
 346 rate a and can be applied against Aedes mosquitoes. The partial derivative of R_0 with
 347 respect to a is given by

$$349 \quad \frac{\partial R_0}{\partial a} = \frac{R_0}{a} \left[2 - \frac{a}{N_H} \frac{\partial N_H}{\partial a} \right] \quad (30)$$

350
 351 Next, we analyze the impact of reducing the carrying capacity of the immature forms,
 352 κ_E , on the magnitude of R_0 . This reduction represents a component of the strategy of
 353 mechanical control, i.e., the identification and destruction of the places where Aedes
 354 mosquitoes breed. The partial derivative of R_0 with respect to κ_E is given by

$$356 \quad \frac{\partial R_0}{\partial \kappa_E} = R_0 \left\{ \frac{pc_S}{N_M \mu_M} \left[1 - \frac{\mu_M (\mu_E + pc_S)}{r_M pc_S} \right] - \frac{1}{N_H} \frac{\partial N_H}{\partial \kappa_E} \right\} \quad (31)$$

357
 358
 359 The use of larvicides is assumed to increase the mortality rate of the larvae, μ_E .
 360 Therefore, the impact of such a strategy is a function of the partial derivative of R_0 with
 361 respect to μ_E , which is

362

$$363 \quad \frac{\partial R_0}{\partial \mu_E} = -R_0 \left(\frac{\kappa_E}{r_M N_M} + \frac{1}{N_H} \frac{\partial N_H}{\partial \mu_E} \right) \quad (32)$$

364

365 Finally, we take the partial derivative of R_0 with respect to the mosquito mortality rate
366 μ_M to estimate the impact of the application of adulticides as a control strategy against
367 the dengue vectors. The result is given by

368

$$369 \quad \frac{\partial R_0}{\partial \mu_M} = R_0 \left[\frac{1}{\mu_M + \gamma_M} + \frac{1}{\mu_M (1-g)} - \frac{pc_s \kappa_E}{\mu_M^2 N_M} - \frac{1}{N_H} \frac{\partial N_H}{\partial \mu_M} \right] \quad (33)$$

370

371 Given these partial derivatives, we can calculate the sensitivity of R_0 to the four
372 parameters above and thereby estimate the relative efficiencies of the control strategies
373 for avoiding the introduction of dengue into a non-infected area. To perform these
374 calculations, we consider equation (27) for each of the parameters. For dengue, the last
375 term in equations (30)-(33), involving the derivative of N_H , is always very small
376 relative to the previous terms. The results of the sensitivity analysis, with parameters'
377 values as in Table 2, are shown in Table 3.

378

379

380 **The sensitivity of the Force of Infection and the human prevalence to the model's**
381 **parameters**

382

383 The concept of 'force of infection' for vector-borne infection first appears in the
384 seminal works of Ronald Ross [27], who termed it the effective inoculation rate and
385 denoted it as h , for 'dependent happening'. The concept was further elaborated by
386 George MacDonald [19] who, in a now-famous appendix to his paper 'The Analysis of
387 Equilibrium in Malaria', defined the inoculation rate as

388

$$389 \quad h = mabs \quad (34)$$

390

391 where m is the mosquito density relative to the human population ($\frac{N_M}{N_H}$ in our notation),
 392 a is the mosquito's daily rate of biting, b is the probability of infection from
 393 mosquitoes to humans and s is a quantity that Macdonald termed the 'Sporozoite Rate',
 394 i.e., the prevalence of infection in the mosquitoes ($\frac{I_M}{N_M}$ in our notation). Note that
 395 equation (34) is now expressed as

$$396 \quad \lambda = ab \frac{I_M}{N_H} \quad (35)$$

397 where
 398
 399

$$400 \quad I_M = \frac{N_H (\mu_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H) \frac{I_H}{N_H}}{ab \left(1 - \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H} \right) \frac{I_H}{N_H} \right)} \quad (36)$$

401
 402

403 Before we analyze the sensitivity of the force of infection to the model's parameters
 404 related to control, we first deduce a relationship between λ and R_0 .

405 We begin by substituting I_M of equation (36) in equation (35) to obtain

$$406 \quad \lambda = \frac{(\mu_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H) \frac{I_H}{N_H}}{\left(1 - \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H} \right) \frac{I_H}{N_H} \right)} \quad (37)$$

407

408 If $\alpha_H \approx 0$, the human prevalence, $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$, can be expressed in terms of R_0 as follows:

409

$$410 \quad \frac{I_H}{N_H} = \frac{\mu_M (1-g)(R_0 - 1)}{\mu_M (1-g)R_0 \left(1 + \frac{\gamma_H}{\mu_H} \right) + \mu_H ac} \quad (38)$$

411

412

413 Therefore:

414

415

$$416 \quad \lambda = \frac{\mu_M (1-g)(\mu_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H) \mu_H (R_0 - 1)}{\mu_M (1-g)(\mu_H + \gamma_H) + \mu_H ac} \quad (39)$$

417
418

419 The partial derivatives of λ and $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$ with respect to the parameters θ_j are readily
420 calculated and the sensitivity of λ and $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$ to the parameters estimated.

421
422
423

424 **Results**

425
426
427

426 *Numerical simulations*

428 We simulated model (1) with the parameter values available from the literature.
429 However, it is known that these parameters vary with the place, local temperature,
430 climatic factors, mosquito strains and human demography. Therefore, we applied a
431 Monte Carlo simulation algorithm [28] to generate parameter distributions that could
432 mimic real conditions. We used a Beta-distributed random number generator with equal
433 parameters to guarantee the symmetry of the distribution around the mean. Because the
434 Beta distribution with equal parameters has a mean of 0.5, we multiplied the final result
435 by 2. We ran the Monte Carlo algorithm one thousand times to generate the
436 distributions of the parameters. The parameters' baseline values, the mean values of the
437 simulation, the variance and the 95% confidence intervals for each parameter are shown
438 in Table 2.

439
440

440 *Results of the sensitivity analysis*

441

442 Table 3 shows the results of the sensitivity analysis according to the general
443 equation (27). The results represent the relative amount of variation (expressed in
444 percentual variation) in the variable if we vary the parameters by 1%.

445

446 Note from Table 3 that R_0 , λ and $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$ show the greatest sensitivities to the
447 mosquito's mortality rate μ_M , followed by the biting rate a and the carrying capacity of
448 the immature stages κ_E . In addition, R_0 , λ and $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$ are very insensitive to the larval
449 mortality rate μ_E . Accordingly, a reduction of 1% in the biting rate a or the carrying

450 capacity of the immature stages κ_E decreases R_0 by 1.94% and 0.69%, respectively, it
451 decreases λ by 5.02% and 2.32%, and decreases $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$ by 2.67% and 1.34%
452 respectively. Also, an increase of 1% in the mosquito mortality rate μ_M causes a
453 decrease of 2.42% in R_0 , of 5.40% in λ and of 3.20% in $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$. In contrast, increasing
454 the larval mortality rate μ_E by 1% decreases R_0 , λ and $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$ by only 0.000828%,
455 0.00193%, 0.0231% respectively. These differences in the sensitivity of R_0 , λ and
456 $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$ to parameter variation can be understood from equation (27). Although the partial
457 derivatives of λ with respect to the parameters are smaller than the partial derivatives of
458 R_0 with respect to the parameters, the ratio $\frac{\theta_j}{\lambda} \gg \frac{\theta_j}{R_0}$. The same applies for $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$.

459

460 Discussion

461

462 The knowledge of dengue epidemiology accumulated over the past decades
463 enables us to conclude that the transmission thresholds and the intensity of dengue
464 transmission are determined by several factors: the level of immune protection of the
465 population involved; the serotype of dengue virus circulating at each time; the density,
466 longevity and biting behavior of the mosquitoes; the climate; and the demography of the
467 human hosts [29]. Despite the current development of a safe and effective tetravalent
468 vaccine [1], vector control is still the only available strategy to minimize the number of
469 cases within the affected populations. To date, however, the effectiveness of the
470 strategies for controlling Aedes mosquitoes has been limited. The analysis presented in
471 this paper is intended to contribute to the efforts to check the advance of dengue to areas
472 still free from the disease and to reduce transmission in endemic areas.

473 This paper presents the most complete analysis of what is a basic model for
474 dengue transmission. All the relevant stages are included and the ones not included (like
475 larvae and pupae) can be trivially added to the model.

476 The current paper is an analysis of the basic model proposed in [21] and
477 numerically studied in [20]. The fact that the extrinsic incubation period is changed

478 from being modeled as a fixed time delay to being modeled as an exponentially
479 distributed time period is not relevant for the proposed analysis. As mentioned above,
480 the expressions developed below in this paper with equations (1) can be replaced by the
481 corresponding expressions of the classical Ross-Macdonald model described above by
482 replacing $\frac{\gamma_M}{\gamma_M + \mu_M}$ by $e^{-\mu_M \tau}$. In other words, the results of the analysis are the same,
483 irrespective of the way we choose to model the incubation period. Actually, the main
484 difference between this paper and the previous ones [15, 20, 21] is that in the current
485 study we analyze the sensitivity of the endemic equilibrium to variation in the
486 parameters related to transmission in a much more complete way than before. The
487 sensitivity analysis presented in the previous papers consisted only in the derivation of
488 the partial derivatives of R_0 with respect to the parameters. This is only part of the
489 sensitivity analysis. In the present paper, the calculation of sensitivity of R_0 to the
490 parameters is completed (equation (27)). In addition, we calculated the equilibrium
491 prevalence for the model, obtaining expressions that are completely new, like equation
492 (37) which relates the force of infection to the prevalence of the disease in humans and
493 to the parameters of transmission relative to the humans hosts only. With this
494 expression we propose the estimation of the force of infection for dengue as a function
495 of the equilibrium prevalence in humans.
496 Furthermore, the current and complete sensitivity analysis includes the force of
497 infection and the prevalence of dengue in humans. Finally, the sensitivity of the basic
498 reproduction number and the force of infection to the biting rate is also a quite new
499 finding.

500 Ellis et al. [30] have approached the problem of the sensitivity of dengue by
501 numerically simulating two coupled models, one describing the vector population and
502 the other the host population. These models are extremely complex, including a total of
503 99 parameters for the vector and host populations. Although the calculations based on
504 these models are very important, they mask the dynamics involved. In contrast, the
505 dynamics of dengue constitute the main interest of our paper. Our model contains only
506 16 parameters and admits an analytical solution that can be compared with the classical
507 models designed for the study of vector-borne infections. These differences
508 notwithstanding, the results of Ellis et al. [30] are qualitatively similar to the results that
509 we obtained.

510 Some of the findings of the current paper are qualitatively similar to previous
511 results. However, this is the first paper that proposes a quantification of the relative
512 efficacy of different control strategies. In other words, we are now able to say how
513 much killing adult mosquitoes is more efficient than killing immature stages, for
514 instance.

515 Our results identify the control of adult mosquitoes as the most effective strategy
516 to reduce both R_0 , λ and $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$. However, we are aware that the effectiveness of this
517 strategy is severely constrained, e.g., by the difficulty of achieving sufficiently high
518 coverage of the surfaces used by the mosquitoes for resting [29,31] and by the
519 limitations of ultra-low volume insecticide spraying, which involves a low probability
520 of contact between adult mosquitoes and the insecticide droplets [18].

521 The second most effective strategy is the reduction of the contact between the
522 vectors and hosts, quantified by the daily biting rate a . This strategy has been
523 successfully applied in malaria control, e.g., through the use of insecticide-impregnated
524 bed-nets. This approach to malaria control is effective [38] because the malaria
525 mosquito bites at night. *Aedes* mosquitoes, in contrast, are day-biting mosquitoes, and
526 bed nets are not a feasible method to avoid their bites. In certain countries, however,
527 people habitually take a *siesta*, a rest during the afternoon [18]. In addition, insecticide-
528 treated clothes (ITCs) used as personal protection against malaria infection [18] are
529 beginning to be tested against dengue [10].

530 The next strategy suggested by the analysis of the model's sensitivity involves
531 the carrying capacity of the immature stages, κ_E . This strategy is associated with the
532 mechanical control of the sources of the mosquitoes. Our assumption is that by
533 destroying mosquitoes' breeding places, we are reducing κ_E .

534 It is probable that this approach is the most widespread strategy for the control
535 of dengue in endemic regions. However, the results obtained from this strategy have
536 been disappointing. It is probable that these disappointing results are due to the lack of
537 cooperation by the affected communities, which often hampers the application of the
538 method. Unfortunately, R_0 was not found to be very sensitive to this strategy. A 1%
539 reduction in κ_E yielded only a 0.69% reduction in R_0 . The force of infection, in
540 contrast, was shown to be relatively sensitive to variation in κ_E . A 1% reduction in this

541 parameter yielded a 2.32% reduction in λ . Finally, a 1% reduction in κ_E caused a
542 reduction of 1.34% in the human prevalence.

543

544 The least effective strategy analyzed was the use of larvicide. This strategy is
545 expected to increase the mortality rate of immature stages, μ_E . Both R_0 and λ vary by a
546 fraction on the order of 10^{-3} percent, and $\frac{I_H}{N_H}$ varies by a fraction on the order of 10^{-2}
547 percent if we vary μ_E by 1%.

548 Obviously, the possible control strategies analyzed in this paper are expected to
549 be applied in combination, although we studied each of them in isolation. In addition, it
550 is necessary to carry out a study of financial costs and logistic feasibility to determine
551 the most effective vector control strategy against dengue.

552 The theoretical case of 100% vertical transmission ($g = 1$), i.e., the case in which
553 all of the eggs from the latent and infected mosquitoes are infected, is interesting. In
554 fact, a structural change occurs in our model if $g \rightarrow 1$. The populations of susceptible
555 and infected eggs become completely decoupled. It can be verified that the disease can
556 sustain itself even without human hosts. Actually, as shown by previous authors [32],
557 this is the only way in which the infection circulates exclusively among the vectors in
558 the absence of hosts.

559 In addition, if $g = 1$ and human hosts are introduced into the system, the
560 evolution of the system over time results in a situation in which all mosquitoes are
561 infected because all of the eggs of the infected mosquitoes are infected. Therefore, if
562 $g = 1$ and human hosts are introduced, the population of susceptible mosquitoes and
563 eggs decreases to zero. This result can be verified from equations (8) and (11).

564 Our approach has some important simplifications with respect to reality. The
565 first one is the homogeneously mixing assumption. According to this assumption, the
566 density of every subpopulation is the same everywhere and from the model it seems as
567 if every single infected mosquito has the same probability of contacting every host.
568 Actually, this is not true and it is a notational artifact. In the appendix we explain how
569 this notational artifact can be eliminated. Furthermore, we show how to relax the
570 homogeneously mixing assumption and analyze some consequences of this.

571 The second limitation is that the model predicts a stable endemic equilibrium,
572 which is seldom observed. One reason for this is that in this model, for simplification,

573 we exclude seasonality, which precludes the existence of such equilibrium for long
574 periods of time. The relative sensitivity of the variables to the parameters, however, is
575 also valid (actually to a very good approximation) for non-equilibrium situations. This
576 have already been demonstrated by numerical simulations of a model very similar to the
577 one we are dealing with in this paper [15, 20, 21]. Finally, the actual values of some of
578 the parameters used in the simulations are not known and we had to take advantage of
579 Monte Carlo simulations. The relative sensitivity to the parameters, however, is not
580 affected by the uncertainties in the parameter's values.

581

582

583 **Acknowledgments:** The research from which these results were obtained has received
584 funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)
585 under grant agreement no. 282589, from LIM01 HCFMUSP and CNPq. The funders
586 had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
587 preparation of the manuscript.

588

589 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist

590

591

592

593 **Appendix - Some comments on the meaning of the model's equations**

594

595 In this appendix we show how to include spatial heterogeneities in the model
596 and, by doing so, we clarify the meaning of the model's equations.

597 First we assume that mosquitoes have a limited range of flight, which implies
598 that the probability of transmission of infection from one infected mosquito to one
599 susceptible host varies according to the distance between them.

600 Consider the first equation of system (1):

601

$$602 \quad \frac{dS_H}{dt} = -abI_M \frac{S_H}{N_H} - \mu_H S_H + r_H N_H \left(1 - \frac{N_H}{K_H}\right) \quad (A1)$$

603

604 All the variables are densities. This implies that we are considering a very large region
605 where the populations of mosquitoes and hosts are constant, that is, do not vary from
606 point to point. Then, one might think that in equation (A1) a mosquito in a certain place
607 can bite a host which can be very far from it. This is not reasonable and it is not true for
608 equation (A1). To see this, consider the parameter a , the mosquitoes' biting rate. We
609 can write this as $a = a' A$, where a' is the biting rate per unit area and A is the area
610 where the mosquitoes' flight ranges. Therefore, only humans inside this area are bitten
611 by this mosquito. But, since the humans and mosquitoes populations are assumed as
612 homogeneously distributed, this does not appear in the equations because in parameter
613 a this effect is hidden.

614 Let us now introduce spatial heterogeneity. For this we should specify the position \vec{r} ,
615 representing the spatial location of individuals. Thus, let $S_H(\vec{r})ds$ be the number of
616 human susceptibles in the small area ds around the position \vec{r} .

617 Let us now consider how $S_H(\vec{r})ds$ varies with time. Let $I_M(\vec{r}')ds'$ be the number of
618 infected mosquitoes in the small area ds' around the position \vec{r}' . The total number of
619 bites the infected mosquitoes population inflicts in a time interval dt is $a'I_M(\vec{r}')ds' dt$. A
620 fraction of those bites $F(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)$ is inflicted on the hosts at position \vec{r} , that is $S_H(\vec{r})ds$.

621 Of course $F(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)$ is a decreasing function of the distance $|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|$ between infected
622 mosquitoes and susceptible humans. Thus equation (A1) becomes:

623

624
$$\frac{dS_H(\vec{r})}{dt} = -b \frac{S_H(\vec{r})}{N_H(\vec{r})} \int d\vec{s}' a'(\vec{r}') F(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|) I_M(\vec{r}') - \mu_H S_H(\vec{r}) + r_H N_H(\vec{r}) \left(1 - \frac{N_H(\vec{r})}{\kappa_H(\vec{r})} \right) \quad (\text{A2})$$

625

626 All the other equations in system (1) should be similarly modified and, of course, the
 627 result is very difficult to integrate. When $a'(\vec{r}') F(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)$ is equal to $a' A \theta(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|)$, and
 628 the densities are homogenously distributed in space, we have

629

630
$$b \frac{S_H(\vec{r})}{N_H(\vec{r})} \int d\vec{s}' a'(\vec{r}') F(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|) = b \frac{S_H}{N_H} I_M \int d\vec{s}' a'(\vec{r}') F(|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|) = b \frac{S_H}{N_H} I_M a \quad (\text{A3})$$

631

632 and equation (A2) reduces to (A1).

633

634 The above formalism is necessary when we are dealing with large regions of space,
 635 where heterogeneities are significant. However, for small regions, where heterogeneities
 636 can be neglected, the system of equations (1) of the main text, are a good
 637 approximation. The relative sensitivity of the transmission variables to the studied
 638 parameters, however, is not expected to be significantly influenced by spatial
 639 heterogeneities. Of course, the value of the transmission variables may vary from place
 640 to place but the relative sensitivity, the main objective of the present analysis, of these
 641 variables to the parameters should be the same.

642 **References**

643

644 1. Guy B, Almond J, Lang J (2011) Dengue vaccine prospects. *Lancet* 377: 381–382.

645 2. Gubler DJ (2002) The global emergence/resurgence of arboviral diseases as public

646 health problems. *Arch Med Res* 33: 330–342.

647 3. WHO (2012) Dengue and severe dengue. Fact sheet N°117. [Available:](#)

648 <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs117/en/>. Accessed 10 April 2012.

649 4. WHO (2009) Dengue and dengue haemorrhagic fever. Fact sheet N°117. Available:

650 <http://who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs117/en/print.html>. Accessed 11 March 2011.

651 5. Gubler DJ (2002) The global emergence/resurgence of arboviral diseases as public

652 health problems. *Arch Med Res* 33: 330–342.

653 6. Beatty ME, Letson GW, Margolis HS (2008) Estimating the global burden of dengue.

654 Abstract book: dengue 2008. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on

655 Dengue and Dengue Haemorrhagic Fever, Phuket, Thailand.

656 7. World Tourism Organization (2011) Tourism highlights. Available: [www.world-](http://www.world-tourism.org/facts/menu.html)

657 [tourism.org/facts/menu.html](http://www.world-tourism.org/facts/menu.html). Accessed 11 March 2011.

658 8. Suaya JA, Shepard DS, Siqueira JB (2009) Cost of dengue cases in eight countries in

659 the Americas and Asia: a prospective study. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 80: 846–855.

660 9. Khasnis AA, Nettleman MD (2005) Global warming and infectious disease. *Arch*

661 *Med Res* 36: 689–696.

662 10. Wilder-Smith A, Renhorn KE, Tissera H, Abu Bakar S, Alphey L, et al. (2012)

663 DengueTools: innovative tools and strategies for the surveillance and control of dengue.

664 *Glob Health Action* 5: 17273.

665 11. Gubler DJ (2011) Dengue, urbanization and globalization: the unholy trinity of the

666 21st century. *Trop Med Health* 39(4 Suppl): 3–11.

667 12. Beatty ME, Beutels P, Meltzer MI, Shepard DS, Hombach J, et al. (2011) Health

668 economics of dengue: a systematic literature review and expert panel's assessment. *Am*

669 *J Trop Med Hyg* 84: 473–488.

- 670 13. Wilder-Smith A, Ooi EE, Vasudevan SG, Gubler DJ (2010) Update on dengue:
671 epidemiology, virus evolution, antiviral drugs, and vaccine development. *Curr Infect*
672 *Dis Rep* 12: 157–164.
- 673 14. Lambrechts L, Scott TW, Gubler DJ (2010) Consequences of the expanding global
674 distribution of *Aedes albopictus* for dengue virus transmission. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 4:
675 e646.
- 676 15. Massad E, Coutinho FAB, Lopez LF, da Silva DR (2011) Modeling the impact of
677 global warming on vector-borne infections. *Phys Life Rev* 8: 169–199.
- 678 16. Luz PM, Vanni T, Medlock J, Paltiel AD, Galvani AP (2011) Dengue vector control
679 strategies in an urban setting: an economic modelling assessment. *Lancet* 377: 1673–
680 1680.
- 681 17. Massad E, Coutinho FAB (2011) The cost of dengue control. *Lancet* 377: 1630–
682 1631.
- 683 18. Reiter P, Gubler DJ (2001) Surveillance and control of urban dengue vectors. In:
684 Gubler DJ, Kuno G, editors. *Dengue and dengue hemorrhagic fever*. Wallingford, UK:
685 CABI Publishing. pp. 425–462.
- 686 19. MacDonald G (1952) The analysis of equilibrium in malaria. *Trop Dis Bull* 49:
687 813–828.
- 688 20. Burattini MN, Chen M, Chow A, Coutinho FAB, Goh KT, et al. (2008) Modelling
689 the control strategies against dengue in Singapore. *Epidemiol Infect* 136: 309–319.
690
- 691 21. Coutinho FAB, Burattini MN, Lopez LF, Massad E (2006) Threshold conditions for
692 a non-autonomous epidemic system describing the population dynamics of dengue. *Bull*
693 *Math Biol* 68: 2263–2282.
694
- 695 22. Coutinho FAB, Burattini MN, Lopez LF, Massad E (2005) An approximate
696 threshold condition for non-autonomous system: an application to a vector-borne
697 infection. *Math Comp Simul* 70: 149–158.

- 698 23. Massad E, Behrens RH, Burattini MN, Coutinho FAB (2009) Modeling the risk of
699 malaria for travelers to areas with stable malaria transmission. *Malar J* 8: 296.
- 700 24. Chitnis N, Hyman JM, Cushing JM (2008) Determining important parameters in the
701 spread of malaria through the sensitivity analysis of a mathematical model. *Bull Math*
702 *Biol* 70: 1272–1296.
- 703 25. Lopez LF, Coutinho FAB, Burattini MN, Massad E (2002) Threshold conditions for
704 infection persistence in complex host-vectors interactions. *C R Biol* 325: 1073–1084.
- 705 26. Fegan G, Noor AM, Akhwale WS, Cousens S, Snow RW (2007) Effect of expanded
706 insecticide-treated bednet coverage on child survival in rural Kenya: a longitudinal
707 study. *Lancet* 370: 1035–1039.
- 708 27. Ross R (1911) *The prevention of malaria*, 2nd ed., with addendum on the theory of
709 happenings. London: Murray.
- 710 28. Amaku M, Azevedo RS, Castro RM, Massad E, Coutinho FAB (2009) Relationship
711 among epidemiological parameters in a non-immunized Brazilian community. *Mem*
712 *Inst Oswaldo Cruz* 104: 897–900.
- 713 29. Rodrigues HS, Monteiro MT, Torres DFM (2012). *Dengue in Cape Verde: vector*
714 *control and vaccination*. arXiv: 1204.0544v1.
- 715 30. Ellis AM, Garcia AJ, Focks DA, Morrison AC, Scott TW (2011) Parameterization
716 and sensitivity analysis of a complex simulation model for mosquito population
717 dynamics, dengue transmission and their control. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 82: 257–264.
- 718 31. *Integrated Vector Management* (2012) Available:
719 <http://www.ivmproject.net/about/index.cfm?fuseaction=static&label=dengue>. Accessed
720 1 April 2012.
- 721
- 722 32. Adams B, Boots M (2010) How important is vertical transmission in mosquitoes for
723 the persistence of dengue? Insights from a mathematical model. *Epidemics* 2: 1–10.
- 724 33. Yasuno M, Tonn RJ (1970) A study of biting habits of *Aedes aegypti* in Bangkok,
725 Thailand. *Bull World Health Organ* 43: 319–325.

- 726 34. Ocampo CB, Wesson DM (2004) Population dynamics of *Aedes aegypti* from a
727 dengue hyperendemic urban setting in Colombia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 71: 506–513.
- 728 35. Index Mundi (2011) Available: <http://www.indexmundi.com/map/?v=30&l=pt>.
729 Accessed 18 August 2011.
- 730
- 731 35. Halstead SB (1990) Dengue. In: Warren KS, Mahmoud AAF editors. *Tropical and*
732 *geographical medicine*. New York: McGraw-Hill. pp. 675–684.
- 733 37. Forattini OP (1996) *Medical culicidology*. São Paulo: EDUSP.
- 734 38. Brownstein JS, Heth E, O’Neill L (2003) The potential of virulent *Wolbachia* to
735 modulate disease transmission by insects. *J Invertebr Pathol* 84: 24–29.
- 736

737

738 **Table 1.** Model variables and their biological meanings.

739

Variable	Biological Meaning
S_H	Density of susceptible humans
I_H	Density of infected humans
R_H	Density of recovered humans
S_M	Density of uninfected mosquitoes
L_M	Density of latent mosquitoes
I_M	Density of infected mosquitoes
S_E	Density of uninfected eggs (imm. Stages)
I_E	Density of infected aquatic forms

740

741

742 **Table 2.** Model parameters, biological meaning, values and sources. The mean,
 743 variance and 95% CI were obtained with Monte Carlo simulations.

744

Parameter	Meaning	Value (Baseline)	Mean	Variance	95% CI	Source
a	Average daily rate of biting	0.164	0.1682	0.026	9.8×10^{-3}	[33]
b	Fraction of bites actually infective	0.6	0.6062	0.296	0.0337	[34]
μ_H	Human natural mortality rate	3.5×10^{-5} days ⁻¹	3.55×10^{-5}	1.019×10^{-9}	2.00×10^{-6}	[35]
r_H	Birth rate of humans	9.5×10^{-5} days ⁻¹	9.531×10^{-5}	8.959×10^{-9}	5.3×10^{-6}	[35]
κ_H	Carrying capacity of humans	5×10^6	5.0123×10^6	2.052×10^{13}	2.81×10^5	[35]
α_H	Dengue mortality in humans	3.5×10^{-4} days ⁻¹	3.473×10^{-4}	1.00×10^{-7}	1.97×10^{-5}	[36]
γ_H	Human recovery rate	0.143 days ⁻¹	0.1434	0.017	8.097×10^{-3}	[36]
P	Hatching rate of susceptible eggs	0.15 days ⁻¹	0.151	0.019	8.55×10^{-3}	[37]
γ_M	Latency rate in mosquitoes	0.143 days ⁻¹	0.1434	0.017	8.097×10^{-3}	[20]
μ_M	Natural mortality rate of mosquitoes	0.09 days ⁻¹	0.08329	1.5×10^{-4}	5.52×10^{-3}	[38]
r_M	Oviposition rate	50 days ⁻¹	51.8295	2073.9	2.8226	[38]
G	Proportion of infected eggs	0.1	0.0964	0.008	5.684×10^{-3}	Assumed
κ_E	Carrying capacity of eggs	9.8×10^7	9.787×10^7	8.003×10^{15}	5.545×10^6	Assumed
μ_E	Natural mortality rate of eggs	0.1 days ⁻¹	0.101	0.008	5.6644×10^{-3}	[38]
C	Dengue susceptibility of <i>A. aegypti</i>	0.54	0.5265	0.249	0.03191	[34]
c_S	Climatic factor	0.07	0.07	0.004	0.00398	Assumed

745

746

747

748

749
 750
 751
 752
 753

Table 3. Results of the sensitivity analysis according to the general equation (27). The results represent the relative amount of variation (expressed in percentual variation) in the variable if we vary the parameters by 1%.

Variable	Mean	95% Confidence Interval
R_0	1.74	1.45 – 2.07
λ	2.59×10^{-5}	$1.48 \times 10^{-5} - 3.96 \times 10^{-5}$
I_H / N_H	1.04×10^{-4}	$3.84 \times 10^{-5} - 1.34 \times 10^{-4}$
Sensitivity of R_0 to the control parameters		
Parameter	Mean	
a	1.94	
κ_E	0.69	
μ_E	(-) 8.28×10^{-4}	
μ_M	(-) 2.42	
Sensitivity of λ to the control parameters		
Parameter	Mean	
a	5.02	
κ_E	2.32	
μ_E	(-) 1.93×10^{-3}	
μ_M	(-) 5.40	
Sensitivity of I_H / N_H to the control parameters		
Parameter	Mean	
a	2.67	
κ_E	1.34	
μ_E	(-) 2.31×10^{-2}	
μ_M	(-) 3.20	

754
 755