

# PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases

## Caught in a trap: DNA contamination in tsetse xenomonitoring can lead to over-estimates of *Trypanosoma brucei* infection

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	PNTD-D-24-00424
<b>Full Title:</b>	Caught in a trap: DNA contamination in tsetse xenomonitoring can lead to over-estimates of <i>Trypanosoma brucei</i> infection
<b>Short Title:</b>	Trypanosome DNA contamination in tsetse xenomonitoring
<b>Article Type:</b>	Research Article
<b>Keywords:</b>	trypanosomiasis; xenomonitoring; HAT; <i>Trypanosoma brucei</i> ; tsetse; Glossina; DNA contamination; Nzi trap; molecular xenomonitoring; AAT; TBR-PCR; infection prevalence; disease surveillance
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p><b>Background</b></p> <p>Tsetse flies (<i>Glossina</i> sp.) are vectors of <i>Trypanosoma brucei</i> subspecies that cause human African trypanosomiasis (HAT). Capturing and screening tsetse is critical for HAT surveillance. Classically, tsetse have been microscopically analysed to identify trypanosomes, but this is increasingly replaced with molecular xenomonitoring. Nonetheless, sensitive <i>T. brucei</i>-detection assays, such as TBR-PCR, are vulnerable to DNA cross-contamination. This may occur at capture, when often multiple live tsetse are retained temporarily in the cage of a trap. This study set out to determine whether infected tsetse can contaminate naïve tsetse with <i>T. brucei</i> DNA via faeces when co-housed.</p> <p><b>Methodology/Principle Findings</b></p> <p>Insectary-reared teneral <i>G. morsitans morsitans</i> were fed an infectious <i>T. b. brucei</i>-spiked bloodmeal. At 19 days post-infection, infected and naïve tsetse were caged together in the following ratios: (T1) 9:3, (T2) 6:6 (T3) 1:11 and a control (C0) 0:12 in triplicate. Following 24-hour incubation, DNA was extracted from each fly and screened for parasite DNA presence using PCR and qPCR. All insectary-reared infected flies were positive for <i>T. brucei</i> DNA using TBR-qPCR. However, naïve tsetse also tested positive. Even at a ratio of 1 infected to 11 naïve flies, 91% of naïve tsetse gave positive TBR-qPCR results. Furthermore, the quantity of <i>T. brucei</i> DNA detected in naïve tsetse was significantly correlated with cage infection ratio. With evidence of cross-contamination, field-caught tsetse from Tanzania were then assessed using the same screening protocol. End-point TBR-PCR predicted a sample population prevalence of 24.8%. Using qPCR and C<sub>q</sub> cut-offs optimised on insectary-reared flies, we estimated that prevalence was 0.5% (95% confidence interval [0.36, 0.73]).</p> <p><b>Conclusions/Significance</b></p> <p>Our results show that infected tsetse can contaminate naïve flies with <i>T. brucei</i> DNA when co-caged, and that the level of contamination can be extensive. Whilst simple PCR may overestimate infection prevalence, quantitative PCR offers a means of eliminating false positives.</p>
<b>Additional Information:</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Government Employee</b>	No - No authors are employees of the U.S. government.
Are you or any of the contributing authors an employee of the United States government?	

<p>Manuscripts authored by one or more US Government employees are not copyrighted, but are licensed under a <a href="#">CC0 Public Domain Dedication</a>, which allows unlimited distribution and reuse of the article for any lawful purpose. This is a legal requirement for US Government employees.</p> <p>This will be typeset if the manuscript is accepted for publication.</p>	
<p><b>Financial Disclosure</b></p> <p>Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review the <a href="#">submission guidelines</a> for detailed requirements. View published research articles from <a href="#">PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases</a> for specific examples.</p> <p>This statement is required for submission and <b>will appear in the published article</b> if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.</p> <p><b>Funded studies</b> Enter a statement with the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initials of the authors who received each award</li> <li>• Grant numbers awarded to each author</li> <li>• The full name of each funder</li> <li>• URL of each funder website</li> <li>• Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript?</li> </ul> <p>Did you receive funding for this work?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Please add funding details as follow-up to "<b>Financial Disclosure</b></p> <p>Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review the <a href="#">submission guidelines</a> for detailed</p>	<p>Funding was provided by Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC; BB/S01375X/1; <a href="http://www.ukri.org/councils/bbsrc/">www.ukri.org/councils/bbsrc/</a>) and Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-031337, INV-001785, INV-046509; <a href="http://www.gatesfoundation.org/">www.gatesfoundation.org/</a>). The Roslin Institute is supported by core funding from the BBSRC (BBS/E/D/20002173; BBS/E/RL/230002C; <a href="http://www.ukri.org/councils/bbsrc/">www.ukri.org/councils/bbsrc/</a>).</p>

requirements. View published research articles from [PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases](#) for specific examples.

This statement is required for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.

#### Funded studies

Enter a statement with the following details:

- Initials of the authors who received each award
- Grant numbers awarded to each author
- The full name of each funder
- URL of each funder website
- Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript?

Did you receive funding for this work?"

Please select the country of your main research funder (please select carefully as in some cases this is used in fee calculation).

as follow-up to "**Financial Disclosure**

Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review the [submission guidelines](#) for detailed requirements. View published research articles from [PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases](#) for specific examples.

This statement is required for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.

UNITED KINGDOM - GB

<p><b>Funded studies</b></p> <p>Enter a statement with the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initials of the authors who received each award</li> <li>• Grant numbers awarded to each author</li> <li>• The full name of each funder</li> <li>• URL of each funder website</li> <li>• Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript?</li> </ul> <p>Did you receive funding for this work?"</p>	
<p><b>Competing Interests</b></p> <p>On behalf of all authors, disclose any competing interests that could be perceived to bias this work.</p> <p>This statement will be typeset if the manuscript is accepted for publication.</p> <p>Review the instructions link below and PLOS NTDs' <a href="#">competing interests</a> policy to determine what information must be disclosed at submission.</p>	<p>The authors confirm that there are no competing interests to declare.</p>
<p><b>Data Availability</b></p> <p>Provide a <b>Data Availability Statement</b> in the box below. This statement should detail where the data used in this submission can be accessed. This statement will be typeset if the manuscript is accepted for publication.</p> <p>Before publication, authors are required to make all data underlying their findings fully available, without restriction. Review our <a href="#">PLOS Data Policy</a> page for detailed information on this policy. Instructions for writing your Data Availability statement can be accessed via the Instructions link below.</p>	<p>All data generated during this project is available at DOIs <a href="http://www.figshare.com/10.6084/m9.figshare.25298644">www.figshare.com/10.6084/m9.figshare.25298644</a> and <a href="http://www.figshare.com/10.6084/m9.figshare.25298689">www.figshare.com/10.6084/m9.figshare.25298689</a></p>

1 Full title

2 **Caught in a trap: DNA contamination in tsetse xenomonitoring can lead to over-estimates of**  
3 ***Trypanosoma brucei* infection**

4 Short title

5 **Trypanosome DNA contamination in tsetse xenomonitoring**

6

7 Author List

8 **Isabel Saldanha** - Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK

9 **Rachel Lea** - Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK

10 **Oliver Manangwa** - Vector and Vector-borne Diseases Research Institute, Tanga, Tanzania

11 **Gala Garrod** - Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK

12 **Lee R. Haines** - Department of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, US

13 **Álvaro Acosta-Serrano** - Department of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, US

14 **Harriet Auty** - School of Biodiversity, One Health & Veterinary Medicine, University of Glasgow, UK

15 **Martha Betson** - School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

16 **Jennifer S. Lord** - Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK

17 **Liam J. Morrison** - The Roslin Institute, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, University of Edinburgh,  
18 Edinburgh, UK

19 **Furaha Mramba** - Vector and Vector-borne Diseases Research Institute, Tanga, Tanzania

20 **Stephen J. Torr** - Department of Vector Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK

21 **Lucas J. Cunningham** - Department of Tropical Disease Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine,  
22 Liverpool, UK

## 23 Abstract

### 24 *Background*

25 Tsetse flies (*Glossina sp.*) are vectors of *Trypanosoma brucei* subspecies that cause human African  
26 trypanosomiasis (HAT). Capturing and screening tsetse is critical for HAT surveillance. Classically,  
27 tsetse have been microscopically analysed to identify trypanosomes, but this is increasingly replaced  
28 with molecular xenomonitoring. Nonetheless, sensitive *T. brucei*-detection assays, such as TBR-PCR,  
29 are vulnerable to DNA cross-contamination. This may occur at capture, when often multiple live  
30 tsetse are retained temporarily in the cage of a trap. This study set out to determine whether  
31 infected tsetse can contaminate naïve tsetse with *T. brucei* DNA via faeces when co-housed.

32

### 33 *Methodology/Principle Findings*

34 Insectary-reared teneral *G. morsitans morsitans* were fed an infectious *T. b. brucei*-spiked  
35 bloodmeal. At 19 days post-infection, infected and naïve tsetse were caged together in the following  
36 ratios: (T1) 9:3, (T2) 6:6 (T3) 1:11 and a control (C0) 0:12 in triplicate. Following 24-hour incubation,  
37 DNA was extracted from each fly and screened for parasite DNA presence using PCR and qPCR. All  
38 insectary-reared infected flies were positive for *T. brucei* DNA using TBR-qPCR. However, naïve  
39 tsetse also tested positive. Even at a ratio of 1 infected to 11 naïve flies, 91% of naïve tsetse gave  
40 positive TBR-qPCR results. Furthermore, the quantity of *T. brucei* DNA detected in naïve tsetse was  
41 significantly correlated with cage infection ratio. With evidence of cross-contamination, field-caught  
42 tsetse from Tanzania were then assessed using the same screening protocol. End-point TBR-PCR  
43 predicted a sample population prevalence of 24.8%. Using qPCR and Cq cut-offs optimised on  
44 insectary-reared flies, we estimated that prevalence was 0.5% (95% confidence interval [0.36, 0.73]).

45

46 *Conclusions/Significance*

47 Our results show that infected tsetse can contaminate naïve flies with *T. brucei* DNA when co-caged,  
48 and that the level of contamination can be extensive. Whilst simple PCR may overestimate infection  
49 prevalence, quantitative PCR offers a means of eliminating false positives.

50

51 Author Summary

52 Tsetse flies (*Glossina sp.*) are vectors of *Trypanosoma brucei* parasites that cause human African  
53 trypanosomiasis, also known as sleeping sickness. As part of disease surveillance, tsetse can be  
54 captured in traps and checked for parasite presence. The molecular screening of disease vectors  
55 (such as mosquitoes, ticks and blackflies) for the presence of pathogen DNA has gained popularity in  
56 recent years. However, DNA contamination may occur at capture when live vectors are retained for  
57 a limited period in a trap cage. To explore this, we conducted experiments, initially with laboratory-  
58 reared tsetse and then field-caught tsetse from Tanzania. Our results show that infected tsetse can  
59 contaminate uninfected tsetse with *T. brucei* DNA when retained together in a trap cage, and that  
60 the level of contamination can be extensive. Infected tsetse consistently shed *T. brucei* DNA in their  
61 faeces, which in turn contaminates other tsetse. This can produce false-positive results, leading to  
62 inaccurate reporting of infection prevalence. These findings impact not only trypanosomiasis  
63 surveillance, but may also have ramifications for the xenomonitoring of other vector-borne  
64 neglected diseases. Future work should explore whether pathogen DNA contamination routes exist  
65 in other vector species and, if so, the methods to mitigate DNA contamination in entomological  
66 traps.

67

## 68 Background

69 Tsetse flies (*Glossina sp.*) are the primary vector for several species of *Trypanosoma* which cause the  
70 neglected tropical disease human African trypanosomiasis (HAT) as well as animal African  
71 trypanosomiasis (AAT). The sub-genera *Trypanozoon* comprises three closely related species: *T.*  
72 *brucei* and the animal pathogens *T. b. evansi* and *T. b. equiperdum*. A species of both human and  
73 animal clinical significance, *T. brucei* can be further divided into three sub-species: *T. brucei*  
74 *rhodesiense* is the zoonotic cause of East African ‘Rhodesian’ HAT (rHAT) and can also cause AAT, *T.*  
75 *brucei gambiense*, is anthroponotic, causing West African ‘Gambian’ HAT (gHAT) and *T. brucei brucei*  
76 causes AAT in livestock across sub-Saharan Africa.

77 Collecting and screening tsetse for the presence of *T. brucei* is a HAT surveillance technique with a  
78 long history, having been standardised in 1924 by Lloyd and Johnson [1]. Systematic sampling of  
79 tsetse populations allows not only the monitoring of tsetse population dynamics, but also parasite  
80 prevalence within a particular environment. The presence of HAT pathogens in tsetse populations is  
81 considered an aspect of ‘tsetse challenge’, an important part of calculating HAT transmission risk  
82 [2,3]. Historically, individual tsetse have been collected, dissected and subjected to microscopic  
83 analysis to determine whether *Trypanosoma sp.* were present and to identify the subspecies  
84 depending on which fly tissues were colonised [1]. This technique was the gold standard for  
85 identification of trypanosome infection in tsetse for several decades, and is still in use today as the  
86 only way to positively identify an active infection [1,4,5]. However, this method is labour-intensive  
87 and suffers from poor sensitivity and specificity due to limitations in microscope resolution,  
88 similarities in *Trypanosoma* physical morphology and the inability to designate maturity of infection  
89 stage within the fly [4–7].

90 Over the last decade, molecular xenomonitoring has largely replaced traditional microscopy  
91 detection of parasites. This is where hematophagous insect vectors are screened for genetic targets  
92 indicative of pathogen presence, as a proxy for human or animal disease occurrence.



93 Xenomonitoring has been developed for a range of arthropod vector-borne diseases, including HAT,  
94 AAT, lymphatic filariasis and onchocerciasis [8–13]. The benefits of molecular xenomonitoring  
95 include the potential for high-throughput sample analysis and very high sensitivity and specificity,  
96 with estimates of 1.9-9.3 times greater sensitivity than dissection [4,14].

97 A variety of molecular assays using a range of *T. brucei* genomic targets have been developed for  
98 xenomonitoring purposes. Minichromosome satellite DNA tandem repeat regions are the most  
99 sensitive targets, with copy numbers estimated at 10,000 in *T. brucei* sensu-lato [15]. Although this  
100 177-bp *T. brucei* s-l repeat (TBR) region was recently confirmed to be more heterogeneous than  
101 initially anticipated [16], it remains the most sensitive and widely-used molecular target in the form  
102 of TBR-PCR, SYBR green TBR-qPCR and a novel probe-based TBR-qPCR assay [16–18].

103 However, such highly sensitive methods can lead to problems in determining a true biological  
104 infection within the vector. Xenomonitoring can be a powerful disease ecology tool, in being able to  
105 detect parasite presence within a given environment with a high degree of sensitivity. Yet it is also  
106 used to estimate trypanosome prevalence. The mere presence of target DNA within a sample is  
107 usually interpreted as a 'positive' fly. However, it is impossible to determine a true mature parasite  
108 infection, with a viable transmission risk, from an immature infection or from a passing infected  
109 bloodmeal. The results may be particularly difficult to interpret when an end-point assay is used  
110 (PCR, LAMP, RPA) as opposed to quantitative DNA methods (qPCR). An end-point assay can only  
111 indicate the presence or absence of pathogen DNA, yet PCR results are often reported as sample  
112 population infection rate or prevalence. Sensitive DNA amplification methods are also susceptible to  
113 DNA contamination [19].

114 Contamination with parasite DNA can occur at several stages in the xenomonitoring process: (i)  
115 molecular screening, (ii) DNA extraction or (iii) when flies are trapped and collected. Whilst inclusion  
116 of controls can easily eliminate contamination at the screening and DNA extraction stages,  
117 contamination at the trapping phase is not possible to determine retrospectively.

118 Several studies that have used TBR-PCR to screen tsetse flies have reported a higher-than-expected  
119 proportion of flies testing positive for *T. brucei* s-I DNA. Whereas a *T. brucei* s-I infection prevalence  
120 of <1% might be expected in wild fly populations [20], studies using TBR-PCR have reported far  
121 higher proportions. From 8.9% (63/706) [21], 13.7% [22] and 15% [23], to more than 40% [24] and  
122 up to 70.7% [25]. In a study reporting *T. brucei* s-I infections in 46% of midgut-positive flies,  
123 McNamara *et al* discussed the possibility of false-positive TBR-PCR due to trace *T. brucei* DNA  
124 residue from previous bloodmeal(s) [26]. At the time, this was countered with evidence of rapid  
125 degradation of *Trypanosoma* DNA in the midgut following an infectious bloodmeal [26]. However  
126 more recent evidence has shown that *T. b. brucei* DNA can remain detectable in the midgut of an  
127 uninfected or refractory tsetse for up to six days post-feed [27].

128 Tsetse traps currently in widespread use were designed before the rise of molecular methods, and  
129 whilst the trypanosome detection methods have changed, the trapping and collection methods have  
130 largely remained the same. For a cloth trap such as Nzi, blue and black panels paired with  
131 transparent mesh netting attract and direct tsetse into a trap cage where they are held until  
132 collection [28]. The trap cage may be a mesh bag or, more commonly, a transparent plastic bottle.  
133 Typically set for 24-48 hours, tsetse traps may capture anywhere from zero to several hundred  
134 tsetse, dependant on location and local population density. Agitated tsetse defecate or excrete  
135 larger (wet) volume of waste products (such as faeces) under heat stress or high humidity [29],  
136 which in turn forms the basis for a DNA contamination pathway.

137 Tsetse faeces, also known as frass, are composed of digested bloodmeal excreta. In an infected  
138 tsetse, faeces can also contain *T. brucei* DNA from lysed or digested parasites. Previous studies have  
139 shown that experimentally-infected tsetse flies excrete *T. brucei* DNA in excreta or faeces and that  
140 this is detectable by PCR [30,31]. This provides a potential route of *T. brucei* DNA contamination  
141 within a tsetse trap. Due to their size and energetic needs, tsetse take relatively large bloodmeals,  
142 with the bloodmeals taken by *G. m. morsitans* and *G. pallidipes* ranging between 37.3-62.3 mg and

143 53.9-76.3 mg of wet mass [32]. Although much of this is metabolised, it has been estimated that for  
144 every 1 mg of blood (dry weight) ingested, a tsetse will excrete approximately 0.5 mg [33].


145 In this study, we tested the hypothesis that trypanosome-infected tsetse flies can contaminate  
146 uninfected individuals with *T. brucei* DNA within a trap environment, subsequently leading to biased  
147 estimates of trypanosome infection when screening trap-caught tsetse using TBR-target molecular  
148 methods. Following on from this, we also developed a means of estimating infection prevalence  
149 accurately in settings where contamination may occur.

150

## 151 Methods

### 152 *Experimental infection of tsetse flies*

153 A total of 140 male and female teneral *Glossina morsitans morsitans* aged 12-48 hours post-  
154 emergence were fed a defibrinated equine bloodmeal (TCS Biosciences Ltd, UK) containing  
155 approximately  $1 \times 10^6$  per mL of bloodstream form *T. brucei brucei* (strain TSW196[34]) in SAPO  
156 containment facilities at Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM). After 24 hours, flies  
157 containing a visible bloodmeal in their abdomens (n=110; 51 female, 59 male) were selected and  
158 placed into solitary cells (S1). Fed flies were maintained for 19 days post-infection by blood-feeding  
159 every 2-3 days in a temperature- ( $25 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ ) and humidity-controlled (68%–79%) environment.  
160 Individual fly faecal samples were collected by placing 25mm filter paper discs (Whatman, UK)  
161 underneath each fly cell (S1). Faecal samples were collected at the following intervals: 6-7 days  
162 (n=45), 8-9 days (n=45), 10-12 days (n=110) and 13-14 days (n=110) post-infectious bloodmeal.  
163 Faecal samples were stored in individual microcentrifuge tubes at room temperature (RT) until  
164 further processing. Of 110 flies that consumed an infectious bloodmeal, 106 survived to 19 days  
165 post-infection.



**Figure 1:** A flow diagram depicting basic experimental framework for the trap experiments. Figure created using biorender.com ([www.biorender.com](http://www.biorender.com) [accessed 01/02/24]).

167

168 *Trap experiments*

169 TBR-qPCR screening of tsetse faecal samples collected 10-14 days post-infection was used to  
 170 determine individual fly infection status [30]. This time was chosen as it surpassed the seven-day  
 171 period where dead *T. brucei* DNA from an infectious bloodmeal would have remained detectable  
 172 [27]. At 19 days post-infection, after 72 hours starvation to mimic field conditions where tsetse  
 173 would be seeking a host, 48 trypanosome-infected flies (IFs) with intact wings were selected and  
 174 marked with a **unique identifier**. Remaining flies (n=62, a mixture of refractory and infected)  
 175 remained in solitary cells. Each IF was tagged with a unique colour marker **artist's oil paint [Windsor  
 176 and Newton, UK] applied to the dorsal surface of the thorax; S1**. Forceps were cleaned with 10%  
 177 bleach and rinsed in nuclease-free water between handling of each fly. IFs and 96 uninfected (naïve)  
 178 flies (UFs) were placed in plastic bottles similar to the cages used for trapping, namely, 250mL  
 179 transparent plastic bottles with a fine mesh cover in place of lid (S1). This experimental design gave a  
 180 density of 48 flies per litre, mimicking field catches [35]. The numbers of IFs and UFs in the bottles  
 181 was varied according to three classes of treatment and a control (Fig.1). The three treatments  
 182 comprised IF:UF in ratios of: (T1) 9:3, (T2) 6:6, (T3) 1:11 and control (C0) 0:12. T3 represents the low  
 183 infection ratio most likely to be encountered in the field [20]. Fly sex ratios were balanced where

184 possible (S2). Each treatment was replicated three times (A, B and C). To test for localised airborne  
185 DNA contamination, control traps C0-A and C0-B were placed within close proximity (<1 metre) to  
186 treatment traps (T1-T3), whereas C0-C was placed in a separate room. Once flies had been placed  
187 into trap vessels and had sufficient time to revive (approximately 30 minutes), they were incubated  
188 for 24 hours in temperature- and humidity-controlled conditions (Fig.1). Once complete, all tsetse  
189 were sedated in a cold room at 5-10°C. UFs were placed into individual collection tubes containing  
190 chilled 100% ethanol and subsequently stored at room temperature (RT). All IFs (n=48) and a  
191 proportion of leftover flies (n=23) were stored in individual tubes on ice for immediate dissection.

192

### 193 *Tsetse dissection and microscopic analysis*

194 To confirm infection status, all IFs (n=48) and some remaining (fed infectious bloodmeal but not  
195 infected) flies (n=23) were dissected and inspected by light microscopy at 400X magnification to  
196 detect trypanosome infection as described elsewhere [1]. Visible procyclic trypomastigote forms in  
197 the midgut (MG) were recorded as infection-positive. Salivary glands (SGs) were not inspected for  
198 presence of epimastigote or metacyclic trypomastigote forms as SG infection is only visible after ~21  
199 days and faecal screening is thought to only be indicative of midgut infection status [30]. It is worth  
200 noting that at 20 days, no bloodstream forms from initial *T. brucei* infectious bloodmeal would have



**Figure 2:** An example of an Nzi trap (a), with detail of typical trap cage filled with tsetse (b) and *Glossina sp.* within trap (c).

201 remained within the tsetse. Dissection equipment was cleansed with 10% bleach and rinsed in  
202 nuclease-free water between each sample. A new glass slide was used for each fly. Once dissection  
203 was complete, each individual fly was placed into collection tube containing chilled 100% ethanol  
204 and stored at RT.

205

#### 206 *Field sampling and collection of tsetse*

207 As part of the BBSRC-funded study ENABLES (BB/S01375X/1) and under the auspices of the Tanzania  
208 Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH; permit codes 2019-414- NA-2018- 360 and 2019-  
209 413- NA-2018- 360), sampling of tsetse species *G. pallidipes*, *G. swynnertoni* and *G. morsitans* took  
210 place at sites in Tarangire National Park and Simanjiro district, Tanzania, in August 2019. The  
211 Tarangire National Park covers 2,850 km<sup>2</sup> and is bordered by Simanjiro, Babati and Monduli districts  
212 [36]. The altitude varies between 1356 m and 1605 m, rising from southeast to northwest on a  
213 raised plateau. The vegetation can be split into seven main types: grassland and floodplains; *Acacia*  
214 *tortilis* parkland; tall *Acacia* woodland; drainage line woodland; *Acacia-Commiphora* woodland;  
215 *Combretum-Dalbergia* woodland; and rocky hills [37]. In August 2019, 51 Nzi traps were set within  
216 the Tarangire National Park (transects TA and TB) and 38 outside and to the east in Simanjiro District  
217 (transects BA and BB). Location coordinates for each trap are listed in S3. Trapping was carried out as  
218 described previously [35]. In short, Nzi traps [28] baited with acetone (100 mg/h), 1-octen-3-ol (1  
219 mg/h), 4-methylphenol (0.5 mg/h) and 3-n-propylphenol (0.1 mg/h) [38,39] were deployed for 72 h  
220 and flies collected every 24 h (Fig.2). Trapped flies were held in-situ in a trap cage (1000 mL plastic  
221 bottle) for approximately 24 hours until collection. The species and sex of individual tsetse were  
222 recorded, each fly was assigned an ID number and stored individually in 1.5 mL collection tubes  
223 containing ~1mL of 100% ethanol. All flies were deceased upon collection. Although sampling was  
224 carried out for the primary purpose of population abundance monitoring and modelling, the  
225 opportunity was taken to collect a proportion of the trapped flies for molecular xenomonitoring

226 purposes. Due to high catch numbers at some sites (>500 tsetse/trap/day), not all flies that were  
227 trapped were collected and screened. Flies were selected randomly for collection.

228

#### 229 *DNA extraction*

230 For faecal samples collected from insectary-reared tsetse (S1), a 2 mm Harris micro-punch was used  
231 to extract a single faecal sample from each filter paper. Hole punch and forceps were cleaned with  
232 10% bleach and then nuclease-free water between each sample. The samples of filter paper were  
233 placed into individual collection tubes containing 40 µL sterile phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and  
234 incubated at 37°C for 1 hour [40] on a rocker set at 5 oscillations per minute. DNA was extracted and  
235 purified from the disc and PBS using **QIAGEN DNeasy 96 Blood and Tissue Kit** following the  
236 manufacturer's protocol for purification of DNA from animal tissues. Eventual purified DNA was  
237 eluted in 80 µL of elution buffer AE.

238 For tsetse flies (both experiment and field), whole intact tsetse or total dissected remains were  
239 placed into individual collection tubes and incubated at 56°C for 3 hours on a rocker set at 5  
240 oscillations per minute to remove ethanol. DNA was extracted and purified using QIAGEN DNeasy 96  
241 Blood and Tissue Kit following the manufacturer's protocol, slightly optimised for large insect  
242 processing with the addition of a mechanical lysis step. In short, after ethanol removal, a quarter-  
243 inch diameter stainless-steel ball (Dejay Distribution Ltd, UK) was placed into each tube. After adding  
244 Buffer-ATL/Proteinase K, samples were then mechanically lysed at 15 Hz for 20 seconds for two  
245 rounds using a QIAGEN TissueLyser II. Following centrifugation at 2000 xg for 1 minute, samples  
246 were incubated at 56°C for 14 hours. Eventual purified DNA was eluted in 80µL elution buffer AE.

247 For insectary-reared flies, a negative extraction control (NEC) was included every 3-18 flies (26 NEC  
248 to 206 flies total). For field flies, an NEC was included for every 93 flies (32 NEC to 2777 flies total).

249

250 *TBR-PCR*

251 PCR primers used in the study are detailed in Table 1. TBR-PCR reactions were carried out using  
252 MyTaq Red Mix (Meridian Bioscience, Cincinnati, US) following the manufacturer's protocol. In brief,  
253 5 µL of DNA template was added to 12.5 µL 2X MyTaq Red Mix, 0.5 µL of each 10 µM forward and  
254 reverse primer and 6.5 µL nuclease-free water to give a 25 µL total reaction volume. For TBR-PCR  
255 reactions to generate amplified products for sequencing, all reagent volumes were doubled to give a  
256 total reaction volume of 50 µL (10 µL template DNA). Thermocycling conditions for TBR-PCR were as  
257 follows; 3 minutes at 95°C initial denaturation, followed by 35 cycles of 15 seconds denaturation at  
258 95°C, 15 seconds annealing at 55°C, and 20 seconds extension at 72°C, followed by final extension  
259 for 2 minutes at 72°C. Thermocycling was carried out using an Applied Biosystems Veriti thermal  
260 cycler (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, US). PCR products were separated by agarose gel electrophoresis  
261 and visualised using a gel documentation system (Syngene International, India; S4). *T. brucei* M249  
262 DNA at concentration of 1 ng/µL was used as positive template control (PTC) for TBR-PCR assays.  
263 Nuclease-free water was used as no-template control (NTC) for all assays. All pre-amplification set-  
264 up was carried out in a STARLAB AirClean 600 workstation (STARLAB, UK) in a separate room to post-  
265 amplification analysis.

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273



275 **Table 1: Trypanosome detection primers used in the study**

Oligo Name	Sequence (5' → 3')	Target	Assay Name	Source
TBR_PCR_F	CGAATGAATATTAACAATGCGCAGT	<i>Trypanozoon</i>	TBR-PCR	[41]
TBR_PCR_R	AGAACCATTTATTAGCTTTGTTGC	minichromosome satellite DNA repeat		
TBR_QPCR_F	CGCAGTTAACGCTATTATACACA	<i>Trypanozoon</i>	TBR-qPCR	[42]
TBR_QPCR_R	CATTAACACTAAAGAACAGCGT	minichromosome satellite		
TBR_QPCR_PRB	FAM-  TGTGCAACATTAAATACAAGTGTG-  ZEN	DNA repeat		
PLC1	CAGTGTTGCGCTTAAATCCA	<i>Trypanozoon</i>	PLC-qPCR /	[9,43]
PLC2	CCCGCCAATACTGACATCTT	<i>glycosylphosphatidylinositol-specific phospholipase-C</i> gene	HAT-HRM	
TbRh1	GAAGCGGAAGCAAGAATGAC	<i>Serum resistance-associated</i>	HAT-HRM	[44]
TbRh2	GGCGCAAGACTTGTAAGAGC	<i>protein</i> gene		
TgsGP1	CGAAGAACAAGCCGTAGCG	<i>T. b. gambiense-specific</i>	HAT-HRM	[44]
TgsGP2	CCGTTCCCGCTTCTACTACC	<i>glycoprotein</i> gene		

276

277 ***TBR-qPCR and PLC-qPCR***


278 **q**PCR primers used in the study are detailed in Table 1. TBR-qPCR reactions were carried out using  
279 Bio-Rad SsoAdvanced Universal Probes Supermix (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, US) in line with  
280 the manufacturer's protocol. In short, 5 µL template DNA was mixed with 10 µL SsoAdvanced  
281 Universal Probes Supermix (2X), 0.4 µM forward and reverse primers, 0.2 µM probe and nuclease-

282 free water added to a 20  $\mu$ L total reaction volume. Thermal cycling conditions were as follows; initial  
283 denaturation at 95°C for 3 minutes followed by 40 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 10 seconds and  
284 annealing and extension at 59°C for 12 seconds. Data was captured during the annealing and  
285 extension step. Thermocycling, fluorescence detection and data capture was carried out using a Mic  
286 and micPCR v.2.9.0 software (Bio Molecular Systems, Upper Coomera, Australia).

287 PLC-qPCR screening of insectary-reared and field collected flies was performed using Agilent Brilliant  
288 III Ultra-Fast Master Mix (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, USA) following the manufacturer's  
289 protocol. Briefly, 5  $\mu$ L of template DNA was mixed with 10  $\mu$ L Ultra-Fast Master Mix (2X), 200 nM of  
290 forward and reverse and primer and nuclease-free water to a total reaction volume of 20  $\mu$ L.

291 Thermal cycling conditions were as follows: initial denaturation at 95°C for 3 minutes followed by 40  
292 cycles of denaturation at 95°C for 10 seconds and annealing and extension at 60°C for 20 seconds.  
293 Data was captured during the annealing and extension step. Following cycling, a melt step was  
294 performed between 65-95°C at 0.3°C per second. Thermocycling, fluorescence detection and data  
295 capture was carried out using a Mic and micPCR v.2.9.0 software (Bio Molecular Systems, Upper  
296 Coomera, Australia).

297 Additional PLC-qPCR screening in field flies was carried out as part of a multiplex HAT-HRM assay  
298 using reaction conditions and thermocycling as described previously [9]. A positive PLC-qPCR sample  
299 was defined as a sample with a single melt peak that occurred at 79.1°C and crossed a baseline  
300 threshold of 10% of the maximum normalized fluorescence (dF/dT) of the highest peak. A positive *T.*  
301 *b. rhodesiense* sample was defined as a sample with melt peaks that occurred at both 79.1°C and  
302 84.2°C and crossed a baseline threshold of 10% of the maximum normalized fluorescence (dF/dT) of  
303 the highest peak.

304  *T. brucei* M249 DNA at concentration of 1 ng/ $\mu$ L was used as positive template control (PTC) for the  
305 TBR-qPCR and PLC-qPCR assays. Nuclease-free water was used as NTC for all assays. All pre-

306 amplification set-up was carried out in a STARLAB AirClean 600 workstation (STARLAB, UK) in a  
307 separate room to post-amplification analysis.

308

### 309 *PCR product sequencing*


310 To confirm amplification of target *T. brucei* DNA in field samples, TBR-PCR products from a sub-  
311 sample of previously confirmed TBR-PCR positive field flies (n=93/688) were purified and sequenced.  
312 173 bp TBR-PCR target products were excised and purified using an Exo-CIP Rapid PCR Cleanup Kit  
313 (New England Biolabs, Ipswich, USA) following the manufacturer's protocol. Resultant purified DNA  
314 was eluted in 20 µL elution buffer. Sanger sequencing was performed by Source BioScience (Source  
315 BioScience Limited, Nottingham, UK) using both TBR\_PCR\_F and TBR\_PCR\_R primers (Table 1).  
316 Sequence clean-up and alignments were performed in BioEdit v7.2 [45]. Resultant sequences were  
317 subject to BLAST nucleotide analysis (National Centre for Biotechnology Information) against the  
318 target *T. brucei* satellite DNA entry (accession number K00392.1).

319

### 320 *Statistical analyses*

321 All data were collated into a centralised database in Excel (Microsoft). Further analyses and data  
322 visualisation were performed using GraphPad Prism v10. All data are presented as the mean ±  
323 standard error (SE). For fly experiment results, Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to  
324 determine if there was an association between proportion of IFs (trap treatment) with UF TBR-qPCR  
325 Cq values. One-way ANOVA was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences  
326 in mean TBR-qPCR Cq values obtained from UFs in T1, T2 and T3. Student's T-test (2-tailed) was used  
327 to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between mean Cq values obtained from  
328 screening IF and UF whole-fly DNA. Mann-Whitney U Test was used to test if there was a significant  
329 difference between TBR-qPCR Cq values from male and female flies.

330



**Figure 3:** Box-and-whisker plots showing Cq value data from *T. brucei* (a) multi-copy target TBR-qPCR screening and (b) single-copy target PLC-qPCR screening of infected flies (IF) and naïve (UF) across four trap types (T1-T3, C0). C0 A+B were placed within close proximity (< 1 metre) of experiments (T1-3), C0 C was placed in a separate room. This was to test localised airborne DNA contamination. Crosses represent the mean Cq values. Grey bars display proportion of samples recording amplification using respective qPCR assays.

334 *Detection of T. brucei DNA in insectary-reared, experimental flies*

335 Screening by TBR-qPCR revealed that flies hosting a trypanosome infection (IFs) produced Cq values  
336 between 14.46-21.57 (mean=17.74,  $\pm 0.108$  SE), which indicates a high quantity of TBR target DNA in  
337 infected flies (Fig.3a). However naïve uninfected flies (UFs), when co-housed with infected ones for  
338 24 hours, were also positive for TBR target DNA. There was a strong negative correlation between  
339 UF TBR-qPCR Cq value and proportion of IFs in the trap ( $r[68]=-0.8153$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ; Fig.3a). In other  
340 words, the quantity of DNA contamination was proportional to the infection rate of the trap. There  
341 were also distinct differences in the TBR-qPCR Cq values for UFs across the three different infection  
342 ratio treatments ( $F[2,17]=40.80$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ; Fig.3a). Multiple comparison tests confirmed significant  
343 differences between all treatments; T1 UF and T2 UF ( $-3.118$  mean Cq,  $p=0.0094$ ), T1 UF and T3 UF ( $-$   
344  $6.983$  mean Cq,  $p<0.0001$ ) and T2 UF and T3 UF ( $-3.865$  mean Cq,  $p<0.0001$ ). End-point TBR-PCR  
345 screening produced similar results to TBR-qPCR screening (S4), with amplification recorded in 100%  
346 of IFs, 100% of T1 UFs ( $n=9/9$ ), 100% of T2 UFs ( $n=18/18$ ) and 69% of T3 UFs ( $n=23/33$ ).

347 Contamination was evident even with an assay with single-copy target and lower sensitivity (PLC-  
348 qPCR), albeit to a lesser extent (Fig.3b). Only 9.1% of T3 UFs recorded amplification by PLC-qPCR,  
349 compared to 90.9% by TBR-qPCR (Fig.3).

350 Contamination was detected in control bottles placed within close proximity ( $< 1$  metre) to bottles  
351 containing infected tsetse (C0-A, C0-B), but not in a control bottle placed in separate room (C0-C).  
352 Low-level amplification ( $Cq > 35$ ) was detected in 28.6% of UFs by TBR-PCR and 50% of UFs by TBR-  
353 qPCR across C0-A and C0-B with mean Cq  $35.23 \pm 0.285$  SE. UFs in C0-C (placed in a separate room)  
354 recorded no amplification by TBR-PCR, TBR-qPCR (Fig. 3a).

355 The DNA contamination evidenced in the results did not occur at either the DNA extraction or  
356 amplification stages. Of 26 total extraction controls (NEC), zero recorded amplification by TBR-PCR or  
357 PLC-qPCR. However, one NEC did produce amplification by TBR-qPCR (Cq 34.29). It should be noted  
358 that this particular NEC was situated between IF samples containing high concentration of *T. brucei*

359 DNA (Cq < 20). The fact that 13 other NECs in this extraction did not record amplification by any  
360 assay suggests that this was localised cross-contamination that did not affect other samples in the  
361 extraction. Of all NTCs across TBR-PCR (n=4), TBR-qPCR (n=7) and PLC-qPCR (n=7), none produced  
362 amplification regardless of assay.

363


#### 364 *Tsetse faecal screening as a predictor of infection status*

365 Experimentally-infected tsetse excrete *T. brucei* DNA in their faeces, and screening these faeces can  
366 determine tsetse midgut infection with high accuracy (S5). Microscopy revealed that 100% (n=48) of  
367 IFs selected for experiments, based on faecal screening, had developed mature midgut infection by  
368 20 days post-infection.

369

370

371



**Figure 4:** Plots displaying Cq values for field-caught flies. (a) shows TBR-qPCR Cq values (circular, black symbol) for all field flies where DNA was available (n=640). (b) shows PLC-qPCR Cq values (triangular, red symbol) for a subset of field flies with TBR-qPCR Cq <22.13 and where DNA was available (n=45). (c) shows comparison of TBR-qPCR Cq values from female (circular symbol, n=428) and male (diamond symbol, n=212) in field-caught flies. There was no significant difference in median TBR-qPCR Cq values from females (median=26.22) and males (median=25.97,  $p=0.5336$ ). For all plots (a, b, c) grey boxplot shows median and 1-99% percentiles, error bars display range. The red dotted horizontal lines represent the Cq cut offs of 22.13 for TBR (a, c) and 25.36 for PLC (b).

373 *Detection of T. brucei DNA in field-collected flies*

374 A total of 2777 tsetse were collected from traps in Tanzania (Table 2). TBR-PCR was performed on all  
 375 2777 flies, of which 688 (24.77%) tested positive. Of these, 661 samples had adequate DNA  
 376 remaining and were subsequently screened using TBR-qPCR, of which 640 recorded amplification  
 377 (Cq < 40). The amount of *T. brucei* DNA detected in samples varied more widely than in experimental  
 378 flies, with TBR-qPCR Cq values from 4.59 to 38.52 and mean of 27.19 ±0.170 SE (Fig. 4). There was no  
 379 significant difference in median TBR-qPCR Cq values from females (median=26.22) and males  
 380 (median=25.97, *p*=0.5336; Fig. 4c). No *T. b. rhodesiense* DNA was detected by HAT-HRM in any of the  
 381 samples. Across all catches (n=62), catch size varied widely from 1 to 420, with mean catch size of  
 382 89.35 ±12.494 SE (S6). Therefore, fly density within the traps varied from 1 to 420 flies per litre, with  
 383 mean density of 89.35 (±12.494 SE) flies per litre and median density of 42 flies per litre.

**Table 2: A table detailing sex, transect and TBR-PCR positive results breakdown of field-caught tsetse by species (*Glossina sp.*).**

Species	Total	Sex		Transect				TBR-PCR+	
		Male	Female	TA	TB	BA	BB	Freq.	PCR+ prop.
<i>G. pallidipes</i>	1675	553	1122	814	0	860	1	666	39.76%
<i>G. swynnertoni</i>	1053	468	585	354	696	3	0	18	1.71%
<i>G. m. morsitans</i>	49	17	32	49	0	0	0	4	8.16%
<b>All species</b>	<b>2777</b>	<b>1038</b>	<b>1739</b>	<b>1217</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>863</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>24.77%</b>

Transects TA and TB consist of traps within Tarangire National Park. Transects BA and BB consist of traps in Simanjiro District close to the border of Tarangire National Park. 'Freq.' represents frequency. 'PCR+ prop.' is number/proportion of tsetse samples that produced diagnostic 173-bp TBR-PCR product.

384

385 DNA contamination was ruled out at both the DNA extraction and amplification stages as none of  
 386 the NECs screened by TBR-PCR (n=32) had amplification. However, of nine NECs screened by TBR-



387 qPCR, two recorded low-level amplification (Cq 36.72, 34.54). In both cases, NECs were surrounded  
 388 by samples containing high quantity of *T. brucei* DNA (Cq < 30) during plate DNA extraction.  
 389 Therefore, these were considered to be instances of localised cross-contamination. Across NTCs  
 390 screened by TBR-PCR (n=32), TBR-qPCR (n=23) and PLC-qPCR (n=1), none recorded amplification.

391

392 *Estimation of sample population T. brucei infection prevalence*

393 Of the total number of *T. brucei* positive field caught tsetse (n=688/2777), 26 lacked sufficient  
 394 volume of template and so were not included in the rest of the study. Calculating the sample  
 395 population infection prevalence estimate was achieved in a two-step process using qPCR Cq cut-offs  
 396 calculated from results of experiments with insectary-reared flies (Fig.3, S5). Based on results from  
 397 experimental, insectary-reared flies, a TBR-qPCR Cq cut-off of 22.13 (95% confidence interval (CI)  
 398 [21.56, 22.70]) was determined for further analysis (Table 3). This was the mean TBR-qPCR Cq value  
 399 of 45 insectary-reared IFs (17.74) added to three standard deviations (0.746). Any samples recording  
 400 TBR-qPCR Cq values  $\leq 22.13$  were considered 'likely infected'. All flies in this subset were *G.*  
 401 *pallidipes* (n=45) and 71.1% (n=32) were female. Furthermore, fly samples recording Cq values <16  
 402 were all female (n=15; Fig. 4).

403

**Table 3: A table displaying calculations of Cq cut-offs based on TBR-qPCR and PLC-qPCR screening of 45 infected flies (IFs), confirmed as midgut infection-positive by microscopy.**

Assay	Mean ( $\mu$ ) Cq of IFs	SD ( $\sigma$ ) of IFs	Cq Cut-off ( $\mu + 3\sigma$ )	Lower CI (95%)	Upper CI (95%)
TBR-qPCR	17.74	0.7458	22.13	21.56	22.70
PLC-qPCR	21.82	1.183	25.36	24.90	25.82

Given the data set is normally distributed, 99.7% of true IFs should lie within three standard deviations (SD,  $\sigma$ ) of the mean ( $\mu$ ). CI = confidence interval.

404


405 Additional PLC screening was then carried out on this subset (TBR-qPCR Cq  $\leq$  22.13) of flies that had  
406 adequate volume of DNA available (n=45), using a combination of HAT-HRM (n=4) and PLC-qPCR  
407 (n=41). All 45 samples recorded amplification when screened with PLC-qPCR, with Cq values ranging  
408 from 18.59 to 36.75 and mean of 29.71  $\pm$ 0.968 SE (Fig. 4). A PLC-qPCR cut-off of 25.36 (95% CI  
409 [24.90, 25.82]) was then calculated from the mean PLC-qPCR Cq value of 45 insectary-reared Ifs  
410 (21.82) added to three standard deviations (1.183; Table 3). Any samples recording PLC-qPCR Cq  
411 values  $\leq$  25.36 were considered 'true infected'. This left 13 individuals, all of which were female *G.*  
412 *pallidipes*. Sample population infection prevalence was therefore estimated to be 0.47% (13/2751)  
413 (95% CI [0.36, 0.73]), and *G. pallidipes* infection prevalence was estimated to be 0.79% (13/1650)  
414 (95% CI [0.61, 1.21]).

415


#### 416 *Detection of T. brucei DNA by individual catch*

417 There were 62 individual catches from which flies were collected and screened. Catches were from  
418 35 different traps, across four transects (TA, TB, BA, BB) over seven discrete sampling days. A total of  
419 24 catches (38.71%) contained at least 1 fly that tested positive by TBR-PCR. Of 62 catches, 19 met  
420 the analysis criteria of having >95% of flies collected and screened, and a total catch size of >1.  
421 When comparing the Cq values obtained from both TBR-qPCR and PLC-qPCR screening, it was  
422 apparent that across the 13 catches where *T. brucei* DNA was detected, six of the catches (BA9\_13,  
423 BA5\_15, TA5\_01, TA1\_01, BA8\_13, BA3\_15) contained one or two samples that recorded  
424 significantly lower Cq values (TBR-qPCR Cq 4.59-12.38, PLC-qPCR Cq 18.59-24.42) than other samples  
425 within the same catch (Fig. 6). When using the respective Cq cut-offs for TBR-qPCR (22.13) and PLC-  
426 qPCR (25.36) to identify true infected samples (Table 3), it revealed infected flies were detected in  
427 five of these 19 catches (Fig. 5), and eight of 62 total catches with a maximum of two infected flies  
428 per catch.

a)



b)



**Figure 5:** Catches where >95% of trapped flies were collected and screened and total catch >1 (n=19). Arranged in order of proportion of TBR +ve flies (L-R, largest to smallest). (a) shows TBR-qPCR Cq values (circular, black symbol) for each fly sample in each catch. (b) shows PLC-qPCR Cq values (triangular, red symbol) for each fly sample in each catch that also had a TBR-qPCR Cq value <22.13 and had DNA available. Grey bars (right axes) represent the proportion (%) of flies in each catch testing TBR-PCR positive. The red dotted horizontal lines represent the Cq cut offs of 22.13 for TBR (a) and 25.36 for PLC (b).

### 430 *Confirmation of T. brucei DNA in field samples*

431 Sequencing of TBR-PCR 173 bp target products revealed high homology to *T. brucei* satellite DNA  
432 target entry (accession number K00392.1). Of 93 samples submitted, 91 returned sequences of  
433 suitable quality for BLAST analysis. Across forward and reverse sequences obtained from 91 different  
434 fly samples, BLAST analysis revealed an average percentage identity of 95.37% ( $\pm 0.137$  SE). The  
435 variable homology is to be expected due to the heterogeneity of the target sequence [16].

436

### 437 Discussion

438 This study demonstrated that DNA from *T. brucei* infecting a tsetse can contaminate naïve  
439 uninfected tsetse within a trap cage environment, and that the level of contamination can be  
440 extensive. Even a low proportion of infected flies placed in a trap (1 infected:11 uninfected; T3)  
441 resulted in average 90.91% of uninfected flies producing a positive TBR-qPCR result (Fig. 3) and 69%  
442 by TBR-PCR. Whilst the use of a less-sensitive assay (PLC-qPCR) led to a ten-fold reduction in false-  
443 negatives (T3; 9.1%), it did not remove the contamination effect entirely and still lead to false-  
444 positive results when used as an end-point assay. Conventional PCR and other DNA-based end-point  
445 assays (LAMP, RPA) that target *T. brucei* may therefore be highly sensitive, yet have insufficient  
446 specificity when used in xenomonitoring of *Glossina sp.* However, DNA quantification using  
447 quantitative PCR can help to eliminate false positive results. Our results showed clear demarcations  
448 in Cq value ranges between infected flies (true-positive) and contaminated naïve flies (false-positive)  
449 using both TBR-qPCR and PLC-qPCR (Fig. 3). By considering Cq cut-offs, we were also able to  
450 determine that the proportion and quantity of *T. brucei* DNA contamination decreases with  
451 proportion of infected flies within the trap cage environment when co-housed for only 24 hours (Fig.  
452 3).

453 Low-level (Cq 32.21-36.64) localised air-borne contamination was also detected; using highly-  
454 sensitive TBR-qPCR, *T. brucei* DNA contamination (Cq < 40) was detected in 50% (n=12/24) of  
455 negative control (naïve) flies in a trap cage (C0-A, C0-B) when placed in close proximity to cages  
456 housing infected flies (T1-3). This hypothesis was reinforced when there was no amplification of  
457 trypanosome DNA in control flies placed in a trap cage in a separate room (C0-C) (Fig. 3).

458 Aerosolised DNA contamination is a known phenomenon that can lead to false-positive results when  
459 screening for target DNA using PCR techniques [19,46]. Analytical sensitivity testing previously  
460 showed the TBR-qPCR assay as having a 95% limit-of-detection of 0.05-0.5 genomic equivalents per  
461 reaction [42]. These results highlight both the extreme sensitivity of the TBR genomic target and the  
462 care which should be taken when handling tsetse samples that may be infected with *T. brucei*.

463 Detection of *T. brucei* DNA in tsetse, by either TBR-PCR or TBR-qPCR, is not indicative of a mature,  
464 transmissible infection. Consideration should be given to whether these assays are as biologically  
465 meaningful as dissections when used to estimate infection rate or prevalence, as concluded by Abdi  
466 *et al* [4].

467 Within-trap contamination was also evident in field samples. Using an end-point assay (TBR-PCR), a  
468 sample population was identified with a *T. brucei* DNA positivity rate of 24.77%. This far exceeds the  
469 expected infection prevalence in field flies [20]. Further to this, six catches recorded >40% infection  
470 prevalence by TBR-PCR, with three of these recording 99-100% proportion TBR-PCR positive (Fig. 5).

471 The largest of which (TA5\_01) comprised 229 TBR-positive flies out of a possible 230 (Fig. 5, S6). As  
472 with the experimental insectary-reared flies, other potential sources of contamination, such as carry-  
473 over contamination during the DNA extraction or amplification stages, were ruled out by use of  
474 controls (negative extraction controls and negative template controls respectively). In addition, pre-  
475 amplification setup was performed within a dedicated PCR workstation with HEPA-filtered airflow,  
476 which is known to reduce aerosolised DNA contamination [47]. Using the quantitative DNA  
477 approach, a two-step Cq cut-off protocol revealed a more accurate true positive sample population  
478 infection prevalence of 0.47% (95% CI [0.36%, 0.73%]). This result is similar to that of a previous

479 study conducted by Ngonyoka *et al* that reported a total *T. brucei* infection rate of 0.39% by ITS-PCR  
480 (a lower-sensitivity DNA target than TBR), in tsetse sampled from villages also bordering Tarangire  
481 national park [48]. However, it is important to state that these results were also not validated by  
482 dissection. In the current study, all tsetse deemed to be likely infected were *G. pallidipes*, giving a *G.*  
483 *pallidipes* infection prevalence of 0.79%, although we do acknowledge the presence of species  
484 sampling bias across different transects (Table 2). This is slightly higher than the majority of *G.*  
485 *pallidipes* infection prevalences reported by previous studies (not using TBR-based methods) in  
486 Tanzania, which range from zero [49,50] to ~0.4% [48] but is lower than the 3.33% reported by  
487 Luziga *et al* [51]. Mature *T. brucei* infection in *G. pallidipes* is thought to be rare [20] as *G. pallidipes*  
488 are more refractory to trypanosome infection than *G. m. morsitans* [52].

489 The likely route of DNA contamination is *T. brucei* DNA in tsetse faeces from lysed or non-viable *T.*  
490 *brucei*. *T. brucei* DNA has previously been detected in tsetse faecal material [30,31] and this was  
491 again confirmed in the present study (S5). Casual observations recorded during the laboratory-based  
492 experiments also noted high frequency of tsetse-tsetse interactions (mating and attempted mating)  
493 within trap cages in addition to defecation (S1h). This agrees with previous research reporting that  
494 opportune male tsetse in particular will expend significant energy in seeking females repeatedly  
495 [53,54]. Bursell previously estimated that laboratory *G. m. morsitans* in 100% humidity conditions  
496 excreted approximately 30 µg of solid waste per hour at 76 hours after feeding [29]. Therefore, we  
497 would expect the defecation rate of the laboratory flies in the current study (72 hours post-feed),  
498 and hungry field flies, to have been similar. Faecal screening revealed that experimentally-infected  
499 tsetse consistently excreted *T. brucei* DNA from days 5 to 14 post-infection (S5). Flies that ingested  
500 an infected bloodmeal but did not have established infections (refractory flies) also excreted *T.*  
501 *brucei* DNA, with 32% (6/19) recording TBR-positive faecal samples and 74% (14/19) containing  
502 detectable TBR DNA at 20 days post-infection. However very low-level parasitaemia, undetected by  
503 microscopy, could account for this. The shedding of *T. brucei* DNA in the faeces of refractory flies  
504 demonstrates the possibility for trapped tsetse to contaminate their surroundings with *T. brucei*

505 DNA without having established infections. It is important to state that we found no evidence to  
506 suggest that biological transmission can occur directly from tsetse to tsetse.

507 Fly parasitaemia is an important factor that likely influenced field results. In the current study we  
508 found that some field flies appear to contain much higher quantity of *T. brucei* DNA than the  
509 experimentally-infected *G. m. morsitans* flies. Whilst the minimum TBR-qPCR Cq value recorded for  
510 the experimentally infected flies was 15.09, field flies recorded Cq values as low as 4.59. All field flies  
511 recording Cq < 22.13 were *G. pallidipes*, and all field flies that recorded Cq <16 were female.

512 Unfortunately, there is a paucity of studies quantifying parasitaemia or *Trypanosoma* DNA in either  
513 laboratory flies or, critically, field flies of any species. Possible explanations include older field flies (>  
514 20 days) accumulating more parasites in the gut leading to higher parasitaemia, or simply the larger  
515 size of *G. pallidipes* [55] enabling them to ingest larger bloodmeals [32] and harbour more parasites.

516 The differences in parasitaemia between *G. pallidipes* sexes reported here agrees with previous field  
517 studies that have found higher rate of *Trypanosoma* infection in *G. pallidipes* females than males  
518 [49,56]. In addition, *G. pallidipes* females are larger than males with a 6.93% larger average wing  
519 length [32,55] and have been found to be more likely to develop mature infections than males,  
520 although not significantly more so [57]. Quantifying tsetse parasitaemia throughout infection stages  
521 in both the insectary and the field is an important next step in being able to determine more  
522 accurately infection rate or prevalence using molecular xenomonitoring methods. There are many  
523 biological factors that impact host-parasite interaction and parasitaemia in wild tsetse, and  
524 refinement of quantitative DNA cut offs may be required for different species and/or sexes.

525 Aside from parasitaemia, the quantity and proportion of *T. brucei* contamination modelled in the  
526 laboratory also does not necessarily apply in field catches. Although the large number of discarded  
527 flies prevented more in-depth analysis (S6), it was clear that for some catches the level of  
528 contamination was considerably greater than predicted, and in other cases less so (Fig. 5). A variety  
529 of biological and environmental factors can influence DNA contamination in the field; catch size (1-

530 420), fly density, higher average digestion rate (and thus potential defecation rate) in wild flies than  
531 in laboratory flies [58] and lack of decontamination measures between handling samples for sexing  
532 and morphological species identification. Conversely, there are factors in the field that may reduce  
533 DNA contamination, including DNA-degrading UV exposure, heat stress leading to adult fly morbidity  
534 [59], natural very low infection rates (< 3%) and the fact that not all flies would have been held in the  
535 trap cage for the maximum length of time (24 hours).

536 It is worth considering that in the current study DNA was extracted from whole tsetse flies, yet in  
537 several previous studies reporting high TBR positivity, DNA was extracted from dissected and excised  
538 tsetse midguts and/or salivary gland tissue only [22–24,26]. As we are hypothesising that *T. brucei*  
539 DNA contamination occurs in faecal samples on the fly exterior, contamination of internal tissues  
540 would only occur if they came into contact with the fly carapace during dissection. Whilst this is  
541 highly likely due to the nature of tsetse dissection, it is not assured.

542 It is not clear how the entomological trap and/or trap cage design impact contamination. In the  
543 current study, Nzi traps with plastic cage bottles were used for sampling Savanna tsetse in Tanzania.  
544 However, high prevalence of *T. brucei* s-l infection has also been reported in studies using Epsilon,  
545 biconical and pyramidal traps to capture a range of species in countries across West, Central and  
546 East Africa [21–25]. Although Musaya *et al* featured images of an epsilon trap with plastic bottle and  
547 biconical trap with transparent bag [24], the other studies do not detail the trap cage design.  
548 Methods to mitigate DNA contamination were not explored in this proof-of-principle study. Whilst  
549 fly density and refractoriness are beyond human control, changes can be made to the trap cage  
550 design and collection protocol to reduce tsetse-tsetse interaction and/or fly defecation. Future  
551 research should explore such approaches keeping in mind field applicability, time and cost.

552 Molecular xenomonitoring is used in the surveillance of a range of other vector-borne diseases,  
553 some of which may also be susceptible to DNA contamination via vector faeces. DNA of *T.*  
554 *congolense* and *T. vivax*, causative agents of animal African trypanosomiasis, may also be shed in



555 tsetse faeces. However, *Plasmodium falciparum*, *Wuchereria bancrofti* and *Mansonella perstans*  
556 DNA have all been detected in the excreta or faeces of *Anopheles sp.* [60]. This provides a viable  
557 pathway for DNA contamination within a mosquito trap. Whether the contamination does occur and  
558 to what extent it affects reporting of infection rates should be explored.

559

## 560 Conclusions

561 During capture of infected tsetse, infected flies can passively contaminate uninfected ones with *T.*  
562 *brucei* DNA while they are retained in the cage of a trap both with insectary-reared and field caught  
563 tsetse. Although simple PCR may overestimate infection prevalence, qPCR offers a means of more  
564 accurately identifying parasite DNA in the tsetse. While these results can clearly impact tsetse  
565 surveillance, they may also have ramifications for xenomonitoring of other vector-borne diseases.  
566 Going forward, careful consideration should be given to vector trapping and collection methods in  
567 the molecular age. This could include DNA contamination, assay sensitivity and the way that results  
568 are interpreted. Future research should focus on methods to mitigate or eliminate DNA  
569 contamination within a trap cage and quantifying parasitaemia of mature salivary gland infection  
570 (confirmed vectors) in both laboratory and field-caught tsetse flies.

571

## 572 Acknowledgements

573 Special thanks go to Zachary Stavrou-Dowd and Dr Clair Rose for their invaluable assistance in tsetse  
574 colony maintenance at LSTM. Many thanks to Godfrey Mashenga, Kombo Shabani and Peter Daffa  
575 for their assistance and expertise in the trapping and collection of tsetse in Tanzania. Thanks also to  
576 Prof Wendy Gibson for providing *T. brucei* M249 DNA for use as positive control. Funding was  
577 provided by Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC; BB/S01375X/1) and Bill

578 & Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-031337, INV-001785, INV-046509). The Roslin Institute is  
579 supported by core funding from the BBSRC (BBS/E/D/20002173; BBS/E/RL/230002C).

580

## 581 References

582 1. Lloyd LI, Johnson WB. The Trypanosome Infections of Tsetse-flies in Northern Nigeria and a  
583 new Method of Estimation. *Bull Entomol Res.* 1924;14: 265–288.

584 doi:10.1017/S0007485300028352

585 2. Rogers DJ. Trypanosomiasis “risk” or “challenge”: a review. *Acta Trop.* 1985;42: 5–23.

586 3. Smith IM, Rennison DB. Some factors concerned in trypanosome challenge. Proceedings of  
587 the 7th Meeting of the International Scientific Committee on Trypanosomiasis Research.

588 Brussels; 1958. pp. 63–66.

589 4. Abdi RD, Agga GE, Aregawi WG, Bekana M, Van Leeuwen T, Delespaux V, et al. A systematic  
590 review and meta-analysis of trypanosome prevalence in tsetse flies. *BMC Vet Res.* 2017;13:

591 100. doi:10.1186/s12917-017-1012-9

592 5. Leak SGA. *Tsetse Biology and Ecology*. 2nd ed. *Tsetse Biology and Ecology: Their Role in the*  
593 *Epidemiology and Control of Trypanosomosis*. 2nd ed. CAB International; 1999. pp. 1–178.

594 6. Ouma JO, Masake RA, Masiga DK, Mooloo SK, Njuguna JT, Ndung’u A JM. Comparative  
595 sensitivity of dot-ELISA, PCR and dissection method for the detection of trypanosome

596 infections in tsetse flies (Diptera: Glossinidae). *Acta Trop.* 2000. Available:

597 [www.elsevier.com/locate/actatropica](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/actatropica)

598 7. Lehane MJ, Msangi AR, Whitaker CJ, Lehane SM. Grouping of trypanosome species in mixed  
599 infections in *Glossina pallidipes*. *Parasitology.* 2000;120: 583–592.

600 doi:10.1017/S0031182099005983

- 601 8. Cunningham LJ, Lingley JK, Haines LR, Ndung'u JM, Torr SJ, Adams ER. Illuminating the  
602 Prevalence of *Trypanosoma brucei* s.l. in *Glossina* Using LAMP as a Tool for Xenomonitoring.  
603 Van Den Abbeele J, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2016;10: e0004441.  
604 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0004441
- 605 9. Garrod G, Adams ER, Lingley JK, Saldanha I, Torr SJ, Cunningham LJ. A pilot study  
606 demonstrating the identification of *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense* and *T. b. rhodesiense* in  
607 vectors using a multiplexed high-resolution melt qPCR. Matovu E, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*.  
608 2020;14: e0008308. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0008308
- 609 10. Lord JS, Lea RS, Allan FK, Byamungu M, Hall DR, Lingley J, et al. Assessing the effect of  
610 insecticide-treated cattle on tsetse abundance and trypanosome transmission at the wildlife-  
611 livestock interface in Serengeti, Tanzania. Mireji PO, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2020;14:  
612 e0008288. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0008288
- 613 11. Pryce J, Reimer LJ. Evaluating the Diagnostic Test Accuracy of Molecular Xenomonitoring  
614 Methods for Characterizing Community Burden of Lymphatic Filariasis. *Clinical Infectious*  
615 *Diseases*. 2021;72: S203–S209. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab197
- 616 12. Farid HA, Morsy ZS, Helmy H, Ramzy RMR, Setouhy E, Weil GJ. A Critical Appraisal of  
617 Molecular Xenomonitoring as a Tool for Assessing Progress toward Elimination of Lymphatic  
618 Filariasis. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2007;77: 593–600.
- 619 13. Pryce J, Unnasch TR, Reimer LJ. Evaluating the diagnostic test accuracy of molecular  
620 xenomonitoring methods for characterising the community burden of *Onchocerciasis*. *PLoS*  
621 *Negl Trop Dis*. 2021;15: e0009812. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0009812
- 622 14. Cunningham LJ, Esterhuizen J, Hargrove JW, Lehane M, Lingley J, Clement Mangwiro T, et al.  
623 Insights into Trypanosomiasis Transmission: Age, Infection Rates, and Bloodmeal Analysis of  
624 *Glossina fuscipes fuscipes* in N.W. Uganda. *bioRxiv*. 2023. doi:10.1101/2023.11.21.568004

- 625 15. Ahmed HA, Picozzi K, Welburn SC, Macleod ET. A comparative evaluation of PCR- Based  
626 methods for species- Specific determination of African animal trypanosomes in Ugandan  
627 cattle. *Parasit Vectors*. 2013;6: 316. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-6-316
- 628 16. Van Reet NI, Patient Pyana P, Dehou SI, Bebronne NI, Deborggraeve SI, Bü scher PI. Single  
629 nucleotide polymorphisms and copy-number variations in the *Trypanosoma brucei* repeat  
630 (TBR) sequence can be used to enhance amplification and genotyping of Trypanozoon strains.  
631 Latrofa MS, editor. *PLoS One*. 2021;16: e0258711. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0258711
- 632 17. Becker S, Franco JR, Simarro PP, Stich A, Abel PM, Steverding D. Real-time PCR for detection  
633 of *Trypanosoma brucei* in human blood samples. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2004;50: 193–  
634 199. doi:10.1016/J.DIAGMICROBIO.2004.07.001
- 635 18. Moser D, Cook G, DE O, Bailey C, McKane M, Donelson J. Detection of *Trypanosoma*  
636 *congolense* and *Trypanosoma brucei* subspecies by DNA amplification using the polymerase  
637 chain reaction. *Parasitology*. 1989;99: 57–66. doi:10.1017/S0031182000061023
- 638 19. Scherczinger CA, Ladd C, Bourke MT, Adamowicz MS, Johannes PM, Scherczinger R, et al.  
639 TECHNICAL NOTE A Systematic Analysis of PCR Contamination\*. *J Forensic Sci*. 1999.
- 640 20. Harley JMB. Further studies on age and trypanosome infection rates in *Glossina pallidipes*  
641 *Aust.*, *G. palpalis fuscipes* Newst. and *G. brevipalpis* Newst. in Uganda. *Bull Entomol Res*.  
642 1967;57: 459–477. doi:10.1017/S0007485300050203
- 643 21. Karshima SN, Ajogi I, Mohammed G. Eco-epidemiology of porcine trypanosomosis in Karim  
644 Lamido, Nigeria: Prevalence, seasonal distribution, tsetse density and infection rates. *Parasit*  
645 *Vectors*. 2016;9: 1–9. doi:10.1186/S13071-016-1732-X/TABLES/7
- 646 22. Grébaud P, Andjingpogbou Y, Mansinsa DP, Manzambi EZ, Mpembelé F, Lejon V, et al.  
647 Monitoring the presence of trypanosomes' DNA - Including *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense*  
648 DNA - From the midguts of riverine *Glossina* trapped in the south east outskirts of Kinshasa

- 649 City (Democratic Republic of Congo). *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*. 2020;77.  
650 doi:10.1016/j.meegid.2019.104095
- 651 23. Lukaw YS, Abdelrahman MM, Mohammed YO, Ochi EB, Sulaiman YR, El-Rayah IE.  
652 Performance assessment of molecular and microscopy tests for detection of trypanosoma  
653 species in glossina fuscipes fuscipes (diptera: glossinidae) midguts in Kajo-Keji county, South  
654 Sudan. *Int J Bioassays*. 2015;4: 3910–3914. Available:  
655 [https://www.ijbio.com/abstract/performance-assessment-of-molecular-and-microscopy-](https://www.ijbio.com/abstract/performance-assessment-of-molecular-and-microscopy-tests-for-detection-of-trypanosoma-species-in-glossina-fuscipes-fusci-14111.html)  
656 [tests-for-detection-of-trypanosoma-species-in-glossina-fuscipes-fusci-14111.html](https://www.ijbio.com/abstract/performance-assessment-of-molecular-and-microscopy-tests-for-detection-of-trypanosoma-species-in-glossina-fuscipes-fusci-14111.html)
- 657 24. Musaya J, Chisi J, Senga E, Nambala P, Maganga E, Matovu E, et al. Polymerase chain reaction  
658 identification of *Trypanosoma brucei rhodesiense* in wild tsetse flies from Nkhotakota  
659 Wildlife Reserve, Malawi. *Malawi Med J*. 2017;29: 5–9. Available:  
660 <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/mmj.v29i1.3>
- 661 25. Malele II, Magwisha HB, Nyingilili HS, Mamiro KA, Rukambile EJ, Daffa JW, et al. Multiple  
662 *Trypanosoma* infections are common amongst *Glossina* species in the new farming areas of  
663 Rufiji district, Tanzania. *Parasit Vectors*. 2011;4: 217. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-4-217
- 664 26. McNamara JJ, Laveissière C, Masiga DK. Multiple trypanosome infections in wild tsetse in  
665 Côte d’Ivoire detected by PCR analysis and DNA probes. *Acta Trop*. 1995;59: 85–92.  
666 doi:10.1016/0001-706X(94)00087-H
- 667 27. Cunningham LJ. Detection and control of *T. brucei* s.l. in the historic sleeping sickness foci of  
668 NW Uganda . University of Liverpool. 2017.
- 669 28. Mihok S. The development of a multipurpose trap (the Nzi) for tsetse and other biting flies.  
670 *Bull Entomol Res*. 2002;92: 385–403. doi:10.1079/BER2002186
- 671 29. Bursell E. Loss of Water by Excretion and Defaecation in the Tsetse Fly. *Journal of*  
672 *Experimental Biology*. 1960;37: 689–697.

- 673 30. Ravel S, Grébaud P, Cuisance D, Cuny G. Monitoring the developmental status of  
674 *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense* in the tsetse fly by means of PCR analysis of anal and saliva  
675 drops. *Acta Trop.* 2003;88: 161–165. doi:10.1016/S0001-706X(03)00191-8
- 676 31. Pilotte N, Cook DAN, Pryce J, Zulch MF, Minetti C, Reimer LJ, et al. Laboratory evaluation of  
677 molecular xenomonitoring using mosquito and tsetse fly excreta/feces to amplify  
678 *Plasmodium*, *Brugia*, and *Trypanosoma* DNA. *Gates Open Res.* 2020;3: 1734.  
679 doi:10.12688/gatesopenres.13093.2
- 680 32. Taylor P. Blood-meal size of *Glossina morsitans* Westw. and *G. pallidipes* Austen (Diptera:  
681 Glossinidae) under field conditions. *Transactions of the Rhodesian Scientific Association.*  
682 1976;57: 29–34.
- 683 33. Bursell E. Nitrogenous waste products of the tsetse fly, *Glossina morsitans*. *J Insect Physiol.*  
684 1965;11: 993–1001. doi:10.1016/0022-1910(65)90202-7
- 685 34. Mehlitz D, Zillmann U, Scott CM, Godfrey DG. Epidemiological studies on the animal reservoir  
686 of Gambiense sleeping sickness. Part III. Characterization of trypanozoon stocks by  
687 isoenzymes and sensitivity to human serum. *Tropenmed Parasitol.* 1982;33: 113–8.
- 688 35. Lord JS, Lea RS, Allan FK, Byamungu M, Hall DR, Lingley J, et al. Assessing the effect of  
689 insecticide-treated cattle on tsetse abundance and trypanosome transmission at the wildlife-  
690 livestock interface in Serengeti, Tanzania. Mireji PO, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2020;14:  
691 e0008288. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0008288
- 692 36. Kiffner C, Thomas S, Speaker T, O'Connor V, Schwarz P, Kioko J, et al. Community-based  
693 wildlife management area supports similar mammal species richness and densities compared  
694 to a national park. *Ecol Evol.* 2020;10: 480–492. doi:10.1002/ece3.5916

- 695 37. Lamprey HF. Estimation of the large mammal densities, biomass and energy exchange in the  
696 Tarangire game reserve and the Maasai steppe in Tanganyika. *Afr J Ecol.* 1964;2: 1–46.  
697 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2028.1964.tb00194.x
- 698 38. Torr SJ, Hall DR, Phelps RJ, Vale GA. Methods for dispensing odour attractants for tsetse flies  
699 (Diptera: Glossinidae). *Bull Entomol Res.* 1997;87: 299–311.  
700 doi:10.1017/S0007485300037251
- 701 39. Torr SJ, Mangwiro TNC, Hall DR. Shoo fly, don't bother me! Efficacy of traditional methods of  
702 protecting cattle from tsetse. *Med Vet Entomol.* 2011;25: 192–201. doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
703 2915.2010.00942.x
- 704 40. Choi E-H, Lee SK, Ihm C, Sohn Y-H. Rapid DNA extraction from dried blood spots on filter  
705 paper: potential applications in biobanking. *Osong Public Health Res Perspect.* 2014;5: 351–7.  
706 doi:10.1016/j.phrp.2014.09.005
- 707 41. Moser D, Cook G, DE O, Bailey C, McKane M, Donelson J. Detection of *Trypanosoma*  
708 *congolense* and *Trypanosoma brucei* subspecies by DNA amplification using the polymerase  
709 chain reaction. *Parasitology.* 1989;99: 57–66. doi:10.1017/S0031182000061023
- 710 42. Saldanha I, Betson M, Vrettou C, Paxton E, Nixon J, Tennant P, et al. Consistent detection of  
711 *Trypanosoma brucei* but not *T. congolense* DNA in faeces of experimentally-infected cattle.  
712 *Res Sq.* 2023. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-3628035/v1
- 713 43. Picozzi K, Carrington M, Welburn SC. A multiplex PCR that discriminates between  
714 *Trypanosoma brucei brucei* and zoonotic *T. b. rhodesiense*. *Exp Parasitol.* 2008;118: 41–46.  
715 doi:10.1016/j.exppara.2007.05.014
- 716 44. Garrod G, Adams ER, Lingley JK, Saldanha I, Torr SJ, Cunningham LJ. A pilot study  
717 demonstrating the identification of *Trypanosoma brucei gambiense* and *T. b. rhodesiense* in

718 vectors using a multiplexed high-resolution melt qPCR. Matovu E, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.  
719 2020;14: e0008308. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0008308

720 45. Hall T. BioEdit : a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for  
721 Windows 95/98/NT. Nucleic Acids Symp Ser. 1999;41: 95–98.

722 46. Salimnia H, Lephart PR, Asmar BI, Prebelich D, Paulson E, Fairfax MR. Aerosolized vaccine as  
723 an unexpected source of false-positive *Bordetella pertussis* PCR results. J Clin Microbiol.  
724 2012;50: 472–474. doi:10.1128/JCM.01250-11

725 47. Held KF, Rundell C, Thibeault R, Ghidoni D, Magoon D, Nguyen T, et al. The Effectiveness of  
726 HEPA Filters on DNA. Applied Biosafety. 2018;23: 91–95. doi:10.1177/1535676018766080

727 48. Ngonyoka A, Gwakisa PS, Estes AB, Salekwa LP, Nnko HJ, Hudson PJ, et al. Patterns of tsetse  
728 abundance and trypanosome infection rates among habitats of surveyed villages in Maasai  
729 steppe of northern Tanzania. Infect Dis Poverty. 2017;6. doi:10.1186/s40249-017-0340-0

730 49. Moolo SK, Steiger RF, Brun R. Trypanosome infection rates in *Glossina swynnertoni* and *G.*  
731 *pallidipes* in Ikoma, Musoma District, Tanzania. Parasitology. 1973;66: 259–267.  
732 doi:10.1017/S0031182000045194

733 50. Msangi AR, Whitaker CJ, Lehane MJ. Factors influencing the prevalence of trypanosome  
734 infection of *Glossina pallidipes* on the Ruvu flood plain of Eastern Tanzania. Acta Trop. 1998.

735 51. Luziga C, Muya C, Mramba F, Byamungu M, Mbata G, Mtambuki A. A tsetse *Glossina*  
736 *pallidipes* harbors the pathogenic trypanosomes circulating in Liwale district, Tanzania. Vet  
737 Parasitol Reg Stud Reports. 2017;9: 93–97. doi:10.1016/j.vprsr.2017.06.002

738 52. Welburn SC, Maudlin I, Ellis DS. Rate of trypanosome killing by lectins in midguts of different  
739 species and strains of *Glossina*. Med Vet Entomol. 1989;3: 77–82. doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
740 2915.1989.tb00477.x



- 741 53. Adlington D, Randolph SE, Rogers DJ. Flying to feed or flying to mate: gender differences in  
742 the flight activity of tsetse (*Glossina palpalis*). *Physiol Entomol.* 1996;21: 85–92.  
743 doi:10.1111/j.1365-3032.1996.tb00839.x
- 744 54. Wall R, Langley PA. The mating behaviour of tsetse flies (*Glossina*): a review. *Physiol Entomol.*  
745 1993;18: 211–218. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3032.1993.tb00470.x
- 746 55. Hargrove J, English S, Torr SJ, Lord J, Haines LR, Van Schalkwyk C, et al. Wing length and host  
747 location in tsetse (*Glossina* spp.): Implications for control using stationary baits. *Parasit*  
748 *Vectors.* 2019;12. doi:10.1186/s13071-018-3274-x
- 749 56. Desta M, Beyene D, Haile S. Journal of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Health Trypanosome  
750 infection rate of *Glossina pallidipes* and trypanosomosis prevalence in cattle in Amaro Special  
751 District of Southern Ethiopia. 2013;5: 164–170. doi:10.5897/JVMAH2013.0199
- 752 57. Peacock L, Ferris V, Bailey M, Gibson W. The influence of sex and fly species on the  
753 development of trypanosomes in tsetse flies. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2012;6.  
754 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0001515
- 755 58. Weitz B, Buxton PA. The Rate of Digestion of Blood Meals of various haematophagous  
756 Arthropods as determined by the Precipitin Test. *Bull Entomol Res.* 1953;44: 445–450.  
757 doi:10.1017/S0007485300025566
- 758 59. Weaving H, Lord JS, Haines L, English S. No evidence for direct thermal carryover effects on  
759 starvation tolerance in the obligate blood-feeder, *Glossina morsitans morsitans*. *Ecol Evol.*  
760 2023;13. doi:10.1002/ece3.10652
- 761 60. Minetti C, Pilotte N, Zulch M, Canelas T, Tettevi EJ, Veriegh FBD, et al. Field evaluation of DNA  
762 detection of human filarial and malaria parasites using mosquito excreta/feces. *PLoS Negl*  
763 *Trop Dis.* 2020;14: 1–17. doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0008175
- 764

## 765 Data availability

766 All data generated during this project is available at DOIs

767 [www.figshare.com/10.6084/m9.figshare.25298644](http://www.figshare.com/10.6084/m9.figshare.25298644) and

768 [www.figshare.com/10.6084/m9.figshare.25298689](http://www.figshare.com/10.6084/m9.figshare.25298689)

769

## 770 Supporting information captions

771 **S1: Images from experiments conducted on insectary-reared tsetse.** (a) and (b) show tsetse being  
772 blood-fed in solitary cells; (c) tsetse resting after bloodmeal; (d) tsetse solitary cells suspended above  
773 filter paper discs in rack; (e) collection of tsetse faecal samples on filter paper; (f) an infected tsetse  
774 marked with green oil paint; (g) experiment trap cages; (h) two infected tsetse (fly IDs 87 and 109)  
775 copulating inside trap cage during experiment; (i) dissected tsetse midgut infected with *T. brucei* as  
776 viewed under a microscope (400X).

777

778 **S2: A table displaying *G. m. morsitans* sex and infection ratios for trap cage experiments.** M = male,  
779 F = female, IF = infected fly, UF = naïve uninfected fly.

780

781 **S3: A table displaying transect, region and coordinates for each Nzi trap set as part of the study.**

782 Tarangire NP = Tarangire National Park.

783

784 **S4: Gel electrophoresis image from TBR-PCR screening of UFs in C0-A control trap (top row) and**  
785 **naïve flies in T1 control traps (bottom row).** Red arrow indicates target 173bp TBR product. NEC =

786 negative extraction control. LAD = 100bp ladder.

787

788 **S5: Dissection and qPCR screening results of insectary-reared tsetse experimentally-infected with**  
789 ***Trypanosoma brucei brucei***. S5A: A box-and-whisker plot (left axis) showing Cq values obtained from  
790 TBR-qPCR screening of faecal samples at four timepoints and eventual whole fly DNA from a subset  
791 of infected (IF) and refractory uninfected flies (UF) that were subject to dissection ante-mortem  
792 (n=44). Samples from infected flies are in red, samples from refractory (uninfected) flies are in blue.  
793 The bars (right axis) shows the proportion of faecal samples recording TBR-qPCR amplification  
794 (where samples were available). The crosses represent the mean Cq values. The amount of *T. brucei*  
795 DNA detected in IF samples was consistently higher than that detected in UFs. Where amplification  
796 was recorded, there was a significant difference between mean TBR-qPCR Cq values from infected  
797 (mean=17.57) and uninfected whole flies at 20 days (mean=33.54,  $p < 0.0001$ ). The midgut infection  
798 rate of this subset was 57% (25/44). S5B: Diagnostic positive predictive value (PPV) and negative  
799 predictive value (NPV) calculations for TBR-qPCR screening of tsetse faecal samples as a diagnosis of  
800 infection. Faecal samples collected 10-14 days post-inoculation that tested positive (TBR-qPCR) were  
801 highly likely to originate from an infected fly, with diagnostic positive predictive value (PPV) of 91%  
802 and negative predictive value (NPV) of 85% A positive TBR-qPCR result ('qPCR\_Y') was any sample  
803 recording amplification ( $Cq < 40$ ). A negative TBR-qPCR result ('TBR-qPCR\_N') was any sample that  
804 did not record amplification. Infected ('Infected\_Y') was any fly confirmed as having mature midgut  
805 infection by microscopy, whilst uninfected ('Infected\_N') was any fly confirmed as having no visible  
806 trypanosome infection by microscopy. Calculations are based on samples collected 10-12 days post-  
807 inoculation and/or 13-14 days post-inoculation.

808

809 **S6: Plots displaying total catch counts and respective sample TBR-qPCR Cq values for transects TA,**  
810 **TB and BA\***. The left Y axis displays individual fly TBR-qPCR Cq values, plotted as black, circular  
811 symbols. The right Y axis displays number of flies caught in each catch, displayed as a stacked bar

812 chart. Red shows the number of flies testing TBR-positive, blue shows the number of flies testing TBR  
813 negative, and grey shows the number of flies that were discarded and not collected. \*Transect BB is  
814 not featured, as it consisted of 1 TBR-negative fly caught in 1 trap (BB17\_15).

## 815 Author Contributions

<b>Isabel Saldanha</b>	Conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, validation, visualisation, writing – original draft preparation, writing – review and editing
<b>Rachel Lea</b>	Data curation, investigation, project administration, writing – review and editing
<b>Oliver Manangwa</b>	Investigation
<b>Gala Garrod</b>	Data curation, investigation
<b>Lee R. Haines</b>	Resources, supervision, writing – review and editing
<b>Álvaro Acosta-Serrano</b>	Resources, supervision, writing – review and editing
<b>Harriet Auty</b>	Funding acquisition, project administration
<b>Martha Betson</b>	Supervision, writing – review and editing
<b>Jennifer S. Lord</b>	Data curation, project administration
<b>Liam J. Morrison</b>	Funding acquisition, project administration
<b>Furaha Mramba</b>	Funding acquisition, project administration
<b>Stephen J. Torr</b>	Investigation, funding acquisition, project administration, resources, supervision, writing – review and editing
<b>Lucas J. Cunningham</b>	Methodology, resources, supervision, writing – review and editing




Fig1.tif



Fig3.tif






Fig4.tif






Fig5.tif

a)



b)





Click here to access/download  
**Supporting Information**  
S1.pdf





Click here to access/download  
**Supporting Information**  
S2.pdf



Click here to access/download  
**Supporting Information**  
S3.pdf



Click here to access/download  
**Supporting Information**  
S4.pdf





Click here to access/download  
**Supporting Information**  
S5.pdf



Click here to access/download  
**Supporting Information**  
S6.pdf





Click here to download Data Review URL  
<http://figshare.com/s/472b8b8eae00d0c9e1c4>





Click here to download Data Review URL  
<http://figshare.com/s/628e5c75442508b4cec5>

