1	High vector competence of Aedes aegypti and Aedes albopictus from ten American								
2	countries as a crucial factor of the spread of Chikungunya								
3									
4	Anubis Vega-Rúa, <sup>a,b</sup> Karima Zouache, <sup>a</sup> Romain Girod, <sup>c</sup> Anna-Bella Failloux, <sup>a,*</sup> Ricardo								
5	Lourenço-de-Oliveira <sup>a,d,*</sup>								
6									
7	<sup>a</sup> Institut Pasteur, Department of Virology, Arboviruses and Insect Vectors, 25-28 rue du								
8	Docteur Roux, 75724 Paris, cedex 15, France.								
9	<sup>b</sup> Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Cellule Pasteur UPMC, 25-28 rue du Dr Roux, 75724 Paris								
10	cedex 15, France.								
11	<sup>c</sup> Institut Pasteur de la Guyane, Unité d'Entomologie médicale, Avenue Pasteur, BP 6010,								
12	97306 Cayenne Cedex, Guyane française.								
13	<sup>d</sup> Laboratório de Transmissores de Hematozoários, Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, Fiocruz, Av.								
14	Brasil 4365, Rio de Janeiro, 21045-900, Brazil.								
15									
16	* Corresponding authors:								
17	Ricardo Lourenço-de-Oliveira: <u>lourenco@ioc.fiocruz.br</u> , <u>ricardo.lourenco-de-</u>								
18	<u>oliveira@pasteur.fr</u>								
19	Anna-Bella Failloux: anna-bella.failloux@pasteur.fr								
20									
21	Running title: Chikungunya in the Americas								
22									
23	Abstract: 247 words								
24	Text: 5117 words								
25									

## 26 ABSTRACT

27 Chikungunya virus (CHIKV) causes a major public health problem. In 2004, CHIKV began 28 an unprecedented global expansion and has been responsible for epidemics in Africa, Asia, 29 islands in the Indian Ocean region, and surprisingly, in temperate regions such as Europe. 30 Intriguingly, no local transmission of chikungunya virus (CHIKV) has been reported in the 31 Americas until recently despite the presence of vectors and annually-reported imported cases. 32 Here, we assessed the vector competence of 35 American Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus 33 populations to three CHIKV genotypes. We also compared the number of viral particles of 34 different CHIKV strains in mosquito saliva at two different times post-infection. Primarily, 35 viral dissemination rates were high for all mosquito populations irrespective of the tested 36 CHIKV isolate. In contrast, differences in transmission efficiency (TE) were underlined in 37 populations of both species through the Americas suggesting the role of salivary glands in 38 selecting CHIKV for highly efficient transmission. Nonetheless, both mosquito species were 39 capable to transmit all three CHIKV genotypes, and TE reached alarming rates as high as 83.3% and 96.7% in Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus populations, respectively. Ae. albopictus 40 better transmitted the epidemic mutant strain CHIKV 0621 of the East-Central-South African 41 42 (ECSA) genotype than did Ae. aegypti, whereas this latter species was more capable of 43 transmitting the original ECSA CHIKV\_115 strain and also the Asian genotype CHIKV\_NC. 44 Therefore, a high risk of establishment and spread of CHIKV throughout the tropical, 45 subtropical and even temperate regions of the Americas is more real than ever.

46

JVI Accepts published online ahead of print

## 47 IMPORTANCE

Until recently, the Americas have never reported chikungunya (CHIK) autochthonous 48 49 transmission despite its global expansion beginning in 2004. Large regions of the continent 50 are highly infested with Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus and millions of dengue (DEN) cases 51 are annually recorded. Indeed, DEN and CHIK viruses share the same vectors. Due to a recent 52 CHIK outbreak affecting Caribbean islands, the need for a Pan-American evaluation of vector 53 competence was compelling as a key parameter in assessing the epidemic risk. We 54 demonstrated for the first time that Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus populations throughout the 55 continent are highly competent to transmit CHIK irrespective to the viral genotypes tested. 56 The risk of CHIK spreading throughout the tropical, subtropical and even temperate regions 57 of the Americas is more than ever a reality. In light of our results, local authorities should immediately pursue and reinforce epidemiological and entomological surveillance to avoid a 58 59 severe epidemic.

60

61 Key words: Americas, Aedes aegypti, Aedes albopictus, chikungunya virus, emergence.

62

### 64 INTRODUCTION

65 Chikungunya virus (CHIKV) is an alphavirus in the family *Togaviridae* that is transmitted by 66 mosquitoes, mainly *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* within an urban cycle. Since 2004, 67 CHIKV has reemerged in the Indian Ocean Islands and has caused severe epidemics in 68 several countries in tropical and subtropical regions in Africa and Asia, as well as in 69 temperate Mediterranean areas in Europe (1).

70 Aedes aegypti is widespread in the Americas, where it is the only confirmed natural 71 dengue virus (DENV) vector (2). Although its geographical distribution is more limited, Ae. 72 *albopictus* is considered a potential vector in the Americas due to the high vector competence 73 of local populations to DENV (3.4). More than two millions dengue cases are annually 74 reported in the American continent each year (5). The most critical epidemiological situation 75 is that described for South America, which reported more than 1.5 million dengue cases in 76 2013, with an incidence rate of more than 650 cases/100,000 inhabitants in the South Cone 77 alone (6). Such an epidemiological scenario points to the weakness of mosquito control 78 activities and the high receptivity to introduction and spread of other arboviroses transmitted by both mosquito species like CHIKV in other parts of the continent (1,7,8). In fact, as 79 CHIKV and DENV share the same mosquito vector species, epidemic waves caused by both 80 81 viruses affect the same regions and human co-infections may occur (9,10). Moreover, the 82 intensification of intercontinental travels with recurrent returns of dozens of viremic CHIKV 83 cases from affected areas -that may bypass the surveillance systems due to the clinical 84 similarities with other viruses circulating in the Americas- exemplifies the vulnerability of 85 this continent to CHIKV epidemics (11,12). Indeed, Brazil, Canada, USA, French Guiana, and the French West Indies (Guadeloupe and Martinique) have reported several imported 86 87 CHIKV cases since its re-emergence in 2004 (6,13).

88 Intriguingly, until December 2013, autochthonous CHIKV transmission has never 89 been reported in the Americas, a continent where all the conditions are apparently suitable for 90 its establishment: (i) it is a virgin continent for CHIKV, (ii) the main mosquito vectors of 91 CHIKV, Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus, are present with high densities in most areas, (iii) 92 imported cases are annually reported in periods of high mosquito density and activity, and (iv) 93 temperature and environmental conditions of large tropical and subtropical zones are 94 favorable to mosquito development and activity as well as to viral replication in the vector 95 (11,14). In the early December 2013, two laboratory-confirmed autochthonous CHIKV cases were reported in the French territory of Saint-Martin Island in the Caribbean (6). Very rapidly, 96 97 an epidemic was established on the island with almost 2030 clinical cases and more than 765 98 confirmed cases today, and subsequently, some CHIKV cases were detected in Martinique, 99 Guadeloupe, Saint-Barthelemy, and also French Guyana (15). Therefore, CHIKV is 100 progressively spreading putting at a high epidemic risk the vastly-infested Ae. aegypti and Ae. 101 albopictus areas of the Americas.

102 To achieve efficient transmission, numerous factors regarding the invertebrate and the 103 vertebrate hosts, the virus, and the environmental conditions must ideally converge (16). 104 Concerning the mosquito host, vector competence is considered to be unique and 105 characteristic for each virus-vector pair. Indeed differences of vector competence can be 106 found between different populations belonging to a single insect vector species (17). Vector 107 competence is a quantitative phenotypic parameter controlled by genetic characteristics of 108 both vector and virus, which in turn is influenced by environmental conditions (18-20). 109 Mosquito vector competence to CHIKV and DENV seems to be determined by genotype-bygenotype interactions, in which successfull transmission depends on some specific 110 111 combination of mosquito and viral genetic characteristics (21-26). CHIKV has four major 112 lineages: East-Central-South Africa (ECSA), West Africa, Asian, and the Indian Ocean, a

113 monophyletic lineage descendant from the ECSA group (27). The CHIKV lineages have 114 displayed distinct transmission efficiencies in mosquito vector species and populations (25,28, 29). Throughout the 2005-2006 CHIKV epidemic in the Indian Ocean region, a CHIKV 115 116 lineage strain harboring a substitution of an alanine to valine at position 226 of the E1 117 envelope glycoprotein (E1-A226V) was better transmitted by Ae. albopictus (22,25,30). It was later shown that other positions in the E2 glycoprotein exert epistatic effects on the 118 119 position E1-226V (23,24) and some substitutions can block the adaptation of the E1-226V to 120 Ae. albopictus. These epistatic interactions are lineage specific.

121 Determining vector competence of mosquito populations is a key parameter in 122 evaluating the risk of CHIKV transmission and spread. Given the alarming epidemiological 123 situation due to the very recent chikungunya outbreak affecting the Caribbean islands, the 124 need for evaluating the vector competence of American mosquito populations is compelling. 125 Until now, studies were only limited to mosquitoes from the USA and the French Caribbean 126 (31-34). With the aim of understanding the factors that may influence CHIKV emergence in 127 the Americas and the risk of CHIKV epidemic spreading throughout the continent, we carried 128 out a comprehensive Pan-American evaluation of vector competence of 35 Ae. aegypti and Ae. 129 albopictus populations from 10 countries towards three CHIKV isolates belonging to two 130 distinct lineages.

131

132

## 133 MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ethics Statement. The Institut Pasteur animal facility has received accreditation from the French Ministry of Agriculture to perform experiments on live animals [see permit numbers at http://webcampus.pasteur.fr/jcms/c\_97619/agrements-des-animaleries] in appliance of the French and European regulations on care and protection of the Laboratory Animals. This study was approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) at the
Institut Pasteur. No specific permits were required for the described field studies in locations
which are not protected in any way and did not involve endangered or protected species.

141

142 Mosquitoes. Thirty five mosquito populations collected in 10 countries from North, Central 143 and South Americas were used: 22 populations of Ae. aegypti and 13 of Ae. albopictus 144 (Figure 1, Table 1). The mosquitoes were field-collected in 2012 with ovitraps (10-58 per 145 collection site). The mosquito collection sites were strategically chosen in order to essentially 146 represent the diverse climates, environments, ecotopes and dengue epidemiological history 147 across the American continent. The field collected eggs were immersed in water for hatching; 148 larvae were split by 100-150 individuals per pan and fed with yeast tablets. Emerging adults 149 were maintained in cages at  $28^{\circ}\pm1^{\circ}$ C with a 14h:10h light:dark cycle, 80% relative humidity, 150 and supplied with a 10% sucrose solution. The F1 generation was used for all infection assays. 151

152 Viral Strains. Three CHIKV isolates belonging to two distinct lineages were used: two 153 CHIKV isolates from La Réunion and one from New Caledonia. The isolates from La 154 Réunion were the strains (i) CHIKV 05.115 (CHIKV 115) and (ii) CHIKV 06.21 155 (CHIKV\_0621), both isolated in 2005 (35) and provided by the French National Reference 156 Center for Arboviruses at the Institut Pasteur in Paris. The amino-acid consensus sequence of 157 these strains differed only by a single substitution: CHIKV\_115 has an alanine at position 226 158 of the E1 envelope glycoprotein (E1-226A), whereas CHIKV\_0621 harbors a valine at the 159 same position (E1-226V). It has been shown the E1-A226V substitution is located in a region 160 known to be involved in viral entry via fusion with endosomal membranes (36). Both strains 161 have an alanine at position 98 of the E1 glycoprotein (E1-98A) that has been shown to exert 162 no negative epistatic effects on the position E1-226; the position E1-98 is located at the base

163 of the fusion loop and presumably modulates the kinetics of the pH-dependent conformational 164 changes and fusion reaction in the endosomal compartment (37). Viral titer estimated by serial 10-fold dilutions on Vero cells was 10<sup>9</sup> plaque forming units (pfu)/mL for both 165 166 CHIKV\_115 and CHIKV\_0621. Both strains were isolated on Ae. albopictus C6/36 cells 167 from human serum or viral stocks and were produced following three passages on Ae. albopictus C6/36 cells then harvested and stored at -80°C until use for the mosquito 168 169 experimental infection assays. The New Caledonia CHIKV strain referenced as NC/2011-568 (CHIKV NC), was isolated in 2011 (28, 37) and provided by the Institut Pasteur of New 170 171 Caledonia. Phylogenetic analysis using the complete CHIKV NC genome nucleotide 172 sequence demonstrated that CHIKV NC belongs to the Asian lineage, displaying 98.1% nucleotide identity with other isolates of the Asian cluster of CHIKV phylogeny. CHIKV NC 173 174 strain has an alanine at position E1-226 (E1-226A) and a threonine at position E1-98 (E1-175 98T). It has been shown that in contrast with the ECSA genotype, the substitution E1-98T 176 exerts a negative epistatic interaction leading to block the ability of Asian CHIKV strains to 177 adapt to Ae. albopictus via the E1-A226V substitution (24). The whole genome sequence of 178 CHIKV NC is available on GenBank under accession no. HE806461. CHIKV NC 2nd passage was used for the experimental infections of mosquitoes. The titer of CHIKV NC 179 stocks was 10<sup>8.1</sup> pfu/mL. 180

181

Mosquito Oral Infections. Five to seven day-old females were fed on an infectious bloodmeal containing 2 mL of washed rabbit erythrocytes, 1 mL of viral suspension supplemented with a phagostimulant (ATP) at a final concentration of 5 mM. The titer of all performed infectious blood-meals was 10<sup>7.5</sup> pfu/mL. Mosquito feeding was limited to 50 min. After the infectious blood-meal, non-engorged females were discarded. Fully engorged females were transferred in cardboard containers and maintained with 10% sucrose at 28°±1°C. All 35 mosquito populations were challenged with the CHIKV\_0621 strain (13 *Ae. albopictus* and 22 *Ae. aegypti* populations) whereas 22 populations (9 *Ae. albopictus* and 13 *Ae. aegypti*) were challenged with the CHIKV\_115 strain and 6 populations (3 *Ae. albopictus* and 3 *Ae. aegypti*) with CHIKV\_NC. Mosquito populations from the same location were simultaneously tested with the CHIKV 0621 and CHIKV 115 strains.

193

194 Dissemination and Transmission Analysis. Batches of ~30 mosquitoes of each combination 195 of mosquito population-virus strain were analyzed at days 7 and 10 post-infection (pi) for all 196 the CHIKV strains tested. Days pi were defined according to the kinetics of CHIKV 197 dissemination and transmission efficiencies in Ae. albopictus from Paquetá, Rio de Janeiro, 198 Brazil (maximum at day 7 pi and slight decrease by day 10; see Figure 2). To estimate viral 199 dissemination, heads were removed from mosquitoes and ground in 250 µL of Leibovitz L15 200 medium (Invitrogen) supplemented with 2% Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS) for further 201 inoculation onto cell C6/36 Ae. albopictus cell culture in 96-well plates. After incubation at 202 28°C for 3 days, plates were stained using hyper-immune ascetic fluid specific to CHIKV as 203 primary antibody. Alexa Fluor® 488 goat anti-mouse IgG was used as the second antibody (Life technologies <sup>TM</sup>). 204

To estimate viral transmission, saliva was collected from individual mosquitoes as described in (38). For that, wings and legs were removed from each mosquito and the proboscis was inserted into a 20  $\mu$ L tip containing 5  $\mu$ L of FBS. After 45 min of salivation, FBS containing saliva was expelled into 45  $\mu$ L of Leibovitz L15 medium for titration. One limitation of this technique is that the volume of saliva delivered by females could not be estimated.

Dissemination efficiency corresponds to the proportion of mosquitoes with virus detected in heads among tested ones (i.e., engorged mosquitoes which have survived until the day of examination). Transmission efficiency corresponds to the proportion of mosquitoes with virus in the saliva among tested ones (i.e., surviving females including females unable to
disseminate the virus and those able to disseminate). The number of infectious particles per
saliva was estimated by titration using focus fluorescent assay on C6/36 *Ae. albopictus* cells.
Samples were serially diluted and inoculated onto C6/36 cells in 96-well plates, following
incubation at 28°C for 3 days. Then, plates were stained as explained above.

218

219 Statistical Analysis. Statistical analyses were performed with STATISTICA 8 software 220 (Statsoft Inc, USA). The numbers of infectious particles in saliva were compared using the 221 Kruskal-Wallis test. Dissemination and transmission efficiencies were compared using Chi-222 square test. Kruskal-Wallis Z multiple comparison test was used to compare more than 5 223 dissemination and transmission efficiency rates.

224

225

# 226 RESULTS

Dissemination efficiency. To measure the ability of American *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus*to allow CHIKV to overcome the midgut barrier, dissemination efficiency (DE) was assessed
for each pairing mosquito population-virus strain at days 7 and 10 pi (Tables 2 and 3).

230 All Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus populations showed similar DE values at days 7 and 10 pi 231 for the three CHIKV isolates (Chi-square test: p>0.05). For CHIKV 0621, DE at day 7 pi 232 ranged from 60% to 100% for Ae. albopictus and from 93.3% to 100% for Ae. aegypti. For 233 CHIKV\_115, DE at day 7 varied from 66.7% to 96.9% for Ae. albopictus and from 96.6% to 234 100% for Ae. aegypti, while for CHIKV\_NC, DE ranged from 90% to 96.7% for Ae. 235 albopictus and from 96.9% to 100% for Ae. aegypti. Ae. aegypti tested populations displayed 236 similar DE values around 100% for the three CHIKV isolates (Chi-square test: p>0.05). 237 Likewise, DE obtained for Ae. albopictus were extensively high although rates were 238 significantly heterogeneous for CHIKV 0621 (Chi-square test: p<0.05) and CHIKV 115 239 (Chi-square test: p<0.05). Thus, when comparing DE values for a given virus between the two 240 mosquito species sampled in a same location, no significant difference was found except for 241 MXC in Mexico when infected with CHIKV\_0621 (Chi-square test: p<0.05) and 242 CHIKV 115 (Chi-square test: p<0.05), and for VRB in United States when infected with CHIKV 115 (Chi-square test: p<0.05). In these three last cases, Ae. aegypti exhibited a 243 244 higher DE than Ae. albopictus collected in the same site whatever the viral strain. In addition, 245 no difference was observed in DE values between the three Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus 246 populations challenged with the CHIKV NC isolate (Chi-square test: p>0.05).

247

Transmission efficiency. In order to determine the ability of American *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* to sustain CHIKV transmission, we assessed the transmission efficiency (TE) at days 7 and 10 pi. only TE values at day 7 pi were presented in Figures 3 and 4 (see Table S1 for TE values at day 10 pi). The TE values obtained for *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* were highly heterogeneous and lower than DE values.

253 When mosquitoes were exposed to CHIKV 0621, TE values ranged from 13.3% to 96.7% at 254 day 7 pi and 6.7% - 85.2 % at day 10 pi. Ae. albopictus better transmitted CHIKV 0621 than 255 Ae. aegypti at day 7 pi (mean  $\pm$  CI: 44.7  $\pm$  7.8 for Ae. aegypti and 55.8  $\pm$  12.3 for Ae. 256 albopictus) and at day 10 pi (mean  $\pm$  CI: 33.1  $\pm$  6.2 for Ae. aegypti and 55.5  $\pm$  12.0 for Ae. 257 albopictus). Within a same mosquito species, TE values were significantly different (Chi-258 square test: p<0.05) at days 7 and 10 pi. When considering each of the 10 populations where 259 the two species co-exist (VRB, MXC, PAN, MAN, PNM, JRB, PAQ, VAZ, BEL, SAN), Ae. albopictus exhibited a higher TE than Ae. aegypti when infected with CHIKV 0621 except 260 261 for the VRB population from Florida, United States (Figures 3 and 4, Table S1).

262 When mosquitoes were infected with CHIKV 115, TE values were comprised between 263 11.1% and 82.1% at day 7 pi and 10% - 76.7% at day 10 pi. Ae. aegypti better transmitted 264 CHIKV\_115 than Ae. albopictus at day 7 pi (mean ± CI: 49.5 ± 10.3 for Ae. aegypti and 49.5 265  $\pm$  13.6 for *Ae. albopictus*). Within a same mosquito species, TE values were significantly 266 different (Chi-square test: p<0.05) at days 7 and 10 pi. When considering each of the four 267 populations where the two species co-exist (VRB, MXC, PAN, and PAQ), one species did not 268 present a clear-cut advantage on the other to transmit CHIKV 115 (Figures 3 and 4, Table 269 S1).

Interestingly, among the eight *Ae. albopictus* populations simultaneously challenged with
CHIKV\_0621 and CHIKV\_115, four showed unexpected lower TE for CHIKV\_115 and one
displayed equal rates (Figure 3, Table S1). Remarkably, TE rates were heterogeneous even
between *Ae. albopictus* populations geographically close, i.e. from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
(JRB, PAQ, BEL, VAZ) when exposed to the same CHIKV\_0621 isolate (Figures 3 and 4).

Lastly, when mosquitoes were exposed to the CHIKV\_NC, TE values varied from 30% to 83.3% at day 7 pi, and 26.7%-53.3% at day 10 pi. *Ae. aegypti* better transmitted CHIKV\_NC than *Ae. albopictus* at day 7 pi (mean  $\pm$  CI: 64.5  $\pm$  20.7 for *Ae. aegypti* and 48.9  $\pm$  25.1 for *Ae. albopictus*). Within a same mosquito species, TE values were significantly different (Chisquare test: p<0.05) at day 7 and not at day 10 pi (Chi-square test: p>0.05) (see Table S1).

We also found that 23% - 56% mosquitoes collected in temperate regions, *Ae. albopictus* TYS (Tyson, United States), *Ae. aegypti* SAL (Salto, Uruguay) and BUE (Buenos Aires, Argentina) were able to efficiently transmit CHIKV\_0621. Moreover, *Ae. aegypti* from the last two sites of the Southern Cone were also competent to efficiently transmit CHIKV\_0115 and CHIKV\_NC at day 7 pi, respectively (SAL = 70% for CHIKV\_115; BUE = 48.3% for CHIKV\_115 and 63.6% for CHIKV\_NC).

286

287 Intensity of transmission. The intensity of viral transmission can be calculated by estimating 288 the viral load in saliva collected from mosquitoes. When infected with CHIKV 0621 isolate, 289 the number of viral particles in saliva ranged from 0.4 to 4.4 log<sub>10</sub> particles for Ae. albopictus 290 and from 0.4 to 5.1 log<sub>10</sub> for Ae. aegypti. Concerning mosquitoes infected with CHIKV\_115 291 isolate, the number of viral infectious particles varied from 0.4 to 4.7  $\log_{10}$  for Ae. albopictus 292 and from 0.4 to 5.0 log<sub>10</sub> for Ae. aegypti. For mosquitoes exposed to CHIKV NC, the viral 293 load in saliva ranged from 0.4 to 2.9  $\log_{10}$  for Ae. albopictus and from 0.4 to 4.2  $\log_{10}$ 294 particles for Ae. aegypti (Figure 5). Viral loads of the three tested CHIKV strains were 295 equivalent in Ae. aegypti populations, whereas Ae. albopictus displayed a slightly lower titer 296 when challenged with CHIKV NC in comparison to CHIKV 0621 and CHIKV 115, both at 297 day 7 pi. Viral loads were highly heterogeneous between individuals belonging to the same 298 population and infected with a given viral strain, but the mean calculated for each mosquito 299 population was roughly similar overall. Indeed, when comparing viral load in saliva between 300 mosquito strains for a given virus at day 7 and 10 pi (Figures 5 and S1), no significant 301 differences were found either for Ae. aegypti or Ae. albopictus (Kruskal-Wallis test: p>0.05), 302 except for Ae. albopictus challenged with CHIKV 115.

303

304

# 305 DISCUSSION

All 35 populations of *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* collected throughout the Americas were susceptible to CHIKV infection by all three tested genotypes. Thus, temperate as well as tropical and subtropical Northern, Central and Southern American *Aedes* mosquitoes are efficient CHIKV vectors. *Ae. albopictus* better transmitted the epidemic CHIKV\_0621 strain isolated on La Réunion Island in 2006 (35) than *Ae. aegypti*, whereas this latter species was more capable to transmit the original strain CHIKV\_115, both belonging to the ECSA genotype (39). The Asian genotype represented by the CHIKV\_NC strain (28) was better
transmitted by *Ae. aegypti*, although it was also efficiently transmitted by *Ae. albopictus*.

314

## 315 Most American Aedes mosquitoes are highly susceptible to CHIKV

316 More than 60% of mosquitoes per population were able to disseminate CHIKV after crossing 317 the midgut barrier (i.e., entry in epithelial cells, viral replication and release of virions from 318 the midgut basal lamina). Thus after being ingested with a blood-meal provided at a titer of  $10^{7.5}$  pfu/mL, CHIKV succeeded in disseminating within the mosquito hemocele which is an 319 essential prerequisite for transmission. It has been shown that a titer of  $\sim 10^4$  pfu/mL in 320 321 monkeys was sufficient enough to infect mosquitoes (40). CHIKV transmission was highly heterogeneous in American mosquitoes, ranging from 11.1% to 96.7% at day 7 pi when 322 323 considering all CHIKV strains. It should be underlined that we are not able to provide a 324 control of salivation and we hypothesize that a CHIKV-negative saliva did not correspond to 325 mosquitoes unable to salivate but to mosquitoes delivering a non-infected saliva. As expected 326 from previous studies (22,25,41,30), Ae. albopictus better transmitted the epidemic strain 327 CHIKV 0621 of the ECSA genotype than Ae. aegypti, even in cases where both mosquito 328 species cohabit. Ae. aegypti transmitted preferentially CHIKV 115 and also, the Asian 329 genotype CHIKV\_NC in accordance with previous findings (28). CHIKV Asian strains have 330 a particular E1-98T substitution which constrains CHIKV adaptation to Ae. albopictus via E1-331 A226V mutation (24). Ae. aegypti are more abundant in the Americas than Ae. albopictus 332 mosquitoes and the E1-98T substitution of CHIKV viral strains does not have a negative 333 effect on CHIKV interaction with Ae. aegypti. Thus, CHIKV Asian strains together with the 334 CHIKV ECSA strains, represent a real danger to the Americas. Intriguingly, the CHIKV 335 strain isolated during the last outbreak in the Caribbean also belongs to the Asian genotype 336 (42) primarily transmitted in the past by Ae. aegypti. Although the intensity of transmission is

highly variable between mosquitoes, the mean number of viral particles delivered bymosquitoes was quite similar for each combination mosquito strain and viral strain.

339 Mosquitoes collected in tropical Latin America, Panama, Venezuela, Brazil, Bolivia, 340 Paraguay, Argentina and Uruguay showed the highest transmission efficiency with up to 341 10,000 viral particles detected in mosquito saliva. Interestingly, mosquitoes from the main 342 Brazilian city of Rio de Janeiro showed high transmission efficiencies. For example, 96.7% of 343 Ae. albopictus JRB were able to transmit CHIKV 0621 (see Table S1). Moreover, the 344 extrinsic incubation period of CHIKV, i.e. the time necessary for the virus to be detected in 345 saliva ready for transmission after being ingested with the blood-meal (43), in both mosquito 346 species is quite short (38). Indeed, an Ae. albopictus population from Rio de Janeiro (PAQ) 347 was able to transmit infectious viral particles as rapidly as 2 days pi (Figure 2). Therefore, the 348 risk of CHIKV establishment in densely populated cities such as Rio de Janeiro hosting more 349 than 6 million people and infested by anthropophilic Aedes mosquitoes should be considered 350 very high.

351

# 352 Mosquitoes from temperate Americas are potentially capable of sustaining CHIKV 353 transmission

354 The ability of CHIKV to extend its natural range of distribution to include temperate regions 355 was exemplified by the Italian outbreak in 2007 and the French local/autochthonous cases in 356 2010 (44,45). In the Americas, more than one hundred imported CHIKV cases were detected 357 in the United States between 1995 and 2009 (11). Some of them developed a viremia high 358 enough to infect mosquitoes. We found that 56.7% of Ae. albopictus TYS from Tyson 359 (United States) and 83.3% of Ae. aegypti SAL from Salto (Uruguay) were able to transmit 360 CHIKV 0621 at day 7 pi (see Table S1). Transmission efficiencies were lower for Ae. aegypti BUE from Buenos Aires (Argentina) (i.e.,23.3%, see Figure 3, Table S1) but higher when 361

362	infected with the CHIKV_NC Asian genotype (i.e., 63.6%, see Figure 3, Table S1).
363	Therefore, the establishment of CHIKV in temperate American countries is not simply a
364	fiction even if less than 30% of both mosquito species collected in the South of United States
365	(VRB, Florida) were able to transmit CHIKV_0621. It has been found that Ae. albopictus
366	from Florida are more competent vectors of CHIKV than Ae. aegypti (31-33). Outbreaks of
367	DENV, also transmitted by Aedes mosquitoes, have occurred in Texas and Florida in the past
368	years (46), reinforcing the risk of epidemics due to imported arboviruses in the United States.
369	Local transmission of CHIKV could be maintained if the virus is introduced in the right place
370	at the right time. Taken together, these findings underline the high variation of susceptibility
371	to CHIKV of American mosquitoes, calling for including other factors (biological and
372	environmental) in assessing transmission potential risk (47). Moreover, mosquito genetic
373	structure should be promptly investigated. Phylogenetic analysis of both mosquito species
374	should bring additional information on colonization history of Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus
375	in the different countries of Americas (48,49). Ae. aegypti was most likely introduced in
376	North America during the slave trade (50) while Ae. albopictus was established in 1985 in the
377	United States (51) probably introduced in shipments of used tires from Japan (52), and in
378	Brazil in 1986 (53) probably arriving from tropical Asia (52).

379

# 380 The fear becomes a reality

381 Still absent until very recently, CHIKV has been detected for the first time in the Americas in 382 late December 2013. Currently, among the 2030 suspected CHIKV cases from the island of 383 Saint-Martin in the Caribbean, more than 765 were confirmed positive to CHIKV by serology 384 (15). The virus then spread to neighboring islands: Saint-Barthelemy with 380 cases, 385 Martinique with 3940 cases, Guadeloupe with 1460 cases. Until now, 10 autochthonous cases 386 have been reported in French Guiana which maintains a daily air link with the two other 387 French Overseas territories of Guadeloupe and Martinique. We previously showed that *Ae*.
388 *aegypti* from French Guiana and French West Indies were highly competent to disseminate
389 CHIKV and mosquito populations collected in dense housing environments exhibited the
390 highest susceptibility (34). Thus, the risk of CHIKV spread and establishment is real and
391 should concern all areas in the Americas where the vector mosquitoes are present.

392

#### 393 Co-circulation of CHIKV and DENV could have great implication on human health

394 Interestingly, DENV is still circulating in the Caribbean together with CHIKV. Cases of co-395 infection DENV-CHIKV in patients have been first reported in 1967 (54) and since the 396 emergence of CHIKV, reports of co-infections are increasing (10,55-63). Both viruses are 397 transmitted by the same mosquito vectors, Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus. Co-infection of a 398 mosquito vector by two viruses can occur after two successive infectious blood-meals taken 399 on two different viremic hosts or after a single blood-meal taken on a co-infected host. It has 400 been shown that CHIKV and DENV can be delivered together in one mosquito bite (64). As 401 co-infections were a quite common phenomenon, consequences on the clinical presentation of 402 the disease are expected.

Finally, the assessment of vector competence should be considered as a prerequisite to better evaluate the potential risk of CHIKV outbreaks once the virus is introduced from endemic regions. The numerous imported CHIKV viremic cases presaged the potential importance of this emerging arbovirus for the Americas where both mosquito species are well established. In light of epidemics now starting in the Caribbean, it remains imperative to pursue and reinforce epidemiological and entomological surveillance actions and control against the mosquitoes, *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus*.

410

## 412 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

413 We thank Anayansi C Valderrama, Carlos Eduardo Borda, Darío Vezzani, Daniel Sánchez-414 Guillén, Eduardo A. Lestani, Fátima Domingos, Gabriel Sylvestre, Gabriela Willat, Glenda 415 Velásquez, Ima Braga, José Bento Lima, L. Phil Lounibos, Lorenzo Carceres, Marcelo 416 Celestino dos Santos, Márcia Gonçalves de Castro, Maria de Lourdes Macoris, Mário 417 Navarro, Nidia Martínez Acosta, Maria C Carrasquilla, Maria Ignez L. Bersot, Mirian G 418 Palomino Salcedo, Mirko Rojas-Cortez, Oscar D. Salomon, Rafael Maciel-de-Freitas, Romeo 419 Humberto Montoya, Sérgio L. Bessa Luz, Steve Juliano, Tamara Chávez Espada, Teresa F. 420 Silva-do-Nascimento, Yasmin Rubio-Palis for their help in mosquito sampling in the field 421 and/or mosquito rearing; Marie Vazeille and Laurence Mousson for technical advices; 422 Myrielle Dupont-Pouzeyrol for providing CHIKV NC, Peter Sahlins and Henri Jupille for 423 correcting the manuscript.

424

This work was funded by CNPq (grants 202106/2011-0 and 306340/2009-7), Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, Institut Pasteur (ACIP grant A-03-2012) and the French Government's Investissement d'Avenir program, Laboratoire d'Excellence "Integrative Biology of Emerging Infectious Diseases" (grant n°ANR-10-LABX-62-IBEID). AVR was supported by the French Ministry of Superior Education and Research, KZ by the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007 - 2 013) under the project "VECTORIE", EC grant agreement number 261466 and the Foundation Inkermann (Fondation de France).

432

# 433 Competing interests

The authors declare that they have neither competing interests nor conflict of interest relatedto this article.

436 Authors' contribution

437	RLO and ABF conceived the study. RLO, AVR and KZ carried out experimental infections of										
438	mosquitos and performed titration assays. AVR, RLO and ABF drafted the manuscript. KZ										
439	and RG helped to draft and to revise the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final										
440	version of the manuscript.										
441											
442											
443	REFERENCES										
444	1. Staples JE, Breiman RF, Powers AM. 2009. Chikungunya fever: an epidemiological										
445	review of a re-emerging infectious disease. Clin. Infect. Dis. 49:942-948.										
446	2. Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, Vazeille M, Filipis AMB, Failloux A-B. 2004. Aedes										
447	aegypti in Brazil: genetically differentiated populations with high susceptibility to										
448	dengue and yellow viruses. Trans. R. Soc. Trop. Med Hyg. 98:43-54.										
449	3. Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, Vazeille M, de Filippis AM, Failloux AB. 2003. Large										
450	genetic differentiation and low variation in vector competence for dengue and yellow										
451	fever viruses of Aedes albopictus from Brazil, the United States, and the Cayman										
452	Islands. Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. 69:105-114.										
453	4. Benedict MQ, Levine RS, Hawley WA, Lounibos LP. 2007. Spread of the tiger:										
454	global risk of invasion by the mosquito Aedes albopictus. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis.										
455	<b>7:</b> 76-85.										
456	5. Organización Panamericana de la Salud. Dengue. [cited 6 Jan 2014].										
457	http://new.paho.org/hq/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=264&Itemi										
458	<u>d=363⟨=es</u> .										
459	6. Organización Panamericana de la Salud. Epidemiological alert. Chikungunya fever, 9										
460	December 2013. [cited 6 Jan 2014].										

461 (http://www.paho.org/hq/index.php?option=com\_docman&task=doc\_view&gid=2380 462 6+&Itemid=999999&lang=en). 7. Figueiredo LT. 2007. Emergent arbovirus in Brazil. Rev. Soc. Bras. Med. Trop. 463 **40:**224-229. 464 465 8. Maciel-de-Freitas R, Aguiar R, Bruno RV, Guimarães MC, Lourenço-de-Oliveira 466 R, Sorgine MH, Struchiner CJ, Valle D, O'Neill SL, Moreira LA. 2012. Why do 467 we need alternative tools to control mosquito-borne diseases in Latin America? Mem. 468 Inst. Oswaldo Cruz 107:828-829. 9. Mackenzie JS, Chua KB, Daniels PW, Eaton BT, Field HE, Hall RA, Halpin K, 469 470 Johansen CA, Kirkland PD, Lam SK, McMinn P, Nisbet DJ, Paru R, Pyke AT, 471 Ritchie SA, Siba P, Smith DW, Smith GA, Van den Hurk AF, Wang LF, Williams DT. 2012. Emerging viral diseases of Southeast Asia and the Western 472 473 Pacific. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 7:497-504. 474 10. Chahar HS, Bharaj P, Dar L, Guleria R, Kabra SK, Broor S. 2009. Co-infections 475 with chikungunya virus and dengue virus in Delhi, India. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 15:1077-476 1080. 477 11. Gibney KB, Fischer M, Prince HE, Kramer LD, St George K, Kosoy OL, Laven 478 JJ, Staples JE. 2011. Chikungunya fever in the United States: a fifteen year review of 479 cases. Clin. Infect. Dis. 52:e121-126. 480 12. Chaves TS, Pellini AC, Mascheretti M, Jahnel MT, Ribeiro AF, Rodrigues SG, 481 Vasconcelos PF, Boulos M. 2012. Travelers as sentinels for chikungunya fever, 482 Brazil. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 18:529-530. 13. Center for Diseases Control. 2006. Chikungunya fever diagnosed among international 483 484 travelers-United States, 2005-2006. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. 55:1040-1042.

- 485 14. Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, Drake JM,
- Brownstein JS, Hoen AG, Sankoh O, Myers F, George DB, Jaenisch T, Wint
  GRW, Simmons CP, Scott TW, Farrar JJ, Hay SI. 2013. The global distribution
  and burden of dengue. Nature 496:504-507.
- 489 15. CIRE Antilles Guyane. Le chikungunya dans les Antilles\_Guyane. Le point
  490 épidémiologique, n. 8, 17-23 February 2014. [cited 2014 Feb 27].
- 491 http://www.invs.sante.fr/fr/Publications-et-outils/Points-epidemiologiques/Tous-les-
- 492 numeros/Antilles-Guyane/2014/Situation-epidemiologique-du-chikungunya-dans-les-
- 493 Antilles.-Point-au-27-fevrier-2014.
- 494 16. Lambrechts L, Failloux AB. 2012. Vector biology prospects in dengue research.
  495 Mem. Inst. Oswaldo Cruz 107:1080-1082.
- 496 17. Bennett KE, Olson KE, Muñoz ML, Fernández-Salas I, Farfán JA, Higgs S,
  497 Black WC, Beaty BJ. 2002. Variation in vector competence for dengue 2 virus
- 498 among 24 collections of *Aedes aegypti* from Mexico and the United States. Am. J.
  499 Trop. Med. Hyg. 67:85-92.
- 500 18. Failloux AB, Vazeille M, Rodhain F. 2002. Geographic genetic variation in
  501 populations of the dengue virus vector *Aedes aegypti*. J. Mol. Evol. 5:653-63.
- 502 19. Black WC IV, Bennett KE, Gorrochótegui-Escalante N, Barrilas-Mury CV,
- Fernandez-Salas I, Munoz ML, Farfan-Ale JÁ, Olson KE, Beaty BJ. 2002.
  Flavivirus susceptibility in *Aedes aegypti*. Arch. Med. Res. 33:379–388.
- 505 20. Tabachnick WJ. 2013. Nature, nurture and evolution of intra-species variation in
  506 mosquito rrbovirus transmission competence. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public. Health.
  507 10:249-277.

508	21. Bosio CF, Fulton RE, Salasek ML, Beaty BJ, Black WC IV. 2000. Quantitative
509	trait loci that control vector competence for dengue-2 virus in the mosquito Aedes
510	aegypti. Genetics 156:687–698.
511	22. Tsetsarkin KA, Vanlandingham DL, McGee CE, Higgs S. 2007. A single mutation
512	in chikungunya virus affects vector specificity and epidemic potential. PLoS Pathog.
513	<b>3:</b> e201.
514	23. Tsetsarkin KA, McGee CE, Volk SM, Vanlandingham DL, Weaver SC, Higgs S.
515	2009. Epistatic roles of E2 glycoprotein mutations in adaption of chikungunya virus to
516	Aedes albopictus and Ae. aegypti mosquitoes. PLoS ONE 4:e6835.
517	24. Vazeille M, Moutailler S, Coudrier D, Rousseaux C, Khun H, Huerre M, Thiria
518	J, Dehecq JS, Fontenille D, Schuffenecker I, Despres P, Failloux AB. 2007. Two
519	chikungunya isolates from the outbreak of La Reunion (Indian Ocean) exhibit
520	different patterns of infection in the mosquito, Aedes albopictus. PLoS ONE 2:e1168.
521	25. Lambrechts L. 2011. Quantitative genetics of Aedes aegypti vector competence for
522	dengue viruses: towards a new paradigm? Trends Parasitol. 27:111-114.
523	26. Volk SM, Chen R, Tsetsarkin KA, Adams AP, Garcia TI, Sall AA, Nasar F,
524	Schuh AJ, Holmes EC, Higgs S, Maharaj PD, Brault AC, Weaver SC. 2010.
525	Genome-scale phylogenetic analyses of chikungunya virus reveal independent
526	emergences of recent epidemics and various evolutionary rates. J. Virol. 84:6497-
527	6504.
528	27. Dupont-Rouzeyrol M, Caro V, Guillaumot L, Vazeille M, D'Ortenzio E, Thiberge
529	JM, Baroux N, Gourinat AC, Grandadam M, Failloux AB. 2012. Chikungunya
530	virus and the mosquito vector Aedes aegypti in New Caledonia (South Pacific Region).
531	Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. 12:1036-1041.

JVI Accepts published online ahead of print

28. Vega-Rua A, Zouache K, Caro V, Diancourt L, Delaunay P, Grandadam M, 532 533 Failloux AB. 2013. High efficiency of temperate Aedes albopictus to transmit 534 chikungunya and dengue viruses in the Southeast of France. PLoS ONE 8:e59716. 29. Arias-Goeta C, Mousson L, Rougeon F, Failloux AB. 2013. Dissemination and 535 536 transmission of the E1-226V variant of chikungunya virus in Aedes albopictus are 537 controlled at the midgut barrier level. PLoS ONE 8:e57548. 538 30. Reiskind MH, Pesko K, Westbrook CJ, Mores CN. 2008. Susceptibility of Florida 539 mosquitoes to infection with chikungunya virus. Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. 78:422-425. 540 31. Richards SL, Anderson SL, Smartt CT. 2010. Vector competence of Florida 541 mosquitoes for chikungunya virus. J. Vector Ecol. 35:439-443. 542 32. Pesko K, Westbrook CJ, Mores CN, Lounibos LP, Reiskind MH. 2009. Effects of 543 infectious virus dose and bloodmeal delivery method on susceptibility of Aedes 544 aegypti and Aedes albopictus to chikungunya virus. J. Med. Entomol. 46:395-399. 545 33. Girod R, Gaborit P, Marrama L, Etienne M, Ramdini C, Rakotoarivony I, Dollin 546 C, Carinci R, Issaly J, Dusfour I, Gustave J, Yp-Tcha MM, Yébakima A, Failloux 547 AB, Vazeille M. 2011. High susceptibility to Chikungunya virus of Aedes aegypti 548 from the French West Indies and French Guiana. Trop. Med. Int. Health. 16:134-139. 549 34. Schuffenecker I, Iteman I, Michault A, Murri S, Frangeul L, Vaney MC, Lavenir 550 R, Pardigon N, Reynes JM, Pettinelli F, Biscornet L, Diancourt L, Michel S, 551 Duquerroy S, Guigon G, Frenkiel MP, Bréhin AC, Cubito N, Desprès P, Kunst F, 552 Rey FA, Zeller H, Brisse S. 2006. Genome microevolution of chikungunya viruses causing the Indian Ocean outbreak. PLoS Med. 3:e263. 553 35. Voss JE, Vaney MC, Duquerroy S, Vonrhein C, Girard-Blanc C, Crublet E, 554 555 Thompson A, Bricogne G, Rey FA. 2010. Glycoprotein organization of 556 Chikungunya virus particles revealed by X-ray crystallography. Nature 468:709-712.

- 557 36. Tsetsarkin KA, Chen R, Leal G, Forrester N, Higgs S, Huang J, Weaver SC.
- 2011. Chikungunya virus emergence is constrained in Asia by lineage-specific
  adaptive landscapes. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 108:7872-7877.
- 560 37. Alibert A, Pfannstiel A, Grangeon JP. Chikungunya outbreak in New Caledonia in
- 561 2011. Status report as at 22 August 2011. Informa'Action n. 34. [cited 2014 Jan 7].
- 562 <u>https://www.spc.int/phs/ENGLISH/Publications/InformACTION/IA34/Status\_report\_</u>
- 563 Chikungunya\_Outbreak\_New\_Caledonia-22Aug2011.pdf.
- 38. Dubrulle M, Mousson L, Moutailler S, Vazeille M, Failloux AB. 2009.
  Chikungunya virus and *Aedes* mosquitoes: saliva is infectious as soon as two days
  after oral infection. PLoS ONE 4:e5895.
- 567 39. Powers AM, Logue CH. 2007. Changing patterns of chikungunya virus: re568 emergence of a zoonotic arbovirus. J. Gen. Virol. 88:2363-2377.
- 569 40. Turell MJ, Beaman JR, Tammariello RF. 1992. Susceptibility of selected strains of
   570 Aedes aegypti and Aedes albopictus (Diptera: Culicidae) to chikungunya virus. J. Med.
- 571 Entomol. **29:**49-53.
- 41. Martin E, Moutailler S, Madec Y, Failloux AB. 2010. Differential responses of the
  mosquito *Aedes albopictus* from the Indian Ocean region to two chikungunya isolates.
  BMC Ecol. 10:8.
- 42. Leparc-Goffart I, Nougairede A, Cassadou S, Prat C, de Lamballerie X. 2014.
  Chikungunya in the Americas. Lancet 383:514.
- 43. Kramer LD, Ebel GD. 2003. Dynamics of flavivirus infection in mosquitoes. Adv.
- 578 Virus Res. **60:**187-232.
- 579 44. Rezza G, Nicoletti L, Angelini R, Romi R, Finarelli AC, Panning M, Cordioli P,
- 580 Fortuna C, Boros S, Magurano F, Silvi G, Angelini P, Dottori M, Ciufolini MG,

- 581 Majori GC, Cassone A; CHIKV study group. 2007. Infection with chikungunya 582 virus in Italy: an outbreak in a temperate region. Lancet 370:1840-1846. 583 45. Grandadam M, Caro V, Plumet S, Thiberge JM, Souares Y, Failloux AB, Tolou 584 HJ, Budelot M, Cosserat D, Leparc-Goffart, Desprès P. 2011. Chikungunya virus, 585 southeastern France. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 17:910-913. 46. Center for Diseases Control. Locally acquired dengue - Key West, Florida, 2009-2010. 586 587 MMWR Morb Mort Wkly Rep. 2010; 59:577-581. 588 47. Fontenille D, Failloux A-B, Romi R. 2007. Should we expect Chikungunya and 589 Dengue in Southern Europe? In: Emerging Pests and Vector-Borne Diseases in 590 Europe (W Takken and BGJ Knols, Eds.). Wageningen Academic Publishers, 591 Wageningen, The Netherlands, p.169-184. 592 48. Bracco JE, Capurro ML, Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, Sallum MA. 2007. Genetic 593 variability of Aedes aegypti in the Americas using a mitochondrial gene: evidence of 594 multiple introductions. Mem. Inst. Oswaldo Cruz 102:573-580. 595 49. Mousson L, Dauga C, Garrigues T, Schaffner F, Vazeille M, Failloux AB. 2005. 596 Phylogeography of Aedes (Stegomvia) aegypti (L.) and Aedes (Stegomvia) albopictus 597 (Skuse) (Diptera: Culicidae) based on mitochondrial DNA variations. Genet. Res. 598 86:1-11. 599 50. Powell JR, Tabachnick WJ. 2013. History of domestication and spread of Aedes 600 aegypti - A rewiew. Mem. Inst. Oswaldo Cruz 108 (Suppl I):11-17. 601 51. Sprenger D, Wuithiranyagool T. 1986. The discovery and distribution of Aedes 602 albopictus in Harris County, Texas. J. Am. Mosq. Control Assoc. 2:217-219. 603 52. Hawley WA, Reiter P, Copeland RS, Pumpuni CB, Craig GB Jr. 1987. Aedes 604 albopictus in North America: probable introduction in used tires from northern Asia.
- <u>JVI Accepts published online ahead of print</u>

605

Science 236: 1114-1116.

606 53. Consoli RAGB, Lourenço-de-Oliveira R. 1994. Principais Mosquitos de 607 Importância Sanitária no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: Fiocruz. 608 54. Myers RM, Carey DE. 1967. Concurrent isolation from patient of two arboviruses, 609 chikungunya and dengue type 2. Science 157:1307-1308. 610 55. Nayar SK, Noridah O, Paranthaman V, Ranjit K, Norizah K, Chem YK, Mustafa B, Chua KB. 2007. Coinfection of dengue virus and chikungunya virus in two 611 612 patients with acute febrile illness. Med. J. Malaysia 62:335-336. 613 56. Hapuarachchi HAC, Bandara KBAT, Hapugoda MD, Williams S, 614 Abeyewickreme W. 2008. Laboratory confirmation of dengue and chikungunya co-615 infection. Ceylon Med. J. 53:104-105. 616 57. Ratsitorahina M, Harisoa J, Ratovonjato J, Biacabe S, Reynes JM, Zeller H, 617 Raoelina Y, Talarmin A, Richard V, Louis Soares J. 2008. Outbreak of dengue and 618 chikungunya fevers, Toasmasina, Madagascar, 2006. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 14:1135-619 1137. 620 58. Schilling S, Emmerich P, Gu"nter S, Schmidt-Chanasit J. 2009. Dengue and chikungunya virus co-infection in a German traveler. J. Clin. Virol. 45:163-164. 621 622 59. Leroy EM, Nkoghe D, Olomo B, Nze-Nkogue C, Becquart P, Grard G, Pourrut X, 623 Charrel R, Moureau G, Ndjoyi-Mbiguino A, De-Lamballerie X. 2009. Concurrent 624 chikungunya and dengue virus infections during simultaneous outbreaks, Gabon, 625 2007. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 15:591-593. 626 60. Chang SF, Su CL, Shu PY, Yang CF, Liao TL, Cheng CH, Hu HC, Huang JH. 627 2010. Concurrent isolation of chikungunya virus and dengue virus from a patient with coinfection resulting from a trip to Singapore. J. Clin. Microbiol. 48:4586-4589. 628 629 61. Kalawat U, Sharma KK, Reddy SG. 2011. Prevalence of dengue and chickungunya

fever and their co-infection. Indian J. Pathol. Microbiol. 54:844-846.

630

631	62. Kumar KJ, Manjunath VG, Shailashree M, Girish GN. 2012. Coinfection with
632	dengue and chikungunya - a case report. J. Indian. Med. Assoc. 110:749-752.
633	63. Caron M, Paupy C, Grard G, Becquart P, Mombo I, Nso BB, Kassa Kassa F,
634	Nkoghe D, Leroy EM. 2012. Recent introduction and rapid dissemination of
635	Chikungunya virus and Dengue virus serotype 2 associated with human and mosquito
636	coinfections in Gabon, central Africa. Clin. Infect. Dis. 55:e45-53.
637	64. Vazeille M, Mousson L, Martin E, Failloux AB. 2010. Orally co-Infected Aedes
638	albopictus from La Reunion Island, Indian Ocean, can deliver both dengue and
639	chikungunya infectious viral particles in their saliva. PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis. 4:e706.
640	

## 641 Figure Legends

642

643 FIG 1 Mosquito populations tested. Color-code indicates localities where only Ae. aegypti (red), only Ae. albopictus (blue) and both Ae. aegypti and Ae. albopictus were collected 644 645 (green). TYS Tyson (United States), VRB Vero Beach (United States), MXC Chiapas 646 (Mexico), PAN Panamá (Panama), DEL Delta Amacuro (Venezuela), TUM Tumbes (Peru), 647 PUM Punchana (Peru), MAN Manaus (Brazil), STR Santarém (Brazil), PNM Parnamirim 648 (Brazil), CAB Campos Belos (Brazil), CPG Campo Grande (Brazil), JRB Jurujuba (Brazil), 649 PAQ Paquetá (Brazil), VAZ Vaz Lobo (Brazil), BEL Belford Roxo (Brazil), SAN Santos 650 (Brazil), BMA Monteagudo (Bolivia), SDG Salto del Guairá (Paraguay), ASU Asuncion 651 (Paraguay), SAL Salto (Uruguay), MIA Misiones (Argentina), ACO Corrientes (Argentina), 652 **BUE** Buenos Aires (Argentina).

653

654 FIG 2 Dissemination (A) and transmission efficiencies (B) of two CHIKV isolates and two 655 clones of the respective viral isolates in Ae. albopictus from Paquetá, Rio de Janeiro (Brazil). At days 1, 2, 3, 7 and 10 after an infectious blood meal, mosquitoes were sacrificed and heads 656 657 and saliva were collected for determination of their infectious status. Mosquito heads were 658 individually ground in 250 µL Leibovitz L15 medium supplemented with 4%, following 659 inoculation onto C6/36 Ae. albopictus cell monolayer in 96-well plates and incubation at 28°C 660 for 3 days. Plates were fixed with 3.6% formaldehyde, washed three times with PBS and 661 analyzed by indirect immunofluorescence assay (IFA). For saliva collection, each mosquito 662 had wings and legs removed and the proboscis inserted into a 20 µL tip containing 5 µL of FBS. After 45 min of salivation, FBS containing saliva was expelled into 45 µL of Leibovitz 663 664 L15 medium and inoculated onto C6/36 Ae. albopictus cell monolayer in 96-well plates. 665 Plates were incubated and stained (IFA) as described in Materials and Methods.

Dissemination efficiency corresponds to the proportion of mosquito females with disseminated virus in head among the tested ones. Transmission efficiency corresponds to the proportion of mosquitoes with infectious saliva among the tested ones. CHIKV\_0621: strain isolated from La Réunion (E1-226V substitution); CHIKV\_115: strain isolated from La Réunion (E1-226A); CHIKV\_0621 (V): clone corresponding to a single virus isolated from CHIKV\_0621; CHIKV\_115 (A): clone corresponding to a single virus isolated from CHIKV 115. Clones were provided by Arias-Goeta C.

673

674 FIG 3 Transmission efficiency of three CHIKV isolates in 35 Ae. albopictus and Ae. aegypti 675 populations from 10 American countries at day 7 post-infection. After an infectious blood-676 meal, mosquitoes were sacrificed and saliva was collected from individual mosquitoes and 677 titrated by focus fluorescent assay on C6/36 Ae. albopictus cells to determine infectious status. 678 Transmission efficiency corresponds to the proportion of mosquitoes with infectious saliva 679 among tested ones. Viral strains: CHIKV 0621 isolated from La Réunion (ECSA genotype, 680 E1-226V and E1-98A substitution), CHIKV 115 isolated from La Réunion (ECSA genotype, 681 E1-226A and E1-98A substitution) and CHIKV NC isolated from New Caledonia (Asian 682 genotype, E1-226A and E1-98T substitution). Mosquito populations (from North to South): 683 TYS Tyson (United States), VRB Vero Beach (United States), MXC Chiapas (Mexico), PAN 684 Panamá (Panama), DEL Delta Amacuro (Venezuela), TUM Tumbes (Peru), PUM Punchana 685 (Peru), MAN Manaus (Brazil), STR Santarém (Brazil), PNM Parnamirim (Brazil), CAB 686 Campos Belos (Brazil), CPG Campo Grande (Brazil), JRB Jurujuba (Brazil), PAQ Paquetá 687 (Brazil), VAZ Vaz Lobo (Brazil), BEL Belford Roxo (Brazil), SAN Santos (Brazil), BMA 688 Monteagudo (Bolivia), SDG Salto del Guairá (Paraguay), ASU Asuncion (Paraguay), SAL 689 Salto (Uruguay), MIA Misiones (Argentina), ACO Corrientes (Argentina), BUE Buenos 690 Aires (Argentina). Error bars show the confidence intervals (95%).

691

692 FIG 4 Transmission efficiency of CHIKV\_0621 and CHIKV\_115 isolates in 35 Ae. aegypti 693 and Ae. albopictus populations from 10 American countries at day 7 post-infection. 694 Transmission efficiency corresponds to the proportion of mosquitoes with infectious saliva 695 among tested ones. Color-code indicates different degrees of transmission efficiency (TE): yellow, mosquito strains with TE  $\leq$  30% (low TE); pale-orange, strains with 30% < TE < 70% 696 697 (moderated TE); red, strains with TE  $\geq$  70% (high TE). Viral strains: CHIKV 0621 isolated 698 from La Réunion (ECSA genotype, E1-226V substitution) and CHIKV\_115 isolated from La 699 Réunion (ECSA genotype, E1-226A substitution. Mosquito populations (from North to 700 South): TYS Tyson (United States), VRB Vero Beach (United States), MXC Chiapas 701 (Mexico), PAN Panamá (Panama), DEL Delta Amacuro (Venezuela), TUM Tumbes (Peru), 702 PUM Punchana (Peru), MAN Manaus (Brazil), STR Santarém (Brazil), PNM Parnamirim 703 (Brazil), CAB Campos Belos (Brazil), CPG Campo Grande (Brazil), JRB Jurujuba (Brazil), 704 PAQ Paquetá (Brazil), VAZ Vaz Lobo (Brazil), BEL Belford Roxo (Brazil), SAN Santos (Brazil), BMA Monteagudo (Bolivia), SDG Salto del Guairá (Paraguay), ASU Asuncion 705 706 (Paraguay), SAL Salto (Uruguay), MIA Misiones (Argentina), ACO Corrientes (Argentina), 707 **BUE** Buenos Aires (Argentina).

708

FIG 5 Viral loads of three CHIKV isolates in saliva of *Ae. albopictus* and *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes from 35 populations from the Americas at day 7 post-infection. At day 7 after an infectious blood-meal, mosquitoes were sacrificed and saliva was collected from individual mosquitoes and titrated by focus fluorescent assay on C6/36 *Ae. albopictus* cells. Viral strains: CHIKV\_0621 isolated from La Réunion (ECSA genotype, E1-226V and E1-98A substitution), CHIKV\_115 isolated from La Réunion (ECSA genotype, E1-226A and E1-98A substitution) and CHIKV NC isolated from New Caledonia (Asian genotype, E1-226A and

716	E1-98T substitution). Mosquito populations (from North to South): TYS Tyson (United
717	States), VRB Vero Beach (United States), MXC Chiapas (Mexico), PAN Panamá (Panama),
718	DEL Delta Amacuro (Venezuela), TUM Tumbes (Peru), PUM Punchana (Peru), MAN
719	Manaus (Brazil), STR Santarém (Brazil), PNM Parnamirim (Brazil), CAB Campos Belos
720	(Brazil), CPG Campo Grande (Brazil), JRB Jurujuba (Brazil), PAQ Paquetá (Brazil), VAZ
721	Vaz Lobo (Brazil), BEL Belford Roxo (Brazil), SAN Santos (Brazil), BMA Monteagudo
722	(Bolivia), SDG Salto del Guairá (Paraguay), ASU Asuncion (Paraguay), SAL Salto
723	(Uruguay), MIA Misiones (Argentina), ACO Corrientes (Argentina), BUE Buenos Aires
724	(Argentina). Error bars refer to the standard error of mean titer for each pairing mosquito
725	population-virus strain.

# TABLE 1 Mosquito populations used. Populations are listed according to their country of collection, from North to South.

Mosquito population	Collection site	Country	Coordinates	Mosqui to species used	Climate	Dominant vegetation	Environm ent	History of Dengue incidenc e
TYS	Tyson Missouri	United States	38°31'N 90°33'W	AL	Temperate	Temperate grassland	Suburban	F
VRB	Vero Beach Florida	United States	27°35'N 80°22'W	AE/AL	Humid subtropical	Subtropical evergreen forest	Suburban	F
MXC	Tapachula	Mexico	14°53'N 92°15'W	AE/AL	Tropical wet and dry	Tropical deciduous forest	Suburban	М
PAN	Panamá/Colo n	Panama	08°59'N 79°30W/ 09°21'N 79°53'W	AE/AL	Tropical wet and dry	Savana	Urban/ Suburban	L
DEL	Delta Amacuro Tucupita	Venezuela	09°03'N 62°02'W	AE	Tropical wet and dry	Savana	Suburban	L
PUM	Punchana Iquitos	Peru	03°43'S 73°15'W	AE	Tropical wet and dry	Amazon forest	Urban	Н
TUM	Tumbes Huaquillas	Peru	03°29'S 80°15'W	AE	Arid	Desert	Suburban	L
MAN	Manaus	Brazil	03°06'S 60°03'W	AE/AL	Tropical wet	Amazon forest	Suburban	Н
STR	Santarém	Brazil	02°25'S 54°42'W	AE/AL	Tropical wet	Amazon forest	Suburban	М
PNM	Parnamirim	Brazil	05°54'S 35°16'W	AE/AL	Semiarid	Transitional Tropical rainforest	Suburban	Н
CAB	Campos Belos	Brazil	13°02'S 46°46'W	AE	Tropical wet and dry	Savana	Urban	L
BEL	Belford Roxo Rio de Janeiro	Brazil	22°45'S 43°24'W	AE/AL	Tropical wet and dry	Atlantic rain forest	Suburban	Н
VAZ	Vaz Lobo Rio de Janeiro	Brazil	22°51'S 43°19W	AE/AL	Tropical wet and dry	Atlantic rain forest	Urban	Н
JRB	Jurujuba Rio de Janeiro	Brazil	22°55'S 43°07'W	AE/AL	Tropical wet and dry	Atlantic rain forest	Suburban	L
PAQ	Paquetá Rio de Janeiro	Brazil	22° 45'S 43°06'W	AE/AL	Tropical wet and dry	Atlantic rain forest	Suburban island	М
SAN	Santos	Brazil	23°57'S 46°20'W	AE/AL	Tropical wet and dry	Atlantic rain forest	Suburban	М
CPG	Campo Grande	Brazil	20°27'S 54°37'W	AE	Tropical wet and dry	Savana	Urban	Н
BMA	Monteagudo	Bolivia	19°48'S 63°57'W	AE	Tropical wet and dry	Mountain Forest	Urban	L
ASU	Asunción	Paraguay	25°18'S 57°37'W	AE	Tropical wet and dry	Chaco	Urban	М
SDG	Salto del Guairá	Paraguay	24°03'S 54°18'W	AE	Humid subtropical	Savana	Suburban	L
MIA	Misiones	Argentina	25°36'S 54°34'W	AL	Humid subtropical	Paranaense forest	Rural	L
ACO	Corrientes	Argentina	27°28'S 58°50'W	AE	Humid subtropical	Humid Chaco	Urban	М
BUE	Buenos Aires	Argentina	34°35'S 58°22W	AE	Temperate	Pampas	Urban	L
SAL	Salto	Uruguay	31°23'S 57°58'W	AE	Temperate	Pampa	Urban	F

AE: Ae. aegypti; AL: Ae. albopictus; F: Free; L: Low; M: Mediun; H: High

732 Table 2. Dissemination efficiency of three CHIKV isolates in 22 Ae. aegypti and 13 Ae. albopictus 733 populations from 10 American countries at day 7 post-infection.

734

Country	Mosquito	CHIK	CHIKV_0621 CHIKV_115		CV_115	CHIK	CHIKV_NC		
Country	population	AE	AL	AE	AL	AE	AL		
United	TYS	ND	96.7% (30)	ND	83.3%(30)	ND	ND		
States	VRB	100% (30)	93.3% (30)	100% (18)	73.3% (30)*	ND	ND		
Mexico	MXC	96.7% (30)	73.3% (30)*	96.7% (30)	66.7% (30)*	ND	ND		
Panama	PAN	96.7% (30)	96.7% (30)	96.7% (30)	93.3% (30)	100% (30)	96.7% (30)		
Venezuela	DEL	100% (23)	ND	100% (28)	ND	ND	ND		
Dom	TUM	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Peru	PUM	100% (30)	ND	100% (29)	ND	ND	ND		
	MAN	100% (30)	96.7% (30)	ND	90.3% (31)	100% (30)	90% (30)		
	STR	100%(30)	100% (30)	ND	88.4% (26)	ND	ND		
	PNM	100% (30)	93.3% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND		
	CAB	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Drozil	CPG	100% (30)	ND	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
Diazii	JRB	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
	PAQ	100% (30)	87.1% (31)	100% (30)	96.9% (29)	ND	ND		
	VAZ	100% (30)	91.3% (23)	ND	ND	ND	ND		
	BEL	100% (30)	90.9%(22)	ND	ND	ND	ND		
	SAN	93.3% (30)	100% (30)	ND	87.5% (8)	ND	ND		
Bolivia	BMA	100% (30)	ND	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
Doroguov	SDG	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Falaguay	ASU	100% (30)	ND	96.7% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
Uruguay	SAL	100% (30)	ND	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
	MIA	ND	60% (30)	ND	66.7% (26)	ND	93.3% (30)		
Argentina	ACO	100% (30)	ND	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
	BUE	100% (30)	ND	96.6% (29)	ND	96.9% (33)	ND		

Dissemination efficiency corresponds to the proportion of mosquitoes with disseminated virus in heads among tested ones. Numbers of analyzed mosquitoes are shown in parenthesis. The titer of infectious blood-meals was 10<sup>7.5</sup> pfu/mL.

735 736 737 738 739 AE: Aedes aegypti; AL: Aedes albopictus; Viral strains: CHIKV 0621 isolated from La Réunion (ECSA genotype, E1-226V and E1-98A substitutions), CHIKV\_115 isolated from La Réunion (ECSA genotype, E1-226A and E1-98A substitutions) and CHIKV\_NC isolated from New Caledonia (Asian genotype, E1-226A and E1-98T substitutions). 740 Mosquito populations (from North to South): TYS Tyson (United States), VRB Vero Beach (United States), MXC Chiapas 741 (Mexico), PAN Panamá (Panama), DEL Delta Amacuro (Venezuela), TUM Tumbes (Peru), PUM Punchana (Peru), MAN 742 743 Manaus (Brazil), STR Santarém (Brazil), PNM Parnamirim (Brazil), CAB Campos Belos (Brazil), CPG Campo Grande (Brazil), JRB Jurujuba (Brazil), PAQ Paquetá (Brazil), VAZ Vaz Lobo (Brazil), BEL Belford Roxo (Brazil), SAN Santos 744 (Brazil), BMA Monteagudo (Bolivia), SDG Salto del Guairá (Paraguay), ASU Asuncion (Paraguay), SAL Salto (Uruguay), 745 MIA Misiones (Argentina), ACO Corrientes (Argentina), BUE Buenos Aires (Argentina). ND: Not determined.

746 \* Statistical differences of DE between the two mosquito species for a given virus (P<0.05)

749 Table 3. Dissemination efficiency of three CHIKV isolates in 22 Ae. aegypti and 13 Ae. albopictus population
750 from 10 American countries at day 10 post-infection.
751

Country	Mosquito	CHIK	V_0621	CH	IKV_115	CHIK	CHIKV_NC		
Country	population	AE	AL	AE	AL	AE	AL		
United	TYS	ND	93.3% (30)	ND	63.6%(11)	ND	ND		
States	VRB	100% (30)	85.7% (7)*	ND	96.7% (30)	ND	ND		
Mexico	MXC	93.3% (30)	70.0% (30)*	100% (30)	53.3% (30)***	ND	ND		
Panama	PAN	100% (30)	96.7% (30)	96.7% (30)	83.3% (30)	100% (30)	96.7% (30)		
Venezuela	DEL	100% (10)	ND	100% (15)	ND	ND	ND		
Dom	TUM	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Peru	PUM	100% (29)	ND	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
	MAN	100% (30)	100% (36)	ND	97.1% (34)	100% (30)	93.3% (30)		
	STR	100%(30)	100% (20)	ND	ND	ND	ND		
	PNM	100% (30)	90% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND		
	CAB	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Drozil	CPG	100% (30)	ND	100% (29)	ND	ND	ND		
DIazii	JRB	100% (30)	100% (30)	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
	PAQ	100% (30)	87.5% (32)*	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
	VAZ	96.7% (30)	100% (32)	ND	ND	ND	ND		
	BEL	100% (30)	88.9%(27)	ND	ND	ND	ND		
	SAN	100% (29)	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Bolivia	BMA	100% (30)	ND	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
Doroguov	SDG	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND		
Falaguay	ASU	100% (30)	ND	93.3% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
Uruguay	SAL	100% (30)	ND	100% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
	MIA	ND	93.3% (30)	ND	80% (30)	ND	96.7% (30)		
Argentina	ACO	100% (30)	ND	96.7% (30)	ND	ND	ND		
	BUE	96.7% (30)	ND	100% (30)	ND	90% (30)	ND		

752 Dissemination efficiency corresponds to the proportion of mosquitoes with disseminated virus in heads among tested ones. Numbers 753 of analyzed mosquitoes are shown in parenthesis. AE: Aedes aegypti; AL: Aedes albopictus; Viral strains: CHIKV\_0621 isolated from

754 La Réunion (ECSA genotype, E1-226V and E1-98A substitutions), CHIKV 115 isolated from La Réunion (ECSA genotype, E1-226A

755 and E1-98A substitutions) and CHIKV\_NC isolated from New Caledonia (Asian genotype, E1-226A and E1-98T substitutions).
 756 Mosquito populations (from North to South): TYS Tyson (United States), VRB Vero Beach (United States), MXC Chiapas (Mexico),
 757 PAN Panamá (Panama), DEL Delta Amacuro (Venezuela), TUM Tumbes (Peru), PUM Punchana (Peru), MAN Manaus (Brazil),

758 STR Santarém (Brazil), PNM Parnamirim (Brazil), CAB Campos Belos (Brazil), CPG Campo Grande (Brazil), JRB Jurujuba 759 (Brazil), PAQ Paquetá (Brazil), VAZ Vaz Lobo (Brazil), BEL Belford Roxo (Brazil), SAN Santos (Brazil), BMA Monteagudo

760 (Bolivia), SDG Salto del Guairá (Paraguay), ASU Asuncion (Paraguay), SAL Salto (Uruguay), MIA Misiones (Argentina), ACO

761 Corrientes (Argentina), BUE Buenos Aires (Argentina). ND: Not determined.

762 \* Statistical differences of DE between the two mosquito species for a given virus: \* (P<0.05); \*\*\* (P<0.001).





**Days post-infection** 

CHIKV\_0621

- - CHIKV\_0621 (V)



Virus isolates





Virus isolates