

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

1 **Article Summary Line:** Evidence of increasing dengue endemicity in Florida: Vector  
2 surveillance during dengue and West Nile virus outbreaks revealed widespread presence of other  
3 dengue virus serotypes in the absence of local index cases.

4 **Running Title:** Dengue and West Nile Virus outbreak in Florida

5 **Keywords:** Dengue virus, West Nile Virus, Arboviruses, Disease Vectors, Disease Outbreaks,  
6 COVID-19

7 **Title:** A molecular surveillance-guided vector control response to concurrent dengue and West  
8 Nile virus outbreaks in a COVID-19 hotspot of Florida

9 **Authors:** Heather Coatsworth<sup>1</sup>, Catherine A. Lippi, Chalmers Vasquez, Jasmine B. Ayers,  
10 Caroline J. Stephenson, Christy Waits, Mary Florez, André B. B. Wilke, Isik Unlu, Johana  
11 Medina, Maria L. Alcaide, Sadie J. Ryan, John A. Lednicky, John C. Beier, William Petrie,  
12 Rhoel R. Dinglasan<sup>2</sup>

13 <sup>1</sup>Corresponding author for review purposes only

14 <sup>2</sup>Corresponding author

15 **Corresponding Author:** Rhoel R. Dinglasan, University of Florida, 2055 Mowry Rd,  
16 Gainesville, FL 32611, USA, [rdinglasan@epi.ufl.edu](mailto:rdinglasan@epi.ufl.edu), (+1) 352-294-8448

17 **Author Affiliations:**

18 University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA (H. Coatsworth, C. Lippi, J. B. Ayers, C. J.  
19 Stephenson, C. Waits, M. Florez, S. J. Ryan, J. A. Lednicky, R. R. Dinglasan)

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

20 Miami-Dade Mosquito Control District, Miami, Florida, USA (C. Vasquez, I. Unlu, J. Medina,

21 W. Petrie)

22 University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA (A. B. B. Wilke, M. L. Alcaide, J. C. Beier)

23 Navy Entomology Center of Excellence, Jacksonville, FL USA (C. Waits)

## 24 **Abstract**

25 Simultaneous dengue virus (DENV) and West Nile virus (WNV) outbreaks in Florida,  
26 USA, in 2020 resulted in 71 dengue virus serotype 1 and 86 WNV human cases. Our outbreak  
27 response leveraged a molecular diagnostic screen of mosquito populations for DENV and WNV  
28 in Miami-Dade County to quickly employ targeted mosquito abatement efforts. We detected  
29 DENV serotypes 2 and 4 in mosquito pools, highlighting the silent circulation of diverse dengue  
30 serotypes in mosquitoes. Additionally, we found WNV-positive mosquito pools in areas with no  
31 historical reports of WNV transmission. These findings demonstrate the importance of proactive,  
32 strategic arbovirus surveillance in mosquito populations to prevent and control outbreaks,  
33 particularly when other illnesses (e.g., COVID-19), which present with similar symptoms are  
34 circulating concurrently. Growing evidence for substantial infection prevalence of dengue in  
35 competent mosquito vectors in the absence of local index cases suggests a higher level of dengue  
36 endemicity in Florida than previously thought.

## 37 **Introduction**

38 Although West Nile Virus (WNV) is endemic in the continental United States, only a  
39 handful of states, especially Florida, are at risk of autochthonous dengue virus (DENV)  
40 transmission (1,2). Throughout 2020, Miami-Dade County was the epicenter of COVID-19 in

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

41 Florida, but unbeknownst to the general U.S. population, the state experienced in parallel,  
42 concurrent outbreaks of DENV and WNV from May - December 2020, resulting in 71 local  
43 cases of dengue fever (DENV serotype 1) and 86 cases of WNV. Herein, we report the outcome  
44 of vector surveillance and control effort in response to the arbovirus outbreaks in Miami-Dade  
45 County (August- November 2020).

## 46 **Methods**

### 47 *Sample collection and processing*

48 Adult mosquitoes were collected with BG-Sentinel traps (Biogents AG, Regensburg, Germany)  
49 baited with dry ice, for 24 hours. Miami-Dade Mosquito Control District (MDMCD) trapped,  
50 morphologically identified, and sorted adult female mosquitoes by location into pools of 2-25  
51 mosquitoes of the same species. Samples were kept cold to avoid RNA degradation, shipped on  
52 dry ice, and stored at -80°C. In total, 743 pools were collected for testing [548 for DENV (pools  
53 of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*, N= 5,079 mosquitoes) and 188 for WNV (pools of  
54 *Anopheles crucians*, *Culex coronator*, *Culex nigripalpus*, and *Culex quinquefasciatus*, N= 2,589  
55 mosquitoes)].

### 56 *RNA extraction*

57 Chilled, sterile 1X phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and sterile glass beads were added to  
58 each sample in a biosafety cabinet (BSC). Each 1 mL sample was homogenized in a Bullet  
59 Blender (speed 8, 5 minutes) with repeated cooling on ice/cold block in the BSC. Samples were  
60 centrifuged (3,750xg, 3 minutes) and 140 µL of the homogenate supernatant was added to AVL  
61 lysis buffer (560 µL) (Qiagen). RNA was extracted using the QIAmp Viral RNA extraction kit  
62 (Qiagen) following the manufacturer's protocols with 2x40 µL elution steps. One pool of 5

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

63 uninfected *Ae. aegypti* (Orlando) mosquitoes was processed in parallel, serving as a negative  
64 extraction control to rule out contamination or spurious amplification.

#### 65 *Real-Time RT-PCR Virus Detection*

66 Sample RNA was either tested for i) WNV or ii) DENV based on the mosquito species  
67 for a given pool. Samples designated for DENV screening were first run through a pan-dengue  
68 serotype screen, DENVAll (Appendix Table 1), while the remaining samples were screened via a  
69 WNV assay (Appendix Table 2). Each sample, prepared in a PCR hood with static air, was run  
70 as technical duplicates. Each plate included a mosquito extraction control, a no template control,  
71 and either i) a positive WNV control or ii) dengue virus serotype 1, 2, 3 and 4 (DENV-1 through  
72 DENV-4) positive controls. All positive RNA controls were obtained from BEI resources diluted  
73 1:10 (Appendix Tables 1,2,5). Analyses used either QuantaBio UltraPlex 1-Step ToughMix (4X)  
74 Low-ROX master mix (Appendix Table 3) or SuperScript™ III Platinum™ One-Step qRT-PCR  
75 (Appendix Table 4) on a BioRad CFX96 Touch Real-Time PCR Detection System at 50°C for  
76 30 minutes (for Superscript reactions) or 50°C for 10 minutes (for QuantaBio reactions), 95°C  
77 for 2 minutes, and 45 cycles of: 95°C for 15 seconds and 60°C for 45 seconds. Both assays  
78 yielded similar results, which helped overcome availability bottlenecks during the COVID-19  
79 pandemic. Samples that were DENV-positive via the DENVAll assay were analyzed for serotype  
80 specificity (Appendix Tables 5). Any putative positive or inconclusive (i.e., only one replicate  
81 amplified) samples were re-run in confirmatory reactions, adding extra technical replicates and  
82 performing additional confirmatory runs as needed to confirm virus positivity.

#### 83 *Positive and negative sample designation*

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

84           A sample was considered 'positive' based on positive technical duplicate results in two  
85 independent runs using the WNV assay (Appendix Table 2) and the DENV serotype-specific  
86 assay (Appendix Table 5). Samples were considered 'negative' based on no detectable Ct value in  
87 either technical duplicate after 45 cycles.

### 88 *Mapping mosquito samples*

89           To understand the spatial distribution of mosquito pools collected for this effort, we  
90 developed maps using ArcMap (v 10.6) at the zip code level, which is the smallest level of  
91 resolution obtainable with our datasets. All datasets were either publicly available: Miami-Dade  
92 County Boundaries, population density and land use (2010 US Census, Miami-Dade County's  
93 Open Data Hub), median household income (2010 US Census, Michigan Population Studies),  
94 persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLWH) (2018, AIDsVu), or obtained with permission from  
95 personal communications (2018 – 2020 mosquito prevalence c/o Chalmers Vasquez, Miami-  
96 Dade Mosquito Control District; 2009 – 2019 Imported DENV cases c/o Andrea Morrison,  
97 Florida Department of Health). Land-use types were manually concatenated to 11 different  
98 primary categories: Agricultural, Cemeteries, Commercial, Educational, Industrial, Marine,  
99 Recreational, Residential, Paved, Water, and Vacant. These types were further summed as:  
100 'urban/built' (Commercial, Educational, Industrial, and Paved), 'agricultural/recreational'  
101 (Agricultural, Recreational), 'residential' (Residential) and 'other' (Cemeteries, Marine, Water,  
102 and Vacant) (Appendix Table 6).

103 *Spatial statistical analysis of vector distribution and spatial visualization of overlapping PLWH*  
104 *and arbovirus hotspots*

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

105           To explore the spatial relationship between positivity and overall mosquito sampling, the  
106           directional distribution and mean center (e.g., central tendencies, dispersion) were computed for  
107           DENV- and WNV-positive mosquito pools, for all collected DENV vectors (*Ae. aegypti* and *Ae.*  
108           *albopictus*) and all WNV vectors (*An. crucians*, *Cx. coronator*, *Cx. nigripalpus*, and *Cx.*  
109           *quinquefasciatus*), both individually and together. Kernel density estimation (KDE) with optimal  
110           distance bandwidths (3) was used to visualize the continuous density of DENV- and WNV-  
111           positive mosquito pools, as well as traps containing un-infected DENV and WNV vectors. To  
112           determine whether arbovirus-positive pools occurred in areas where there were imported DENV  
113           cases or in areas with a higher number of PLWH, local Moran's I, a local indicator of spatial  
114           association (LISA), analyses with inverse distance weighting were performed to detect and  
115           identify PLWH hotspots (areas of elevated incidence or prevalence) that potentially overlap with  
116           locations of arbovirus positive pools, as well as imported DENV cases for 2019 only, and for the  
117           2009-2019 period. All spatial statistical analyses were completed in ArcMap (v 10.6).

## 118   **Results**

### 119   *Molecular detection of arbovirus-positive mosquito pools*

120           We found that 2.96% of female mosquito pool samples (22/743 pools, 382/7,668  
121           mosquitoes) were positive for an arbovirus; 4 were DENV-2 positive, 9 were DENV-4 positive  
122           (2.43% DENV positivity), and 9 were WNV positive (4.79% WNV positivity) (Table 1 and  
123           Appendix 7). Results were confirmed and verified independently by the Florida Department of  
124           Health (FLDOH), and the inclusion of a pool of lab reared mosquitoes in every extraction and  
125           PCR run ruled out contamination during lab handling or spurious amplification of mosquito  
126           material.

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

127 For DENV, we tested 45 *Ae. albopictus* and 510 *Ae. aegypti* mosquito pools, and only *Ae.*  
128 *aegypti* pools were found to be positive for DENV-2 and/or DENV-4 (2.43% positivity).

129 For WNV, we tested five *An. crucians*, five *Cx. coronator*, 47 *Cx. nigripalpus* and 131  
130 *Cx. quinquefasciatus* pools. Only *Cx. nigripalpus* pools were WNV positive (19.1% positivity),  
131 although CDC findings from earlier in 2020 (June), found three positive *Cx. quinquefasciatus*  
132 pools.

133 Mosquito pool samples that were found to be DENV- or WNV-positive were reported to  
134 the MDMCD within 48-72 hours. Miami-Dade Mosquito Control Division initiated door-to-door  
135 source reduction in the areas where positive mosquito pools were found. Vectobac WGD (Valent  
136 Biosciences), a larvicide product containing *Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis*, was applied at  
137 positive pool sites for four weeks. Adulticide treatment using chlorpyrifos was also conducted  
138 (weather permitting) using Mosquitomist (Clarke).

139 *A spatial-climatic distribution of arbovirus-positive mosquito pools identified exigent and*  
140 *emerging areas of concern*

141 DENV-positive mosquito pools were distributed throughout the county, with most  
142 (11/13) positive pools located in downtown Miami (N=3), Wynwood (N=2), and South Miami  
143 (N=6) (Figure 1A) and in areas with mid-to-high human population density (2,000 – 7,000  
144 people/km<sup>2</sup>) (Figure 1B). At the zip code level, DENV-positive pools were primarily found in  
145 built and residential environments (59.42%) over more rural, (i.e., agricultural and recreational)  
146 areas (14.62%) (Figure 1C). Conversely, the thirteen WNV-positive pools (9 identified herein)  
147 had three primary infection foci – in Wynwood (N=4), high population density (>3000  
148 people/km<sup>2</sup>, urban built environment), in Homestead (N=8), low population density (<470

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

149 people/km<sup>2</sup>, mostly agricultural and recreational land), and in North Miami (N=1), mid  
150 population density (1,000 – 3,000 people/km<sup>2</sup> and mixed land use) (Figure 1D-F). WNV-positive  
151 pools were primarily from agricultural and recreational areas (69.32%) and were less common in  
152 urban built and residential areas (15.98%).

153         The directional distribution and mean center computations of dengue vector distributions  
154 showed that DENV-positive mosquito pools were within the directional distribution of all  
155 dengue vector traps (Figure 2A). *Ae. aegypti* prevalence dominated the traps in much of the  
156 county and had a much larger directional distribution than *Ae. albopictus*, whose presence was  
157 concentrated in southern Miami-Dade County (Figure 2B). Although the directional distribution  
158 of all WNV vectors overlapped with the directional distribution of the WNV-positive mosquito  
159 pools, the latter extended well beyond the southernmost tip of the WNV vector directional ellipse  
160 (Figure 2C). *Culex quinquefasciatus*, *An. crucians* and *Cx. nigripalpus* had distinct directional  
161 distributions in the Miami Beach area, North Miami, and South Miami, respectively (Figure 2D).  
162 The distribution of *Cx. coronator* encompassed all three of these zones, lacking any strict  
163 boundary (Figure 2D).

164         The KDE maps show a clear high density of vector trapping efforts across Miami-Dade  
165 County except for the southernmost area (Appendix Figure 1A). The KDE map for DENV-2  
166 positive pools showed high values surrounding each positive pool but low values between pools  
167 (Appendix Figure 1B), while the DENV-4 positive KDE map showed connected high values  
168 across all positive pools (Appendix Figure 1C). The KDE map for the WNV vector trapping  
169 effort showed a high concentration of vectors in the downtown Miami/Miami Beach areas, with  
170 areas of mid values dotted throughout the county (Appendix Figure 1E). The WNV-positive



Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

171 pools showed two clear high-value foci, one in Homestead, and one in Miami Beach (Appendix  
172 Figure 1F).

173 DENV-positive mosquito pools were in areas of higher average maximum temperatures,  
174 lower average minimum temperatures, and higher total precipitation (Appendix Figure 2 A-C).  
175 WNV-positive pools displayed the same trend with respect to temperature but were found in  
176 areas of lower total precipitation (Appendix Figure 2D-F).

177 LISA analyses on imported DENV case data showed similar clusters for both the 2009-  
178 2019 imported DENV data (Appendix Figure 3A), as well as the 2019 only imported DENV  
179 dataset (Appendix Figure 3B). The northwestern area of Miami-Dade was a high-high cluster,  
180 indicating this area is a hotspot for imported DENV cases. Conversely, the Miami Beach area  
181 was a low-low cluster, suggesting a consistently lower-than-average number of imported DENV  
182 cases (a cold spot). The low-high outliers for both datasets occurred just below the hotspot in  
183 northwest Miami-Dade, while the high-low outlier for the decade-wide dataset was in South  
184 Miami, and the 2019 only data had high-low outliers throughout North Miami.

185 We explored the possibility of increased arbovirus risk to special populations in Miami-  
186 Dade (i.e., PLWH) by examining in parallel the LISA results for PLWH and the spatial  
187 distribution of DENV or WNV positive pools and observed that DENV-positive mosquito pools  
188 were in the low-low PLWH cluster (Appendix Figure 3C), while one of the WNV-positive pool  
189 foci was in a PLWH hotspot (Appendix Figure 3D).

## 190 **Discussion**

191 *Ecological distribution of WNV-positive mosquito pools*

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

192           Although WNV-positive mosquito pools are rarely reported in Miami-Dade County, we  
193 found nine positive mosquito pools collected between June – November 2020; three other WNV  
194 positive mosquito pools were found in 2020 (collected earlier in June and analyzed by the CDC).  
195 All four mosquito species we tested can transmit WNV (4,5); however, we only found WNV-  
196 positive *Cx. nigripalpus* pools, an expected result, as it is the primary enzootic and epidemic  
197 vector of mosquito-borne viruses encephalitides such as WNV, St. Louis encephalitis virus, and  
198 eastern equine encephalitis virus throughout southern Florida (6). This result is intriguing,  
199 considering the overwhelmingly dominant collection of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* throughout the  
200 county. Differences in WNV vector positivity may be due to several factors including host  
201 preference and vector competence. Previous reports show that *Cx. quinquefasciatus* has a wide  
202 range of WNV competency that appears to partition according to spatial and climatic scales and  
203 is influenced by virus genetic background (7–11).

204           There appeared to be a centralized distribution of traps collecting *Culex* and *Anopheles*  
205 mosquitoes, while positive pool traps were dispersed throughout the county. The spatial  
206 partitioning of the WNV-positive mosquito pools suggests that the positive pools had a distinct  
207 spatial trend within the larger distribution of traps collecting *Culex* and *Anopheles* mosquitoes in  
208 Miami-Dade County. This might indicate that current trap coverage is not adequate to reliably  
209 detect WNV-positive mosquito pools. As WNV infects a wealth of other non-human animals  
210 (i.e., horses, alligators, birds, etc.) (12), controlling the spread of WNV requires additional  
211 zoonotic measures including implementing equine WNV vaccines, as well as testing dead birds  
212 to understand prevalence and virus hotspots throughout the county.

213           WNV-positive mosquito pools were primarily located in areas with lower precipitation,  
214 higher maximum temperature, and lower minimum temperature (range of 21-29°C), optimal for

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

215 multiple *Culex* vectors (10). As there was no clear overlap between the spatial distribution of  
216 WNV vectors and climatic variables, these general climatic conditions are likely ideal for all the  
217 WNV vectors we analyzed. WNV-positive mosquito pools were found primarily in agricultural  
218 and recreational areas. These areas include protected bird sanctuaries, as well as habitats for  
219 resident and migrating shorebirds, which are known WNV avian hosts (12).

#### 220 *Ecological distribution of DENV-positive mosquito pools*

221 Although other dengue vectors (i.e., *Aedes spp.*) are present in Miami-Dade (13), our data  
222 suggest that *Ae. aegypti* is clearly the primary vector of concern. Evidence suggests that  
223 Floridian *Ae. aegypti* (Monroe County) and *Ae. albopictus* (Indian River County) are similarly  
224 competent for DENV-1 (14). DENV vector competency varies greatly based on DENV serotype  
225 and FL *Ae. aegypti* geographic origin (15), so extrapolations of *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus*  
226 vector competence across FL may not be appropriate. Our findings may be a by-product of *Ae.*  
227 *aegypti* prevalence, as considerably more *Ae. aegypti* were collected than *Ae. albopictus* in traps  
228 across the entirety of Miami-Dade County in 2020, and in former years (13).

229 DENV-positive pools were primarily located in areas with higher precipitation, higher  
230 maximum temperature, and lower minimum temperature. The directional distribution of DENV-  
231 positive pools suggests that the current trap spread is more than adequate to reliably detect  
232 DENV-positive pools. However, since trap density within the DENV-positive pool distribution  
233 area is not as concentrated as in the other *Aedes* positive trap locales, additional traps in the  
234 ellipse margins could prove useful.

#### 235 *Epidemiological relevance of WNV-positive mosquito pools*

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

236 WNV-positive mosquito pools overlapped with the timing of 27 human symptomatic  
237 cases (June, July, August), 33 human asymptomatic blood donors (June, July August), as well as  
238 15 WNV-positive birds (June, July), all in Miami-Dade County (16). One of the WNV-positive  
239 pool foci overlapped with a hotspot of PLWH (Appendix Figure 3D). This is especially  
240 concerning for PLWH, as these individuals are at a higher risk of neurotropism from WNV  
241 infection (17–21). WNV positive pools were primarily found in more rural areas with lower  
242 median household incomes, and low to medium population density (Figure 1 D-F). Low-income  
243 areas have previously been associated with higher WNV prevalence (22,23). These data  
244 underscore the need for tailored programs to protect and prevent infection in these at-risk  
245 populations.

#### 246 *Epidemiological relevance of DENV-positive mosquito pools*

247 In the last five years, the number of local DENV cases in Florida has risen from zero  
248 (2017) to 71 (2020). A rise in cases can also be seen in the imported DENV case numbers  
249 (DENV-1 through DENV-4). In 2017, there were only 18 imported cases, 73 in 2018, 395 in  
250 2019, 41 in 2020. This spike in dengue cases was mirrored in Miami-Dade County, where local  
251 case numbers moved from zero cases in 2017, to one in 2018, fourteen in 2019 and four in 2020,  
252 and travel-associated cases progressed from nine in 2017, to thirty-eight in 2018, 226 in 2019  
253 and twenty in 2020. The large spike in imported cases in 2019 may have introduced other DENV  
254 serotypes into the resident Miami-Dade mosquito populations, acting as seeding events, which  
255 are known drivers of local DENV case incidence (24,25).

256 To examine whether this could be the case, we analyzed the available zip code-mapped  
257 historical (2009 – 2019) and 2019 imported DENV data using LISA analyses (Appendix Figure

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

258 3A and B), as well as the 2019 only imported DENV dataset (Appendix Figure 3B). The  
259 similarity in the decade-long and 2019 LISA analyses suggests that the high number of imported  
260 cases in 2019 may have driven the hotspot trends seen in our analyses. None of our DENV-  
261 positive mosquito pools overlapped with known imported DENV case hotspots. This could be  
262 due to a lack of reporting of zip code level imported DENV data. Alternatively, if mosquitoes  
263 bite individuals outside of their listed area of primary residence, such as where individuals spend  
264 time outdoors, where they work, or where they socialize, the direct overlap would not be  
265 observed.

266         Local human cases of DENV-1, DENV-2 and DENV-3 have been reported in FL  
267 (2,16,26–28). In 2020, only DENV-1 local cases were reported, despite our findings of DENV-2  
268 and DENV-4 positive mosquito pools in the county. ‘Silent’ DENV circulation, defined as  
269 transmission between DENV asymptomatic individuals, as well as DENV maintenance in the  
270 vector population despite no reported human infection, likely represents the majority of  
271 transmission events (29). Finding additional DENV serotypes in the absence of a local human  
272 index case is not the first instance of silent DENV circulation in *Ae. aegypti* in the Americas.  
273 Previous reports have shown that DENV-4 was found in Manatee County, FL in 2018, and  
274 DENV-3 was detected in *Ae. aegypti* in Brazil despite no human index cases (30,31). This silent  
275 circulation is likely due to low but persistent vertical transmission in the mosquito population  
276 (31–33). This disparity could also be due to inherent differences in mosquito vector competence  
277 for DENV-1, -2 and -4, as mosquitoes collected in Miami-Dade had higher DENV-1 infection  
278 and transmission rates than mosquitoes from Miami-Dade infected with DENV-2 and -4 (15).  
279 Although the pathogenicity of the 2020 Miami-Dade human DENV-1 index strain is unknown,

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

280 the strain may be more infectious to or cause increased disease severity in humans than other  
281 circulating dengue strains.

282 Having multiple concurrent circulating serotypes puts individuals at an increased risk of  
283 DENV infection due to complications arising from immune enhancement (34,35). These risks  
284 include dengue fever and severe dengue (dengue hemorrhagic fever and dengue shock  
285 syndrome) and can be fatal (36). A woman in her 30's died from DENV-2 in Miami-Dade in  
286 2019, and subsequent viral analysis suggested that infection occurred after DENV circulation  
287 had occurred in the Miami area (37).

288 There were more DENV-positive pools in areas with lower prevalence of PLWH, higher  
289 median household income and mid-high population density (Figure 1A-C, Appendix Figure 3C).  
290 Although there does not seem to be evidence for an association between income and DENV  
291 prevalence (38), DENV is a known urban-centric disease (39).

292 *The perfect storm: arbovirus transmission in a global pandemic*

293 Miami Dade County has been a hotspot of SARS-CoV-2 transmission throughout the  
294 pandemic, with the highest case rate and death toll in the state. Unfortunately, due to the non-  
295 standardized nature of COVID-19 case reporting throughout Florida (reports range from  
296 residence-based, testing locale-based and exposure-based), we could not directly map COVID-19  
297 prevalence alongside mosquito pool positivity. The potential for immunocompromise resulting  
298 from acute SARS-CoV-2 infection to increase severity and/or transmissibility of other diseases  
299 (i.e. West Nile, dengue) in the Miami Dade population is concerning.

300 Due to the similar symptoms produced by COVID-19, West Nile, and dengue infection  
301 (fever, headache, muscle pain, nausea, vomiting, malaise), symptomatic WNV or DENV

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

302 infected individuals may have self-quarantined assuming they were positive for COVID-19 and  
303 never received a correct diagnosis. The high number of asymptomatic WNV positive individuals  
304 identified directly through blood donorship suggests that the proportion of asymptomatic WNV  
305 positive human carriers may be high, and previous reports show that the majority of DENV  
306 infected humans are also asymptomatic carriers (29). It should be noted that dengue is not  
307 currently part of routine blood donor screening in Miami-Dade.

308         The spread of the positive pools is intriguing, as prior arbovirus positive pools (for WNV  
309 and Zika virus) in Miami-Dade County were solely concentrated within the Miami Beach, Little  
310 River and Wynwood locales. Our data suggest a much wider arbovirus positive pool spread,  
311 ranging across the county.

312         Together, these data highlight a lack of vector containment and the importance of  
313 continued surveillance for arboviruses in their vector species. This is especially true when  
314 infection risk and continued transmission is increased due to: i) the presence of other illnesses  
315 (e.g., COVID-19) that present similarly in a clinic to arbovirus infection, ii) the high incidence of  
316 PLWH in areas of known WNV positivity resulting in potentially worse health outcomes  
317 following infection, and iii) climatic conditions favoring above-average *Ae. aegypti* and *Cx.*  
318 *nigripalpus* vector indices. The large proportion of asymptomatic WNV cases highlights the  
319 critical need for improved DENV diagnostics, as no dengue rapid diagnostic tests are currently  
320 cleared for use in the United States (37). Prevention and control measures are imperative to  
321 prevent future and expanded DENV and WNV outbreaks; targeted vector control efforts through  
322 continued mosquito pathogen screening and subsequent population specific insecticide spraying  
323 are necessary to prevent arbovirus spread throughout the county.

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

## 324 **Acknowledgments**

325           This research was supported in part by U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
326 (CDC) grant 1U01CK000510-03, Southeastern Regional Center of Excellence in Vector Borne  
327 Diseases Gateway Program. The CDC did not have a role in the design of the study, the  
328 collection, analysis, or interpretation of data, or writing the manuscript. Christy Waits is a  
329 contractor employee of the U.S. Government. This work was prepared as part of her official  
330 duties. Title 17, U.S.C., §105 provides that copyright protection under this title is not available  
331 for any work of the U.S. Government. Title 17, U.S.C., §101 defines a U.S. Government work as  
332 a work prepared by a military Service member or employee of the U.S. Government as part of  
333 that person's official duties. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do  
334 not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Navy, Department  
335 of Defense, nor the U. S. Government. The Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, or  
336 the U. S. Government did not have a role in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, or  
337 interpretation of data, or writing of the manuscript.

## 338 **Author Bio**

339           Dr. Coatsworth is a post-doctoral associate at the University of Florida. Her primary  
340 research interests include arbovirology, vector biology, and vector-borne disease transmission.

## 341 **References**

- 342 1. Franco C, Hynes NA, Bouri N, Henderson DA. The Dengue Threat to the United States.  
343 [cited 2021 Sep 10]; Available from: [www.liebertpub.com](http://www.liebertpub.com)
- 344 2. Rey JR. Dengue in Florida (USA). *Insects* 2014, Vol 5, Pages 991-1000 [Internet]. 2014  
345 Dec 16 [cited 2021 Oct 7];5(4):991–1000. Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/2075->



Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

346 4450/5/4/991/htm

347 3. Fotheringham AS, Brunsdon C, Charlton M. Quantitative Geography: Perspectives on  
348 Spatial Data Analysis. 6th ed. London: Sage Publications; 2000.

349 4. Turell MJ, Sardelis MR, Dohm DJ, O'guinn ML. Potential North American Vectors of  
350 West Nile Virus.

351 5. Unlu I, Kramer WL, Roy AF, Foil LD. Detection of West Nile Virus RNA in Mosquitoes  
352 and Identification of Mosquito Blood Meals Collected at Alligator Farms in Louisiana. J  
353 Med Entomol [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2021 Sep 10];47(4):625–33. Available from:  
354 <https://academic.oup.com/jme/article/47/4/625/992551>

355 6. Day JF, Tabachnick WJ, Smartt CT. Factors That Influence the Transmission of West Nile  
356 Virus in Florida. J Med Entomol [Internet]. 2015;52(5):743–54. Available from:  
357 <https://academic.oup.com/jme/article/52/5/743/828059>

358 7. Anderson SL, Richards SL, Tabachnick WJ, Smartt, Chelsea T. Effects of West Nile  
359 Virus Dose and Extrinsic Incubation Temperature on Temporal Progression of Vector  
360 Competence in *Culex pipiens quinquefasciatus*. Source J Am Mosq Control Assoc  
361 [Internet]. 2010;26(1):103–7. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2987/09-5926.1>

362 8. Richards SL, Lord CC, Pesko KN, Tabachnick WJ. Environmental and biological factors  
363 influencing *Culex pipiens quinquefasciatus* Say (Diptera: Culicidae) vector competence  
364 for West Nile virus. Am J Trop Med Hygiene [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2021 Sep  
365 10];83(1):126–34. Available from:  
366 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2912589/pdf/tropmed-83-126.pdf>

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

- 367 9. Keyel AC, Timm OE, Backenson PB, Id CP, Quinones S, Mcdonough KA, et al. Seasonal  
368 temperatures and hydrological conditions improve the prediction of West Nile virus  
369 infection rates in Culex mosquitoes and human case counts in New York and Connecticut.  
370 2019; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217854>
- 371 10. Shocket MS, Verwillow AB, Numazu MG, Slamani H, Cohen JM, El Moustaid F, et al.  
372 Transmission of west nile and five other temperate mosquito-borne viruses peaks at  
373 temperatures between 23°C and 26°C. *Elife*. 2020 Sep 1;9:1–67.
- 374 11. Richards SL, Anderson SL, Lord CC. Vector competence of Culex pipiens  
375 quinquefasciatus (Diptera: Culicidae) for West Nile virus isolates from Florida. 2014;  
376 Available from: <http://cdo.ncdc>.
- 377 12. Marra P., Griffing S, Caffrey C, Kilpatrick MA, McLean R, Brand C, et al. West Nile  
378 Virus and Wildlife . *Bioscience* [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2021 Sep 11];54(5):393–402.  
379 Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/54/5/393/416853?login=true>
- 380 13. Wilke ABB, Vasquez C, Medina J, Carvajal A, Petrie W, Beier JC. Community  
381 Composition and Year-round Abundance of Vector species of Mosquitoes make Miami-  
382 Dade County, Florida a Receptive Gateway for Arbovirus entry to the United states.  
383 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-45337-2>
- 384 14. Richards SL, Anderson SL, Alto BW. Vector Competence of Aedes aegypti and Aedes  
385 albopictus (Diptera: Culicidae) for Dengue Virus in the Florida Keys. *J Med Entomol*  
386 [Internet]. 2012;49(4):942–6. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1603/ME11293>
- 387 15. Stephenson CJ, Coatsworth H, Waits CM, Nazario-Maldonado NM, Mathias DK,

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

- 388           Dinglasan RR, et al. Geographic partitioning of dengue virus transmission risk in Florida.  
389           prep. 2021;
- 390   16.   Morrison A, Rowe D, McDermott C, Stanek D, Heberlein-Larson L, LaCrue A, et al.  
391           Florida Arbovirus Surveillance [Internet]. Available from:  
392           [http://www.floridahealth.gov/diseases-and-conditions/mosquito-borne-](http://www.floridahealth.gov/diseases-and-conditions/mosquito-borne-diseases/_documents/2020-week-53-arbovirus-surveillance-report.pdf)  
393           [diseases/\\_documents/2020-week-53-arbovirus-surveillance-report.pdf](http://www.floridahealth.gov/diseases-and-conditions/mosquito-borne-diseases/_documents/2020-week-53-arbovirus-surveillance-report.pdf)
- 394   17.   Klein RS. A Moving Target: The Multiple Roles of CCR5 in Infectious Diseases. 2007;  
395           Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/jid/article/197/2/183/809887>
- 396   18.   Pang J, Thein T-L, Lye DC, Leo Y-S. Differential Clinical Outcome of Dengue Infection  
397           among Patients with and without HIV Infection: A Matched Case-Control Study. *Am J*  
398           *Trop Med Hyg.* 2015;92(6):1156–62.
- 399   19.   WG G, DH M, JK L, S L, SF Y, WA F, et al. CCR5 deficiency increases risk of  
400           symptomatic West Nile virus infection. *J Exp Med* [Internet]. 2006 Jan 23 [cited 2021 Sep  
401           20];203(1):35–40. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16418398/>
- 402   20.   JK L, CY L, C G, C J, B J, H J, et al. Genetic deficiency of chemokine receptor CCR5 is a  
403           strong risk factor for symptomatic West Nile virus infection: a meta-analysis of 4 cohorts  
404           in the US epidemic. *J Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2008 Jan 15 [cited 2021 Sep 20];197(2):262–5.  
405           Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18179388/>
- 406   21.   JK L, DH M, A L, GA F, D K, D F, et al. CCR5 deficiency is a risk factor for early  
407           clinical manifestations of West Nile virus infection but not for viral transmission. *J Infect*  
408           *Dis* [Internet]. 2010 Jan 15 [cited 2021 Sep 20];201(2):178–85. Available from:

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

- 409 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20025530/>
- 410 22. Harrigan RJ, Thomassen HA, Buermann W, Cummings RF, Kahn ME. Economic  
411 Conditions Predict Prevalence of West Nile Virus. PLoS One [Internet].  
412 2010;5(11):15437. Available from: [www.plosone.org](http://www.plosone.org)
- 413 23. Rothman SE, Jones JA, LaDeau SL, Leisnham PT. Higher West Nile Virus Infection in  
414 *Aedes albopictus* (Diptera: Culicidae) and *Culex* (Diptera: Culicidae) Mosquitoes From  
415 Lower Income Neighborhoods in Urban Baltimore, MD. J Med Entomol [Internet]. 2021  
416 May 15 [cited 2021 Sep 11];58(3):1424–8. Available from:  
417 <https://academic.oup.com/jme/article/58/3/1424/6013060>
- 418 24. Guzzetta G, Marques-Toledo CA, Rosà R, Teixeira M, Merler S. Quantifying the spatial  
419 spread of dengue in a non-endemic Brazilian metropolis via transmission chain  
420 reconstruction. Available from: [www.nature.com/naturecommunications](http://www.nature.com/naturecommunications)
- 421 25. Li N, Feng Y, Vrancken B, Chen Y, Dong L, Yang Q, et al. Assessing the impact of  
422 COVID-19 border restrictions on dengue transmission in Yunnan Province, China: an  
423 observational epidemiological and phylogenetic analysis. Lancet Reg Heal Pacific  
424 [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 11];14:100259. Available from:  
425 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanwpc.2021.100259>
- 426 26. Trout A, Baracco G, Rodriguez M, Barber J, Leal A, Radke E, et al. Locally Acquired  
427 Dengue --- Key West, Florida, 2009--2010. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. 2010 [cited  
428 2021 Oct 7];59(19):577–81. Available from:  
429 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5919a1.htm>

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

- 430 27. Radke EG, Gregory CJ, Kintziger KW, Sauber-Schatz EK, Hunsperger EA, Gallagher  
431 GR, et al. Dengue Outbreak in Key West, Florida, USA, 2009. *Emerg Infect Dis*  
432 [Internet]. 2012 Jan [cited 2021 Oct 7];18(1):135. Available from:  
433 [/pmc/articles/PMC3310087/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21511107/)
- 434 28. FD T, MN R, KD S, AS G, SF M, S I. Origin of the dengue virus outbreak in Martin  
435 County, Florida, USA 2013. *Viol Reports* [Internet]. 2014 Mar 1 [cited 2021 Oct 7];1–  
436 2(C):2–8. Available from: <https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC4318122>
- 437 29. Bosch QA ten, Clapham HE, Lambrechts L, Duong V, Buchy P, Althouse BM, et al.  
438 Contributions from the silent majority dominate dengue virus transmission. *PLOS Pathog*  
439 [Internet]. 2018 May 1 [cited 2021 Sep 11];14(5):e1006965. Available from:  
440 <https://journals.plos.org/plospathogens/article?id=10.1371/journal.ppat.1006965>
- 441 30. Boyles SM, Mavian CN, Finol E, Ukhanova M, Stephenson CJ, Hamerlinck G, et al.  
442 Under-the-Radar Dengue Virus Infections in Natural Populations of *Aedes aegypti*  
443 Mosquitoes. *mSphere*. 2020 Apr 29;5(2).
- 444 31. Ferreira-De-Lima H, Dos P, Andrade S, Matsumiya Thomazelli L, Toledo Marrelli M,  
445 Urbinatti PR, et al. Silent circulation of dengue virus in *Aedes albopictus* (Diptera:  
446 culicidae) resulting from natural vertical transmission. Available from:  
447 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-60870-1>
- 448 32. Stephenson CJ, Coatsworth H, Kang S, Lednicky JA, Dinglasan RR. Transmission  
449 Potential of Floridian *Aedes aegypti* Mosquitoes for Dengue Virus Serotype 4:  
450 Implications for Estimating Local Dengue Risk. *mSphere* [Internet]. 2021 Aug 25 [cited  
451 2021 Sep 11];6(4). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSphere>

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

- 452 33. Ayers JB, Xie X, Coatsworth H, Stephenson CJ, Waits M, Shi P-Y, et al. Ecology and  
453 transmission of a dengue virus serotype 4 identified in 1 wild *Aedes aegypti* in Florida 2.  
454 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.07.11.451177>
- 455 34. Cummings DAT, Schwartz IB, Billings L, Shaw LB, Burke DS. Dynamic effects of  
456 antibody-dependent enhancement on the fitness of viruses [Internet]. 2005. Available  
457 from: [www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0507320102](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0507320102)
- 458 35. Recker M, Blyuss KB, Simmons CP, Tinh Hien T, Wills B, Farrar J, et al. Immunological  
459 serotype interactions and their effect on the epidemiological pattern of dengue Hospital for  
460 Tropical Diseases, 190 Ben. Available from: <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org>.
- 461 36. Gubler DJ. Dengue and Dengue Hemorrhagic Fever. *Clin Microbiol Rev*.  
462 1998;11(3):480–96.
- 463 37. Sharp TM, Morris S, Morrison A, de Lima Corvino D, Santiago GA, Shieh W, et al. Fatal  
464 Dengue Acquired in Florida. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;(384):2257–9.
- 465 38. Mulligan K, Dixon J, Sinn C-LJ, Elliott SJ. Is dengue a disease of poverty? A systematic  
466 review.
- 467 39. Gubler DJ. Dengue, Urbanization and Globalization: The Unholy Trinity of the 21st  
468 Century. *Trop Med Health*. 2011;39(4):3–11.

## 469 **Supplementary Information**

470 *Contamination troubleshooting*

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

471 We noted issues with DENV-2 amplification in the no template and mosquito extraction negative  
472 controls with the CDC DENV-2 serotype-specific RT-qPCR assay for a few of the mosquito  
473 pools. We addressed these concerns using standard contamination troubleshooting protocols:  
474 preparing all qPCR reactions in a PCR hood, deep cleaning qPCR preparation areas, creating  
475 new primer and probe dilutions, and using different primer and probe stocks. We also tested each  
476 assay reagent for inherent DENV-2 RNA/cDNA contamination but did not find any evidence of  
477 contamination. Due to these issues, a new DENV-2 serotype specific assay was implemented  
478 (see DENV2 Alm, Supplementary Table 5) targeting a different region of the DENV-2 E  
479 glycoprotein. No amplification of negative controls was seen with the new primer-probe  
480 combination.

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

481 Table 1. Positive mosquito pool results from screening mosquitoes collected in Miami-Dade  
 482 County (Florida, USA) in 2020. WNV = West Nile virus, DENV-2 = dengue virus serotype 2,  
 483 DENV-4 = dengue virus serotype 4

Collection Date	Sample ID	Overall sample result	Species	Pool Size
06/09/20	N/A*	WNV positive	<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i>	18
06/23/20		WNV positive	<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i>	4
		WNV positive	<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i>	24
06/30/20		WNV positive	<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i>	5
07/23/20	0723-30	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
	0723-31	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
	0723-39	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
	0723-44	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
07/30/20	0730-37	DENV-2 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	25
	0730-41	DENV-2 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	25
08/20/20	0820-06	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
	0820-07	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
	0820-08	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
	0820-09	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
	0820-11	WNV positive	<i>Culex nigripalpus</i>	25
08/28/20	0828-2	DENV-2 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	23
	0828-10	DENV-2 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	25
09/17/20	0917-4	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	13
	0917-8	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	8
	0917-11	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	8
	0917-12	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	4
	0917-13	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	10
	0917-16	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	3
	0917-27	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	6
09/22/20	0922-2	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	5
09/29/20	0929-07	DENV-4 positive	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	2

484 \*Pathogen detection conducted by the CDC.

485 Figure 1. Spatial distribution of arbovirus positive mosquito pools (purple – DENV, orange –  
 486 WNV). A and D: Positive pool spread throughout Miami-Dade County – DENV positive pools  
 487 (A), or WNV positive pools (D). B and E: Positive pool spread overlayed on 2010 Miami-Dade  
 488 population density (individuals/km<sup>2</sup>) – DENV positive pools (B), or WNV positive pools (E). C  
 489 and F: Positive pool spread overlayed on 2010 Miami-Dade land use data – DENV positive  
 490 pools (C) or WNV positive pools (F).

491 Figure 2. Spatial analysis of A: DENV positive pool distribution (purple) within traps containing  
 492 DENV vectors (black), B: Distribution of traps containing *Aedes aegypti* (purple) or *Aedes*  
 493 *albopictus* (pink), C: WNV positive pool distribution (orange) within traps containing WNV  
 494 vectors (black), D: Distribution of traps containing *Culex quinquefasciatus* (dark orange), *Culex*  
 495 *nigripalpus* (light orange), *Culex coronator* (yellow), or *Anopheles crucians* (brown).

496



Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

497 **Appendix**

498 For Appendix Tables 1, 2, and 5: Positive controls used were the following: DENV-1:NR-  
499 50530, DENV-2: NR-50531, DENV-3: NR-50532, DENV-4: NR-50533, and WNV: NR-50434.  
500 Limits of quantification (LOQs) were determined by standard curve analysis of diluted RNA  
501 positive controls

502 **Appendix Table 1.** Pan-dengue Real-Time RT-PCR assay (assay courtesy of an active  
503 collaboration with Dr. Remi Charrel (Aix Marseille University))

Description	Name	Sequence	Fluor/ Quencher	Position	Product size (bp)	Target	Limit of quantification (LOQ)
Dengue All 1 Forward	DenAll-1 For	AGGACYAGAGGTTAGAGGAGA		DENV1: 10590 - 10610 DENV2: 10579 - 10599 DENV3: 10564 - 10584 DENV4: 10506 - 10526			
Dengue All 1 Reverse	DenAll-1 Rev	CGYTCTGTGCCTGGAWTGAT		DENV1: 10697 - 10678 DENV2: 10685 - 10666 DENV3: 10479 - 10499 DENV4: 10611 - 10592	DENV1: 108 DENV2: 107 DENV3: 106 DENV4: 106	DENV sfRNA	DENV1: 30 copies/μL DENV2: 279 copies/μL DENV3: 66 copies/μL DENV4: 20.1 copies/μL
Dengue All 1 Probe	DenAll-1 Probe	ACAGCATATTGACGCTGGGARA GACC	FAM/BHQ- 1	DENV1: 10629 - 10654 DENV2: 10617 - 10642 DENV3: 10601 - 10626 DENV4: 10543 - 10568			
Dengue All 2 Forward	DenAll-2 For	GGACTAGAGGTTAGAGGAGACC CC		DENV1: 10591 - 10614 DENV2: 10580 - 10603 DENV3: 10565 -	DENV1: 81 DENV2: 80 DENV3: 79 DENV4: 79	DENV sfRNA	

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

					10588		
					DENV4:		
					10507 -		
					10530		
					DENV1:		
					10671 -		
					10651		
					DENV2:		
					10659 -		
					10639		
Dengue All 2 Reverse	DenAll-2 Rev	GAGACAGCAGGATCTCTGGTC			DENV3:		
					10643 -		
					10623		
					DENV4:		
					10585 -		
					10565		
					DENV1:		
					10633 -		
					10650		
					DENV2:		
					10619 -		
					10636		
Dengue All 2 Probe	DenAll-2 Probe	AGCATATTGACGCTGGGA	FAM/BHQ- 1		DENV3:		
					10583 -		
					10600		
					DENV4:		
					10545 -		
					10562		

504

505 **Appendix Table 2.** West Nile Virus Real-Time RT-PCR assay (courtesy of Dr. Thomas  
506 Unnasch, University of South Florida)

Description	Name	Sequence	Fluor/ Quencher	Position	Product size (bp)	Target	Limit of quantification (LOQ)
WNV A forward primer	10668F	CAGACCACGCTACGGC G		10668 - 10684			
WNV A reverse primer	10770R	CTAGGGCCGCGTGGG		10770 - 10756	103	WNV 3'UTR	1.5 x 10 <sup>-6</sup> ng
WNV A probe	WNV A probe	CTGCGGAGAGTGCACT CTGCGAT	FAM/BHQ- 1	10691 - 10714			

507

508 **Appendix Table 3.** Reaction volumes for each assay using 1-step qRT-PCR using QuantaBio  
509 UltraPlex 1-Step ToughMix (4X) Low-ROX master mix. Volumes are representative of one  
510 25µL reaction. Primer and probes were diluted to working solutions of 10µM for assay use. Final  
511 primer and probe concentrations/reaction are denoted by [ ]

Assay	Reagent	Volume (in µL)
Dengue serotype specific – Dengue 1	Water	10.3
	4X Reaction mix	6.25
	Dengue 1 forward primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 1 reverse primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 1 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	Template	3

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

Dengue serotype specific – Dengue 2	Water	12.8
	4X Reaction mix	6.25
	Dengue 2 forward primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	Dengue 2 reverse primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	Dengue 2 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	Template	3
Dengue serotype specific – Dengue 3	Water	10.3
	4X Reaction mix	6.25
	Dengue 3 forward primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 3 reverse primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 3 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	Template	3
Dengue serotype specific – Dengue 4	Water	12.8
	4X Reaction mix	6.25
	Dengue 4 forward primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	Dengue 4 reverse primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	Dengue 4 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	Template	3
West Nile Virus	Water	11.6
	4X Reaction mix	6.25
	WNV A forward primer [10µM]	0.9375 [Final conc. 0.375µM]
	WNV A reverse primer [10µM]	0.9375 [Final conc. 0.375µM]
	WNV A 4 probe [10µM]	0.3125 [Final conc. 0.125µM]
	Template	5
Dengue All	Water	7.75
	2X Reaction mix	6.25
	DENVAll-1 forward primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	DENVAll-1 reverse primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	DENVAll-1 probe [10µM]	0.50 [Final conc. 0.2µM]
	DENVAll-2 forward primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	DENVAll-2 reverse primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	DENVAll-2 probe [10µM]	0.50 [Final conc. 0.2µM]
	Template	5

512

513 **Appendix Table 4.** Reaction volumes for each assay using SuperScript™ III Platinum™ One-  
 514 Step qRT-PCR Kit. Volumes are representative of one 25µL reaction. Primer and probes were  
 515 diluted to working solutions of 10µM for assay use. Final primer and probe  
 516 concentrations/reaction are indicated [ ]

Assay	Reagent	Volume (in µL)
Dengue serotype specific – Dengue 1	Water	3.55
	2X Reaction mix	12.5
	Dengue 1 forward primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 1 reverse primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 1 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	RT/Platinum Taq	0.5
	Template	3
Dengue serotype specific – Dengue 2	Water	6.05
	2X Reaction mix	12.5
	Dengue 2 forward primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	Dengue 2 reverse primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	Dengue 2 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	RT/Platinum Taq	0.5
Dengue serotype specific –	Water	3
	Water	3.55

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

Dengue 3	2X Reaction mix	12.5
	Dengue 3 forward primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 3 reverse primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 3 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	RT/Platinum Taq	0.5
	Template	3
Dengue serotype specific – Dengue 4	Water	6.05
	2X Reaction mix	12.5
	Dengue 4 forward primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	Dengue 4 reverse primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	Dengue 4 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	RT/Platinum Taq	0.5
West Nile Virus	Water	4.8125
	2X Reaction mix	12.5
	WNV A forward primer [10µM]	0.9375 [Final conc. 0.375µM]
	WNV A reverse primer [10µM]	0.9375 [Final conc. 0.375µM]
	WNV A 4 probe [10µM]	0.3125 [Final conc. 0.125µM]
	RT/Platinum Taq	0.5
Dengue All	Water	3.0
	2X Reaction mix	12.5
	DENVAll-1 forward primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	DENVAll-1 reverse primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
	DENVAll-1 probe [10µM]	0.50 [Final conc. 0.2µM]
	DENVAll-2 forward primer [10µM]	1.25 [Final conc. 0.5µM]
Alm Dengue 2 serotype specific	Water	3.55
	2X Reaction mix	12.5
	Dengue 2 forward primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 2 reverse primer [10µM]	2.5 [Final conc. 1µM]
	Dengue 2 probe [10µM]	0.45 [Final conc. 0.18µM]
	RT/Platinum Taq	0.5
Template	3	

517

518 **Appendix Table 5.** Serotype-specific assays, including both CDC (Santiago et al., 2013,  
519 doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0002311) and Alm dengue 2 serotype-specific assays (Alm et al., 2015,  
520 doi: 10.1186/s12879-015-1226-z). “Alm” is used to refer to the publication describing the assay  
521 primers and probe to differentiate it from the CDC DENV-2 target

Description	Name	Sequence	Fluor/ Quencher	Position	Product size (bp)	Target	Limit of quantification (LOQ)
Dengue 1 forward primer	D1-F_CDC	CAAAAGGAAGTCGYGCAATA		8936- 8955	112	DENV 1 NS5	3 copies/µL
Dengue 1 reverse primer	D1-R_CDC	CTGAGTGAATTCTCTCTGCT RAAC		9023- 9047			
Dengue 1 probe	D1-Pr_CDC	CATGTGGYTGAGGAGCRCGC	FAM/BH Q-1	8961- 8979			
Dengue 2 forward primer	D2-F_CDC	CAGGCTATGGCACYGTCACG AT		1426- 1447	78	DENV 2 E	27.9 copies/ µL
Dengue 2 reverse primer	D2-R_CDC	CCATYTGAGCARGACCATC TC		1482- 1504			

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

Dengue 2 probe	D2-Pr_CDC	CTCYCCRAGAACGGGCCTC GACTTCAA	FAM/BH Q-1	1454- 1480			
Dengue 2 Alm forward primer	DENV2_Alm_F	GCAGAAACACAACATGGAAC RATAGT		1873- 1898			
Dengue 2 Alm reverse primer	DENV2_Alm_R	TGATGTAGCTGTCTCCRAAT GG		2050- 2071	199	DENV 2 E	27.9 copies/ μL
Dengue 2 Alm probe	DENV2_Alm_probe	TCAACATAGAAGCAGAACC	FAM/BH Q-1	2030- 2048			
Dengue 3 forward primer	D3-F_CDC	GGACTRGACACACGCACCCA		701-720	74	DENV 3 prM	66 copies/ μL
Dengue 3 reverse primer	D3-R_CDC	CATGTCTCTACCTTCTCGAC TTGYCT		749-775			
Dengue 3 probe	D3-Pr_CDC	ACCTGGATGTCGGCTGAAG GAGCTTG	FAM/BH Q-1	722-747			
Dengue 4 forward primer	D4-F_CDC	TTGTCCTAATGATGCTRGTC G		884-904			
Dengue 4 reverse primer	D4-R_CDC	TCCACCYGAGACTCCTTCCA		953-973	89	DENV 4 prM	20.1 copies/ μL
Dengue 4 probe	D4-Pr_CDC	TYCCTACYCCTACGCATCGC ATTCCG	FAM/BH Q-1	939-965			

522

## 523 Appendix Table 6. Summed categories of land use description types from the 2010 US Census

Land Use Description	Summed Category
Agriculture, Other (Exotic Birds, Monkeys, Research Facilities).	Agricultural
Fallow.	Agricultural
Farm Storage Areas (Storage Structures or Lots for Farm Implements).	Agricultural
Fish Farms (Includes Tropical Fish Aquariums, Fish and Alligator Farms).	Agricultural
Groves.	Agricultural
Horse Training and Stables.	Agricultural
Pasture (Grazing, Animal Farming, Dairy Farms and Animal Feed Lots), excluding Horse and Poultry.	Agricultural
Plant Nurseries (Includes Sod Farms and Ornamental Nurseries).	Agricultural
Poultry.	Agricultural
Row and Field Cropland.	Agricultural
Cemeteries.	Cemeteries
Marine commercial (includes private commercial [non-recreational] marinas and repair yards on public or private land).	Commercial
Office and/or Business and other services (ground level) / Residential (upper levels). Low-density < 15 dwellings per acre or 4 floors.	Commercial
Office Building.	Commercial
Office/Business/Hotel/Residential. Substantial components of each use present. Treated as any combination of the mentioned uses with a hotel as part of development.	Commercial
Sales and Services (Wholesale facilities, Spot commercial, strip commercial, neighborhood shopping centers/plazas). Excludes office facilities.	Commercial
Shopping Centers (Regional and Community).	Commercial
Colleges and Universities, Including Research Centers, Public and Private.	Educational
Private Schools, Including Playgrounds (K-12, Vocational Ed., Day Care and Child Nurseries).	Educational
Public Schools, Including Playgrounds (K-12, Vocational Ed., Day Care and Child Nurseries).	Educational
Antenna Arrays.	Industrial
Communications (Radio, TV, Cable, and Phone), excluding Antenna Arrays.	Industrial
Electric Power (Generator and Substation, and Service Yards).	Industrial

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

Extraction, Excavation, Quarrying, Rock-Mining, excluding the resulting water body (see 917).	Industrial
Industrial Extensive.	Industrial
Industrial intensive, Commercial Condominium type of use.	Industrial
Industrial Intensive, heavy-light manufacturing, and warehousing-storage type of use.	Industrial
Industrial Intensive, Office type of use.	Industrial
Junk Yard.	Industrial
Major Approved Projects.	Industrial
Major Transmission Lines.	Industrial
Oil and Gas Storage (Tank Farms).	Industrial
Sewerage Treatment Plants.	Industrial
Solid Waste Disposal and Transfer (Includes Dumps, Solid Waste Land Fills, Resource Recovery Plants and Facilities, Trash Transfer Stations).	Industrial
Water Supply Plants.	Industrial
Wellfields.	Industrial
Canal right-of-way.	Marine
Coastal Water (Bay only) within Biscayne Bay National Park (Excluding Ocean Waters).	Marine
Coastal Water (Bay only) within the Biscayne Bay Urban Aquatic Preserve (Excluding Ocean Waters).	Marine
Coastal Water (Ocean only) within Biscayne National Park (Excluding Bay Waters).	Marine
Coastal Waters within Everglades National Park.	Marine
Inland water bodies (Lakes, Ponds, and Watercourses) associated with industrial areas, industrial parks, and new industrial development.	Marine
Inland water bodies (Lakes, Rock Pits) associated with extraction, excavation, quarrying and rock-mining activities.	Marine
Inland water bodies (Lakes, Watercourses) associated with residential developments.	Marine
Marina complexes (docks, piers, moorings, ramps, boat lifts and hoists, boat maintenance and repair, boat storage, fueling operations) for recreational craft located within Parks and Preserves and other small craft harbor complexes used primarily for recreation.	Marine
Other inland water bodies (Lakes, Ponds, Watercourses other than rivers and canals), including road borrow pits.	Marine
Remaining Bay Waters (Excluding Ocean).	Marine
Remaining Ocean Waters (Excluding Bay).	Marine
Rivers and Canals (Water).	Marine
Water Conservation Areas (Properties owned by SFWMD; Big Cypress national preserve, Everglades, and Francis Taylor WMA (also known as conservation areas 3A and 3B)).	Marine
Beaches.	Recreational
Biscayne National Park.	Recreational
County Operated Parks.	Recreational
Cultural (auditoriums, convention centers, exhibition centers, museums, art galleries, libraries).	Recreational
Everglades National Park.	Recreational
Golf courses, Public and Private.	Recreational
Municipal Operated Parks.	Recreational
Other Nature Preserves and Protected Areas (State Mangrove Preserves, Turkey Point Wilderness Area, Great Cypress Swamp Preserves, and acquired government owned EEL sites).	Recreational
Private Recreational Camps/Areas not associated with private Residential Developments (Boy Scout/Girl Scout Camps, Private Recreational Camps). Includes private tennis courts and pools that are part of the recreational complex.	Recreational
Private Recreational Facilities Associated with private Residential Developments, except marinas/yacht basins, includes landscape and open spaces associated to residential, commercial and office developments.	Recreational
Recreational Vehicle Parks/Camps.	Recreational
Sports Stadiums, Arenas, and Tracks.	Recreational
Mobile Home Parks and Permanent Mobile Homes.	Residential
Multi-Family, High Density (Over 25 DU/Gross Acre).	Residential
Multi-Family, Low-Density (Under 25 DU/Gross Acre).	Residential
Residential MF-- government-owned or government subsidized multi-family residential or elderly housing	Residential

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

Residential predominantly (condominium/ rental apartments with lower floors Office and/or Retail. High density > 15 dwelling units per ac, multi-story buildings (Generally more than 5 stories).	Residential
Residential SF--government-owned or government subsidized multi-family residential or elderly housing	Residential
Single-Family, High Density (Over 5 DU/Gross Acre, other than Townhouses, Duplexes and Mobile Homes).	Residential
Single-Family, Low-Density (Under 2 DU/Gross Acre).	Residential
Single-Family, Med.-Density (2-5 DU/Gross Acre).	Residential
Townhouses.	Residential
TRANSIENT-RESIDENTIAL (HOTEL-MOTEL)	Residential
Two-Family (Duplexes).	Residential
Governmental/Public Administration (Other than Military or Penal).	Commercial
Hospitals, clinics, medical offices and/or dental facilities	Commercial
Houses of Worship and Religious, and associated uses (parking, retreat houses, residencies, childcare, etc.).	Commercial
Military Facilities.	Industrial
Nursing homes, Assisted living facilities, and Adult congregate living quarters	Commercial
Penal and Correctional.	Commercial
Social Services, and Charitable institutions (Shrines, Elks, Moose, Lions Club).	Commercial
Airports (other than Military and Small Grass Airports).	Industrial
Bus/Truck/Freight Forwarding Terminals.	Industrial
Highways and Expressways right-of-way and associated open and landscaped areas excluding paved expressways and ramps.	Paved
Ocean Ship Terminals and Port Facilities, Bay and River Based.	Marine
Parking - Public and Private Garages and Lots.	Paved
Paved Highways, Expressways and Ramps.	Paved
Private Drives.	Paved
Railroads - Terminals, Trackage, and Yards.	Paved
Road Maintenance and Storage Yards, and Motor Pools.	Paved
Small Grass Airports (Includes Crop Dusting Activities).	Industrial
Street right-of-way and entrance features both public and private, and utility easements.	Paved
Streets and Roads, except Expressways and Private Drives.	Paved
TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATION, AND UTILITIES	Industrial
Vacant Government owned or controlled.	Vacant
Vacant, Non-Protected, Privately-Owned.	Vacant
Vacant, Protected, Government-Owned or controlled. EEL sites included	Vacant
Vacant, Protected, Privately-Owned. Proposed and designated EEL sites until acquired or protected under any other conservation or environmental mechanism.	Vacant

524

525 **Appendix Table 7. WNV-positive and DENV-positive samples**

Sample	Sample Designation	Replicate #	Ct value	Avg Ct	Assay Run	Positive Control (1:10)	Positive Control Avg Ct
0723-30	WNV positive	1	39.78	41.77	WNV Run 1	WNV	26.05
		2	41.77				26.01
		1	45.49	43.48	WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	43.48				23.77
0723-31	WNV positive	1	38.18	36.56	WNV Run 1	WNV	26.05
		2	36.56				26.01
		1	37.52	42.73	WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	42.73				23.77
0723-39	WNV positive	1	32.69		WNV Run 1	WNV	26.05

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

		2	33.11				26.01
		1	33.31		WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	32.99				23.77
0723-44	WNV positive	1	29.33		WNV Run 1	WNV	26.05
		2	29.5				26.01
		1	28.66		WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	28.6				23.77
0820-06	WNV positive	1	15.11		WNV Run 1	WNV	24.26
		2	15				24.42
		1	13.98		WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	14.08				23.77
0820-07	WNV positive	1	32.88		WNV Run 1	WNV	24.26
		2	32.75				24.42
		1	31.43		WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	31.22				23.77
0820-08	WNV positive	1	36.06		WNV Run 1	WNV	24.26
		2	38.35				24.42
		1	35.96		WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	36				23.77
0820-09	WNV positive	1	37.82		WNV Run 1	WNV	24.26
		2	37.02				24.42
		1	35.88		WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	34.74				23.77
0820-11	WNV positive	1	39.66		WNV Run 1	WNV	24.26
		2	41.72				24.42
		1	39.45		WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	38.42				23.77
		1	43.27		WNV Run 2	WNV	23.74
		2	Neg				23.77
0730-37	DENV-2 positive	1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-1	28.42
		2	Neg				28.47
		1	33.7	33.78	DENV2 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-2	25.06
		2	33.86				24.78
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-3	30.49
		2	Neg				30.38
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV4 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-4	27.88
		2	Neg				28.08
		1	37.47	36.62	DENV2 serotype specific Run 2	DENV-2	23.96
		2	35.77				24.10
0730-41	DENV-2 positive	1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-1	28.42
		2	Neg				28.47
		1	27.21	27.205	DENV2 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-2	25.06
		2	27.20				24.78
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-3	30.49
		2	Neg				30.38
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV4 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-4	27.88
		2	Neg				28.08
		1	29.11	29.15	DENV2 serotype specific Run 2	DENV-2	23.96
		2	29.19				24.10
0828-2	DENV-2 positive	1	38.97	38.97	DENVAll Run 1	DENV-1	28.90
						DENV-2	29.13
						DENV-3	24.75
						DENV-4	24.91
		2	Neg				32.37
							32.32
							28.83
							28.79
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-1	30.51
		2	Neg				30.82
		1	32.35	32.43	DENV2 serotype	DENV-2	27.63





Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

		1	42.04	42.32	DENVAll Run 2	DENV-1	32.26
						DENV-2	32.37
							27.28
							27.57
		2	42.6			DENV-3	33.38
							34.10
						DENV-4	32.02
							32.28
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-1	31.84
		2	Neg				31.97
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV2 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-2	28.28
		2	Neg				26.43
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-3	30.75
		2	Neg				30.53
		1	40.53	38.95	DENV4 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-4	26.88
		2	37.37				26.58
		1	Neg	39.19	DENV4 serotype specific Run 2	DENV-4	27.52
		2	39.19				27.77
		1	38.82	38.9	DENV4 serotype specific Run 3	DENV-4	27.02
		2	38.98				27.04
0917-11	DENV-4 positive	1	33.14	33.12	DENVAll Run 1	DENV-1	31.24
							31.02
						DENV-2	25.67
							26.01
		2	33.09			DENV-3	30.19
							30.38
						DENV-4	29.49
							29.22
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-1	31.84
		2	Neg				31.97
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV2 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-2	28.28
		2	Neg				26.43
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-3	30.75
		2	Neg				30.53
		1	38.09	37.96	DENV4 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-4	26.88
		2	37.82				26.58
		1	Neg	40.38	DENV4 serotype specific Run 2	DENV-4	27.52
		2	40.38				27.77
		1	37.16	36.98	DENV4 serotype specific Run 3	DENV-4	27.02
		2	36.80				27.04
0917-12	DENV-4 positive	1	33.47	33.05	DENVAll Run 1	DENV-1	31.24
							31.02
						DENV-2	25.67
							26.01
		2	32.63			DENV-3	30.19
							30.38
						DENV-4	29.49
							29.22
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-1	31.84
		2	Neg				31.97
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV2 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-2	28.28
		2	Neg				26.43
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-3	30.75
		2	Neg				30.53
		1	Neg	37.55	DENV4 serotype specific Run 1	DENV-4	26.88
		2	37.55				26.58
		1	42.13	41.54	DENV4 serotype specific Run 2	DENV-4	27.52
		2	40.94				27.77
		1	36.04	35.92	DENV4 serotype specific Run 3	DENV-4	27.02
		2	35.79				27.04
0917-13	DENV-4 positive	1	32.84	33.42	DENVAll Run 1	DENV-1	31.24

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

						DENV-2	31.02
							25.67
		2	33.99			DENV-3	26.01
							30.19
						DENV-4	30.38
							29.49
							29.22
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype	DENV-1	31.84
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		31.97
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV2 serotype	DENV-2	28.28
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		26.43
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype	DENV-3	30.75
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		30.53
		1	Neg	38.46	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	26.88
		2	38.46		specific Run 1		26.58
		1	40.29	40.50	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.52
		2	40.7		specific Run 2		27.77
		1	38.75	37.99	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.02
		2	37.23		specific Run 3		27.04
0917-16	DENV-4 positive	1	35.95	37.09	DENVAll Run 1	DENV-1	31.24
							31.02
						DENV-2	25.67
							26.01
		2	38.23			DENV-3	30.19
							30.38
						DENV-4	29.49
							29.22
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype	DENV-1	31.84
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		31.97
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV2 serotype	DENV-2	28.28
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		26.43
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype	DENV-3	30.75
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		30.53
		1	36.57	36.57	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	26.88
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		26.58
		1	39.41	40.94	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.52
		2	42.46		specific Run 2		27.77
		1	35.05	35.50	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.02
		2	35.94		specific Run 3		27.04
0917-27	DENV-4 positive	1	36.42	36.42	DENVAll Run 1	DENV-1	31.24
							31.02
						DENV-2	25.67
							26.01
		2	Neg			DENV-3	30.19
							30.38
						DENV-4	29.49
							29.22
		1	Neg	N/A	DENVAll Run 2	DENV-1	32.26
							32.37
						DENV-2	27.28
							27.57
		2	Neg			DENV-3	33.38
							34.10
						DENV-4	32.02
							32.28
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype	DENV-1	31.84
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		31.97
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV2 serotype	DENV-2	28.28
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		26.43
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype	DENV-3	30.75
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		30.53

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

		1	36	36.33	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	26.88
		2	36.65		specific Run 1		26.58
		1	Neg	38.29	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.52
		2	38.29		specific Run 2		27.77
		1	37.12	37.45	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.37
		2	37.77		specific Run 3		27.16
0922-2	DENV-4 positive	1	33.91	34.28	DENVAll Run 1	DENV-1	31.24
						DENV-2	31.02
							25.67
							26.01
		2	34.64			DENV-3	30.19
							30.38
						DENV-4	29.49
							29.22
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype	DENV-1	31.84
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		31.97
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV2 serotype	DENV-2	28.28
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		26.43
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype	DENV-3	30.75
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		30.53
		1	36.11	35.72	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	26.88
		2	35.33		specific Run 1		26.58
		1	36.75	37.51	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.52
		2	38.26		specific Run 2		27.77
		1	35.08	35.17	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.02
		2	35.25		specific Run 3		27.04
0929-07	DENV-4 positive	1	Neg	38.87	DENVAll Run 1	DENV-1	31.11
						DENV-2	31.14
							26.75
							26.70
		2	38.87			DENV-3	32.47
							32.44
						DENV-4	30.46
							30.75
		1	Neg	40.23	DENVAll Run 2	DENV-1	32.26
							32.37
						DENV-2	27.28
							27.57
		2	40.23			DENV-3	33.38
							34.10
						DENV-4	32.02
							32.28
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV1 serotype	DENV-1	29.37
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		29.47
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV2 serotype	DENV-2	28.28
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		26.43
		1	Neg	N/A	DENV3 serotype	DENV-3	30.26
		2	Neg		specific Run 1		30.06
		1	38.84	38.32	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	27.37
		2	37.8		specific Run 1		27.16
		1	39.59	38.27	DENV4 serotype	DENV-4	31.25
		2	36.94		specific Run 2		31.34

526

527 **Appendix Figure 1.** Kernel density estimation (KDE) of uninfected vector populations and  
 528 arbovirus positive mosquito pools (purple – DENV, orange – WNV). A: KDE on traps that  
 529 collected DENV vectors, B: KDE on all DENV positive pools, C: KDE on all DENV-2 positive

Reserved space. Do not place any text in this section. Include the mandatory author checklist or your manuscript will be returned. Use *continuous* line numbering in your manuscript.

530 pools, D: KDE on all DENV-4 positive pools, E: KDE on traps that collected WNV vectors, F:  
531 KDE on WNV positive pools.

532 **Appendix Figure 2.** Yearly temperature and precipitation maps for Miami-Dade County in 2020  
533 overlaid with arbovirus positive mosquito pools (purple – DENV, orange – WNV). A and D:  
534 Maximum average temperature for 2020 in Miami-Dade visualized with DENV positive pools  
535 (A) or WNV positive pools (D). B and E: Minimum average temperature for 2020 in Miami-  
536 Dade visualized with DENV positive pools (B) or WNV positive pools (E). C and F: Total  
537 precipitation in Miami-Dade in 2020 visualized with DENV positive pools (C) or WNV positive  
538 pools (F).

539 **Appendix Figure 3.** Local Moran's I, a local indicator of spatial association (LISA), analyses of  
540 imported DENV cases and PLWH overlaid with arbovirus positive mosquito pools (purple –  
541 DENV, orange – WNV). A: LISA from DENV imported cases (2009 – 2019) visualized with  
542 2020 DENV positive pools, B: LISA from 2019 DENV imported cases visualized with 2020  
543 DENV positive pools, C: LISA from PLWH visualized with 2020 DENV positive pools, D:  
544 LISA from PLWH visualized with 2020 WNV positive pools.


A



B



C



### LEGEND

- DENV-2 Positive Pool
- DENV-4 Positive Pool
- WNV Positive Pool

### Population Density

- ≤ 470
- ≤ 1245
- ≤ 2135
- ≤ 3682
- ≤ 7131

### Land Use

- Agricultural
- Recreational
- Residential
- Commercial
- Educational
- Industrial
- Paved
- Cemeteries
- Vacant
- Marine
- Water


D







E




F







A




B




C




D



E




F







A




B




C



D



E



F

