Chikungunya intra-vector infection dynamics in *Aedes albopictus* reveals low vector barrier intensity and supports an explosive epidemic potential in mainland France

Barbara Viginier[1], Lucie Cappuccio[1], Céline Garnier[1], Edwige Martin[2], Carine Maisse[1], Claire Valiente Moro[2], Guillaume Minard[2], Albin Fontaine[3,4,5], Sébastian Lequime[6], Maxime Ratinier[1], Frédérick Arnaud[1] & Vincent Raquin*[1]

1 IVPC UMR754, INRAE, Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, EPHE, PSL Research University, F-69007 Lyon, France.

2 Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, INRAE, VetAgro Sup, UMR Ecologie Microbienne, F-69622 Villeurbanne, France.

3 Unité Parasitologie et Entomologie, Département Microbiologie et maladies infectieuses, Institut de Recherche Biomédicale des Armées (IRBA), Marseille, France.

4 Aix Marseille Univ, IRD, SSA, AP-HM, UMR Vecteurs–Infections Tropicales et Méditerranéennes (VITROME), Marseille, France.

5 IHU Méditerranée Infection, Marseille, France.

6 Cluster of Microbial Ecology, Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.

*Corresponding author
Correspondence: vincent.raquin@ephe.psl.eu

Abstract

Arbovirus emergence and epidemic potential, as approximated by the vectorial capacity formula, depends on host and vector parameters, including the vector's intrinsic ability to replicate then transmit the pathogen known as vector competence. Vector competence is a complex, time-dependent, quantitative phenotype influenced by biotic and abiotic factors. A combination of experimental and modelling approaches is required to assess arbovirus intra-vector dynamics and estimate its epidemic potential. In this study, we measured infection, dissemination, and transmission dynamics of chikungunya virus (CHIKV) in a field-derived *Aedes albopictus* population (Lyon metropolis, France) after oral exposure to a range of virus doses spanning human viraemia. Statistical modelling indicates rapid and efficient CHIKV progression in the vector mainly due to an absence of a dissemination barrier, with 100% of the infected mosquitoes ultimately exhibiting a disseminated infection, regardless of the virus dose. Transmission rate data revealed a time-dependent, but overall weak, transmission barrier, with individuals transmitting as soon as 2 days post-exposure (dpe) and >50% infectious mosquitoes at 6 dpe for the highest dose. Based on these experimental intra-vector dynamics data, epidemiological simulations conducted with an agent-based model showed that even at low mosquito biting rates, CHIKV could trigger explosive outbreaks. Together, this reveals the high epidemic potential of CHIKV upon transmission by *Aedes albopictus* in mainland France.

Keywords: Arbovirus ; vector ; mosquito ; *Aedes albopictus* ; chikungunya virus ; epidemiology ; vector competence ; modelisation

45 **Introduction**

46 Arthropod-borne viruses (arboviruses) are pathogens transmitted to vertebrate hosts by hematophagous
47 arthropods, mainly mosquitoes. Arbovirus spread is a multi-factorial, dynamic process that can be estimated
48 using the vectorial capacity (VCap) model, which aims to determine the average number of infectious vector
49 bites that arise per day from one infected host in a susceptible human population (Smith et al., 2012). The
50 vector-centric component of VCap integrates mosquito ecological (density per host, survival) and behavioural
51 (daily biting rate per human) factors along with the vector's proxies of virus transmission efficiency such as
52 vector competence (VComp) and its time-related expression, the extrinsic incubation period (EIP). VComp
53 represents the ability of mosquitoes to : i) allow midgut infection following an infectious blood meal, ii)
54 disseminate the virus beyond the midgut barrier, and iii) retransmit the virus through the saliva during the next
55 bite. In VCap models, VComp and EIP are often simplified under the EIP_{50}, the time required to reach 50% of
56 infectious mosquitoes. Effectively, each individual mosquito has a given EIP leading to a range of EIPs in the
57 population. EIP distribution can be assessed experimentally by measuring the time between the initial
58 mosquito infection and the mosquito infectiousness using an adequate number of individual mosquitoes and
59 time points. Taking into account the time-dependency of Vcomp improves VCap estimation and therefore
60 allow to capture the full epidemic potential of arboviruses (Lequime et al., 2020). VComp is impacted by biotic
61 (*e.g.*, mosquito and virus genotype, virus dose, microbiota) and abiotic (*e.g.*, temperature) factors (Viglietta et
62 al., 2021), but how these factors shape VComp dynamics has still to be determined.

63 Dengue virus (DENV), yellow fever virus (YFV), Zika virus (ZIKV), and chikungunya virus (CHIKV) pose a major
64 threat as they are responsible for hundreds of millions of human infections each year worldwide, leading to
65 severe morbidity and mortality (Labeaud et al., 2011; Bhatt et al., 2013). These arboviruses are primarily
66 transmitted to humans by *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes, although the Asian tiger mosquito, *Aedes albopictus,* is
67 often incriminated as a vector. Indeed, *Ae. albopictus* is an important vector of arboviruses as evidenced by
68 vector competence laboratory assays and the detection of infected field specimens (Gratz, 2004; Paupy et al.,
69 2009). Notably, *Ae. albopictus* was identified as the main vector during CHIKV outbreaks in Gabon (2007),
70 Congo (2011) as well as in a major outbreak at La Réunion island (2006) (Schuffenecker et al., 2006; Bonilauri
71 et al., 2008; Pagès et al., 2009; Paupy et al., 2012; Mombouli et al., 2013). In Europe, this vector species is
72 incriminated for autochthonous circulation of CHIKV for instance in Italy (Venturi et al., 2017) and mainland
73 France (Delisle et al., 2015). Vector competence studies established that vector competence of *Ae. albopictus*
74 for CHIKV depends on genetic (*e.g.*, mosquito and virus genotype) and environmental (*e.g.*, temperature)
75 factors (Tsetsarkin et al., 2007; Vazeille et al., 2007; Zouache et al., 2014; Sanchez-Vargas et al., 2019). Host
76 viremia, approxymated by virus dose in the blood meal during artifical mosquito infectious feeding
77 experiments, is another major factor that drives mosquito vector competence (Nguyet et al., 2013; Aubry et
78 al., 2020). Vertebrate host viremia for CHIKV last 4 to 12 days with an increase in blood viral titer prior to
79 symptoms, up to a peak around 8 $\log_{10}$ infectious particles/mL followed by a decrease until virus clearance for
80 most of the cases (Schwartz & Albert, 2010). Beyond non-human primates, an estimate of CHIKV human
81 viremia dynamics is lacking due to limited longitudinal monitoring of infected patients, despite it could help to
82 decipher the duration and magnitude of human infectiousness for mosquitoes (Labadie et al., 2010). In *Ae.*
83 *albopictus*, two studies exposed mosquitoes to a range of CHIKV doses in the blood meal with varying
84 outcomes on vector competence as estimated by mosquito infection and dissemination rate (Pesko et al.,
85 2009; Hurk et al., 2010). Vector competence studies on *Ae. albopictus* from mainland France measured CHIKV
86 transmission rate although upon exposure to a single dose, always above 6.5 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL range (Moutailler
87 et al., 2009; Vega-Rua et al., 2013; Zouache et al., 2014; Vega-Rúa et al., 2015). In addition, these studies
88 focused on a limited number of time points after CHIKV exposure that prevent to capture the dynamics of
89 vector competence. A study monitoring intra-vector dynamics of CHIKV and its epidemiological relevance is
90 still lacking, notably upon variations of vector competence major drivers such as virus dose.

91 Here, we studied intra-vector infection dynamics of a field-derived population of *Ae. albopictus* from Lyon
92 metropolis exposed by artificial membrane feeding to a range of human viraemia-like CHIKV (La Réunion 06.21
93 isolate, East Central South Africa (ECSA) clade) doses, based on our model of human CHIKV viremia. Strains
94 from ECSA clade carrying the same A226V mutation on enveloppe *E1* gene than 06.21 were identified from
95 autochtonous cases in mainland France, supporting the choice of the 06.21 strain for this study (Franke et al.,
96 2019). Individual mosquitoes were analyzed from day 2 to day 20 post-exposure (dpe) to determine infection,
97 dissemination, and transmission rates by infectious titration in addition to the quantification of CHIKV RNA

load in the saliva. This allowed us to estimate CHIKV intra-vector dynamics and the strength of vector infection, dissemination, and transmission barriers as well as the distribution of EIP according to the virus dose in the blood meal. These data were implemented in the agent-based model *nosoi* (Lequime et al., 2020) to estimate, using realistic vectorial capacity parameters, the epidemic potential of CHIKV in a French population of *Ae. albopictus*. Our results improve our understanding on vector-virus interactions and provides key informations to better anticipate and prevent CHIKV emergence in mainland France.

Methods

Modelling chikungunya viraemia in humans

Chikungunya virus (CHIKV) loads in human blood along with the time course of infection in patients were recovered from two studies. The first study monitored blood CHIKV viraemia from a retrospective cohort of 102 febrile patients in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia, between 2005 and 2009 (Riswari et al., 2015). The second study assessed CHIKV RNA viremic profile from 36 sera from day 1 to day 7 of illness during a CHIKV epidemic in 2009 in Thepa and Chana districts of Songkhla province, Thailand (Appassakij et al., 2013). For the second study, the median value of the blood CHIKV RNA loads from a group of patients (n=2 to 21) per day of illness was used. The viraemia data from RT-qPCR was expressed on the logarithmic scale to the base 10 before model fitting. Wood's gamma-type function was used to model the viraemia dynamic. The function is given in the following equation:

$$y(t) = at^b e^{-ct} \text{ (Eq. 1)}$$

where *y(t)* represents the level of viraemia in the blood at *t* days post-infection, with *a*, *b,* and *c* representing constants linked to the viraemia dynamic (Islam et al., 2013). Viraemia data were originally expressed in time pre- or post-symptom onset, while the model represents viraemia as a function of time post-infection. A fixed arbitrary median intrinsic incubation period of 6 days was added to each viraemia time to standardize the time scale between the data and the model. This fixed incubation period falls into the estimated 2-10 days incubation range (Moloney et al., 2014) and was chosen to ensure that all observed viraemia data occurred after infection. The model was fitted to the data using non-linear least-squares regression implemented in the *nls* function in the R environment (RCoreTeam, 2022). This method proposed a possible intra-human CHIKV viraemia dynamic with 95% confidence intervals.

CHIKV stock production and titration

The CHIKV strain 06.21 from the Indian Ocean lineage was isolated from a newborn serum sample with neonatal encephalopathy in La Réunion island in 2005 (Schuffenecker et al., 2006). This strain was amplified in *Aedes albopictus* cell line C6/36 as previously described (Raquin et al., 2015). CHIKV was inoculated at a multiplicity of infection of 0.01 on *Ae. albopictus* C6/36 cells cultivated in Leibovitz's L-15 media (Gibco) with 10% (v:v) 1X Tryptose Phosphate Broth (Gibco), 10% (v:v) foetal bovine serum and 0.1% (v:v) 10,000 units/mL penicillin/streptomycin (Gibco). Cells were incubated for 3 days at 28°C before the cell supernatant was clarified by centrifugation for 5 min at 500 g and stored at -80°C as aliquots. CHIKV infectious titer was measured on C6/36 using fluorescent focus assay (Raquin et al., 2015). Briefly, 3 x 10^5 cells/well were inoculated in 96-well plates (TPP) with 40 µL/well of viral inoculum (after culture media removal) and incubated for 1 h at 28°C. 150 µL/well of a mix 1:1 L-15 media and 3.2% medium viscosity carboxymethyl cellulose (Sigma) were added as an overlay before incubation of the cells for 3 days at 28°C. After incubation, cells were fixed in 150 µL/well of 4% paraformaldehyde for 20 min at room temperature (RT) and then rinsed 3 times in 100 µL/well of 1X Dulbecco's phosphate-buffered saline (DPBS) (Gibco) prior to immune labelling. Cells were permeabilized for 30 min in 50 µL/well of 0.3% (v:v) Triton X-100 (Sigma) in 1X DPBS + 1% Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA, Sigma) at RT then rinsed 3 times in 100 µL/well of 1X DPBS. A Semliki Forest virus anticapsid antibody (Dr. Carine Maisse) diluted 1:600 in 1X DPBS + 1% BSA was used as a primary antibody (Greiser-Wilke et al., 1989). Cells were incubated in 40 µL/well of primary antibody for 1 h at 37°C, rinsed 3 times in 100 µL/well of 1X DPBS then incubated in 40 µL/well of anti-mouse Alexa488 secondary antibody (Life Technologies) at 1:500 in 1X DPBS + 1% BSA for 30 min at 37°C. Cells were rinsed 3 times in 100 µL/well 1X DPBS, then once in 100 µL/well tap water, stored at 4°C overnight before the enumeration of fluorescent foci under Zeiss Colibri 7 fluorescence microscope at 10X objective. The CHIKV infectious titer was expressed as

150 the log_{10} fluorescent focus unit (FFU) per mL. Plates were then stored at 4°C protected from light to allow
151 further reading. The infectious titer of the CHIVK 06.21 stock was 8.63 log_{10} FFU/mL.
152
153 **Mosquito colony maintenance**
154 The Lyon metropolis population of *Aedes albopictus* originates from a field sampling of larvae in 2018 that
155 were brought back to insectary for rearing (Microbial Ecology lab, Lyon, France) for less than 10 generations
156 before experimental infections. Sampling locations included Villeurbanne (N : 45°46'18990'' E : 4°53'24615'')
157 and Pierre-Bénite (N :45°42'11534'' E : 4°49'28743'') in Lyon metropolis area, mainland France. The population
158 was maintained and amplified under standard laboratory conditions (28°C, 80% relative humidity, 16:8 hours
159 light:dark cycles) using mice feeding (*Mus musculus*) in accordance with the Institutional Animal Care and Use
160 Committee from Lyon1 University and the French Ministry for Higher Education and Research (Apafis #31807-
161 2021052715018315). Eggs were hatched for 1 h in dechlorinated tap water, and larvae were reared at 26°C
162 (16:8 h light:dark cycle) at a density of 200 larvae in 23 x 34 x 7 cm plastic trays (Gilac) in 1.5 L of dechlorinated
163 tap water supplemented with 0.1 g of a 3:1 (TetraMin tropical fish food:Biover yeast) powder every two days.
164 Adults were maintained in 32.5 x 32.5 x 32.5 cm mesh cages (Bugdorm) at 28°C, 80% relative humidity, 16:8 h
165 light:dark cycle with permanent access to 10% sugar solution.
166
167 **Experimental mosquito exposure to CHIKV**
168 Female mosquitoes (4 to 8-day old) were confined in 136 x 81 mm plastic feeding boxes (Corning-Gosselin)
169 with ~60 individual per box then transferred to the level 3 biosafety facility (SFR Biosciences, AniRA-L3, Lyon
170 Gerland) at 26°C, 12:12 h light:dark cycle deprived from sugar solution 16 h before the infectious blood meal.
171 The blood meal was composed of a 2:1 (v:v) mixture of washed human erythrocytes (from multiple anonymous
172 donors collected by EFS AURA under the CODECOH agreement DC-2019-3507) and viral suspension at several
173 doses, and supplemented with 2% (v:v) of 0.5 M ATP, pH 7 in water (Sigma). Feeders (Hemotek) were covered
174 with pig small intestine and filled with 3 mL of infectious blood mixture. Females were allowed to feed for 1 h
175 at 26°C and blood aliquots were taken before (T0) and after (1 h) the feeding and stored at -80°C for virus
176 titration (Figure S1). Mosquitoes were anaesthetized on ice and fully engorged females were transferred in 1-
177 pint cardboard containers (10-25 females/container) and maintained with 10% sucrose. Cardboard containers
178 were placed in 18 x 18 x 18 inches cages (BioQuip) and kept in climatic chambers at 26°C, 70% humidity. Two
179 independent vector competence experiments were conducted with 370 and 418 individuals mosquitoes per
180 experiment, respectively. In a first experiment (n=370), mosquito body and head infection were tested for the
181 presence of infectious virus at 4 time points while in the second experiment (n=418), mosquito head and saliva
182 were analyzed at 10 time points.
183
184 **Mosquito dissection and CHIKV detection**
185 At the selected day post-exposure (dpe) to CHIKV, individual saliva were collected then the heads and
186 bodies were recovered. Prior to saliva collection, mosquitoes were anaesthetized on ice then legs and wings
187 were removed under a stereomicroscope. Individuals were placed on plastic plates maintained by double-
188 sided adhesive tape. The proboscis was inserted in a trimmed 10 µL filtered tip containing 10 µL of foetal
189 bovine serum (FBS) held above the mosquito by modelling clay (Heitmann et al., 2018). Two µL of 1%
190 pilocarpine hydrochloride (Sigma) supplemented with 0.1% Tween-20 (Sigma) in water were added on the
191 thorax of each mosquito to promote salivation. Mosquitoes were allowed to salivate at 26°C, 80% relative
192 humidity for 1 h. The FBS that contains the saliva was expelled in an ice-cold tube filled with 150 µL of DMEM
193 media (Gibco) supplemented with antibiotics solution (Amphotericin B 2.5 µg/ml, Nystatin 1/100, Gentamicin
194 50 µg/ml, Penicillin 5U/ml and Streptomycin 5 µg/ml (Gibco)). Following salivation, each mosquito's head and
195 body were separated using a pin holder with 0.15 mm minutien pins (FST). Heads and bodies were transferred
196 in individual grinding tubes (Qiagen) containing 500 µL of DMEM supplemented with antibiotics (see above)
197 and one 3-mm diameter tungsten bead (Qiagen). Samples were ground on a 96-well adapter set for 2 x 1 min,
198 30 Hz using a TissueLyser II (Qiagen), then stored at -80°C. CHIKV detection was performed once on 40 µL of
199 undiluted (raw) saliva, head and body samples using fluorescent focus assay on C6/36 cells (see above). Each
200 mosquito sample was declared positive or negative for CHIKV in the presence or absence of a fluorescent
201 signal, respectively. Each 96-well plate contained positive (virus stock) and negative (raw grinding media)
202 controls. Two independent persons examined each plate. Of note, saliva samples were deposited immediately
203 (no freezing step) on C6/36 cells to maximize CHIKV detection. 30 µL of saliva sample were immediately mixed

204 with 70 µL of TRIzol (Life Technologies) and stored at -80°C before RNA isolation. The rest of the samples were
205 stored at -80°C as a backup.
206
207 **RNA isolation from saliva**
208 Total RNA was isolated from 30 µL of saliva mixed with 70 µL TRIzol and then stored at -80°C, as described
209 (Raquin et al., 2017). After thawing samples on ice, 20 µL chloroform (Sigma) were added. The tubes were
210 mixed vigorously, incubated at 4°C for 5 min and centrifuged at 17,000 G for 15 min, 4°C. The upper phase was
211 transferred in a new tube containing 60 µL isopropanol supplemented with 1 µL GlycoBlue (Life Technologies).
212 Samples were mixed vigorously and stored at -80°C overnight to allow RNA precipitation. After 15 min at
213 17,000 G, 4°C, the supernatant was discarded, and the blue pellet was rinsed with 500 µL ice-cold 70% ethanol
214 in water. The samples were centrifuged at 17,000 G for 15 min, 4°C, the supernatant was discarded, and the
215 RNA pellet was allowed to dry for 10 min at room temperature. Ten µL RNAse-free water (Gibco) were added,
216 and samples were incubated at 37°C for 10 min to solubilize RNA prior to transfer in RNAse-free 96-well plates
217 and storage at -80°C.
218
219 **CHIKV RNA load quantification in saliva**
220 Total RNA (2 µL) isolated from individual mosquito saliva were used as template in a one-step TaqMan RT-
221 qPCR assay. The QuantiTect Virus kit (Qiagen) was used to prepare the reaction mix in a final volume of 30 µL.
222 The reaction solution consisted of 6 µL 5X master mix, 1.5 µL primers (forward 5'-CCCGGTAAGAGCGGTGAA-3'
223 and reverse 5'-CTTCCGGTATGTCGATGGAGAT-3') and TaqMan probe (5'-6FAM-TGCGCCGTAGGGAACATGCC-
224 BHQ1-3') (Hurk et al., 2010) mixed at 0.4 µM and 0.2 µM final concentration respectively, 0.3 µL 100X RT mix,
225 20.2 µL RNAse-free water (Gibco) and 2 µL template saliva RNA. RT-qPCR reaction was conducted on a Step
226 One Plus machine (Applied) for 20 min at 50°C (RT step), 5 min at 95°C (initial denaturation) and 40 cycles with
227 15 s at 95°C and 45 s at 60°C. Serial dilutions of CHIKV 06.21 synthetic RNA from 8 to 1 $\log_{10}$ copies/µL were
228 used as an external standard to estimate CHIKV RNA copies in saliva samples. Each plate contained duplicates
229 of standard synthetic RNA samples as well as negative controls and random saliva samples without reverse
230 transcriptase (RT-) also in duplicate. Aliquots from the same standard RNA (thawed only once) were used for
231 all the plates, and samples from a single time-point were measured on the same plate to allow sample
232 comparison.
233
234 **Statistical analyses**
235 Mosquito infection (number of CHIKV-positive mosquito bodies / number engorged mosquitoes),
236 dissemination (number of CHIKV-positive heads / number of CHIKV-positive bodies) and transmission rate
237 (number of positive CHIKV-saliva / number of CHIKV-positive heads) were analysed by logistical regression and
238 considered as binary response variables. The time (dpe) and virus dose ($\log_{10}$ FFU/mL) were considered
239 continuous explanatory variables in a full factorial generalized linear model with a binomial error and a logit
240 link function. Logistic regression assumes a saturation level of 100% and could not be used to model the
241 relationship between the probability of transmission (response variable) and the time post-infection, the dose
242 and their interaction (predictors). Therefore, we first estimated the saturation level (K) for each dose and
243 subtracted the value N = number of mosquitoes with CHIKV dissemination x (100% - K) to the number of
244 mosquitoes without virus in their saliva at each time post virus exposure to artificially remove mosquitoes that
245 would never ultimately transmit the virus from the dataset. Logistic regression was then used on these
246 transformed data to predict transmission rates across time post virus exposure and the virus dose (Figure S2).
247 The statistical significance of the predictors' effects was assessed by comparing nested models using deviance
248 analysis based on a chi-squared distribution. All the statistical analyses were performed in R Studio (Posit), and
249 figures were created with the package *ggplot2* within the *Tidyverse* environment (Wickham et al., 2019). The
250 R script used for this study is available, and supplementary table 1 summarizes the proportion of infected,
251 disseminated and infectious mosquitoes for all the experiments conducted.
252
253 **Epidemiological modelling using *nosoi***
254 A series of stochastic agent-based model simulations were performed using the R package *nosoi* and a
255 specific branch available on *nosoi*'s GitHub page (https://github.com/slequime/nosoi/tree/fontaine) as
256 previously done (Lequime et al., 2020). Briefly, 100 independent simulations were run in replicates for each
257 condition. Each simulation started with one infected human and was run for 365 days or until the allowed

number of infected individuals (100,000 humans or 1,000,000 mosquitoes, respectively) was reached. We considered transmission only between an infected mosquito and an uninfected human or between an infected human and an uninfected mosquito. Vertical and sexual transmission, and the impact of potential superinfection were ignored during the simulations. We assumed no particular structure within host and vector populations.

It was also considered that humans do not die from infection and leave the simulation after they clear the infection (here 12 days). Each human agent experienced a Poisson-like distribution of bites per day with a mean value manually set at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 or 60 based on field measurement of *Aedes albopictus* blood-feeding behaviour (Delatte et al., 2010). Human-to-mosquito transmission followed a time-post-infection-dependent probability function, identical for all human agents, computed from the human viraemic profile (Eq. 1, see above) and dose-response experiments (Eq. 2) :

$$p_{trans\ H\to M}(t) = \frac{1}{1+\exp\left(-\left(-11.1678+1.9929*\left(a*t^{b}*\exp(-c*t)\right)\right)\right)} \text{ (Eq. 2)}$$

where based on our model, a = 0.01479, b = 7.21809 and c = 1.11915.

The daily survival probability of infected mosquito agents was set empirically at 0.85 (Favier et al., 2005; Fontaine et al., 2018). Human biting (only one per mosquito agent) was set at fixed dates depending on a gonotrophic cycle duration drawn for each mosquito in a truncated Poisson distribution with a mean of 4 days (no draws below 3). The mosquito-to-human transmission was determined for each mosquito agent based on its individual EIP value acting as a threshold for transmission (if time post-infection is greater or equal to the EIP value, the mosquito can transmit). However, a certain proportion (based on saturation parameter K, see above) of mosquitoes never transmitted. The individual EIP value was dependent on the virus dose that initiated the infection based on this equation (Lequime et al., 2020):

$$DD50 = \frac{\left(\log\left(\frac{-P}{P-1.001}\right) - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \times X1\right.}{\beta_2 + \beta_3 \times X1} \text{ (Eq. 3)}$$

where P = 0.5 (i.e., the median transmission probability), β_0 is the Y-intercept value (-2.328973), β_1 (0.278953), β_2 (0.136746) and β_3 (0.003276) are model coefficients associated to the virus dose, time post virus exposure and their interaction, respectively. X1 represents the virus dose value.

Results

Estimating CHIKV viraemia in humans by modelisation of clinical data

Intra-human dynamic of CHIKV viraemia over time post-infection was approximated using time course of human CHIKV viraemia in individual patients from two studies (Appassakij et al., 2013; Riswari et al., 2015). CHIKV loads were assessed at 3 to 6 different time points, prior or post symptoms onset from the blood of 5 patients. The range of CHIKV viraemia duration among the 5 patients was 4-12 days, with a minimal and a maximum CHIKV load of 1 and 8.78 $\log_{10}$ PFU equivalent/mL, respectively. Of note, two patients displayed 1.04 and 3.25 $\log_{10}$ PFU equivalent/mL before symptoms onset, respectively. Modelling CHIKV viraemic profile using a Wood's gamma-type function indicates that mean viral load rapidly increases to peak after 6.45 days (*i.e.* within 24h after symptoms onset) at 7.55 $\log_{10}$ PFU equivalent/mL (7.01-8.78 $\log_{10}$ equivalent PFU/mL depending on the patient) (Figure 1).



Figure 1 - Estimated time course of CHIKV load in human blood as a function of days post-infection. A Wood's gamma-type function was used to model CHIKV viraemia dynamics based on the time course of human viraemia data in 5 patients. The black line represents model prediction using mean fit parameter values. Each dot represents a single experimental measurement with colours corresponding to different patients. The vertical gold line indicates the day of symptoms onset. The grey ribbon represents upper and lower predicted values. Refers to raw data table "ChikV_Viremia_dynamic.txt" (see data availability section).

The dose, but not the time, modulates mosquito infection rate

Female *Ae. albopictus* were exposed to a human erythrocytes suspension containing three CHIKV doses (3.94, 6.07 and 8.63 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL) that span the estimated range of human viraemia as estimated above (Figure 1). Mosquito infection rate (IR) remained below 7% (n=35 to 53 individuals tested) at 3.94 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL, ranged from 65 to 85% at 6.07 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL (n=20 to 35) and raised above 94% at 8.63 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL (n=12 to 24) (Figure 2A). A detail table of these data is presented in supplementary table S1. IR significantly increases with the dose but it does not depend on the time post-exposure (Wald χ^2, P_{dose} = 1.1 x 10^{-6}, P_{time} = 0.9 and $P_{dose*time}$ = 0.17). As IR depends on the virus dose but not on the time post-exposure, we fitted a logistic model to the data considering CHIKV titer in the blood meal as a unique explanatory variable (Figure 2B). Dose-dependent IR describes a sigmoid with a median oral infection dose ($OID_{50\%}$) of 5.6 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL and an $OID_{25\%}$ and $OID_{75\%}$ of 5.05 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL and 6.15 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL, respectively. The oral infection saturation level was reached at about 7.5 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL.



Figure 2 - Dose-dependent infection rate of *Ae. albopictus* mosquitoes exposed to CHIKV 06.21. (A) The mosquito infection rate corresponds to the proportion (in %) of mosquito bodies positive for CHIKV infection out of the total of engorged mosquitoes, measured at 2, 6, 9 and 14 days post-exposure for three CHIKV doses (3.94, 6.07 and 8.63 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL) in the blood meal. The number of individuals analysed at each time point is indicated above the bars that represents the 95% confidence interval. (B) Mosquito infection rate as a function of CHIKV dose in the blood meal. Blue dots correspond to the observed infection rate upon the three CHIKV doses tested. Dot size is proportional to the number of mosquitoes tested. The black line was obtained by fitting a logistic model to the data. The grey ribbon indicates the 95% confidence interval. The oral infectious dose (OID) to infect 25%, 50% and 75% of the mosquitoes exposed to CHIKV is indicated with the associated standard error (in $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL). Refers to raw data table "Data_titer_EIPdyna_body_head_final.txt" (see data availability section).

Dose- and time-dependent mosquito dissemination dynamics

The proportion of CHIKV-positive heads among positive bodies (*i.e.,* mosquito dissemination rate, DIR) was analysed using virus dose, time post-exposure and their interaction as explanatory variables. At 2 days post-exposure, <50% of the mosquitoes presented a disseminated infection for the doses 3.94 (n=1 individual tested) and 6.07 (n=18) $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL, whereas DIR was already above 80% after 2 days in mosquitoes exposed to 8.63 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL of CHIKV (n=23) (Figure 3A). Notably, DIR increases >80% for all the three doses after 6 dpe (n=1 to 29 individual tested per time point and dose) (Figure 3A and table S1). Although they are not in interaction, both time and dose impact DIR (Wald χ^2, $P_{dose} = 8.29 \times 10^{-6}$, $P_{time} = 1.75 \times 10^{-6}$ and $P_{dose*time} = 0.83$). The plateau was 100% at doses 3.94 and 8.63 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL and 95.6% at the dose 6.07 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL (n=22/23). The time to reach 50% dissemination in *Ae. albopictus* exposed to CHIKV was 7.5 days, 2.2 days and <1 day for 3.94, 6.07 and 8.63 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL CHIKV doses in the blood meal, respectively. DIR was inferred from experimental data for a larger set of CHIKV dose ranging from 3 to 8 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL (Figure 3B). All the CHIKV doses tested led to 100% dissemination within the 40 days range used for predictions, although a longer time is required to reach this plateau at the lowest dose.



Figure 3 - Dose-dependent dissemination rate of *Ae. albopictus* mosquitoes exposed to CHIKV 06.21. (A) The mosquito dissemination rate corresponds to the number of CHIKV-positive heads out of the infected (CHIKV-positive bodies) individuals, measured at 2, 6, 9 and 14 days post-exposure for three virus doses (3.94, 6.07 and 8.63 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL) in the blood meal. Dot size is proportional to the number of mosquitoes tested. No disseminated females were detected at day 14 post-exposure at the 3.94 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL dose. Logistic regression was used to model the time-dependent effect of the virus dose on mosquito dissemination rate. Lines correspond to fit values with their 95% confidence intervals displayed as ribbons. The time needed to reach 50% dissemination is 7.5, 2.2 and <1 day for the 3.94, 6.07 and 8.63 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL CHIKV doses, respectively, as indicated within each facet label. (B) Predicted dissemination dynamics according to virus dose and time post-exposure for a range of CHIKV blood meal titers (3 to 8 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL). Refers to raw data table "Data_titer_EIPdyna_final.txt" (see data availability section).

Time post-exposure modulates transmission rate and viral load in the saliva

The presence of infectious CHIKV particles in individual mosquito saliva collected by forced salivation technique was monitored at a fine time scale. This allowed us to measure the transmission rate (TR) and quantify individual viral load in saliva over time, and to estimate the extrinsic incubation period (EIP). Two virus doses (5.68 and 8.06 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL) were used to obtain a workable proportion of infectious mosquitoes at a high number of time points that covers mosquito expected lifespan while remaining in the range of human viraemia. From day 2 post-exposure, TR increases following a sigmoid shape, reaching a plateau of around 60% for both doses (Figure 4A). TR was analysed using virus dose, time post-exposure and their interaction as explanatory variables, and only time was significant (Wald χ^2, P_{time} = 0.0037, P_{dose} = 0.18, and $P_{dose*time}$ = 0.8). Infectious saliva samples were detected as soon as day 2 post-exposure to CHIKV, with a 33% TR at dose 5.68 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL (n=1/3 individuals tested) and 14% at dose 8.06 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL (n=2/14). The time needed to reach 50% infectious mosquitoes (*i.e.* Extrinsic Incubation Period 50%, $EIP_{50\%}$) was 7.5 and 3.5 days for doses 5.68 and 8.06 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL, respectively. A TR saturation at 100% is a prerequisite to applying logistic regression analysis to the data. Therefore, the proportion of mosquitoes that would not ultimately transmit the virus was artificially removed from the dataset based on the predicted saturation level at each dose (*i.e.*, 40% of mosquitoes without the virus in their saliva were removed at each time post-infection). Logistic regression was used on these transformed data to predict TR across a range of doses over time (Figure S2).

To decipher if CHIKV load in the saliva could be associated with the virus dose mosquitoes were challenged with, total RNA was isolated at each time point from the saliva of individual mosquitoes exposed to 5.68 or 8.06 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL. Viral load was measured by TaqMan RT-qPCR assay and analysed according to virus dose and time post-exposure. A high individual variation is noticed (up to 10,000 fold difference between individuals), although CHIKV load in the saliva seems to decrease over time (Figure 4B). Only the time post-exposure significantly affected viral load when considering saliva samples that were CHIKV-positive both in qRT-PCR and in infectious titration (Anova, P_{time} = 0.006, P_{dose} = 0.66 and $P_{dose*time}$ = 0.94). Of note, both time

and virus dose affected viral load in the saliva when considering RNA-positive samples regardless of the presence of infectious virus (Figure S3).



Figure 4 - Transmission dynamics of CHIKV 06.21 by *Ae. albopictus*. (A) Mosquito transmission rate corresponds to the number of CHIKV-positive saliva out of the number of CHIKV-positive heads collected at 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, and 20 days post-exposure for two virus doses (5.68 and 8.06 $\log_{10}$ FFU/mL) in the blood meal. Dot size is proportional to the number of saliva tested. (B) CHIKV RNA load of each saliva scored positive for infectious CHIKV was measured by TaqMan RT-qPCR assay using a synthetic RNA as standard, then expressed in $\log_{10}$ CHIKV RNA copies/saliva. Each dot represents a saliva sample from a mosquito exposed to the indicated dose. Refers to raw data tables "Data_titer_EIPdyna_final.txt" and "Data_CHIKV_RNA_load_saliva.txt" (see data availability section).

Simulation of CHIKV epidemic upon dose-dependent intra-vector dynamics

A stochastic agent-based model was used to assess the epidemiological impact of within-host CHIKV dynamics using the R package nosoi, as done previously for ZIKV (Lequime et al., 2020). Starting with one infected human in a population of susceptible humans and mosquitoes, the model simulates CHIKV transmissions according to human viraemia, its derived probability of mosquito infection, and virus transmission timeliness (EIP). The model was run 100 independent times for a maximum of 365 days for a range of eleven mean individual mosquito biting rates (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 60 independent mosquitoes biting per person per day). Simulations led to large outbreaks (>100 secondary infections) even under a low mosquito biting rate (Figure 5A). The maximum threshold of mosquito infections was reached regardless of biting intensity, although the time needed to reach this threshold and the inter-simulation variation were higher at the lowest biting intensity (*i.e.* 1 bite per day) compare to other conditions (Figure 5B). Accordingly, secondary cases values distributions across simulations were narrow for all conditions except at 1 bite per day reflecting the explosive nature of the outbreak. The mean secondary case values increases as a function of the mosquito biting intensity with a mean (± SD) of 3.68 (± 1.92), 7.37 (± 2.71), 11.06 (± 3.32), 14.75 (± 3.84), 18.43 (± 4.29), 22.12 (± 4.7), 25.81 (± 5.07), 29.5 (± 5.43), 33.18 (± 5.75), 36.87 (± 6.07) and 221.15 (± 6.09) for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 60 mosquito bites per person per day, respectively (Figure 5C).



Figure 5 - Influence of dose-dependent intra-mosquito CHIKV dynamics on outbreak simulations with various levels of mosquito bites. Stochastic agent-based epidemiological simulations considering within-vector infection dynamics on transmission probability during mosquito-human infectious contacts were performed in 100 independent replicates. A total of 11 mosquito bite intensity levels were tested: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 60 bites per human per day. (A) Stacked proportions of outbreak simulations resulting in no secondary infected human host, < 100 and ≧ 100 infected human hosts. (B) Cumulative number of infected humans over time. Each curve represents a simulation run. (C) Violin plots showing the number of secondary cases densities for each intensity of mosquito exposure. Refers to raw data tables “Compiled_results_run5.csv”, “cumulative_run5.csv” and “R0dist_run5.csv” (see data availability section).

441 ## Discussion

442 Vector competence (VComp) of *Aedes albopictus* for chikungunya virus (CHIKV) has been widely
443 studied, notably since the La Réunion outbreak in 2006. VComp studies outline *Ae. albopictus* overall
444 potential for CHIKV transmission although knowledge gaps remain regarding intra-vector virus dynamics
445 and its impact on CHIKV epidemic potential notably regarding the virus dose. Our work contributes to fill
446 these gaps, providing important data on the interplay between CHIKV and *Ae. albopictus* as well as on the
447 vireamia-dependent human infectiousness for mosquitoes.
448
449 **A CHIKV journey in the mosquito**
450 *Ae. albopictus* midgut infection is strongly influenced by CHIKV dose in the blood meal. Previous studies
451 documented an oral infectious dose for 50% of the mosquitoes ($OID_{50\%}$) ranging from 1.7 to 3.52 log_{10}
452 infectious particles per mL of blood for CHIKV 06.21 and thus lower than the 5.60 log_{10} FFU/mL $OID_{50\%}$
453 estimated in our *Ae. albopictus* population (Tsetsarkin et al., 2007; Pesko et al., 2009; Hurk et al., 2010).
454 ZIKV $OID_{50\%}$ was 5.62 log_{10} FFU/mL in *Ae. albopictus* while in *Ae. aegypti*, ZIKV and DENV $OID_{50\%}$ ranged
455 from 4.73 to 8.10 log_{10} FFU/mL and from 3.95 to 5.5 log_{10} PFU/mL, respectively (Nguyet et al., 2013; Aubry
456 et al., 2020; Lequime et al., 2020). Altogether, it shows that mosquito dose-response to arbovirus infection
457 impacts viral emergence depending on the mosquito and virus genotypes considered, although the
458 underlying genetic determinants remain unclear (Aubry et al., 2020). The CHIKV time-independent
459 infection rate and relatively low $OID_{50\%}$ in *Ae. albopictus* suggests that primary infection of midgut cells is
460 rapid and efficient. Such CHIKV midgut infection pattern could be promoted by the presence of several
461 potential midgut receptors for *Alphavirus* entry in mosquitoes (Franz et al., 2015). Importantly, a 0.5 log_{10}
462 FFU/mL increase in $OID_{50\%}$ during the exponential phase results in twice as much infected mosquitoes,
463 which could exacerbate outbreaks, notably upon large vector densities. Therefore, dose-response
464 experiments at a small dose range for each virus and mosquito genotype of interest would significantly
465 improve our understanding of vector competence.
466 CHIKV dissemination from the *Ae. albopictus* midgut depends on the interaction between time post-
467 exposure and virus dose. A previous study showed that at day 6 post-exposure, CHIKV dissemination rate
468 in *Ae. albopictus* increases with virus dose, being ~10%, ~50% and >80% upon 3.6, 4.4 and 5.2 log_{10} PFU/mL
469 in the blood meal respectively (Pesko et al., 2009). Here, we show that if at least 6 days are needed to
470 reach ~30% dissemination upon 3.94 log_{10} FFU/mL, virus doses of 6.07 and 8.63 log_{10} FFU/mL led overall
471 to ~90% dissemination regardless of the time point (except at day 2 for the 6.07 log_{10} FFU/mL dose where
472 only 40% dissemination was observed). Of note, CHIKV dissemination rate at 3.94 log_{10} FFU/mL shall be
473 interpreted with caution due to the low sample size that arise directly from the low infection rate (1.9 to
474 6.5%, n = 37 to 53 individuals per time point). These results reveal the ability of CHIKV to efficiently
475 disseminate from the midgut, as modelling for a larger dose range estimates that all infected mosquitoes
476 eventually disseminate even at the lowest dose considered (2 log_{10} FFU/mL). CHIKV and ZIKV present a
477 nearly identical $OID_{50\%}$ suggesting similar midgut infection potential in *Ae. albopictus*. However, ZIKV
478 dissemination is slower and, to a minor extend, reaches lower value compared to CHIKV (Lequime et al.,
479 2020). This discrepancy might be due to viral replication in the midgut as dissemination rate correlates with
480 midgut viral load (Houk et al., 1981; Bosio et al., 1998; Dickson et al., 2014; Vazeille et al., 2019; Carpenter
481 et al., 2021). CHIKV dissemination might arise from an efficient replication in the midgut tissue. Recently,
482 the CHIKV 3' untranslated region was recently shown to promote dissemination through an increased viral
483 replication in the mosquito midgut (Merwaiss et al., 2020). Identifying mosquito factors that impede viral
484 replication, for instance by interfering with key virus replication determinants, represents an interesting
485 lead for engineered vector control approaches that could limit arbovirus spread (Raquin et al., 2017;
486 Merkling et al., 2020; Williams et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2022).
487 Ultimately, arboviruses infect and replicate in mosquito salivary glands, this step being essential to
488 allow virus transmission to the host (Vega-Rúa et al., 2015; Raquin & Lambrechts, 2017). Virus prevalence
489 in the head is often used as a proxy for transmission potential but it is likely an overestimate due to salivary
490 glands barriers, notably for CHIKV (Sanchez-Vargas et al., 2021). Our study shows that ~60% of the
491 mosquitoes with disseminated infection eventually become infectious, this being an underestimate of
492 mosquito-to-host transmission potential due to the use of forced salivation technique (Gloria-Soria et al.,
493 2022). Moreover, transmission rate strongly depends on the time post-exposure. Previously, the time to

494 reach 50% of infectious mosquitoes in the population ($EIP_{50\%}$) was estimated by a meta-analysis at 7 days
495 (± 1 day), based on dissemination data and for mosquitoes exposed to relatively high virus doses
496 (Christofferson et al., 2014). Despite no overall effect of virus dose on the transmission rate (P_{dose} = 0.18),
497 CHIKV $EIP_{50\%}$ was 7.5 and 3.5 days in mosquitoes exposed to 5.68 or 8.06 log_{10} FFU/mL, respectively,
498 suggesting that virus dose might influence CHIKV transmission. Increasing sample size and/or testing an
499 intermediate virus dose (*e.g.* 6 log_{10} FFU/mL) could help to better capture the impact of virus dose on
500 transmission rate and resolve this discrepancy. Interestingly, when considering all CHIKV-positive salivas
501 (including the ones with only CHIKV RNA but no infectious virus), the CHIKV RNA load in the saliva depends
502 on time post-exposure and virus dose but not in interaction. Overall, the CHIKV load in saliva seems higher
503 at high dose but decreases overtime, questioning arbovirus-salivary glands interaction. In a previous study,
504 individual ZIKV-disseminated *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes were offered successive non-infectious blood meals
505 in an attempt to monitor expelled virus during feeding in a non-sacrificial manner. Authors observed an
506 on/off presence of ZIKV in the blood meal for a single individual over time; however, wether this is due to
507 biological or methodological causes is unclear (Mayton et al., 2021). In *Ae. albopictus*, up to 10,000-fold
508 difference of CHIKV RNA load in the saliva was found between individuals at a given time point and dose,
509 in accordance with previous results (Dubrulle et al., 2009; Bohers et al., 2020; Robison et al., 2020). No
510 correlation was found between CHIKV titer in the salivary glands and in the saliva, that might be linked with
511 such inter-individual variations (Sanchez-Vargas et al., 2019). Despite several studies that identified
512 histological and genetical factors modulating viral infection in this tissue, it is still unclear how and in which
513 amount infectious virions are produced in salivary glands and then transferred into the saliva over time
514 (Ciano et al., 2014; Modahl et al., 2019; Chowdhury et al., 2021; Sanchez-Vargas et al., 2021). Notably, viral
515 particles in the saliva might use specific viral factors and/or mosquito saliva proteins to persist in the saliva
516 and promote their transmission (Pompon et al., 2017; Marin-Lopez et al., 2021). This is key as virus titer in
517 the mosquito inoculum is associated with viraemia level and symptoms severity in mice and macaques
518 models (Labadie et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2022).
519
520 **Human viremia and mosquito infection**
521 A large majority of VComp studies exposed *Ae. albopictus* to a high (>7 log_{10} plaque-forming units
522 (PFU)/mL) CHIKV titer in the blood meal (Coffey et al., 2014). According to our estimate, CHIKV viraemia in
523 humans can reach >7 log_{10} PFU equivalent per mL of blood, although this corresponds to the highest value
524 measured within a short time window (<2 days). Our CHIKV viraemia estimate from human longitudinal
525 data lasts from 4 to 12 days with a mean maximum titer of 7.55 log_{10} PFU/mL, which is largely supported
526 by previous human and nonhuman studies (Lanciotti et al., 2007; Panning et al., 2008; Labadie et al., 2010;
527 Schwartz & Albert, 2010). The mean human viraemia is above 3.94 log_{10} FFU/mL during 5.5 days, implying
528 that humans are infectious to mosquitoes during more than half of their viraemia. These data are key to
529 improve sanitary guidelines for the management of CHIKV infections and spread. However, major
530 differences in CHIKV viraemia magnitude and length are observed between individual hosts, which can be
531 associated with host and/or virus genotypes as observed in dengue virus (DENV)-infected patients (Nguyet
532 et al., 2013). In addition, if artificial mosquito blood feeding limits variation in blood composition and
533 promotes reproducibility, it does not necessary represent the native infectiousness of human-derived
534 arbovirus for mosquitoes. This is partly linked to host plasma factors level (IgM, IgG, low-density
535 lipoproteins or gamma-aminobutyric acid) while asymptomatic DENV cases are more infectious to
536 mosquitoes than symptomatic counterparts at a given dose suggesting a link between host immune
537 response and vector transmission (Nguyet et al., 2013; Duong et al., 2015; Wagar et al., 2017; Zhu et al.,
538 2017). Moreover, for CHIKV, ~85% infections are symptomatic with a median blood titer about 100-fold
539 higher compare to asymptomatic carriers, although this difference was not statistically significant
540 (Appassakij et al., 2013). Thus, improving epidemiological models by implementing the time-dependant
541 human host infectiousness to mosquitoes represents an interesting lead to better anticipate and prevent
542 CHIKV outbreaks. This notably prompts the need for viraemia monitoring over time in large groups of
543 patients infected by arboviruses, using standardized virus titration procedures to facilitate comparisons
544 and calibrate dose-response experiments in mosquitoes. This also requires other improvements of
545 modelling strategies to account for *Ae. albopictus* tendancy to take several consecutive blood meals,
546 mosquito and human populations structure or eventual sanitary measures that could be implemented
547 (Delatte et al., 2010; Armstrong et al., 2019; Fikrig & Harrington, 2021). Although those limitations could

modulate the explosiveness of the outbreak and could be improved, our data support that CHIKV transmission potential of local *Ae. albopictus* is not a limiting factor for local CHIKV emergence and spread. Finally, such an experimental design can be used to investigate the impact of several (a)biotic factors on VComp, as exemplified here with virus dose that showed a major effect on intra-vector dynamics and consequently on virus propagation. In conclusion, we underline the importance of testing multiple pairs of mosquito and virus genotypes to assess VComp in a dynamic manner, under a standardized procedure and coupled to modelling tools in order to get the most of vector competence assays. Together, this work can help to improve vector control strategies and case management by health authorities.

Appendices

FigS1 - CHIKV infectious titer is stable upon a one hour incubation at 37°C in human erythrocytes suspension. Refers to raw data table "blood_titration_FFU.txt" (see data availability section).

FigS2 - Rescaled mosquito transmission dynamics. Refers to raw data table "Data_titer_EIPdyna_final.txt" (see data availability section).

FigS3 - Time-course of CHIKV load in mosquito saliva. Refers to raw data table "Data_CHIKV_RNA_load_saliva.txt" (see data availability section).

TabS1 - Proportion of infected, disseminated and infectious mosquitoes over time according to the dose of CHIKV in the blood meal. Refers to raw data table "Raw_data_viginier_et_al2023" (see data availability section).

Acknowledgements

This project was funded by the scientific breakthrough project Micro-Be-Have (Microbial impact on insect behavior) of the Université de Lyon within the program Investissements d'Avenir (ANR-11-IDEX-0007; ANR-16-IDEX-0005). We thank the Equipex InfectioTron program and its project manager Isabelle Weiss. We also thank all the members of the Micro-Be-Have consortium for insightful discussions. We thank Anna-Bella Failloux and Patrick Mavingui for the CHIKV 06.21 isolate. We acknowledge the contribution of SFR Biosciences (UAR3444/CNRS, US8/Inserm, ENS de Lyon, UCBL) AniRa biosafety level 3 platform (Marie-Pierre Confort) and plateau Analyse Génétique et Cellulaire (Bariza Blanquier) facilities in Lyon.

Data, scripts, code, and supplementary information availability

Data, R scripts, supplementary information and main figures in full size are available online: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8033668

Conflict of interest disclosure

The authors declare that they comply with the PCI rule of having no financial conflicts of interest in relation to the content of the article.

Sebastian Lequime is a recommender for PCI infections.

Author contributions

BV: Investigation; Data curation; Validation
LC: Investigation; Data curation; Validation
CG: Investigation; Data curation; Validation

589 **EM**: Resources
590 **CM**: Resources
591 **CVM**: Funding acquisition; Resources; Supervision; Writing – review and editing
592 **GM**: Funding acquisition; Writing – review and editing
593 **AF**: Data curation; Formal analysis; Software; Visualization; Methodology; Writing – review and editing
594 **SL**: Data curation; Formal analysis; Software; Visualization; Methodology; Writing – review and editing
595 **MR**: Funding acquisition; Supervision; Writing – review and editing
596 **FA**: Funding acquisition; Project administration; Supervision; Writing – review and editing
597 **VR**: Conceptualization; Investigation; Formal analysis; Data curation; Methodology; Investigation; Project
598 administration; Supervision; Validation; Visualization; Writing – original draft; Writing – review and
599 editing.

600 **Funding**

601 Micro-Be-Have (Microbial impact on insect behavior) of the Université de Lyon within the program
602 Investissements d'Avenir (ANR-11-IDEX-0007; ANR-16-IDEX-0005).

603 **References**

604

605 Appassakij H, Khuntikij P, Kemapunmanus M, Wutthanarungsan R, Silpapojakul K (2013) Viremic profiles in
606 chikv-infected cases. *Transfusion*, 53, 2567–2574. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1537-2995.2012.03960.x

607 Armstrong PM, Ehrlich HY, Magalhaes T, Miller MR, Conway PJ, Bransfield A, Misencik MJ, Gloria-Soria A,
608 Warren JL, Andreadis TG, Shepard JJ, Foy BD, Pitzer VE, Brackney DE (2019) Successive blood meals
609 enhance virus dissemination within mosquitoes and increase transmission potential. *Nature*
610 *microbiology*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-019-0619-y

611 Aubry F, Dabo S, Manet C, Filipović I, Rose NH, Miot EF, Martynow D, Baidaliuk A, Merkling SH, Dickson LB,
612 Crist AB, Anyango VO, Romero-Vivas CM, Vega-Rúa A, Dusfour I, Jiolle D, Paupy C, Mayanja MN,
613 Lutwama JJ, Kohl A, Duong V, Ponlawat A, Sylla M, Akorli J, Otoo S, Lutomiah J, Sang R, Mutebi J-P, Cao-
614 Lormeau V-M, Jarman RG, Diagne CT, Faye O, Faye O, Sall AA, McBride CS, Montagutelli X, Rašić G,
615 Lambrechts L (2020) Enhanced Zika virus susceptibility of globally invasive *Aedes aegypti* populations.
616 *Science*, 370, 991–996. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd3663

617 Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, Drake JM, Brownstein JS, Hoen AG,
618 Sankoh O, Myers MF, George DB, Jaenisch T, Wint GRW, Simmons CP, Scott TW, Farrar JJ, Hay SI (2013)
619 The global distribution and burden of dengue. *Nature*, 496, 504–507.
620 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12060

621 Bohers C, Mousson L, Madec Y, Vazeille M, Rhim A, M'ghirbi Y, Bouattour A, Failloux A-B (2020) The recently
622 introduced *Aedes albopictus* in Tunisia has the potential to transmit chikungunya, dengue and Zika
623 viruses. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 14, e0008475.
624 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008475

625 Bonilauri P, Bellini R, Calzolari M, Angelini R, Venturi L, Fallacara F, Cordioli P, Angelini P, Venturelli C,
626 Merialdi G, Dottori M (2008) Chikungunya Virus in *Aedes albopictus*, Italy. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*,
627 14, 852–854. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1405.071144

628 Bosio CF, Beaty BJ, Black WC (1998) Quantitative genetics of vector competence for dengue-2 virus in *Aedes*
629 *aegypti*. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 59, 965–970.
630 https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.1998.59.965

631 Carpenter A, Bryant WB, Santos SR, Clem RJ (2021) Infection of *Aedes aegypti* Mosquitoes with Midgut-
632 Attenuated Sindbis Virus Reduces, but Does Not Eliminate, Disseminated Infection. *Journal of Virology*,
633 95, e00136-21. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.00136-21

634 Chowdhury A, Modahl CM, Missé D, Kini RM, Pompon J (2021) High resolution proteomics of *Aedes aegypti*
635 salivary glands infected with either dengue, Zika or chikungunya viruses identify new virus specific and
636 broad antiviral factors. *Scientific Reports*, 11, 23696. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-03211-0

637 Christofferson RC, Chisenhall DM, Wearing HJ, Mores CN (2014) Chikungunya Viral Fitness Measures within
638 the Vector and Subsequent Transmission Potential. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e110538.
639 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0110538

640 Ciano K, Saredy J, Bowers D (2014) Heparan Sulfate Proteoglycan: An Arbovirus Attachment Factor Integral
641 to Mosquito Salivary Gland Ducts. *Viruses*, 6, 5182–5197. https://doi.org/10.3390/v6125182

642 Coffey LL, Failloux A-B, Weaver SC (2014) Chikungunya Virus–Vector Interactions. *Viruses*, 6, 4628–4663.
643 https://doi.org/10.3390/v6114628

644 Delatte H, Desvars A, Bouétard A, Bord S, Gimonneau G, Vourc'h G, Fontenille D (2010) Blood-Feeding
645 Behavior of *Aedes albopictus*, a Vector of Chikungunya on La Réunion. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic*
646 *Diseases*, 10, 249–258. https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2009.0026

647 Delisle E, Rousseau C, Broche B, Leparc-Goffart I, L'Ambert G, Cochet A, Prat C, Foulongne V, Ferré JB,
648 Catelinois O, Flusin O, Tchernonog E, Moussion IE, Wiegandt A, Septfons A, Mendy A, Moyano MB,
649 Laporte L, Maurel J, Jourdain F, Reynes J, Paty MC, Golliot F (2015) Chikungunya outbreak in
650 Montpellier, France, September to October 2014. *Eurosurveillance*, 20. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-
651 7917.es2015.20.17.21108

652 Dickson LB, Sanchez-Vargas I, Sylla M, Fleming K, Black WC (2014) Vector competence in West African
653 *Aedes aegypti* Is Flavivirus species and genotype dependent. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*, 8, e3153.
654 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0003153

655 Dong Y, Dong S, Dizaji NB, Rutkowski N, Pohlenz T, Myles K, Dimopoulos G (2022) The *Aedes aegypti* siRNA
656 pathway mediates broad-spectrum defense against human pathogenic viruses and modulates
657 antibacterial and antifungal defenses. *PLoS Biology*, 20, e3001668.
658 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001668

659 Dubrulle M, Mousson L, Moutailler S, Vazeille M, Failloux A-B (2009) Chikungunya virus and *Aedes*
660 mosquitoes: saliva is infectious as soon as two days after oral infection. *PloS One*, 4, e5895.
661 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0005895

662 Duong V, Lambrechts L, Paul RE, Ly S, Lay RS, Long KC, Huy R, Tarantola A, Scott TW, Sakuntabhai A, Buchy
663 P (2015) Asymptomatic humans transmit dengue virus to mosquitoes. *Proceedings of the National*
664 *Academy of Sciences*, 112, 14688–14693. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1508114112

665 Favier C, Schmit D, Mller-Graf CDM, Cazelles B, Degallier N, Mondet B, Dubois MA (2005) Influence of
666 spatial heterogeneity on an emerging infectious disease: the case of dengue epidemics. *Proceedings of*
667 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 272, 1171–1177. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2004.3020

668 Fikrig K, Harrington LC (2021) Understanding and interpreting mosquito blood feeding studies: the case of
669 *Aedes albopictus*. *Trends in Parasitology*, 37, 959–975. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2021.07.013

670 Fontaine A, Lequime S, Moltini-Conclois I, Jiolle D, Leparc-Goffart I, Reiner RC, Lambrechts L (2018)
671 Epidemiological significance of dengue virus genetic variation in mosquito infection dynamics. *PLOS*
672 *Pathogens*, 14, e1007187. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1007187

673 Franke F, Giron S, Cochet A, Jeannin C, Leparc-Goffart I, Valk H de, Jourdain F, Lamballerie X de, L'Ambert
674 G, Paty MC (2019) Autochthonous chikungunya and dengue fever outbreak in Mainland France, 2010-
675 2018. *European Journal of Public Health*, 29. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckz186.628

676 Franz AWE, Kantor AM, Passarelli AL, Clem RJ (2015) Tissue Barriers to Arbovirus Infection in Mosquitoes.
677 *Viruses*, 7, 3741–3767. https://doi.org/10.3390/v7072795

678 Gloria-Soria A, Brackney DE, Armstrong PM (2022) Saliva collection via capillary method may
679 underestimate arboviral transmission by mosquitoes. *Parasites & Vectors*, 15, 103.
680 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-022-05198-7

681 Gratz NG (2004) Critical review of the vector status of Aedes albopictus. *Medical and Veterinary*
682 *Entomology*, 18, 215–227. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0269-283x.2004.00513.x

683 Greiser-Wilke I, Moennig V, Kaaden O-R, Figueiredo LTM (1989) Most Alphaviruses Share a Conserved
684 Epitopic Region on Their Nucleocapsid Protein. *Journal of General Virology*, 70, 743–748.
685 https://doi.org/10.1099/0022-1317-70-3-743

686 Heitmann A, Jansen S, Lühken R, Leggewie M, Schmidt-Chanasit J, Tannich E (2018) Forced Salivation As a
687 Method to Analyze Vector Competence of Mosquitoes. *Journal of Visualized Experiments : JoVE*, 57980.
688 https://doi.org/10.3791/57980

689 Houk EJ, Hardy JL, Presser SB, Kramer LD (1981) Dissemination Barriers for Western Equine
690 Encephalomyelitis Virus in *Culex Tarsalis* Infected after Ingestion of Low Viral Doses. *The American*
691 *Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 30, 190–197. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.1981.30.190

692 Hurk AF van den, Hall-Mendelin S, Pyke AT, Smith GA, Mackenzie JS (2010) Vector Competence of
693 Australian Mosquitoes for Chikungunya Virus. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*, 10, 489–495.
694 https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2009.0106

695 Islam ZU, Bishop SC, Savill NJ, Rowland RRR, Lunney JK, Trible B, Doeschl-Wilson AB (2013) Quantitative
696 Analysis of Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome (PRRS) Viremia Profiles from Experimental
697 Infection: A Statistical Modelling Approach. *PLoS ONE*, 8, e83567.
698 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0083567

699 Labadie K, Larcher T, Joubert C, Mannioui A, Delache B, Brochard P, Guigand L, Dubreil L, Lebon P, Verrier
700 B, Lamballerie X de, Suhrbier A, Cherel Y, Grand RL, Roques P (2010) Chikungunya disease in nonhuman
701 primates involves long-term viral persistence in macrophages. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 120,
702 894–906. https://doi.org/10.1172/jci40104

703 Labeaud AD, Bashir F, King CH (2011) Measuring the burden of arboviral diseases: the spectrum of
704 morbidity and mortality from four prevalent infections. *Population Health Metrics*, 9, 1.
705 https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-7954-9-1

706 Lanciotti RS, Kosoy OL, Laven JJ, Panella AJ, Velez JO, Lambert AJ, Campbell GL (2007) Chikungunya virus in
707 US travelers returning from India, 2006. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 13, 764–767.
708 https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1305.070015

709 Lequime S, Bastide P, Dellicour S, Lemey P, Baele G (2020) nosoi: A stochastic agent-based transmission
710 chain simulation framework in r. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 11, 1002–1007.
711 https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210x.13422

712 Lequime S, Dehecq J-S, Matheus S, Laval F de, Almeras L, Briolant S, Fontaine A (2020) Modeling intra-
713 mosquito dynamics of Zika virus and its dose-dependence confirms the low epidemic potential of *Aedes*
714 *albopictus*. *PLOS Pathogens*, 16, e1009068. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1009068

715 Marin-Lopez A, Jiang J, Wang Y, Cao Y, MacNeil T, Hastings AK, Fikrig E (2021) *Aedes aegypti* SNAP and a
716 calcium transporter ATPase influence dengue virus dissemination. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*,
717 15, e0009442. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0009442

718 Mayton EH, Hernandez HM, Vitek CJ, Christofferson RC (2021) A Method for Repeated, Longitudinal
719 Sampling of Individual *Aedes aegypti* for Transmission Potential of Arboviruses. *Insects*, 12, 292.
720 https://doi.org/10.3390/insects12040292

721 Merkling SH, Raquin V, Dabo S, Henrion-Lacritick A, Blanc H, Moltini-Conclois I, Frangeul L, Varet H, Saleh
722 M-C, Lambrechts L (2020) Tudor-SN Promotes Early Replication of Dengue Virus in the *Aedes aegypti*
723 Midgut. *iScience*, 23, 100870. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2020.100870

724 Merwaiss F, Filomatori CV, Susuki Y, Bardossy ES, Alvarez DE, Saleh M-C (2020) Chikungunya virus
725 replication rate determines the capacity of crossing tissue barriers in mosquitoes. *Journal of Virology*,
726 95. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.01956-20

727 Modahl C, Chowdhury A, Oliveira F, Kini RM, Pompon J (2019) Salivary gland RNA-seq from arbovirus-
728 infected *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* provides insights into virus transmission. *Access*
729 *Microbiology*, 1. https://doi.org/10.1099/acmi.imav2019.po0039

730 Moloney RM, Kmush B, Rudolph KE, Cummings DAT, Lessler J (2014) Incubation Periods of Mosquito-Borne
731 Viral Infections: A Systematic Review. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 90, 882–
732 891. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.13-0403

733 Mombouli J-V, Bitsindou P, Elion DOA, Grolla A, Feldmann H, Niama FR, Parra H-J, Munster VJ (2013)
734 Chikungunya Virus Infection, Brazzaville, Republic of Congo, 2011. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 19,
735 1542–1543. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1909.130451

736 Moutailler S, Barré H, Vazeille M, Failloux A (2009) Recently introduced *Aedes albopictus* in Corsica is
737 competent to Chikungunya virus and in a lesser extent to dengue virus. *Tropical Medicine &*
738 *International Health*, 14, 1105–1109. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3156.2009.02320.x

739 Nguyet MN, Duong THK, Trung VT, Nguyen THQ, Tran CNB, Long VT, Dui LT, Nguyen HL, Farrar JJ, Holmes
740 EC, Rabaa MA, Bryant JE, Nguyen TT, Nguyen HTC, Nguyen LTH, Pham MP, Nguyen HT, Luong TTH, Wills
741 B, Nguyen CVV, Wolbers M, Simmons CP (2013) Host and viral features of human dengue cases shape
742 the population of infected and infectious *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes. *Proceedings of the National*
743 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 110, 9072–9077.
744 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1303395110

745 Pagès F, Peyrefitte CN, Mve MT, Jarjaval F, Brisse S, Iteman I, Gravier P, Tolou H, Nkoghe D, Grandadam M
746 (2009) *Aedes albopictus* Mosquito: The Main Vector of the 2007 Chikungunya Outbreak in Gabon. *PLoS*
747 *ONE*, 4, e4691. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0004691

748 Panning M, Grywna K, Esbroeck M van, Emmerich P, Drosten C (2008) Chikungunya fever in travelers
749 returning to Europe from the Indian Ocean region, 2006. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 14, 416–422.
750 https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1403.070906

751 Paupy C, Delatte H, Bagny L, Corbel V, Fontenille D (2009) *Aedes albopictus*, an arbovirus vector: from the
752 darkness to the light. *Microbes and Infection / Institut Pasteur*, 11, 1177–1185.
753 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micinf.2009.05.005

754 Paupy C, Kassa FK, Caron M, Nkoghé D, Leroy EM (2012) A Chikungunya Outbreak Associated with the
755 Vector *Aedes albopictus* in Remote Villages of Gabon. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*, 12, 167–
756 169. https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2011.0736

757 Pesko K, Westbrook CJ, Mores CN, Lounibos LP, Reiskind MH (2009) Effects of Infectious Virus Dose and
758 Bloodmeal Delivery Method on Susceptibility of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* to Chikungunya
759 Virus. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 46, 395–399. https://doi.org/10.1603/033.046.0228

760 Pompon J, Manuel M, Ng GK, Wong B, Shan C, Manokaran G, Soto-Acosta R, Bradrick SS, Ooi EE, Missé D,
761 Shi P-Y, Garcia-Blanco MA (2017) Dengue subgenomic flaviviral RNA disrupts immunity in mosquito
762 salivary glands to increase virus transmission. *PLOS Pathogens*, 13, e1006535.
763 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1006535

764 Raquin V, Lambrechts L (2017) Dengue virus replicates and accumulates in *Aedes aegypti* salivary glands.
765 *Virology*, 507, 75–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2017.04.009

766 Raquin V, Merkling SH, Gausson V, Moltini-Conclois I, Frangeul L, Varet H, Dillies M-A, Saleh M-C,
767 Lambrechts L (2017) Individual co-variation between viral RNA load and gene expression reveals novel
768 host factors during early dengue virus infection of the *Aedes aegypti* midgut. *PLoS Neglected Tropical*
769 *Diseases*, 11, e0006152. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006152

770 Raquin V, Moro CV, Saucereau Y, Tran F-H, Potier P, Mavingui P (2015) Native *Wolbachia* from Aedes
771 albopictus Blocks Chikungunya Virus Infection *In Cellulo*. *PLOS ONE*, 10, e0125066.
772 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125066

773 RCoreTeam (2022) R Core Team (2021) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

774 Riswari SF, Ma'roef CN, Djauhari H, Kosasih H, Perkasa A, Yudhaputri FA, Artika IM, Williams M, Ven A van
775 der, Myint KS, Alisjahbana B, Ledermann JP, Powers AM, Jaya UA (2015) Study of viremic profile in
776 febrile specimens of chikungunya in Bandung, Indonesia. *Journal of clinical virology : the official*
777 *publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical Virology*, 74, 61–5.
778 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2015.11.017

779 Robison A, Young MC, Byas AD, Rückert C, Ebel GD (2020) Comparison of Chikungunya Virus and Zika Virus
780 Replication and Transmission Dynamics in *Aedes aegypti* Mosquitoes. *The American journal of tropical*
781 *medicine and hygiene*. https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0143

782 Sanchez-Vargas I, Harrington LC, Black WC, Olson KE (2019) Analysis of Salivary Glands and Saliva from
783 *Aedes albopictus* and *Aedes aegypti* Infected with Chikungunya Viruses. *Insects*, 10, 39.
784 https://doi.org/10.3390/insects10020039

785 Sanchez-Vargas I, Olson KE, Black WC (2021) The Genetic Basis for Salivary Gland Barriers to Arboviral
786 Transmission. *Insects*, 12, 73. https://doi.org/10.3390/insects12010073

Schuffenecker I, Iteman I, Michault A, Murri S, Frangeul L, Vaney M-C, Lavenir R, Pardigon N, Reynes J-M, Pettinelli F, Biscornet L, Diancourt L, Michel S, Duquerroy S, Guigon G, Frenkiel M-P, Bréhin A-C, Cubito N, Desprès P, Kunst F, Rey FA, Zeller H, Brisse S (2006) Genome Microevolution of Chikungunya Viruses Causing the Indian Ocean Outbreak. *PLoS Medicine*, 3, e263. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0030263

Schwartz O, Albert ML (2010) Biology and pathogenesis of chikungunya virus. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 8, 491–500. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2368

Smith DL, Battle KE, Hay SI, Barker CM, Scott TW, McKenzie FE (2012) Ross, Macdonald, and a Theory for the Dynamics and Control of Mosquito-Transmitted Pathogens. *PLoS Pathogens*, 8, e1002588. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1002588

Tsetsarkin KA, Vanlandingham DL, McGee CE, Higgs S (2007) A single mutation in chikungunya virus affects vector specificity and epidemic potential. *PLoS pathogens*, 3, e201. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.0030201

Vazeille M, Madec Y, Mousson L, Bellone R, Barré-Cardi H, Sousa CA, Jiolle D, Yébakima A, Lamballerie X de, Failloux A-B (2019) Zika virus threshold determines transmission by European *Aedes albopictus* mosquitoes. *Emerging Microbes & Infections*, 8, 1668–1678. https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2019.1689797

Vazeille M, Moutailler S, Coudrier D, Rousseaux C, Khun H, Huerre M, Thiria J, Dehecq J-S, Fontenille D, Schuffenecker I, Despres P, Failloux A-B (2007) Two Chikungunya Isolates from the Outbreak of La Reunion (Indian Ocean) Exhibit Different Patterns of Infection in the Mosquito, *Aedes albopictus*. *PLoS ONE*, 2, e1168. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0001168

Vega-Rúa A, Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, Mousson L, Vazeille M, Fuchs S, Yébakima A, Gustave J, Girod R, Dusfour I, Leparc-Goffart I, Vanlandingham DL, Huang Y-JS, Lounibos LP, Ali SM, Nougairede A, Lamballerie X de, Failloux A-B (2015) Chikungunya Virus Transmission Potential by Local Aedes Mosquitoes in the Americas and Europe. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 9, e0003780. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0003780

Vega-Rúa A, Schmitt C, Bonne I, Locker JK, Failloux A-B (2015) Chikungunya Virus Replication in Salivary Glands of the Mosquito *Aedes albopictus*. *Viruses*, 7, 5902–5907. https://doi.org/10.3390/v7112917

Vega-Rua A, Zouache K, Caro V, Diancourt L, Delaunay P, Grandadam M, Failloux A-B (2013) High Efficiency of Temperate *Aedes albopictus* to Transmit Chikungunya and Dengue Viruses in the Southeast of France (["Moreira, Luciano A."], Eds,). *PLoS ONE*, 8, e59716. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059716

Venturi G, Luca MD, Fortuna C, Remoli ME, Riccardo F, Severini F, Toma L, Manso MD, Benedetti E, Caporali MG, Amendola A, Fiorentini C, Liberato CD, Giammattei R, Romi R, Pezzotti P, Rezza G, Rizzo C (2017) Detection of a chikungunya outbreak in Central Italy, August to September 2017. *Eurosurveillance*, 22, 17–00646. https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.es.2017.22.39.17-00646

Viglietta M, Bellone R, Blisnick AA, Failloux A-B (2021) Vector Specificity of Arbovirus Transmission. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 12, 773211. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2021.773211

Wagar ZL, Tree MO, Mpoy MC, Conway MJ (2017) Low density lipopolyprotein inhibits flavivirus acquisition in Aedes aegypti. *Insect Molecular Biology*, 26, 734–742. https://doi.org/10.1111/imb.12334

Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, Grolemund G, Hayes A, Henry L, Hester J, Kuhn M, Pedersen T, Miller E, Bache S, Müller K, Ooms J, Robinson D, Seidel D, Spinu V, Takahashi K,

828 Vaughan D, Wilke C, Woo K, Yutani H (2019) Welcome to the Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source*
829 *Software*, 4, 1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

830 Williams AE, Franz AWE, Reid WR, Olson KE (2020) Antiviral Effectors and Gene Drive Strategies for
831 Mosquito Population Suppression or Replacement to Mitigate Arbovirus Transmission by *Aedes*
832 *aegypti*. *Insects*, 11, 52. https://doi.org/10.3390/insects11010052

833 Zhang Y, Yan H, Li X, Zhou D, Zhong M, Yang J, Zhao B, Fan X, Fan J, Shu J, Lu M, Jin X, Zhang E, Yan H (2022)
834 A high-dose inoculum size results in persistent viral infection and arthritis in mice infected with
835 chikungunya virus. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 16, e0010149.
836 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0010149

837 Zhu Y, Zhang R, Zhang B, Zhao T, Wang P, Liang G, Cheng G (2017) Blood meal acquisition enhances
838 arbovirus replication in mosquitoes through activation of the GABAergic system. *Nature*
839 *Communications*, 8, 1262. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01244-6

840 Zouache K, Fontaine A, Vega-Rua A, Mousson L, Thiberge J-M, Lourenco-De-Oliveira R, Caro V, Lambrechts
841 L, Failloux A-B (2014) Three-way interactions between mosquito population, viral strain and
842 temperature underlying chikungunya virus transmission potential. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
843 *Biological Sciences*, 281, 20141078. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.1078