

1 Little disease but lots of bites: social, urbanistic, mobility, and entomological risk factors of human
2 exposure to *Aedes aegypti* in South Texas, U.S.

3
4 Nicole A. Scavo^{1,2*}, Jose G. Juarez¹, Luis Fernando Chaves³, Nadia A. Fernandez^{1,4}, Ester Carbajal¹,
5 Joshuah Perkin⁵, Berlin Londono-Renteria⁶, and Gabriel L. Hamer^{1*}

6 ¹ Department of Entomology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

7 ² Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, USA

8 ³ Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, School of Public Health and Department of Geography,
9 Indiana University, Bloomington IN, 47405 USA

10 ⁴ Instituto Politecnico Nacional, Centro de Biotecnologia Genomica, 88710, Reynosa, Mexico

11 ⁵ Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843

12 ⁶ Department of Tropical Medicine, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA

13

14 *corresponding authors: nicole.scavo@tamu.edu, gabe.hamer@ag.tamu.edu

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

30 **Abstract**

31 *Background*

32 *Aedes aegypti* presence, human-vector contact rates, and *Aedes*-borne virus transmission are highly
33 variable through time and space. The Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV), Texas, is one of the few regions
34 in the U.S. where local transmission of *Aedes*-borne viruses occurs, presenting an opportunity to evaluate
35 social, urbanistic, entomological, and mobility-based factors that modulate human exposure to *Ae.*
36 *aegypti*.

37

38 *Methodology & Principal Findings*

39 Mosquitoes were collected using BG-Sentinel 2 traps during November 2021 as part of an intervention
40 trial, with knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) and housing quality surveys to gather environmental
41 and demographic data. Human blood samples were taken from individuals and a Bitemark Assay
42 (ELISA) was conducted to quantify human antibodies to the *Ae. aegypti* Nterm-34kDa salivary peptide as
43 a measure of human exposure to bites. In total, 64 houses were surveyed with 142 blood samples
44 collected. More than 80% of participants had knowledge of mosquito-borne diseases and believed
45 mosquitoes to be a health risk in their community. Our best fit generalized linear mixed effects model
46 found four fixed effects contributed significantly to explaining the variation in exposure to *Ae. aegypti*
47 bites: higher annual household income, younger age, larger lot area, and higher female *Ae. aegypti*
48 abundance per trap night averaged over 5 weeks prior to human blood sampling.

49

50 *Conclusions*

51 Most surveyed residents recognized mosquitoes and the threat they pose to individual and public health.
52 Urbanistic (i.e., lot size), social (i.e., income within a low-income community and age), and
53 entomological (i.e., adult female *Ae. aegypti* abundance) factors modulate the risk of human exposure to
54 *Ae. aegypti* bites. The use of serological biomarker assays, such as the Bitemark Assay, are valuable tools

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

55 for surveillance and risk assessment of mosquito-borne disease, especially in areas like the LRGV where
56 the transmission of target pathogens is low or intermittent.

57

58 **Author Summary**

59 *Aedes aegypti* is a mosquito vector with public health importance on the global scale as it transmits
60 viruses such as dengue, chikungunya, and Zika. Although transmission rates of dengue and Zika are low
61 in the U.S., there are a few regions, including south Texas, where local transmission has occurred. Our
62 study aimed to evaluate the factors associated with risk of exposure to these viruses using a serological
63 bioassay that measured antibody response to an *Ae. aegypti* salivary protein to assess human-vector
64 contact. We collected mosquitoes, took human-blood samples, and conducted urbanistic and demographic
65 surveys in November 2021 in eight communities in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas. Our knowledge,
66 attitude, and practices survey found that most residents recognized adult mosquitoes, though few
67 individuals knew someone personally who been sick with a mosquito-borne disease. Outdoor adult
68 female *Ae. aegypti* abundance was positively associated with exposure to mosquito bites. Household
69 income, individual age, and lot area also significantly affected exposure levels. The Bitemark Assay we
70 used in this study can be utilized as a tool for entomological risk assessment and could be used as an
71 alternative to infection exposure in areas where mosquito-borne disease levels are low.

72

73 **Introduction**

74 The yellow fever mosquito, *Aedes aegypti* L. (Diptera: Culicidae), is the main vector of
75 arboviruses such as dengue, Zika, chikungunya, and Mayaro viruses. Diseases caused by these *Aedes*-
76 borne viruses pose a threat to global health with dengue virus (DENV) affecting 390 million people
77 annually (1), Zika having autochthonous transmission in 87 countries (2), and chikungunya causing an
78 average annual loss 106,000 disability-adjusted life years (DALY) (3). With no effective vaccines
79 available for protecting humans, public health authorities rely on controlling the mosquito vectors to

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

80 reduce disease. *Aedes aegypti* vector control has shown variable levels of efficacy in reducing mosquito
81 populations (4,5) and preventing disease transmission of arboviruses (6,7). With the risk of a shifting
82 global distribution of *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes (8) and some regions showing potential for vector presence
83 without associated viruses (9), novel methods of surveillance and control that focus on high-risk areas are
84 needed.

85 The region known as the Lower Rio Grande Valley (LRGV) along the U.S.-Mexico border in
86 south Texas is one of the few regions in the U.S. with local vector-borne transmission of *Aedes*-borne
87 viruses (10), and more recently human malaria (11). This can be explained by the fact that *Ae. aegypti* is
88 well-established in the area as an efficient urban vector due to its affinity for man-made container habitat
89 and highly anthropophilic behavior (12). *Colonias* are low-income, mostly Hispanic communities in the
90 area that are unincorporated leading to a general lack of services (e.g., poor water sanitation) (13) and
91 marginalized residents with little political power (14). Understanding the ecological and social factors that
92 modulate *Ae. aegypti* abundance and human exposure to mosquito bites is key to developing efficient and
93 effective vector control programs. Some of the previously detected risk factors for an increased indoor
94 and outdoor abundance in low and middle-income communities of the LRGV include demographic
95 indices (i.e., number of children and toddlers) and housing variables (i.e., air conditioning window-
96 mounted units, number of windows) (15). Furthermore, the presence of air-conditioning reduced the risk
97 of prior exposure to dengue virus in this region (16). However, we currently lack the understanding of
98 how some of these risk factors relate to human-vector interactions with the added component of human
99 mobility or how vector abundance translates to exposure to vector bites.

100 Current guidelines for evaluating the success of a vector control intervention recommend the use
101 of a human outcome variable, such as active infection or past exposure to pathogens, to inform
102 intervention efficacy (17). However, many regions with local transmission of mosquito-borne pathogens
103 do not have consistent and sufficient burden of human disease necessary for a human disease outcome
104 variable. For instance, West Nile virus (WNV) serosurvey in humans in Connecticut, U.S. didn't find

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

105 seropositive participants in their study despite WNV being prevalent in neighboring states and that birds
106 and mosquitoes were infected in the region (18,19). Similarly, the LRGV represents the margin of *Aedes*-
107 borne virus endemicity and has only sporadic local transmission of DENV (24 locally acquired cases
108 from 2010-2017) (20). The same pattern exists for malaria transmission, with a single autochthonous
109 human case of malaria in South Texas in 2023 (11). This makes evaluating an intervention using a human
110 disease outcome variable difficult to utilize in *a priori* planning of a vector control intervention study.

111 To overcome the limitation of measuring disease transmission reduction where disease
112 transmission is low, the use of a human antibody response to mosquito salivary proteins has emerged as a
113 valuable tool (21–24). In this context, humans develop antibodies in response to exposure to salivary
114 proteins associated with vector bites, and immunological assays can detect this past evidence of exposure
115 to vector bites. Moreover, such tools can be used to estimate the risk of arbovirus exposure in areas with
116 high transmission (25,26). It has been shown that for different mosquito species the use of IgG antibody
117 response to salivary gland proteins can serve as effective indicators of human-vector contact as an
118 exposure biomarker (23,27–29). Moreover, high bite exposure measured via this method has been linked
119 to disease levels in humans for both the malaria (27,28) and dengue systems (25,30) indicating its
120 usefulness in assessing mosquito-borne disease risk. IgG antibodies are used over IgM as their specificity
121 is greater (25), and is specific to the genus level, with some cross-reactivity between *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae.*
122 *albopictus* (31). However, immune response intensity is not linked to the likelihood of being bitten by
123 infected mosquitoes (32). Salivary biomarkers also allow for individual mosquito bite exposure
124 assessment and improve the ability to assess heterogeneity of disease transmission compared to
125 community-level entomological measures (23).

126 Our study focuses on comparing the use of an antibody response against *Ae. aegypti* salivary
127 gland peptides (i.e., Nterm34kDa) as an endpoint measurement in relation to mosquito abundance. Also,
128 we aim to describe social, urbanistic, and human mobility risk factors associated with *Ae. aegypti*
129 exposure in low-income communities (a.k.a. *colonias*) of the LRGV. The results build on our previous

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

130 work in the area to elucidate seasonal patterns of mosquito abundance (33), dispersal of *Ae. aegypti* from
131 discarded containers (34), and evaluating vector control interventions (5). Ultimately, our work can help
132 guide public health programs to better understand the local ecology of mosquitoes along the U.S.-Mexico
133 border and how vector control interventions might be evaluated in the LRGV and in other regions.

134

135 **Methods**

136 *Ethic statement*

137 This project received approval from the Institutional Review Board of Texas A&M University
138 (IRB2021-0886D). We obtained individual written consent from each household owner for the weekly
139 outdoor entomological surveillance and KAP surveys. We obtained individual written consent from adults
140 that participated in the blood sampling and assent from children for the same procedure.

141

142 *Study location and site selection*

143 The study was carried out in the county of Hidalgo, Texas, U.S., which is part of the LRGV
144 region located along the U.S.-Mexico border. The county of Hidalgo has an estimated 870,000
145 inhabitants, of which 92% consider themselves Hispanic or Latino origin, 26% are foreign borne
146 individuals and 24% live in poverty (based on income and family size/composition) (35). The climate in
147 this region is considered humid sub-tropical, with a cold/dry season from November to February (7–21
148 °C), and a rainy season that starts in April (18–30 °C), peaks in September (23–33 °C) and finishes in
149 October (19–31 °C) (36).

150 Sites were selected based on previous work in the area (15,33) where rapport had been built with
151 community members. Briefly, potential sites were selected based on average income level per household,
152 total number of households in the community, isolation of community, and distance from our base of
153 operations in Weslaco, Texas. We selected eight low-income communities based on high community
154 participation in past studies (Fig. 1).

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

155 **Figure 1.** Study sites in Hidalgo county in south Texas. 1 – La Piñata, 2 – South Donna, 3 – Balli, 4 –
156 Progresso, 5 – Chapa, 6 – Mesquite, 7 – Indian Hills West, 8 – Indian Hills East.

157

158 *Entomological Sampling*

159 Adult mosquito sampling was carried out as part of an Auto-Dissemination Station (ADS)
160 (BanfieldBio Inc.) intervention study. The intervention study was a cluster randomized control trial that
161 was carried out from June 2021 until March 2022. Mosquito sampling was done using BG Sentinel 2
162 traps (Biogents, Germany) baited with BG lures (Biogents, Germany) placed in the peridomicile of homes
163 at a density of 1 trap per 500m². Traps were left for 24 hours once per week, collected mosquitoes were
164 separated by sex and species (*Ae. aegypti*, *Ae. albopictus*, *Culex* sp., *Anopheles* and other) and stored at -
165 20°C. Mosquito identification was done based on morphology using taxonomic keys (37). Households
166 within communities were randomly selected based on desired trap density. Houses were approached for
167 participation in the study and if homeowners agreed, a trap was placed in their lot. If a household dropped
168 out of the study, a neighbor was recruited as a replacement in the following order: neighbor to the right,
169 neighbor to the left, neighbor in behind, neighbor directly across the street.

170

171 *Surveys and Blood Sample Collection*

172 Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice (KAP) and housing quality surveys were conducted
173 concurrently at the same household visit from November 1-13, 2021. The format of the surveys was
174 similar to those previously done by our group in 2017 and 2018 (38). Briefly, we used a structured face-
175 to-face questionnaire with a mixture of close-ended, semi-closed-ended, open-ended and ranking
176 questions (see Supplementary Material 1). The KAP survey asked participants about household
177 demographics, mosquitoes, the pathogens mosquitoes transmit, and their household member movement
178 patterns. The house quality survey consisted of evaluating the quality of windows, doors, and their
179 screens; housing construction material; and water holding containers and was carried out

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

180 counterclockwise from the main house entrance. We recorded housing materials (timber/metal, cement,
181 brick), screen quality (with holes, with no holes, size of holes) on windows and doors, the type of air
182 conditioning (A/C) unit (window mounted, central) if present, and the type and number of mosquito
183 container habitats found in each household peridomicile (see Supplementary Dataset 1). We defined the
184 peridomicile of a household as the area between the property limit to the main house perimeter. From 95
185 houses under weekly entomological surveillance, 47 agreed to participate with the KAP, blood sample
186 and housing surveys. An additional 17 houses were recruited as replacements (replacement houses were
187 recruited from the left, right, back and front, adjacent to the BG house, if no house agreed no further
188 house was recruited) for a total of 64 houses surveyed.

189 Blood sampling was done via finger prick and four circles of blood were collected on a 903-
190 protein saver card (GE Healthcare, USA). Samples were dried and placed into a plastic bag with desiccant
191 and stored at 4°C until further processing.

192

193 *Bitemark Assay*

194 The *An. gambiae* gSG6-P1 peptide for the measure of exposure to *Anopheles* spp. (27) and the
195 *Ae. aegypti* peptide Nterm-34kDa (39) were synthesized by Genscript (Piscataway, NJ, USA). ELISA
196 conditions were standardized as described elsewhere (27,30). Briefly, dried blood samples were prepared
197 by punching a 6mm circle out of the Whatman® 903 protein saver card (GE Healthcare, US), and eluting
198 it into 500 µL of elution buffer (PBS 1×) and incubating overnight at 4 °C. At the time of sample
199 preparation UltraCruz High Binding ELISA Multiwell Microplates (96-well) were coated with 100
200 µL/well of either gSG6-P1 or Nterm-34kDa peptide (2 µg/mL). Plates were incubated overnight at 4 °C
201 and blocked with 200 µL of 5% skim milk solution in PBS-tween 20 (0.05%) (Blocking buffer) for 30
202 min at 37 °C. The sample elution was used to prepare a 1:50 dilution of the sample in blocking buffer.
203 Then, 100 µL of that dilution were added to each well (individual samples were tested in duplicate).
204 Plates were incubated at 37 °C for 2 h, washed three times, then incubated 1 h at 37 °C with 100 µL/well

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

205 of a 1/1000 dilution of goat monoclonal anti-human IgG conjugated with horseradish peroxidase
206 (ABCAM, Cambridge, MA). After three final washes, colorimetric development was carried out using
207 tetra-methyl-benzidine (Abcam) as a substrate. In parallel, each assessed microplate contained in
208 duplicate: a positive control (pool of diluted samples), a negative control (wells with no human sample),
209 and a blank (Wells with no antigen). The blank was composed by wells containing no sample. The
210 reaction was stopped with 0.25 N sulfuric acid, and the optical density (OD) was measured at 450 nm.

211 Optical density normalization and plate to plate variation was performed as previously described
212 by our group and others (27). Briefly, antibody levels were expressed as the ΔOD value:
213 $\Delta OD = OD_x - OD_b$, where OD_x represents the mean of individual OD in both antigen wells and OD_b the
214 mean of the blank wells. For each tested peptide, positive controls of each plate were averaged and
215 divided by the average of the OD_x of the positive control for each plate to obtain a normalization factor
216 for each plate as previously described (27). Each plate normalization factor was multiplied by plate
217 sample ΔOD to obtain normalized ΔOD that were used in statistical analyses.

218

219 *Statistical analysis*

220 We collected 99 variables between the KAP and housing surveys. To make the analysis more
221 manageable, we used dimension reduction methods to generate two indices (windows and doors)
222 following the procedures described in Chaves et al. (40). To start, we carried out descriptive statistics on
223 the KAP and housing datasets to assess which variables had low standard deviation or extremely low or
224 high frequencies which would impact the results of our data reduction techniques. We removed variables
225 that fell under these categories, that were colinear in nature, or that had a high degree of missing values
226 not collected in the original surveys. If variables were colinear in nature, we kept the variables that had
227 been shown to be important in other studies based on our knowledge of the literature. The door and
228 window indices were generated via Principal Components Analysis (PCA) by grouping variables
229 according to their relevance to door, window, and host categories. Other indices were tested, though only

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

230 these three were kept as they explained more than 50% of the cumulative variability. Details on index
231 creation and PCAs biplots can be found in Supplementary Material 1.

232 After data reduction and elimination of identification variables (e.g., street name, latitude,
233 longitude) from the dataset, 47 explanatory variables remained. We then chose to select 12 variables from
234 this set so that our n/k value would be above ten (41). We used our knowledge of the literature to identify
235 10 variables from our set that were relevant to our study (41,42). Rows with missing data were omitted
236 from the analysis.

237 Our outcome variable of interest was individual exposure to *Ae. aegypti* bites measured via the
238 Bitemark Assay (i.e., ΔOD). We analyzed how social, urbanistic, entomological, and movement factors
239 were associated with bite exposure using a generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) approach. A mixed
240 model was chosen to account for the potential lack of spatial independence (i.e., individuals nested within
241 households and households nested within communities). While both linear mixed models (32,43) and
242 GLMMs (44–46) have been used in similar serological-biomarker studies, we chose a Gaussian GLMM
243 because they are an ideal tool for analyzing normal data whose independence is constrained by different
244 factors (e.g., spatial or temporal) and that are modeled as random effects (47,48) in our study.

245 We constructed a global model (mgloball) to evaluate the effect of 10 fixed effects on ΔOD
246 while controlling for non-independence among houses surveyed in the same communities. The 10 fixed
247 effects included average distance in miles traveled per week, income (2 levels: $< \$25,000$, $> \$25,000$), host
248 community index (host.1), door index (door.2), age (years), sex (2 levels: male, female), AC type (4
249 levels: window, central, mini-split, none), average abundance of *Ae. aegypti* females averaged over 5
250 weeks prior to sampling, area of lot (m^2), and total containers in the lot (SM1, Table 1). Details on
251 variable selection can be found in Supplementary Material 1. Individuals nested with homes with homes
252 nested within each of eight communities was set as a random effect. Restricted Maximum likelihood
253 (REML) was used due to the unbalanced nature of our dataset (47). Abundance of *Ae. aegypti* females

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

254 was averaged over 5 weeks as IgG response to bites has been shown to last for a least 4 weeks (49) and is
255 more persistent than *Anopheles* IgG responses (50).

256 We first created a global model (mglobl1) that had a Gaussian distribution with an identity link
257 as our outcome variable is continuous. To check model assumptions, we lotted the distribution of
258 residuals and assessed QQ plots. Results showed deviation from the expected distribution, so we next ran
259 another global model (mglobal2) using a log link for a Gaussian distribution. Plotted residuals from
260 mglobal2 showed a normal distribution. Backward elimination was used to simplify mglobal2 such that
261 simpler models with lower AIC values were kept (42,51). All models were generated, and figures were
262 created using R Version 4.3.2 (September 1, 2023), except for Fig. 1 which was created using QGIS
263 (version 3.16.6-Hannover). R code can be found in Supplementary Material 2 and a more detailed
264 statistical description can be found in Supplementary Material 3.

265

266 **Results**

267 In total, 64 adult humans from different households were interviewed using our KAP survey. The
268 human knowledge level of adult mosquitoes was high with 100% of interviewees recognizing an adult
269 mosquito specimen. Fewer individuals were able to identify larval or pupal mosquitoes (35.9 %). Most
270 interviewees (90.6%) believed mosquitoes affect their families either as a nuisance, health risk, or cause
271 of allergies, though the level of the problem they believed mosquitoes caused varied (Table 1).
272 Knowledge of mosquito-borne diseases was also high, 81.3% of respondents had heard of them before the
273 interview. Most participants (82.8%) considered mosquito-borne disease a risk to their community,
274 though few knew someone personally who had been infected (28.1%). Lots surveyed had an average size
275 of 682 m² (sd=236) with a variety of vegetation cover and vegetation height. Few lots (14.3%) actively
276 stored water on their property for later use. However, most lots (76.6%) had other containers that could
277 serve as larval habitat if filled with water via a rain event. Most houses had some form of air conditioning
278 with window units being the most common followed by central systems (Table 2).

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

279

280 **Table 1.** Knowledge, attitudes, and practices of household heads in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, Texas
 281 related to mosquitoes and their diseases.

Knowledge, Attitudes, & Practices	Response	No. positive responses/Total (%)
Mosquitoes	Recognized mosquito larvae or pupae	23/64 (35.9)
	Recognized adult mosquitoes	64/64 (100)
	Believed mosquitoes effect their families	58/64 (90.6)
	Believed mosquitoes were most abundant in the summer	53/64 (82.8)
	Believed mosquitoes were most abundant in the evening	57/64 (89.1)
	Considered mosquitoes to be a problem in their community	62/63 (98.4)
	Small or moderate problem	28/63 (44.4)
	Serious problem	15/63 (23.8)
	Very serious problem	19/63 (30.1)
Mosquito-borne diseases	Had heard about mosquito-borne diseases	52/64 (81.3)
	Dengue	31/64 (48.4)
	Zika	28/64 (43.8)
	Chikungunya	5/64 (7.8)
	West Nile Virus	4/64 (6.3)
	Malaria	3/64 (4.7)
	Considered mosquito-borne diseases of concern to their community	53/64 (82.8)
	Low	11/64 (17.2)
	Moderate	14/64 (21.9)
High	27/64 (42.2)	
	Knew someone who had been infected with a mosquito-borne disease	18/64 (28.1)

282

283 **Table 2.** Housing and lot variables in the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

Question	Response	No. positive responses/total (%)
Water storage on property	Yes	9/63 (14.3)
Air conditioning type	None	3/63 (4.8)
	Window	39/63 (61.9)
	Minisplit	6/63 (9.5)
	Central	15/63 (23.8)
% cover of vegetation in lot	< 25	20/64 (31.3)
	25-50	14/64 (21.9)
	51-75	22/64 (34.4)
	> 75	8/64 (12.5)

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

Vegetation height	< 5 cm	37/64 (57.8)
	> 5 cm	27/64 (42.2)
Level of shade cover	None	7/64 (10.9)
	Little	34/64 (53.1)
	A lot	23/64 (35.9)
Orderliness	Disorderly	25/64 (39.1)
	Average	25/64 (39.1)
	Orderly	14/64 (21.9)
Housing type	Custom	27/63 (42.9)
	Manufactured	17/63 (27.0)
	Mobile	19/63 (30.2)
Roof material	Shingles	48/63 (76.2)
	Metal	10/63 (15.9)
	Other	5/63 (7.9)
Wall material	Brick	8/64 (12.5)
	Cement	12/64 (18.8)
	Timber	39/64 (60.9)
	Other	5/64 (7.8)
Larval containers	Absent	15/64 (23.4)
	Present	49/64 (76.6)

284

285 Over the course of the five weeks before the blood samples were collected, a total of 1,379
 286 female *Ae. aegypti* were collected, with an average of 2.9 ± 0.005 caught per trap night. The mean of
 287 ΔOD values from the Bitemark Assay for *Ae. aegypti* was 0.12, with a range of 0.05 – 0.43. No
 288 *Anopheles* were caught during the five weeks prior to human blood sampling. The range of ΔOD for
 289 *Anopheles* was 0.08 – 0.35 with a mean of 0.18 ± 0.004 .

290 Given the large number of variables we collected, two indices were generated by grouping
 291 variables of similar nature together using PCA: door and window. Plots of the PCAs and their
 292 interpretation can be found in Supplementary Material 1. Descriptive statistics of the 12 explanatory
 293 variables can be found in Supplementary Materials 1. Minimization of AIC via backward elimination
 294 identified the best fit model which considered the following covariates: annual household income, age of
 295 participant, lot area, and the female *Ae. aegypti* abundance per trap night averaged over five weeks prior
 296 to human blood sampling. Households with an annual income of >\$25,000 (i.e., 35% of households) were
 297 more 1.21(Exponentiated 95% CI: 1.06 – 1.39) times more likely to be exposed to *Ae. aegypti* bites. Age
 298 was also a significant indicator of bite exposure, with older individuals being 7% less likely to be bitten.

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

299 Larger lots were 1.11(Exponentiated 95% CI: 1.04 – 1.17) times more likely to have individuals in the
300 household exposed to bites. For each additional adult female *Ae. aegypti* in the lot, humans were 1.12
301 (Exponentiated 95% CI: 1.05 – 1.18) times more likely to be exposed to bites.

302

303 Discussion

304 The results from our KAP survey indicate that most residents recognized adult mosquitoes, had
305 heard of mosquito-borne disease, and considered it to be a problem in their communities. Even so, less
306 than one third of residents surveyed knew someone personally who had been affected by a mosquito-
307 borne disease. These results further illustrate that the LRGV is an area of low dengue endemicity (9)
308 where human disease outcome variables such as human dengue incidence are not good surveillance or
309 intervention evaluation tools. In areas of low malaria endemicity where it is difficult to detect active
310 human infection by the parasite, serological evidence of past exposure has been recommended as an
311 alternative to measuring active infection (21,22). Moreover, one of these serological biomarkers, IgG
312 response to species-specific salivary proteins, have been positively linked to clinical malaria (27,28) and
313 higher viremia in dengue patients (25). Although the intensity of the immune response cannot be used as
314 an indicator of exposure to a dengue-positive mosquito (32), the serological biomarker is a good tool to
315 use in areas like the LRGV where infection risk is comparatively low but still present (52).

316 We evaluated the Bitemark Assay, which measures to IgG response to the *Ae. aegypti* Nterm-
317 34KDa peptide, to relate female *Ae. aegypti* abundance to human exposure to their bites with the goal of
318 evaluating an alternative tool in the surveillance of *Ae. aegypti*, their associated viruses, and interventions
319 aimed at *Ae. aegypti* population control. Since serological biomarkers have been suggested as a cheaper
320 and quicker option than entomological measures (52), it is important to assess the relationship between
321 bite exposure and *Ae. aegypti* abundance. Our results corroborate a previously established link between
322 *Ae. aegypti* abundance and bite exposure measured via a serological biomarker, a link that has been
323 shown for both larval (44) and adult (32) abundance measures. Humans in homes with higher abundance

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

324 of *Ae. aegypti* in traps had 1.12 times higher exposure for each individual mosquito than humans in
325 homes with fewer *Ae. aegypti* in traps. We did not sample the indoor vector abundance as we have done
326 in past studies in these communities (33), so we don't know how this positive but weak association with
327 outdoor abundance would have compared to indoor abundance.

328 Our results indicate that there are other factors – environmental and social in nature - that predict
329 exposure to *Ae. aegypti* bites in the LRGV. Socially, age and income were significant predictors of
330 exposure. A higher income (i.e., >\$25,000), led to more exposure to *Ae. aegypti* bites, a finding that is an
331 expected extension of Juarez et al. (2021b) work in the area who found that medium income, i.e.,
332 \$25,000-50,000, was an indicator of higher outdoor *Ae. aegypti* relative abundance than in low- or high-
333 income areas. While Martina and colleagues (33) found low-income communities to have a higher
334 relative abundance of *Ae. aegypti* mosquitoes than mid- or high-income communities, their study design
335 drew income data from the U.S. Census at the block level where our study and Juarez et al. (15) used
336 income data at the household level. These differences in scale could explain the difference in the results, a
337 phenomenon widely described in ecology as the paradox of how resource availability is described
338 depending on a density measurement (53). Another possible explanation for these differences is that all
339 our communities are classified as low-income and it is possible that higher income households, within
340 this lower income context, have more exposure to *Ae. aegypti* bites. This could be due to these households
341 have more resources for outdoor spaces such as more plant pots-saucers or water features that could serve
342 as habitat for larva.

343 To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to find a relationship between SES, as
344 measured by income, and exposure to *Ae. aegypti* bites. Other studies have showed mixed results in terms
345 of SES variables and bite exposure. For example, one SES variable, occupation type, has been associated
346 with exposure previously (32) while education level has been shown to have no effect on exposure (54).
347 In our study, age was negatively associated with exposure to *Ae. aegypti* bites indicating that younger
348 people were more likely to be bitten than older people. In previous studies, age has been a contributor to

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

349 bite exposure levels, though the directionality of the relationship varied among studies (32,44,54).
350 Doucoure and colleagues (44) propose three hypotheses to understand the difference in exposure between
351 adults and children: 1) antibody response is directly correlated to the bites received, 2) children have
352 stronger reactions to bites than adults, or 3) adults experience desensitization to bites. Although this study
353 was not designed to interrogate these three hypotheses, we observed that children had different mobility
354 and behaviors than adults, such that they spent most of their time away from home (i.e., at school) or
355 inside (i.e., sleeping). These differences could translate to different exposure levels to *Ae. aegypti* bites
356 (first hypothesis). Our results showed consistency with previous work in regard to lot size (15,55), i.e.,
357 larger lots were associated with higher bite exposure.

358 Our study has several limitations. First, our group has been working in the LRGV in the same
359 communities for at least 5 years. Because of this, the people we surveyed may have more knowledge
360 about mosquitoes and their biology compared to the wider community since they have had years of
361 exposure to our past community engagement and outreach (56). Moreover, most of our surveys were
362 conducted during the day during the week, meaning that generally retired or individuals without normal
363 business hour work schedules were surveyed. This could have biased the age structure of our study.

364 Our study supports the use of the Nterm-34kDa serological biomarker as a proxy for adult *Ae.*
365 *aegypti* entomological surveillance and provides an example of how it can be effective for assessing risk
366 in areas of low arboviral endemicity. We recommend further studies on the use of the Bitemark Assay to
367 provide insights into the strength of this tool to measure risk factors associated with human exposure to
368 vector bites as well as an outcome variable for vector control trials.

369

370 **Acknowledgments**

371 We appreciate the support of the residents and city and country public health agencies in the Lower Rio
372 Grande Valley, TX who collaborated with us to conduct this study. We thank Danya Garza, Salvador

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

373 Solis, Odaliz Saucedo, Javier Elizondo, Chris Roundy, and Charlotte Rhodes for their assistance in the
374 field.

375

376 **References**

377

- 378 1. Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, et al. The global
379 distribution and burden of dengue. *Nature*. 2013;496(7446):504–7.
- 380 2. World Health Organization. Zika Epidemiology Update. 2019.
- 381 3. Puntasecca CJ, King CH, Labeaud AD. Measuring the global burden of Chikungunya and
382 Zika viruses: A systematic review. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* 2021; 15(3).
- 383 4. Bowman LR, Donegan S, McCall PJ. Is Dengue vector control deficient in effectiveness
384 or evidence?: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* 2016;10(3):
385 e0009055.
- 386 5. Juarez JG, Chaves LF, Garcia-Luna SM, Martin E, Badillo-Vargas I, Medeiros MCI, et al.
387 Variable coverage in an Autocidal Gravid Ovitrap intervention impacts efficacy of *Aedes*
388 *aegypti* control. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 2021; 00: 1-12.
- 389 6. Sharp TM, Lorenzi O, Torres-Velásquez B, Acevedo V, Pérez-Padilla J, Rivera A, et al.
390 Autocidal gravid ovitraps protect humans from chikungunya virus infection by reducing
391 *Aedes aegypti* mosquito populations. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2019;13(7): e0007538.
- 392 7. Utarini A, Indriani C, Ahmad RA, Tantowijoyo W, Arguni E, Ansari MR, et al. Efficacy
393 of *Wolbachia*-infected mosquito deployments for the control of dengue. *N. Engl. J. Med.*.
394 2021;384(23):2177–86.

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

- 395 8. Kraemer MUG, Reiner RC, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Gilbert M, Pigott DM, et al. Past and
396 future spread of the arbovirus vectors *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*. *Nat Microbiol.*
397 2019 May 1;4(5):854–63.
- 398 9. Olson MF, Juarez JG, Kraemer MUG, Messina JP, Hamer GL. Global patterns of
399 aegyptism without arbovirus. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2021;15(5). e0009397.
- 400 10. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Potential Range of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes*
401 *albopictus* in the United States, 2017. 2023.
- 402 11. Texas Department of State Health Services. Health Advisory: Locally Acquired Malaria
403 Case. 2023.
- 404 12. Eder M, Cortes F, Teixeira de Siqueira Filha N, Araújo de França GV, Degroote S, Braga
405 C, et al. Scoping review on vector-borne diseases in urban areas: Transmission dynamics,
406 vectorial capacity and co-infection. *Infect. Dis. Poverty.* 2018; 7:90.
- 407 13. Hargrove WL, Juárez-Carillo PM, Korc M. Healthy vinton: A health impact assessment
408 focused on water and sanitation in a small rural town on the U.S.-Mexico border. *Int. J.*
409 *Environ. Res. Public Health.* 2015 Apr 7;12(4):3864–88.
- 410 14. Braier M. The Right to Light: Visibility and government in the Rio Grande Valley
411 colonias. *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.* 2020;110(4):1208–23.
- 412 15. Juarez JG, Garcia-Luna S, Medeiros MCI, Dickinson KL, Borucki MK, Frank M, et al.
413 The eco-bio-social factors that modulate *Aedes aegypti* abundance in south Texas border
414 communities. *Insects.* 2021;12(2):1–16.
- 415 16. Reiter P, Lathrop S, Bunning M, Biggerstaff B, Singer D, Tiwari T, et al. Texas lifestyle
416 limits transmission of dengue virus. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 2003; 9(1).
- 417 17. World Health Organization. Global Vector Control Response 2017-2030. 2017.

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

- 418 18. Mccarthy TA, Hadler JL, Julian K, Walsh SJ, Biggerstaff BJ, Hinten SR, et al. West Nile
419 Virus serosurvey and assessment of personal prevention efforts in an area with intense
420 Epizootic activity: Connecticut, 2000. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 2001; 951(1): 307-316.
- 421 19. McMillan JR, Armstrong PM, Andreadis TG. Patterns of mosquito and arbovirus
422 community composition and ecological indexes of arboviral risk in the Northeast United
423 States. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2020 Feb 1;14(2).
- 424 20. Rivera A, Adams LE, Sharp TM, Lehman JA, Waterman SH, Paz-Bailey G. Morbidity
425 and Mortality Weekly Report Travel-Associated and Locally Acquired Dengue Cases
426 [Internet]. 2010. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/dengue/>
- 427 21. Bousema T, Youssef RM, Cook J, Cox J, Alegana VA, Amran J, et al. Serologic markers
428 for detecting malaria in areas of low endemicity, Somalia, 2008. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.*
429 2010;16(3):392–9.
- 430 22. Sarr J, Orlandi-Pradines E, Fortin S, Sow C, Cornелиe S, Rogerie F, et al. Assessment of
431 exposure to *Plasmodium falciparum* transmission in a low endemicity area by using
432 multiplex fluorescent microsphere-based serological assays. *Parasit. Vectors.* 2011;4(1).
- 433 23. Poinsignon A, Cornелиe S, Mestres-Simon M, Lanfrancotti A, Rossignol M, Boulanger D,
434 et al. Novel peptide marker corresponding to salivary protein gSG6 potentially identifies
435 exposure to *Anopheles* bites. *PLoS One.* 2008;3(6).
- 436 24. Doucoure S, Drame PM. Salivary biomarkers in the control of mosquito-borne diseases.
437 *Insects.* 2015; 6: 961–76.
- 438 25. Londono-Renteria B, Cardenas JC, Cardenas LD, Christofferson RC, Chisenhall DM,
439 Wesson DM, et al. Use of anti-*Aedes aegypti* salivary extract antibody concentration to

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

- 440 correlate risk of vector exposure and dengue transmission risk in Colombia. PLoS One.
441 2013;8(12).
- 442 26. Londono-Renteria BL, Shakeri H, Rozo-Lopez P, Conway MJ, Duggan N, Jaber-Douraki
443 M, et al. Serosurvey of human antibodies recognizing *Aedes aegypti* D7 Salivary Proteins
444 in Colombia. Front. Public Health. 2018;6.
- 445 27. Montiel J, Carbal LF, Tobón-Castaño A, Vásquez GM, Fisher ML, Londono-Rentería B.
446 IgG antibody response against *Anopheles* salivary gland proteins in asymptomatic
447 *Plasmodium* infections in Narino, Colombia. Malar J. 2020 Jan 23;19(1).
- 448 28. Londono-Renteria BL, Eisele TP, Keating J, James MA, Wesson DM. Antibody response
449 against *Anopheles albimanus* (Diptera: Culicidae) salivary protein as a measure of
450 mosquito bite exposure in Haiti. J Med Entomol. 2010 Nov;47(6):1156–63.
- 451 29. Londono-Renteria B, Patel JC, Vaughn M, Funkhauser S, Ponnusamy L, Grippin C, et al.
452 Long-lasting permethrin-impregnated clothing protects against mosquito bites in outdoor
453 workers. Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. 2015;93(4):869–74.
- 454 30. Olajiga OM, Maldonado-Ruiz LP, Fatehi S, Cardenas JC, Gonzalez MU, Gutierrez-Silva
455 LY, et al. Association of dengue infection with anti-alpha-gal antibodies, IgM, IgG, IgG1,
456 and IgG2. Front. Immunol. 2022;13.
- 457 31. Doucoure S, Mouchet F, Cornélie S, DeHecq JS, Rutee AH, Roca Y, et al. Evaluation of
458 the human IgG antibody response to *Aedes albopictus* saliva as a new specific biomarker
459 of exposure to vector bites. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012;6(2).
- 460 32. Fustec B, Phanitchat T, Aromseree S, Pientong C, Thaewongiew K, Ekalaksananan T, et
461 al. Serological biomarker for assessing human exposure to *Aedes* mosquito bites during a

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

- 462 randomized vector control intervention trial in northeastern Thailand. PLoS Negl Trop
463 Dis. 2021 May 1;15(5).
- 464 33. Martin E, Medeiros MCI, Carbajal E, Valdez E, Juarez JG, Gracia-Luna S, et al.
465 Surveillance of *Aedes aegypti* indoors and outdoors using Autocidal Gravid Ovitrap in
466 South Texas during local transmission of Zika virus, 2016 to 2018. Acta Trop.
467 2019;192:129–37.
- 468 34. Juarez JG, Garcia-Luna S, Chaves LF, Carbajal E, Valdez E, Avila C, et al. Dispersal of
469 female and male *Aedes aegypti* from discarded container habitats using a stable isotope
470 mark-capture study design in South Texas. Sci. Rep. 2020;10(1).
- 471 35. U.S. Census Bureau. Hidalgo County, Texas [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2019 Mar 14].
472 Available from: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/hidalgocountytexas>
- 473 36. NOAA. Local Climatological Data, McAllen Miller Int Airport, TX. 2017 [cited 2019 Jan
474 29]. National Weather Service: Climate Prediction Center. Available from:
475 <https://w2.weather.gov/climate/xmacis.php?wfo=bro>
- 476 37. Darsie R, Ward R. Identification and geographical distribution of the mosquitoes of North
477 America, north of Mexico. University Press of Florida; 2016.
- 478 38. Juarez JG, Garcia-Luna SM, Medeiros MCI, Dickinson KL, Borucki MK, Frank M, et al.
479 The eco-bio-social Factors that modulate *Aedes aegypti* abundance in south Texas border
480 communities. Insects. 2021;12(2):183.
- 481 39. Manning JE, Oliveira F, Sepulveda N, Londono-Renteria B, Olajiga OM, Marin-Lopez A,
482 et al. *Aedes aegypti* anti-salivary proteins IgG levels in a cohort of DENV-like symptoms
483 subjects from a dengue-endemic region in Colombia. Front. Epidemiol. 2022; 2:1002857.

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

- 484 40. Chaves LF, Calzada JE, Rigg C, Valderrama A, Gottdenker NL, Saldaña A. Leishmaniasis
485 sand fly vector density reduction is less marked in destitute housing after insecticide
486 thermal fogging. *Parasit Vectors*. 2013;6(1).
- 487 41. Harrison XA, Donaldson L, Correa-Cano ME, Evans J, Fisher DN, Goodwin CED, et al.
488 A brief introduction to mixed effects modelling and multi-model inference in ecology.
489 *PeerJ*. 2018;2018(5).
- 490 42. Burnham KP, Anderson DR. Multimodel inference: Understanding AIC and BIC in model
491 selection. Vol. 33, *Sociological Methods and Research*. 2004. p. 261–304.
- 492 43. Ya-Umphun P, Cerqueira D, Parker DM, Cottrell G, Poinsignon A, Remoue F, et al. Use
493 of an *Anopheles* salivary biomarker to assess malaria transmission risk along the Thailand-
494 Myanmar border. *J. of Infect. Dis*. 2017;215(3):396–404.
- 495 44. Doucoure S, Mouchet F, Cournil A, Le Goff G, Cornelie S, Roca Y, et al. Human
496 antibody response to *Aedes aegypti* saliva in an urban population in Bolivia: A new
497 biomarker of exposure to dengue vector bites. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg*. 2012
498 Sep;87(3):504–10.
- 499 45. Kassam NA, Laswai D, Kulaya N, Kaaya RD, Kajeguka DC, Schmiegelow C, et al.
500 Human IgG responses to *Aedes* mosquito salivary peptide Nterm-34kDa and its
501 comparison to *Anopheles* salivary antigen (gSG6-P1) IgG responses measured among
502 individuals living in Lower Moshi, Tanzania. *PLoS One*. 2022;17.
- 503 46. Calzada JE, Saldaña A, González K, Rigg C, Pineda V, Santamaría AM, et al. Cutaneous
504 Leishmaniasis in dogs: Is high seroprevalence indicative of a reservoir role? *Parasitology*.
505 2015;142(9):1202–14.

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

- 506 47. Bolker BM, Brooks ME, Clark CJ, Geange SW, Poulsen JR, Stevens MHH, et al.
507 Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. Trends in
508 Ecology and Evolution. 2009; 24: 127–35.
- 509 48. Chaves LF. An entomologist guide to demystify pseudoreplication: Data analysis of field
510 studies with design constraints. J. Med. Entomol. 2010; 47(3):291–8.
- 511 49. Elanga Ndille E, Doucoure S, Poinsignon A, Mouchet F, Cornelie S, D’Ortenzio E, et al.
512 Human IgG antibody response to *Aedes* Nterm-34kDa salivary peptide, an
513 epidemiological tool to assess vector control in chikungunya and dengue transmission
514 area. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2016 Dec 1;10(12).
- 515 50. Orlandi-Pradines E, Almeras L, Denis de Senneville L, Barbe S, Remoué F, Villard C, et
516 al. Antibody response against saliva antigens of *Anopheles gambiae* and *Aedes aegypti* in
517 travellers in tropical Africa. Microbes Infect. 2007; 9(12–13):1454–62.
- 518 51. Venables WN, Ripley BD. Modern Applied Statistics with S. New York City : Springer;
519 2002.
- 520 52. Sagna AB, Yobo MC, Ndille EE, Remoue F. New immuno-epidemiological biomarker of
521 human exposure to *Aedes* vector bites: From concept to applications. Trop. Med. Infect.
522 Dis. 2018; 3:80.
- 523 53. R.C. Lewontin, R. Levins. On the characterization of density and resource availability.
524 Am. Nat . 1989;134(4).
- 525 54. Kassam NA, Laswai D, Kulaya N, Kaaya RD, Kajeguka DC, Schmiegelow C, et al.
526 Human IgG responses to *Aedes* mosquito salivary peptide Nterm-34kDa and its
527 comparison to *Anopheles* salivary antigen (gSG6-P1) IgG responses measured among
528 individuals living in Lower Moshi, Tanzania. PLoS One. 2022;17.

Risk factors for *Aedes aegypti* bite exposure in Texas

- 529 55. Donnelly MAP, Klueh S, Snyder RE, Barker CM. Quantifying sociodemographic
530 heterogeneities in the distribution of *aedes aegypti* among California households. PLoS
531 Negl. Trop. Dis. 2020;14(7):1–21.
- 532 56. Juarez JG, Carbajal E, Dickinson KL, Garcia-Luna S, Vuong N, Mutebi JP, et al. The
533 unreachable doorbells of South Texas: community engagement in colonias on the US-
534 Mexico border for mosquito control. BMC Public Health. 2022;22(1).
- 535

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.12.24302266>; this version posted February 13, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Figure 1