

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Short Title: Public communication by mosquito control programs

Public communication and outreach by mosquito programs in the United States

Nicole Thomas¹, Jo Anne G. Balanay¹, Sachiyo Shearman², Stephanie L. Richards^{1*}

¹Department of Health Education and Promotion, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina, United States of America

²School of Communication, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina, United States of America

* richardss@ecu.edu

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

Abstract

Blood feeding female mosquitoes cause itchy welts and can transmit pathogens that cause diseases such as chikungunya, malaria, West Nile encephalitis, and Zika. Mosquito control programs conduct mosquito, pathogen, and epidemiological surveillance, carry out source reduction, treat mosquito habitats with larvicides or adulticides, and disseminate information to the public. Here, 100 organizations (e.g., private/public mosquito control programs, national professional mosquito/pest control associations) in the United States were asked to complete a survey (N=39 respondents) about their public communication and outreach efforts. Results indicate most programs (N=27, 69%) have dedicated personnel for public communication. A checklist was constructed to compare communication strategies between a subset of program websites and Facebook pages. Recommendations for improving public communication and outreach strategies for mosquito control programs are discussed.

Introduction

Mosquitoes (Order Diptera, Family Culicidae) transmit pathogens that impact public and veterinary health (e.g., yellow fever [virus], dengue [virus], West Nile [virus], chikungunya [virus], filariasis [worm], and malaria [protozoan]) [1]. Mosquito control programs (MCP) protect public health from mosquito-related issues using methods such as community education, source reduction, bed nets, larvicides, adulticides, biological control, and release of sterilized or genetically altered mosquitoes [1, 2, 3]. Surveillance informs operational decisions of MCP and helps programs evaluate intervention efforts [4].

Social media is one of the largest growing forms of community outreach in the United States (US) and 93% of adults use the internet [5]. Facebook is the most used social media platform (68% of internet users) [6, 7]. In some cases, people prefer social media platforms over mainstream outlets as a news source due to a stronger sense of connection by direct association or perceived closeness [8, 9]. Program utilization of different media platforms including social media, podcasts, television, and websites could increase public knowledge and awareness of mosquito-borne diseases and methods for prevention. Internet-based sources include micro-blog posts (e.g., Facebook and X [formerly Twitter]), web encyclopedias, search queries, and other forms of social media [10]. These sources are especially helpful in areas where public health agencies are limited such as developing countries [10]. In some cases, public health agencies deal with public distrust of government officials to provide safe solutions (e.g., yellow fever vaccine) [9]. Media platforms are readily available to public health agencies; however, lack of real-time information distributed through these methods can lead to misinformation [11].

57 Through investigation and analysis of social media and other outreach methods used by
58 county/state/federal agencies, private pest control companies, and professional public health
59 pest control associations, public education about mosquito-borne disease and mosquito control
60 could be streamlined and improved. There has not yet been another comparative analysis of
61 such entities. Improvement of outreach effort can facilitate public communication by MCP and
62 combat misinformation. Analysis of keywords in public social media messages can help identify
63 early indicators to integrate infodemiology (i.e., online information about human behavior) and/or
64 infoveillance (i.e., surveillance of online information) into public communication campaigns [10,
65 12]. Exploration of public search and commenting queries on social media outlets can show
66 areas of rising public concern related to potential outbreaks. Google search demands have
67 been previously analyzed for a flea-related disease outbreak of plague [13] and similar methods
68 could be implemented for mosquito-borne diseases. Google Trends (GT) can track internet
69 search history for a specified range of time using term and topic searches [13]. Spatiotemporal
70 search parameters allowed GT to monitor relationships between public internet searches and
71 confirmed plague cases in the region of interest [13].

72 Investigation into methods used by the public when conducting illness queries can be a
73 starting point for surveillance data. Some of the public may post on Facebook to obtain
74 opinions, while others may use Google or YouTube to search for information [8]. Some
75 individuals search government health agency websites for information, and others utilize social
76 media for broadcasting on X about symptoms [8]. The public generally seeks information when
77 health risk uncertainty rises and may engage in popular social platforms (i.e., Reddit) for posting
78 questions soliciting public response [8]. Emphasis placed on illness symptom searches or posts
79 is “syndromic surveillance” [14]. On platforms such as X, an individual can post symptoms and
80 their geo-location data is recorded [14]. By highlighting key words and emojis, symptoms can be
81 tracked, and outbreak trends confirmed to evaluate risk [14]. Countries, such as the US, United
82 Kingdom, and China track influenza trends by comparing social media trends with confirmed
83 outbreaks [14]. The same study showed that, where locations were tracked, relevant tweets
84 were positively correlated with observed public health data. On a larger scale, predictions of
85 epidemics could be made from social media data which could help track transmission of vector-
86 borne, food-borne, and other illnesses [10].

87 One obstacle facing public health educational campaigns is determining the best
88 method(s) for disseminating information including evaluation of: 1) information source, 2)
89 messaging, 3) audience, and 4) method of information delivery (e.g., news, blog, social media)
90 [6, 15]. Hence, the evaluation of outreach methods used by public and private health agencies

91 would be beneficial [6]. To combat misinformation, public health agencies should effectively
92 distribute accurate information to the public [15]. The internet presence of public health
93 agencies should engage the public through resources such as social media [15]. Public and
94 private MCP must also engage with the public via social and traditional types of media and
95 advertising must be balanced with reliable information to maintain credibility [8].

96 Public interaction strategies should provide up-to-date information and enhance
97 engagement with social media posts [15]. Knowledge of diverse disciplines (e.g., business,
98 psychology, marketing) can enhance public health messaging [6]. Scientists should succinctly
99 relay findings to be received by audiences of different backgrounds and cultures to increase the
100 likelihood of reading and sharing [16]. Improved marketing tools can help structure messaging
101 to increase positive perception of information [6]. Public health organizations often disseminate
102 information via academic journals and academic conferences [6]. Higher value is placed on
103 information received by people with whom the recipient has an established relationship or
104 familiarity [9]. Therefore, increasing internet and social media presence is vital for public health
105 organizations to help establish themselves as consistent and knowledgeable sources of
106 information to the community [15].

107 Daily news reporting is related to public internet searches; hence, these sources can be
108 paired to streamline and improve communication [17]. This relationship was observed during the
109 2016 Zika virus outbreak and showed an avenue of information sharing to further mosquito
110 control education [17]. Increasing public awareness of public health pests and mosquito-borne
111 diseases can be a joint effort between different cooperating agencies and industries. Risk
112 communication, messaging, and other forms of outreach can be improved when multiple
113 specialties provide input that considers audience diversity. Through utilization of market
114 research and business strategies, public health agencies can incorporate cost-effective
115 communication methods to disseminate information [6, 16]. Social media outlets provide an
116 opportunity for cost-conscious public health messaging [11]. Risk communication plans should
117 be in place and implemented before an outbreak. Proactive evaluation of current methods of
118 communicating public health pest information would inform policy recommendations to improve
119 accessibility. Consequently, the objectives of this study were to: 1) Identify and describe current
120 public communication and outreach methods for disseminating information on mosquito-borne
121 disease awareness and prevention by county/state/federal agencies, private vector/pest control
122 companies, and professional public health pest control associations, and 2) Analyze
123 communication and outreach methods regarding mosquito-borne disease to provide
124 recommendations on improving future communication.

125 **Materials and Methods**

126 **Survey on Public Communication**

127 Mosquito control programs vary in size and scope across the US; hence, differences in
128 public communication methods were expected between programs. To assess and compare
129 MCP communication efforts, a 23-question survey was developed in Qualtrics and administered
130 by email to 100 MCP and other mosquito-related organizations across the US from March 7-22,
131 2024 (Appendix). The survey was approved by the East Carolina University Medical Center
132 Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB# 24-000301). Participants provided written consent prior to
133 completing the survey. Questions included topics such as geographic location, funding level,
134 mosquito-borne diseases of concern, frequency/ types of communication utilized, status of
135 communication staff, and availability of funding for communication.

136 The following types of MCP were contacted: state agency (SA), federal agency (FA),
137 private pest control agency (PR), public pest control (PU), and professional public health pest
138 control associations (PA). Programs in the following US regions were contacted: 1) North-
139 Atlantic (N=10), 2) Mid-Atlantic (N=21), 3) South-Atlantic (N=10), 4) North-Central (N=15), 5)
140 West-Central (N=10), 6) South Central (N=13), 7) North-Pacific (N=10), 8) South-Pacific/Pacific
141 (N=10). One federal agency (no headquarter location provided) was also included (Table 1).

142 **Table 1.** Regions and agency types for 100 programs contacted.

Region	Total	State Agency (SA)	Federal Agency (FA)	Private Pest Control (PR)	Public Pest Control (PU)	Professional Public Health Pest Control Agency (PA)
North-Atlantic	10	2	2	3	2	1
Mid-Atlantic	21	1	-	12	6	2
South Atlantic	10	-	1	3	5	1
North Central	15	-	1	1	12	1
West Central	10	-	-	-	9	1
South Central	13	-	1	6	6	-
North Pacific	10	1	-	1	8	-
South Pacific	10	3	1	2	3	1

143

144 **Website and Social Media Analysis**

145 A media content checklist was developed to evaluate a subset of respondent
146 organizations for items such as: Feedback provided to the public, mosquito-borne disease
147 awareness and prevention information, and messaging delivery systems/methods. This
148 checklist allowed for comparison of websites with social media resources. The checklist
149 assessed: 1) program purpose, 2) mosquito-borne disease (e.g., diseases of concern, numbers
150 of cases/illness/death), 3) prevention strategies, and 4) information delivery methods (e.g.,
151 positive/negative messaging [benefits vs. risks], presence/absence of images, ability of
152 audience to provide feedback). The checklist was completed for a subset of five websites and
153 related Facebook pages including private pest control programs (this group was
154 underrepresented in the survey respondents), municipal mosquito control, and statewide non-
155 profit mosquito/pest association. These five organizations were randomly selected based on the
156 presence of a website and Facebook page. Facebook pages were evaluated for posts made
157 between January 1 - December 31, 2023.

158 **Data Analysis**

159 A total of 39 (39% response rate) complete surveys were received in Qualtrics and data
160 were analyzed with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 29, IBM, Armonk, New
161 York). Chi-square ($P<0.05$) was used to assess the association between reported funding and
162 personnel dedicated to risk communication.

163

Results

164 Some respondents skipped questions; therefore, total numbers may vary in figures. No
165 responses were received from private pest control programs. Respondents were from the
166 following US regions and states: North-Atlantic (N=2, 5%; New York), Mid-Atlantic (N=3, 8%;
167 North Carolina, Virginia), South-Atlantic (N=5, 13%; Georgia, South Carolina), North-Central
168 (N=13, 33%; Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin, Native American reservation between
169 Wisconsin and Michigan), West-Central (N=7, 18%; Colorado, Utah, Wyoming), South Central
170 (N=2, 5%; Louisiana), North-Pacific (N=1, 3%; Washington), and South-Pacific (N=6, 15%;
171 Arizona, California).

172 Respondent programs included: district (N=14; 36%) county environmental/public health
173 (N=10; 26%), other (N=8; 21%)(e.g., Indian Health Service, US Environmental Protection
174 Agency, and county mosquito programs through public works), state health (N=2; 5%), large
175 county (N=2; 5%), state/regional professional association (N=1; 3%), federal health (N=1; 3%),

176 and city public works (N=1; 3%) (Fig. 1). Programs reported an average of \$900,000 in total
177 annual program funding, ranging between \$0 to \$20,000,000.

178 **Fig. 1.** Program types of survey respondents.

179 Insert figure here.

180 Some respondents (N=20; 51%) indicated their program covered a larger region than where
181 they were based, while others (N=19; 49%) stated their program covered only the region in
182 which they were located. Programs covering a larger region indicated coverage areas included
183 other municipalities, counties, and multiple states.

184 Respondents (scale of 1-10; 1=weak, 10=strong) indicated an emphasis of 7.7 ± 2.4
185 (mean \pm standard deviation) on information-sharing regarding the specific diseases of
186 prevalence in their area. Examples of reasons for low ratings included, “we support other
187 entities in doing this but do not do so ourselves”, “we have no one dedicated to public outreach
188 and education”, and “we can do better”. None of the respondents select a value of 1. Low
189 emphasis ratings (i.e., 2-4) comprised 18% of the total responses. Medium emphasis ratings
190 (i.e., 5-7) were 8% of responses. Most (74%) indicated a high emphasis (i.e., 8-10) on
191 information sharing.

192 Most respondents (N=27; 82%) indicated having a dedicated public communication
193 outreach division for dissemination of information about vector-borne disease and/or mosquito
194 control. Five (15%) respondents indicated not having a public outreach division and one (3%)
195 was unsure. However, 34% (N=11) of respondents indicated their agency had funding
196 dedicated to public communication, 53% (N=17) did not have funding, and 13% (N=4) were
197 unsure. Chi-square analysis showed dedicated communication funding was significantly
198 associated with dedicated communication personnel ($X^2=43.04$; $P<0.01$).

199 Communication methods utilized by respondents included: 1) in-person/phone outreach
200 (N=29, 26%), 2) website (N=27, 24%), 3) printed brochures/advertising (N=26, 23%), 4) social
201 media (N=19, 17%), 5) virtual advertising (N=8, 7%), and 6) other (N=4, 4%)(i.e., press releases
202 and news broadcasts) (Fig. 2).

203 **Fig. 2.** Methods of public communication used by respondents.

204 Insert figure here.

205 The primary communication methods indicated by respondents included: 1) response to citizen
206 pest complaints via site visits (N=28, 13%) and phone (N=28, 13%), 2) website (N=26, 12%), 3)
207 brochures (N=24, 11%), 4) email (N=21, 10%), 5) booth at local fair (N=19, 9%), 6) Facebook
208 (N=14, 7%), 7) Instagram (N=13, 6%), 8) workshop/conference (N=13, 6%), 9) visits to schools

209 for education (N=11, 5%), and 10) local media outlet advertisements (N=10, 5%) (Figure 2).
210 When programs were asked about types of online communication, most (N= 26, 48%) was
211 informational, followed by risk communication for an impending health concern (N=23, 43%), or
212 other (N=3, 6%) (e.g., promotion of services or press releases), and some programs selected
213 'other', indicating they did not use online communication (N=2, 3%).

214 Images (N=26; 93%) were frequently used in online public communication messages,
215 followed by web links (N=25, 89%), text (N=23, 82%), infographics (N=19, 68%), and alteration
216 of fonts (N=18, 64%). One respondent (4%) also reported using quick response (QR) Codes.
217 Respondents indicated that positive framework/phrasing was their primary delivery method
218 (N=19, 90%) while negative framework (N=6, 29%) was used less frequently. In some cases,
219 audiences could provide feedback (N=8, 38%) and paid advertisements (N=4, 19%) were also
220 utilized. When customizing information for social media, programs shorten messaging (N=14,
221 50%), modify messages for the target audience (N=11, 39%), or make no modifications to
222 messaging (N=10, 36%). Some respondents indicated restricting public comments on social
223 media (N=4, 14%) and/or selected 'other' (i.e., messaging handled by a public information
224 officer or is posted on their website [N=2, 7%]).

225 Respondents indicated communicating with the public always (N=17, 57%) or most of
226 the time (N=9, 30%) and most (N=19, 63%) never communicated with agricultural industries.
227 Most programs communicated with beekeepers sometimes (N=10, 33%), most of the time (N=7,
228 23%), or never (N=7, 23%). Most programs communicated with health professionals sometimes
229 (N=10, 40%) or never (N=7, 23%). Programs not communicating with the public listed these
230 barriers: lack of time (N=11, 25%), lack of communication personnel (N=11, 25%), lack of
231 funding (N=8, 18%), lack of social media expertise (N=8, 18%), and/or perceived lack of public
232 interest (N=2, 5%).

233 A checklist was completed to analyze program websites and Facebook pages for five
234 private pest control programs over a one-year period. An additional evaluation was carried out
235 on the most active Facebook post. Media content analysis included private pest control
236 companies (N=3, 60%), city mosquito control (N=1, 20%), and a statewide non-profit
237 mosquito/pest association (N=1, 20%). Programs showed information about mosquito borne
238 diseases (N=3, 60%) where diseases of concern (N=2, 40%) and total number of illness/deaths
239 (N=1, 20%) were listed. Most (N=3, 60%) did not include prevention strategies to protect against
240 mosquito-borne illness. Most Facebook pages included prevention strategies (N=4, 80%) that
241 focused on treatment options and sales and allowed the public to leave comments. All programs

242 provided images on both their website and Facebook page, including mosquitoes/vectors (N=4,
243 80%), treatments (N=3, 60%), positive people (N=2, 40%), and the environment (N=1, 20%).

244 The Facebook analysis showed that all programs (N=5, 100%) provided information in a
245 positive framework whereas one program (20%) also used negative framework in their
246 messaging. All websites (N=5, 100%) showed a statement of purpose and links to additional
247 information on external websites. However, 60% (N=3) of Facebook pages did not include a
248 statement of purpose. The average number of agency posts on all five Facebook pages during
249 the study period was (mean \pm standard deviation) 58.6 ± 47.1 and 51.7 ± 85.3 images were
250 shared via Facebook posts. When the most popular post (21 likes/comments/shares ± 24.5) on
251 each program's Facebook page was analyzed, 57% (N=4) of the posts focused on public
252 participation (e.g., community meeting), while others included information about disease
253 prevention and awareness.

254 Discussion

255 Vector control agencies communicate with the public in a variety of ways including, but
256 not limited to television, radio, newspaper, website, and social media [18]. Social media showed
257 an increase in communication frequency between the public and health organizations during the
258 Zika epidemic in 2015-2016 [19]. Social media allows individuals not connected to traditional
259 media sources to remain informed [3]. Web links can be provided for users to find additional
260 information and this method is frequently utilized [3]. Environmental health literacy can facilitate
261 risk communication by helping vector control programs address audiences from a variety of
262 backgrounds [20]. This study showed that site visits and phone calls are the most utilized
263 methods of public communication, and that social media are underutilized for reaching a larger
264 audience. Organizations involved in information dissemination on mosquito control and
265 mosquito-borne disease prevention need to give more attention to improving social media use
266 as a potentially efficient and effective communication tool for the public.

267 Previous studies show low survey participation in states that have mosquito control
268 programs with lower budgets, which may have also limited survey responses here [21]. Limited
269 funding may have also contributed to the lack of survey participation by private pest control
270 companies, as funding efforts are likely weighted towards field personnel and equipment [21].
271 This should be investigated further. Funding for public communication was related to the
272 presence of dedicated communication personnel, which may imply the importance of financial
273 resources in improving an organization's communication and outreach program.

274 **Study Limitations**

275 Although we had a relatively high (39%) survey response rate from a variety of different
276 types of programs across the US, it was difficult to recruit private pest control companies to
277 complete the survey due to lack of direct contact information. Program funding reported by
278 respondents varied widely between programs (range, 0 to \$20 million) and budgetary
279 constraints for communication efforts varied, likely due to program size and priorities.

280 Analysis of a subset of programs' social media and websites was successful but may be
281 limited due to the willingness of the public to engage with posts [11]. Even if someone positively
282 views a post, they may or may not respond to the post [11]. This study did not consider the
283 number of times a post was viewed but this may be considered if other social media platforms
284 are analyzed.

285 **Future Studies**

286 Information about public communication methods of private pest control programs
287 should be studied further and compared to public programs. Future studies may consider
288 implementing public communication strategies and assessment of efficacy within different types
289 of audiences (Lindsey, 2022). It would be beneficial for future research to expand the number of
290 organizations whose media content is analyzed through checklists, including county, state, and
291 federal programs.

292 **Conclusions and Recommendations**

293 Communication personnel existed in most surveyed programs and many respondents
294 use social media as a communication tool. Several organizations prioritize communication about
295 mosquito control and mosquito-borne diseases; however, these efforts are often handled by a
296 public information officer or at a federal rather than regional level. Notably, this study found that
297 the primary reasons for lack of online communication are due to the lack of personnel with
298 social media knowledge and lack of personnel dedicated to communication, hence this
299 deficiency could be improved with training on public communication via social media. Mosquito
300 control programs could consider redistributing funding and/or priorities to increase public risk
301 communication efforts. Posting information about disease prevention and community
302 involvement would likely help programs increase public engagement, awareness, and possibly
303 long-term support for programs.

304 **Acknowledgements**

305 The authors thank the many mosquito control program directors and others that provided
306 valuable feedback for our survey.

307 **Author Contributions**

308 Conceptualization: Jo Anne G. Balanay, Stephanie Richards, Sachiyo Shearman, Nicole
309 Thomas.
310 Data curation: Nicole Thomas.
311 Formal analysis: Nicole Thomas.
312 Investigation: Jo Anne G. Balanay, Stephanie Richards, Sachiyo Shearman, Nicole Thomas.
313 Methodology: Jo Anne G. Balanay, Stephanie Richards, Sachiyo Shearman, Nicole Thomas.
314 Project administration: Jo Anne G. Balanay, Stephanie Richards, Sachiyo Shearman, Nicole
315 Thomas.
316 Writing – original draft: Nicole Thomas, Stephanie L. Richards.
317 Writing – review & editing: Jo Anne G. Balanay, Stephanie Richards, Sachiyo Shearman, Nicole
318 Thomas.
319

320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370

Appendix

Survey Questions

1. Please list the location information for your mosquito control or other pest/vector-related program:
City: _____
County: _____
State: _____
2. Does your program cover a larger region or area (beyond the area of program residence)? If yes, please describe.
 - Yes
If yes, please describe: _____
 - No
3. Please select the choice which best describes your program type:
 - County mosquito control program within environmental/public health department
 - City mosquito control program within public works department.
 - Large county mosquito control effort
 - Mosquito control district
 - State health agency
 - Federal health agency
 - State or regionally funded professional association
 - National professional association
 - Non-profit mosquito/ pest association
 - Private pest control company
 - Other: _____. Please describe.
4. On the scale of 1 to 10, 1 = low emphasis and 10 = strong emphasis, how much does your program emphasize public communication regarding specific mosquito-borne disease(s) and/or other vector-borne diseases in your region?
5. Please explain why you selected your emphasis rating _____

6. What is the approximate total annual budget of your vector control program?

7. Please list the approximate percentage of vector control program budget dedicated to each of the following:
 - Public education
 - Mosquito or other pest surveillance
 - Arbovirus surveillance: List arboviruses surveyed:

 - Mosquito control (e.g., larvicide, adulticide, source reduction)
 - Control of other vectors/pests (Please specify.)
 - Other: _____
8. From what source does your program receive funding?
If funding comes from a range of sources, please list approximate percentage received from each source below.
 - Donations: _____
 - City/County Government: _____
 - State Government: _____
 - Federal Government: _____
 - Federal, State, or Local Government Grant (Please Specify): _____

- 371 ○ Other: _____
- 372 ○ Unsure/Don't know
- 373 9. Does your organization or program have a division, group, and/or individual
- 374 personnel dedicated or partially dedicated to public communication/outreach?
- 375 ○ Yes
- 376 If yes, please specify: _____
- 377 ○ No
- 378 ○ Unsure/ Don't Know
- 379 10. Does your program have dedicated funding for public communication efforts about
- 380 vector-related issues (e.g. mosquito-borne or other vector-borne diseases, mosquito
- 381 control treatments, etc.)?
- 382 ○ Yes
- 383 ○ If yes, approximately how much funding is dedicated to communication?
- 384 Please describe.
- 385 ○ No
- 386 ○ Unsure/ Don't Know
- 387 11. What are the primary methods of public communication utilized by your program?
- 388 Please assign the items below a number, based on your program's frequency of use,
- 389 where 1 is the most frequently utilized. Please list 0 for items that do not apply.:
- 390 ○ Facebook
- 391 ○ Instagram
- 392 ○ Email
- 393 ○ Website
- 394 ○ Response to citizen pest complaints via site visit and/or in person consultation
- 395 ○ Response to citizen pest complaints via phone
- 396 ○ Workshop/ Conference
- 397 ○ Booth at local fair
- 398 ○ Visit to schools for education
- 399 ○ Brochures
- 400 ○ Local media outlet advertisements (e.g., regional news broadcasts, local
- 401 newspapers, etc.). Please list and describe.
- 402 ○ My program does not conduct public communication.
- 403 ○ Other: _____. Please describe.
- 404 12. If your program conducts public communication, what types of messaging are used?
- 405 Please assign the items below a number, based on your program's frequency of use,
- 406 where 1 is the most frequently utilized. Please list 0 for items that do not apply.
- 407 Beside each applicable category, please specify if this communication is virtual or in-
- 408 person:
- 409 ○ Informational (related to a notable subject or specific pest)
- 410 ○ Risk communication (notifying the public of an impending health risk/concern
- 411 facing members of the community)
- 412 ○ My program does not conduct public communication.
- 413 ○ Other: _____. Please describe.
- 414 13. If your program conducts online public communication, approximately how frequently
- 415 does your program update communication messaging? Select one and please
- 416 specify if this communication is virtual or in-person:
- 417 ○ Once or more per week.
- 418 ○ Biweekly
- 419 ○ Monthly
- 420 ○ Seasonally
- 421 ○ Bi-annually

- 422 ○ Annually
423 ○ As needed if there is a disease outbreak
424 ○ As needed to provide details about mosquito control treatments
425 ○ My program does not conduct online public communication.
426 ○ Other: _____. Please describe.
- 427 14. Please describe program plans (if any) to initiate or further develop mosquito/pest
428 communication.
- 429 _____
- 430 15. If your program does not conduct public communication, please describe barrier(s)
431 that may impact this. Choose all that apply:
432 ○ Lack of time
433 ○ Lack of funding
434 ○ Lack of/limited personnel dedicated to communication.
435 ○ Lack of personnel expertise in social media or other online communication skills.
436 ○ Perceived lack of public interest.
437 ○ Other: _____. Please describe.
- 438 16. What communication platforms are utilized by your program?
439 ○ In-person/Phone Outreach
440 ○ Printed Brochures/Advertisement
441 ○ Virtual Advertisement
442 ○ Program Website
443 ○ Social Media
444 ○ Other – Please specify: _____
- 445 17. What is the approximate percentage of communication that is Virtual or Online
446 versus In-Person/Phone Calls?
447 ○ Virtual or Online: _____
448 ○ In-Person/ Phone: _____
- 449 18. How is communication modified across media platforms used by your program?
450 Select all that apply:
451 ○ Abbreviated message for social media
452 ○ Comments restricted on social media
453 ○ Messages modified to reflect target audience
454 ○ Other – please explain. _____
455 ○ No modifications
- 456 19. What items are included in your public outreach messages? Select all that apply.
457 ○ Test
458 ○ Infographics
459 ○ Images
460 ○ Font alteration (e.g. change of colors, increasing boldness, including italics)
461 ○ Using web links
462 ○ Other – please specify. _____
- 463 20. Please describe your communication methods regarding delivery. Select all that
464 apply.
465 ○ Positive Framework/Phrasing
466 ○ Negative Framework/Phrasing
467 ○ Paid advertisements. Please specify (e.g. billboards, vehicle decals, virtual ads)
468 _____
469 ○ Allowing audience feedback – please specify if this is via survey, phone calls, or
470 public comments
- 471 21. How often do you target the following audiences with your mosquito/vector-related
472 information?

- 473 • General public
- 474 ○ Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always
- 475 • Health professionals
- 476 ○ Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always
- 477 • At risk populations (e.g., immunocompromised, elderly people sensitive to insecticides)
- 478 ○ Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always
- 479 • Beekeepers
- 480 ○ Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always
- 481 • Agricultural Industries
- 482 ○ Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, Always
- 483 • Other (Please describe.): _____
- 484

485 22. Please provide any additional feedback on communication here:

486 _____

487
488
489
490
491
492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550

References

1. Benelli G. Research in mosquito control: Current challenges for a brighter future. *Parasit Res.* 2015;114:2801–2805. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-015-4586-9> PMID: 26093499
2. Jones RT, Ant TH, Cameron MM, Logan JG. Novel control strategies for mosquito-borne diseases. *Phil Trans Roy Soc B: Biol Sci.* 2020;376:20190802. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0802> PMID: 33357056
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022 [cited August 16, 2022]. Prevention and control: Community engagement. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mosquitoes/guidelines/west-nile/prevention-control/community-engagement.html>
4. World Health Organization. 2023 [cited March 7, 2023]. Surveillance in emergencies. Available at: from <https://www.who.int/emergencies/surveillance>
5. Perrin A, Atske S. 2021 [cited April 2, 2021]. 7% of Americans don't use the internet. Who are they? *Pew Res Cent.* Available at: <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2021/04/02/7-of-americans-dont-use-the-internet-who-are-they/>
6. Brownson RC, Eyster AA, Harris JK, Moore JB, Tabak RG. Getting the word out: New approaches for disseminating public health science. *J Pub Hlth Manage Prac.* 2018;24:102–111. <https://doi.org/10.1097/phh.0000000000000673> PMID: 28885319
7. Greenwood S, Duggan M, Perrin A. 2020 [cited March 9, 2023]. Social media update 2016. *Pew Res Cent: Internet, Science, Tech.* Available from: <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2016/11/11/social-media-update-2016/>
8. Westerman D, Spence PR, Van Der Heide B. Social media as information source: Recency of updates and credibility of information. *J Comp-Med Comm.* 2013;19:171–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12041> No PMID
9. DiLorenzo S 2018 [cited Jan 1, 2023]. Rumors, mistrust hinder Brazil yellow fever vaccine campaign. *AP News.* Available from: <https://apnews.com/article/ea2f76fcd9594280a2287b9382d61e43>
10. Barros JM, Duggan J, Rebolz-Schuhmann D. The application of internet-based sources for public health surveillance (infoveillance): Systematic review. *J Med Inter Res.* 2020;22:1-11. <https://doi.org/10.2196/13680> PMID: 32167477
11. Carvajal P, Balanay J, Shearman S, Richards SL. Facebook and mosquito-borne disease outbreaks: An analysis of public responses to federal health agencies' posts about dengue and Zika in 2016. *PLoS Glob Pub Hlth.* 2022;2:e0000977. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0000977> PMID: 36962780
12. Mavragani A, Ochoa G. Google trends in infodemiology and infoveillance: Methodology framework. *JMIR Pub Hlth Surv.* 2019;5:e13439. <https://doi.org/10.2196/13439> PMID: 31144671
13. Bragazzi NL, Mahroum, N. Google trends predicts present and future plague cases during the plague outbreak in Madagascar: Infodemiological Study. *JMIR Pub Hlth Surv.* 2019;5:e13142. <https://doi.org/10.2196/13142> PMID: 30763255
14. Edo-Osagie O, Smith G, Lake I, Edeghere O, De La Iglesia B. Twitter mining using semi-supervised classification for relevance filtering in syndromic surveillance. *PLoS ONE.* 2019;14:e0210689. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210689> PMID: 31318885
15. Gatewood J, Monks SL, Singletary CR, Vidrascu E, Moore JB. Social media in public health: Strategies to distill, package, and disseminate public health research. *J Pub Hlth Manage Prac.* 2020;26:489-492. <https://doi.org/10.1097/phh.0000000000001096> PMID: 32732723
16. Milkman KL, Berger J. The science of sharing and the sharing of science. *Proc Nat Acad Sci.* 2014;111:13642–13649. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1317511111> PMID: 25225360

- 551 17. Southwell BG, Dolina S, Jimenez-Magdaleno K, Squiers LB, Kelly BJ. Zika virus–related
552 news coverage and online behavior, United States, Guatemala, and Brazil. *Em Inf Dis.*
553 2016;22,1320–1321. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2207.160415> PMID: 27100826
- 554 18. Mulderij-Jansen V, Elsinga J, Gerstenbluth I, Duits A, Tami A, Bailey A. Understanding
555 risk communication for prevention and control of vector-borne diseases: A mixed-method
556 study in Curaçao. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2020;14:e0008136.
557 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008136> PMID: 32282848
- 558 19. Lwin MO, Lu J, Sheldenkar A, Cayabyab YM, Yee AZ, Smith HE. Temporal and textual
559 analysis of social media on collective discourses during the Zika virus pandemic. *BMC*
560 *Pub Hlth.* 2020;20:804. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08923-y> PMID: 32471495
- 561 20. Lindsey M, Richmond B, Quintanar DR, Spradlin J, Halili L. Insights into improving risk
562 and safety communication through environmental health literacy. *Int J Env Res Pub Hlth.*
563 2022;19:5330. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19095330> PMID: 35564724
- 564 21. Nguyen V, Weaver-Romero AL, Wang X, Tavares Y, Bauer A, McDowell RC, Dorsainvil
565 C, Eason MD, Malcolm AN, Raz CD, Byrd BD, Riegel C, Clark M, Ber J, Harrison RL,
566 Evans CL, Zohdy S, Allen B, Campbell LP, Killingworth D, Grey EW, Riles MT, Lee Y,
567 Giordano BV. Survey of invasive mosquito surveillance and control capacity in
568 southeastern USA reveals training and resource needs. *J Am Mosq Control*
569 *Assoc.*2023;39:108–121. <https://doi.org/10.2987/22-7107> PMID: 36972520
- 570
571





Fig. 2



- County-Environmental/Public Health
- County-Standalone
- State Health Agency
- State/Regional Professional Association

- City-Public Works
- District
- Federal Health Agency
- Other

Figure