

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Response to: ‘Lack of evidence for Zika virus transmission by *Culex* mosquitoes’

Constância Ayres¹, Duschinka Guedes¹, Marcelo Paiva^{1,2}, Mariana Donato¹, Priscilla Barbosa¹, Larissa Krokovsky¹, Sura Rocha¹, Karina Saraiva¹, Mônica Crespo¹, Tatiana Rezende¹, Gabriel Wallau¹, Rosângela Barbosa¹, Cláudia Oliveira¹, Maria Alice Melo-Santos¹, Lindomar Pena¹, Marli Cordeiro¹, Rafael Franca¹, André Oliveira¹, Christina Peixoto¹ and Walter S Leal³

Emerging Microbes & Infections (2017) 6, e91; doi:10.1038/emi.2017.86; published online 18 October 2017

In response to the letter “Lack of evidence for Zika virus transmission by *Culex* mosquitoes” that questioned the findings published by Guedes *et al.*,¹ we vehemently disagree with the overall perspective. The argument raised by the authors is flawed. First and foremost, none of the previous reports (published before the 2015 ZIKV epidemic) indicating *Aedes* species as natural ZIKV vectors;^{2–6} and the one that led to the incrimination of *Ae. aegypti* as the main vector,⁷ triaged the specimens by gonotrophic stages (blood fed, black blooded, gravid or unengorged). In all cases, the mosquitoes were collected, and virus isolation/detection was conducted regardless of the feeding status. Please note that our results provide more detailed data (mosquito feeding status) than the previous studies, because we considered it important regarding another potential vector. Therefore, our findings do also satisfy the third vector incrimination criterion.

Second, the only technical criticism of our study regarding the high Ct values that were reported for the field-collected samples is equally unfounded. The authors stated, ‘For ZIKV transmission in the Americas, criterion 3 has been met only for *Ae. aegypti*, with detection of naturally infected mosquitoes with titers compatible with transmission-competence in Mexico⁸ and Brazil.’⁹ However, the study in Mexico did not report any Ct value for the field-caught mosquito samples, the authors of this study only discussed the low titer levels observed for the *Ae. aegypti* field samples, and Ferreira-de-Brito *et al.*⁹ reported Ct values for *Ae. aegypti* (36.68, 37.78 and 38.04) that are very similar to those observed in our study for *Cx. quinquefasciatus*, although these authors were not able to isolate ZIKV. This suggests that ZIKV infection in nature may exhibit a different performance when compared with artificial infection under laboratory conditions. All other quoted papers where low Ct values were registered relate to controlled experimental infections and not to natural infections. Indeed, vector competence is only one parameter of vectorial capacity; which include other entomological traits, such as abundance, longevity and biting rate, which are affected by abiotic factors.¹⁰ Therefore, the process of arbovirus transmission in nature is a complex phenomenon

that should not be limited to previous simple models without considering the great capacity for virus evolution and adaptation to new hosts as well as the high genetic diversity observed within and between mosquito populations. Differences in results of vector competence studies are common, and negative results have also been reported for *Ae. aegypti*, as pointed out by Guedes *et al.*¹ Unfortunately, the only study that has examined the same virus and *Culex* mosquito population reported very limited methodological details,¹¹ making it impossible to compare both studies.

It is important to highlight that the first studies of ZIKV vectors were performed in the context of yellow fever surveillance, which led to a strong bias for *Aedes* species. If other species are also involved in ZIKV transmission, research should be conducted in an appropriate manner to consider different densities of mosquitoes present in Zika outbreak areas, including those areas where *Ae. aegypti* is absent. Unfortunately, these studies have not considered the high abundance of *Cx. quinquefasciatus*, and the sampling methods used in most of these studies have favored *Aedes* species (Table 1). This fact would explain the lack of evidence supporting the incrimination of *Culex* in ZIKV transmission as noted by the letter. Considering the abundance of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* in Recife, the analysis of a greater number of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* pools enabled the detection of ZIKV in this mosquito species.¹

Last, although we were able to photograph mature ZIKV particles in the salivary glands at 7 days post infection, detected ZIKV-infected mosquitoes in nature, isolated ZIKV strains and sequenced the ZIKV genome from this mosquito species for the first time, which corroborates earlier finding,¹⁴ we understand that additional studies are needed to unambiguously establish the role of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* in ZIKV transmission. Additional reports concerning new data of virus surveillance in field-caught *Culex* and *Aedes* mosquitoes from other regions of Brazil are under review.

Regarding caution from part of the media and public health authorities, we followed the WHO statement on data sharing of

¹Instituto Aggeu Magalhães (IAM), Fundação Oswaldo Cruz (Fiocruz). Av. Moraes Rego, s/n Campus da UFPE, Cidade Universitária, Recife, PE 50670-420, Brazil; ²Centro Acadêmico do Agreste, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Caruaru, PE 55002-970, Brazil and ³University of California-Davis, Davis, CA 95616, USA

Correspondence: C Ayres

E-mail: tans@cpqam.fiocruz.br

Received 13 September 2017; accepted 19 September 2017

Table 1 Number of female mosquitoes analyzed for ZIKV detection in recent outbreaks of Zika virus in the Americas

Local	<i>Aedes aegypti</i>		<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i>		References
	N	+	N	+	
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	315	2	385	0	9
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	406	2	0	0	12
Recife, Brazil	408	2	1496	3	1
Chiapas, Mexico	472	15	~151	0	8
Jalisco, Mexico	179	6	115	15	13

Abbreviations: Number of females tested, N; number of ZIKV-positive pools, +.

relevant information,¹⁵ as mentioned in reference.⁹ We should also exercise caution not to overlook other potential vectors. After all, when comes to human health, caution is a two-way street. We believe that human population has the right to know about other possible routes of ZIKV transmission and to attempt preventing mosquito bites and thus reducing the risk of ZIKV infection.

To conclude, we would like to state that any researcher who is interested in repeating our experiments is very welcome at the Department of Entomology at Aggeu Magalhães Institute, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation. We believe that a healthy debate about Zika vectors will only contribute to the progress of scientific knowledge.

- Guedes DR, Paiva MH, Donato MM *et al*. Zika virus replication in the mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus* in Brazil. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2017; **6**: 1–11.
- Dick GWA, Kitchen SF, Haddow A. Zika virus (I). Isolations and serological specificity. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 1952; **46**: 509–520.
- Haddow AJ, Williams MC, Woodall JP *et al*. Twelve isolations of ZIKA Virus from *Aedes* (*Stegomyia*) *africanus* (Theobald) taken in an above a Uganda forest. *Bull World Health Organ* 1964; **31**: 57–69.

- Weinbren M, Williams M. Zika virus: Further isolations in the zika area, and some studies on the strains isolated. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 1958; **52**: 263–268.
- Akoua-Koffi C, Diarrassouba S, Béné VB *et al*. Investigation surrounding a fatal case of yellow fever in Côte d'Ivoire in 1999. *Bull Soc Pathol Exot* 2001; **94**: 227–230.
- McCrae AWR, Kirya BG. Yellow fever and Zika virus epizootics and enzootics in Uganda. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 1982; **76**: 552–562.
- Marchette NJ, Garcia RRA. Isolation of Zika virus from *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes in Malaysia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 1969; **18**: 411–415.
- Guerbois M, Fernandez-Salas I, Azar SR *et al*. Outbreak of Zika virus infection, Chiapas State, Mexico, 2015, and first confirmed transmission by *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes in the Americas. *J Infect Dis* 2016; **214**: 1349–1356.
- Ferreira-de-Brito A, Ribeiro I, Moraes de Miranda R *et al*. First detection of natural infection of *Aedes aegypti* with Zika virus in Brazil and throughout South America. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz Rio Janeiro* 2016; **111**: 655–658.
- Tabachnick WJ. Ecological effects on arbovirus-mosquito cycles of transmission. *Curr Opin Virol* 2016; **21**: 124–131.
- Fernandes RS, Campos SS, Ribeiro PS *et al*. *Culex quinquefasciatus* from areas with the highest incidence of microcephaly associated with Zika virus infections in the northeast region of Brazil are refractory to the virus. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz* 2017; **112**: 577–579.
- Ayllón T, Campos R de M, Brasil P *et al*. Early evidence for Zika virus circulation among *Aedes aegypti* mosquitoes, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2017; **23**: 1411–1412.
- Elizondo-Quiroga D, Medina-Sánchez A, Sánchez-González JM *et al*. Zika virus in salivary glands of five different species of wild-caught mosquitoes from Mexico. *bioRxiv* 2017, 151951.
- Guo X, Li C, Deng Y *et al*. *Culex pipiens quinquefasciatus*: a potential vector to transmit Zika virus. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2016; **5**: e102.
- WHO. WHO statement on the first meeting of the International Health Regulations (2005) (IHR 2005) Emergency Committee on Zika virus and observed increase in neurological disorders and neonatal malformations. Available at <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/statements/2016/1st-emergency-committee-zika/en/> (accessed 1 February 2016).



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in the credit line; if the material is not included under the Creative Commons license, users will need to obtain permission from the license holder to reproduce the material. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

© The Author(s) 2017