Pyrethroid susceptibility reversal in *Aedes aegypti:* a longitudinal study in Tapachula, Mexico

Patricia Penilla-Navarro[1], Francisco Solis-Santoyo[1], Alma Lopez-Solis[1], Americo D. Rodriguez[1],

Farah Vera-Maloof[1], Saul Lozano[2], Elsa Contreras-Mejía[3], Geovanni Vázquez-Samayoa[3], Rene

Torreblanca-Lopez[3], Rushika Perera[4], William C. Black IV[4] and Karla Saavedra-Rodriguez[4]*

[1]Centro Regional de Investigación en Salud Pública, Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública, Tapachula, Chiapas, México (30700)

[2]Centers for Diseases Control and Prevention, Arboviral Diseases Branch, Fort Collins, Colorado, 80521

[3]Jurisdiccion Sanitaria VII, Tapachula Chiapas, Antiguo Hospital General de Tapachula, Tapachula, Chiapas, Mexico (30798)

[4]Center for Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases, Colorado State University, 1685 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

* Corresponding author:
Karla Saavedra-Rodriguez
ksaavedr@colostate.edu
Center for Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases, Colorado State University, 1685 Campus Delivery,
Fort Collins, Colorado, 80521
Phone: (970) 231-1482

Short title: Pyrethroid resistance reversal in field *Aedes aegypti*

Abstract

Pyrethroid resistance in *Aedes aegypti* has become widespread after almost two decades of frequent applications to reduce the transmission of mosquito-borne diseases. Because few insecticide classes are available for public health use, insecticide resistance management (IRM) is proposed as a strategy to retain their use. A key hypothesis of IRM assumes that negative fitness is associated with resistance, and when insecticides are removed from use, susceptibility is restored. In Tapachula, Mexico, pyrethroids (PYRs) were used exclusively by dengue control programs for 15 years, thereby contributing to selection for high PYR resistance in mosquitoes and failure in dengue control. In 2013, PYRs were replaced by organophosphates—insecticides from a class with a different mode of action. To test the hypothesis that PYR resistance is reversed in the absence of PYRs, we monitored *Ae. aegypti's* PYR resistance from 2016 to 2021 in Tapachula. We observed significant declining rates in the lethal concentration 50 (LC_{50}), for permethrin and deltamethrin. For each month following the discontinuation of PYR use by vector control programs, we observed increases in the odds of mosquitoes dying by 1.5% and 8.4% for permethrin and deltamethrin, respectively. Also, knockdown-resistance mutations (*kdr*) in the voltage-gated sodium channel explained the variation in the permethrin LC_{50}s, whereas variation in the deltamethrin LC_{50}s was only explained by time. This trend was rapidly offset by application of a mixture of neonicotinoid and PYRs by vector control programs. Our results suggest that IRM strategies can be used to reverse PYR resistance in *Ae. aegypti*; however, long-term commitment by operational and community programs will be required for success.

Author summary

The mosquito *Aedes aegypti* is the principal urban vector of the viruses that cause three globally

significant diseases: dengue fever, chikungunya, and Zika fever, for which vaccines and

effective treatments are currently absent. The only way to control dengue, chikungunya, and

Zika fever outbreaks is to diminish vector populations. During epidemics, the most frequent way

of targeting adult mosquitoes is outdoor spatial spraying of insecticides. Control of *Ae. aegypti* is

difficult because limited insecticide classes are available for public health, leading to operational

practices that overuse single molecules for long periods of time, imposing great selection

pressure on mosquito populations for insecticide resistance. Insecticide resistance management

(IRM) is proposed as a strategy to prevent resistance and avoid depleting the susceptibility

resource in mosquito populations. IRM strategies assume that alternation of insecticides with

different toxicological modes of action will prevent the selection of resistance. Unfortunately,

very few field evaluations have reported IRM schemes to control *Ae. aegypti*. In our study, the

exclusive use of pyrethroids in vector control programs in Mexico from 1999 to 2013, led in the

selection of knockdown resistance (*kdr*) to pyrethroid insecticides. To address this issue, vector

control programs temporarily phased out pyrethroids from 2013 to 2019, substituting them with

an insecticide class with a different mode of action: organophosphates (OPs). During six years,

we monitored pyrethroid resistance in 24 mosquito populations from Tapachula, Mexico. We

show that discontinuing pyrethroids for six years led in pyrethroid resistance reversal in *Ae.*

aegypti in the field. However, high levels of pyrethroid resistance continue to jeopardize

operational application, necessitating longer periods of pyrethroid cessation and novel IRM

strategies to achieve lower resistance thresholds.

Introduction

Insecticide spraying is an important tool for mitigating *Aedes* adult populations and reducing the transmission of arboviruses such as dengue, Zika, and chikungunya [1]. The most used adulticides for *Aedes* control programs are classified by their mode of action as sodium channel modulators (e.g., pyrethroids and DDT) or acetylcholinesterase inhibitors (e.g., organophosphates and carbamates) [2, 3]. Because few formulations are approved and available for public health use, the operational tendency in dengue vector control is the use of a chemical class for long periods, resulting in an intense selection for resistance that eventually leads to mosquito control failure. Then, there is a subsequent switch to an alternative insecticide until resistance develops for that insecticide resulting in failure again. To resolve this challenge, insecticide resistance management (IRM) has been proposed as a strategy to retain the use of insecticides on natural populations [4].

IRM involves temporal or spatial rotations among alternative insecticides with different modes of action [3]. Ideally, these schemes reduce selection pressure from any one insecticide for any resistance mechanism [5-7]. Strikingly, few studies have demonstrated the value of IRM schemes in mosquito populations. One of these studies reported that annual rotations and spatial mosaics of pyrethroids (PYR), organophosphates (OP), and carbamates (CARB) reduced PYR resistance in *Anopheles albimanus* in Mexico compared to an exclusive PYR scheme [8, 9]. In *Ae. aegypti*, a 3-month randomized trial in Mexico showed high efficacy of indoor residual spraying of bendiocarb (CARB) compared to deltamethrin (PYR) in a region with widespread PYR resistance [10]. More recently, the impact of varying operational treatment regimens was evaluated in PYR-resistant *Ae. aegypti* populations from Florida over 2.5 years, where PYR susceptibility did not decline [11].

In Mexico, PYR application by dengue control programs for nearly two decades resulted in widespread resistance in *Ae. aegypti* populations [12-14]. From 1999 to 2010, PYR type-1

formulations containing permethrin or phenothrin were used intensively. Then, from 2010 to 2013,

PYRs type-2, which contain an alpha-cyano moiety, were used briefly. Both PYRs type-1 and

type-2 target the voltage-gated sodium channel (VGSC); however, PYR type-2 increased toxicity

is due to differences in the way the PYR binds to the VGSC and possibly to additional ion channels

[15]. Despite this, two major resistance mechanisms—target site insensitivity and enhanced

metabolism—confer resistance to both type-1 and type-2 pyrethroids in *Ae. aegypti* populations

in Mexico [12-14]. Target site resistance is associated with amino acid replacements that prevent

the PYR from binding to the VGSC, commonly referred to as knockdown resistance mutations

(*kdr*) [16-18]. In Mexico, three amino acid replacements— V410L, V1016I, and F1534C—are

associated with different levels of pyrethroid resistance [19-22]. The frequency of the three *kdr*

mutations increased simultaneously from 2000 to 2013—a period of exclusive PYR use by vector

control programs [23]. In addition, enhanced metabolism has been associated with PYR

resistance in Mexican *Ae. aegypti* through bioassays and transcription analysis of insecticide

detoxification-associated genes such as the carboxyl/cholinesterases (CCE), glutathione-s-

transferases (GST), and cytochrome P^{450} monooxygenases (CYP) [24, 25].

Mechanisms of resistance, such as *kdr*-conferring mutations in *Ae. aegypti* commonly have

been associated with a lower fitness in the absence of insecticides [26-29]. For example, two

PYR-resistant laboratory strains from Thailand and Brazil were restored almost to susceptibility

after 12 and 15 generations, respectively, without insecticide pressure [26, 27]. Then a semi-field

study showed that a PYR-resistant strain from Mexico lost phenotypic resistance in ten

generations, whereas *kdr* frequencies were unchanged [28]. Recently, the absence of insecticides

for eight generations resulted in a decline in PYR resistance and *kdr*-allele frequencies in *Ae.*

aegypti from different geographical regions in Mexico [29]. These observations support the

potential use of IRM schemes under the assumption that susceptibility alleles will replace

resistance-conferring alleles when an insecticide is discontinued.

A major goal in this field study is to test whether PYR discontinuation and replacement with

alternative chemicals cause the reversal of PYR resistance and *kdr*-conferring mutations in

mosquito populations. We conducted a 5-year longitudinal observational study in which the vector

control program in Tapachula, Mexico, replaced the use of PYRs with OPs from 2013 to 2019.

We surveyed 24 mosquito sites in Tapachula and determined the LC_{50} for permethrin (type-1)

and deltamethrin (type-2) and *kdr* allele frequencies every year from 2016 to 2021. Our results

show large spatial heterogeneity in PYR resistance across Tapachula. Despite the heavy use of

OPs and a lack of control over the domestic use of PYR at our study site, we report a substantial

decline in the pyrethroid LC_{50}s and one of the *kdr* alleles over time. Strikingly, the decline in LC_{50}s

was rapidly offset by the reintroduction of PYRs in combination with a neonicotinoid. Because few

insecticide classes are available for public health use, the evaluation of IRM schemes to maintain

insecticide effectiveness is imperative.

Methods

Study site. The city of Tapachula in the state of Chiapas is located in southeastern Mexico near

the border with Guatemala. Tapachula is located 177 m above sea level and has a population of

305,766 inhabitants within 303 km^2. The city has a tropical climate, with an average maximum

temperature of 33 °C, a minimum temperature of 23 °C and an average annual precipitation of

1,399.5 mm. Tapachula has two very distinct seasons: the dry season from November to April

and the rainy season from May to October.

Insecticide applications by vector control programs. Tapachula's Vector Control District VII

maintains detailed documentation of the insecticide use since 2011. Between 2011 and 2022,

insecticide applications were conducted as whole-city or focalized spraying operations. Because

Tapachula is a dengue endemic city, whole-city spraying is planned on a yearly basis to reduce

mosquito populations from April to November. Every year, four application cycles consisting of

four weekly sequential applications cover the city using ultra-low volume spraying (ULV). In

contrast, focalized spraying is a reactive strategy to treat households with a "suspected" dengue

case. Within a week of the report, dengue "suspected" households are treated with indoor residual

spraying and/or intradomicile spatial spraying, and neighboring blocks are treated with ULV. The

insecticide applications follow the national guidelines published by Centro Nacional de Prevention

y Control de Enfermedades in Mexico (CENAPRECE) [30]. The data was used to summarize the

total area treated by each insecticide formulation each year.

Collection sites. We collected larvae at 24 sites in Tapachula. These sites were located in each

of four quadrants: Northwest (NW), Northeast (NE), Southwest (SW), and Southeast (SE). Each

collection site consisted of nine consecutive blocks (3 x 3 x 3). One larvitrap (half of a rubber tire)

was filled with 3 L of water and suspended from a fence, window, or tree in the front or back yard

of individual houses [31]. This collection method proved to be 3.6-fold more efficient than ovitraps

to collect *Ae. aegypti* [31]. The water from the larvitraps was poured into plastic containers and

transferred to the insectary; the larvitrap was then refilled with 3 L of water. Six houses were

included per site, and sites were visited every week for 3 to 4 consecutive weeks or until 500-800

Ae. aegypti females per site were obtained. Larvae and pupae were transported to the insectary

at Centro Regional de Investigación en Salud Pública (CRISP). Adults were identified following

emergence, and *Ae. aegypti* were placed in cages (30 cm^3) with other mosquitoes collected from

the same site. These adults were allowed to blood feed on a rabbit (under accepted procedures

by the Ethical Commission of the Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública), which allowed us to obtain

sufficient F_1 and F_2 offspring for the insecticide bioassays. Environmental conditions consisted of

27 ± 2 ˚C temperature, 70–80% humidity, and a 12:12 h photoperiod.

Collection times. At each site, we conducted five collections from 2018 to 2020. Additionally,

collections were made at 17 sites in 2016 as a preliminary survey of PYR resistance levels and

kdr alleles. Because pyrethroids were discontinued by vector control programs in May 2013, we

timed each collection according to the number of months after pyrethroid discontinuation. The

chronological collections were conducted in September 2016 (38 months after PYR removal),

September 2018 (62 months), March 2019 (68 months), September 2019 (74 months), March

2020 (80 months), and September 2020 (86 months).

Bioassays. The F_1 or F_2 adult offspring were exposed to insecticide concentrations using the

bottle bioassay procedures described in Solis-Santoyo et al. (2021) [32]. Technical grade

insecticides (Supelco) were used to determine the lethal concentration 50 (LC_{50}), which is the

amount required to kill 50% of the mosquitoes. We determined the LC_{50} for permethrin (PYR type-

1), deltamethrin (PYR type-2), malathion (OP), chlorpyrifos (OP), and bendiocarb (CARB). In this

study, we show the results for pyrethroids only. During the bioassay, 15 to 20 females (2–3 days

old) were gently aspirated into each bottle. After 1 h of exposure, the mosquitoes were transferred

to plastic containers and maintained in the insectary to observe the mortality at 24 h. The LC_{50} of

each insecticide was also determined for the NO reference strain every 6 months to confirm

insecticide toxicity. The LC_{50}, 95% confidence intervals, slope, intercept, and *p* values were

determined using the binary logistic regression model with QCal software [33]. The null hypothesis

(Ho) assumed the observed mortality curve adjusts to a binary logistic regression model. Thus,

we expected *p* values greater than 0.05 to accept the Ho. When the Ho was rejected, the bioassay

was repeated. To estimate the level of resistance among sites, we calculated a resistance ratio

(RR) by dividing the LC_{50} of the field sites by the LC_{50} of the NO strain calculated in each period.

Genotyping *kdr* mutations. Genomic DNA was isolated from 50 individual F_1 female mosquitoes

from each collection site following the procedures of Black and DuTeau [34]. The DNA was

suspended in TE buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM EDTA pH 8) and stored at -20 ˚C. The V1016I

and F1534C mutations located in the VGSC gene were genotyped according to established

protocols [19, 21]. The genotype frequencies at each locus were tested for Hardy-Weinberg (HW)

equilibrium. The null hypothesis is that equilibrium is present in the population, which was verified

with a chi-square test (df = 1 and *p* value > 0.05). Bayesian 95% Highest Density Intervals (HDI)

around frequencies at loci 1016 and 1534 were calculated in WinBUGS for each collection site

[35].

Linkage disequilibrium between alleles at loci 1016 and 1534. Four potential 1016/1534

dilocus haplotypes were analyzed: V_{1016}/F_{1534} (VF), V_{1016}/C_{1534} (VC), I_{1016}/F_{1534} (IF), I_{1016}/C_{1534} (IC).

The number of times (T_{ij}) that an allele at locus i (1016) appears with an allele at locus j (1534)

and an unbiased estimate of the composite disequilibrium coefficient (Δij) were calculated using

the program LINKDIS according the procedures in Vera-Maloof (2015) [17]. A χ^2 test was

performed to determine if significant disequilibrium exists among all alleles at loci 1016 and 1534.

The statistic was calculated and summed over all two-allele interactions. The linkage

disequilibrium correlation coefficient Rij is distributed from -1 (both mutations trans) to 0 (the 1534

and 1016 alleles occur independently) to 1 (both mutations cis) and therefore provides a

standardized measure of disequilibrium.

Generalized logistic regression. A multivariate logistic regression model tested the relation

between the odds of dying (dead/batch) and three independent variables: concentration of

insecticide, time (in months), and collection site. The data were obtained from the bottle bioassays

in which groups of mosquitoes (batch) were exposed to different concentrations of permethrin

and deltamethrin for 1 h, and mortalities were scored at 24 h. The independent variable was the

number of dead mosquitoes recorded at 24 h. The experimental unit was a batch of mosquitoes

from a "site," collected in a "month," and exposed to a specific concentration of insecticide

(μg/bottle). The 24 collection sites across Tapachula were included as nominal variables in the

model. Time in "months" was included as numerical variables consisting of the number of months

after the discontinuation of pyrethroids by vector control programs. Because, pyrethroid use was

reestablished at the end of 2019 (as a mixture of imidacloprid and allethrin), the regression

analysis excluded the 80- and 86-month time points. The null hypothesis is that the odds of dying

is independent of the insecticide concentration, time, and site. The generalized multinomial linear

regression model was conducted using the MASS package in R (glm (dead/batch ~ dose + time

+ site)), using a binomial distribution.

Results

Insecticide use by vector control programs in Tapachula

From 1999 to 2010, permethrin synergized with piperonyl butoxide (PBO) was used exclusively

by vector control programs [13]. Since 2011 CENAPRECE added classes of insecticides with a

different mode of action, such as OPs and CARBs [30] to the list of approved insecticides.

Tapachula's Vector Control District VII replaced the use of PYR with OPs in May 2013. The

number of treated hectares in Tapachula's whole-city and focalized application is shown in

Figures 1A and B, respectively. In 2012, whole-city spraying applied phenothrin (PYR) across

83,000 hectares. Then, between 2013 and 2022, OPs such as chlorpyrifos-ethyl and malathion

were used intensively. In 2019 and 2022, primarily OPs were used; however, applications of OPs

were alternated with a mixture of imidacloprid (neonicotinoid) and prallethrin (PYR). In contrast,

the number of hectares treated with focalized spraying was three-fold lower than whole-city

spraying (Fig 1B). Phenothrin was used until May 2013; in our study, this time is considered month

0 after the discontinuation of PYR. From 2013 to 2018, the focalized use of malathion,

chlorpyrifos-ethyl, and pirimiphos-methyl was reported. From 2018 to 2022, these OPs were

alternated with a mixture of imidacloprid and prallethrin. Between 2020 and 2022, this mixture

was used to treat between 25 and 60% of the focalized interventions. Additional insecticides used

for indoor residual spraying included propoxur and bendiocarb in 2018; subsequently, bendiocarb

was used exclusively in 2019 and 2020.

Pyrethroid resistance in *Aedes aegypti* from Tapachula

We determined the levels of resistance to permethrin (PYR type-1) and deltamethrin (PYR type-

2) in adult females using a customized bottle bioassay. Briefly, we exposed mosquitoes to four to

six pyrethroid concentrations for 1 h, then transferred mosquitoes to observation cups and

recorded mortality at 24 h. An initial screening in 2016 included ten sites in Tapachula and nine

sites across the coast of Chiapas (see coordinates in Table S1). From 2018 to 2021, we

conducted recurrent collections at 24 sites in Tapachula (Fig 2). The collections were conducted

chronologically in September 2016 (38 months after PYR discontinuation), September 2018 (62

months), March 2019 (68 months), September 2019 (74 months), March 2020 (80 months), and

September 2020 (86 months). The LC_{50} of each collection site was calculated using a binary

logistic regression model and then compared to the New Orleans (NO) susceptible reference LC_{50}

to determine the relative resistance ratios (RR).

Permethrin resistance levels. In our initial screening in 2016, permethrin RRs ranged from 10-

to 81-fold. The RRs and their 95% confidence intervals for permethrin and deltamethrin at each

collection site and time are shown in Figure 3A. In 2018, the RRs ranged between 7- and 63-fold

[32]. In March 2019 and September 2019, the RRs ranged from 7- to 52-fold and from 8- to 42-

fold, respectively (Fig 3A). In March 2020, the RRs slightly increased from 22- to 59-fold after

PYR was reintroduced by the vector control program in a mixture of imidacloprid and prallethrin

(a neonicotinoid and a PYR type-1).

Deltamethrin resistance levels. In 2016, RRs ranged between 21- and 190-fold (Fig 3B). In

2018 and March of 2019, RRs ranged between 11- and 102-fold and 8- and 81-fold, respectively.

In September of 2019, we observed the smallest RR range, between 6- and 49-fold, suggesting

that the removal of PYR from vector control programs resulted in deltamethrin resistance reversal.

However, the RRs observed in March and September of 2020 increased to 22- and 127-fold and

22- and 88-fold, respectively. These increases corresponded to the reintroduction of PYR in a

mixture of imidacloprid and prallethrin in 2019.

Modeling the odds of dying according to the site, time from PYR-removal, and insecticide

concentration. We conducted a multivariate logistic regression to test the relation between the

odds of dying and three independent variables: site, time in months, and insecticide concentration.

The bioassays provided the number of dead mosquitoes out of the total mosquitoes exposed to

a specific concentration of insecticide (dose-response). This strategy allowed us to include the

dose-response data from four to six concentrations instead of only using the LC_{50} value, thereby

providing more statistical power. Figure 4A shows the proportion of dead individuals by the group

of mosquitoes from each collection site and time exposed to the different insecticide

concentrations. Note that this figure includes data from cemeteries along the coast of Chiapas

(indicated as 'panteon'); however, the generalized linear model included only collection sites

within the city of Tapachula from 2016 to March 2020. We excluded coastal sites because

insecticide selection pressure is unknown. In addition, we excluded bioassay data from

September 2020 and 2021 because, during these years, the pyrethroid prallethrin was

reintroduced by the vector control program. The analysis was run separately for permethrin and

deltamethrin.

For permethrin, 625 dose-response entries were included in the model. Figure 4A shows the

proportion of dead mosquitoes for each concentration, site, and time. The multivariate logistic

model was significant (p value < 2.2e-16), with the odds of dying being explained by the

insecticide concentration, the time, and the collection site (Table 1). The McFadden's Pseudo R2

for this model was 0.79 (p < 0.000). The estimates for the model (Annex 1) showed that a one-

unit increase in one log of permethrin concentration corresponded to an increase in the odds of

dying of 814% (p value = 2E-16), with site and time remaining constant. One unit of time (one

month) corresponded to an increase in the odds of dying by 1.5% (p value = 2e-16), with site and

concentration remaining constant. Out of 24 site estimates, 18 were significant, with two showing

positive and 16 negative directions (Table S2).

For deltamethrin, 656 data entries were included in the multivariate regression analysis. The

three independent variables (concentration, time, and site) significantly explained the odds of

dying (p value = 2.2e-16) (Table 1). Figure 4B shows the proportion of dead mosquitoes for each

concentration, site, and time. The McFadden's Pseudo R2 for this model was 0.786 ($p < 0.05$).

The estimates showed that a one-unit increase in one log of the dose of deltamethrin

corresponded to an increase in the odds of dying by 447% (*p* value = 2e-16), with time and site

remaining constant. Every month after PYR removal corresponded to an increase in the odds of

dying by 8.4% (*p* value = 2e-16), with site and dose remaining constant. Out of 24, 19 site

estimates were significant, with six showing positive and 13 negative directions (Table S2).

***Kdr*-allele frequencies over time.** The frequency of two knockdown resistance-associated

mutations (*kdr*) in the VGSC were screened in ~50 individuals from each of the 144 collection

sites from 2016 to 2020. Genotypic frequencies were calculated for 7,013 individual mosquitoes.

At the V1016I locus, alleles segregated in all 144 collection sites. Meanwhile, at the F1534C locus,

alleles segregated at 113 sites, mostly because of fixation of the resistant allele at 31 sites.

Frequencies of the resistant alleles at loci F1534C (C1534) and V1016I (I1016) and their 95%

Bayesian high-density intervals (HDI) are shown in Figure 5. In 2016, we screened ten sites in

the city of Tapachula and seven sites along the coast of Chiapas (cemeteries). Nonoverlapping

95% HDI suggested significant differences between the city and coastal collections. Resistant

I1016 frequencies were significantly higher in the city (mean = 0.48, 95% HDI = 0.45 - 0.507) than

along the coast (mean = 0.31, HDI = 0.28 - 0.35). For resistant allele C1534, city frequencies

were also higher (mean = 0.97, 95% HDI = 0.968 - 0.983) than along the coast (mean = 0.889,

95%HDI = 0.86 - 0.91). Because of these differences between city and coastal sites, the

multivariate regression analysis included only the city collection sites from 2016 to 2020. For

easier visualization, the resistant allele frequency was summarized by quadrant at the different

collection times (Fig S1). The C1534 allele frequency was close to fixation in 2016, 2018, 2019-

M, and 2019-S (mean allele frequency from 0.93 to 0.98). Then, from March to September of

2020, the mean frequency declined from 0.91 to 0.84 (95%HDI = 0.83 - 0.86), respectively. For

I1016, no clear tendency for decline was observed from 2016 to 2019; however, in March 2020,

the frequencies were significantly higher than at other collection times. These higher frequencies

seemed to be a response to the reintroduction of pyrethroids in vector control programs.

Relation between LC$_{50}$ and *kdr*-alleles. In Mexican mosquito populations, C1534 and I1016

occurred together more often than expected [17]. In our linkage disequilibrium analysis among

144 collections, resistant alleles at C1543 and I1016 were not in disequilibrium, possibly because

C1534 was close to fixation in most of the collections. To test whether a particular dilocus

genotype explains the variation in LC$_{50}$s, we conducted a multivariate regression analysis using

LC$_{50}$ as the response. Independent variables were site, month, and the proportion of each of the

nine possible dilocus genotype combinations (Fig 6). The first two letters correspond to the 1016

locus and the second two letters to locus 1534. An individual with homozygote-susceptible

genotypes at both loci (V1016I and F1534C) were designated as VVFF, whereas the double-

resistant homozygote was assigned IICC. The most common dilocus genotypes among

collections were IVCC, IICC, and VVCC (Fig 6). From 2016 to 2018, the frequency of the resistant

IICC genotype declined, whereas VVCC increased. From March 2019 to September 2020, IICC

increased again. The increase seemed to be a response to pyrethroid reintroduction in vector

control programs in 2019 and 2020. Then, in September 2020, IICC decreased significantly. The

model for permethrin included 74 sites with phenotypes and genotypes. The permethrin LC$_{50}$s

were significantly explained by the VVCC haplotype (estimate = -1.465, T = -2.192, *p* value =

0.0337). For deltamethrin, LC$_{50}$s were only significantly explained by the month (estimate = -

0.056, T = -7.42, *p* value = 2.7E-09).

Discussion

We tested the hypothesis that PYR resistance carries negative fitness and that susceptibility is

restored in field mosquito populations when pyrethroids are not used anymore. To account for the

large heterogeneity in field mosquito populations, we screened 24 collection sites every year in

Tapachula. Our results indicate that mosquitoes from the 24 sites became more susceptible to

pyrethroids over time. The model detected that with every passing month after the discontinuation

of pyrethroids by vector control programs, mortality increased by 8.4% and 1.5% for deltamethrin

and permethrin, respectively. This decline in resistance was also evident for one of the *kdr*

mutations, for which the resistant C1534 allele declined 12% after near fixation in the initial part

of our study. These results were expected, as several laboratory investigations have

demonstrated that PYR resistance reversed in less than 15 generations in the absence of

insecticides. However, few studies have evaluated the response of mosquito populations in the

field where mosquitoes are under different insecticide selection pressures. Recently, one study in

Florida measured the phenotypic and genotypic response of PYR-resistant *Ae. aegypti*

populations following 2.5 years of the operational use of organophosphates [11]. The results did

not detect a decline in diagnostic times with the CDC bottle bioassay; however, the authors

observed a significant decline in the frequency of double homozygous *kdr* resistant genotypes

(V1016I and F1534C). In our study, however, we identified decreases in both the pyrethroid LC_{50}s

and *kdr* genotypes. One potential explanation for these differences is that the methods used to

measure resistance targeted different resistant phenotypes. The study in Florida used a time-

response assay to measure knockdown in mosquitoes at 30 min of exposure. In comparison, the

dose-response assay in our study measured the mortality at 24 h using different pyrethroid

concentrations. Although, the CDC bottle bioassay has shown greater variation in the dose–

response curves in comparison with the WHO tube test and the topical application bioassay [36],

scoring mortality at 24 h instead of 30 min is a better predictor of resistance because it accounts

for recovery due to metabolic resistance mechanisms [37]. Whether the dose-response assays

are more sensitive than the time-response assays to identify changes in pyrethroid resistance is

of special interest, as the interpretation of results might have important implications at the

operational level.

Despite the significant decline in pyrethroid LC_{50}s over time, our results show that the RR levels

are still higher than 10-fold almost 8 years after the discontinuation of PYR. This finding is

consistent with an observational study in Sao Paulo, Brazil, in which levels of PYR resistance

remained high 10 years after the switch to OPs to control *Ae. aegypti* [38]. The authors suggested

that pyrethroid resistance remained high in mosquito populations because of the widespread use

of pyrethroids in consumer-based products for domestic and residential application. For instance,

a survey in the city of Merida, Mexico, showed that 87% of households regularly use pyrethroid-

based commercial products to reduce mosquito nuisance [39]. Moreover, the use of PYR surface

sprays led to a significant increase in the frequency of V1016I *kdr* homozygotes in surviving *Ae.*

aegypti, suggesting strong selection pressure for this allele [40]. Strikingly, even when our study

did not account for the use of pyrethroid-based commercial products and despite the large

heterogeneity in PYR resistance across the 24 sites, our model was able to identify a decline in

PYR resistance over time. A limitation in our model is that we cannot predict the time required to

reach lower levels of resistance (< 5-fold), which would require continuing to monitor for resistance

for several years. Another limitation is that our surveillance began 3 years after the discontinuation

of the PYRs, and we lack information about the PYR resistance levels during the peak of PYR

use in Tapachula. Our closest references are three studies that evaluated *Ae. aegypti* PYR

resistance in Mexico using the same methods. In 2007, five collection sites in the states of

Quintana Roo and Yucatan showed permethrin RRs ranging between 2.6- and 10.2-fold [24]. In

2009, seven sites in the state of Veracruz showed deltamethrin RRs were lower than 3-fold at

four sites and between 16- and 20-fold at three sites. In the same study, permethrin RRs were

lower than 10-fold at four sites and between 11- and 33-fold at three sites [13]. In 2014, eight sites

from the states of Yucatan, Guerrero, and Chiapas showed deltamethrin RRs ranging between

18- and 108-fold whereas permethrin RRs ranged between 15- and 60-fold. In this last study,

Tapachula showed RRs of 25- and 95-fold for permethrin and deltamethrin, respectively [29].

These findings suggest high levels of pyrethroid RRs were widespread just before our study.

However, because large heterogeneity in pyrethroid RRs can be found at the city scale [32],

making assumptions about resistance levels across states and different studies should be done

with caution.

Interestingly, our RRs were higher for deltamethrin (PYR type-2) than for permethrin (PYR

type-1). This finding was unexpected, as mosquito populations were subject to PYR type-1 rather

than PYR type-2 from 1999 to 2013. One possible explanation could be that mosquito populations

were exposed to PYR type-2 selection from the use of consumer-based pyrethroid products.

Future studies should evaluate the use of these products at the study sites. A second observation

was that PYR discontinuation by vector control programs resulted in higher deltamethrin decline

rates than those rates observed for permethrin; however, *kdr* dilocus genotypes did not explain

the variation. These results suggest a possible higher fitness cost for deltamethrin resistance in

the absence of insecticides. Specific mechanisms of resistance for pyrethroids type-1 and type-2

might include a combination of several mechanisms such as specific *kdr* mutations, compensatory

ion channel mutations, cuticle modification, and specific enzyme detoxifying variants with different

fitness costs in mosquitoes. A recent study showed that metabolic resistance was associated with

higher fitness costs than target-site resistance in the absence of insecticides [41]. From the three

congenic *Ae. aegypti* strains carrying either CYP-mediated, *kdr*-mediated, or CYP + *kdr*

mechanisms, strains with CYP-mediated resistance showed a significantly reduced net

reproductive rate relative to the susceptible and the *kdr* strains [41]. In our study, we observed a

major decline in PYR RRs from 2016 to 2019, which did not match the decline in *kdr* alleles that

occurred mostly from 2019 to 2020. We hypothesize that metabolic resistance mechanisms or

epistatic factors might have had a greater impact on the resistance levels from 2016 to 2019. A

side project measured the enzymatic activity of CCE, CYP, and GST in collections taken in 2018

and 2020 from 22 sites in Tapachula [42]. The number of sites with mean enzymatic activity higher

than the susceptible New Orleans (NO) reference strain declined for alpha-, beta-, and PNPA-

esterases at three, one, and five collection sites, respectively. In addition, an increase was

observed in the number of sites with higher GST and CYP activity than the susceptible strain. The

enzyme activity levels were not significantly associated with PYR RRs, but bioassays using PYRs

in combination with enzyme inhibitors significantly increased the mortality, suggesting

biochemical assays might not be sensitive enough to explain PYR resistance. Including DNA or

RNA markers of insecticide detoxification genes might be a good option to explore the role of

metabolic resistance in mosquito populations. However, this requires a fine understanding of the

genes conferring resistance to a particular insecticide in a geographical region and their variation

within and between populations [24]. For instance, single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in

detoxification genes have been associated with PYR resistance in our study sites, and we are in

the process of testing their segregation and association with different levels of resistance in field

mosquitoes [43].

Many studies have intended to use *kdr* frequencies as a proxy for pyrethroid resistance.

Particularly in this study, *kdr* mutations explained somewhat the large variation among pyrethroid

RRs. Only one dilocus genotype (VVCC) significantly explained the large variation in permethrin

LC_{50}s; however, no *kdr* dilocus genotype explained deltamethrin LC_{50}s. From 2016 to 2019,

C1534 allele frequencies had low spatial and temporal heterogeneity because of proximity to

fixation, whereas I1016 frequencies had large spatial heterogeneity within a 0.35 to 0.68 range.

The lack of association between the PYR LC_{50}s and *kdr*-dilocus genotypes could be because the

method to measure resistance in our study (24-h mortality) was not only measuring *kdr* but also

was measuring recovery mechanisms due to metabolic resistance. Recovery rates among

knocked-down mosquitoes ranged between 30 and 45% at our study sites. A previous genome-

wide association mapping from pools of mosquitoes exposed to a permethrin LC_{50} showed that

mosquitoes exhibiting knockdown resistance at 1 h of exposure were strongly associated with *kdr*

mutations (V410L and V1016I), whereas mosquitos recovering at 4 h were associated with SNPs

at a different group of ion channels and detoxifying enzyme-coding genes [44]. The operational

implication of mosquito recovery has not been evaluated in the field, and its role in selection of

pyrethroid resistance mechanisms might be underestimated.

One important observation in our study is that significant changes in *kdr* frequencies occurred

between 2020 and 2021, with C1534 decreasing by 6%, whereas I1016 increased by 15%. The

increase in I1016 frequencies occurred simultaneously with an increase in pyrethroid LC_{50}s,

following the use of imidacloprid and prallethrin (PYR type-1) during whole-city spraying and focal

indoor spatial spraying from 2019 to 2020. Such a rapid increase was also documented in Iquitos,

Peru, where *kdr* frequencies and heterogeneity increased following a 6-week cypermethrin spray

application in 2013 and 2014 [45]. The rapid response in resistance indicated a strong impact of

vector control activities on the susceptibility of mosquito populations. Similarly, our study

illustrates how short periods of pyrethroid use offset the trends in PYR resistance reversal.

Inevitably, IRM strategies will require long-term commitments between vector control programs

and community participation to manage the use of pyrethroids and allow the natural course of

pyrethroid reversal in resistant populations over time.

Conclusion

The trends in insecticide resistance in our study followed the application of insecticides by vector

control programs, suggesting that operational control seems to have a significant impact in

resistance levels across the mosquito collections. Our results in the field support the hypothesis

that PYR resistance has negative fitness in the absence of pyrethroids. We observed a decline in

PYR resistance over time despite high heterogeneity, heavy application of OPs, and possibly

residential-level use of consumer-based PYR products. Despite the significant decline in the

range of PYR RRs, resistance is still considered high. Whether the PYR RRs calculated in the

laboratory are associated with differences in operational effectiveness requires further evaluation.

Our results suggest that pyrethroid reversal is possible; however, long-term IRM by vector control

programs and community participation are needed to speed the process.

Acknowledgements

We thank Francisco Pozos and Eduardo Vazquez Lopez from the Vector Control Program in

Tapachula District VII for sharing information about insecticide use and coordinating larval

collections during this study. We acknowledge the technical support received in the field and the

laboratory of the Insecticide Resistance Group at CRISP.

Disclaimer

479   The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily

480   represent the official position of CDC.

Figure legends

Fig 1. Number of treated hectares during insecticide interventions in Tapachula from 2011

to 2022: A) Whole-city spraying and, B) Focalized spraying. Data provided by Vector Control

District VII in Tapachula, Chiapas.

Fig 2. *Aedes aegypti* collection sites in Tapachula, Chiapas, from 2018 to 2021. Larvitraps

were used to collect 500-800 females per site to generate the F_1 offspring for insecticide

bioassays and kdr genotyping.

Fig 3. Pyrethroid resistance ratios in *Aedes aegypti* collection sites from 2016 to 2021: A)

Permethrin and, B) Deltamethrin. Bars represent the 95% confidence intervals. Sites are

categorized within four geographical quadrants in Tapachula (NW = northwest, NE = northeast,

SW = southwest, and SE = southeast). Collections from across coastal Chiapas were obtained

from cemeteries (panteon). M = March and S = September. Resistance ratios are relative to the

New Orleans LC_{50} calculated at each time point.

Fig 4. Proportion of dead mosquitoes from a specific site, collection time, and

concentration for: A) Permethrin and, B) Deltamethrin. Orange-scale colors represent the

number of months after PYRs were discontinued by vector control programs.

Fig 5. Allele frequency of *kdr* mutations V1016I and F1534C in *Aedes aegypti* from

Tapachula and coastal Chiapas over time. Approximately 50 mosquitoes were genotyped to

calculate the allele frequencies at each site and time point. Sites are categorized in four

geographical quadrants in Tapachula (NW = northwest, NE = northeast, SW = southwest, and SE

= southeast). Collections across coastal Chiapas were obtained from cemeteries (panteon). M =

March and S = September. Bars represent the 95% HDI around the frequency.

Fig 6. Proportion of mosquitoes carrying each of the nine dilocus genotypes over 5 years of study. The number of mosquitoes analyzed per year ranged from 714 to 1200. The first two letters correspond to the amino acid at the V1016I locus (resistant = I, susceptible = V) and the second pair corresponds to the amino acid at F1534C locus (resistant = C, susceptible = F). Dilocus genotypes go from double-resistant homozygote = IICC, to double-susceptible homozygote = VVFF.

Supplementary Files

Supplementary Fig 1S. Allele frequency of *kdr*-mutations C1534 and I1016 in *Aedes aegypti* from Tapachula over time. Frequency and 95% HDI were calculated yearly from samples that ranged from 714 to 1200 mosquitoes (~50 mosquitoes per collection site). Sites are categorized in four geographical quadrants in Tapachula (NW = northwest, NE = northeast, SW = southwest, and SE = southeast). Circles correspond to C1534 allele frequency and triangles to I1016 allele frequency.

Supplementary Table S1. Location of *Aedes aegypti* cemetery collections in the coast of Chiapas. Larvae were collected from each cemetery on 2016's wet season. The municipality name and geographical coordinates are provided.

Supplementary Table S2. Summary of generalized linear model estimates for A) Permethrin and, B) Deltamethrin. Independent variables include the insecticide concentration (log(concentration)), site (24 sites), time in months (after PYR discontinuation). Estimates, standard error, z-value, probability and change are shown for each variable.

References

1.	Moyes CL, Vontas J, Martins AJ, Ng LC, Koou SY, Dusfour I, et al. Contemporary status of insecticide resistance in the major Aedes vectors of arboviruses infecting humans. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2017;11(7):e0005625. Epub 2017/07/21. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005625. PubMed PMID: 28727779; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5518996.

2.	van den Berg H, da Silva Bezerra HS, Al-Eryani S, Chanda E, Nagpal BN, Knox TB, et al. Recent trends in global insecticide use for disease vector control and potential implications for resistance management. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):23867. Epub 2021/12/15. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-03367-9. PubMed PMID: 34903838; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8669011.

3.	McCaffery A, R N. The Insecticide Resistance Action Committee (IRAC): Public responsibility and enlightened industrial self interest. Outlooks on Pest Management. 2006;2:11-4.

4.	Dusfour I, Vontas J, David JP, Weetman D, Fonseca DM, Corbel V, et al. Management of insecticide resistance in the major Aedes vectors of arboviruses: Advances and challenges. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019;13(10):e0007615. Epub 2019/10/11. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0007615. PubMed PMID: 31600206; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6786541.

5.	Curtis CF. Possible Methods of Inhibiting or Reversing the Evolution of Insecticide Resistance in Mosquitos. Pestic Sci. 1981;12(5):557-64. doi: DOI 10.1002/ps.2780120513. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1981MN84800012.

6.	Curtis CF. Theoretical-Models of the Use of Insecticide Mixtures for the Management of Resistance. B Entomol Res. 1985;75(2):259-65. doi: Doi 10.1017/S0007485300014346. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1985AME7500008.

7.	Brogdon WG, McAllister JC. Insecticide resistance and vector control. Emerg Infect Dis. 1998;4(4):605-13. doi: DOI 10.3201/eid0404.980410. PubMed PMID: WOS:000077532500010.

8.	Hemingway J, Penilla RP, Rodriguez AD, James BM, Edge W, Rogers H, et al. Resistance management strategies in malaria vector mosquito control. A large-scale field trial in Southern Mexico. Pestic Sci. 1997;51(3):375-82. doi: Doi 10.1002/(Sici)1096-9063(199711)51:3<375::Aid-Ps636>3.0.Co;2-K. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1997YJ39800025.

9.	Penilla RP, Rodriguez AD, Hemingway J, Torres JL, Arredondo-Jimenez JI, Rodriguez MH. Resistance management strategies in malaria vector mosquito control. Baseline data for a large-scale field trial against Anopheles albimanus in Mexico. Medical and Veterinary Entomology. 1998;12(3):217-33. doi: DOI 10.1046/j.1365-2915.1998.00123.x. PubMed PMID: WOS:000075782800001.

10.	Vazquez-Prokopec GM, Medina-Barreiro A, Che-Mendoza A, Dzul-Manzanilla F, Correa-Morales F, Guillermo-May G, et al. Deltamethrin resistance in Aedes aegypti results in treatment failure in Merida, Mexico. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2017;11(6):e0005656. Epub 2017/06/13. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005656. PubMed PMID: 28604781; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5481028.

11.	Casey Parker-Crockett, Aaron Lloyd, Daviela Ramirez, Connelly CR. Impacts of differential mosquito control treatment regimens on insecticide susceptibility status of Aedes aegypti (Diptera: Culicidae). SN Applied Sciences. 2022;4(249). doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-022-05130-9.

12.	Aponte A, Penilla P, F. D-M, A. C-M, D. LA, F. S, et al. The pyrethroid resistance status and mechanisms in *Aedes aegypti* from the Guerrero state, Mexico. Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology 2013;107:226-34.

13.	Flores AE, Ponce G, Silva BG, Gutierrez SM, Bobadilla C, Lopez B, et al. Wide spread cross resistance to pyrethroids in Aedes aegypti (Diptera: Culicidae) from Veracruz state Mexico. J Econ Entomol. 2013;106(2):959-69. Epub 2013/06/22. PubMed PMID: 23786088; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3980443.

14.	Kuri-Morales PA, Correa-Morales F, Gonzalez-Acosta C, Moreno-Garcia M, Santos-Luna R, Roman-Perez S, et al. Insecticide susceptibility status in Mexican populations of Stegomyia aegypti (=

Aedes aegypti): a nationwide assessment. Med Vet Entomol. 2018;32(2):162-74. Epub 2017/11/23. doi:
10.1111/mve.12281. PubMed PMID: 29165810.
15.   Soderlund DM, Knipple DC. The molecular biology of knockdown resistance to pyrethroid
insecticides. Insect Biochem Mol Biol. 2003;33(6):563-77. Epub 2003/05/29. PubMed PMID: 12770575.
16.   Garcia GP, Flores AE, Fernandez-Salas I, Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Reyes-Solis G, Lozano-Fuentes S,
et al. Recent rapid rise of a permethrin knock down resistance allele in Aedes aegypti in Mexico. PLoS
Negl Trop Dis. 2009;3(10):e531. Epub 2009/10/16. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0000531. PubMed PMID:
19829709; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2759509.
17.   Vera-Maloof FZ, Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Elizondo-Quiroga AE, Lozano-Fuentes S, Black Iv WC.
Coevolution of the Ile1,016 and Cys1,534 Mutations in the Voltage Gated Sodium Channel Gene of
Aedes aegypti in Mexico. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015;9(12):e0004263. Epub 2015/12/15. doi:
10.1371/journal.pntd.0004263. PubMed PMID: 26658798; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4684211.
18.   Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Maloof FV, Campbell CL, Garcia-Rejon J, Lenhart A, Penilla P, et al.
Parallel evolution of vgsc mutations at domains IS6, IIS6 and IIIS6 in pyrethroid resistant Aedes aegypti
from Mexico. Scientific Reports. 2018;8(1):6747. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-25222-0.
19.   Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Urdaneta-Marquez L, Rajatileka S, Moulton M, Flores AE, Fernandez-Salas
I, et al. A mutation in the voltage-gated sodium channel gene associated with pyrethroid resistance in
Latin American Aedes aegypti. Insect Mol Biol. 2007;16(6):785-98. Epub 2007/12/21. doi:
10.1111/j.1365-2583.2007.00774.x. PubMed PMID: 18093007.
20.   Haddi K, Tome HVV, Du Y, Valbon WR, Nomura Y, Martins GF, et al. Detection of a new
pyrethroid resistance mutation (V410L) in the sodium channel of Aedes aegypti: a potential challenge
for mosquito control. Sci Rep. 2017;7:46549. Epub 2017/04/20. doi: 10.1038/srep46549. PubMed PMID:
28422157; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5396194.
21.   Yanola J, Somboon P, Walton C, Nachaiwieng W, Somwang P, Prapanthadara LA. High-
throughput assays for detection of the F1534C mutation in the voltage-gated sodium channel gene in
permethrin-resistant Aedes aegypti and the distribution of this mutation throughout Thailand. Trop Med
Int Health. 2011;16(4):501-9. Epub 2011/02/24. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-3156.2011.02725.x. PubMed PMID:
21342372.
22.   Du Y, Nomura Y, Satar G, Hu Z, Nauen R, He SY, et al. Molecular evidence for dual pyrethroid-
receptor sites on a mosquito sodium channel. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(29):11785-90. Epub
2013/07/04. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1305118110. PubMed PMID: 23821746; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC3718148.
23.   Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Maloof FV, Campbell CL, Garcia-Rejon J, Lenhart A, Penilla P, et al.
Parallel evolution of vgsc mutations at domains IS6, IIS6 and IIIS6 in pyrethroid resistant Aedes aegypti
from Mexico. Sci Rep. 2018;8(1):6747. Epub 2018/05/02. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-25222-0. PubMed
PMID: 29712956; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5928250.
24.   Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Suarez AF, Salas IF, Strode C, Ranson H, Hemingway J, et al. Transcription
of detoxification genes after permethrin selection in the mosquito Aedes aegypti. Insect Mol Biol.
2012;21(1):61-77. Epub 2011/10/29. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2583.2011.01113.x. PubMed PMID: 22032702;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3540788.
25.   Strode C, Wondji CS, David JP, Hawkes NJ, Lumjuan N, Nelson DR, et al. Genomic analysis of
detoxification genes in the mosquito Aedes aegypti. Insect Biochem Mol Biol. 2008;38(1):113-23. Epub
2007/12/12. doi: 10.1016/j.ibmb.2007.09.007. PubMed PMID: 18070670.
26.   Brito LP, Linss JG, Lima-Camara TN, Belinato TA, Peixoto AA, Lima JB, et al. Assessing the effects
of Aedes aegypti kdr mutations on pyrethroid resistance and its fitness cost. PLoS One.
2013;8(4):e60878. Epub 2013/04/18. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0060878. PubMed PMID: 23593337;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3620451.

27.   Cheng Chang, Xin-Yi Huang, Pin-Chun Chang, Huai-Hui Wu, Shu-MeiDai. Inheritance and stability
of sodium channel mutations associated with permethrin knockdown resistance in Aedes aegypti.
Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology. 2012;104(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pestbp.2012.06.003.
28.   Grossman MK, Uc-Puc V, Rodriguez J, Cutler DJ, Morran LT, Manrique-Saide P, et al. Restoration
of pyrethroid susceptibility in a highly resistant Aedes aegypti population. Biol Lett. 2018;14(6). Epub
2018/06/15. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2018.0022. PubMed PMID: 29899128; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC6030600.
29.   Vera-Maloof FZ, Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Penilla-Navarro RP, A DR-R, Dzul F, Manrique-Saide P, et
al. Loss of pyrethroid resistance in newly established laboratory colonies of Aedes aegypti. PLoS Negl
Trop Dis. 2020;14(3):e0007753. Epub 2020/03/17. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0007753. PubMed PMID:
32176693; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7117762.
30.   Federacion DDOdl. NOM-EM-003-SSA2–2010 para la vigilancia epidemiologica. Prevencion y
control de enfermedades transmitidas por vector. [NOM-032-SSA-2–2002 for epidemiological
monitoring. Prevention and control of vector-transmitted diseases]. DOF, Mexico. 2011.
31.   Quezada-Yaguachi WE, Rodriguez AD, Solís-Santoyo F, Lopez-Solis AD, IV WCB, Saavedra-
Rodriguez K, et al. Comparative Evaluation of the Regular Ovitrap vs an Innovated Larvitrap for Aedes
Entomological Surveillance in Tapachula. Advances in Entomology. 2022;10:77-84. doi: DOI:
10.4236/ae.2022.101006 J.
32.   Solis-Santoyo F, Rodriguez AD, Penilla-Navarro RP, Sanchez D, Castillo-Vera A, Lopez-Solis AD, et
al. Insecticide resistance in Aedes aegypti from Tapachula, Mexico: Spatial variation and response to
historical insecticide use. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021;15(9):e0009746. Epub 2021/09/28. doi:
10.1371/journal.pntd.0009746. PubMed PMID: 34570792; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8475978
Rodriguez was unable to confirm their authorship contributions. On their behalf, the corresponding
author has reported their contributions to the best of their knowledge.
33.   Lozano-Fuentes S, Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Black WCt, Eisen L. QCal: a software application for the
calculation of dose-response curves in insecticide resistance bioassays. J Am Mosq Control Assoc.
2012;28(1):59-61. Epub 2012/04/27. doi: 10.2987/11-6192.1. PubMed PMID: 22533088.
34.   Black IV WC, DuTeau NM. RAPD-PCR and SSCP analysis for insect population genetic studies. The
Molecular Biology of Insect Disease Vectors: A Methods Manual. Crampton J BC LC, editor, editor. New
York: Chapman and Hall; 1997.
35.   Lunn, A T, N B, D S. WinBUGS—A Bayesian modelling framework: Concepts, structure, and
extensibility. Statistics and Computing. 2000;10(4):325-37.
36.   Althoff RA, Huijben S. Comparison of the variability in mortality data generated by CDC bottle
bioassay, WHO tube test, and topical application bioassay using Aedes aegypti mosquitoes. Parasit
Vectors. 2022;15(1):476. Epub 2022/12/21. doi: 10.1186/s13071-022-05583-2. PubMed PMID:
36539831; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9769033.
37.   Owusu HF, Jancaryova D, Malone D, Muller P. Comparability between insecticide resistance
bioassays for mosquito vectors: time to review current methodology? Parasit Vectors. 2015;8:357. Epub
2015/07/08. doi: 10.1186/s13071-015-0971-6. PubMed PMID: 26148484; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC4492098.
38.   Macoris ML, Martins AJ, Andrighetti MTM, Lima JBP, Valle D. Pyrethroid resistance persists after
ten years without usage against Aedes aegypti in governmental campaigns: Lessons from Sao Paulo
State, Brazil. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2018;12(3):e0006390. Epub 2018/03/31. doi:
10.1371/journal.pntd.0006390. PubMed PMID: 29601580; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5895049.
39.   Lorono-Pino MA, Chan-Dzul YN, Zapata-Gil R, Carrillo-Solis C, Uitz-Mena A, Garcia-Rejon JE, et al.
Household use of insecticide consumer products in a dengue-endemic area in Mexico. Trop Med Int
Health. 2014;19(10):1267-75. Epub 2014/07/22. doi: 10.1111/tmi.12364. PubMed PMID: 25040259;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4167961.

40.   Gray L, Florez SD, Barreiro AM, Vadillo-Sanchez J, Gonzalez-Olvera G, Lenhart A, et al.
Experimental evaluation of the impact of household aerosolized insecticides on pyrethroid resistant
Aedes aegypti. Sci Rep. 2018;8(1):12535. Epub 2018/08/24. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-30968-8. PubMed
PMID: 30135460; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6105583.
41.   Smith LB, Silva JJ, Chen C, Harrington LC, Scott JG. Fitness costs of individual and combined
pyrethroid resistance mechanisms, kdr and CYP-mediated detoxification, in Aedes aegypti. PLoS Negl
Trop Dis. 2021;15(3):e0009271. Epub 2021/03/25. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0009271. PubMed PMID:
33760828; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7990171.
42.   Solis-Santoyo F, Rodriguez AD, Black W, Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Sanchez-Guillen D, Castillo-Vera
A, et al. Current enzyme-mediated insecticide resistance status of Aedes aegypti populations from a
dengue-endemic city in southern Mexico. Salud Publica Mex. 2023;65(1, ene-feb):19-27. Epub
2023/02/08. doi: 10.21149/13910. PubMed PMID: 36750076.
43.   Campbell CL, Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Kubik TD, Lenhart A, Lozano-Fuentes S, Black WCt. Vgsc-
interacting proteins are genetically associated with pyrethroid resistance in Aedes aegypti. PLoS One.
2019;14(1):e0211497. Epub 2019/01/30. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0211497. PubMed PMID: 30695054;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6350986.
44.   Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Campbell CL, Lozano S, Penilla-Navarro P, Lopez-Solis A, Solis-Santoyo F,
et al. Permethrin resistance in Aedes aegypti: Genomic variants that confer knockdown resistance,
recovery, and death. PLoS Genet. 2021;17(6):e1009606. Epub 2021/06/18. doi:
10.1371/journal.pgen.1009606. PubMed PMID: 34138859.
45.   Baltzegar J, Vella M, Gunning C, Vasquez G, Astete H, Stell F, et al. Rapid evolution of knockdown
resistance haplotypes in response to pyrethroid selection in Aedes aegypti. Evol Appl. 2021;14(8):2098-
113. Epub 2021/08/26. doi: 10.1111/eva.13269. PubMed PMID: 34429751; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC8372076.
693

A) Permethrin

B) Deltamethrin

NE   NW   panteon   SE   SW

Table 1. Analysis of variance for multivariate logistic regression for permethrin and deltamethrin. The model tests the odds of dying as a response to insecticide concentration, time in months (after PYR discontinuations) and site (24 sites). The intercept, estimates and change in the odds of dying (%) for one unit of time (month) or one unit (log) of insecticide concentration holding other factors constant is shown.

Insecticide	Variable	ANOVA			GLM regression estimates		
		LR	Chisq	p value	Estimate	p value	**Change**
Permethrin	Intercept				-7.348	2.00E-16	
	Concentration	26314.7	1	2.2E-16	2.098	2.00E-16	814%
	Month	220.7	1	2.2E-16	0.015	2.00E-16	1.50%
	Site	1336.7	24	2.2E-16	-1.3 to 0.21	**	
Deltamethrin	Intercept				-6.781	2.00E-16	
	Concentration	22917	1	2.2E-16	1.498	2.00E-16	447%
	Month	5444.3	1	2.2E-16	0.0807	2.00E-16	8.40%
	Site	1528.7	24	2.2E-16	-0.95 to 0.6	‡ <0.005	

Df=degrees of freedom. ** 18 out of 24 site estimates were significant (<0.05), two of them were positive and 16 were negative. ‡ 10 out of 24 site estimates were significant.

Supplementary Table S1. Location of *Aedes aegypti* cemetery collections in the coast of Chiapas. Larvae were collected from each cemetery on 2016's wet season. The municipality name and geographical coordinates are provided.

Cemetery (panteon)	Municipality	Latitude	Longitude
Huixtla	Huixtla	15.136806	92.452194
Mapastepec	Mapastepec	15.445222	92.901222
Mazatan	Mazatan	14.867544	92.449967
Motozintla	Motozintla	15.365367	92.252292
Pijijiapan	Pijijiapan	15.684753	93.203253
Puerto Madero	Puerto Madero	14.722694	92.427417
Ciudad Hidalgo	Ciudad Hidalgo	14.685778	92.148889
Panteon Jardin	Tapachula	14.894917	92.249056
Panteon Municipal	Tapachula	14.90425	92.270306

Supplementary Table S2. Summary of generalized linear model estimates for A) Permethrin and, B) Deltamethrin. Independent variables include the insecticide concentration (log), site (24 sites), time in months (after PYR discontinuation). Estimates, standard error, z-value, probability and change are shown for each variable.

A) Permetrhin

Variable	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)	Significance	Change
Intercept	-7.348	0.119	-61.779	< 2e-16	***	0.001
Log(concentration)	2.098	0.019	109.040	< 2e-16	***	8.148
Month	0.015	0.001	14.167	< 2e-16	***	1.015
Site_NE2	-1.196	0.100	-11.935	< 2e-16	***	0.302
Site_NE3	-0.074	0.104	-0.715	0.474877		0.929
Site_NE4	-0.772	0.105	-7.351	1.97E-13	***	0.462
Site_NE5	-0.582	0.100	-5.803	6.51E-09	***	0.559
Site_NE6	-0.966	0.097	-9.977	< 2e-16	***	0.381
Site_NW1	-0.826	0.096	-8.612	< 2e-16	***	0.438
Site_NW2	-1.372	0.084	-16.345	< 2e-16	***	0.254
Site_NW3	-0.430	0.093	-4.629	3.68E-06	***	0.651
Site_NW4	-0.824	0.098	-8.437	< 2e-16	***	0.438
Site_NW5	0.192	0.090	2.127	0.033394	*	1.212
Site_NW6	-0.599	0.096	-6.266	3.71E-10	***	0.550
Site_SE1	-0.659	0.100	-6.613	3.77E-11	***	0.517
Site_SE2	-0.072	0.100	-0.716	0.473898		0.931
Site_SE3	-1.125	0.085	-13.221	< 2e-16	***	0.325
Site_SE4	-0.664	0.102	-6.516	7.24E-11	***	0.515
Site_SE5	0.212	0.104	2.041	0.041232	*	1.236
Site_SE6	-0.203	0.098	-2.067	0.038763	*	0.816
Site_SW1	-0.115	0.083	-1.375	0.169204		0.892
Site_SW2	-0.047	0.093	-0.504	0.613916		0.954
Site_SW3	-0.404	0.097	-4.172	3.02E-05	***	0.668
Site_SW4	-0.321	0.098	-3.284	0.001024	**	0.726
Site_SW5	-1.255	0.103	-12.138	< 2e-16	***	0.285
Site_SW6	-0.284	0.085	-3.351	0.000805	***	0.753

B) Deltamethrin

Variable	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)	Significance	Change
Intercept	-6.782	0.107	-63.178	< 2e-16	***	0.001
Log(concentration)	1.498	0.014	110.203	< 2e-16	***	4.474
Month	0.081	0.001	65.266	< 2e-16	***	1.084
Site_NE2	-0.951	0.087	-10.939	< 2e-16	***	0.387
Site_NE3	-0.272	0.091	-2.993	0.002761	**	0.762
Site_NE4	-0.594	0.098	-6.073	1.25E-09	***	0.552
Site_NE5	-0.836	0.091	-9.203	< 2e-16	***	0.434
Site_NE6	-0.944	0.088	-10.762	< 2e-16	***	0.389
Site_NW1	-0.535	0.086	-6.211	5.27E-10	***	0.586
Site_NW2	-0.312	0.077	-4.04	5.34E-05	***	0.732
Site_NW3	0.072	0.084	0.853	0.39366		1.075
Site_NW4	0.000	0.088	0.002	0.998245		1.000
Site_NW5	0.424	0.083	5.132	2.87E-07	***	1.528
Site_NW6	0.173	0.084	2.067	0.03875	*	1.189
Site_SE1	-0.930	0.090	-10.284	< 2e-16	***	0.394
Site_SE2	0.349	0.089	3.933	8.38E-05	***	1.417
Site_SE3	-0.799	0.077	-10.321	< 2e-16	***	0.450
Site_SE4	-0.309	0.090	-3.454	0.000553	***	0.734
Site_SE5	0.292	0.090	3.25	0.001154	**	1.338
Site_SE6	-0.185	0.093	-1.996	0.045898	*	0.831
Site_SW1	-0.489	0.077	-6.332	2.42E-10	***	0.613
Site_SW2	0.606	0.082	7.36	1.83E-13	***	1.833
Site_SW3	-0.706	0.085	-8.334	< 2e-16	***	0.493
Site_SW4	0.392	0.086	4.571	4.85E-06	***	1.481
Site_SW5	0.014	0.093	0.153	0.878695		1.014
Site_SW6	-0.114	0.077	-1.485	0.137452		0.892