



PCR testing in mosquito control programmes

Understanding local vectors pathogens and insecticide resistance

By Mosquito Arabia

Residents experience mosquitoes through bites, interrupted evenings and concern for their families. A control programme has to address that nuisance, but complaints alone cannot establish whether disease transmission is a credible local concern. Laboratory testing can strengthen the assessment when it is connected to species identification, field surveillance and public-health intelligence.

PCR can support species identification, pathogen detection and screening for genetic insecticide-resistance markers. These are separate questions requiring suitable assays. Together with field surveillance, their results can inform both the assessment of health risk and the selection of control measures.

Identify the vector before assessing the threat

Two laboratory questions need separate answers. Molecular species identification can help resolve mosquitoes that are difficult to distinguish by appearance. Pathogen testing asks whether a specified infectious agent's genetic material is present. Confirming a vector species does not establish that it carries a pathogen, and detecting a pathogen does not establish transmission to residents. ECDC guidance supports combining morphological and molecular identification within a targeted surveillance design. [1]

For example, confirming *Aedes aegypti* can change which habitats and adult behaviours a programme prioritises. Testing those mosquitoes for dengue virus answers a further question. A species assay is not a dengue assay. The term "PCR testing" should never conceal what was actually commissioned, which specimens were examined or which targets were included.

For RNA viruses such as dengue, Zika and West Nile, laboratories generally use reverse-transcription PCR, or RT-PCR, to detect viral RNA. A validated panel only addresses its stated targets. A report of "not detected" cannot establish that the mosquitoes are free of every pathogen. [2]

Annoyance and health risk overlap imperfectly

A high biting burden is a legitimate reason to act, regardless of pathogen findings. It also creates opportunities for human contact with mosquitoes. The health significance depends on which species are biting, whether relevant pathogens are circulating and the conditions supporting transmission. Fewer complaints do not necessarily mean lower disease risk.

CDC's West Nile guidance recognises that high mosquito abundance can occur without virus, while outbreaks can occur at lower abundance when infection rates are high. This is why a programme should track nuisance and evidence of pathogen activity separately, then interpret them together. [2]



Sampling determines what the result can mean

A laboratory can analyse only the material submitted. We recommend mapping the surveillance area, choosing traps for the target species and retaining collection dates, locations and operating effort. Sampling should cover relevant habitats and exposure settings, rather than only the easiest access points or the address generating the most complaints. One trap represents a sampling location, not an entire community.

Agree collection, preservation, transport and turnaround with a laboratory experienced in mosquito specimens before sampling begins. Protect diagnostic features and the nucleic acid required for testing. A control device that destroys the catch may need a separate surveillance network. Specimen deterioration and delayed reporting can undermine the value of an otherwise capable assay. [3]

Pooling can make testing more affordable, but it requires a documented design. Keep species, collection place and period traceable, and record how many mosquitoes enter each pool. One positive pool does not mean that every mosquito in it was positive. Percentage of pools positive is not the percentage of individual mosquitoes infected. Where justified, use appropriate pooled-sample infection estimates with uncertainty intervals. [2]

Detection is evidence requiring interpretation

A valid positive result establishes detection of the target genetic material in the tested sample. It does not, by itself, demonstrate viable virus, an infectious mosquito or a locally acquired human case.

Whole-mosquito testing also does not establish that the agent reached the saliva. Demonstrating vector competence requires additional evidence about the mosquito's ability to acquire and transmit the pathogen.

This distinction has practical evidence behind it. In New York's West Nile surveillance work, researchers did not isolate infectious virus from approximately half of the mosquito pools with detectable RNA. They noted that low infectious-virus levels could contribute to that finding. Detection and infectiousness therefore need careful interpretation; failure to isolate virus is not proof that the original detection was meaningless. [4]

A negative finding has limits too. The target may be absent, uncommon, outside the sampled locations or undetected because of specimen quality or assay performance. CDC notes particular challenges in predicting dengue, chikungunya and Zika outbreaks from mosquito surveillance. An isolated negative result should not postpone a response supported by human case information or other credible evidence. [3]



Test the resistance mechanisms as well as the pathogen

Genetic resistance screening adds a further question: do local mosquitoes carry variants associated with reduced susceptibility to the insecticides being considered? PCR-based genotyping or sequencing can detect specified markers, including variants associated with knockdown resistance, known as *kdr*, in the mosquito's voltage-gated sodium channel. These markers can help explain target-site resistance to pyrethroids. A pathogen assay will not provide this information. [6,8]

A marker's significance depends on the species, variant and insecticide. Its presence does not prove that every carrier will survive treatment, quantify resistance intensity or establish that a formulated product will fail in the field. Its absence does not prove susceptibility: an assay may miss other variants or mechanisms, including metabolic resistance. Genetic findings should complement standardised phenotypic bioassays that measure the response to exposure. CDC bottle bioassays provide one such approach. [6,7]

For example, research published in 2019 combined bioassays with molecular testing of *Aedes aegypti* from Jazan, Saudi Arabia, and identified resistance-associated *kdr* variants. This demonstrates regional relevance; it does not establish the current resistance profile of another locality or justify selecting an insecticide without local evidence. [8]

We recommend recording species, collection area, sample size, markers tested and genotype or allele frequencies where the assay supports them. Results from bioassay survivors must be distinguished from an unbiased population sample. Agree a separate viable cohort for bioassays before preserving material for genetic tests. Compare findings over time, then review approved insecticide options and field performance alongside source management. Resistance evidence should prompt a technical review rather than simply more frequent spraying.

Turn laboratory findings into local action

We recommend agreeing the response pathway before commissioning tests. A credible pathogen-positive or unexpected pathogen finding should prompt timely discussion with the laboratory and relevant public-health authority, with confirmation where required. Review the collection location and expand targeted surveillance where justified. Appropriate preventive action should proceed while confirmation is arranged when the wider evidence warrants it.

Control still depends on field work: identify productive breeding sources, correct water-management problems and choose suitable larval and adult interventions. Testing should help prioritise and assess that work. It does not remove mosquitoes, and a positive test alone does not determine which treatment to use or justify blanket spraying.

For Gulf municipalities and residential communities, this means bringing the contractor, laboratory and health authority into an agreed reporting process. Combine species and abundance trends with laboratory findings, resident exposure and available human case intelligence. WHO recommends integrating vector, environmental and human infection surveillance for dengue. A private site's mosquito results cannot substitute for that public-health assessment. [5]



Give residents a clear account of the evidence

Resident communication should state what was sampled, where and when, what was tested, and what happens next. “No dengue virus RNA was detected in the samples collected” is more accurate than “the community is disease-free”. A positive result should be explained with the authority’s assessment and the actions being taken, without presenting it as a diagnosis in residents.

Residents should receive practical prevention advice and a clear route to current public-health guidance. Mosquito testing cannot diagnose illness in a person. Equally, nuisance should not be dismissed simply because laboratory screening is negative. The service still owes residents a measurable response to biting and its underlying sources.

Molecular testing earns its place when the result changes a decision: where to investigate, how to prioritise control, which interventions to assess or when to escalate. Resistance markers concern the mosquito’s response to an insecticide; they do not prove that it carries a pathogen or is more infectious. A locally informed programme connects laboratory findings with field performance and resident exposure, while continuing to address nuisance in its own right.

References

- [1] ECDC. Guidelines for the surveillance of invasive mosquitoes in Europe. 2012.
<https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/guidelines-surveillance-invasive-mosquitoes-europe>
- [2] CDC. Guidelines for West Nile Virus Surveillance and Control. Online guidance, accessed October 2026.
<https://www.cdc.gov/west-nile-virus/php/surveillance-and-control-guidelines/index.html>
- [3] CDC. Surveillance and Control of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* in the United States.
<https://www.cdc.gov/mosquitoes/pdfs/mosquito-control-508.pdf>
- [4] White DJ et al. Mosquito Surveillance and Polymerase Chain Reaction Detection of West Nile Virus, New York State. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2001;7(4):643–649.
https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/7/4/01-7407_article
- [5] WHO. Promoting dengue vector surveillance and control. Accessed October 2026.
<https://www.who.int/activities/promoting-dengue-vector-surveillance-and-control>
- [6] WHO. Manual for monitoring insecticide resistance in mosquito vectors and selecting appropriate interventions. 2022.
<https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240051089>
- [7] CDC. CDC Bottle Bioassay. Updated June 2026.
<https://www.cdc.gov/mosquitoes/php/insecticide-resistance/cdc-bottle-bioassay.html>
- [8] Dafalla O et al. Knockdown resistance mutations contributing to pyrethroid resistance in *Aedes aegypti* population, Saudi Arabia. *East Mediterr Health J*. 2019;25(12):905–913.
<https://doi.org/10.26719/emhj.19.081>