

Ecological processes underlying the emergence of novel enzootic cycles— arboviruses in the neotropics as a case study

Sarah Guth^{1*}, Kathryn Hanley², Benjamin M. Althouse^{2,3,4}, and Mike Boots¹

¹Department of Integrative Biology, University of California, Berkeley, CA

²Department of Biology, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, USA

³Epidemiology, Institute for Disease Modeling, Bellevue, WA, USA

⁴Information School, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

Abstract

Pathogens originating from wildlife (zoonoses) pose a significant public health burden, comprising the majority of emerging infectious diseases. Efforts to control and prevent zoonotic disease have traditionally focused on animal-to-human transmission, or “spillover”. However, in the modern era, increasing international mobility and commerce facilitate the spread of infected humans, non-human animals (hereafter animals), and their products worldwide, thereby increasing the risk that zoonoses will be introduced to new geographic areas. Imported zoonoses can potentially ‘spill back’ to infect local wildlife—a danger magnified by urbanization and other anthropogenic pressures that increase contacts between human and wildlife populations. In this way, humans can function as vectors, dispersing zoonoses from their ancestral enzootic systems to establish reservoirs elsewhere in novel animal host populations. Once established, these enzootic cycles are largely unassailable by standard control measures and have the potential to feed human epidemics. Understanding when and why translocated zoonoses establish novel enzootic cycles requires disentangling ecologically complex and stochastic interactions between the zoonosis, the human population, and the natural ecosystem. We address this challenge by delineating potential ecological mechanisms affecting each stage of enzootic establishment—wildlife exposure, enzootic infection, and persistence—applying existing ecological concepts from epidemiology, invasion biology, and population ecology. We ground our study in the neotropics, where four arthropod-borne viruses (arboviruses) of zoonotic origin—yellow fever, dengue, chikungunya, and Zika viruses—have separately been introduced into the human population. This paper is a step towards developing a framework for predicting and preventing novel enzootic cycles in the face of zoonotic translocations.

Introduction

Humans have frequently enabled pathogens to overcome physical barriers to dispersal (1). The European conquest of the Americas brought Old World diseases to the New World, movement of troops during World War II propagated dengue viruses across the Asia-Pacific region (2), and air travel has provided an international transmission network for emerging infectious diseases (EIDs) such as the 2019 (ongoing) SARS-CoV-2 pandemic (3), the 2002-2003 SARS-CoV-1 outbreak (4) and pandemic influenza (5). Today, the majority of pathogens that infect humans are broadly distributed across geographic regions—globalized by human movement and population expansion, particularly during the past century (1). Animal pathogens have likewise spread globally through anthropogenic channels. The globalization of agriculture has expanded the geographic range of many livestock diseases with major economic repercussions, which continue to disproportionately affect the developing world (6). Domestic and wild animals translocated by humans have introduced their pathogens to new ecosystems, threatening biodiversity conservation—an anthropogenic impact termed “pathogen pollution” (7). In some cases, these invasive animal infections have

maintained transmission post-emergence in local wildlife, establishing persistent reservoirs that subsequently reseed transmission and thwart control efforts in the original animal host population. Examples include African Swine Fever virus in Eastern Europe, where a novel enzootic cycle of the invasive livestock pathogen in wild boars has prevented disease eradication (8,9); and rabies virus in Africa, where human-mediated dispersal of domestic dogs established wild carnivore reservoirs that now contribute to rabies persistence in both wildlife and human communities (10).

Clearly, the global spread of zoonoses poses a unique and critical threat to human health. Novel enzootic cycles occur when zoonoses are introduced to new regions, infect local wildlife (spillback), and persist in local animal host populations (enzootic establishment). Figure 1 provides a diagram of these processes and Table 1 provides definitions of all terms in this paper). Now, more than ever, global conditions are ideal for the generation of novel enzootic cycles. In an increasingly connected world, international trade and travel provide pathways for pathogen introductions, while the recent surge in the emergence and re-emergence of animal pathogens has increased the number of zoonoses poised to exploit those pathways (11). Human population expansion into natural habitat is intensifying contact between humans and animals, creating more opportunities for imported zoonoses to spill back into naïve wildlife populations (12). The probability that these introduced infections persist in animal populations is increasing as human development pushes wildlife into crowded habitat patches and climate change alters transmission conditions (7).

In this era of globalization, zoonoses are increasingly being recognized as global threats. The emergence of SARS-CoV-2 in Wuhan, China has since affected 210 countries and territories, causing nearly 2 million cases and 125,000 deaths worldwide as of April 15th 2020 (13). The pandemic has prompted an extraordinary global response—many countries have imposed nationwide lockdowns and closed their borders, nonessential international travel has largely been suspended (14), warring countries have declared cease-fire (15), and the World Health Organization (WHO) and United Nations have led international health and humanitarian organizations in mobilizing unprecedented funds for mitigating the spread and impact of the virus (16). Previously, the 2002-2003 SARS-CoV-1 epidemic prompted efforts to build infrastructure for global health security (17); and the WHO has declared recent outbreaks of Ebola, H1N1, and Zika as public health emergencies of international concern (PHEICs) (18). Nevertheless, this dialogue on the globalization of infectious disease continues to conflate zoonoses and human-specific pathogens, often overlooking what makes the spread of zoonoses so uniquely dangerous—the potential for enzootic reservoirs to establish in previously naïve regions. Some zoonoses such as Ebola virus and SARS-CoV-1 have remained within the human population after introductions to new regions. Conversely, introductions of yellow fever virus (YFV) in South America, *Yersinia pestis* (plague) in the Americas (19), rabies virus in parts of Africa, and West Nile virus in North America infected and persisted in local wildlife, inhibiting control and eradication efforts (10,20,21). The enzootic establishment of YFV in South America is a particularly noteworthy case because three New World introductions of three additional arboviruses—dengue (DENV), chikungunya (CHIKV), and Zika (ZIKV) viruses—have since followed. All three arboviruses now circulate in the same urban transmission cycle as YFV in the South American human population, raising the question: will their transmission remain within the human population, or will novel enzootic cycles emerge (22–25)? Identifying mechanisms that shape the outcome of zoonotic translocations is critical for developing strategies to mitigate the public health consequences of global transmission networks.

An emerging body of literature is beginning to discuss the risk that human-to-animal transmission will seed persistent enzootic reservoirs (22–25), but overall, disease emergence and spillover from wildlife continues to dominate the conversation on zoonotic transmission. Our understanding of enzootic establishment is limited by the difficulty in quantifying a process that is both highly stochastic and the product of interactions between multiple systems. In this review, we provide a conceptual framework to begin disentangling this ecological complexity, applying concepts from disease ecology, invasion biology, and population ecology. Cross-species pathogen emergence has previously been compared to species invasions (26) and population ecology used to understand post-introduction persistence (27) in the context of zoonotic spillover in human populations and host shifts within wildlife communities. Adapting this interdisciplinary theory on pathogen emergence to enzootic establishment, we review potential ecological mechanisms affecting the probability that translocated zoonoses emerge in novel enzootic cycles. We discuss the impact of each mechanism on the process of enzootic establishment: (1) local wildlife becomes exposed, (2) the zoonosis successfully infects the novel hosts, and (3) transmission persists indefinitely (28,29). We ground our discussion in the neotropics, where four arboviruses of zoonotic origin—YFV, DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV—have separately been introduced into the human population. We additionally discuss the utility of modeling approaches, which we illustrate by building a simulation model for our neotropics case study. Our aim is to delineate the ecological processes that shape the outcome of zoonotic translocations as a first step towards developing a framework for predicting and preventing novel enzootic cycles, and therefore we do not discuss other key factors such as immunity, phylogeny, and evolution.

The case study

YFV, DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV all originated in sylvatic cycles involving non-human primates and primatophilic *Aedes* spp. mosquitoes in either Africa or Southeast Asia. As a result of human introductions, all four now circulate in human urban cycles in the Americas vectored by the anthropophilic mosquitoes *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* (30). YFV eventually spilled back to infect New World mosquitoes and primates, establishing a novel enzootic cycle that is broadly similar to the sylvatic transmission cycle in which it originated, albeit the taxonomic separation between Old World and New World hosts and vectors (31). To date, only YFV has successfully established sustained sylvatic transmission in New World primate and mosquito populations (31). However, given the similar histories of DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV to that of YFV, there seems a high risk that neotropical mosquitoes and primates will also provide a suitable ecological niche for novel enzootic reservoirs of DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV. DENV and ZIKV belong to the same genus, *Flavivirus*, as YFV, and CHIKV (family *Togaviridae*, genus *Alphavirus*) belongs to the same phylogenetic group as Mayaro virus (MAYV), an endemic South American zoonosis that circulates in primates and *Haemagogus* spp. (32). DENV additionally has spilled back at least once into a novel enzootic system—the virus established a persistent enzootic cycle in Africa after being introduced from Asia (33)—which offers a formidable warning of enzootic establishment in the American tropics.

ZIKV infections have recently been detected in New World primates, suggesting that the emergence of a persistent enzootic cycle could be imminent. Carcasses of free-living *Callithrix* spp. (marmosets) and *Sapajus* spp. (capuchins) were found to be infected with ZIKV strains of the ZIKV lineage currently circulating in the South American human population (34) and several monkeys have tested PCR-positive (35,36). Mosquito surveillance in Brazil additionally detected an amplicon of DENV in a pool of *Haemagogus*

leucocelaenus (37). Sylvatic YFV now feeds recurring human epidemics in South America, allowing urban YFV transmission to continue despite vaccination campaigns. Thus, preventing the other three arboviruses, as well as any new introductions, from also establishing persistent enzootic reservoirs will be critical for forestalling further human morbidity and mortality from zoonotic transmission in the American tropics. However, the majority of the work on these imported arboviruses has focused on retrospective analysis of the conditions that enabled their introductions—particularly the global invasion of mosquito vectors *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus*—and the transmission burden in the human population (38–41). Only a few recent papers have begun to discuss the threat of enzootic establishment (22–25,42). We add to this discussion by considering how each ecological mechanism identified in our review may affect the trajectory of DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV in South America, using YFV as a frame of reference.

Wildlife exposure

Once a translocated zoonosis has established in a new human system, there is an immediate risk that the pathogen spills back into local wildlife populations. The probability of spillback first depends on the rate at which wildlife is exposed, which can be captured by propagule pressure—a concept from invasion biology that represents the number, and temporal and spatial distribution of nonnative individuals introduced to a new system, and a key determinant of invasion success (43,44).

Propagule pressure hinges on introduction pathways between a source and recipient population. The propagule pressure of a translocated zoonosis on local wildlife will vary based on the availability of transmission pathways between the human (source) and wildlife (recipient) populations. Borrowing from landscape and movement ecology, Borremans et al. (45) identified permeability—the likelihood that source and recipient hosts, along with the pathogen, enter an ecosystem boundary region—as the ecological basis of pathways available for cross-species pathogen emergence across ecosystem boundaries. With respect to the human-wildlife boundary, permeability for translocated zoonoses will increase with wildlife tolerance of (or preference for) anthropogenically modified landscapes, and human communities’ proximity to the edge of a species’ habitat and incursions into natural habitat for resource extraction.

Host boundary permeability creates opportunities for contacts between infected source and recipient hosts, increasing propagule pressure on the recipient host population. Transmission route determines the type(s) of contact, and thus degree of permeability, required for the translocated zoonosis to cross the human-wildlife interface (45,46). Zoonotic introductions can occur via direct contacts such as bushmeat hunting or the wildlife trade—common in the developing world—or via indirect mechanisms such as environmental contamination—e.g., if infected bats leave saliva on forest fruits consumed by humans or shed excreta in the human environment (61,62,66). For directly transmitted zoonoses, propagule pressure on local enzootic systems will require sufficient permeability for humans and wildlife to come into close contact. Conversely, zoonoses that can survive outside their hosts will be less constrained by host boundary permeability. Domestic animals often intersect with both humans and wildlife and thus, have the potential to bridge transmission between the two populations. Vectors can likewise function as bridge hosts; as long as a competent vector is present, vector-borne zoonoses only require some degree of spatial and temporal overlap to transmit between humans and wildlife.

Transmission burden in the human population inhabiting the new region—a combination of time since introduction and the number of subsequent human cases—will

determine the volume of pathogen propagules available to exploit transmission pathways to local wildlife (48). Consistent circulation and a high number of cases in the human population may result in more opportunities to spill back into enzootic transmission cycles, producing greater propagule pressure. The precise propagule pressure that led YFV to invade New World non-human primate populations is unknown, but phylogenetic analyses suggest multiple spillback introductions (49,50). Evidence that YFV reached its current widespread distribution in South America through long-distance, human-mediated dispersal implies that many spillback introductions occurred across a broad spatio-temporal landscape.

Vector-borne transmission may limit opportunity for spillback introductions to wildlife populations during periods of robust vector control efforts. Notably, in the 20th century, *Ae. aegypti* eradication campaigns significantly reduced the YFV burden, to the point where health officials erroneously considered the arbovirus to be eradicated from the New World (21). Following relaxation of eradication efforts, *Ae. aegypti* populations rebounded and *Ae. albopictus* invaded (38). These vectors increase arboviral boundary permeability, allowing zoonotic exchange to evade physical barriers (i.e., animals and humans do not need to interact directly or even occupy the same habitat for effective contacts to occur) (51). *Ae. albopictus* populations are often peridomestic, which may further bridge urban and sylvatic systems (42). It has been hypothesized that human-mediated movement of infected vectors played a significant role in the spread of enzootic YFV (50). Human-mediated vector dispersal and vector capacity to transmit between species without direct contacts have the potential to similarly facilitate enzootic invasion of DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV.

Several New World primates are considered habitat generalists, with high permeability of human-modified landscapes, likely increasing opportunities for human-to-animal pathogen introductions. In particular, *Aotus* spp. (howler monkeys)—the New World primate most susceptible to YFV—often occupy the forest edge and have been hypothesized to bridge urban and enzootic transmission of YFV (52). At the same time, deforestation, urbanization, and bushmeat hunting are pushing humans into wildlife habitat (53,54).

Inconsistent circulation in the human population likely limited YFV propagule pressure on New World non-human primates. A virulent pathogen, YFV historically emerged intermittently in large, deadly outbreaks in human cities, relying on re-introductions along shipping routes (21). However, in recent decades, unprecedented population growth combined with climate change and the re-invasion of *Ae. aegypti* has fueled an increase in the frequency and magnitude of arboviral epidemics in the neotropics (55). Between 1980 and 2007, the number of reported DENV cases in the Americas increased 4.6-fold (56,57) and in 2019, exceeded 3 million, surpassing a previous record of 2.4 million (58); the 2013 introduction of CHIKV resulted in 2.9 million cases within the following three years (59), and the 2015-2016 ZIKV pandemic reached 48 countries and territories (60). Furthermore, unlike YFV, DENV, ZIKV, and CHIKV lack available, safe vaccines (61). This heightened arboviral burden has the potential to increase propagule pressure of DENV, ZIKV, and CHIKV on New World wildlife populations, accelerating the timeline between translocation and enzootic establishment.

Enzootic infection

Not all wildlife exposures result in enzootic infections. To progress to the second step of enzootic establishment, the translocated zoonosis must be able to infect the exposed animals. Infecting novel host species in a novel environment can be described as a niche shift. The

concept of an ecological niche has many nuanced definitions in ecology, but generally represents the set of abiotic and biotic conditions that allow a species to occupy a particular space within an ecosystem (62). A pathogen niche is defined by its hosts, vectors, ecophysiological requirements, and the many ways in which these parts interact (63,64). Like other species, a translocated zoonosis will have a realized niche—existing transmission cycles—and a fundamental niche—the range of systems the zoonosis could theoretically invade if given the opportunity (63). The probability that the zoonosis undergoes a niche shift to infect novel hosts in its new range depends on the degree of overlap between its fundamental niche and novel environment (62).

Host specificity influences the breadth of the pathogen’s fundamental niche. Generalists are defined by broad fundamental host ranges (65), which intuitively, will intersect with a wider range of enzootic systems, facilitating shifts to novel hosts (66–68). Alternatively, zoonoses can evolve to invade environments outside of their original fundamental niches (62). Some pathogen types inherently have higher potential for fundamental niche shifts than others. In particular, YFV, DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV are all single-stranded RNA viruses—a group of pathogens previously shown to be the most likely to shift host species, predisposed to cross-species emergence by high mutation rates (28). Species diversity creates the host environment available to a translocated zoonosis. Disease ecologists have described a complex relationship between biodiversity and pathogen transmission within a given focal host species, where increasing diversity can have either an amplification or dilution effect on transmission, largely contingent on changes in community capacity to support infection (community competence) (69,70). Similarly, biodiversity in enzootic systems may either facilitate or inhibit the invasion of a translocated zoonosis depending on the abundance and distribution of competent hosts and vector species—susceptible to the zoonosis and infectious enough to transmit to the next susceptible individual. When increasing biodiversity adds competent host and vector species, we expect an amplified probability that wildlife exposures result in enzootic infections. However, adding low-competence species may cause a dilution effect, where wildlife exposures are increasingly “wasted” on hosts that cannot support infection. Additionally, competition among infectious agents can constrain host environments created by biodiversity. Native zoonoses already circulating in an enzootic system can compete for susceptible hosts, driving the competitive exclusion of a translocated zoonosis (71–73).

The “complete” host ranges of YFV, DENV, ZIKV, and CHIKV are not known, as it is practically infeasible to detect every enzootic infection. However, evidence of broad cell tropism and evolutionarily conserved viral entry strategies (74,75) suggest wide fundamental host ranges which are more likely to launch into novel systems (76). Phylogenetic analysis has demonstrated the relative ease with which YFV can shift between human and non-human primate host types, with multiple sylvatic strains circulating in the human population, but no evidence of major genetic adaptations between urban and enzootic transmission cycles (77).

A remarkably diverse assemblage of non-human primates and mosquitoes inhabit the neotropics. This biodiversity could amplify the probability of novel enzootic infections because New World primates and mosquitoes are competent hosts of a broad range of arboviruses (24,78). Previous meta-analyses suggest that the probability of cross-species emergence increases as the phylogenetic distance between novel and original host species decreases (i.e., as hosts become more closely related) (67,68,79–82). Thus, YFV, DENV, ZIKV, and CHIKV may be predisposed to shift to New World monkeys and arboreal mosquito vectors, which are phylogenetically related to the Old World monkeys and *Aedes* spp. that maintain sylvatic YFV, DENV, ZIKV, and CHIKV in Africa and Asia (31). That being said, New and Old World monkeys and mosquitoes could be divergent in critical

immune factors and/or cell surface receptors involved in viral infection. Nevertheless, experimental infection has demonstrated that neotropical primates are competent hosts for ZIKV and DENV (83–86); neotropical *Haemagogus leucocelaenus* and *Aedes terreus* are competent vectors for CHIKV (25); and *Sabethes cyaneus* is a competent vector for ZIKV, though significantly less competent than *Ae. aegypti* (87). However, even if neotropical primatophilic mosquito species have limited capacity to vector DENV, ZIKV, or CHIKV, as humans encroach on forest habitat, anthropophilic vectors *Ae. aegypti* and *Ae. albopictus* could play an increasingly important role in sustaining enzootic cycles in peridomestic urban forests (42).

Evidence of cross-protective effects that could drive competitive exclusion of DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV from New World enzootic systems is inconclusive. Speculation that hyperendemic DENV has conferred widespread cross-immunity against YFV in Asia—where YFV has remained absent despite the presence of suitable vectors and an entirely susceptible human population—has since been challenged (31,88). Additionally, there is no evidence of reciprocal cross-protective effects that would allow YFV to exclude DENV from New World enzootic systems (89). It has been hypothesized that ZIKV cross-protective immunity against DENV underlies the decline in DENV incidence following the first ZIKV outbreaks observed in Brazil (90) and Colombia (91); however, neutralization assays have not supported this hypothesis (92). A recent experimental infection study in mice suggests strong cross-protection of CHIKV against Mayaro (MAYV) virus—the endemic alphavirus that circulates in South American primates and *Haemagogus* spp. (93). However, there is no evidence of reciprocal cross-protective effects that would allow MAYV to exclude CHIKV from New World enzootic systems (89).

Persistence

The outcome of spillback events depends on the potential for transmission between individuals in the novel animal host population. If animal transmission is limited, spillback might result in an isolated wildlife case, or alternatively, trigger an outbreak that threatens conservation efforts but eventually dies out (94,95). However, above a critical transmission threshold, the translocated zoonosis will persist indefinitely—the final step of successful enzootic establishment. In disease ecology and epidemiology, that critical transmission threshold is represented by the effective reproduction number (R)—the average number of secondary cases generated by a single infected individual in a population of susceptible and non-susceptible hosts. While $R > 1$, each infected individual will, on average, produce at least one secondary infection, allowing the pathogen to persist. The effective reproduction number is a function of pathogen attributes such as transmissibility and duration of infectiousness, as well as the average rate of contact between infected and susceptible individuals (and vectors if vector-borne) in a given population.

The average contact rate between infected and susceptible hosts is largely shaped by population ecology (96). Dynamic demographic rates and structuring of host populations determine the abundance, distribution, and movement of hosts available to translocated zoonoses in enzootic systems. Wildlife populations with high carrying capacities will have larger baseline populations of susceptible hosts. High birth rates replenish the supply of susceptible hosts, inhibiting mortality and conferred immunity from depleting the susceptible population and driving the effective reproduction below the threshold of persistence (97). Spatial structuring of susceptible hosts can either limit or enhance the potential for pathogen persistence. Pathogen dispersal between patches can promote persistence across a metapopulation by buffering against local depletion of susceptible individuals. On the other

hand, spatial structure can limit contacts between patches, lowering the effective reproduction number and driving an epidemic to extinction (96,98).

While some New World monkeys are large species with low birth rates, one of the clade's defining features is its diverse set of remarkably small-bodied, short-lived primates. For example, the pygmy marmoset (*Callithrix pygmaea*) is a small-bodied New World primate with bimodal annual birth peaks, high twin birth rates, and a natural lifespan of about 10 years (99). These smaller-bodied primates also tend to require smaller home ranges and live in higher densities, allowing for greater sympatric species richness. A meta-analysis of New World primate assemblages found that on average, forest sites contained six sympatric species, but this number could reach as high as 14 species, peaking near the equator (100). New World enzootic mosquito species occupy the canopy, preying primarily on primates. These vectors do not appear to demonstrate strong host preferences and thus, likely bridge transmission between sympatric groups of primate species. This spatial structure—vector-mediated pathogen dispersal between primate groups (intra- and inter-species)—may have facilitated the enzootic establishment of YFV. It has been hypothesized that enzootic YFV persists within primate metapopulations occupying continuous forest in wandering epizootics, in which transmission continually shifts between subpopulations. We suspect that the demographic rates and structuring of primate host and mosquito vector populations in the New World would, as with YFV, facilitate the persistence of DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV should they spill back successfully.

The ecology of enzootic establishment in the Anthropocene

Anthropogenic impacts are affecting ecological processes at every stage of enzootic establishment. Wildlife exposure to urban transmission of translocated zoonoses will likely increase as humans continue to encroach on wildlife habitats (2,12,22,23,101). Land conversion and extraction of natural resources drive humans, mosquito vectors, and primates to coincide in human-modified landscapes, potentially increasing the boundary permeability of the translocated arboviruses. Climate change will alter the epidemiology of zoonoses, particularly vector-borne zoonoses, substantially reducing transmission at temperature extremes, but increasing transmission in moderate warming scenarios (102). Rapid population growth and the global expansion of mosquito vectors contribute to heightened zoonotic transmission burden in the human population, which subsequently places greater propagule pressure on enzootic systems. Species composition is changing in many ecosystems, which can facilitate or inhibit pathogen invasions depending on whether lost species are competent hosts (70). However, habitat specialists are highly sensitive to anthropogenic impacts, whereas habitat generalists—which often bridge transmission between urban and enzootic systems—often persist (103). By increasing the concentration of competent hosts, anthropogenic change can have an amplification effect on enzootic infection. Habitat loss is additionally pushing animals into dense populations ripe for disease persistence (7).

Recent trends in enzootic YFV reflect the changing ecology of enzootic establishment in the Anthropocene. The past decade has seen a surge in the frequency and magnitude of YFV epizootics in South America. The discovery of co-circulating sylvatic transmission cycles during the 2016-2017 YFV epidemic in Brazil implies multiple spillback introductions on a local scale across a short timespan (77). Additionally, enzootic YFV has invaded previously non-endemic regions, significantly expanding its range in the New World.

376 A case for modeling

377 It is challenging to approach the ecological complexity of enzootic establishment through
 378 field and experimental studies alone. Mathematical models can however be a useful tool that
 379 allows us to integrate existing data and ecological theory to elucidate system dynamics,
 380 particularly when data are sparse, as is often the case with enzootic systems (22,104,105).
 381 Many modeling approaches can be applied to a range of questions that allow us to better
 382 understand the risk that translocated zoonoses will emerge in novel enzootic cycles. For
 383 example, species distribution models, or ecological niche models—statistical approaches that
 384 leverage associations between presence-absence information and environmental variables to
 385 infer habitat suitability—can be used to identify at-risk systems where high permeability of
 386 humans, vectors, and translocated zoonoses create ideal conditions for enzootic establishment
 387 (46,106–108). Metapopulation modeling is often an important tool to demonstrate conditions
 388 of pathogen persistence in wildlife populations given that they are typically fragmented (96).
 389 Next-generation matrix methods are a useful tool to quantify the effective reproduction
 390 number of translocated zoonoses in novel enzootic systems to understand the probability of
 391 successful invasion (109). Explicit simulations that capture significant amounts of the
 392 complexity of systems have been effectively used to compare the impact of interventions in
 393 the human and wildlife population (110). We would also argue that simple models can be
 394 very useful in helping us understand the system-specific dynamics that influence the
 395 ecological processes underlying enzootic establishment. For example, Althouse et al. (22)
 396 developed the only previous model of vector-borne transmission in non-human primate hosts
 397 (22,104,105), and showed that whether ZIKV persists enzootically in South America is
 398 highly dependent on primate birth rates and mosquito population sizes. Based on model
 399 outcomes for the range of parameter values estimated to apply to the neotropics, they
 400 concluded that ZIKV has a high potential for enzootic establishment in the New World.

401 The modeling approach of Althouse et al. (22) can be applied to all four translocated
 402 arboviruses circulating in the neotropics. In particular, we can examine how key differences
 403 between the different viruses may impact their relative risk of enzootic establishment.
 404 Specifically, the extrinsic incubation period (EIP)—the delay from initial infection until
 405 transmission is possible—varies between YFV, DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV (111–114). EIP
 406 helps determine the length of the mosquito infectious period, defining onward transmission
 407 (115) and therefore has the potential to impact the risk of spillback. However, a model is
 408 needed to explore whether these differences are likely to be relevant, particularly in the
 409 context of the long lifespans of New World sylvatic mosquitoes in South American enzootic
 410 systems. To examine this question, we built on the model of Althouse et al. (22), and
 411 simulated the introduction of a single infected primate within a multi-host metapopulation
 412 model to explore how a spillback event might play out for all four translocated arboviruses
 413 given New World mosquito lifespans (*see the Supplementary Information for a more detailed*
 414 *description of the model methods*). Except for the primate birth rate (which we hold
 415 constant), we reproduce their range of parameter values, additionally varying the length of
 416 the EIP to reflect differences between the arboviruses, and the mosquito lifespan to reflect
 417 differences between species and environmental conditions. Given that EIP and mosquito
 418 lifespan are highly variable across conditions, the values selected for our simulations were
 419 not meant to perfectly describe the four arboviruses or particular mosquito species; instead,
 420 we aimed to capture the range of values that have been observed across arboviruses and
 421 environmental conditions to understand general trends in the effect of EIP and lifespan on the
 422 probability of enzootic establishment. For EIP, we selected values between 2 (reflecting the
 423 lower bound for CHIKV (111)) and 10 days (approximating the longer EIP of ZIKV (87)).
 424 For mosquito lifespan, we use 7 days—taken from the previous model of enzootic vector-

borne transmission in primates (22)—as our starting value and selected two additional values at 7 day intervals: 14 days approximately represents mean values from mark-release-recapture studies in South America for *Ae. albopictus* in field conditions (116), and 21 days approximately represents conservative mean values for *Haemagogus* spp. and *Sabethes* spp. at warmer temperatures (117). For each set of values, we ran 50 simulations, calculating the probability of persistence as the proportion of simulations in which infected primates remained at the end of the three-year period.

At shorter mosquito lifespans, EIP length affected the probability of persistence; increasing EIP to 10 days, as we might observe with ZIKV, decreased the probability of persistence, whereas shortening EIP to 2 days, as we might observe with CHIKV or at warm temperatures, increased the probability of persistence (Figure 2). However, extending the mosquito lifespan negated this effect; when the mosquito lifespan reflects New World sylvatic species and warm temperatures at 21 days, there is a relatively high probability of sylvatic establishment across all EIP values. Long-lived sylvatic mosquitoes are hypothesized to play a substantial role in YFV maintenance in the neotropics (118), which may be part of the reason why YFV has established and maintained enzootic transmission despite an EIP of 7 days. These results also suggest that despite differences in EIP, there may be a particularly high risk of enzootic establishment for DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV in the New World due to naturally longer-lived sylvatic species and warmer temperatures, which both shorten EIP and extend mosquito lifespans. This work is important in highlighting the need for surveillance efforts to be equally vigilant of DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV spillback in the New World. The results give a good example of how models can be useful in our understanding of complex ecological interactions. In this case we may have expected that difference in EIP may have been important in determining relative risk of enzootic establishment, however, due to longer mosquito lifespans, our model suggests that these differences are unlikely to be relevant.

Discussion

The goal of this study is to stimulate research on the emergence of novel enzootic cycles and begin to disentangle the underlying ecology complexity. We have argued here that the establishment of novel enzootic cycles is a pressing threat with the capacity to dramatically alter disease dynamics. The International Task Force for Disease Eradication identifies the existence of an animal reservoir as a barrier to eradicating a disease because enzootic transmission often feeds human epidemics (119). In some cases, enzootic cycles have even contributed to the evolution of pandemic pathogens; for example, pigs have functioned as “mixing vessels” for the evolution of pandemic swine influenza (120). We delineated potential ecological mechanisms at each stage of enzootic establishment, grounding our discussion in the neotropics, where the danger of enzootic establishment is evident in the history of YFV and an ongoing threat given the endemic circulation of DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV in the human population. Enzootic YFV, which has triggered devastating human epidemics across the neotropics, has expanded its geographic range since its initial establishment (121). There is a real danger that DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV will also establish persistent enzootic reservoirs in the New World, similarly inhibiting efforts to prevent future human epidemics. Given that enzootic cycles are nearly impossible to control or eradicate, avoiding enzootic establishment will be critical to mitigate the current arbovirus public health emergency in the New World. Moreover, enzootic cycles can thwart efforts to eradicate pathogens in the human population, as has occurred with the carriage of Guinea worm by dogs (122). In particular, the recent discovery of natural ZIKV (34–36) infection in non-

human primates in Brazil calls for renewed urgency to understand the potential for enzootic persistence.

Spillback events in which humans introduce pathogens into wildlife populations may become common occurrences, as urbanization and anthropogenic pressure on wildlife populations increase opportunities for human-wildlife contact. As a result, understanding the risk that arboviruses will persist in sylvatic cycles after spillback events should be established as a research priority, particularly in the era of SARS-CoV-2. There is significant concern that SARS-CoV-2 could spill back into susceptible wildlife within its expanded geographic range and establish novel enzootic reservoirs, becoming endemic outside of China. The high burden and global distribution of human SARS-CoV-2 transmission places propagule pressure on a wide range of enzootic systems. Bats—the putative origin of SARS-CoV-2 (123)—are the second most diverse mammalian group, inhabit every continent except Antarctica, and harbor a large diversity of coronaviruses (124). Many bat species migrate long distances (>1,000 km) (125), increasing their probability of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 and capacity to subsequently spread the virus. Although previous work has demonstrated that human-adapted CoV often cannot infect bat cells (126), the cell-surface receptor implicated in SARS-CoV-2 invasion of host cells—angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2)—has been found to be highly diverse across bat species and in some cases, conducive to human SARS-CoV-2 infection (127). ACE2 also appears to be conserved across mammal species, suggesting that the virus may have the potential to establish in a broad range of other mammalian host species (128–130). Furthermore, there is a possibility that human SARS-CoV-2 could infect initially unsuitable host species through mutation events (131).

To mitigate the risk that SARS-CoV-2 establishes novel enzootic reservoirs and becomes endemic outside of China, it is critical to identify susceptible wildlife species and populations and implement policies that limit their exposure to the virus. The US government has, at present, suspended all bat research to prevent humans from infecting and seeding an enzootic reservoir of SARS-CoV-2 in North American bats (132). However, bat research is still active in many other parts of the world, as are other forms of bat-human contact, though many countries have banned bat bushmeat in response to the pandemic (133). Additional policies may be needed to minimize human contact with other potentially susceptible wildlife populations—species with ACE2 receptors predicted to associate with the SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor binding site (RBD), and populations that occupy anthropogenic landscapes (particularly in regions experiencing a high burden of human transmission) and characterized by demographic rates and structuring predicted to facilitate sustained epidemics and enzootic persistence. It is also critical to monitor via surveillance whether these potentially susceptible animals become exposed and begin to demonstrate capacity for between-host transmission. In particular, researchers should monitor domestic animals, which can bridge transmission between human and wildlife populations (45). Notably, efficient SARS-CoV-2 replication and confirmed cases have been reported in cats (129,134) and ACE2 receptors of domestic cattle have been predicted to associate with the SARS-CoV-2 RBD (135).

The risk of enzootic persistence depends on a multitude of factors, many of which are unknown or poorly characterized, such as infectivity, number of spillback events, and the transmission conditions needed for persistence. Here we provide a conceptual framework of ecological factors to begin addressing the challenge of predicting this risk. Considering ecological mechanisms is a first step towards developing targeted intervention strategies. We additionally argue for the utility of modeling in detangling ecological complexity, providing a simulation model of arboviral transmission in New World primates and mosquitoes as an example. Our results indicate that although long extrinsic incubation periods (EIPs) can

reduce the probability of enzootic persistence, the long mosquito lifespans that are characteristic of tropical New World sylvatic species may negate this effect—suggesting that differences in EIP that we may have expected to be important in determining the translocated arboviruses’ relative risk of enzootic establishment are unlikely to be relevant. Overall, our work is important in highlighting the need to be vigilant of imported zoonoses and emphasizing the importance of robust programs to mitigate the risk of spillback events that lead to enzootic persistence.

Table 1. Definitions of terms used in this paper.

Table 2. An outline of the ecological mechanisms affecting each stage of enzootic establishment, and their influence on the enzootic potential of translocated arboviruses in the neotropics.

Figure 1. A diagram of the processes by which novel enzootic cycles emerge.

Figure 2. Model results predicting the probability of establishment across mosquito birthrates and EIPs. Mosquito birthrate is equivalent to 1/lifespan and increases from the top to bottom panels, while EIP increases left to right. Within each panel, the total population size of mosquitoes (in two populations) and primates (in two populations) changes horizontally and vertically, respectively. For each parameter set, we simulated the introduction of a single infected primate and subsequent transmission for a three-year period. Blue indicates no simulations establishing, whereas red indicates all simulations establishing. Contour lines show 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, and 0.95 probability of establishment.

Learning points

- The globalization of zoonoses—capable of both infecting humans and establishing persistent enzootic reservoirs of transmission in new regions—poses a unique and critical threat to human health. Understanding the risk that translocated zoonoses spill back and establish reservoirs in novel wildlife hosts should be established as a research priority, particularly in the era of SARS-CoV-2.
- Novel enzootic cycles occur when zoonoses are introduced to new regions (translocation), infect local wildlife (spillback), and persist in local animal host populations (enzootic establishment).
- Understanding when and why translocated zoonoses establish novel enzootic cycles requires disentangling ecologically complex and stochastic interactions between the zoonosis, the human population, and the natural ecosystem.
- Mathematical modeling can inform risk assessments by leveraging existing empirical data. For example, simulation modeling indicates that long extrinsic incubation periods (EIPs) in the mosquito can reduce the probability of enzootic persistence, but the long mosquito lifespans that are characteristic of tropical New World sylvatic species may negate this effect. These model predictions suggest that while we may have expected differences in EIP to significantly affect the risk that translocated arboviruses establish novel enzootic cycles in the neotropics, these differences are unlikely to be relevant.

Key papers in the field

- Althouse BM, Vasilakis N, Sall AA, Diallo M, Weaver SC, Hanley KA. Potential for Zika Virus to Establish a Sylvatic Transmission Cycle in the Americas. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2016 Dec 15;10(12):e0005055.
- Weaver SC. Urbanization and geographic expansion of zoonotic arboviral diseases: mechanisms and potential strategies for prevention. *Trends in Microbiology*. 2013 Aug;21(8):360–3.
- Han BA, Majumdar S, Calmon FP, Glicksberg BS, Horesh R, Kumar A, et al. Confronting data sparsity to identify potential sources of Zika virus spillover infection among primates. *Epidemics*. 2019 Jun;27:59–65.
- Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, Failloux A-B. High risk for chikungunya virus to initiate an enzootic sylvatic cycle in the tropical Americas. Vasilakis N, editor. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2017 Jun 29;11(6):e0005698.
- Hanley KA, Monath TP, Weaver SC, Rossi SL, Richman RL, Vasilakis N. Fever versus fever: The role of host and vector susceptibility and interspecific competition in shaping the current and future distributions of the sylvatic cycles of dengue virus and yellow fever virus. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*. 2013 Oct;19:292–311.

References

1. Smith KF, Sax DF, Gaines SD, Guernier V, Guégan J-F. Globalization of human infectious disease. *Ecology*. 2007 Aug;88(8):1903–10.
2. Gubler DJ. Dengue, Urbanization and Globalization: The Unholy Trinity of the 21st Century. *Tropical Medicine and Health*. 2011;39(4):S3–11.
3. Jin Y, Yang H, Ji W, Wu W, Chen S, Zhang W, et al. Virology, Epidemiology, Pathogenesis, and Control of COVID-19. *Viruses*. 2020 Mar 27;12(4):372.
4. Wilder-Smith A, Freedman DO. Confronting the New Challenge in Travel Medicine: SARS. *Journal of Travel Medicine*. 2006 Mar 8;10(5):257–8.
5. Khan K, Arino J, Hu W, Raposo P, Sears J, Calderon F, et al. Spread of a Novel Influenza A (H1N1) Virus via Global Airline Transportation. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2009 Jul 9;361(2):212–4.
6. Perry BD, Grace D, Sones K. Current drivers and future directions of global livestock disease dynamics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2013 Dec 24;110(52):20871–7.
7. Tompkins DM, Carver S, Jones ME, Krkošek M, Skerratt LF. Emerging infectious diseases of wildlife: a critical perspective. *Trends in Parasitology*. 2015 Apr;31(4):149–59.
8. Gogin A, Gerasimov V, Malogolovkin A, Kolbasov D. African swine fever in the North Caucasus region and the Russian Federation in years 2007–2012. *Virus Research*. 2013 Apr;173(1):198–203.
9. Cwynar P, Stojkov J, Wlzlak K. African Swine Fever Status in Europe. *Viruses*. 2019 Mar 30;11(4):310.

- 605 10. Lembo T, Hampson K, Kaare MT, Ernest E, Knobel D, Kazwala RR, et al. The Feasibility of
606 Canine Rabies Elimination in Africa: Dispelling Doubts with Data. *PLoS Neglected*
607 *Tropical Diseases*. 2010 Feb 23;4(2):e626.
- 608 11. Gibbs EPJ. Emerging zoonotic epidemics in the interconnected global community.
609 *Veterinary Record*. 2005 Nov 26;157(22):673–9.
- 610 12. Hassell JM, Begon M, Ward MJ, Fèvre EM. Urbanization and Disease Emergence:
611 Dynamics at the Wildlife–Livestock–Human Interface. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*.
612 2017 Jan;32(1):55–67.
- 613 13. WHO. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report - 85. World Health
614 Organization; 2020.
- 615 14. Salcedo A, Yar S, Cherelus G. Coronavirus Travel Restrictions, Across the Globe. *New*
616 *York Times*. 2020 Apr 15;
- 617 15. Hubbard B, Al-Batati S. Saudi Arabia Declares Cease-Fire in Yemen, Citing Fears of
618 Coronavirus. *New York Times*. 2020 Apr 8;
- 619 16. WHO. WHO and UNICEF to partner on pandemic response through COVID-19 Solidarity
620 Response Fund. WHO News Release. 2020 Apr 3;
- 621 17. Hoffman SJ. The evolution, etiology and eventualities of the global health security
622 regime. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2010 Nov 1;25(6):510–22.
- 623 18. Hoffman SJ, Silverberg SL. Delays in Global Disease Outbreak Responses: Lessons from
624 H1N1, Ebola, and Zika. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2018 Mar;108(3):329–33.
- 625 19. Kugeler KJ, Staples JE, Hinckley AF, Gage KL, Mead PS. Epidemiology of Human Plague in
626 the United States, 1900–2012. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2015 Jan;21(1):16–22.
- 627 20. Kilpatrick AM. Globalization, Land Use, and the Invasion of West Nile Virus. *Science*.
628 2011 Oct 21;334(6054):323–7.
- 629 21. Bryan CS, Moss SW, Kahn RJ. Yellow fever in the Americas. *Infectious Disease Clinics of*
630 *North America*. 2004 Jun;18(2):275–92.
- 631 22. Althouse BM, Vasilakis N, Sall AA, Diallo M, Weaver SC, Hanley KA. Potential for Zika
632 Virus to Establish a Sylvatic Transmission Cycle in the Americas. *PLOS Neglected Tropical*
633 *Diseases*. 2016 Dec 15;10(12):e0005055.
- 634 23. Weaver SC. Urbanization and geographic expansion of zoonotic arboviral diseases:
635 mechanisms and potential strategies for prevention. *Trends in Microbiology*. 2013
636 Aug;21(8):360–3.
- 637 24. Han BA, Majumdar S, Calmon FP, Glicksberg BS, Horesh R, Kumar A, et al. Confronting
638 data sparsity to identify potential sources of Zika virus spillover infection among
639 primates. *Epidemics*. 2019 Jun;27:59–65.

- 640 25. Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, Failloux A-B. High risk for chikungunya virus to initiate an
641 enzootic sylvatic cycle in the tropical Americas. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2017
642 Jun 29;11(6):e0005698.
- 643 26. Dunn AM, Hatcher MJ. Parasites and biological invasions: parallels, interactions, and
644 control. *Trends in Parasitology*. 2015 May;31(5):189–99.
- 645 27. Dobson A. Population Dynamics of Pathogens with Multiple Host Species. *The American*
646 *Naturalist*. 2004 Nov;164(S5):S64–78.
- 647 28. Woolhouse MEJ, Haydon DT, Antia R. Emerging pathogens: the epidemiology and
648 evolution of species jumps. *Trends Ecol Evol (Amst)*. 2005 May;20(5):238–44.
- 649 29. De Fine Licht HH. Does pathogen plasticity facilitate host shifts? *PLOS Pathogens*. 2018
650 May 3;14(5):e1006961.
- 651 30. Weaver SC, Charlier C, Vasilakis N, Lecuit M. Zika, Chikungunya, and Other Emerging
652 Vector-Borne Viral Diseases. *Annual Review of Medicine*. 2018 Jan 29;69(1):395–408.
- 653 31. Hanley KA, Monath TP, Weaver SC, Rossi SL, Richman RL, Vasilakis N. Fever versus fever:
654 The role of host and vector susceptibility and interspecific competition in shaping the
655 current and future distributions of the sylvatic cycles of dengue virus and yellow fever
656 virus. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*. 2013 Oct;19:292–311.
- 657 32. de Thoisy B, Gardon J, Salas RA, Morvan J, Kazanji M. Mayaro Virus in Wild Mammals,
658 French Guiana. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2003 Oct;9(10):1326–9.
- 659 33. Vasilakis N, Cardoso J, Hanley KA, Holmes EC, Weaver SC. Fever from the forest:
660 prospects for the continued emergence of sylvatic dengue virus and its impact on public
661 health. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*. 2011 Jul;9(7):532–41.
- 662 34. Terzian ACB, Zini N, Sacchetto L, Rocha RF, Parra MCP, Del Sarto JL, et al. Evidence of
663 natural Zika virus infection in neotropical non-human primates in Brazil. *Scientific*
664 *Reports*. 2018;(1).
- 665 35. Favoretto SR, Araujo DB, Duarte NFH, Oliveira DBL, da Crus NG, Mesquita F, et al. Zika
666 Virus in Peridomestic Neotropical Primates, Northeast Brazil. *EcoHealth*. 2019
667 Mar;16(1):61–9.
- 668 36. Favoretto S, Araújo D, Oliveira D, Duarte N, Mesquita F, Zanotto P, et al. First detection
669 of Zika virus in neotropical primates in Brazil: a possible new reservoir. *bioRxiv*. 2016;
- 670 37. de Figueiredo ML, de C Gomes A, Amarilla AA, de S Leandro A, de S Orrico A, de Araujo
671 RF, et al. Mosquitoes infected with dengue viruses in Brazil. *Virology Journal*. 2010;7(1).
- 672 38. Kraemer MUG, Reiner RC, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Gilbert M, Pigott DM, et al. Past and
673 future spread of the arbovirus vectors *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*. *Nature*
674 *Microbiology*. 2019 May;4(5):854–63.

- 675 39. Rodriguez-Morales AJ, Villamil-Gómez WE, Franco-Paredes C. The arboviral burden of
676 disease caused by co-circulation and co-infection of dengue, chikungunya and Zika in
677 the Americas. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*. 2016 May;14(3):177–9.
- 678 40. Campbell LP, Luther C, Moo-Llanes D, Ramsey JM, Danis-Lozano R, Peterson AT. Climate
679 change influences on global distributions of dengue and chikungunya virus vectors.
680 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2015 Feb
681 16;370(1665):20140135–20140135.
- 682 41. Fauci AS, Morens DM. Zika Virus in the Americas — Yet Another Arbovirus Threat. *New*
683 *England Journal of Medicine*. 2016 Feb 18;374(7):601–4.
- 684 42. Hendy A, Hernandez-Acosta E, Chaves BA, Fé NF, Valério D, Mendonça C, et al. Into the
685 woods: Changes in mosquito community composition and presence of key vectors at
686 increasing distances from the urban edge in urban forest parks in Manaus, Brazil. *Acta*
687 *Tropica*. 2020 Jun;206:105441.
- 688 43. Levine JM. Species Diversity and Biological Invasions: Relating Local Process to
689 Community Pattern. *Science*. 2000 May 5;288(5467):852–4.
- 690 44. Simberloff D. The Role of Propagule Pressure in Biological Invasions. *Annual Review of*
691 *Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 2009 Dec;40(1):81–102.
- 692 45. Borremans B, Faust C, Manlove KR, Sokolow SH, Lloyd-Smith JO. Cross-species pathogen
693 spillover across ecosystem boundaries: mechanisms and theory. *Philosophical*
694 *Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2019 Sep
695 30;374(1782):20180344.
- 696 46. Plowright RK, Parrish CR, McCallum H, Hudson PJ, Ko AI, Graham AL, et al. Pathways to
697 zoonotic spillover. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*. 2017 May 30;15(8):502–10.
- 698 47. Plowright RK, Eby P, Hudson PJ, Smith IL, Westcott D, Bryden WL, et al. Ecological
699 dynamics of emerging bat virus spillover. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
700 *Sciences*. 2015 Jan 7;282(1798):20142124.
- 701 48. Cassey P, Delean S, Lockwood JL, Sadowski JS, Blackburn TM. Dissecting the null model
702 for biological invasions: A meta-analysis of the propagule pressure effect. Jordano P,
703 editor. *PLOS Biology*. 2018 Apr 23;16(4):e2005987.
- 704 49. Bryant JE, Holmes EC, Barrett ADT. Out of Africa: A Molecular Perspective on the
705 Introduction of Yellow Fever Virus into the Americas. *PLoS Pathogens*. 2007;3(5):e75.
- 706 50. Mir D, Delatorre E, Bonaldo M, Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, Vicente AC, Bello G.
707 *Phylogenetics of Yellow Fever Virus in the Americas: new insights into the origin of the*
708 *2017 Brazilian outbreak*. *Scientific Reports*. 2017;7(1).
- 709 51. Kilpatrick AM, Randolph SE. Drivers, dynamics, and control of emerging vector-borne
710 zoonotic diseases. *The Lancet*. 2012 Dec;380(9857):1946–55.

- 711 52. Warner MD. Assessing habitat utilization by neotropical primates: A new approach.
712 Primates. 2002 Mar;43(1):59–71.
- 713 53. Robinson JG, Bennett EL. Having your wildlife and eating it too: an analysis of hunting
714 sustainability across tropical ecosystems. Animal Conservation. 2004 Nov;7(4):397–408.
- 715 54. Barreto P, World Resources Institute, Global Forest Watch (Organization), Instituto do
716 Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazônia, editors. Human pressure on the Brazilian
717 Amazon forests. Washington, D.C.: World Resources Institute; 2006. 84 p. (WRI report).
- 718 55. Gubler DJ. The Global Emergence/Resurgence of Arboviral Diseases As Public Health
719 Problems. Archives of Medical Research. 2002 Jul;33(4):330–42.
- 720 56. San Martín JL, Brathwaite Dick O, del Diego J, Montoya RH, Dayan GH, Zambrano B. The
721 History of Dengue Outbreaks in the Americas. The American Journal of Tropical
722 Medicine and Hygiene. 2012 Oct 3;87(4):584–93.
- 723 57. Solórzano JO, Guzmán MG, Brathwaite O, Bouckenooghe A, Zambrano B, Dayan GH, et
724 al. The Epidemiology of Dengue in the Americas Over the Last Three Decades: A
725 Worrisome Reality. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2010 Jan
726 1;82(1):128–35.
- 727 58. PAHO Epidemiological Update: Dengue, February 2020. Pan American Health
728 Organization (PAHO), World Health Organization (WHO); 2020.
- 729 59. Yactayo S, Staples JE, Millot V, Cibrelus L, Ramon-Pardo P. Epidemiology of Chikungunya
730 in the Americas. Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2016 Dec 15;214:S441–5.
- 731 60. Pan American Health Organization. Zika Epidemiological Update. 2017.
- 732 61. Silva JVJ, Lopes TRR, Oliveira-Filho EF de, Oliveira RAS, Durães-Carvalho R, Gil LHV. G.
733 Current status, challenges and perspectives in the development of vaccines against
734 yellow fever, dengue, Zika and chikungunya viruses. Acta Tropica. 2018 Jun;182:257–63.
- 735 62. Guisan A, Petitpierre B, Broennimann O, Daehler C, Kueffer C. Unifying niche shift
736 studies: insights from biological invasions. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 2014
737 May;29(5):260–9.
- 738 63. Roche B, Broutin H, Choisy M, Godreuil S, de Magny GC, Chevalere Y, et al. The niche
739 reduction approach: an opportunity for optimal control of infectious diseases in low-
740 income countries? BMC Public Health. 2014;14(1).
- 741 64. Lloyd-Smith JO. Vacated niches, competitive release and the community ecology of
742 pathogen eradication. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological
743 Sciences. 2013 Aug 5;368(1623):20120150.
- 744 65. Carroll GR. Concentration and Specialization: Dynamics of Niche Width in Populations of
745 Organizations. American Journal of Sociology. 1985 May;90(6):1262–83.

- 746 66. Turner PE, Morales NM, Alto BW, Remold SK. Role of evolved host breadth in the initial
747 emergence of an RNA virus: predicting virus emergence. *Evolution*. 2010;64(11):3273–
748 86.
- 749 67. Gilbert GS, Webb CO. Phylogenetic signal in plant pathogen–host range. *PNAS*. 2007
750 Mar 20;104(12):4979–83.
- 751 68. Olival KJ, Hosseini PR, Zambrana-Torrel C, Ross N, Bogich TL, Daszak P. Host and viral
752 traits predict zoonotic spillover from mammals. *Nature*. 2017 29;546(7660):646–50.
- 753 69. Johnson PTJ, Preston DL, Hoverman JT, Richgels KLD. Biodiversity decreases disease
754 through predictable changes in host community competence. *Nature*. 2013
755 Feb;494(7436):230–3.
- 756 70. Johnson PTJ, Ostfeld RS, Keesing F. Frontiers in research on biodiversity and disease.
757 Seabloom E, editor. *Ecology Letters*. 2015 Oct;18(10):1119–33.
- 758 71. Pepin KM, Lambeth K, Hanley KA. Asymmetric competitive suppression between strains
759 of dengue virus. *BMC Microbiology*. 2008;8(1):28.
- 760 72. Durbin AP, Mayer SV, Rossi SL, Amaya-Larios IY, Ramos-Castaneda J, Eong Ooi E, et al.
761 Emergence potential of sylvatic dengue virus type 4 in the urban transmission cycle is
762 restrained by vaccination and homotypic immunity. *Virology*. 2013 Apr;439(1):34–41.
- 763 73. Bremermann HJ, Thieme HR. A competitive exclusion principle for pathogen virulence.
764 *Journal of Mathematical Biology*. 1989 Apr;27(2):179–90.
- 765 74. Laureti M, Narayanan D, Rodriguez-Andres J, Fazakerley JK, Kedzierski L. Flavivirus
766 Receptors: Diversity, Identity, and Cell Entry. *Frontiers in Immunology*. 2018;9.
- 767 75. Schnierle BS. Cellular Attachment and Entry Factors for Chikungunya Virus. *Viruses*. 2019
768 Nov 19;11(11):1078.
- 769 76. Woolhouse MEJ. Population biology of emerging and re-emerging pathogens. *Trends in*
770 *Microbiology*. 2002 Oct;10(10):s3–7.
- 771 77. Moreira-Soto A, Torres MC, Lima de Mendonça MC, Mares-Guia MA, Dos Santos
772 Rodrigues CD, Fabri AA, et al. Evidence for multiple sylvatic transmission cycles during
773 the 2016-2017 yellow fever virus outbreak, Brazil. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2018
774 Sep;24(9):1019.e1-1019.e4.
- 775 78. Althouse BM, Durbin AP, Hanley KA, Halstead SB, Weaver SC, Cummings DAT. Viral
776 kinetics of primary dengue virus infection in non-human primates: A systematic review
777 and individual pooled analysis. *Virology*. 2014 Mar;452–453:237–46.
- 778 79. Parker IM, Saunders M, Bontrager M, Weitz AP, Hendricks R, Magarey R, et al.
779 Phylogenetic structure and host abundance drive disease pressure in communities.
780 *Nature*. 2015 Apr;520(7548):542–4.

- 781 80. Cooper N, Griffin R, Franz M, Omotayo M, Nunn CL. Phylogenetic host specificity and
782 understanding parasite sharing in primates. Fryxell J, editor. Ecology Letters. 2012
783 Dec;15(12):1370–7.
- 784 81. Gomez JM, Nunn CL, Verdu M. Centrality in primate-parasite networks reveals the
785 potential for the transmission of emerging infectious diseases to humans. Proceedings
786 of the National Academy of Sciences. 2013 May 7;110(19):7738–41.
- 787 82. Guth S, Visher E, Boots M, Brook CE. Host phylogenetic distance drives trends in virus
788 virulence and transmissibility across the animal– human interface. :12.
- 789 83. Vanchiere JA, Nehete PN, Abee CR, Wilkerson GK, Weaver SC, Brady AG, et al.
790 Experimental Zika Virus Infection of Neotropical Primates. The American Journal of
791 Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2018 Jan 10;98(1):173–7.
- 792 84. Chiu CY, Sánchez-San Martín C, Bouquet J, Li T, Yagi S, Tamhankar M, et al. Experimental
793 Zika Virus Inoculation in a New World Monkey Model Reproduces Key Features of the
794 Human Infection. Scientific Reports. 2017 Dec;7(1).
- 795 85. Althouse BM, Durbin AP, Hanley KA, Halstead SB, Weaver SC, Cummings DAT. Viral
796 kinetics of primary dengue virus infection in non-human primates: A systematic review
797 and individual pooled analysis. Virology. 2014 Mar;452–453:237–46.
- 798 86. Carrion R, Patterson JL. An animal model that reflects human disease: the common
799 marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*). Current Opinion in Virology. 2012 Jun;2(3):357–62.
- 800 87. Karna AK, Azar SR, Plante JA, Yun R, Vasilakis N, Weaver SC, et al. Colonized *Sabethes*
801 *cyaneus*, a Sylvatic New World Mosquito Species, Shows a Low Vector Competence for
802 Zika Virus Relative to *Aedes aegypti*. Viruses. 2018 Aug 16;10(8):434.
- 803 88. Wasserman S, Tambyah PA, Lim PL. Yellow fever cases in Asia: primed for an epidemic.
804 International Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2016 Jul;48:98–103.
- 805 89. Souza NCS e, Félix AC, de Paula AV, Levi JE, Pannuti CS, Romano CM. Evaluation of
806 serological cross-reactivity between yellow fever and other flaviviruses. International
807 Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2019 Apr;81:4–5.
- 808 90. Ribeiro GS, Kikuti M, Tauro LB, Nascimento LCJ, Cardoso CW, Campos GS, et al. Does
809 immunity after Zika virus infection cross-protect against dengue? The Lancet Global
810 Health. 2018 Feb;6(2):e140–1.
- 811 91. Rico-Mendoza A, Porras-Ramírez A, Chang A, Encinales L, Lynch R. Co-circulation of
812 dengue, chikungunya, and Zika viruses in Colombia from 2008 to 2018. Revista
813 Panamericana de Salud Pública. 2019 Jun 7;43:1.
- 814 92. Ariën KK, Michiels J, Foqué N, Heyndrickx L, Van Esbroeck M. Can Zika virus antibodies
815 cross-protect against dengue virus? The Lancet Global Health. 2018 May;6(5):e494.

- 816 93. Webb EM, Azar SR, Haller SL, Langsjoen RM, Cuthbert CE, Ramjag AT, et al. Effects of
817 Chikungunya virus immunity on Mayaro virus disease and epidemic potential. *Scientific*
818 *Reports*. 2019;9(1).
- 819 94. MacArthur JA, Mann PG, Oreffo V, Scott GBD. Measles in monkeys: an epidemiological
820 study. *Journal of Hygiene*. 1979 Oct;83(2):207–11.
- 821 95. Langwig KE, Voyles J, Wilber MQ, Frick WF, Murray KA, Bolker BM, et al. Context-
822 dependent conservation responses to emerging wildlife diseases. *Frontiers in Ecology*
823 *and the Environment*. 2015 May;13(4):195–202.
- 824 96. Keeling MJ. *Journal of Animal Metapopulation moments: coupling, stochasticity and*
825 *Ecology* 2000, 69, 725±736 persistence. 2000;12.
- 826 97. Anderson RM, May RM. The invasion, persistence and spread of infectious diseases
827 within animal and plant communities. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*
828 *Biological Sciences*. 1986;(314):533–70.
- 829 98. Keeling MJ, Gilligan CA. Metapopulation dynamics of bubonic plague. *Nature*. 2000
830 Oct;407(6806):903–6.
- 831 99. Harris RA, Tardif SD, Vinar T, Wildman DE, Rutherford JN, Rogers J, et al. Evolutionary
832 genetics and implications of small size and twinning in callitrichine primates.
833 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2014 Jan 28;111(4):1467–72.
- 834 100. Peres CA, Janson CH. Species coexistence, distribution, and environmental
835 determinants of neotropical primate richness: A community-level zoogeographic
836 analysis. *Primate Communities*. 1999.
- 837 101. Vasconcelos PFC, Monath TP. Yellow Fever Remains a Potential Threat to Public
838 Health. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*. 2016 Aug;16(8):566–7.
- 839 102. Githeko AK, Lindsay SW, Confalonieri UE, Patz JA. Climate change and vector-borne
840 diseases: a regional analysis. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2000;12.
- 841 103. Sverdrup-Thygeson A, Skarpaas O, Blumentrath S, Birkemoe T, Evju M. Habitat
842 connectivity affects specialist species richness more than generalists in veteran trees.
843 *Forest Ecology and Management*. 2017 Nov;403:96–102.
- 844 104. Althouse Benjamin M., Hanley Kathryn A. The tortoise or the hare? Impacts of
845 within-host dynamics on transmission success of arthropod-borne viruses. *Philosophical*
846 *Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2015 Aug
847 19;370(1675):20140299.
- 848 105. Althouse BM, Lessler J, Sall AA, Diallo M, Hanley KA, Watts DM, et al. Synchrony of
849 Sylvatic Dengue Isolations: A Multi-Host, Multi-Vector SIR Model of Dengue Virus
850 Transmission in Senegal. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2012 Nov 29;6(11):e1928.
- 851 106. Judson SD, Fischer R, Judson A, Munster VJ. Ecological Contexts of Index Cases and
852 Spillover Events of Different Ebolaviruses. *PLOS Pathogens*. 2016 Aug 5;12(8):e1005780.

- 853 107. Walsh MG, Wiethoelter A, Haseeb MA. The impact of human population pressure on
854 flying fox niches and the potential consequences for Hendra virus spillover. Scientific
855 Reports. 2017;7(1).
- 856 108. Pigott DM, Golding N, Mylne A, Huang Z, Weiss DJ, Brady OJ, et al. Mapping the
857 zoonotic niche of Marburg virus disease in Africa. Transactions of The Royal Society of
858 Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2015 Jun;109(6):366–78.
- 859 109. Jesse M, Mazzucco R, Dieckmann U, Heesterbeek H, Metz JAJ. Invasion and
860 Persistence of Infectious Agents in Fragmented Host Populations. Adler FR, editor. PLoS
861 ONE. 2011 Sep 30;6(9):e24006.
- 862 110. Sokolow SH, Nova N, Pepin KM, Peel AJ, Pulliam JRC, Manlove K, et al. Ecological
863 interventions to prevent and manage zoonotic pathogen spillover. Philosophical
864 Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2019 Sep
865 30;374(1782):20180342.
- 866 111. Dubrulle M, Mousson L, Moutailler S, Vazeille M, Failloux A-B. Chikungunya Virus and
867 Aedes Mosquitoes: Saliva Is Infectious as soon as Two Days after Oral Infection. PLoS
868 ONE. 2009 Jun 12;4(6):e5895.
- 869 112. Biggerstaff BJ, Arana-Vizcarrondo N, Johansson MA, Staples JE. Incubation Periods of
870 Yellow Fever Virus. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2010 Jul
871 1;83(1):183–8.
- 872 113. Chan M, Johansson MA. The Incubation Periods of Dengue Viruses. Vasilakis N,
873 editor. PLoS ONE. 2012 Nov 30;7(11):e50972.
- 874 114. Krow-Lucal ER, Biggerstaff BJ, Staples JE. Estimated Incubation Period for Zika Virus
875 Disease. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2017 May;23(5):841–5.
- 876 115. Keeling MJ, Grenfell BT. Effect of variability in infection period on the persistence
877 and spatial spread of infectious diseases. Mathematical Biosciences. 1998 Jan
878 15;147(2):207–26.
- 879 116. Lacroix R, Delatte H, Hue T, Reiter P. Dispersal and Survival of Male and Female
880 Aedes albopictus (Diptera: Culicidae) on Réunion Island. J Med Entomol. 2009 Sep
881 1;46(5):1117–24.
- 882 117. Dégallier N, Sá Filho GC, Monteiro HAO, Castro FC, Vaz Da Silva O, Brandão RCF, et
883 al. Release–Recapture Experiments with Canopy Mosquitoes in the Genera Haemagogus
884 and Sabethes (Diptera: Culicidae) in Brazilian Amazonia. J Med Entomol. 1998 Nov
885 1;35(6):931–6.
- 886 118. Cardoso J da C, de Almeida MAB, dos Santos E, da Fonseca DF, Sallum MAM, Noll CA,
887 et al. Yellow Fever Virus in *Haemagogus leucocelaenus* and *Aedes serratus* Mosquitoes,
888 Southern Brazil, 2008. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2010 Dec;16(12):1918–24.

- 889 119. Center for Disease Control. International Task Force for Disease Eradication.
890 Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 1990;39(13):209.
- 891 120. Nelson MI, Vincent AL. Reverse zoonosis of influenza to swine: new perspectives on
892 the human–animal interface. Trends in Microbiology. 2015 Mar;23(3):142–53.
- 893 121. Elton NW. Progress of Sylvan Yellow Fever Wave in Central America: Nicaragua and
894 Honduras. American Journal of Public Health and the Nations Health. 1952
895 Dec;42(12):1527–34.
- 896 122. The Lancet. Guinea worm disease eradication: a moving target. The Lancet. 2019
897 Mar;393(10178):1261.
- 898 123. Zhou P, Yang X-L, Wang X-G, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, et al. A pneumonia outbreak
899 associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. Nature. 2020
900 Mar;579(7798):270–3.
- 901 124. Wong A, Li X, Lau S, Woo P. Global Epidemiology of Bat Coronaviruses. Viruses. 2019
902 Feb 20;11(2):174.
- 903 125. Fleming TH, Eby P. Ecology of bat migration. In: Bat Ecology. Chicago, Illinois:
904 University of Chicago Press; 2003. p. 156–97.
- 905 126. Li F. Receptor recognition and cross-species infections of SARS coronavirus. Antiviral
906 Research. 2013 Oct;100(1):246–54.
- 907 127. Hou Y, Peng C, Yu M, Li Y, Han Z, Li F, et al. Angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2)
908 proteins of different bat species confer variable susceptibility to SARS-CoV entry.
909 Archives of Virology. 2010 Oct;155(10):1563–9.
- 910 128. Melin AD, Janiak MC, Marrone F, Arora PS, Higham JP. Comparative ACE2 variation
911 and primate COVID-19 risk [Internet]. Genetics; 2020 Apr. Available from:
912 <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.09.034967>
- 913 129. Sun K, Gu L, Ma L, Duan Y. Atlas of ACE2 gene expression in mammals reveals novel
914 insights in transmission of SARS-Cov-2 [Internet]. Genomics; 2020 Mar. Available from:
915 <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.30.015644>
- 916 130. Damas J, Hughes GM, Keough KC, Painter CA, Persky NS, Corbo M, et al. Broad Host
917 Range of SARS-CoV-2 Predicted by Comparative and Structural Analysis of ACE2 in
918 Vertebrates [Internet]. Genomics; 2020 Apr. Available from:
919 <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.16.045302>
- 920 131. Zhang Y-Z, Holmes EC. A Genomic Perspective on the Origin and Emergence of SARS-
921 CoV-2. Cell. 2020 Apr;181(2):223–7.
- 922 132. Michelle DZ. U.S. advises suspending bat research over concerns coronavirus could
923 infect North American species. The Washington Post.

- 924 133. Mccall R. Eating bats and pangolins banned in Gabon as a result of coronavirus
925 pandemic. Newsweek. 2020 Apr 6;
- 926 134. Shi J, Wen Z, Zhong G, Yang H, Wang C, Liu R, et al. Susceptibility of ferrets, cats,
927 dogs, and different domestic animals to SARS-coronavirus-2 [Internet]. Microbiology;
928 2020 Mar. Available from: <http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.03.30.015347>
- 929 135. Luan J, Jin X, Lu Y, Zhang L. SARS-CoV-2 spike protein favors ACE2 from *Bovidae* and
930 *Cricetidae*. Journal of Medical Virology [Internet]. 2020 Apr 10 [cited 2020 Apr 20];
931 Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/jmv.25817>

932

933

934 **Supporting Information Legends**

935


936 **Supplementary Information.** An extended description of the simulation model discussed in
937 this manuscript.


Table 1. Definitions of terms used in this paper

Term	Definition
Zoonosis	an animal pathogen that can also infect humans
Spillover	animal-to-human transmission
Spillback	human-to-animal transmission
Propagule pressure	the number, and temporal and spatial distribution of wildlife exposures to a translocated zoonosis
Permeability	the likelihood that humans and potential wildlife hosts, along with the translocated zoonosis, enter the boundary region at the human-wildlife interface
Realized niche	the set of hosts, vectors, and ecophysiological requirements that characterize existing transmission cycles of a translocated zoonosis
Fundamental niche	the set of hosts, vectors, and ecophysiological requirements that characterize the range of systems a zoonosis could theoretically invade if given the opportunity
Reservoir host	for a given zoonotic pathogen, the primary host species that is responsible for maintaining transmission
Enzootic (sylvatic) cycle	sustained and endemic transmission of a pathogen in a wildlife population
Enzootic (sylvatic) establishment	when a pathogen is introduced to a wildlife population and subsequently persists, attaining endemic status
Extrinsic incubation period (EIP)	the interval in the vector from initial infection until transmission is possible

stage	ecological mechanisms	case study
Wildlife exposure: urban transmission of a translocated zoonosis places propagule pressure on enzootic systems.	Permeability of the human-wildlife interface for humans, wildlife, and the translocated zoonosis creates pathways for propagule pressure.	
	Habitat specificity: generalists are more tolerant of human-modified landscapes, increasing wildlife permeability.	Several New World primate hosts—including <i>Aotus</i> spp., the most susceptible to YFV—are habitat generalists that often occupy the forest edge.
	Natural resource extraction and land conversion increases human permeability.	Deforestation, urbanization, and bushmeat hunting encroach on wildlife habitat in South America.
	Transmission route determines the type(s) of contact, and thus degree of permeability, required for a translocated zoonosis to cross the human-wildlife interface.	Vector-borne transmission may have initially constrained YFV, but now, abundant mosquitoes likely increase human-mediated dispersal and may facilitate wildlife exposure to urban transmission without direct contact with humans.
Enzootic infection: a translocated zoonoses infects exposed animals, undergoing a niche shift .	Transmission burden in the human population determines the volume of pathogen propagules available to exploit pathways to enzootic systems.	Heightened arboviral burden in the human population likely increases propagule pressure of DENV, ZIKV, and CHIKV on New World enzootic systems.
	Overlap between the fundamental niche of the zoonosis and the novel environment determines the probability that the zoonosis undergoes a niche shift to infect novel hosts in its new range.	
	Pathogen host specificity influences the breadth of the fundamental niche. Generalists are more likely to have the ability to infect and transmit between novel hosts.	Conserved cellular receptors and transmission dynamics suggest that YFV, DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV are generalists. The high mutation rates of single-stranded RNA viruses may additionally trigger fundamental niche shifts.
	Species diversity creates the host environment available to translocated zoonoses, and facilitates or inhibits invasion depending on the context. When additional species are susceptible and infectious to the translocated zoonosis, increasing species diversity is expected to amplify the probability of enzootic infection. However, when additional species are not competent hosts, there can be a dilution effect.	New World primates and mosquitoes are remarkably diverse. Given evidence that these species are competent arboviral hosts, this biodiversity could amplify the probability of enzootic infections of YFV, DENV, CHIKV, and ZIKV.
3. Persistence: Enzootic transmission of a translocated zoonosis persists indefinitely while R > 1 .	Competitive exclusion can constrain host environments created by biodiversity. Native zoonoses already circulating in an enzootic system can compete for susceptible hosts in an enzootic system, preventing infections of translocated zoonoses.	There is some evidence of cross-protection between the arboviruses, but co-circulation in urban transmission cycles does not support this hypothesis.
	Host population ecology shapes the average contact rate between infected and susceptible hosts—a key determinant of the effective reproduction number.	
	Demographic rates such as the carrying capacity and birth rate determine the abundance of susceptible hosts.	The New World has a diverse set of remarkably small-bodied, short-lived primates that live in relatively high densities.
	Population structure determines opportunities to contact susceptible hosts, and in metapopulations, can create pathogen dispersal patterns that either buffer against or promote local extinction.	Vector-mediated pathogen dispersal between primate groups (intra- and inter-species) may facilitate the persistence of New World enzootic YFV—a persistence pattern that has been described as wandering epizootics.

The emergence of novel enzootic cycles





Supporting Information

Simulation model methods

Our approach builds on Althouse et al. (1), which explored how the force of infection and primate birthrate affect the probability that ZIKV will establish a sylvatic cycle in the Americas. Expanding their analysis, we explored the effects of the mosquito extrinsic incubation period (EIP) and lifespan, and primate birthrate, and considered DENV, CHIKV, and YFV in addition to ZIKV. We simulate the introduction of a single infected primate into metapopulations of susceptible primate hosts and mosquito vectors, applying the Gillespie stochastic simulation algorithm with the Binomial Tau Leap approximation to the following transition rates for mosquitoes:

$$S_{m_j} \rightarrow S_{m_j} + 1 = \mu_{m_j}(S_{m_j}(t) + (1 - \rho)I_{m_j}(t)) \quad (1)$$

$$S_{m_j} \rightarrow S_{m_j} - 1 = \nu_{m_j}S_{m_j} \quad (2)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} S_{m_j} \rightarrow S_{m_j} - 1 \\ E_{m_j} \rightarrow E_{m_j} + 1 \end{array} \right\} = \sum_i r_{m_j p_i} \beta_{p_i m_j}(t) I_{p_i} S_{m_j} / N_j \quad (3)$$

$$E_{m_j} \rightarrow E_{m_j} - 1 = \nu_{m_j}E_{m_j} \quad (4)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} E_{m_j} \rightarrow E_{m_j} - 1 \\ I_{m_j} \rightarrow I_{m_j} + 1 \end{array} \right\} = \sigma_{m_j}E_{m_j} \quad (5)$$

$$I_{m_j} \rightarrow I_{m_j} + 1 = \rho I_{m_j} \quad (6)$$

$$I_{m_j} \rightarrow I_{m_j} - 1 = \nu_{m_j}I_{m_j} \quad (7)$$

and for primates:

$$S_{p_i} \rightarrow S_{p_i} + 1 = \mu_{p_i}N_{p_i} \quad (8)$$

$$S_{p_i} \rightarrow S_{p_i} - 1 = \nu_{p_i}S_{p_i} \quad (9)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} S_{p_i} \rightarrow S_{p_i} - 1 \\ I_{p_i} \rightarrow I_{p_i} + 1 \end{array} \right\} = \sum_j r_{m_j p_i} \beta_{m_j p_i}(t) I_{m_j} S_{p_i} / N_j \quad (10)$$

$$I_{p_i} \rightarrow I_{p_i} - 1 = \nu_{p_i}I_{p_i} \quad (11)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} R_{p_i} \rightarrow R_{p_i} + 1 \\ I_{p_i} \rightarrow I_{p_i} - 1 \end{array} \right\} = \gamma_{p_i}I_{p_i} \quad (12)$$

$$R_{p_i} \rightarrow R_{p_i} - 1 = \nu_{p_i}R_{p_i} \quad (13)$$

The equations divide primate and mosquito metapopulations into primate species 1,...,i and mosquito species 1,...,j. The model assumes host preference, with mosquito species j biting the

corresponding primate species j more often than other primate species—characterized by the on-diagonal rates within a contact matrix. Primate-mosquito species pairs are coupled by off-diagonal cross-biting rates, calculated as a fixed fraction (10%) of the on-diagonal within-pair biting rates. Given that vertical transmission in the mosquito population is thought to be negligible in enzootic cycles (2), the mosquito transovarial transmission rate ρ is set to zero. Thus, all primates and mosquitoes are born susceptible to arbovirus infection at rates μ and infected at rates $\beta(t)$, proportional to the number of mosquito bites given or received per day and the probability of successful transmission. We assume that birthrate = 1/lifespan—a conservative estimate given that primates’ peak reproductive years occur before the age of mortality (3) and mosquitoes have the capacity to complete multiple gonotrophic cycles within a lifetime (4). Thus, birthrates vary as we explore three mosquito lifespans (7, 14, and 21 days). Transmission probabilities vary seasonally in Equation 14 and 15 due to changes in environmental conditions such as rainfall and temperature (5). After infection, mosquitoes enter the exposed compartment, progressing to the infectious period at one of three fixed rates σ_{m_j} (1/2, 1/7, or 1/10 days).

Primates become infectious immediately and recover at a fixed rate γ_{p_i} , whereas mosquitoes remain infectious for life. Within each simulation, all parameter values are held constant across mosquito and primate species. Between simulations, only the EIP, and mosquito and primate lifespans, and number of species are varied—all other parameter values are fixed. Holding parameters constant whenever possible allowed us to minimize model complexity and target the effects of our parameters of interest. Furthermore, for the majority of these parameters, there is not enough empirical data to accurately characterize differences between New World species. Full lists of parameter values used for the simulations presented in Figure 2 are given in the table below. For each set of parameter values, we ran 50 simulations and calculated the probability of sylvatic establishment as the proportion of simulations in which there were infected primates remaining at the end of the simulated three-year period.

Parameter	Description	Value
t	Time in days	
$r_{m_j p_i}$	Biting rate per day to primates by mosquito j	0.5 days^{-1}
$b_{p_i m_j}$	Baseline transmission probability, from primate i to mosquito j	0.6
$b_{m_j p_i}$	Baseline transmission probability, from mosquito j to primate i	0.6
c_j	Percent of the magnitude of seasonal variation for mosquito j	0.1
μ_{p_i}	Primate i birth rate (=1/lifespan)	$1/(5 \times 365)$ to $1/(15 \times 365) \text{ years}^{-1}$
ν_{p_i}	Primate i death rate, set equal to birth rate	
γ_{p_i}	Primate i recovery rate	$1/4 \text{ days}^{-1}$
μ_{m_j}	Mosquito j birth rate	$1/7 \text{ days}^{-1}$
ν_{m_j}	Mosquito j death rate, set equal to birth rate	
σ_{m_j}	Extrinsic incubation period in mosquito j	0
ρ	Mosquito rate of transovarial transmission	0

By default, the compartmental model described in Equation 1 through 13 assumes exponentially distributed waiting periods. This assumption is biologically unrealistic because individuals leave their current compartment at a constant rate, regardless of how much time has passed since they entered that compartment. For example, with constant rates, individuals have an equal probability of leaving the latent compartment regardless of the time since infection. In reality, the probability of progressing should be very low immediately after infection, and

highest around the latent period mean—a trajectory better represented by a gamma distribution, or its discrete analog, the Erlang distribution. The use of exponentially distributed infectious and latent periods significantly affects model estimations of the basic reproductive number, duration of epidemics, and critical population size required for disease persistence in directly transmitted pathogens (6–8). Given the short mosquito lifespan and the resulting interaction between EIP and the length of the infectious period, epidemic dynamics would be more sensitive to the distribution of waiting periods in the mosquito vector than in the primate host. Thus, we explored the effect of modeling the latent period in the mosquito vector (EIP) as an Erlang distribution by splitting the latent period into a series of separate compartments, commonly referred to as a boxcar configuration (9).

We constructed two models with Erlang-distributed EIPs—a model with 10 exposed compartments, and a model with 50 exposed compartments. Figure S1 demonstrates the differences between the probability distributions of the exponentially-distributed EIP relative to both Erlang-distributed EIPs. As expected, modeling EIP as less-dispersed Erlang distributions resulted in higher probabilities of longer EIPs, thus decreasing the probability of sylvatic persistence. However, the Erlang-distributed models produced the same general trends as the exponentially distributed models, with shorter EIPs and longer mosquito lifespans increasing the probability of sylvatic establishment. As a result, in the interest of minimizing model complexity, in our main text, we report results from our exponentially-distributed model. Simulation results from the Erlang-distributed models with respect to differences in the mosquito EIP and lifespan are presented in Figure S2 and S3.




Figure S1. Comparison of exponential- and gamma-distributed EIPs. By default, waiting periods (such as the EIP) in traditional compartment models follow exponential probability distributions (in blue). In the case of EIP, this assumption is unrealistic because individuals have an equal probability of leaving the incubation compartment regardless of the time since infection. In reality, the probability of progressing should be very low immediately after infection and highest around the EIP mean—a trajectory better represented by a gamma distribution (in green and purple). A gamma distributed EIP can be constructed in a compartmental model via a boxcar configuration of the latent period (i.e., splitting the latent period up into a series of separate compartments, or boxes). Note how as the number of latent boxes increases (green vs. purple), the gamma distribution becomes less dispersed, and more closely centered around the EIP mean.




Figure S2. The probability of establishment with a 10-box Erlang-distributed EIP. Mosquito birthrate = $1/\text{lifespan}$ and increases from the top to bottom panels, while EIP increases left to right. Here, we constructed an Erlang-distributed EIP by splitting the exposed compartment into 10 separate boxes. Within each panel, the total population size of mosquitoes (in two populations) and primates (in two populations) changes horizontally and vertically, respectively. For each parameter set, we simulated the introduction of a single infected primate and subsequent transmission for a three-year period. Blue indicates no simulations establishing, whereas red indicates all simulations establishing. Contour lines show 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, and 0.95 probability of establishment.




Figure S3. The probability of establishment with a 50-box Erlang-distributed EIP.

Mosquito birthrate = $1/\text{lifespan}$ and increases from the top to bottom panels, while EIP increases left to right. Here, we constructed an Erlang-distributed EIP by splitting the exposed compartment into 50 separate boxes. Within each panel, the total population size of mosquitoes (in two populations) and primates (in two populations) changes horizontally and vertically, respectively. For each parameter set, we simulated the introduction of a single infected primate and subsequent transmission for a three-year period. Blue indicates no simulations establishing, whereas red indicates all simulations establishing. Contour lines show 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, and 0.95 probability of establishment.

References

1. Althouse BM, Vasilakis N, Sall AA, Diallo M, Weaver SC, Hanley KA. Potential for Zika Virus to Establish a Sylvatic Transmission Cycle in the Americas. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2016 Dec 15;10(12):e0005055.

- 109 2. Adams B, Boots M. How important is vertical transmission in mosquitoes for the persistence
110 of dengue? Insights from a mathematical model. *Epidemics*. 2010 Mar 1;2(1):1–10.
- 111 3. Alberts SC, Altmann J, Brockman DK, Cords M, Fedigan LM, Pusey A, et al. Reproductive
112 aging patterns in primates reveal that humans are distinct. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2013
113 Aug 13;110(33):13440–5.
- 114 4. Briegel H. Physiological bases of mosquito ecology. *J Vector Ecol*. 2003 Jun;28(1):1–11.
- 115 5. Althouse Benjamin M., Hanley Kathryn A. The tortoise or the hare? Impacts of within-host
116 dynamics on transmission success of arthropod-borne viruses. *Philosophical Transactions of*
117 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2015 Aug 19;370(1675):20140299.
- 118 6. Keeling MJ, Grenfell BT. Effect of variability in infection period on the persistence and
119 spatial spread of infectious diseases. *Mathematical Biosciences*. 1998 Jan 15;147(2):207–26.
- 120 7. Lloyd AL. Realistic Distributions of Infectious Periods in Epidemic Models: Changing
121 Patterns of Persistence and Dynamics. *Theoretical Population Biology*. 2001 Aug
122 1;60(1):59–71.
- 123 8. Wearing HJ, Rohani P, Keeling MJ. Appropriate Models for the Management of Infectious
124 Diseases. *PLOS Medicine*. 2005 Jul 26;2(7):e174.
- 125 9. Getz WM, Dougherty ER. Discrete stochastic analogs of Erlang epidemic models. *Journal of*
126 *Biological Dynamics*. 2018 Jan 1;12(1):16–38.

127

128