

WORLD HEALTH  
ORGANIZATIONORGANISATION MONDIALE  
DE LA SANTÉ ✓INTER-REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON  
MALARIA FOR THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN  
AND EUROPEAN REGIONSWHO/Mal/142 Rev.1  
23 March 1956

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Provisional agenda item 2

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INSECTICIDE-RESISTANT STRAINS

(with special reference to pests of medical importance)

by

Dr J. R. BUSVINE  
Reader in Entomology Applied to Hygiene  
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

The purpose of this paper is not to provide a summary of the scientific work on insecticide resistance; that has been quite adequately reviewed by Metcalf (1955). The intention is to provide a speculative discussion on certain points of practical interest. In addition, some very recent data on resistant strains of mosquitos are put on record.

## WHAT IS MEANT BY INSECTICIDE RESISTANCE?

For a long time applied entomologists have used the term "resistance" to refer to a natural characteristic of a species. In this sense, we could say that Culex fatigans is more resistant to DDT than Anopheles gambiae. In recent years, however, the word has been widely used to describe strains or races, within species, which are abnormal in being less susceptible to insecticides than the original or natural population of the species. In fact, such strains usually, if not invariably, arise following the extensive use of insecticides and the selective mortality resulting. For the remainder of the paper, the word will be used in the secondary or special sense.

Physiological resistance denotes enhanced capacity to survive a poison.

Behaviouristic resistance implies the avoidance of lethal contamination with a poison.

In an analogous way, one must distinguish natural behaviouristic resistance, characteristic of the original behaviour of a species (e.g. avoidance of DDT by A. gambiae), from "developed" behaviouristic resistance, as shown by strains of A. albimanus in certain areas, following intensive use of DDT.<sup>32</sup>

#### HOW SHOULD RESISTANCE BE DETECTED AND MEASURED?

The first indication of incipient resistance has usually come from field workers, who see that pests are not being killed by treatments which ought to be effective. However, there are several possible causes for failure of insecticides in the field and it is desirable to verify or exclude the possibility of physiological resistance as soon as possible. The proper course is to make comparative measurements of susceptibility levels under conditions as standard as possible. This should also give an indication of the magnitude of the resistance. The test method can be quite simple, but it must rest on sound principles, which will now be considered.

#### Condition of the insects

The susceptibilities of insects normally vary very much with age, state of nutrition and the temperature. Unless such things are standardized to some extent, any test method will give such variable results that only very gross types of resistance can be demonstrated.

The difficulty is not so serious in cases where insects from treated and untreated localities can be reared together and treated side by side. However, when comparisons are to be made from one year to another or from one country to another, the difficulties of standardization require careful consideration.

A partial solution may be in making relative measurements of susceptibility to two different insecticides. (A pronounced change in the ratio of susceptibility to two compounds may indicate resistance to the one being used in the field).

In regard to mosquitos, the following points may be noted:

(a) Larvae. Most experimenters find larvicide tests give very variable results, probably because larvae change their age and physiological condition rapidly. Susceptibility of normal larvae will alter considerably in the course of a single day, especially with the onset of moulting.

(b) Adults

- (i) Males are almost always much more susceptible than females.
- (ii) Unfed females are more susceptible than fed ones. Onset of hibernation is likely to affect certain species
- (iii) Susceptibility to DDT will increase at lower temperatures.

Conditions of the test

Measurements of resistance have been made in many different ways, the two main types of test being by dosage or by time of exposure. Measurements based on time of exposure to a residue (or aerosol) suffer from the fact that they are based on the improbable assumption that dosage increases regularly with time of exposure. In methods based on dosage received in a standard treatment, batches of insects are exposed at different levels, to obtain a dosage-mortality curve. Dosage can be applied:

(i) By topical application. This is a satisfactory method, but difficult to do with mosquitos, owing to their fragility. Different species vary in their sensitivity to handling.

(ii) By exposure to a standard aerosol, at various concentrations. This is difficult to carry out except in a well-equipped laboratory.

(iii) By exposure to standard residues. This is usually the most convenient and satisfactory method.

Different methods of measurement may record quite different degrees of resistance for a particular strain. Two examples will illustrate this: (a) a DDT-resistant strain of flies from Sardinia was investigated by a topical application method, which indicated a resistance of X300 when acetone was used as the DDT solvent, but only X16 when oil was used;<sup>3</sup> (b) a laboratory-selected DDT resistant strain of Drosophila melanogaster was tested by exposure to DDT residues in a treated cage. With a 24-hour exposure, the degree of resistance indicated was X2000; but with a 6-hour exposure, it was only X6 (Crow 1954).<sup>10</sup> These examples show the desirability of adopting standard methods of measuring resistance.

Methods recommended for mosquitos

Adults

The WHO Expert Committee on Malaria has advocated a method based on that of Busvine & Nash (1953).<sup>7</sup> Full details are given in the Committee's Fifth Report.<sup>35</sup>

Larvae

The adoption of a standard method for measuring resistance of larvae would seem highly desirable. It would be convenient to regularize a method in which DDT in a particular miscible solvent (e.g. alcohol or acetone) is added to water in a standard way. Variations of this type of method have been widely used giving, for example, the following 24-hour median lethal doses for normal Aedes aegypti (p.p.m.): Ginsburg (1949)<sup>19</sup> .011; Deonier et al. (1949)<sup>12</sup> .003; Pal et al. (1952)<sup>29</sup> .050; Wharton (1955)<sup>34</sup> .008; Elliott (1955)<sup>14</sup> .006; Brown (1955)<sup>2</sup> .004.

Examples of measurements of resistant strains of mosquitos

(1) Measurements on adults by Busvine method

(a) Anopheles sacharovi in Greece and Lebanon

Field observations of insecticide resistance of A. sacharovi have been made in Greece since 1951<sup>27</sup> and in the Lebanon in 1954.<sup>16</sup> Measurements of resistance were made in 1954 and 1955 as follows:

Area	Date	m.l.d. (%)		Author
		DDT	dieldrin	
Greece, Agoulinitza	1954	1.2	-	Livadas <sup>26</sup>
" Skala	1954	2.6	-	"
" Skala	1955	>3	>1	Busvine <sup>5</sup>
Lebanon, Arida	1955	1.7	-	"

Unfortunately no data are available from areas where insecticides have never been used, so that normal susceptibility of A. sacharovi is unknown. The tolerance level at Agoulinitza was the lowest found by Professor Livadas, but in his opinion there was some indication of incipient resistance even there.

(b) Anopheles sundaicus in Java

The emergence of DDT resistance in A. sundaicus was first reported by Crandell (1954)<sup>9</sup> and later by Chow.<sup>10</sup> Measurements of resistance levels were made in 1955 by Davidson.<sup>11</sup>

Insecticide	m.l.c. (%)	
	Semarang (DDT-sprayed area)	Tjilatjap (unsprayed area)
DDT	9.0*	0.5
dieldrin	0.08	0.065
gamma BHC	0.0085	0.008
aldrin	0.4	0.37

\* Extrapolated from probit/log. concentration graph.

(c) Anopheles stephensi in Saudi Arabia

Preliminary reports of resistance were made by Drs R. H. Daggy and R.L. Peffly. Measurements of resistance levels were made by Davidson in 1955,<sup>11</sup> both in Saudi Arabia and in London.

Insecticide	m.l.c. (%)		
	Al-Haza (DDT-sprayed area)	Ain-es-Saih (unsprayed area)	London (Laboratory colony)
DDT	5.0	<.5	1.4
dieldrin	0.17	<.1	0.12
gamma BHC	0.013	<.05	0.014
aldrin	0.5	<.2	0.03

(d) Anopheles gambiae in Northern Nigeria

Elliott & Ramakrishna have recently reported dieldrin resistance in Northern Nigeria in a large trial area sprayed with dieldrin.<sup>15</sup> Their measurements of resistance are compared below with some made by Busvine on A. gambiae colonies in London.<sup>6</sup>

Insecticide	m.l.c. (%)	
	Birnin Kebbi (Nigeria: dieldrin sprayed)	London (Laboratory colony)
DDT	1.6	0.95
dieldrin	2.0	0.25
gamma BHC	-	0.015

(2) Measurements of resistance in larvae

(Suspensions prepared by adding DDT in acetone solution to a large quantity of water).

(a) Culex fatigans in Malaya

Reports of insecticide-resistant strains of Culex fatigans have been made from India<sup>30</sup> and elsewhere;<sup>22</sup> but precise data are only available from a strain in Malaya (Reid 1955).<sup>31</sup>

Insecticide	24-hour m.l.d.	(p.p.m.)
	Kuala Lumpur (unsprayed)	Penang (BHC treated)
DDT	0.224	0.245
gamma BHC	0.026	0.257
dieldrin	0.006	0.060

(b) Aedes aegypti in Trinidad

DDT-resistance of a strain of Aedes aegypti in Trinidad was reported by Gillette in 1954.<sup>18</sup> The degree of resistance was measured by Brown on a sub-colony at Communicable Diseases Center, Savannah, Georgia.<sup>2</sup>

Insecticide	24 hour m.l.d. (p.p.m.)	
	Savannah (Laboratory colony)	Trinidad colony
DDT	0.004	2.0

HOW DOES RESISTANCE ARISE?

If resistant strains develop as a result of selective mortality due to wide use of insecticide, the possibility of a strain emerging and the speed with which it will develop depends on three factors:

- (i) the numbers and character of resistant genes in the original population;
- (ii) the intensity of selection, i.e. the magnitude of the population exposed and the proportion killed;
- (iii) the number of generations per year of the treated insect.

The first two points require rather careful consideration.

(i) If we think of an insecticide continually killing off the more susceptible members of a population it seems obvious that a more resistant race will result from the "survival of the fittest" (in a rather special sense). However, though we all know that individual insects vary in susceptibility, we also know that much of this variation is due to chance accidents of environment and is not inherited. If all variations were of this type, no amount of selection would raise the level of resistance.

Probably some variability of susceptibility in all insects depends on genetic constitution, though it may be indirect. For example, heritable variability in size or resistance to starvation, desiccation and so forth, could all influence resistance to insecticides. These characters, however, would be unlikely to vary

enormously. Regarding size, for example, it is unlikely that a race more than two or three times normal could be developed by selection. Therefore natural indirect characters seem unlikely to give rise to very great degrees of resistance.

On the other hand, certain species possess genes promoting specific physiological resistance to particular insecticides. These genes are quite unbeneficial as far as concerns normal existence in the absence of insecticides. They may even be slightly harmful, which would explain why they are rare. But when a large population containing a few individuals possessing these genes is suddenly exposed to the abnormal selective action of widespread insecticides, the effect is dramatic. The proportion of individuals with resistant genes rises rapidly, and, where multiple genes are present, their combination in the progeny will prove even more immune to the insecticide than the parents.

It must be admitted that much of the foregoing argument is somewhat speculative, because very few people have made extensive investigations of the range of variation existing in populations of insects before wide use of insecticides. I think, however, that these theories are reasonable, and if so, it is clear that happenings in the vast natural populations in the field may not always be possible to be duplicated in the relatively small inbred populations in a laboratory.

(ii) With regard to the intensity of selection, it is clear that if only a small proportion of an insect population is coming into contact with insecticide, and if the survivors mix and breed with the general mass, the dilution effect will tend to prevent the emergence of a resistant strain.

However, with the modern methods of using insecticides wholesale, it has been possible to reach a high proportion of insect populations over considerable areas. For example, if all the villages in a certain district are sprayed with DDT, it is likely that most of the flies and mosquitos which habitually infest human dwellings will be affected. Possibly this is more likely to occur with insects of medical importance as compared with agricultural pests, which would explain the more frequent occurrence of cases of resistance among the former.

### CAN RESISTANCE BE PREVENTED?

One obvious way to avoid resistance is not to use the insecticide concerned. This is not quite so pointless as it seems, for I have heard it reasonably suggested that in countries where typhus is an ever-present threat, DDT should be saved for epidemics and not used as a general hygiene measure, short of complete eradication against lice. Intermittent use, it was said, would tend to build up resistance among lice and thus lessen the value of DDT for preventing a typhus epidemic.

When the regular use of insecticide is necessary to control endemic disease (e.g. in antimalarial work) it may be desirable to restrict the attack to the adult stage. It has been claimed that simultaneous use of insecticide against larvae and adults is prone to develop resistance more quickly than use against adults only. This seems quite possible, in view of the greater proportion of the population exposed to selective action, especially in the wholesale application by aerial spraying.

An opposite policy has also been advocated, sometimes supported by rather obscure logic. It is suggested that resistance develops from inadequate dosing and that heavy applications should be used to prevent it. However, this is only certain to be true where the insecticide produces complete extermination. Otherwise it is difficult to see why a higher mortality should not produce more rapid selection for resistance.

### CAN RESISTANCE BE OVERCOME?

#### Increasing dosage

When an insect can develop a specific physiological resistance - such as that of the housefly to certain kinds of chlorinated hydrocarbons - the level of tolerance may be raised several hundred times. Obviously it is not feasible to attack them by increasing dosage, for one is not able to contaminate them with enough poison to compensate for the increased resistance.

However, it is quite possible that direct and specific resistance mechanisms do not exist in all types of insect for all types of poison. Where a specific resistance does not exist, it is still possible for an insect to develop resistance through indirect factors (e.g. enhanced "vigour") but, as already explained, one would not

expect this form of resistance to reach very high levels. In such a situation it may be possible to attain permanent control by increasing dosage. (Possibly this may have occurred in the Tennessee Valley, where the dose necessary to kill A. quadrimaculatus larvae has apparently increased in recent years, but satisfactory control is still obtained).<sup>17</sup>

Increasing dosage is not always as simple as it may appear. For example, if we consider residual wall deposits of insecticide, it may be easy to double the deposit, but this may not substantially affect the contamination of the mosquito which alights on it. Hadaway and Barlow (1951)<sup>21</sup> found no significant increase in kill of mosquitos by rates of deposit above 3 mg DDT per sq. ft. (The heavy deposits necessary in the field are to give longer action, not greater immediate toxicity).

More effective than increasing rates of application of residual insecticides may be improvements in formulation, times or places of spraying, etc.

#### Changing insecticide

When pronounced forms of resistance have developed, one can change to another type of compound in the hope that the pest will not be able to become resistant to that too. However, apart from the question of whether that will eventually happen or not, the choice of really suitable alternative insecticides is not as great as might appear.

Many of them can be grouped into classes, and resistance developed to one member of the group automatically provides a defence against the others. Three examples of such group resistance have been observed:-

- (a) Resistance to DDT and its analogues (methoxychlor, DDD, etc.)

Musca domestica, Pediculus humanus

- (b) Resistance to gamma BHC, chlordane, heptachlor, dieldrin, aldrin, endrin, isodrin, toxaphene.

M. domestica, Blattella germanica, Culex fatigans, C. tarsalis,  
Boophilus decoloratus.

- (c) Resistance to various organo-phosphorus insecticides.

Tetranychus tilarius, M. domestica.

Supposing it is feasible to use two or three different types of insecticide, it may be possible to defeat resistance by changing from one to another at suitable intervals. This is only likely to succeed if the resistance to the first insecticide declines fairly rapidly when it is discontinued or superseded. Incidentally, we must remember that residual insecticides such as DDT do not necessarily cease to have an effect as soon as their use is discontinued, but decline in activity gradually. It is true that if the selective influence of an insecticidal treatment is removed, many laboratory colonies decline in resistance in the course of a year or so. The decline is presumably due to the fact that the genes responsible for resistance are either linked with other unfavourable genes or else themselves have additional effects which are unfavourable. For example, a number of DDT-resistant strains of housefly have been found to have slightly longer life cycles than normal. This is not a serious disadvantage, but it might well be the sort of thing responsible for slow elimination of resistant members of the population in the absence of insecticides. Since the decline in resistance appears to be a slow process, there does not appear to be much hope of alternating between different kinds of insecticides.

An alternative suggestion has been to use mixtures of different kinds of insecticides at the same time. The possibilities of this depend on whether susceptibility to the two substances is positively correlated, quite independent, or negatively correlated. In the first place the mixture will achieve nothing, or at the most the mixture will act like a slightly increased dose of the strongest insecticide. In the second case there will also be little additional effect. If, however, it happened that the order of susceptibility to compound A is the reverse of that to compound B, then the mixture has distinct possibilities. For the resistant survivors from poison A will be exterminated by substance B. However, we have still to have the existence of two compounds of this type demonstrated.

#### WHAT WAS THE OCCURRENCE OF RESISTANCE IN THE PAST?

As we all know, resistance strains are not an entirely recent occurrence. The earliest examples are the Californian scale insects, which developed races resistant to lime sulfur and to HCN; these date from some 50 years ago. Nevertheless, despite

the fairly extensive use of insecticides since then, the number of instances of resistance prior to 1940 is quite small, not more than two or three, if one excludes doubtful cases and artificially induced laboratory strains.

In the last decade, there has been a considerable increase in the number of cases of resistance. Many of these are concerned with synthetic chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides. It is not clear whether this is because these compounds are more liable to permit resistance mechanisms to develop in insects or whether their very extensive use has resulted in the present situation. Possibly each factor is partly responsible.

#### WHAT IS THE PRESENT SITUATION REGARDING RESISTANCE?

It is difficult to make an exact statement on the occurrence of resistant strains at the present time, because the information available varies so much in detail and precision. On one hand, we have the almost universal example of the housefly, which has been the subject of numerous scientific investigations, and at the other extreme are verbal reports, based on general impressions, which have appeared in print with the reference "personal communication".

The following list is slightly conservative, since it only includes cases supported by published data or WHO reports:

#### Resistant strains of insects of medical importance

(N.B. The remark "chlordanes etc." implies resistance to some and probably all of the compounds in group (b) of the preceding section).

- |       |   |                                      |            |
|-------|---|--------------------------------------|------------|
| (i)   | The housefly ( <u>M. domestica</u> ; <u>M. vicina</u> ) | DDT (1947) <sup>33</sup>             | World-wide |
|       |   | chlordanes etc. (1948)               | " "        |
| (ii)  | <u>Culex fatigans</u>                                   | DDT (1953) <sup>22</sup>             | Réunion    |
|       |   | BHC (1954) <sup>30</sup>             | India      |
|       |   | BHC etc. (1955) <sup>31</sup>        | Malaya     |
| (iii) | Salt marsh breeding culicines                           |                                      |            |
|       | <u>Aedes taeniorhynchus</u> )                           | DDT (1950) <sup>13</sup>             | Florida    |
|       | <u>A. sollicitans</u> )                                 |                                      |            |
|       | <u>A. nigromaculus</u> )                                | DDT (1950) <sup>1</sup>              | California |
|       | <u>Culex tarsalis</u> )                                 | chlordanes etc. (1951) <sup>20</sup> | "          |

(iv)	<u>Anopheles quadrimaculatus</u>	DDT (1952) <sup>17</sup>	Tennessee
(v)	<u>Anopheles sacharovi</u>	DDT (1953) <sup>27</sup> chlordanes etc. (1954) <sup>26</sup>	Greece "
(vi)	<u>Anopheles sunaicus</u>	DDT (1954) <sup>9</sup>	Java
(vii)	<u>Anopheles gambiae</u>	dieldrin (1955) <sup>15</sup>	Nigeria
(viii)	<u>Anopheles stephensi</u>	DDT (1955) <sup>11</sup>	Saudi Arabia
(ix)	<u>Aedes aegypti</u>	DDT (1954) <sup>18</sup>	Trinidad
(x)	<u>Pediculus humanus</u>	DDT (1952) <sup>23</sup> (1953) <sup>4</sup>	Korea Egypt
(xi)	<u>Cimex lectularius</u>	DDT (1948) <sup>24</sup> (1953) <sup>25</sup>	Hawaii Israel

Measurements of resistance of A. sacharovi in Greece suggest that quite a small level of resistance (X3 to X5) may result in survival of these mosquitos. It is, of course, easy to increase a wall deposit by these amounts (though perhaps not economically possible); but this may not alter the dosage picked up by the mosquito.

From what has been said, then, it would seem that considerable risks of immunity to insecticides exist in cases where an insect pest has a naturally low susceptibility and the margin of safety is already small.

In attempting to predict the future importance of resistance, one is handicapped by the fragmentary nature of the information about present examples. Therefore it is very desirable to establish the following facts for all cases of suspected resistance:

(i) The level of resistance should be measured and its geographical extent determined.

(ii) The type of resistance should be investigated to distinguish between specific forms (probably depending on some biochemical mechanism) and general immunity (possibly due to indirect causes, such as "vigour", thicker cuticle etc.).

(iii) If physiological resistance has been excluded, the possible existence of a race showing behaviouristic change should be investigated.

#### WHAT ARE THE FUTURE PROSPECTS OF RESISTANCE?

It is evident that the ability to develop resistance differs considerably from one species of insect to another and also depends on the insecticide used. The rather rapid, ubiquitous and extremely high levels of resistance shown by the housefly exposed to chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides is clearly exceptional. Personally, I have always been impressed by the anomaly of this resistance and have been inclined, perhaps wrongly, to under-estimate the gravity of the threat of resistance in other species. However, while it still seems to be true that the enormously high, specific type of resistance is rare, it must be emphasized that quite low levels of resistance may have serious practical consequences.

The practical importance of enhanced resistance depends on the margin of effectiveness possible with the insecticide treatment used. Now, the control of mosquitos (and perhaps other insects) by residual wall treatments does not appear to have a large margin of effectiveness. Quite apart from resistant races, there have always been some species of low susceptibility to DDT, such as Culex fatigans; and others, like Anopheles gambiae, which were easily irritated and often escaped with a non-lethal dose.

REFERENCES

1. Bohart, R. M. & Murray, W. (1950) Proc. 18th Conference Californian Mosq. Contr. Assn p.20
2. Brown, A. W. A. & Perry (1956) Nature, (in press)
3. Busvine, J. R. (1951) Nature, 168, 193
4. Busvine, J. R. (1953) Nature, 171, 118
5. Busvine, J. R. (1955) Report to World Health Organization. October
6. Busvine, J. R. (1956) Nature, (in press)
7. Busvine, J. R. & Nash, R. (1953) Bull. ent. Res. 44, 371
8. Chow, C. Y. (1955) WHO/Mal./Inform/3
9. Crandell, H. A. (1954) Mosquito News, 14, 194
10. Crow, J. (1954) J. econ. Ent. 47, 393
11. Davidson, G. (1955) Report to World Health Organization, December
12. Deonier, C. C. et al. (1949) Mosquito News, 9, 150
13. Deonier, C. C. et al. (1950) J. econ. Ent. 43, 506
14. Elliott, R. (1955) Trans. roy. Soc. trop. Med. Hyg. 49, 528
15. Elliott, R. & Ramakrishna, V. (1956) Nature (in press)
16. Garrett-Jones, C. & Gramiccia, G. (1954) Bull. Wld Hlth Org. 11, 865
17. Gartrell, F. E. & Ludvik, G. (1954) Amer. J. trop. Med. Hyg. 3, 817
18. Gillette, H. P. S. (1954) A. R. malar. Div. Hlth Dep. Trinidad
19. Ginsburg, J. M. (1947) Science, 105, 233
20. Gjullin, C. M. & Peters, R. (1952) Mosquito News, 12, 1
21. Hadaway, A. B. & Barlow, F. (1951) Bull. ent. Res. 41, 603
22. Hamon, J. (1953) Bull. Soc. Path. exot. 46, 454
23. Burlbut, H. S. et al. (1952) Science, 115, 11

24. Johnson, M. S. & Hill, A. (1948) Med. News Letter Bur. Med. Surg. Washington 12, 27
25. Levinson, Z. H. (1953) Riv. Parasit. 13, 57
26. Livadas, G. A. (1955) Mosquito News, 15, 67
27. Livadas, G. A. & Georgopoulos, G. D. (1953) Bull. Wld Hlth Org. 8, 497
28. Metcalf, R. L. (1955) Physiol. Rev. 35, 197
29. Pal, R. & Sharma, M. (1952) Indian J. Malar. 6, 275
30. Rajagopalan, N. et al. (1954) Malaria and other mosquito-borne diseases, Bull. Nat. Soc. India, 2, 211
31. Reid, J. (1955) Bull. Wld Hlth Org. 12, 705
32. Trapido, H. (1952) Amer. J. trop. Med. Hyg. 1, 853
33. Weismann, R. (1947) Mitt. Schweiz. ent. Ges. 20, 484
34. Wharton, R. H. (1955) Bull. ent. Res. 46, 301
35. Wld Hlth Org. techn. Rep. Ser. (1954) 80