



LJMU Research Online

Edmunds, C, Wilding, CS and Rae, R

Pathogenicity and environmental tolerance of commercial and UK native entomopathogenic nematodes (*Steinernema* and *Heterorhabditis* spp.) to the larvae of mosquitoes (*Aedes aegypti* and *Ochlerotatus detritus*)

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/12568/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Edmunds, C, Wilding, CS and Rae, R (2020) Pathogenicity and environmental tolerance of commercial and UK native entomopathogenic nematodes (*Steinernema* and *Heterorhabditis* spp.) to the larvae of mosquitoes (*Aedes aegypti* and *Ochlerotatus detritus*). International

LJMU has developed [LJMU Research Online](#) for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

**Pathogenicity and environmental tolerance of commercial and
UK native entomopathogenic nematodes (*Steinernema* and
Heterorhabditis spp.) to the larvae of mosquitoes (*Aedes aegypti*
and *Ochlerotatus detritus*)**

Cassandra Edmunds, Craig Stephen Wilding and Robbie Rae*

*Corresponding author

E-mail: r.g.rae@ljmu.ac.uk

School of Natural Sciences and Psychology,

Liverpool John Moores University,

Liverpool,

L3 3AF.

UK.

Keywords: EPNs, *Steinernema*, *Heterorhabditis*, biological control, mosquitoes, *Aedes*

1 **Abstract**

2 Many vector mosquito species have evolved resistance to chemical insecticides and
3 the search for novel biological control strategies warrants further attention.
4 Entomopathogenic nematodes (EPNs) (*Heterorhabditis* and *Steinernema* spp.) have been
5 developed as biological control agents for use against agricultural pests but whether they
6 could be used to control aquatic mosquito larvae warrants further research. We exposed
7 *Aedes aegypti* and *Ochlerotatus detritus* larvae to commercially available (*Steinernema*
8 *feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae*, *S. kraussei* and *Heterorhabditis bacteriophora*) and wild isolated (*S.*
9 *affine* and *S. glaseri*) EPNs and monitored survival over 7 days. We also exposed EPNs to
10 water with a range of salinities and pHs found in the marshland habitats of British
11 mosquitoes. *Ae. aegypti* and *O. detritus* were killed by commercial EPNs, but wild strains
12 were unable to kill *Ae. aegypti* yet did kill *O. detritus*. All EPNs were capable of tolerating a
13 wide range of pHs but showed variable tolerance to different salinities. EPNs could be used
14 as an alternative to chemical insecticides but target species and habitat may influence choice
15 of EPN strain in control operations.

1 **Introduction**

2 Mosquitoes from the genus *Aedes*, *Culex* and *Anopheles* are some of the world's
3 biggest killers as they vector infectious arboviruses (e.g. dengue and Zika) and the malarial
4 parasite *Plasmodium* (Naghavi et al. 2015). These pathogens cause nearly 350 million cases
5 and nearly half a million deaths per year (Moyes et al. 2017). Due to the rise in insecticide
6 resistance in many mosquito vector species (Moyes et al. 2017; Ranson 2016) alternative
7 control strategies are needed urgently (Achee et al. 2019; Thomas, 2018). Non-chemical
8 approaches include the use of *Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis* (*Bti*) (Lacey 2007; Zhang et
9 al. 2017), the sterile insect technique (Lees et al. 2015) and the introduction of *Wolbachia*
10 infection into mosquito populations (O'Neill 2018; Gomes and Barillas-Mury 2018). The use
11 of parasitic nematodes, particularly entomopathogenic nematodes (EPNs), warrants further
12 investigation. For example, mermithid nematodes such as *Romanomermis culicivorax* and
13 *Romanomermis iyengari* (Koylinski et al. 2012) are natural parasites of mosquitoes and will
14 successfully infect and kill mosquitoes. However, they are difficult to mass-produce as they
15 must be grown *in vivo* in mosquitoes limiting their practicable use. An alternative is the use
16 of entomopathogenic nematodes from the families Steinernematidae and Heterorhabditidae,
17 which are natural parasites of many insects and have been developed as biological control
18 agents used widely in agriculture (Campos-Herrera 2015). Nematodes are applied to soil
19 where they seek out insect hosts and are attracted to host specific cues and carbon dioxide
20 (Dillman et al. 2012). They penetrate inside and release a symbiotic bacterium (*Xenorhabdus*
21 spp. for *Steinernema* and *Photorhabdus* spp. for *Heterorhabditis*) (Ciche and Ensign 2003;
22 Martens et al. 2003), which proliferates and produces an abundance of toxins, invasins and
23 extracellular enzymes that can kill the host in 24-48 hours (Bisch et al. 2016). The nematodes
24 then feed on the decaying cadaver, reproduce, and when this food source is exhausted, the
25 offspring turn to dauer stage nematodes and search for more hosts to parasitise.

1 EPNs have been successfully shown to control a range of terrestrial insect pests
2 (Campos-Herrera 2015), however there have been mixed results investigating whether
3 *Heterorhabditis* and *Steinernema* could be used to kill the aquatic stages of mosquito vectors.
4 *Steinernema carpocapsae* is able to penetrate through the gut wall of *Aedes aegypti*, *Aedes*
5 *stimulans* and *Aedes trichurus* resulting in host death (although many are encapsulated)
6 (Welch and Bronskill 1962; Bronskill 1962). Whilst Dadd (1971) recorded *Culex pipiens*
7 ingesting *S. carpocapsae*, often hundreds at a time, they would fail to make it into the
8 haemocoel and not cause mortality. Similarly, Poinar and Kaul (1982) showed that *C. pipiens*
9 would ingest *Heterorhabditis bacteriophora*, but at high doses they would escape
10 melanisation and cause death. Recently, de Oliveira Cardoso et al. (2015) found that two
11 *Heterorhabditis* species (two strains of *Heterorhabditis indica* and *Heterorhabditis baujardi*)
12 could kill *A. aegypti* but *S. carpocapsae* could not. Peschiutta et al. (2014) reported *H.*
13 *bacteriophora* could cause 84% mortality in *Ae. aegypti* and Cagnolo and Almirón (2010)
14 showed *Steinernema rarum* could kill *Culex apicinus*. Dilipkumar et al. (2019) demonstrated
15 that *Steinernema abassi* exerted high mortality against *A. aegypti*, *H. indica* against *A.*
16 *stephensi* and *S. siamkayai* against *C. quinquefasciatus*. Although not a mosquito, Edmunds
17 et al. (2017) also showed that aquatic stages of the non-biting midge *Chironomus plumosus*
18 were rapidly killed by *Steinernema feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae*, *Steinernema kraussei* and *H.*
19 *bacteriophora*. Yooyangket et al. (2018) also showed that as well as nematodes, the bacteria
20 isolated from native EPNs (*Xenorhabdus stockiae* and *Photorhabdus luminescens* subsp.
21 *akhurstii*) were highly toxic to mosquitoes (*Ae. aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*). With these
22 conflicting reports on the susceptibility of mosquitoes and varying degrees of nematode
23 pathogenicity we decided to investigate whether commercially produced and field isolated
24 EPNs could be used to kill the larval stage of two species of mosquito under laboratory
25 conditions. We concentrated on *Ae. aegypti* and *Ochlerotatus detritus*, a medium sized

1 mosquito typically found in coastal areas throughout the U.K. (Clarkson and Setzkorn 2011;
2 Blagrove et al. 2016). It is highly halo-tolerant and gravid females oviposit in salt-marsh
3 habitats where they lay their eggs on the soil of shallow pools, which are subject to regular
4 tidal inundations (Service 1968; Becker et al. 2010). It is multivoltine and an opportunistic
5 biter of both humans and animals, and is regularly noted as one of the top three recorded
6 nuisance-biting mosquitoes in the U.K. (Medlock et al. 2012). *O. detritus* has been found to
7 be able to transmit Japanese encephalitis and West Nile virus under laboratory conditions
8 (Mackenzie-Impoinvil *et al.*, 2015; Blagrove *et al.*, 2016). Owing to the sensitive nature of
9 the habitat in which *O. detritus* is found, it can be difficult to control using standard chemical
10 controls (Brown et al., 2019). Larger scale strategies are often co-ordinated by local
11 governing authorities such as digging deeper channels in marshy or boggy areas where
12 specific species such as *Ochlerotatus* spp. are known to breed (James-Pirri et al., 2009; Rey
13 et al., 2012) or using Bti with only limited success (Clarkson and Setzkorn, 2011)
14 Therefore, new control strategies for this species need to be examined and the susceptibility
15 of *O. detritus* to EPNs has never been tested. As mosquitoes such as *O. detritus* live in
16 saltmarshes that are subject to extreme and variable environmental conditions, we
17 investigated whether EPNs could survive under a range of pHs and salinities.

18 Our aims were: 1. To discover whether EPNs could cause mortality to *Ae. aegypti* and
19 *O. detritus* 2. To examine whether commercially available or wild isolated EPNs were more
20 pathogenic 3. To investigate whether there was a difference in susceptibility of the two
21 mosquito species exposed to EPNs 4. To understand the survival of EPNs in a range of pHs
22 and salinities commonly found in the environment of *O. detritus*. Demonstration of
23 pathogenicity of EPNs could lead to novel and effective method of mosquito control.

24 **Materials and Methods**

1 **Insect sourcing and rearing**

2 *Aedes aegypti* (New Orleans strain – Stell et al. 2012) eggs were obtained from the
3 Liverpool Insect Testing Establishment (LITE) at the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine.
4 Egg papers were floated in a flat-bottomed tray containing approximately 7 cm depth of
5 nutrient-rich medium (cat biscuits in distilled water allowed to stagnate for a minimum of 24
6 hrs). Hatched larvae were kept at room temperature (19-25°C) until they reached third instar.
7 *Ochlerotatus detritus* larvae were collected from a pool with salinity of 25 ppt at Little
8 Neston (N 53° 16' 40.771" W 3° 4' 6.967"). Once transported back to the laboratory at
9 Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU) they were incubated at 15°C in containers of
10 brackish water collected with the larvae and allowed to develop to third instar. The
11 temperature of 15°C was chosen as temperatures above this adversely affect the survival of
12 *O. detritus* and this is a representative temperature of salt marsh pools (Currie-Jordan, 2019).

13 **Entomopathogenic nematode strains**

14 Commercial EPN strains (*S. feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae*, *H. bacteriophora* and *S.*
15 *kraussei*) were supplied as partially desiccated nematodes by BASF Agricultural Specialities,
16 U.K at ~6 million nematodes per pack. From a recent survey of EPNs from around the U.K.
17 (Edmunds et al. 2018) several species and strains of *Steinernema* were isolated and cultured
18 for use in this study including *Steinernema affine* (strain 173) and *Steinernema glaseri*
19 (strains 93, 119 and 367). Briefly, Edmunds et al. (2018) baited 518 soil samples from around
20 the U.K. with the waxmoth (*Galleria mellonella*) (a highly susceptible host). After 7 days any
21 potentially EPN parasitised *G. mellonella* were placed on individual White traps (White,
22 1927) and nematodes were identified using molecular verification of the 18SrRNA gene.
23 Using this approach 18 wild isolates of EPNs were isolated and cultured at LJMU and several
24 strains were used in this experiment. In order to obtain sufficient EPNs for pathogenicity

1 assays the nematodes were sub-cultured using *G. mellonella*. Briefly, 1 ml of approximately
2 1,000 dauer stage *S. affine* 173, *S. glaseri* 93, 119 or 367 were pipetted onto a pre-moistened
3 10 cm Whatman filter paper and placed in a Petri dish. Ten *G. mellonella* larvae were added
4 and the Petri dish sealed and stored at 20°C. Every 48 hours *G. mellonella* were examined for
5 mortality and any dead were placed in a modified White trap (White 1927) and new dauer
6 stage nematodes were collected after 14 days.

7 **Survival of *Ae. aegypti* and *O. detritus* exposed to EPNs**

8 As per standard mosquito testing procedures (WHO, 2005) 100 ml of distilled water
9 and 0.025 g of crushed cat biscuit was added to 250 ml plastic cups (70 mm diameter top x 44
10 mm base x 80 mm height) with twenty-five L3 stage *Ae. aegypti* added to each cup. Both
11 commercially available *S. feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae*, *H. bacteriophora* and *S. kraussei* and
12 naturally isolated *S. affine* 173 and *S. glaseri* 93 and 367 were added at doses of 0, 2000,
13 4000 and 8000 to three replicate cups. The nematodes were quantified per ml using a
14 stereomicroscope and then added directly to the water before addition of the mosquitos. To
15 assess the survival of *O. detritus* exposed to EPNs, modifications were made to the assay
16 since *O. detritus* is larger than *A. aegypti* and inhabits brackish water with a salinity of 25 ppt,
17 therefore, in assays using *O. detritus* only 15 larvae were added to 100 ml of 25 ppt salinity
18 water. Fifteen larvae were chosen as any more would affect their survival due to crowding
19 (Edmunds, personal observation). After the nematodes were added, cups containing *Ae.*
20 *aegypti* were incubated at 20°C and *O. detritus* assays were incubated at 15°C. Survival of
21 the L3 larvae was monitored every 24 hours for 7 days. The numbers of dead, alive, pupated
22 or eclosed individuals was recorded. Three cups were used for each treatment and the
23 experiment was repeated three times.

24 **Survival of EPNs exposed to different water salinities and pHs**

1 Using a curved bottomed 96-well plate, 50 µl of saline solution (0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50
2 or 60 ppt) was added to 12 wells in a 96 well plate. To separate wells, 1 EPN of each strain
3 was added. The plate lid was sealed with Parafilm® and plates incubated at 15°C. The
4 following EPNs were used: commercially available *S. feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae* and *H.*
5 *bacteriophora* (no *S. kraussei* were used) and naturally isolated *S. affine* 173 and *S. glaseri*
6 93, 119 and 367. Survival was monitored every 24 h for 7 days. The EPNs were recorded as
7 alive if they responded to prodding with a wire pick. The experiment was repeated three
8 times. To examine the survival of EPNs exposed to different pHs a similar set up was used.
9 Fifty microliters of water adjusted to pH 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 or 10 was added to 8 wells in a 96
10 well plate. Ten EPNs were added to each well, sealed with Parafilm® and incubated at 15°C.
11 Nematode survival of *S. feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae*, *S. kraussei* and *H. bacteriophora* and
12 naturally isolated *S. affine* 173 and *S. glaseri* 119 and 367 was recorded every day for 7 days
13 and the experiment was repeated three times.

14 **Data analysis**

15 Survival of mosquitoes [exposed to different doses](#) and nematodes exposed to different
16 pHs and salinities was analysed using Log-Ranked tests using OASIS (Yang et al. 2011).

17 **Results**

18 **Survival of *Ae. aegypti* and *O. detritus* exposed to commercial and naturally isolated** 19 **EPNs**

20 There was a highly significant difference in the survival of *Ae. aegypti* larvae when
21 exposed to all doses (2000, 4000 and 8000 nematodes) of commercially produced *S. feltiae*,
22 *S. carpocapsae*, *S. kraussei* and *H. bacteriophora* compared to the control (0 nematodes) ($p \leq$
23 0.001) (Fig. 1A-D) with 70-80% of mosquito larvae dead within 6-7 days. In contrast,
24 naturally isolated *S. glaseri* 93 had no effect on the survival of *Ae. aegypti* at doses of 2000 (p

1 = 0.098), 4000 ($p = 0.1519$) or 8000 EPNs ($p = 0.1134$) compared to the control (Fig. 1E).
2 Similarly, the survival of *Ae. aegypti* was not affected by exposure to *S. glaseri* 367 or *S.*
3 *affine* 173 applied at 2000, 4000 or 8000 EPNs compared to the control ($p > 0.05$) (Fig.
4 1F,G).

5 Commercial *S. feltiae*, *S. kraussei*, *S. carpocapsae* and *H. bacteriophora* caused
6 significant mortality to *O. detritus* compared to the untreated control when applied at 2000 (p
7 ≤ 0.001), 4000 ($p \leq 0.001$) and 8000 nematodes ($p \leq 0.001$) (Fig. 2A-D) with rapid mortality
8 observed e.g. for exposure to *S. feltiae* there was 90-100% mortality within 3 days. Similar to
9 the commercial EPNs, naturally isolated *S. glaseri* 93 and 367 and *S. affine* 173 caused a
10 significant difference in survival of *O. detritus* larvae when exposed to 2000 ($p \leq 0.001$),
11 4000 ($p \leq 0.001$) and 8000 nematodes ($p \leq 0.001$) compared to the untreated controls (Fig.
12 2E-G). Over the course of the experiment dead *A. aegypti* (and *O. detritus*) were examined
13 for presence of EPNs that had penetrated into the larvae and many dauer juveniles were
14 observed (Fig. 3).

15 **Survival of EPNs exposed to different salinities and pHs**

16 Commercial EPNs (*S. feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae* and *H. bacteriophora*) and naturally
17 isolated *S. affine* 173 and *S. glaseri* 93, 119 and 367 differed in their tolerance to salinities of
18 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 or 60 ppt over 7 days (Table 1). Survival of the commercial strain of *S.*
19 *feltiae* and the wild isolate of *S. affine* 173 in 0 ppt was significantly greater than those
20 exposed to 30, 40, 50 and 60 ppt ($p < 0.05$). This was similar to the survival of *H.*
21 *bacteriophora* which was killed by salinities of 20, 30, 40, 50 and 60 ppt ($p < 0.05$).
22 However, the other nematodes showed a mixed survival response when exposed to different
23 salinities. For example, the survival of *S. glaseri* 367 was significantly affected by the
24 extreme salinities of 10 and 60 ppt ($p < 0.05$). Whereas the survival of *S. glaseri* 93 was

1 significantly reduced by all salinities apart from 30 ppt ($p < 0.05$). Similarly, commercial *S.*
2 *carpocapsae* was killed by all salinities apart from 50 ppt.

3 There was no significant difference in the survival of the commercial EPNs (*S. feltiae*,
4 *S. carpocapsae*, *H. bacteriophora* and *S. kraussei*) and naturally isolated *S. affine* 173 and *S.*
5 *glaseri* 119 and 367 exposed to pH 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 over 7 days (Table 2).

6 **Discussion**

7 Previous studies examining the effect EPNs have on mosquitoes have reported mixed
8 results suggesting that both EPN species and mosquito target have an effect upon
9 pathogenicity. The results from our study show that exposure to commercial EPNs or strains
10 isolated from the wild can have dramatic differences in the survival of *Ae. aegypti* and *O.*
11 *detritus*. We found that field-collected EPN strains were avirulent towards *Ae. aegypti* but
12 highly pathogenic to *O. detritus*. In general, the pathogenicity of field collected EPNs is
13 compared to commercial preparations infrequently. Those few studies that do exist report
14 conflicting results. McGraw and Koppenhöfer (2008) found that naturally isolated *S. feltiae*
15 and *S. carpocapsae* were no less effective than their counterpart commercial strains against
16 the annual bluegrass weevil (*Listronotus maculicollis*). Noujeim et al. (2015) observed higher
17 mortality of sawflies (*Cephalcia tannourinensis*) when exposed to a natural strain of *H.*
18 *bacteriophora* compared to a commercial strain. Bélair et al. (2013) compared the
19 pathogenicity of commercial preparations of *S. carpocapsae* and *S. feltiae* with field-isolated
20 strains towards black cutworm (*Agrotis ipsilon*) finding no difference between the virulence
21 of the commercial and five strains of *S. feltiae*. However, they did find a more virulent strain
22 of *S. carpocapsae* and four strains that were significantly less virulent than the commercial *S.*
23 *carpocapsae*. Ultimately, natural variation in virulence plays a large role in the success of

1 these nematodes and should be considered when selecting the most suitable strain or species
2 to combat specific pests in biological control programmes.

3 We found that our wild EPN isolates were highly pathogenic to *O. detritus*. The *O.*
4 *detritus* larvae that were used in these experiments were collected from a naturally occurring
5 population from Little Neston saltmarsh. These mosquitoes have benefited from the stringent
6 legal protections on the area and only sporadic mosquito control measures such as *Bti*
7 spraying for many years (Clarkson and Setzkorn 2011; Brown et al. 2019). Generally, natural
8 infection of nematodes in British mosquitoes is low (Medlock and Snow 2008). Service
9 (1977) reported finding larvae of *Ochlerotatus cantans* infected with several nematodes, but
10 these were unidentified mermithids and not EPNs. To investigate this further we used *G.*
11 *mellonella* baiting of several samples from the Little Neston area collected in a previous
12 study (Edmunds et al. 2018) but found no EPNs, likely due to unsuitability of the heavy clay
13 substrate of this habitat for EPNs (Kung et al. 1990). Therefore, it seems *O. detritus* may not
14 come into contact with EPNs frequently, and perhaps therefore has not evolved defences
15 against them, making them particularly susceptible to attack. However, it seems curious as to
16 why the wild isolates were unable to kill *Ae. aegypti*. The *Ae. aegypti* New Orleans strain has
17 been laboratory reared for many years (Stell et al. 2012), and since genetic diversity in long-
18 established mosquito colonies is typically reduced (Lainhart et al. 2015, Azrag et al. 2016), it
19 would be thought that lower genetic diversity may increase susceptibility, however, we found
20 the opposite. The reasons for this resistance remain elusive. Perhaps these mosquitoes are
21 more efficient at recognising and encapsulating nematodes, as observed in *Ae. aegypti* and *C.*
22 *pipiens* (Welch and Bronskill 1962; Bronskill 1962; Poinar and Kaul 1982). Although it
23 should be noted that this response seems to be specific to the field-collected strains as
24 commercial preparations were able to kill *Ae. aegypti*.

1 Mosquito larvae are tolerant of a broad range of acidic and basic aquatic conditions
2 (Clark et al. 2004). For example, *O. detritus* are found in salt-marshes with brackish water
3 (measured at 25 ppt at Little Neston). Therefore, a range of salinities and pHs were tested to
4 ascertain whether the EPNs were capable of tolerating mosquito habitats. The EPNs used in
5 this study showed a mixed ability to tolerate a wide range of salinities. For example,
6 commercial *S. feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae*, *H. bacteriophora* and field collected *S. affine* 173
7 were killed at salt concentrations of over 30 ppt but *S. glaseri* 367 was only killed at the
8 lowest and highest concentrations (10 and 60 ppt). EPNs have previously been shown to cope
9 well with high saline environments. For example, Griffin et al. (1994) showed that six strains
10 of *H. bacteriophora* could survive for over 19 weeks in seawater. Thurston et al. (1994) even
11 found that *H. bacteriophora* virulence was enhanced by low levels of salinity but higher
12 concentrations affected survival. Our most salinity-tolerant strain was *S. glaseri* 367, which
13 was the only EPN isolate from an extensive survey of Lundy Island (Edmunds et al. 2018).
14 This extreme survival of saline conditions could potentially be due to adaption to the coastal
15 conditions that prevail across such a small island. As well as salinity, we also investigated the
16 tolerance of the EPNs to different pHs. We showed that commercial and UK native
17 nematodes were remarkably resistant to water of a range of acid and alkali pHs. Studies on
18 the effect of soil pH on EPNs have shown that they can survive and parasitise within a broad
19 pH range but high alkaline content can act as a nematocide (Kung et al. 1990) and low pH
20 significantly restricted infection by *S. krausseii*, *S. glaseri*, *S. scarabaei*, *H. bacteriophora* and
21 *H. zealandica* (Barbercheck 1992; Koppenhöfer and Fuzy 2006). We have previously shown
22 that EPNs sink to the bottom of water columns but remain alive and pathogenic (Edmunds et
23 al. 2017). Mosquito genera exhibit different feeding strategies with *Anopheles* and *Culex*
24 typically surface feeding, whilst *Aedes* feed on substrates and container walls (Yee et al.
25 2008; Skiff and Yee 2014) thus EPNs may be better suited for control of *Aedes*.

1 Ultimately, this research has shown that commercial preparations of EPNs are
2 pathogenic to *Ae. aegypti* and *O. detritus* and that field-collected EPN species have reduced
3 virulence to *Ae. aegypti*. These results mean there is potential for the production of a
4 successful biological control agent for pestiferous mosquitoes (providing the results could be
5 repeated in the field) but careful consideration should be given to whether endemic or
6 commercial varieties should be used as well as EPN tolerance to specific habitat conditions.

7 **References**

- 8 Achee NL, Grieco JP, Vatandoost H, Seixas G, Pinto J, Ching-NG L, Martins AJ,
9 Juntarajumnong W, Corbel V, Gouagna C et al. 2019. Alternative strategies for mosquito-
10 borne arbovirus control. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 13(1):e0006822.
- 11 Azrag RS, Ibrahim I, Malcolm, C, El Rayah E, El-Sayed B. 2016. Laboratory rearing of
12 *Anopheles arabiensis*: impact on genetic variability and implications for Sterile Insect
13 Technique (SIT) based mosquito control in northern Sudan. Malar J. 15:432.
- 14 Becker A, Petric D, Zgomba M, Boase C, Madon MB, Dahl C, Kaiser A. 2010. Mosquitoes
15 and their control. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- 16 Bélair G, Simard L, Dionne J. 2013. Canadian entomopathogenic nematode isolates virulence
17 against black cutworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Phytoprotection. 93(1):43-46.
- 18 Bisch G, Ogier J-C, Medigue C, Roy Z, Vincent S, Tailliez P, Givaudan A, Gaudriault S.
19 2016. Comparative genomics between two *Xenorhabdus bovienii* strains highlights
20 differential evolutionary scenarios within an entomopathogenic bacterial species. Genome
21 Biol Evol. 8(1):148-160.
- 22 Blagrove MS, Sherlock K, Chapman GE, Impoinvil DE, McCall PJ, Medlock JM, Lycett G,
23 Solomon T, Baylis M. 2016. Evaluation of the vector competence of a native UK mosquito

- 1 *Ochlerotatus detritus* (*Aedes detritus*) for dengue, chikungunya and West Nile virus. Parasit
2 Vectors. 9:452.
- 3 Bronskill JF. 1962. Encapsulation of Rhabditoid nematodes in mosquitoes. Can J Zool.
4 40(7):1269-1275.
- 5 Brown FV, Logan RE, Wilding CS. 2019. Carbamate resistance in a UK population of the
6 halophilic mosquito *Ochlerotatus detritus* implicates selection by agricultural usage of
7 insecticide. Int J Pest Manage.
- 8 Cagnolo SR, Almirón WR. 2010. Capacity of the terrestrial entomopathogenic nematode
9 *Steinernema rarum* (Rhabditida: Steinernematidae) to parasitise *Culex apicinus* larvae
10 (Diptera: Culicidae). Rev Soc Entomol Arg. 69(1):141-145.
- 11 Campos-Herrera R. 2015. Nematode pathogenesis of insects and other pests. Switzerland:
12 Springer International Publishing.
- 13 Ciche TA, Ensign JC. 2003. For the insect pathogen *Photorhabdus luminescens*, which end
14 of a nematode is out? Appl Environ Microbiol. 69(4):1890-1897.
- 15 Clark TM, Flis BJ, Remold SK. 2004. pH tolerances and regulatory abilities of freshwater
16 and euryhaline Aedine mosquito larvae. J Exp Biol. 207(13):2297–2304.
- 17 Clarkson M, Setzkorn C. 2011. The domestic mosquitoes of the Neston area of Cheshire, UK.
18 Eur Mosq Bull. 29:122–128.
- 19 Currie-Jordan, A. 2019. Quantitative analysis of the ecology and feeding behavior of *Aedes*
20 *detritus*. PhD thesis. The University of Liverpool.
- 21 Dadd RH. 1971. Size limitations on the infectibility of mosquito larvae by nematodes during

- 1 filter-feeding. *J Invertebr Pathol.* 18(2):246–251.
- 2 De Oliveira Cardoso D, Gomes VM, Dolinski C, Souza RM. 2015. Potential of
3 entomopathogenic nematodes as biocontrol agents of immature stages of *Aedes aegypti*,
4 *Nematoda*. 2:e092015.
- 5 Dilipkumar A, Raja Ramalingam K, Chinnaperumal K, Govindasamy B, Paramasivam D,
6 Dhayalan A, Pachiappan P. 2018. Isolation and growth inhibition potential of
7 entomopathogenic nematodes against three public health important mosquito vectors.
8 *Experimental Parasitology*.
- 9 Dillman AR, Guillermin ML, Lee JH, Kim B, Sternberg PW, Hallem EA. 2012. Olfaction
10 shapes host-parasite interactions in parasitic nematodes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*.
11 109(35):2324-2333.
- 12 Edmunds CV, Wilding CS, Rae R. 2017. Susceptibility of *Chironomus plumosus* larvae
13 (Diptera: Chironomidae) to entomopathogenic nematodes (Rhabditida: Steinernematidae and
14 Heterorhabditidae): potential of control. *Eur J Entomol.* 114:526-532.
- 15 Edmunds CV, Post RJ, Wilding CS, Rae R. 2018. A survey investigating the diversity and
16 distribution of entomopathogenic nematodes in the UK and the first confirmed record of
17 *Steinernema carpocapsae*. *Nematology.* 20(9):851-858.
- 18 Gomes FM, Barillas-Mury C. 2018. Infection of anopheline mosquitoes with *Wolbachia*:
19 implications for malaria control. *PLoS Pathog.* 14:e1007333.
- 20 Griffin CT, Finnegan MM, Downes MJ. 1994. Environmental tolerances and the dispersal of
21 *Heterorhabditis*: survival and infectivity of European *Heterorhabditis* following prolonged
22 immersion in seawater. *Fundam Appl Nematol.* 17(5):415–421.
- 23 James-Pirri M-J, Ginsberg HS, Erwin RM, Taylor J. 2009. Effects of open marsh water

1 management on numbers of larval salt marsh mosquitoes. J Med Entomol. 46(6):1392–1399.

2 Koppenhöfer AM, Fuzy EM. 2006. Effect of soil type on infectivity and persistence of the
3 entomopathogenic nematodes *Steinernema scarabaei*, *Steinernema glaseri*, *Heterorhabditis*
4 *zealandica* and *Heterorhabditis bacteriophora*. J Invertebr Pathol. 92(1):11-22.

5 Koylinski KC, Sylla M, Black WIV, Foy BD. 2012. Mermithid nematodes found in adult
6 *Anopheles* from southeastern Senegal. Parasit Vectors. (5):131.

7 Kung SP, Gaugler R, Kaya HK. 1990. Influence of soil pH and oxygen on persistence of
8 *Steinernema* spp. J Nematol. 22(4):440–5.

9 Lacey LA. 2007. *Bacillus thuringiensis* serovariety *israelensis* and *Bacillus sphaericus* for
10 mosquito control. J Am Mosq Control Assoc. 23(2):133-163.

11 Lainhart W, Bickersmith SA, Moreno M, Tong Rios C, Vinetz JM, Conn JE. 2015. Changes
12 in genetic diversity from field to laboratory during colonization of *Anopheles darlingi* Root
13 (Diptera: Culicidae). Am J Trop Med. 93(5):998-1001.

14 Lees RS, Gilles JRL, Hendrichs J, Vreysen MJB, Bourtzis K. 2015. Back to the future: the
15 sterile insect technique against mosquito disease vectors. Curr Opin Insect Sci. (10):156-162.

16 Mackenzie-Impoinvil L, Impoinvil DE, Galbraith SE, Dillon RJ, Ranson H, Johnson N,
17 Fooks AR, Solomon T, Baylis M. 2015. Evaluation of a temperate climate mosquito,
18 *Ochlerotatus detritus* (= *Aedes detritus*), as a potential vector of Japanese encephalitis virus.
19 Med Vet Entomol. 29(1):1–9.

20

21 Martens EC, Heungens K, Goodrich-Blair H. 2003. Early colonization events in the
22 mutualistic association between *Steinernema carpocapsae* nematodes and *Xenorhabditis*

1 *nematophila* bacteria. J Bacteriol. 185(10):3147-3154.

2 Medlock JM, Hansford KM, Anderson M, Mayho R, Snow KR. 2012. Mosquito nuisance
3 and control in the UK - a questionnaire-based survey of local authorities. Eur Mosq Bull.
4 30:15-29.

5 Medlock JM, Snow KR. 2008. Natural predators and parasites of British mosquitoes – a
6 review. Eur Mosq Bull. 25:1-11.

7 McGraw BA, Koppenhöfer AM. 2008. Evaluation of two endemic and five commercial
8 entomopathogenic nematode species (Rhabditida: Heterorhabditidae and Steinernematidae)
9 against annual bluegrass weevil (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) larvae and adults. Biol Control.
10 46(3):467–475.

11 Moyes CL, Vontas J, Martins AJ, Ching Ng L, Ying Koou S, Dusfour I, Raghavendra K,
12 Pinto J, Corbel V, David J-P, Wheetman D. 2017. Contemporary status of insecticide
13 resistance in the major *Aedes* vectors of arboviruses infecting humans. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.
14 11(7):e0005625.

15 Naghavi M, Wang H, Lozano R, Davis A, Liang X, Zhou M. et al. 2015. Global, regional,
16 and national age-sex specific all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 240 causes of death,
17 1990-2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. Lancet.
18 385(9963):117-171.

19 Noujeim E, Rehayem M, Nemer N. 2015. Comparison of indigenous and exotic
20 entomopathogenic nematode strains for control of the cedar web-spinning sawfly, *Cephalcia*
21 *tannourinensis* in vitro. Biocontrol Sci Technol. 25(7):843-851.

22 O’Neill SL. 2018. The use of *Wolbachia* by the World Mosquito Program to interrupt
23 transmission of *Aedes aegypti* transmitted viruses. In: Hilgenfeld R, Vasudevan SG, editors.

1 Dengue and Zika: Control and Antiviral Treatment Strategies. Singapore: Springer; p. 355-
2 360.

3 Peschiutta M, Cagnolo SR, Almirón WR. 2014. Susceptibilidad de larvas de *Aedes aegypti*
4 (Linnaeus) (Diptera: Culicidae) al nematode entomopatógono *Heterorhabditis*
5 *bacteriophora* (Poinar) (Rhabditida: Heterorhabditidae). Rev Soc Entomol Arg. 73(3):99-
6 108.

7 Poinar GO, Kaul HN. 1982. Parasitism of the mosquito *Culex pipiens* by the nematode
8 *Heterorhabditis bacteriophora*. J Invertebr Pathol. 39(3):382–387.

9 Ranson H, Lissenden N. 2016. Insecticide resistance in African *Anopheles* mosquitoes: a
10 worsening situation that needs urgent action to maintain malaria control. Trends Parasitol.
11 32(3):187-196.

12 Rey JR, Walton WE, Wolfe RJ, Roxanne C, O’Connell SM, Berg J, Sakolsky-Hoopers GE,
13 Laderman AD. 2012. North American wetlands and mosquito control. Int J Environ Res.
14 Public Health 9(12):4537–4605.

15 Service MW. 1968. Observations on the ecology of some British mosquitoes. Bull Entomol
16 Res. 59(1):161-194.

17 Service MW. 1977. Ecological and biological studies on *Aedes cantans* (Meig.) (Diptera:
18 Culicidae) in southern England. J Appl Ecol. 14(1):159-196.

19 Skiff JJ, Yee DA. 2014. Behavioral differences among four co-occurring species of container
20 mosquito larvae: effects of depth and resource environments. J Med Entomol. 51(2):375–381.

21 Stell FM, Roe RM, Arellano C, Kennedy L, Thornton H, Saavedra-Rodriguez K, Wesson
22 DM, Black WC, Apperson CS. 2012. Proof of concept for a novel insecticide bioassay based
23 on sugar feeding by adult *Aedes aegypti* (*Stegomyia aegypti*). Med Vet Entomol. 27(3):284-

2 Thomas MB. 2018. Biological control of human disease vectors: a perspective on challenges
3 and opportunities. *BioControl*. 63(1):61–69.

4 Thurston GS, Yansong N, Kaya HK. 1994. Influence of salinity and infectivity of
5 entomopathogenic nematodes. *J Nematol*. 26(3):345-351.

6 Welch H, Bronskill JF. 1962. Parasitism of mosquito larvae by the nematode DDD136
7 (Nematoda: Neoplectanidae). *Can J Zool*. 40(7):1263–1268.

8 White GF. 1927. A method for obtaining infective nematode larvae from cultures. *Science*.
9 66(1709):302-303.

10

11 World Health Organisation. 2005. Guidelines for laboratory and field-testing of mosquito
12 larvicides. World Health Organisation, Geneva. Report Number
13 WHO/CDS/WHOPES/GCDPP/2005.13

14 Yang J-S, Nam H-J, Sep M, Han SK, Choi Y, Nam HG, Lee S-J, Kim S. 2011. OASIS:
15 Online application of the survival analysis of lifespan assays performed in aging research.
16 *PLoS One*. 6(8):e23525.

17 Yee DA, Kesavaraju B, Juliano SA. 2004. Larval feeding behavior of three co-occurring
18 species of container mosquitoes. *J Vector Ecol*. 29(2):315–322.

19 Yooyangket T, Muangpat P, Polseela R, Tandhavanant S, Thanwisal A, Vitta A. 2018.
20 Identification of entomopathogenic nematodes and symbiotic bacteria from Nam Nao
21 National Park in Thailand and larvicidal activity of symbiotic bacteria against *Aedes aegypti*
22 and *Aedes albopictus*. *PLoS One*. 13(4):e0195681.

1 Zhang Q, Hua G, Adang M.J. 2017. Effects and mechanisms of *Bacillus thuringiensis* crystal
2 toxins for mosquito larvae. *Insect Sci.* 24(5):714-729

3

4 **Figure legends**

5 Figure 1: Survival of *Ae. aegypti* exposed to commercial EPNs: *S. feltiae* (A), *S. carpocapsae*
6 (B), *S. kraussei* (C) and *H. bacteriophora* (D) and naturally isolated *S. glaseri* 93 (E) and 367
7 (F) and *S. affine* 173 (G) exposed to 0 (blue), 2000 (red), 4000 (green) and 8000 (purple)
8 nematodes for 7 days. Bars represent \pm one standard error.

9 Figure 2: Survival of *O. detritus* exposed to commercial EPNs: *S. feltiae* (A), *S. carpocapsae*
10 (B), *S. kraussei* (C) and *H. bacteriophora* (D) and naturally isolated *S. glaseri* 93 (E) and 367
11 (F) and *S. affine* 173 (G) exposed to 0 (blue), 2000 (orange), 4000 (grey) and 8000 (yellow)
12 nematodes for 7 days. Bars represent \pm one standard error.

13 Figure 3: After 48 hours of infection *S. kraussei* had penetrated into *Ae. aegypti* larvae and
14 were visible in the head of the larvae. Arrows point to dauer stage nematodes. Scale bar
15 represents 100 μm .

16 Table 1: Mean percentage survival of commercial EPNs (*S. feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae* and *H.*
17 *bacteriophora*) and naturally isolated *S. affine* 173 and *S. glaseri* 93, 119 and 367 exposed to
18 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 or 60 ppt salinity on day 7 and *p* values (bold) from log rank statistical
19 analysis when compared to the survival of nematodes exposed to 0 ppt salinity. *P* values <
20 0.05 are denoted with *

21 Table 2: Mean percentage survival of commercial EPNs (*S. feltiae*, *S. carpocapsae*, *S.*
22 *kraussei* and *H. bacteriophora*) and naturally isolated *S. affine* 173 and *S. glaseri* 119 and 367

1 exposed to pH 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 on day 7 and *p* values (bold) from log rank statistical
2 analysis when compared to the survival of nematodes exposed to pH 7.

3

4

5