

NewScientist

Health

search New Scientist Go » Login

Home News In-Depth Articles Blog Opinion Video Galleries Topic Guides Last Word E-Newsletter Jobs Subscribe

SPACE TECH ENVIRONMENT HEALTH LIFE PHYSICS&MATH SCIENCE IN SOCIETY

Home | Health | News

'Evolution proof' agents give mosquitoes a slow death

08 April 2009

Magazine issue 2703. **Subscribe** and get 4 free issues. For similar stories, visit the **Evolution** Topic Guide

INSECTICIDE resistance in malarial mosquitoes could be wiped out for good, paradoxically by using slow-killing agents.

The World Health Organization recommends fast-acting insecticides for malaria control. But such agents stop mosquitoes from reproducing, giving any insect that resists them an enormous competitive advantage. As this drives the evolution of resistance, Andrew Read at Pennsylvania State University in University Park decided to examine what happened if this selection pressure was removed by only killing elderly mosquitoes that had already laid eggs.

This could be achieved using slow-killing insecticides, which should still stop malaria transmission as mosquitoes can't pass on the parasite until it has grown inside them for two weeks, almost a lifetime to a mosquito.

Crucially, using a model, Read found that such an approach is "evolution proof": mosquitoes never evolve resistance to slow-acting insecticides because both resistant and susceptible insects have the same chance of laying eggs, removing the selection pressure favouring resistant mosquitoes (*PLoS Biology*, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1000058).

Some insecticides that take weeks to kill, such as insect-killing fungi, are already being studied. Read believes these may be the only way to wipe out malaria.

Insecticides that take weeks to kill may be the only way to successfully wipe out malaria



Your name

Subscribe to New Scientist and you'll get:

51 issues of New Scientist magazine

Unlimited access to all New Scientist online content - a benefit only available to subscribers

Great savings from the normal price

Subscribe now!

If you would like to reuse any content from New Scientist, either in print or online, please contact the syndication department first for permission. New Scientist does not own rights to photos, but there are a variety of licensing options available for use of articles and graphics we own the copyright to.

Comment title

Email



This week's issue

Subscribe



25 April 2009

ADVERTISEMENT

More Latest news

Reprogramming offers hope of safer stem cells

17:00 23 April 2009

Specialised cells can be reprogrammed using proteins rather than genes, which is less likely to cause cancer.

Fluorescent puppy is world's first transgenic dog

12:00 23 April 2009

A cloned beagle that glows could help researchers to model human disease, but the process could be too expensive to continue

Viruses could kill superbugs that antibiotics can't



11:00 23 April 2009 A virus that gobbles up a bacterium that causes persistent ear infections could be the next weapon

against bacteria that have evolved resistance to antibiotics

Trial debut for malaria vaccine from mosquito spit

10:58 23 April 2009

Volunteers to receive first vaccine based on whole but weakened malaria parasite

1 of 3 4/23/09 1:41 PM



read all 22 comments

Comments 1 | 2 | 3

This comment breached our terms of use and has been removed.

? Thu Apr 09 10:54:53 BST 2009 by **Ross**

But if it kills them after they've all ready reproduced, what's the point? They have a bit less time to go round spreading malaria, but their children will have their own 2 weeks and so on. Presumably if there are less in the wild, there will be less pressure on the individuals to compete for food so their population will increase anyway, just to a younger demographic than before?

reply report this comment

?

Thu Apr 09 19:55:50 BST 2009 by **Tom Bentley**

The point is that the female mosquitoes will not survive long enough to vector the malaria, but will survive long enough to reproduce. So the mosquitoes won't be under strong selective pressure to develop resistance to the disease (as they are with current practices), but the pesticides will prevent the mosquitoes from transmitting malaria.

This should lead to efficient and evolution-resistant pesticides to prevent mosquito transmission of malaria, with the trade-off that we'll have to live with some mosquito bites. If those bites don't give people malaria, it seems like a worthwhile trade-off to me.

reply report this comment

?

Fri Apr 10 10:08:19 BST 2009 by **B B King**

Good try, but you meant "develop resistance to the *pesticide*".

reply report this comment

view thread

What's The Point

Thu Apr 09 11:11:17 BST 2009 by Paul Taylor

Neither the New Scientist article nor the abstract of the paper explains very clearly how this is supposed to control Malaria. However, the following paragraph from early in the paper seems to do so:

These facts also mean that the majority of eggs a female will produce in her lifetime are laid in the window before malaria-infected mosquitoes can become dangerous to humans. Thus, in principle at least, public health advances can be achieved with minimal selection for resistance by an insecticide that kills after the majority of mosquito reproduction has occurred but before malaria parasites are infectious. Unlike in agriculture, the aim here is disease control, not necessarily insect control.

see all related stories

Most read Most commented

Bionic penguins take to the water – and the skies 🍎

Where's the remotest place on Earth?

13 things that do not make sense

Quantum gods don't deserve your faith

Green and mean: The downside of clean energy

TWITTER

New Scientist is on Twitter



Get the latest from New Scientist: sign up to our Twitter feed Reading in is the new going out

Subscribe

News Newscient

Partners

We are partnered with Approved Index. Visit the site to get free quotes from website designers and a range of web, IT and marketing services in the UK.

Related Jobs

Microbiologist

BMS 1 Haematology

Microbiologist

2 of 3 4/23/09 1:41 PM

reply report this comment

read all 22 comments

Comments 1 | 2 | 3

All comments should respect the New Scientist House Rules. If you think a particular comment breaks these rules then please use the "Report" link in that comment to report it to us.

If you are having a technical problem posting a comment, please contact technical support.

search New Scie	entist		Go »	Login for full access Login
About us	User Help	Subscriptions	Links	
New Scientist	Contact Us	Subscribe	Site Map	© Copyright Reed Business Information Ltd
Advertise	FAQ / Help	Renew	Browse all articles	
Syndication	Disclaimer	Gift subscription	Magazine archive	
Who's who	Ts & Cs	My account	NewScientistJobs	
RBI Jobs	Cookies	Back issues	The LastWord	
	Privacy Policy	Customer Service	E-Newsletter RSS Feeds	

3 of 3 4/23/09 1:41 PM