DISCOVERY OF RESISTANCE-BREAKING CHEMISTRIES FOR VARROA MITE MANAGEMENT

Philene D. Vu¹, Lacey J. Jenson¹, Dennis vanEngelsdorp², and Troy D. Anderson¹⁺, 1Department of Entomology and Fralin Life Science Institute, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA and ²Department of Entomology, Universit

Ę e
5 E
5 Ë
5 e
5 VT26 8
5 VT37 g VT42 VT52 g ë VT67 g VT70L g
5 F
5 VT0L

0

INTRODUCTION

The varroa mite is a primary driver for the periodical losses of bee colonies. The mite requires bees for food and reproduction and, in turn, elicits physiological deficiencies and disease transmission that compromise the health of bee colonies. The mite nervous system is a target site for existing acaricide chemistries. However, these acaricides not only have adverse health effects on bees, but resistance to these chemistries limits their use to reduce mite infestations and disease transmission in bee colonies. Voltage-gated chloride channels are involved the maintenance of nerve and muscle excitability in arthropod pests, which suggests these channels might be exploited as target sites for acaricide chemistries. Apistan® (the pyrethroid taufluvalinate), Checkmite+™ (the organophosphate coumaphos), and Apivar® (the foramidine amitraz) are among several control products for management of varroa mites (Martel et al. 2007). The effectiveness of these chemistries has diminished as a result of the increasing incidence of either target-site or metabolic detoxification resistance in varroa mite populations, worldwide (Van Leeuwen et al. 2010; González-Cabrera et al. 2013; Dmitryjuk et al. 2013). Here, we report a toxicological analysis of a natural stilbene product and related analogs against acaricide-susceptible and -resistant varroa mite populations. The specific aims of this study are: 1) to determine the field efficacy of stilbene chemistries to acaricide-susceptible and -resistant varroa mite populations and 2) to determine the mechanisms of resistance in acaricide-susceptible and -resistant varroa mite populations.

EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH AND RESULTS

TOXICITY AND FIELD EFFICACY BIOASSAYS OF ESTABLISHED AND EXPERIMENTAL ACARICIDES

- Ø Honey bee colonies are maintained at the Virginia Tech Price's Fork Apiary. Nurse bees (6-10 d old adults) were collected for each toxicity and field efficacy bioassay. Technical grade *tau*-fluvalinate, coumaphos, and amitraz were purchased from ChemService Inc. (West Chester, PA). 4,4-diisothiocyanatostilbene-2,2'-disulfonic acid (DIDS), 2-
methoxystilbene, and 3,5-dimethoxystilbene were purchase
- btu-Fluvalinate, coumaphos, amitraz, and stilbene toxicity was examined with honey bees using oral and topical exposure bioassays. Technical grade acaricides were orally be acaricides were orally at the stated at 10% or t observed for the honey bees exposed to each oral and topical treatment of acaricide.
- Field efficacy of *tau-fluvalinate, couraphos, amitraz, and s*tibenes was assessed with acaricide-susceptible and -resistant varroa mite populations using contact exposure biolossays. Bioassay arenas consisted of a 750-mi collected from the brood frame(s) of a hive. Bloassay arenas contained a 3 x 3 cm tab impregnated with fau-fluvalinate (Apistan®, 10.2% ai), coumaphos (CheckMite+™, 10.0% ai),
or amitraz (Apivar®, 3.% ai) or treated with t varroa mites attached to the honey bees were counted after a 3-min ethanol wash.

CYTOCHROME P450 MONOOXYGENASE, ESTERASE, GLUTATHIONE *S***-TRANSFERASE, AND ACETYLCHOLINESTERASE BIOASSAYS**

Ø Cytochrome P450 monooxygenase, esterase, and glutathione *S*-transferase enzyme activities were measured in varroa mites from 20 honey bee colonies using the methods described by Anderson and Zhu (2004) and Jin-Clark et al. (2008). Acetylcholinesterase activity was measured in varroa mites using the methods of Adelman et al. (2012). Total protein was measured according to the method of Smith et al. (1985). Enzyme and protein measurements were performed on a SpectraMax M2 multimode microplate reader (Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA).

Cyano(3-phenoxyphenyl)methyl N-[2-chloro-4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]-D-valinate

O-(3-Chloro-4-methyl-2-oxo-2H-chromen-7-yl) O,O-diethyl phosphorothioate

[(2,4-dimethylphenyl)imino]methyl}-N-methylimidoformamide

Table 1. Field efficacy bioassays of *tau***-fluvalinate (Apistan®), coumaphos (CheckMite+™), and amitraz (Apivar®) against acaricide-susceptible and –resistant varroa mite** populations. Acaricide efficacy was assessed for the varroa mite populations after a 3- and 6-h exposure period. Varroa mites remaining on the honey bees were removed after a 3-
min ethanol wash. Acaricide efficacy < 60% s mites per 100 honey bees. The honey bee colonies have not been treated with acaricides.

esterase, glutathione S-transferase, and acetylcholinesterase activities in acaricide-susceptible- and resistant-varroa mite populations. P450 activity was measured using 7-ethoxycoumarin as a substrate. Esterase activity was measured using α-naphthyl acetate and β-naphthyl acetate as substrates. Glutathione *S*-transferase activity was measured using 1- chloro-2,4-dinitrobenzoic acid as a substrate. Acetylcholinesterase activity was measured using acetylthiocholine iodide and 5,5'-dithio-bis (2-nitrobenzoic acid) as substrates. Enzyme activities are presented as the mean + standard error (*n* = 3).

Table 2. Field efficacy bioassays DIDS, 2-methoxystibene, 3,5-dimethoxystibene, and (E)-2(4-methoxystyry)phenol) against acaricle-resistant varoa mite populations.
Acaricide efficacy was assessed for the varroa mite popula wash. Acaricide efficacy < 60% suggests the possibility of resistance after a 6-h exposure period. Each test was considered valid based on the presence of > 5 varroa mites per 100
honey bees. Varroa mite populations were

ş g F
5 e
5 Ë VT22 VT26 8
5 VT37 g VT42 VT52 g i
5 VT67 Ę VT70L g
5 VT112 VT0L

0

Ø Apistan® (the *tau*-fluvalinate pyrethroid), Checkmite+™ (the organophosphate coumaphos), and Apivar® (the foramidine amitraz) were used as acaricide standards. Both *tau*-fluvalinate and coumaphos have lower field efficacy than amitraz to the tested varroa mite populations. This suggests that the varroa mites are resistant to *tau*-fluvalinate and coumaphos based on the percent efficacies being less than 60% (Table 1).

Ø Cytochrome P450 monooxygenases, esterases, glutathione *S*-transferases, and acetylcholinesterase exhibit differential activities across the varroa mite populations (Fig. 1). The differences in enzyme activities may confer metabolic detoxification resistance in the varroa mite populations with reduced *tau*-fluvalinate and coumaphos field efficacy; however, these use of acaricide synergists will be required to confirm the possibility of metabolic detoxification resistance and the involved mechanisms.

Ø *tau*-Fluvalinate- and coumaphos-resistant varroa mite populations appear to be tolerant to the stilbenes 2-methoxystilbene, 3,5 dimethoxystilbene, and (E)-2-(4-methoxystyrl)phenol with field-efficacy percentages less than 60% (Table 2). However, the stilbene DIDS exhibited field efficacy higher than 60% against the acaricide-resistant varroa mite populations compared to *tau*fluvalinate and coumaphos (Table 2). These data suggest that DIDS might serve as a candidate chemistry for the development of resistance-breaking acaricides for varroa mite management.

Ø Our current research activities are focused on the acaricide-resistance monitoring and management, identification of metabolic detoxification and target-site resistance mechanisms, and discovery of unique resistance-breaking acaricides for the management of varroa mite population and the protection of honey bee colony health.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: We thank Almond Board of California, NSF S-STEM Program, and Fralin Life Science Institute for the financial resources to support this project. In addition, we thank Nicholas Life Science Institute for the financial resources to support this project. In addition, we thank Nicholas
Larson, Jackson Means, and Ian Sandum for their technical assistance.

LITERATURE CITED

Jin-Clark et al., 2008. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 54:645-652 Martel, A.-C., et al., 2007. Apidologie 38(6): 534-544 Smith et al., 1985. Analytic. Biochem. 150:76–85 Van Leeuwen, T., et al., 2010. Insect Biochem Mol Biol 40(8): 563-572 Adelman, Z. N., et al., 2011. PLoS One 6(10): e26228 Anderson and Zhu, 2004. Pestic. Biochem. Physiol. 80:54-64 Dmitryjuk, M., et al., 2014. Exp Appl Acarol 62(4): 499-510 Gonzalez-Cabrera, J., et al., 2013. PLoS One 8(12): e82941

