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Mosquito Biology

• Aquatic
• Holometabolous
• Hematophagous
• Vectors for parasites, viruses and some bacteria
  – 300 million to 500 million cases, 1 million deaths resulting from Malaria each year
  – 50 million cases of Dengue each year
  – 200,000 cases, 30,000 deaths resulting from Yellow Fever Virus each year
Life Cycle

- Holometabolous
  - Larvae or juveniles do not resemble adults
  - Separate life stages
- Egg (up to 6 months)
- Larvae (10-21 days)
- Pupae (2-6 days)
- Adults (1-? Days)
Worldwide Distribution

- Every continent except Antarctica
- Non-flowing, stagnant water (old tires, rain gutters, bird baths)
- Marshes, swamps, and lakes
- Opportunist
Using Insects As Bioreporters

• Response to chemical, biological or physical insult can be measured using many methods
  – Genetic (gene duplication, transcriptional regulation)
  – Translational/post-translational modification (protein/enzyme alteration)
  – Physical appearance and LD50 data
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Molecular and genetic ecotoxicologic approaches to aquatic environmental bioreporting.
What Sets this Detection Method Apart from Others?

- Currently, detection systems for biological warfare agents utilize PCR (polymerase chain reaction) to amplify genetic material specific to an agent, or Antibodies that recognize proteins specific for known agents.
- Current detection systems for chemical warfare agents utilize physical and chemical properties that are specific for known agents.
- In the IAD system, we are measuring the **response of an organism** to an agent, or class of agents. Inherent in this, is that our antibodies detect proteins that are in the insect, and their translational/post-translational alteration after exposure to an environmental sample.
- So far, the proteins that are responsive to insult with chem/bio agents are agent and dose specific.
Figure 1. LD$_{50}$ Studies in *Aedes aegypti* L4 Larvae Exposed to Select Agents. Groups of larvae were exposed to log-fold increases of select agents for 2 hours. Thereafter, the percent of live and dead larvae were determined.
**Figure 2.** LDH Activity in the Exposure Media 1-HOUR Following Exposure to a High Dose of Select Agent. L3/L4 larvae were exposed to a high dose of select agent (see Table 1 for doses and agents) for 1 hour. Thereafter, the lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) activity in the exposure media was determined using A) a cuvette-type spectrophotometer or B) a microplate reader.
Proteins Modified by Post-Translational Modification are Targets of Interest

**Toxicity 'Biosignature' for n-Octane**

Selective Protein Alteration Following 10 Minute Exposure to n-Octane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>0.0 ppm</th>
<th>1.0 ppm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caspase 9</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Caspase 9" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Caspase 9" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uNOS</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="uNOS" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="uNOS" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actin</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Actin" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Actin" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyto. c</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cyto. c" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cyto. c" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucin</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Mucin" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Mucin" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phos-p38</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="phos-p38" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="phos-p38" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, Student's t test mean +/- SEM, n = 3 per group
Dose-Dependent Induction of Phosphorylated p38
After 10 Minute Exposure to TCE

Figure 3. Larvae were exposed to 0.0, 0.5, 1.0 or 5.0 ppm trichloroethylene (TCE) for 10 minutes. Thereafter, whole-larvae were homogenized in lysis buffer and total protein was extracted. Levels of phosphorylated p38 and phospholipase Cγ1 (PLC) were immediately quantified using an HRP-based ELISA. Values indicated are relative protein levels from control or TCE-treated larvae (mean ± SEM, n = 3 per group).
Biosignature for Neuropeptide Y in *Aedes aegypti*

**Figure 4.** NPY 400ng/ml t=30min

*Subsequent Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Mucin Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (n=3)</td>
<td>23567 ± 4611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuropeptide Y (n=3)</td>
<td>36092 ± 2669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05↑*

*nd = not determined*
Cyt c and p38 Levels Following Exposure to Neuropeptide Y in *Aedes aegypti*

*\( p < 0.05; \) \( n = 3 \) per group

Mean ± SEM

One-way ANOVA, LSD post hoc

Control Ab. = isotype control antibody

Figure 5. Dose Response \( t = 30 \text{min} \)
Figure 6 & 7. Histogram of normalized ratios of median intensities of cy3 (control) and cy5 (treatment) proteins following ricin or Bacillus anthracis exposure. L3/L4 larvae were exposed to B. anthracis/ricin or vehicle-control (water) exposure media.
**B. anthracis** \( (10^5 \text{ spores/ml 18hr Exposure}) \)

\[ y = 764 \times 0.035067 \times \text{normal} \]
Future Issues

• To obtain a better estimate, or biosignature of the “total effect”, our focus is to shift to the Antibody Microarray format more thoroughly.

• To date, experiments designed to measure the LDH present in the media surrounding treated mosquitoes have produced meaningful, statistically significant data. We intend to continue with this line of investigation, including metabonomics, as it adds to the credibility of our hypothesis that Aedes aegypti is susceptible to insult with CBW materials.

• In collaboration with Dr. Stephen Higgs and the group at UTMB we will utilize our assay system to analyze mosquito proteins isolated from groups “treated” with a variety of viral agents.
Conclusion

With the advent of microarray technology, the ability to produce “biosignature” data is greatly increased. However, multiple exposures and subsequent data mining to compare results across single experiment boundaries are needed. In concert with the LDH assay, in the form of a system that samples exposure media in real-time, detection of CBW agents using in vivo protein bioreporters is foreseeable. However, the limitations of using a systems to auto-detect chem/bio agents without a user/operator include high false alarm rates and environmental contamination issues. Short of this, we have shown that Aedes aegypti larvae are susceptible to insult with a variety of threat agents as well as toxic industrial chemicals. Furthermore, we have demonstrated that chem/bio agents produce a unique profile of protein alteration in mosquitoes that is measurable.
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