

# Supplementary materials

## Larval nutritional stress affects vector life history traits and human malaria transmission

Amélie Vantaux, Thierry Lefèvre, Anna Cohuet, Kounbobr Roch Dabiré, Benjamin Roche and Olivier Roux

### Material and methods

#### *Field mosquito collection*

Wild, blood-fed *An. coluzzii* female mosquitoes were collected while at rest in human dwellings in the Kou valley (southwestern Burkina Faso, 11°23'14"N, 4°24'42"W). They were placed individually in oviposition cups containing spring water and maintained under controlled conditions (27±1°C, 80±10% relative humidity, 12L:12D). After oviposition, the females were identified by species diagnostic PCR [1]. The larvae were reared in spring water exposed to ambient conditions in the insectaries (27±2°C, 80±5% relative humidity, 12L:12D) and fed with Tetramin® baby fish food *ad libitum*. Adults were reared in mesh cages (30x30x30cm) and provided with cotton wool pads imbibed with 5% glucose and water *ad libitum*. The females were allowed to have three successive blood meals on rabbits to ensure the maturation of their eggs and then were provided with a laying site (plastic cup Ø=45mm; h=40mm).

## 24 *Mosquito infection*

25 We used Direct Membrane Feeding Assays (DMFA) whereby gametocyte-infected blood was  
26 drawn from naturally-infected patients and from which mosquitoes feed through a membrane  
27 [2]. Gametocyte carriers were selected by examining thick blood smears from school children  
28 aged between 5 and 11 years from two villages in southwestern Burkina Faso (Dande and  
29 Soumousso, located 60km north and 40km southeast of Bobo-Dioulasso, respectively). The  
30 day before the DMFA, a screening campaign was carried out among 100 children (number  
31 chosen based on logistical constraints). All infected children with asexual stages above 1000  
32 parasites/ $\mu$ l or with malarial symptoms were immediately treated. Among the 1 to 4  
33 asymptomatic gametocytes carriers remaining for inclusion in the study, we selected up to 3  
34 of them with the highest gametocytemias (low gametocytemias often result in very low  
35 infection rates impeding reliable infection intensity assessment) for blood-withdrawal the next  
36 day. On the day of DMFA, we withdrew blood from the gametocyte carriers still meeting the  
37 above-mentioned criteria as the parasitemia might have changed over the 24-h period. Malaria  
38 positive individuals were treated according to national recommendations (Artesunate +  
39 Amodiaquine). As negative control (non infected mosquitoes), females were fed on the same  
40 blood in which the gametocytes were heat-inactivated. This heat-inactivation inhibits  
41 infection and does not affect the nutritive quality of the blood [3]. Heat-inactivation was  
42 achieved by placing the reconstituted blood in a thermo-mixer and heated at 43°C for 15 min  
43 and 900 rpm while the remaining blood was maintained at 37°C. Three hundred  $\mu$ l of blood  
44 were distributed in membrane feeders maintained at 37°C by water jackets. Four to six day-  
45 old female mosquitoes were allowed to feed for up to 2 hours through a Parafilm®  
46 membrane. Fed females were sorted out and placed in new cages (30 X 30 X 30 cm) where  
47 they had constant access to cotton wool pads imbibed with a 2.5 % glucose solution. This  
48 procedure is used in routine in our laboratory [3-13].

49 *Measurements of wing size and eggs volume*

50 *Wing length* was used as a surrogate of body size and was measured from the alula to the  
51 wing tip, excluding the scales [14]. One wing per individual was dissected for females 7 days  
52 post-blood meal and for males 3 days post-emergence. The wings were photographed using a  
53 stereomicroscope and measured with ImageJ software (Wayne Rasband, [rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/](http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/)).

54 *Fecundity*. Eggs were photographed using a stereomicroscope and were measured using  
55 ImageJ software.

56 *Statistical analyses*

57 Cox proportional hazard mixed effect models were carried out with the “*coxme*” function in  
58 the “*coxme*” package. A Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) with a binomial error and  
59 a logit link function were carried out with the “*glmer*” function in “*lme4*” package. Cox  
60 proportional hazard models were carried out with the “*Coxph*” function in the “*Survival*”  
61 package. GLMMs with a negative binomial error structure were carried out with the  
62 “*glmmadmb*” function in the “*glmmADMB*” package).

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70 *Mathematical model*

71 We provide details below on the mathematical model used to quantify the  
 72 epidemiological outcomes of the different nutritional regimes.

$$\begin{aligned}
 73 \quad \frac{dL_m}{dt} &= [b_S S_m + b_E E_m + b_I I_m] \theta - \epsilon \gamma L_m \\
 74 \quad \frac{dS_m}{dt} &= \epsilon \gamma L_m - d_S S_m - ab I_h \frac{S_m}{S_m + E_m + I_m} \\
 75 \quad \frac{dE_m}{dt} &= ab I_h \frac{S_m}{S_m + E_m + I_m} - (d_E + \sigma) E_m \\
 76 \quad \frac{dI_m}{dt} &= \sigma E_m - d_I I_m \\
 77 \quad \frac{dS_h}{dt} &= -ac I_m \frac{S_h}{S_h + I_h + R_h} \\
 78 \quad \frac{dI_h}{dt} &= ac I_m \frac{S_h}{S_h + I_h + R_h} - \omega I_h \\
 79 \quad \frac{dR_h}{dt} &= \omega I_h
 \end{aligned}$$

80 The different categories are explained in the main text and the parameters are described in  
 81 table S2. It is worth pointing out that we did not consider human population demography.  
 82 Indeed, since we focused on the outbreak size over one season, human demography, definitely  
 83 slower than that of mosquitoes, is not expected to significantly influence this epidemiological  
 84 outcome. Similarly, we did not consider an “Exposed” class for human, since this latency  
 85 period in humans is considered very short compared to the human lifespan. We also chose to  
 86 focus on the outbreak size during one season in order to include the contribution of mosquito  
 87 demographic parameters changes between different groups, such as for the proportion of  
 88 gravid individuals, which could not be included in simple analysis such as R0 that focuses on  
 89 the transmission potential of only one infectious individual. Finally, the Latin Hypercube  
 90 Sampling was conducted within the confidence interval of each parameter presented in table  
 91 S2.

92

93 **Results**

94 *Development success and time*

95 The male to female sex ratio was 0.86 and 0.96 for the low food and high food groups,  
96 respectively ( $X^2_1=2.9$ ,  $P=0.09$ ). The males developed significantly faster than did the females  
97 ( $13.64\pm 0.04$  vs.  $13.84\pm 0.04$  days, respectively;  $X^2_1=7.7$ ,  $P<0.01$ ). There was no significant  
98 interaction between larval diet and the sex of the mosquito ( $X^2_1=0.97$ ,  $P=0.32$ ).

99 *Wing size* – The males were significantly smaller than were the females ( $2.68\pm 0.01$  vs.  
100  $2.9\pm 0.01$ mm, respectively;  $X^2_1=14.5$ ,  $P<0.0001$ ). There was no significant interaction  
101 between larval diet and the sex of the mosquito ( $X^2_1=3.7$ ,  $P=0.055$ ).

102 *Results of infection intensity effects on the proportion of gravid females*

103 Among infected females, low food females were less likely to harbour eggs ( $X^2_1=16.1$ ,  
104  $P<0.0001$ ). There was a significant effect of gametocyte carrier on the proportion of gravid  
105 females ( $X^2_3=8.9$ ,  $P=0.03$ ), with females fed on the blood from the gametocyte carrier A  
106 having a significantly higher proportion of gravid females than the mosquitoes fed on the  
107 blood from the three other gametocyte carriers (Tukey's *post-hoc* tests, all  $P<0.05$ ), all other  
108 comparisons being non-significant. There was no significant effect of parasite intensity  
109 ( $X^2_1=1.5$ ,  $P=0.22$ ), wing size ( $X^2_1=1.7$ ,  $P=0.19$ ) nor of their interaction (wing size\*parasite  
110 intensity:  $X^2_1=1.04$ ,  $P=0.3$ ; larval diet\*parasite intensity:  $X^2_1=1.9$ ,  $P=0.17$ ; parasite  
111 intensity\*gametocyte carrier:  $X^2_3=6.3$ ,  $P=0.1$ ; wing size\*gametocyte carrier:  $X^2_3=1.9$ ,  $P=0.6$ ;  
112 larval diet\*gametocytes carrier:  $X^2_3=7.1$ ,  $P=0.07$ ).

113

114

115

116 **Tables**

117

118 **Table S1: Infection rate and intensity in females.** L = low food mosquitoes, H = high food  
 119 mosquitoes. Gametocyte density: number of gametocytes per  $\mu\text{l}$ .

Larval diet replicate	Gametocyte carrier	Gametocyte density	Mosquito group	Infection rate $\pm$ 95% CI	Infection intensity $\pm$ se
1	A	152	L	0.23 $\pm$ 0.09	4.17 $\pm$ 0.66
			H	0.25 $\pm$ 0.09	7.04 $\pm$ 1.69
2	B	56	L	0.59 $\pm$ 0.15	4.83 $\pm$ 0.74
			H	0.92 $\pm$ 0.1	6.83 $\pm$ 0.81
3	C	72	L	0.71 $\pm$ 0.14	7.03 $\pm$ 0.98
			H	0.87 $\pm$ 0.09	9.71 $\pm$ 1
	D	128	L	0.6 $\pm$ 0.13	28.53 $\pm$ 4.04
			H	0.57 $\pm$ 0.18	26.53 $\pm$ 3.39

120

121

122  
123

124 **Table S2: Parameters used in the theoretical model.**

Parameter	Unit	High food IC	Low food IC
$b_s$ (% of gravid $S_m$ )	%	0.494-0.747	0-0.127
$b_E$ (% of gravid $E_m$ )	%	0.25-0.43	0.05-0.16
$b_I$ (% of gravid $I_m$ )	%	0.25-0.43	0.05-0.16
$\theta_s$ (Number of eggs produced by each $S_m$ )		73-86.4	26.1-36
$\theta_E$ (Number of eggs produced by each $E_m$ )		73.22-84.94	32.76-38.94
$\theta_I$ (Number of eggs produced by each $I_m$ )		73.22-84.94	32.76-38.94
$\epsilon$ (Mosquito development time)	days.ind <sup>-1</sup>	12.83-12.91	14.64-14.76
$\gamma$ (Mosquito development success)	%	0.77	0.81
$d_S$ (Mean survival rate of $S_m$ )	days.ind <sup>-1</sup>	10.7-11.7	9.7-10.9
$d_E$ (Mean survival rate of $E_m$ )	days.ind <sup>-1</sup>	12.5-13.02	15.4-17
$d_I$ (Mean survival rate of $I_m$ )	days.ind <sup>-1</sup>	12.5-13.02	15.4-17
$b$ (Mosquito susceptibility)	%	0.47-0.61	0.417-0.55
$\sigma$ (Extrinsic incubation period)	days.ind <sup>-1</sup>	10-18	10-18
$a$ (Biting rate)	days.ind <sup>-1</sup>	1/4	1/4
$c$ (Human susceptibility)	%	0.5	0.5

125  
126

$S_m$ =Susceptible mosquitoes,  $E_m$ =Exposed mosquitoes and  $I_m$ =Infectious mosquitoes

128 **References**

129

- 130 [1] Santolamazza, F., Mancini, E., Simard, F., Qi, Y., Tu, Z. & della Torre, A. 2008 Insertion  
 131 polymorphisms of SINE200 retrotransposons within speciation islands of *Anopheles gambiae*  
 132 molecular forms. *Malaria Journal* **7**, 163.
- 133 [2] Bousema, T., Dinglasan, R.R., Morlais, I., Gouagna, L.C., van Warmerdam, T., Awono-Ambene,  
 134 P.H., Bonnet, S., Diallo, M., Coulibaly, M., Tchuinkam, T., et al. 2012 Mosquito feeding assays to  
 135 determine the infectiousness of naturally infected *Plasmodium falciparum* gametocyte carriers. *PLoS*  
 136 *ONE* **7**, e42821.
- 137 [3] Sangare, I., Michalakis, Y., Yameogo, B., Dabire, R.K., Morlais, I. & Cohuet, A. 2013 Studying fitness  
 138 cost of *Plasmodium falciparum* infection in malaria vectors: validation of an appropriate negative  
 139 control. *Malar J* **12**, 2.
- 140 [4] Harris, C., Lambrechts, L., Rousset, F., Abate, L., Nsango, S.E., Fontenille, D., Morlais, I. & Cohuet,  
 141 A. 2010 Polymorphisms in *Anopheles gambiae* immune genes associated with natural resistance to  
 142 *Plasmodium falciparum*. *PLoS pathogens* **6**, e1001112.
- 143 [5] Harris, C., Morlais, I., Churcher, T.S., Awono-Ambene, P., Gouagna, L.C., Dabire, R.K., Fontenille, D.  
 144 & Cohuet, A. 2012 *Plasmodium falciparum* produce lower infection intensities in local versus foreign  
 145 *Anopheles gambiae* populations. *PLoS ONE* **7**.
- 146 [6] Alout, H., Yameogo, B., Djogbénou, L.S., Chandre, F., Dabiré, R.K., Corbel, V. & Cohuet, A. 2014  
 147 Interplay between malaria infection and resistance to insecticides in vector mosquitoes. *Journal of*  
 148 *Infectious Diseases*.
- 149 [7] Alout, H., Djégbé, I., Chandre, F., Djogbénou, L.S., Dabiré, R.K., Corbel, V. & Cohuet, A. 2014  
 150 Insecticide exposure impacts vector-parasite interactions in insecticide-resistant malaria vectors.  
 151 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **281**.
- 152 [8] Sangare, I., Dabire, R., Yameogo, B., Da, D.F., Michalakis, Y. & Cohuet, A. 2014 Stress dependent  
 153 infection cost of the human malaria agent *Plasmodium falciparum* on its natural vector *Anopheles*  
 154 *coluzzii*. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution* **25**, 57-65.
- 155 [9] Da, D.F., Churcher, T.S., Yerbanga, R.S., Yaméogo, B., Sangaré, I., Ouedraogo, J.B., Sinden, R.E.,  
 156 Blagborough, A.M. & Cohuet, A. 2015 Experimental study of the relationship between *Plasmodium*  
 157 gametocyte density and infection success in mosquitoes; implications for the evaluation of malaria  
 158 transmission-reducing interventions. *Experimental Parasitology* **149**, 74-83.
- 159 [10] Vantaux, A., Dabiré, R., Cohuet, A. & Lefèvre, T. 2014 A heavy legacy: offspring of malaria-  
 160 infected mosquitoes show reduced disease resistance. *Malaria Journal* **13**, 442.
- 161 [11] Gendrin, M., Rodgers, F.H., Yerbanga, R.S., Ouédraogo, J.B., Basáñez, M.-G., Cohuet, A. &  
 162 Christophides, G.K. 2015 Antibiotics in ingested human blood affect the mosquito microbiota and  
 163 capacity to transmit malaria. *Nat Commun* **6**.
- 164 [12] Yerbanga, R., Lucantoni, L., Ouedraogo, R., Da, D., Yao, F., Yameogo, K., Churcher, T., Lupidi, G.,  
 165 Taglialatela-Scafati, O., Gouagna, L., et al. 2014 Transmission blocking activity of *Azadirachta indica*  
 166 and *Guiera senegalensis* extracts on the sporogonic development of *Plasmodium falciparum* field  
 167 isolates in *Anopheles coluzzii* mosquitoes. *Parasites & Vectors* **7**, 185.
- 168 [13] Da, D.F., Dixit, S., Sattabonkot, J., Mu, J., Abate, L., Ramineni, B., Ouedraogo, J.B., MacDonald,  
 169 N.J., Fay, M.P., Su, X.Z., et al. 2013 Anti-Pfs25 human plasma reduces transmission of *Plasmodium*  
 170 *falciparum* isolates that have diverse genetic backgrounds. *Infection and Immunity* **81**, 1984-1989.
- 171 [14] Van Handel, E. & Day, J.F. 1989 Correlation between wing length and protein content of  
 172 mosquitoes. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc* **5**, 180-182.

173