
Sublethal Pyriproxyfen Exposure Alters *Anopheles arabiensis* Fitness and Pyrethroid Susceptibility without Trans-Generational Carry-Over

[Simoni Twaha Mnzava](#)*, Augustino Thabiti Mmbaga, [Anitha Mutashobya](#), Letus Laurian Muyaga, [Mwema Felix Mwema](#), Halfan Ngowo, [Dickson Wilson Lwetoijera](#)*

Posted Date: 20 November 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202511.1558.v1

Keywords: pyriproxyfen; *anopheles arabiensis*; autodissemination; pyrethroids; insecticides; sub lethal dose and semi-field settings



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Sublethal Pyriproxyfen Exposure alters *Anopheles arabiensis* Fitness and Pyrethroid Susceptibility without Trans-Generational Carry-Over

Simoni Twaha Mnzava ^{1,2,*}, Augustino Thabiti Mmbaga ^{1,2}, Anitha Mutashobya ^{1,2}, Letus Laurian Muyaga ¹, Mwema Felix Mwema ³, Halfan Ngowo ^{1,2} and Dickson Wilson Lwetoijera ^{1,2,*}

¹ Environmental Health and Ecological Sciences Department, Ifakara Health Institute, P.O. Box 53, Ifakara, Tanzania

² School of Life Sciences and Bio-Engineering, The Nelson Mandela African Institution of Sciences and Technology, P.O. Box 447, Arusha, Tanzania

³ School of Materials, Energy, Water and Environmental Sciences, The Nelson Mandela African Institution of Science and Technology, P. O. Box 447, Arusha, Tanzania

* Correspondence: stwaha@ihi.or.tz; dwilson@ihi.or.tz

Simple Summary

Malaria is spread by mosquitoes, and controlling their population is an important way to reduce the disease. Scientists are testing new tools to help fight mosquitoes, especially as they become resistant to commonly used insecticides. One such tool is a substance called pyriproxyfen, which works by interfering with mosquito development and reproduction. In this study, we exposed mosquito larvae to very small amounts of pyriproxyfen and observed the effects over three generations. We found that mosquitoes exposed to this chemical became temporarily tolerant to insecticides, but this effect did not continue in later generations. We also saw that the exposed mosquitoes laid fewer eggs, had lower egg hatching rates, and were smaller in size. These results show that pyriproxyfen may be useful in mosquito control programs because it weakens mosquitoes without causing trans-generational carry-over. This approach could help improve the effectiveness of existing malaria control strategies and protect public health

Abstract

Background: Pyriproxyfen (PPF), a juvenile hormone analogue is a promising chemistry for autodissemination strategies, where mosquitoes aid in transferring insecticides to their breeding sites. This study evaluated the effects of sublethal PPF exposure on *Anopheles arabiensis* fitness (fecundity, fertility, and body size) and pyrethroids susceptibility across three generations. **Methods:** Laboratory-reared, pyrethroid-resistant mosquito larvae were exposed once to sublethal PPF concentrations of (0.0003, 0.0006, 0.0008, and 0.001 mg a.i./L), which caused emergence inhibition rates of 5%, 10%, 15%, and 20%, respectively, alongside a control group. Emerged adults were tested for susceptibility to 0.75% permethrin, 3.75% permethrin and 0.05% deltamethrin using WHO tube bioassays. Knockdown was recorded at 1 h, mortality at 24 h post-exposure, while fecundity, fertility, and body size were measured across three generations. **Results:** First-generation *Anopheles arabiensis* emerging from PPF-treated larvae showed reduced susceptibility to 0.75% permethrin and 0.05% deltamethrin compared to controls. Mortality from permethrin dropped from 22.7% in the controls to 11% and then 3% at 0.0003 and 0.001 mg a.i./L. For deltamethrin, mortality fell from 62.7% to 36% and then 23.3% at the same concentrations. Knockdown at 60 min was also significantly reduced, with permethrin KDT₆₀ dropping from 41.3% in controls to 9.3% and 3.3%, and deltamethrin KDT₆₀ from 79.7% to 66.7% and 65%. No significant differences were observed in subsequent generations ($p > 0.05$). PPF exposure also induced notable fitness costs in the first generation: mean wing length decreased from 3.07 mm in controls to 2.88–2.66 mm (6–13% reduction), mean egg production

dropped from 30.1 to 13.9–18.8 eggs per female (37–54% reduction), and egg hatching rate declined from 87% to 79–82% (6–9% reduction). **Conclusion:** These findings suggest that sublethal PPF doses can temporarily enhance insecticide resistance without leading to heritable resistance and negatively impact key mosquito fitness traits. PPF may thus be a valuable addition to integrated vector management strategies.

Keywords: pyriproxyfen; *Anopheles arabiensis*; autodissemination; pyrethroids; insecticides; sub lethal dose and semi-field settings

1. Background

Malaria remains a major problem, with an estimated 263 million cases globally in 2023, an increase of 11 million from the previous year. This rise underscores the threat malaria poses, especially in regions with limited resources (1,2). According to the World Malaria Report 2024, sub-Saharan Africa continues to bear a disproportionate share of the global malaria burden, accounting for approximately 95% of malaria cases and deaths worldwide (2). Controlling mosquito-borne diseases remains vital for public health and the well-being of vulnerable communities in sub-Saharan African countries. Alarming statistics reveal that Tanzania is among the four countries in sub-Saharan Africa accounting for over half of the worldwide malaria-related deaths (2,3).

Long-lasting insecticide-treated nets (LLINs) and indoor residual spraying (IRS) have long been the cornerstone of malaria control in Africa (2,4). However, the effectiveness of these indoor interventions is increasingly threatened by the emergence of insecticide resistance in targeted mosquito populations (2,5). This growing resistance necessitates the exploration of alternative vector control strategies to sustain malaria control efforts.

To complement LLINs and IRS, many African countries are now adopting larval source management (LSM) as a supplementary malaria control strategy (2,6–10). LSM involves applying chemical or biological products to mosquitoes breeding habitats to eliminate immature stages before they develop into adult vectors (2,11). Unlike LLINs and IRS, which primarily target adult mosquitoes, LSM focuses on preventing the emergence of adult mosquitoes. By targeting breeding sites, LSM complement existing malaria control efforts and contributes towards elimination goal (2,7,10).

For effective larviciding, WHO has recommended its use in areas where mosquito breeding habitats are few, fixed and findable (1). This presents a major challenge in rural and peri-urban areas, where mosquito breeding sites are often numerous, hidden in nature and difficult to access (12). Additionally, the widespread adoption of LSM is hindered by the high operation costs. As an alternative, use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) has improved the identification and treatment of breeding habitats in rural settings, surpassing the limitations of human-based larviciding efforts (12,13). However, despite its potential, UAV-based larviciding remains costly and requires significant technical expertise, which limits its large-scale adoption (12,14).

Given these challenges, there is a pressing need for complementary cost-effective larviciding approaches. One promising solution is the autodissemination technique using PPF, an approach that baits mosquitoes themselves to transfer insecticides to their preferred breeding sites (15,16). In this strategy, mosquitoes pick up a lethal dose of PPF from contaminated artificial resting sites and transfer it to their breeding habitats during oviposition, ultimately inhibiting the emergence of mosquitoes therein (15). Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of PPF autodissemination in controlling *Aedes*, *Culex* and *Anopheles* mosquitoes in laboratory, semi field and field settings (15,16). This method exploits mosquito behavior to achieve high coverage of breeding habitats. It requires minimal human effort, uses less insecticide, and incurs low associated labor costs (17,18).

Pyriproxyfen is a juvenile hormone analogue and insect growth regulator (IGR) that effectively disrupts the development of mosquitoes (19,20). It mimics the action of natural juvenile hormones,

interfering with mosquito development and preventing larvae from maturing into adults (21). So far, there is no documented evidence of PPF resistance in malaria vectors. However, an in vitro study suggests that PPF can be metabolized by P450 enzymes, similar to pyrethroids (22). A recent evidence by Opiyo et al., indicates that sublethal doses of PPF may amplify pyrethroid resistance in mosquitoes that already exhibit early signs of pyrethroid resistance (23). However, the assessed effect of PPF exposure on pyrethroid susceptibility was in a single generation, with uncertain whether the observed resistance was temporary (tolerance) or actual resistance. To address this gap, this study assessed the effects of sublethal PPF exposure on *An. arabiensis* fitness parameters and susceptibility to pyrethroid insecticides over multiple generations.

2. Methods

2.1. Study Area

The study was conducted from March to November 2024 at Kinin'gina village, rural southeastern Tanzania (8.11417°S, 36.67484°E). Experiments were carried out in the semi field system (SFS) using laboratory reared *An. arabiensis*. Detailed description of the SFS at Ifakara Health Institute and its validation for entomological studies has been described elsewhere (24,25).

2.2. Mosquito Rearing

Third-instar larvae of pyrethroid-resistant *An. arabiensis* were obtained from the IHI insectary. This colony originated from field collections in Sakamaganga village, Ifakara, southern Tanzania, and has been maintained since 2011. The strain exhibits established resistance mechanisms, including *kdr* mutations and upregulation of cytochrome P450 enzymes. In June 2024, WHO susceptibility bioassays indicated 24% and 52% mortality when exposed to discriminating doses of permethrin and deltamethrin, respectively, confirming a high level of resistance. During all experiments, larvae were reared on *TetraMin*® fish food twice daily, and adults were maintained on a 10% sucrose solution *ad libitum*. For egg laying, female mosquitoes were starved for 12 hours prior to blood feeding, which was conducted by allowing them to feed on the arm of a consenting human volunteer for 30 minutes on two consecutive days to ensure full engorgement.

2.3. Tested Insecticide

PPF powder containing 50% active ingredient (a.i.) with a particle size of 20 to 63 µm, manufactured by Ban Field Bio Inc., USA, was used in all experiments.

2.4. Treatments with Pyriproxyfen

To establish test sublethal concentrations, a larval bioassay using twenty-five laboratory-reared third-instar larvae of *An. arabiensis* exposed in 200 ml of either untreated water (control) or PPF concentrations (0.00001, 0.0001, 0.0005, 0.0008, 0.001, 0.0015, 0.002, 0.01, 0.025, 0.05, 0.1, and 0.5 mg/L) were conducted. Each concentration was replicated four times. Larvae were fed with *TetraMin*® fish food twice daily. Using WHOPES guidelines, the number of live larvae, pupae, and emerged adults were recorded every 24 hours until all larvae had either died or emerged (27). Test PPF concentrations of 0.0003, 0.0006, 0.0008, and 0.001 mg/L that resulted to 5%, 10%, 15%, and 20% adult emergence inhibition respectively, were selected for the follow-up experiment. In the main experiment, concentrations of 5% and 20% were used for rearing larvae used in the pyrethroid susceptibility bioassay experiment, while concentrations of 5%, 10%, 15%, and 20% were used for rearing larvae used in the fitness experiment. All test concentrations were prepared by serially diluting stock solution of 0.1 mg AI/L.

2.5. Effect of Pyriproxyfen Exposure on Insecticide Susceptibility

To assess the effect of larval exposure to sublethal doses of PPF on adult insecticide susceptibility, 3000 third-instar larvae of pyrethroid-resistant *An. arabiensis* were equally divided into six basins containing 2 L of water. Larvae were exposed to either 0.0003 mg/L or 0.001 mg/L PPF, or to untreated water. Adults emerging from PPF treated and untreated basins in the first generation were pooled and maintained in 35 × 35 × 35 cm net cages. Following blood feeding, the second and third generations larvae were not exposed to PPF. Emerged adults labelled as treatment and control groups, were kept separately, provided with 10% glucose, for WHO standard susceptibility assays. For each generation, 150 unfed mosquitoes of 3 – 5-day-old females from each treatment and control group were exposed to 0.75% permethrin, 0.05% deltamethrin, and 3.75% permethrin (28). Six replicates of 25 mosquitoes per replicate were performed for each test insecticide, with respective controls of non-impregnated papers. To establish the effect of PPF, similar procedures were performed for adult mosquitoes reared in untreated water.

2.6. Effect of Pyriproxyfen Exposure on Fitness Parameters

To assess the effects of PPF on mosquito fitness exposed to sublethal doses, 2000 third-instar larvae in 2 L of water were exposed to each PPF concentrations of 0.0003, 0.0006, 0.0008, 0.001 mg/L, and untreated water (control). This setup was replicated four times. Emerged adults from each group in the first generation were kept in net cages and blood-fed to produce second and third generations that were reared without PPF. In each generation, 30 blood-fed *An. arabiensis* females (5–9 days old) from each treatment and control group were individually placed in oviposition cups lined with damp filter paper 72 hours' post-blood feeding. Mosquitoes were maintained on 10% glucose solution *ad libitum* during oviposition monitoring. Oviposition cups were observed for up to seven days, and once eggs were detected, the filter paper was removed, eggs were counted under a stereomicroscope and transferred into basins containing 2 L of water. Eggs were monitored daily for three consecutive days to record hatching. Fecundity was determined by the number of eggs laid, while fertility was calculated as the proportion of eggs that hatched.

After oviposition, females were killed by freezing for 10 minutes, and one wing was removed, mounted on a slide, and measured (from the apical notch to the axillary margin) under a microscope using a micrometer to estimate body size (28).

2.7. Statistical Analysis and Presentation

The results were analyzed using open source software, R version 4.5.1(29).

Experiment 1: Dose-response analysis

To evaluate emergence inhibition, a log dose–response analysis was performed. This analysis estimated the concentrations of PPF required to achieve 5%, 10%, 15%, and 20% emergence inhibition rates.

Experiment 2: Effect of sub-lethal PPF exposure on susceptibility to pyrethroids

The effect of sub-lethal PPF exposure on susceptibility to pyrethroids was evaluated using standard WHO bioassays with permethrin (0.75% and 3.75%) and deltamethrin (0.05%) across three mosquito generations. The outcomes assessed were knockdown at 60 minutes and 24-hour mortality, both modeled as binary responses. Binomial Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) were fitted using the `glmer` function in the `lme4` package (30), with PPF concentration, generation, and insecticide type as fixed effects, and replicate batches included as random intercepts. Separate models were fitted for each insecticide, and interactions between generation and PPF concentration were tested. Descriptive statistics (mean ± SD) and odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals were reported.

Experiment 3: Effect of sub-lethal PPF exposure on mosquito fitness

Fitness parameters assessed included fecundity, hatchability, and wing length across three generations. For fecundity, data showed zero inflation and skewness, confirmed by Shapiro–Wilk testing. Poisson GLMs were fitted separately for each generation, as well as an overall model testing the Generation × Concentration interaction. Predictions were generated with `ggeffects`.

Hatchability was analyzed using binomial GLMs fitted per generation, as well as an overall model that included the Concentration \times Generation interaction. Overdispersion was tested and appropriately accounted for. Model results were expressed as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals, and predicted proportions hatched (with 95% confidence intervals) were generated using ggeffects.

Wing length was treated as a continuous trait. Data were first tested for normality using the Shapiro–Wilk test, which showed mild skewness. Accordingly, Gamma GLMs with a log-link were fitted to model the effects of PPF exposure. Both separate and interaction models were fitted to assess PPF effects across generations. Predicted means with 95% confidence intervals.

3. Results

3.1. Initial Tests to Determine the Range of Sub-Lethal PPF Doses

Emergence inhibition of third-instar larvae exposed to various PPF doses are summarized in (Figure. 1). Data from four replicates of the *An. arabiensis* colony were pooled per dose to estimate the concentrations inhibiting 5%, 10%, 15%, and 20% adult emergence, used in subsequent experiments. PPF doses between $3e-4$ mg a.i/L and 0.003 mg a.i/L caused 5% and nearly 50% emergence inhibition. Therefore, subsequent experiments used doses in the range of $3e-4$ mg a.i/L to 0.001 mg a.i/L.




Figure 1. Percentage inhibition of adult mosquito emergence from larvae reared with different concentrations of pyriproxyfen.

3.2. Effect of Sub Lethal Dose of PPF on *An. arabiensis* Susceptibility to Pyrethroids

In the first generation, adult mosquitoes from larvae exposed to PPF showed significantly reduced mortality when exposed to permethrin and deltamethrin. For permethrin, mortality dropped significantly at 0.0003 mg a.i/L ($p = 0.026$) and at 0.001 mg a.i/L ($p < 0.001$). Similarly, deltamethrin showed significant reductions at both 0.0003 and 0.001 mg a.i/L ($p < 0.001$ for both). No significant differences in mortality were observed in the second and third generations ($p > 0.05$) (Table 1). However, exposure to 3.75% permethrin resulted in 100% knockdown and mortality across all PPF concentrations and controls in all generations.

Table 1. Summary of 24-Mortality of resistant *Anopheles arabiensis* emerged from varied concentrations of pyriproxyfen and exposed to permethrin and deltamethrin.

Insecticides	Generations	PPF conc. (mg a.i/L)	OR [95% CI]	Mean Mortality (%) \pm SD	P value	Susceptibility status
Permethrin	1	No PPF	1	22.67 \pm 3.11	–	R
		0.001	0.66 (0.52 – 0.97)	3 \pm 2.49	P < 0.026	R
		0.0003	0.77 (0.60 – 0.97)	11 \pm 4.86		R
	2	No PPF	1	22.67 \pm 3.94	–	R
		0.001	0.99 (0.79 – 1.25)	23 \pm 3.86	0.953	R
		0.0003	0.97 (0.77 – 1.23)	22 \pm 3.19	0.813	R
	3	No PPF	1	25 \pm 4.22	–	R
		0.001	1.05 (0.83 – 1.33)	24.67 \pm 4.77	0.694	R
		0.0003	1.01 (0.80 – 1.27)	22.67 \pm 4.29	0.953	R
Deltamethrin	1	No PPF	1	62.67 \pm 5.99	–	R
		0.001	0.18 (0.13 – 0.26)	23.33 \pm 7.78	P < 0.001	R
		0.0003	0.34 (0.24 – 0.47)	36 \pm 11.05	P < 0.001	R
	2	No PPF	1	60.33 \pm 7.33	–	R
		0.001	0.99 (0.71 – 1.37)	60 \pm 14.77	0.933	R
		0.0003	0.92 (0.66 – 1.28)	58.33 \pm 3.98	0.617	R
	3	No PPF	1	62 \pm 6.27	–	R

0.001	0.89 (0.64 – 1.24)	61.33 ± 6.23	R
		0.867	
0.0003	0.97 (0.70 – 1.35)	59.33 ± 9.16	R
		0.504	

Key: SD = Standard deviation; OR = Odds ratio; CI = Confidence Interval.

A similar pattern was observed in knockdown at 60 minutes. Both insecticides showed significant knockdown reductions at 0.0003 and 0.001 mg a.i/L in the first generation ($p < 0.001$). No significant differences were found in second and third generations ($p > 0.05$) (Table 2).

Table 2. Summary of knockdown 60-minutes of resistant *Anopheles arabiensis* emerged from varied concentrations of pyriproxyfen and exposed to permethrin and deltamethrin.

Insecticides	Generations	PPF conc. (mg a.i/L)	KDT ₆₀ (min) (%) ± SD	OR [95% CI]	P value
Permethrin	1	No PPF	41.3 ± 7.9	1	–
		0.001	3.3 ± 2.3	0.44 (0.35 – 0.56)	P < 0.001
		0.0003	9.3 ± 4.3	0.50 (0.39 – 0.64)	P < 0.001
	2	No PPF	27.3 ± 6.8	1	–
		0.001	30 ± 7.1	1.03 (0.81 – 1.30)	0.810
		0.0003	27.7 ± 8.6	1.01 (0.80 – 1.27)	0.952
	3	No PPF	27.3 ± 8.3	1	–
		0.001	29 ± 6.8	1.01 (0.80 – 1.29)	0.904
		0.0003	31 ± 4.6	1.06 (0.84 – 1.34)	0.629
Deltamethrin	1	No PPF	79.7 ± 6.9	1	–
		0.001	65 ± 3.5	0.47 (0.33 – 0.68)	P < 0.001
		0.0003	66.7 ± 4.9	0.51 (0.35 – 0.74)	P < 0.001
	2	No PPF	77.3 ± 6.5	1	–

	0.001	74 ± 4	0.83 (0.57 – 1.61)	0.342
	0.0003	75.3 ± 4.1	0.90 (0.61 – 1.30)	0.565
3	No PPF	78.7 ± 6.2	1	–
	0.001	75.7 ± 3.3	0.89 (0.61 – 1.31)	0.557
	0.0003	77.7 ± 7.3	0.94 (0.64 – 1.39)	0.767

Key: SD = Standard deviation; OR = Odds ratio; CI = Confidence Interval.

3.3. Effect of Sublethal Dose of Pyriproxyfen on Body Size, Fecundity, and Fertility

Mosquitoes from PPF-exposed larvae in the first generation had significantly shorter mean wing lengths compared to the control group (3.07 mm). The mean wing lengths were 2.88 mm at 0.0003 mg a.i./L ($p < 0.004$), 2.82 mm at 0.0006 mg a.i./L, 2.77 mm at 0.0008 mg a.i./L, and 2.66 mm at 0.001 mg a.i./L (all $p < 0.001$). No significant differences in mean wing length were observed in the second and third generations ($p > 0.05$). (Table 3).

Table 3. Predicted mean wing lengths of *Anopheles arabiensis* between control and pyriproxyfen exposed groups across varying concentrations.

Generations	PPF Concentrations (mg a.i./L)	Predicted Mean [95% CI] (mm)*	Estimate [95% CI]	P value
1	Control	3.07 (2.99 – 3.15)	1	–
	0.0003	2.88 (2.88 – 2.80)	0.94 (0.90 – 0.98)	0.004
	0.0006	2.82 (2.74 – 2.90)	0.92 (0.88 – 0.96)	$P < 0.001$
	0.0008	2.77 (2.69 – 2.85)	0.90 (0.86 – 0.95)	$P < 0.001$
	0.001	2.66 (2.58 – 2.74)	0.87 (0.87 – 0.91)	$P < 0.001$
2	Control	3.06 (2.98 – 3.14)	1	–
	0.0003	3.05 (2.97 – 3.13)	0.97 (0.93 – 1.01)	0.098
	0.0006	2.98 (2.90 – 3.06)	0.97 (0.94 – 1.01)	0.157
	0.0008	3.05 (2.97 – 3.13)	1.00 (0.96 – 1.04)	0.907
	0.001	2.99 (2.91 – 3.07)	0.98 (0.94 – 1.01)	0.216
3	Control	3.08 (3.00 – 3.16)	1	–
	0.0003	3.02 (2.94 – 3.10)	0.98 (0.95 – 1.01)	0.235

0.0006	3.02 (2.94 – 3.10)	0.98 (0.95 – 0.01)	0.210
0.0008	3.04 (2.96 – 3.12)	0.99 (0.96 – 0.02)	0.470
0.001	3.01 (2.93 – 3.09)	0.98 (0.95 – 0.01)	0.187

Key: CI; Confidence Interval *predicted values were obtained from a GLMs model.

A similar trend was observed for mean egg production. In the first generation, the mean number of eggs per female significantly decreased in the PPF-exposed groups: 18.83 at 0.0003 mg a.i./L, 17.80 at 0.0006 mg a.i./L, 14.93 at 0.0008 mg a.i./L, and 13.90 at 0.001 mg a.i./L, all compared to a mean of 30.7 eggs in the control group ($p < 0.001$ for all). No significant differences in mean egg production were found in subsequent generations ($p > 0.05$). (Table 4).

Table 4. Predicted mean eggs laid of *Anopheles arabiensis* between control and pyriproxyfen exposed groups across varying concentrations.

Generations	PPF concentrations. (mg a.i/l)	Predicted Mean [95% CI]*	RR [95% CI]	P value
1	Control	30.07 (28.17 – 32.09)	1	–
	0.0003	18.83 (17.34 – 20.45)	0.63 (0.56 – 0.70)	$P < 0.001$
	0.0006	17.80 (16.35 – 19.38)	0.59 (0.53 – 0.66)	$P < 0.001$
	0.0008	14.93 (13.61 – 16.38)	0.50 (0.44 – 0.56)	$P < 0.001$
	0.001	13.90 (12.63 – 15.30)	0.46 (0.41– 0.52)	$P < 0.001$
2	Control	30.13 (28.23 – 32.16)	1	–
	0.0003	30.47 (28.55 – 32.51)	1.01 (0.92 – 1.11)	0.815
	0.0006	28.77 (26.91 – 30.75)	0.95 (0.87 – 1.05)	0.329
	0.0008	28.83 (26.97 – 30.82)	0.96 (0.87 – 1.05)	0.354
	0.001	28.00 (26.17 – 29.96)	0.93 (0.85 – 1.02)	0.125
3	Control	30.67 (28.75 – 32.71)	1	–
	0.0003	31.23 (29.30 – 33.30)	1.02 (0.93 – 1.12)	0.693
	0.0006	30.80 (28.88 – 32.85)	1.00 (0.92 – 1.10)	0.926
	0.0008	30.00 (28.10 – 32.03)	0.98 (0.89 – 1.07)	0.639
	0.001	29.90 (28.01 – 31.92)	0.97 (0.89 – 1.07)	0.590

Key: CI; Confidence Interval, RR; Relative Risk *predicted values were obtained from a GLMs model.

Similarly, the mean proportion of hatched eggs per female was significantly lower in the first generation of PPF-exposed mosquitoes compared to the control group. The predicted mean

proportion was 0.87 in controls, decreasing to 0.82, 0.82, 0.79, and 0.79 at 0.0003, 0.0006, 0.0008, and 0.001 mg a.i./L, respectively (all $p \leq 0.005$). No significant differences were observed in the second and third generations, where proportions remained similar across all PPF concentrations (0.87–0.89, $p > 0.005$) (Table 5).

Table 5. Predicted mean hatching rate of *Anopheles arabiensis* eggs between control and pyriproxyfen exposed groups across varying concentrations.

Generations	PPF concentrations. (mg a.i/l)	Predicted Mean Proportion [95% CI]*	OR [95% CI]	P value
1	Control	0.87 (0.85 – 0.89)	1	–
	0.0003	0.82 (0.79 – 0.85)	0.66 (0.49 – 0.88)	0.005
	0.0006	0.82 (0.78– 0.85)	0.64 (0.48 – 0.86)	0.003
	0.0008	0.79 (0.75 – 0.82)	0.54 (0.40 – 0.73)	0.001
	0.001	0.79 (0.75 – 0.83)	0.55 (0.40– 0.75)	0.001
2	Control	0.88 (0.86– 0.90)	1	–
	0.0003	0.89 (0.86– 0.89)	1.01 (0.76 – 1.35)	0.932
	0.0006	0.89 (0.86– 0.89)	1.01 (0.76 – 1.36)	0.925
	0.0008	0.89 (0.87 – 0.91)	1.09 (0.81 – 1.47)	0.565
	0.001	0.88 (0.85 – 0.90)	1.15 (0.55 – 1.86)	0.358
3	Control	0.88 (0.86 – 0.90)	1	–
	0.0003	0.87 (0.85 – 0.89)	0.92 (0.97 – 1.22)	0.574
	0.0006	0.89 (0.87 – 0.91)	1.06 (0.80 – 1.41)	0.690
	0.0008	0.88 (0.86 – 0.90)	0.97 (0.73 – 1.28)	0.807
	0.001	0.88 (0.85 – 0.90)	0.94 (0.71 – 1.25)	0.677

Key: CI; Confidence Interval, RR; Relative Risk *predicted values were obtained from a binomial GLMs model.

4. Discussion

Identifying new insecticides and innovative delivery methods is a public health priority due to the increasing spread of pyrethroid resistance among disease transmitting mosquitoes (11,19,31,32). Pyriproxyfen a juvenile hormone analog, is one such insecticide known to induce sterilization and emergence inhibition in exposed mosquitoes (31,33,34). Previous studies have examined the combined effects of PPF and pyrethroids to understand its interactions with conventional vector control tools like LLINs and IRS (22,23,35–39). In this context, present study investigated the effects of sublethal PPF exposure on *An. arabiensis* pyrethroid susceptibility across three generations, and effect of such exposure on mosquito fecundity, fertility and body size. We examined these

interactions in situations where the emerged adults were exposed to pyrethroid insecticide class (permethrin and deltamethrin) commonly used for adult mosquito control.

The findings show that PPF exposure does not lead to heritable insecticide resistance, but it induces a temporary increase in tolerance in the first generation. However, in the absence of continuous PPF exposure, the second and third generations exhibited susceptibility, fecundity, fertility and body size comparable to the control group. These results indicate that a single larval exposure to PPF produces transient effects that are not heritable, and that assessing three generations is sufficient to capture its transgenerational impact. As hypothesized, exposure to 3.75% permethrin resulted in 100% knockdown and mortality across all generations, regardless of PPF exposure. These results align with those of Opiyo et al., who reported increased resistance in *An. arabiensis* following sublethal PPF exposure (23). This study suggests that pyrethroid resistance associated with aquatic exposure to PPF may be restricted to the first generation and is not carried over to subsequent mosquito generations. The observed response likely reflects temporary tolerance rather than true resistance, which arises from the selection of heritable traits within mosquito populations. Cross-resistance between PPF and other insecticide classes has been reported in housefly *Musca domestica*, against methoxyfenozide (diacylhydrazines), such as; cyromazine (triazines), and lufenuron (benzoylureas)(40). Resistance to PPF in the greenhouse whitefly *Trialeurodes vaporariorum* has been linked to overexpression of the cytochrome P450 gene CYP4G61, highlighting the potential role of metabolic mechanisms. (37).

Some studies suggest that interactions between PPF and pyrethroids could upregulate detoxification enzymes, such as cytochrome P450s, which may metabolize both insecticide classes in *An. arabiensis* (22,23), raising concerns about cross-resistance. However, this effect might be dose-dependent with continuous exposure of mosquitoes to PPF. Prolonged contact with sublethal concentrations of insecticides and domestic pollutants such as hydrogen peroxide and soap detergent act as selective pressure that favors resistance traits. For instance, Shayo et al. reported increased tolerance in both susceptible *An. gambiae* and pyrethroid-resistant *An. arabiensis* following exposure to domestic pollutants such as hydrogen peroxide and soap detergent (41). Similarly, Shilla et al. found enhanced insecticide tolerance in susceptible *An. gambiae* after exposure to microplastics combined with insecticides (41). These findings highlight the importance of considering environmental co-factors when assessing resistance development.

Because mosquitoes contaminated with PPF through autodissemination become temporarily more tolerant to pyrethroids, this could reduce the short-term efficacy of pyrethroid-based interventions. A key strategy to address this is the rotation of insecticides with different modes of action, which helps maintain overall vector control effectiveness while minimizing potential negative interactions with PPF-based tools. When integrated into a broader management program, PPF interventions provide additional value by targeting immature mosquito stages and complementing existing control measures. Notably, when permethrin was tested at a high dose of 3.75%, all mosquitoes, whether pre-exposed to PPF or not, were fully susceptible across all three generations. This confirms that high-dose intensity assays are effective in resistant populations.

Nevertheless, exposure to sublethal doses of PPF during the larval stage significantly affected key reproductive and fitness parameters in the first generation of *An. arabiensis* mosquitoes. Fecundity and fertility were both markedly reduced, with egg-laying and hatching rates significantly lower in PPF-exposed groups compared to controls. Additionally, exposed mosquitoes had shorter wing lengths, indicating reduced body size, a known proxy for overall fitness and survival. These effects were not observed in the second and third generations, suggesting that the impact of PPF is transient and confined to direct exposure. Our findings are consistent with previous studies demonstrating PPF's ability to impair mosquito reproduction and development (31,43–49). The reduction on fecundity and fertility could be due to the fact that PPF mimics the action of JH at a time that it should not be present, affecting the vitellogenesis or some other step in the formation of eggs (31,34,44,45). Similar effects have been reported in LLINs co-treated with PPF, where resistant mosquitoes were sterilized upon exposure to Olyset Duo (39,50,51). These findings highlight the

added value of PPF in vector control, as it can induce sterility even in resistant mosquitoes. The sterilizing effect of PPF either at larval or adult exposure supports its potential as a complementary tool for managing resistant mosquito populations and interrupting transmission.

The smaller body sizes observed in the exposed groups are likely a consequence of PPF induced stress during larval development, although other factors such as chemical exposure or larval competition are also known to produce smaller adults (46,48,52). From a vector control perspective, PPF exposure is particularly valuable, as it can reduce mosquito population growth and vectorial capacity even without causing immediate mortality. By limiting reproductive output and reducing adult fitness, PPF contributes to an integrated approach that suppresses vector populations and complements existing interventions.

The limitations of this study include: 1) Only the first generation of mosquitoes was exposed to PPF, while subsequent generations were reared without further exposure. Future studies should extend across multiple generations with repeated PPF exposure to better capture long-term effects. 2) Further investigations are needed to assess delayed effects on mosquitoes beyond the 24-hour period following PPF pre-exposure. Additionally, it remains unclear whether similar sublethal effects particularly the temporary increase in pyrethroid tolerance would occur in *Anopheles gambiae* s.s. or *Anopheles funestus*. These species differ in larval ecology, behavior, and resistance mechanisms, which could influence their responses to PPF, emphasizing the need for species-specific assessments in future studies. (3) It should be noted that this study assessed phenotypic resistance, which reflects the observable response of mosquitoes to insecticide exposure. While the results suggest that metabolic resistance may play a role, it is likely that other underlying mechanisms also contribute to the observed tolerance. Therefore, further investigations, including molecular and gene expression analyses, are necessary to identify the specific genes and pathways responsible for the upregulation of detoxification enzymes and to clarify the mechanisms driving resistance in these mosquito populations. Moreover, studies should be conducted to examine whether field applications of PPF, either by larviciding or other means, exacerbate pyrethroid resistance in areas where such resistance already exists in wild vector populations. This study provides important insights into the transient nature of PPF-induced effects on insecticide susceptibility and mosquito fitness, supporting its potential role as a complementary tool in integrated vector management strategies.

5. Conclusions

This study demonstrates temporary effects of sublethal dose of PPF exposure on *An. arabiensis* susceptibility to pyrethroids and fitness across multiple generations. The findings support the strategic use of PPF in integrated vector management through cross-rotation with pyrethroids, helping to manage resistance while preserving the effectiveness of existing interventions.

Authors' contributions: STM and DWL conceived, designed and implemented the study. STM executed the experiment. STM, HG and LLM carried out data analysis and interpretation of the results. STM wrote the manuscript. ATM, LLM, AM, MFM and DWL revised the manuscript. All authors participated in reviewing and approving the final version of the manuscript for submission.

Funding: This study was funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) (using the UK's Official Development Assistance (ODA) funding) and Wellcome [218776/Z/19/Z] through the NIHR-Wellcome Partnership for Global Health Research.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: The study was approved by the Ifakara Health Institute Review Board with certificate number IHI/IRB/No: 17- 2020 of 21st April 2020 and the National Institute for Medical Research – Tanzania with a certificate number Ref No. BD.242/437/01C/107. No anticipated risk was associated with the participants in the study, as it was carried out in a semi-field environment.

Consent for publication: Permission to publish this work was also obtained from the National Institute of Medical Research (NIMR), Ref No: BD.242/437/01C/107.

Data availability and materials: Data will be made available on request from the authors.

Acknowledgments: The authors express gratitude to Ifakara Health Institute (IHI) for granting access to essential research facilities. Also, the authors would like to acknowledge Ms. Naomi Urio, for her valuable technical inputs in this manuscript and Mr. Abdallah Kipekepeke for his guidance on data analysis planning. Recognition is also given to Mrs. Monica Mpingwa for his assistance in maintaining the colony, as well as to all technicians at IHI Mosquito City (Kinin'gina), Vector Sphere and Bagamoyo for their contributions during this study.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this study.

List of Abbreviations

a.i	active ingredient
DHS- MIS	Demographic Health Survey Malaria Indicator Survey
GTS	Global Technical Strategy
IGR	Insecticide Growth Regulator
IVM	Integrated Vector Management
IRS	Indoor Residual Spray
LC	Lethal Concentration
LLINs	Long Lasting Insecticide Treated nets
LSM	Larval Source Management
NMSP	National Malaria Strategic Plan
PPF	Pyriproxyfen
SFS	Semi Field System
WHO	World Health Organization

References

1. WHO. "Interim Position Statement" The role of larviciding for malaria control in sub-Saharan Africa [Internet]. 2012. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/337991/WHO-HTM-GMP-2012.06-eng.pdf?sequence=1>
2. WHO. World malaria report 2024 [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Feb 14]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2024>
3. TDHS-MIS. TDHS -MIS, 2022 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2025 May 1]. Available from: <https://www.dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-FR382-DHS-Final-Reports.cfm>
4. Bhatt S, Weiss DJ, Cameron E, Bisanzio D, Mappin B, Dalrymple U, et al. The effect of malaria control on Plasmodium falciparum in Africa between 2000 and 2015. Nature [Internet]. 2015 Oct 1 [cited 2023 Jul 24]; 526:207–11. Available from: <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2015Natur.526.207B>
5. Kisinza WN, Nkya TE, Kabula B, Overgaard HJ, Massue DJ, Mageni Z, et al. Multiple insecticide resistance in Anopheles gambiae from Tanzania: a major concern for malaria vector control. Malar J [Internet]. 2017 Oct 30 [cited 2023 Jul 24]; 16:439. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5663032/>

6. CDC. Malaria. 2024 [cited 2025 Feb 20]. Larval Source Management and Other Vector Control Interventions. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/malaria/php/public-health-strategy/larval-management.html>
7. Choi L, Wilson A. Larviciding to control malaria. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2017 Jul 25 [cited 2023 Jul 24];2017(7):CD012736. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6483557/>
8. Devine GJ, Killeen GF. The potential of a new larviciding method for the control of malaria vectors. *Malar J*. 2010 May 25; 9:142.
9. Newby G, Chaki P, Latham M, Marrenjo D, Ochomo E, Nimmo D, et al. Larviciding for malaria control and elimination in Africa. *Malar J*. 2025 Jan 15;24(1):16.
10. Okumu F, Moore SJ, Selvaraj P, Yafin AH, Juma EO, Shirima GG, et al. Elevating larval source management as a key strategy for controlling malaria and other vector-borne diseases in Africa. *Parasit Vectors*. 2025 Feb 7;18(1):45.
11. Mmbaga A, Lwetoijera D. Current and future opportunities of autodissemination of pyriproxyfen approach for malaria vector control in urban and rural Africa - PubMed [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Nov 6]. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37440995/>
12. Stanton MC, Kalonde P, Zembere K, Hoek Spaans R, Jones CM. The application of drones for mosquito larval habitat identification in rural environments: a practical approach for malaria control? *Malar J* [Internet]. 2021 Dec [cited 2023 Jul 28];20(1):244. Available from: <https://malariajournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12936-021-03759-2>
13. Fillinger U, Lindsay SW. Suppression of exposure to malaria vectors by an order of magnitude using microbial larvicides in rural Kenya. *Trop Med Int Health TM IH*. 2006 Nov;11(11):1629–42.
14. Carrasco-Escobar G, Manrique E, Ruiz-Cabrejos J, Saavedra M, Alava F, Bickersmith S, et al. High-accuracy detection of malaria vector larval habitats using drone-based multispectral imagery. Costantini C, editor. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2019 Jan 17;13(1): e0007105.
15. Devine GJ, Perea EZ, Killeen GF, Stancil JD, Clark SJ, Morrison AC. Using adult mosquitoes to transfer insecticides to *Aedes aegypti* larval habitats. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* [Internet]. 2009 Jul 14 [cited 2023 Jul 28];106(28):11530–4. Available from: <https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.0901369106>
16. Lwetoijera D, Kiware S, Okumu F, Devine GJ, Majambere S. Autodissemination of pyriproxyfen suppresses stable populations of *Anopheles arabiensis* under semi-controlled settings. *Malar J*. 2019 May 9;18(1):166.
17. Chandel K, Suman DS, Wang Y, Unlu I, Williges E, Williams GM, et al. Targeting a Hidden Enemy: Pyriproxyfen Autodissemination Strategy for the Control of the Container Mosquito *Aedes albopictus* in Cryptic Habitats. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* [Internet]. 2016 Dec 29 [cited 2023 Jul 28];10(12): e0005235. Available from: <https://www.researchwithrutgers.com/en/publications/targeting-a-hidden-enemy-pyriproxyfen-autodissemination-strategy->
18. McKemey A, Adey R. Autodissemination of insecticides for mosquito control. Review of current R&D status, and feasibility for widespread operational adoption. 2018 Aug;
19. Lupenza ET, Kihonda J, Limwagu AJ, Ngowo HS, Sumaye RD, Lwetoijera DW. Using pastoralist community knowledge to locate and treat dry-season mosquito breeding habitats with pyriproxyfen to control *Anopheles gambiae* s.l. and *Anopheles funestus* s.l. in rural Tanzania. *Parasitol Res*. 2021 Apr;120(4):1193–202.
20. Lwetoijera D, Harris C, Kiware S, Dongus S, Devine GJ, McCall PJ, et al. Effective autodissemination of pyriproxyfen to breeding sites by the exophilic malaria vector *Anopheles arabiensis* in semi-field settings in Tanzania. *Malar J*. 2014 Apr 29; 13:161.
21. Dhadialla TS, Carlson GR, Le DP. New insecticides with ecdysteroidal and juvenile hormone activity. *Annu Rev Entomol*. 1998; 43:545–69.
22. Yunta C, Grisales N, Nász S, Hemmings K, Pignatelli P, Voice M, et al. Pyriproxyfen is metabolized by P450s associated with pyrethroid resistance in *An. gambiae*. *Insect Biochem Mol Biol* [Internet]. 2016 Nov [cited 2023 Jul 28]; 78:50–7. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0965174816301278>
23. Opiyo MA, Ngowo HS, Mapua SA, Mpingwa M, Nchimbi N, Matowo NS, et al. Sub-lethal aquatic doses of pyriproxyfen may increase pyrethroid resistance in malaria mosquitoes. *PloS One*. 2021;16(3): e0248538.

24. Ferguson HM, Ng'habi KR, Walder T, Kadungula D, Moore SJ, Lyimo I, et al. Establishment of a large semi-field system for experimental study of African malaria vector ecology and control in Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2008;7(158).
25. Ngowo HS, Hape EE, Matthiopoulos J, Ferguson HM, Okumu FO. Fitness characteristics of the malaria vector *Anopheles funestus* during an attempted laboratory colonization. *Malar J.* 2021 Mar 12;20(1):148.
26. Betwel et al, Changes in contributions of different *Anopheles* vector species to malaria transmission in east and southern Africa from 2000 to 2022 | *Parasites & Vectors* | Full Text [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Jul 18]. Available from: <https://parasitesandvectors.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13071-023-06019-1>
27. WHO. WHO (2005) Guidelines for Laboratory and Field Testing of Mosquito Larvicides. World Health Organization, Geneva, WHO/CDS/WHOPES/GCDPP/200513. - References - Scientific Research Publishing [Internet]. 2005 [cited 2025 Aug 11]. Available from: <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3433421>
28. Nasci RS. Relationship of wing length to adult dry weight in several mosquito species (Diptera: Culicidae). *J Med Entomol.* 1990 Jul;27(4):716–9.
29. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Sep 30]. Available from: <https://www.r-project.org/>
30. Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker [aut B, cre, Walker S, Christensen RHB, et al. lme4: Linear Mixed-Effects Models using “Eigen” and S4 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2025 Aug 1]. Available from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/lme4/index.html>
31. Kunambi HJ, Ngowo H, Ali A, Urrio N, Ngonzi AJ, Mwalugelo YA, et al. Sterilized *Anopheles funestus* can autodisseminate sufficient pyriproxyfen to the breeding habitat under semi-field settings. *Malar J.* 2023 Sep 21;22(1):280.
32. Lwetoijera D, Harris C, Kiware S, Dongus S, Devine GJ, McCall PJ, et al. Effective autodissemination of pyriproxyfen to breeding sites by the exophilic malaria vector *Anopheles arabiensis* in semi-field settings in Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2014 Apr 29; 13:161.
33. Ahmed TH, Saunders TR, Mullins D, Rahman MZ, Zhu J. Molecular action of pyriproxyfen: Role of the Methoprene-tolerant protein in the pyriproxyfen-induced sterilization of adult female mosquitoes. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2020 Aug 31;14(8): e0008669.
34. Harburguer L, Zerba E, Licastro S. Sublethal Effect of Pyriproxyfen Released from a Fumigant Formulation on Fecundity, Fertility, and Ovicidal Action in *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae). *J Med Entomol.* 2014 Mar 1;51(2):436–43.
35. Brogdon WG, McAllister JC, Corwin AM, Cordon-Rosales C. Independent selection of multiple mechanisms for pyrethroid resistance in Guatemalan *Anopheles albimanus* (Diptera: Culicidae). *J Econ Entomol.* 1999 Apr;92(2):298–302.
36. Fine BC, Godin PJ, Thain EM. Penetration of Pyrethrin I labelled with Carbon-14 into Susceptible and Pyrethroid Resistant Houseflies. *Nature.* 1963 Aug;199(4896):927–8.
37. Karatolos N, Williamson MS, Denholm I, Gorman K, Ffrench-Constant RH, Bass C. Over-expression of a cytochrome P450 is associated with resistance to pyriproxyfen in the greenhouse whitefly *Trialetrodes vaporariorum*. *PloS One.* 2012;7(2):e31077.
38. Lilly DG, Latham SL, Webb CE, Doggett SL. Cuticle Thickening in a Pyrethroid-Resistant Strain of the Common Bed Bug, *Cimex lectularius* L. (Hemiptera: Cimicidae). *PloS One.* 2016;11(4):e0153302.
39. Ngufor C, N'Guessan R, Fagbohoun J, Odjo A, Malone D, Akogbeto M, et al. Olyset Duo® (a pyriproxyfen and permethrin mixture net): An experimental hut trial against pyrethroid resistant *Anopheles gambiae* and *Culex quinquefasciatus* in southern Benin. *PLoS ONE.* 2014;9(4).
40. Shah RM, Abbas N, Shad SA, Varloud M. Inheritance mode, cross-resistance and realized heritability of pyriproxyfen resistance in a field strain of *Musca domestica* L. (Diptera: Muscidae). *Acta Trop.* 2015 Feb 1; 142:149–55.
41. Shayo et al, F. Exposure of malaria vector larval habitats to domestic pollutants escalate insecticides resistance: experimental proof | *International Journal of Tropical Insect Science* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2025 Jun 4]. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42690-020-00123-w>

42. Shilla DJ, Matiya DJ, Nyamandito NL, Tambwe MM, Quilliam RS. Insecticide tolerance of the malaria vector *Anopheles gambiae* following larval exposure to microplastics and insecticide. *PloS One*. 2024;19(12): e0315042.
43. Fournet F, Sannier C, Monteny N. Effects of the insect growth regulators OMS 2017 and diflubenzuron on the reproductive potential of *Aedes aegypti*. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc*. 1993 Dec;9(4):426–30.
44. Harris C, Lwetoijera DW, Dongus S, Matowo NS, Lorenz LM, Devine GJ, et al. Sterilising effects of pyriproxyfen on *Anopheles arabiensis* and its potential use in malaria control. 2013;1–8.
45. Itoh T, Kawada H, Abe A, Eshita Y, Rongsriyam Y, Igarashi A. Utilization of bloodfed females of *Aedes aegypti* as a vehicle for the transfer of the insect growth regulator pyriproxyfen to larval habitats. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc*. 1994 Sep;10(3):344–7.
46. Juliano SA, Ribeiro GS, Maciel-de-Freitas R, Castro MG, Codeço C, Lourenço-de-Oliveira R, et al. She's a femme fatale: low-density larval development produces good disease vectors. *Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz*. 2014 Dec;109(8):1070–7.
47. Koama B, Namountougou M, Sanou R, Ndo S, Ouattara A, Dabiré RK, et al. The sterilizing effect of pyriproxyfen on the malaria vector *Anopheles gambiae*: physiological impact on ovaries development. *Malar J*. 2015 Mar 4; 14:101.
48. Moura L, De Nadai BL, Corbi JJ. What does not kill it does not always make it stronger: High temperatures in pyriproxyfen treatments produce *Aedes aegypti* adults with reduced longevity and smaller females. *J Asia-Pac Entomol*. 2020 Jun;23(2):529–35.
49. Tunaz H, Uygun N. Insect Growth Regulators for Insect Pest Control*. *Turk J Agric for*. 2004 Jan 1;28(6):377–87.
50. Koffi A, Ahoua Alou L, Djenontin A, Kabran JP, Dosso Y, Kone A, et al. Efficacy of Olyset ® Duo, a permethrin and pyriproxyfen mixture net against wild pyrethroid-resistant *Anopheles gambiae* s.s. from Côte d'Ivoire: an experimental hut trial. *Parasite*. 2015 Oct; 22:28.
51. Mosha JF, Kulkarni MA, Lukole E, Matowo NS, Pitt C, Messenger LA, et al. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness against malaria of three types of dual-active-ingredient long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) compared with pyrethroid-only LLINs in Tanzania: a four-arm, cluster-randomised trial. *The Lancet*. 2022 Mar 26;399(10331):1227–41.
52. Lushasi SC, Mwalugelo YA, Swai JK, Mmbando AS, Muyaga LL, Nyolobi NK, et al. The Interspecific Competition Between Larvae of *Aedes aegypti* and Major African Malaria Vectors in a Semi-Field System in Tanzania. *Insects*. 2024 Dec 31;16(1):34.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.