ARTICLE IN PRESS

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



ScienceDirect



Interactions between pesticides and pathogen susceptibility in honey bees

Scott T O'Neal, Troy D Anderson and Judy Y Wu-Smart

5 There exist a variety of factors that negatively impact the health 6 and survival of managed honey bee colonies, including the

- and survival of managed honey bee colonies, including the
 spread of parasites and pathogens, loss of habitat, reduced
- availability or quality of food resources, climate change, poor
- practices, as well as exposure to agricultural and apicultural
- pesticides both in the field and in the hive. These factors are
- ¹² often closely intertwined, and it is unlikely that a single stressor
- is driving colony losses. There is a growing consensus,
- 14 however, that increasing prevalence of parasites and
- 15 pathogens are among the most significant threats to manage
- 16 bee colonies. Unfortunately, improper management of hives by
- 17 beekeepers may exacerbate parasite populations and disease
- 18 transmission. Furthermore, research continues to accumulate
- 19 that describes the complex and largely harmful interactions
- 20 that exist between pesticide exposure and bee immunity. This
- 21 brief review summarizes our progress in understanding the
- ²² impact of pesticide exposure on bees at the individual, colony,
- and community level.

Address

24 Department of Entomology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE, USA

Corresponding author: Wu-Smart, Judy Y (jwu-smart@unl.edu)

25 Current Opinion in Insect Science 2018, 26:xx-yy

- This review comes from a themed issue on Parasites/parasitoids/
 biological control
- Edited by Bryony Bonning, Elke Genersch and Annette Bruun
 Jensen

30 doi:10.1016/j.cois.2018.01.006

31 2214-5745/© 2018 Published by Elsevier Inc.

32 Introduction

Bees are important pollinators of many crops and native 33 plants, contributing about one-third of the human diet 34 globally and providing immeasurable ecosystem services 35 [1-3]. There are ca. 4000 species of bees across North 36 America, but a number of species have exhibited popu-37 lation declines [4,5[•]], including several bumble bee spe-38 cies that have decreased in both abundance (up to 96%) 39 and geographical range (23-87%) [6]. Similar declines 40 have also been reported in solitary species, particularly 41

42 with bees that are habitat and flower specialists [7].

Additionally, beekeepers have reported economically 43 unsustainable, annual honey bee colony losses of ca. 44 31–46% since 2010 [8]. Research efforts are focused on 45 the relationship between current agricultural practices 46 and consistent losses of honey bee colonies. This includes 47 large-scale conversion of natural landscapes into produc-48 tive crop fields, which has led to a reduction in forage 49 availability and malnutrition, as well as increased pesti-50 cide exposures to bees [4,8-18,19,20-22]. Other factors 51 that affect honey bee health can include parasites and 52 pathogens, with increased infestations and infections, 53 respectively, in colonies with reduced immunocompe-54 tence caused by poor nutrition and exposure to pesticides 55 [23−26,27^{••}]. 56

There are multiple interacting stressors that affect honey 57 bee colonies. For example, the ectoparasitic mite Varroa 58 *destructor* feeds on the hemolymph of bees, resulting in physiological deficiencies that reduce overwintering suc-59 cess for the colony [28]. Moreover, physical damage to the 60 bee cuticle caused by mite feeding can introduce several 61 viruses into host bees [29,30]. If unmanaged, Varroa mite 62 infestations can increase the mortality of bees in the 63 colony within one season [31,32]. The lack of, or 64 improper, Varroa mite management is a significant driver 65 for losses among beginning and hobbyist beekeepers [33]. 66 However, Varroa mites continue to be the major reason 67 for the use of beekeeper-applied miticides or varroacides 68 since their introduction to the U.S. [34,35]. These apicul-69 tural pesticides, along with agricultural pesticides (insec-70 ticides, fungicides, herbicides) transported to the hive by 71 foraging bees, may result in synergistic interactions that 72 cause higher toxicity than compounds acting alone [36-73 40,41[•]]. Pesticides may also accumulate in the hive, affect 74 brood development, and increase selection pressure for 75 varroacide-resistant mites [42-44]. Laboratory studies 76 often examine individual stressors for direct evidence of 77 their adverse effects on bees; however, complex stressor 78 interactions and the ability for bees to socially or behav-79 iorally defend themselves have made it difficult to under-80 stand the causes and effects of stressor interaction in the 81 field [25,41[•],45,46]. This review examines the current 82 literature focusing on pesticide exposure and pathogen 83 impacts on honey bees, with emphasis on the interface 84 between these stressors at different levels of biological 85 organization (i.e., individual to colony to apiary). 86

Individual-level effects

Laboratory studies have demonstrated that exposure to sublethal doses of pesticides can negatively affect honey 89

www.sciencedirect.com

Current Opinion in Insect Science 2018, 26:1-6

87

2 Parasites/parasitoids/biological control

bee behavior [47,48], foraging [49], longevity [43], and 90 olfactory learning and memory [50-53]. Pesticide expo-91 sure can also impair honey bee detoxification pathways 92 [54], and the harmful effects of interactions between 93 multiple pesticides in bees appear to be nearly as complex 94 as the drug interactions observed in mammals [39,55]. 95 More pertinent to concerns related to the increasing role 96 of pathogens in colony decline is the impact of pesticide 97 exposure on the immune response of honey bees and 98 their ability to resist or tolerate pathogen infection. The 99 pathogen most commonly used in laboratory studies has 100 been the microsporidium Nosema ceranae, which has 101 proven the most tractable in controlled infection studies. 102 Significant effects on honey bee immune responsiveness 103 to infection with Nosema have been observed with expo-104 sure to neonicotinoid pesticides [23,24,56–58,59^{••},60^{••}], 105 fipronil [23,57,61], as well as fungicides [62], in addition to 106 altered queen physiology and survival [59**] and reduced 107 sperm viability and gene expression [60^{••}]. More note-108 worthy, given the widespread prevalence of agricultural 109 and apicultural pesticide residues in the hive environ-110 ment [42], is the finding that bees exposed to these 111 residues in the hive also have increased susceptibility 112 to Nosema [62,63]. With regards to other honey bee 113 pathogens, harmful interactions have been demonstrated 114 between viral pathogenicity and exposure to the neoni-115 cotinoid pesticide clothianidin [26], as well as the pyre-116 throid miticide *tau*-fluvalinate [64]. Recent work has also 117 employed a model insect virus [65^{••}] to reveal that 118 119 exposure to the formamidine miticide amitraz increases mortality associated with viral infections [66[•]]. In addition 120 to pesticide exposure, there is also mounting evidence 121 that organosilicone spray adjuvants used in various pesti-122 cide formulations may pose a more serious threat than 123 previously realized, as they have been demonstrated to 124 both impair olfactory learning [67] and increase viral 125 pathogenicity in bees [68[•]]. Another exciting recent study 126 shows a synergistic interaction when bee larvae are 127 exposed to clothianidin or the organophosphate dimeth-128 oate in combination with Paenibacillus larvae, the causa-129 tive agent of American foulbrood [69]. Finally, gene 130 expression studies have also suggested that thymol, for-131 mic acid, and the phosphorothioate miticide coumaphos 132 133 may suppress expression of genes related to bee immunity [70]. A number of recent reviews address in greater 134 detail the links between pesticides and bee diseases 135 [71^{••}] and provide some discussion of improvements 136 and future directions for this research [72^{••}]. Although 137 there exist ample correlative studies to suggest a link 138 between pesticide exposure and the ability of bees to 139 resist or tolerate pathogen infection, there is very little 140 known about the mechanisms of such a connection. One 141 outlier is a study describing a negative modulator of NF-142 κB activation (NF- κB function reviewed here [73]) that 143 reduces honey bee immunocompetence when exposed to 144 clothianidin and another neonicotinoid, imidacloprid, but 145 not when exposed to the organophosphate chlorpyrifos 146

[26]. Two recent studies also described an important role 147 for the evolutionarily conserved ATP-sensitive inwardly 148 rectifying potassium (K_{ATP}) channel in the regulation of 149 honey bee cardiac function [65^{••}] and antiviral immunity 150 $[74^{\bullet\bullet}]$. This supports earlier findings that K_{ATP} channels 151 play a role in mediating fruit fly survival during viral 152 infections similar to that observed in mammals [75]. 153 Although the exact mechanism has yet to be elucidated, 154 evidence suggests that K_{ATP} channels have a function in 155 modulating antiviral RNAi by facilitating tissue-specific 156 regulation of innate immune response mechanisms by the 157 cellular environment of the heart [76]. Taken together, 158 these studies also support the hypothesis that disruption 159 of cardiac function and subsequent inability to maintain 160 homeostasis may reduce the ability of bees to tolerate 161 infection by pathogens [66[•]], providing another possible 162 mechanism by which cardioactive pesticides could reduce 163 honey bee immunocompetence. 164

Colony-level effects

Pesticide effects on honey bee colonies are typically 166 studied in the field; however, the number of interacting 167 biotic and abiotic stressors that can affect these colonies 168 presents variables that are difficult to manage with these 169 studies. Additionally, social bee behaviors, such as age-170 based divisions of labor, can cause disparities in the 171 evaluation of pesticide exposures, toxicities, and risks 172 to the different castes and their roles in the colony 173 [38,77,78]. For example, older forager bees are more 174 likely to be exposed to pesticides via contact or oral 175 exposure to contaminated nectar and water sources than 176 younger nurse bees, and these older bees are reported to 177 be more sensitive to these pesticide exposures 178 [79,80^{••},81[•],82[•]]. By contrast, nurse bees are more likely 179 to be exposed to pesticide-contaminated pollen than 180 forager bees, since the nurse bees consume pollen to 181 produce glandular secretions to feed brood and queen 182 bees. Nurse bees infected by Varroa mites and feeding on 183 pesticide-contaminated pollen may have higher virus 184 titers compared to those feeding on uncontaminated 185 pollen and, in turn, can increase the risk of transmitting 186 viruses to the brood and queen during feeding [78,83–85]. 187 Additionally, young adult bees emerging from parasitized 188 pupae may be disproportionately impacted by Varroa 189 mites as multiple mites reproduce and feed within the 190 developing pupal cell. Heavy parasitism alters physiolog-191 ical features critical for winter survival in host bees and 192 may lead to developmental abnormalities such as mal-193 formed wings caused by Varroa-vectored deformed wing 194 virus [86,87]. In addition, the exposure of bees to pesti-195 cides can not only adversely affect brood care and pro-196 duction, but can affect other caste behaviors such as 197 mating, egg laying, and other routine tasks that support 198 healthy colony numbers. Forager bees exposed to certain 199 pesticides are reported to exhibit impaired foraging beha-200 viors and cognitive functions that not only lead to reduced 201 food stores, lower brood production, and higher pathogen 202

165

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8878573

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8878573

Daneshyari.com