

Integrated fly management in European ruminant operations from the perspective of directive 2009/128/EC on sustainable use of pesticides

Luc Durel · Augustin Estrada-Peña · Michel Franc · Heinz Mehlhorn · Jérémy Bouyer

Received: 2 December 2014 / Accepted: 15 December 2014 / Published online: 30 December 2014
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2014

Abstract Integrated pest management (IPM) in agriculture animals remains undeveloped as compared to IPM in crops. With respect to the range of external nuisance arthropods that may bother farm animals, development and implementation of systematic IPM strategies are difficult to carry out. However, recurrent outbreaks of blue tongue disease in sheep and cattle, the public threats regarding the prophylactic use of veterinary insecticides and the need to preserve the efficacy of available actives have to lead the reflexion on new control strategies for arthropod pests of livestock. A recent extension of EU regulation on the use of pesticides in crops provides an opportunity to compare IPM strategies and to suggest new lines of reflection for the control of nuisance pests in ruminants under European conditions. In this paper, actions suggested by the Annex III of the Directive 2009/128/CE on Sustainable Use of

Pesticides and related National Action Plans from 28 member states of the EU were reviewed from an animal production perspective by a group of veterinary entomologists. Eight lines of action have been identified and thus challenged with respect to current husbandry practices in modern European ruminant operations. Many IPM strategies for crops were identified to be unsuitable for large animals. Suggestions for implementing tools, opportunities and constraint assessment, and needs for support were also discussed. Only control of pest development sites and monitoring of harmful organisms were considered achievable in the near future; both in conjunction with the use of topical insecticides. Complementary actions such as alternatives to chemical control require further researches and industrial development. Marketing of IGR-based feed additives would be of great interest, but development of new compounds for veterinary medicines is very unlikely with respect to the European regulatory environment and associated cost of development.

L. Durel (✉)
Virbac, 13ème rue LID, 06511 Carros Cedex, France
e-mail: luc.durel@virbac.com

A. Estrada-Peña
Departamento de Patología Animal, Facultad de Veterinaria,
Universidad de Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain

M. Franc
Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse, Service de Parasitologie,
Toulouse, France

H. Mehlhorn
Heinrich-Heine Universität, Institut für Zoomorphologie,
Zellbiologie und Parasitologie, Düsseldorf, Germany

J. Bouyer
Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique
pour le Développement (CIRAD), 34398 Montpellier, France

J. Bouyer
Institut Sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles, Laboratoire National
d'Élevage et de Recherches Vétérinaires,
BP 2057 Dakar – Hann, Sénégal

Keywords Integrated pest management · Veterinary medicine · Flies · Insecticides

Introduction

The sustainability of pest control is frequently compromised by two processes: (1) the appearance of new pest species and (2) the emergence of new resistance patterns of indigenous organisms. These mechanisms have frequently led to the loss of valuable chemicals and uncontrollable pest and disease outbreaks which can be amplified by environmental changes (climatic or local, through landscape fragmentation or irrigation for example) and socio-demographic changes (chaotic urbanisation, poverty, degradation of the medical and veterinary health services, and globalisation of commercial exchanges, to name but a few) (Gubler 2002; Purse et al. 2005).

Under current EU regulation, only compounds enlisted in Annex I of Commission Regulation (EU) No. 37/2010 on classification of the pharmacologically active substances regarding maximum residue limits (MRL) in foodstuffs of animal origin are allowed for use as veterinary medicines. Thus, only a few drugs are granted a marketing authorization for use as insecticidal/acaricidal medicines in ruminants in the EU. Synthetic pyrethroids (SPs) are the most used compounds (permethrin, cypermethrin, deltamethrin, and flumethrin). Identification of new compounds and development of new medicines for farm animals that comply with the high European standards could take years or even decades to develop and is probably cost prohibitive. Therefore, extending the efficiency of existing molecules against endemic pest arthropods of livestock or even emerging species must be preserved for as long as possible.

In 2008, the unexpected outbreak of Blue Tongue virus (BTV) in Europe has highlighted the limits of massive use of topical insecticidal medicines in ruminants from an economical as well as a social point of view. Several works demonstrated the relatively low efficacy of the deltamethrin-based products on several *Culicoides* spp. midges (Schmahl et al. 2008; Mehlhorn et al. 2008a, b; Schmahl et al. 2009; Mullens et al. 2010; Venail et al. 2011), and threats regarding the consequences of approximately monthly application of SP on cattle and sheep on wild fauna and beneficial species such as honeybees are rising. Opponents to systematic disinsectization of farm animals pointed out that no product available on the European market was registered for the control of midges (off-label use). The European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) issued recommendations for a parsimonious use of SP, in order to mitigate environmental impact of mass disinsectization (Algers et al. 2008). Risk of insecticide resistance emergence in *Culicoides* spp. was also discussed. Blue-tongue virus (Wilson and Mellor 2008) and more recently Schmallenberg virus (SBV) (Hoffmann et al. 2012) were spread in northern Europe by midges species for which there was scant data on habits. Studies indicated that the treatment of livestock and animal housing with SP, the use of midge-proofed stabling for viremic or high-value animals, and the promotion of good farm practice in order to at least partially eliminate local breeding sites were the best options available at this time (Carpenter et al. 2008), at least before a vaccine became available in the case of BTV (Savini et al. 2008). Treatment of animals is certainly the less acceptable method within European public opinion.

In 2009, the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union issued the Directive 2009/128/EC for the Sustainable Use of Pesticides (DirSU) to reduce the risks and impacts of pesticide use on people's health and the environment (OJEC 2009). Topical insecticidal medicines for ruminants are not within the scope of the DirSU. Products for building disinsectization, which can be considered as key

elements of pest arthropod control programs, are ruled by the EU Regulation No. 528/2012 on biocides (OJEC 2012), but it is anticipated that the scope of the DirSU will be extended to cover biocidal products.

The DirSU features the principle of integrated pest management (IPM). Article 3–3 of the DirSU indicates that IPM would be “the careful consideration of all available [plant] control techniques, and subsequent integration of appropriate measures, that discourage the development of populations of harmful organisms and keep the use of [plant] protection products and other interventions at levels that are economically and ecologically justified and reduce or minimize risks to human health and the environment. IPM emphasizes the growth of a healthy [crop] with the least possible disruption to [agro-ecosystems] and encourages natural pest control mechanisms”. The scope of this definition is clearly crop protection, and European pesticide regulation displays significant differences with regulation on veterinary medicinal products. However, authors have estimated that compliance to the Directive 2009/128/EC could be a fruitful attitude in order to provide pragmatic and achievable recommendations for implementing IPM strategies in livestock operations.

The objective of this paper is to present the potential of existing scientific research as well as existing expertise and knowledge in light of the DirSU to support the stakeholders in their political and technical decisions concerning management of food producing animal risks related to insecticide use and the environment.

Materials and methods

Directive 2009/128/EC

The full text of this directive is available on the website of the Official Journal of the European Union (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/>) in all official languages of the EU. This text has been adopted on 21 October 2009 and published on 24 November 2009 (OJEC L309) and came into force the following day. The directive was expected to be transposed and implemented by Member States (MS) by 25 November 2011. One of the key features of the directive is that each MS should develop and adopt its *National Action Plan* (NAPs) and set up quantitative objectives, targets, measures, and times to fulfil the directive's provisions. MS had until 14 December 2012 to communicate their NAPs to the European Commission and to other MS.

Annexes of the directive

Four annexes have been attached to the DirSU. Annex III entitled “General principles of integrated pest management” was used as guideline for the present work. Regulators stated that measures designed to amend non-essential elements of

this directive in order to take account of scientific and technical progress shall be adopted later, in accordance with regulatory procedures. At the time of writing, no new provisions had been issued. DirSU has been issued for promoting the sustainable use of pesticides in crops. All proposals refer to crop protection and plant protection measures and products. Some of the measures are clearly not applicable to animal protection and they have been withdrawn; withdrawal of these actions is however discussed in the discussion section. Where applicable, wording of provisions has been changed in order to encompass agriculture animal protection, i.e., in turning crop into livestock, or plant protection measures into livestock protection measures.

National action plans

Member states were encouraged to make public drafts of the NAPs as well as to encourage public participation in respect of the drawing up of certain plans and programs related to the environment. Therefore, 28 NAPs are available online and they can be compared (http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/pesticides/sustainable_use_pesticides/national_action_plans_en.htm).

All available NAPs were examined for this work. Special attention has been paid to chapters dedicated to IPM. As already exposed, actions exclusively related to crops have been withdrawn. When recommended measures were appropriate for both crops and agriculture animals, a common wording was proposed without reference to any Reign. When appropriate, the words crop or plant were changed into animals or livestock.

IPM in livestock: Proposals

Generic measures from Annex III of the DIRSU

Annex III of the DirSU provides eight tracks for reflection upon IPM implementation which are suggested to be followed by MS. The suggested scope of actions encompass the prevention/suppression of harmful organisms by choosing options other than pesticide use, the monitoring of harmful organisms by adequate methods and tools, the development of robust and scientifically-based decision making schemes, the promotion of methods other than chemical ones if they provide satisfactory pest control, the promotion of targeted treatment of pests with specific pesticides, the use of pesticides at the necessary levels, the implementation of anti-resistance strategies to maintain effectiveness of the products, and the success assessment of applied animal protection measures.

Initial official provisions of Annex III of the DirSU are collated in Table 1. Three proposals related to crop rotation,

Table 1 Main provisions of the Annex III of the Directive 2009/128/EC and proposed wording for agriculture animals

| | Initial wording according to DIRSU Annex III | Final wording |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | <p>The prevention and/or suppression of harmful organisms should be achieved or supported among other options especially by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –crop rotation –use of adequate cultivation techniques (e.g., stale seedbed technique, sowing dates and densities, under-sowing, conservation tillage, pruning, and direct sowing) –use, where appropriate, of resistant/tolerant cultivars and standard/certified seed and planting material –use of balanced fertilisation, liming and irrigation/drainage practices –preventing the spreading of harmful organisms by hygiene measures (e.g., by regular cleansing of machinery and equipment) –protection and enhancement of important beneficial organisms, e.g., by adequate plant protection measures or the utilisation of ecological infrastructures inside and outside production sites. | <p>The prevention and/or suppression of harmful organisms should be achieved or supported among other options especially by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –<i>withdrawn</i> –use of adequate husbandry techniques, including building design, manure and waste management, animal density management –use, where appropriate, of resistant/tolerant breeds –adequate management of pastures and building surroundings, including drainage of moistly area, tree cutting down, etc. –preventing the spreading of harmful organisms by hygiene measures (e.g., by regular cleansing of building and facilities), –<i>Parasitoides</i> |
| 2 | <p>Harmful organisms must be monitored by adequate methods and tools, where available. Such adequate tools should include observations in the field as well as scientifically sound warning, forecasting and early diagnosis systems, where feasible, as well as the use of advice from professionally qualified advisors.</p> | <p>Harmful organisms must be monitored by adequate methods and tools, where available. Such adequate tools should include observations in the field as well as scientifically sound warning, forecasting and early diagnosis systems, where feasible, as well as the use of advice from professionally qualified advisors.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Based on the results of the monitoring the professional user has to decide whether and when to apply plant protection measures. Robust and scientifically sound threshold values are essential components for decision making. For harmful organisms threshold levels defined for the region, specific areas, crops, and particular climatic conditions must be taken into</p> | <p>Based on the results of the monitoring the professional user has to decide whether and when to apply livestock protection measures. Robust and scientifically sound threshold values are essential components for decision making. For harmful organisms threshold levels defined for the region, specific areas, animal hosts, and particular climatic conditions must be taken into</p> |

Table 1 (continued)

| Initial wording according to DIRSU Annex III | Final wording |
|--|---|
| account before treatments, where feasible. | account before treatments, where feasible. |
| 4 Sustainable biological, physical, and other non-chemical methods must be preferred to chemical methods if they provide satisfactory pest control. | Sustainable biological, physical, and other non-chemical methods must be preferred to chemical methods if they provide satisfactory pest control. |
| 5 The pesticides applied shall be as specific as possible for the target and shall have the least side effects on human health, non-target organisms, and the environment | The pesticides applied shall be as specific as possible for the target and shall have the least side effects on human health, on farm animal health, non-target organisms, and the environment |
| 6 The professional user should keep the use of pesticides and other forms of intervention to levels that are necessary, e.g., by reduced doses, reduced application frequency or partial applications, considering that the level of risk in vegetation is acceptable and they do not increase the risk for development of resistance in populations of harmful organisms. | The professional user should keep the use of pesticides and other forms of intervention to levels that are necessary, e.g., by reduced doses, reduced application frequency or partial applications, considering that the level of risk in livestock is acceptable and they do not increase the risk for development of resistance in populations of harmful organisms. |
| 7 Where the risk of resistance against a plant protection measure is known and where the level of harmful organisms requires repeated application of pesticides to the crops, available anti-resistance strategies should be applied to maintain the effectiveness of the products. This may include the use of multiple pesticides with different modes of action. | Where the risk of resistance against livestock protection measures is known and where the level of harmful organisms requires repeated application of pesticides to the animals, available anti-resistance strategies should be applied to maintain the effectiveness of the products. This may include the use of multiple pesticides with different modes of action. |
| 8 Based on the records on the use of pesticides and on the monitoring of harmful organisms, the professional user should check the success of the applied plant protection measures. | Based on the records on the use of pesticides and on the monitoring of harmful organisms, the professional user should check the success of the applied livestock protection measures. |

use of tolerant/resistant cultivars, and enhancement of beneficial organisms have been considered as too far from strategies applicable to farm animal IPM. Thus, they have been withdrawn from the initial text.

Two proposals have been significantly changed: adequate cultivation technique turned into adequate husbandry technique; balanced fertilization, liming, and irrigation/drainage

turned into adequate pasture and building management. Only minor changes were made in other proposals.

Detailed measures from NAPs

From Annex III provisions, NAPs focus on some aspects or others, depending on local conditions. The initial eight tracks of reflection are more or less substantiated. Eleven recommended detailed measures were identified in the 28 NAPs; they are reported in Table 2. In depth analysis of NAPs also provide some interesting suggestions on tools and methodologies needed for the implementation of IPM. Strengths, weaknesses, and support requirements of such proposals are also indicated in Table 2. Practical implementation of such measures is discussed in the following section. As initial measures were intended for IPM implementation in crops, wording of measures has been adapted to livestock production, as already described.

Discussion

Withdrawn items

Annex III clearly indicates that crop rotation, use of tolerant/resistant cultivar, and enhancement of beneficial organisms are options that must be considered. A change in the food animal species produced cannot generally be considered as most pest flies are parasites of several agriculture animal species. Interest of resistant animal hosts such as tick-resistant *Bos taurus* × *Bos indicus* cross breed or trypanotolerant cattle both resistant to trypanosomes and ticks has been substantiated for some tropical areas (Mattioli et al. 2000; Bouyer et al. 2013). However, such an evolution would imply dramatic genetic changes in highly productive European cattle breeds and no data support the interest of this technique for increasing resistance to nuisance arthropods other than ticks. Beneficial organisms have been identified as predators (mainly parasitoides) or parasites (mainly fungi) of arthropod pests of livestock such as ticks, tsetse or *Stomoxys calcitrans* (Linnaeus, 1758) (Bouyer et al. 2011b; Samish 2006; Kaaya and Munyinyi 1995), but the effects remained small-scaled and temporary.

Prevention and suppression of harmful organisms

It has been demonstrated that *S. calcitrans* pupae may develop in round hay balls as well as in wasted hay felt from feeders (Broce et al. 2005; Talley et al. 2009). Therefore, feeders should be situated on firm, dry places where food stuff and animal manure would be easy to remove. Drainage of such places would facilitate maintenance. Roughly speaking, all places that do not naturally dry off during summer should

Table 2 Main actions to be carried out for the implementation of IPM in farm animal operations with respect to Annex III of the Directive 2009/128/EC and suggestions for implementing tools, expected opportunities and constraints, and needs for support

| Refer to Annex III | Actions | Tools | Opportunity | Constraints | Support needed for |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| 1. Prevention and/or suppression of harmful organisms | Husbandry techniques Building design Pasture and building surroundings management | Inventory/guidelines Guidelines Edges maintenance drainage | Limit nuisance from arthropod pest Controlling development sites and outdoor sources | Not always applicable, depends on farm organization, facilities Workload | Demo trails, on site assistance Training, demo trails, on site assistance |
| 2. Monitoring harmful organisms | Hygiene measures Desinsectization of buildings Regular observations in the field/on animals (scouting) Warning, forecasting, and early diagnosis | Minimum recommendations for animal and pest specific hygiene Minimum recommendations for buildings treatment Checklists, observation sheet, software Public monitoring system at regional or national level Monitoring device/population dynamics modeling | Alternative to insecticide Easy to implement Avoid useless treatments improve farmer competence Avoid useless treatments, Improve efficacy | Time consuming Selection of molecules different from epicutaneous treatment Requires expertise to be built in time, high level advisory services | Training and advisory services Training, on site assistance |
| 3. Application of animal protection measures (APM) | Threshold as application criteria | Management decision support tools (e.g., leaflets with decision schemes, recommendation, software.) | Avoid non beneficial treatments | Requires expertise to be built over time, high level of advisory services, Risk of animal losses | Training, on site assistance, threshold definition at proper scale, Information platform available (website) |
| 4. Sustainable biological, physical, and other non-chemical methods | Alternative to chemical control Development of the sterile insect technique to control vectors | Guidance on the alternative control means and their efficiency Area-wide IPM principles and methods | Avoid treatments when valid alternative available Validated alternative to insecticides | Application not providing satisfactory pest control Area-wide organization necessary | Training, on site assistance National/agency-based organisation of the control |
| 5. The Animal Protection Product (APP) applied shall be as specific as possible | Select APP efficacious to the pests present | Guidelines on APP category to be used and on mitigation measures to reduce risk | Increase efficacy on pest control by precise applications | Limited spectrum of action for the selected products | Training, on site assistance |
| 6. Use of pesticides at necessary levels | Apply doses and application frequency included on the label Restrict treatment to activity period of vectors Restrict treatment to vectors' biting sites | Information campaign on the need to respect the label Information on vector activity available to public Footbaths/restricted application | Cost reduction, development of good practice management Reduction of insecticides use Easy to implement Reduced impact on non-target organisms | Possible resistance Development due to under dosing Development of reliable population dynamics models To be tested for European vectors | Training, on site assistance Information platform available (website) Guidelines for using restricted application, Training, on site assistance |

Table 2 (continued)

| Refer to Annex III | Actions | Tools | Opportunity | Constraints | Support needed for |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 7. Anti-resistance strategies should be applied to maintain the effectiveness of the products | Use of multiple APP with different modes of action | Regional or national anti-resistance strategy with simple recommendations for farmers, based on international guidelines | Maintain product efficacy and hence optimal pest control | Reduced product availability due to authorization restrictions | Training, on site assistance Development of new molecules/biocides |
| 8. Check the success of the applied livestock protection measures | Maintain records on pesticide use and on the monitoring of harmful organisms | Recommendations | Progressively implement sustainable use, capitalize experience | Higher workload | Direct and indirect checking and recording, to reward system in place |

drain off in order to control development sites: This strategy has been efficiently combined with chemical techniques within an integrated strategy in Reunion Island (Bouyer et al. 2011b). Manure can also be covered with black plastic which increases the temperature inside the pile, destroying *S. calcitrans* larvae. Finally, the use of a manure pit is also very efficient to reduce the availability of breeding sites, not only for *S. calcitrans*, but also for biting midges (Ninio et al. 2011).

In tropical areas, large trees are suitable resting site for sand flies (Oca-Aguilar et al. 2013), and *S. calcitrans* and *Musca* spp. tend to prefer locations with forestry surrounding (Leclercq 1971; Rouet 2011), as well as tabanids which live outdoors and rest on trees. Trees are often used as wind-breaker hedges, quite close to farm buildings. Giant gramineae with large leaves such as sugar cane or elephant grass offer suitable resting sites for *S. calcitrans* (Gilles and David 2007). Identification of resting sites for main pests could improve the control strategies of limiting suitable surfaces or spraying them specifically with residual insecticides. *S. calcitrans* has been observed to preferably rest outdoors on south and east-facing bright surfaces of barns and fences, whereas *Musca domestica* (Linnaeus, 1758) tends to rest indoors (Rouet 2011; Lysyk 1993). Resting surfaces could also be painted black using insecticidal paints, a strategy that proved very efficient to control *Culex quinquefasciatus* (Say, 1823) and the pan-tropical urban pest mosquito *Anopheles gambiae* (Gilles, 1902), the main malaria vector in Sub-Saharan Africa (Mosqueira et al. 2010a, b). An alternative strategy could be the interception of *S. calcitrans* between their hunting and resting sites using insecticide-impregnated nets (Maia et al. 2010; Bauer et al. 2006) or even to protect the breeding sites (manure stocks) with such nets to intercept females before they lay their eggs, and unfed emerging adults (which are more sensitive to insecticides).

When applied, insecticides of different classes should be sprayed on animals and on building walls and roofs or insecticide-impregnated nets.

Monitoring of harmful organisms

Monitoring is important strategically in providing early warning of problems that may arise and is widely considered as a necessary component of any IPM strategy (Vreysen et al. 2013; Gerry et al. 2011; Ehler 2006) in order to correctly identify the harmful organisms whose physiological and ecological needs may vary amongst each other. Pest insects may be caught by means of various traps and any increase in the number of captures may indicate a change in the relative abundance of a given species or the emergence of a seasonal species.

Regarding anthropophilic or zoophilic species such as *S. calcitrans* and *Musca* spp., large scale entomological surveillance (ES) is of limited interest. Geographical range of such species is very large and seasonal recolonization of farms

comes from local on-farm sources or from the close neighborhood (Beresford and Sutcliffe 2009). In Europe, even in northern latitudes, eradication of the nuisance fly population never happens; a new generation emerges in spring from pupae that has survived in larval resting sites for diapausing species (*Musca autumnalis* (De Geer, 1776)) or development cycles can be slowed down until better climatic conditions and some imago can be observed during winter (*S. calcitrans*).

Various devices have been developed for pest insect monitoring in crops or greenhouses and vectors in pastures (Baldacchino et al. 2013). They most often focus on a single nuisance species and an attractant can be used for increasing sensitivity of detection devices (Baldacchino et al. 2014). The most reliable way to identify emergence of pest arthropods in livestock would certainly be to carefully observe the animals at different times of the day. Flies can be counted on cattle's forelegs (*S. calcitrans*) or other body parts (head and back). Assessment of fly-repelling behaviors may also be an option to consider (Gerry 2007; Vitela et al. 2007). This activity is really time consuming as several animals must be observed, and the observer must be able to identify the different species of flies. Thus, the use of monitoring traps is often a more appealing approach. Some difficulties immediately arise from the use of insect traps in cattle or sheep operations. First of all, animals are frequently outdoors during summertime and therefore monitoring systems have to move with them in large open spaces. It is also important to ensure traps are protected from curious animals. Many different insects can be caught in traps including beneficial species and even small vertebrates. However, specific traps are needed for some major pests of cattle that can be observed on animals only (*Haematobia irritans* (Linnaeus, 1758)). In barns, traps must also be protected from animals, especially cattle. Effectiveness of traps made of phthalogen blue clothes (Vavoua, Nzi) (Gilles et al. 2008) as well as various sticky traps (Gilles et al. 2008; Taylor and Berkebile 2006; Berry et al. 1986; Beresford and Sutcliffe 2012; Cilek 2003; Hogsette 1993) or even solar-charged, battery-powered, or electrocuting grids (Pickens 1991) have been tested for *S. calcitrans*. Blacklight suction traps are extensively used for monitoring of *Culicoides* species in farm animal operations (Viennet et al. 2011, 2012). Disposable sticky traps seem to be a more practical device to implement on farms for monitoring relative fly abundance in commercial cattle farms. Sticky ribbons or cardboard can be changed on a regular basis (monthly in winter or weekly in summer), and the number of caught organisms can be recorded. Glue-coated string is another solution that can allow monitoring of endophagous vectors within buildings (Bouyer et al. 2011b). Stuck flies can be counted per

meter and per day each week on a given length of rolled-out clear string.

Interest of ES of pest insects or arthropod vectors of public health interest has been substantiated a long time ago (Serfling 1952). Monitoring pests can allow restricting chemical treatments to activity periods. Management of large scale ES of arthropod pests of livestock population dynamics can be implemented in most of European countries, provided that public authorities make this decision. Such ES has been implemented for the follow up of the eradication of warble fly and it is currently running for midges, regarded as vectors of BTV (Goffredo et al. 2004; Goffredo and Meiswinkel 2004; Ivana et al. 2009; Lacková et al. 2009; Ramilo et al. 2012).

Application of animal protection measures (APM)

In any pest management approach, the pest's population level should guide management decisions such as when and how to control the pest (Gerry 2007). Many authors have issued high quality results on correlation between fly burden and economic losses (Campbell and Berry 1987; Campbell et al. 2001; Taylor et al. 2012a; Catangui et al. 1997). Generalization of these results remains difficult. Therefore, action thresholds for the application of insecticides on animals or any other control measure do not currently exist in Europe. The first observation of flies on animals in conjunction with positive fly trapping would be the signal to initiate control measures (threshold). In the case of *S. calcitrans*, applying early treatments before populations peak is recommended and seems to delay the apparition of high densities and reduce peak density (Bouyer et al. 2011b).

Sustainable non chemical methods of control

In confined cattle, fences can be defended by insecticide-treated nets (ITNs). Authors have tested ITNs for preventing cattle being bitten by *Culicoides* midges (Bauer et al. 2012; Del Río et al. 2014). Three meter high nets surrounding the area to be defended were required to significantly decrease the midge population abundance. This strategy is also efficient against *Stomoxys* with 1 m-high fences (Maia et al. 2010; Bauer et al. 2006). Impact on non-targeted organisms has to be considered (Del Río et al. 2014). The use of photovoltaic cells has recently be proposed in order to attract polarotactic species such as tabanids, and thus destroy them using an associated electric powered device (Blahó et al. 2012). Such self-sufficient traps could be used in pastures to prevent attacks from heavy insects that are less sensitive to low doses of SPs that are generally approved for use in agriculture animals.

Practical use of pest arthropod predators remains a field to investigate. However, many works have been published on parasitoids of nuisance flies. In Europe, synanthropic flies are

exposed to at least 41 species of parasitic Coleoptera and Hymenoptera. *Muscidifurax* and *Spalangia* species are really effective against harassing flies of livestock. *Spalangia cameroni* may have a high potential for the control of *S. calcitrans* (Baldacchino et al. 2013) and could be an alternative to chemical control of *M. domestica* (Skovgård and Nachman 2004), but the control cost is often prohibitive if governmental or professional organizations are not involved to produce the parasitoids. In the USA, several companies are now able to provide these ancillary insects for on-farm use. Biological control needs sustained releases of parasitoids and moderate to high control costs must be considered. Moreover, introduction in a given biotope of exotic selected species of parasitoids should certainly be avoided.

Since the early 1990s, bacteria *Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis* (Bti) or *Bacillus sphaericus* has been used successfully in the biological control of mosquitoes within large areas in Germany (Becker 1997). *Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis* produce so-called d-endotoxins that are specifically toxic to some insect species. Recently, Australian authors have tested toxicity of various strains of Bti to buffalo fly (*H. irritans exigua* (de Meijere, 1906)), sheep blowfly (*Lucilia cuprina* (Wiedemann, 1830)), and sheep louse (*Bovicola bovis* (Haeckel, 1896)) and found that some isolates have a high toxic activity against larvae of the two fly species and a moderate activity against lice (Gough et al. 2002).

The main alternative biological control method that is available presently is the sterile insect technique (SIT), that allowed the eradication of screwworms (*Cochliomyia hominivorax* (Coquerel, 1858)) from northern and central America (Wyss 2000), and more recently from Libya following an outbreak caused by the importation of infested cattle from southern America (Vargas-Terán et al. 1994). The SIT technique consists of releasing male insects that are either sterilized using ionizing radiation (Dyck et al. 2005) or transformed to carry a lethal gene (Alphey 2014). It is considered that SIT might represent a major alternative for controlling mosquito vectors (McGraw and O'Neill 2013). Recently, it was proposed to use sterile males as specific transporters of biocides like juvenile growth hormone analogues instead of sexual competitors only, a technique known as boosted-SIT (Bouyer and Lefrançois 2014).

Specific treatments for the target organisms

Only a few drugs are available for use as veterinary medicines in Europe. Beside SPs are the formamidin compounds (amitraz) which is recommended for the control of mange mites, lice, ticks, and sheep keds, organophosphates (dimpylate) with the same indications and pyrimidin derived compounds (dicyclanil) for blowfly control. Four macrocyclic lactones are also available in Europe, without respect to their larvicide activity on internal myiasis (*Hypoderma* spp.,

Oestrus ovis (Linnaeus, 1758)), they are active on lice and mange mites, and their topical formulations are authorized for the control of *H. irritans*. There was some evidence recently that ivermectin treatment of cattle can reduce tsetse survival and fecundity, but not on a cost-effective basis (Pooda et al. 2013). Fipronil has been successfully used for controlling horn flies in Latin America (Guglielmone et al. 2000); however, this active is not allowed for use in farm animals in Europe. For farm buildings, SPs (deltamethrin, cyfluthrin, and λ -cyhalothrin), organophosphates (phoxim), neonicotinoids, or similar (thiamethoxam, spinosad) are available.

The development of bacterial toxins to treat larval habitat is also an alternative: for example, the use of Spinosad® is efficient against vectors like mosquitoes that breed in water (Bond et al. 2004; Hertlein et al. 2010): Spinosad is a mixture of tetracyclic macrolide neurotoxins, spinosyn A, and D, produced during the fermentation of the soil actinomycete *Saccharopolyspora spinosa*. Its use against vectors using semi-humid breeding sites should be explored.

Use of pesticides at the necessary levels

Changes in dosages or frequency of treatment for topical insecticides currently authorized for use in cattle and sheep are off label uses and must be discouraged. Changes may lead to violative drug residues in milk or meat from treated animals. Insecticides must be applied as labeled by the manufacturer. However, long-term use of any insecticide even at appropriate levels still creates a selection pressure that will develop resistance in the target population. Thus, insecticide-based veterinary medicines must be part of the IPM strategy on livestock farms.

Availability of population dynamics models adapted to each particular situation might allow improvement in the present recommendations of the manufacturers by designing appropriate intervention thresholds and periods. Moreover, treatments can be restricted to times of the activity periods of vectors. Finally, it has been demonstrated that restricting the use of insecticides to vector biting sites using insecticide footbaths allowed a 90 % reduction of treatment time, costs, and insecticide doses in West Africa and an efficient control of tsetse flies (Bouyer et al. 2008; 2007) and trypanosomes (Bouyer et al. 2009). It was also demonstrated that this strategy has potential for limiting vector-borne zoonosis like sleeping sickness within a one health perspective (Ndeledje et al. 2013). However, its use necessitates training and guidelines (Bouyer et al. 2011a). Such strategies could be explored against European vectors since this method strongly reduces the impacts of insecticides on non-target organisms (Vale and Grant 2002; Vale et al. 2007).

Anti-resistance strategies

When animals are treated with a topical SP-based formulation, buildings must be treated with another class of pesticide. However, due to the limited number of authorized products for use as topical insecticide on animals or as residuals insecticides in farm buildings, only few combinations of drugs can be considered.

Insect growth regulators (IGRs) as veterinary medicines for farm animals have not been marketed in Europe. (S)-methoprene-based premix that has been demonstrated to be effective for control of the horn fly (*H. irritans*) (Miller et al. 1977), however, is not allowed for use in farm animals in Europe. Fluazuron (for cattle) and cyromazine (for sheep) have been included in Annex III of the MRL regulation. These IGRs would be available for pharmaceutical development. Cyromazine is marketed in Europe for building sanitization. Winter feeding sites where hay, manure, and urine are mixed together should be treated with cyromazine in May in order to inhibit larval development for the rest of the year (Taylor et al. 2012b).

Check the success of the applied measures

There are few consistent data on the assessment of control measure impact on relative abundance of nuisance fly populations in cattle operations (Vreysen et al. 2014). The interest of monitoring devices deserves to be further investigated.

Conclusions

The 2009/128/EC Directive on Sustainable Use of Pesticides provides a fruitful framework to address key elements of generic IPM strategies for cattle and sheep under European conditions. Among the eight lines of action for the implementation of IPM strategies, only two can be seriously considered, prevention, and suppression of harmful organism in the surroundings of animals (destruction of adult resting and larval development sites), and pest monitoring. Continued education of farmers and veterinarians would certainly contribute to the implementation of these basic IPM actions. Responsible use of veterinary insecticides must be encouraged. There is no room for alternate chemical compounds or significant changes in usages of veterinary medicines because of the strict-related regulations. Development of an IGR-based veterinary medicine for ruminants would be welcome. Non-chemical alternatives deserve further investigation.

Acknowledgments The work of Dr Bouyer is conducted within the project ‘Integrated Vector Management: innovating to improve control and reduce environmental impacts’ of Institut Carnot Santé Animale (ICSA) excellence network (<http://www6.jouy.inra.fr/gabi/Le-Partenariat/L-Institut-Carnot-Sante-Animale-ICSA>).

This work has been funded by VIRBAC laboratories, France.

References

- Algers, B., H. Blokuis, D. Broom, P. Costa, M. Domingo, M. Greiner, D. Guemene, J. Hartung, F. Koenen, C. Müller-Graf, D. Morton, A. Osterhaus, D. Pfeiffer, R. Roberts, M. Sanaa, M. Salman, J. Sharp, P. Vannier, M. Wierup, and M. Wooldridge. 2008. Bluetongue vectors and insecticides. Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Animal Health and Welfare. *EFSA J.* 1–70
- Alphey L (2014) Genetic control of mosquitoes. *Annu Rev Entomol* 59: 205–224
- Baldacchino F, Muenworn V, Desquesnes M, Desoli F, Charoenviriyaphap T, Duvallat G (2013) Transmission of pathogens by *Stomoxys* flies (Diptera, Muscidae): a review. *Parasite* 20:26–39
- Baldacchino F, Porciani A, Bernard C, Jay-Robert P (2014) Spatial and temporal distribution of Tabanidae in the Pyrenees Mountains: the influence of altitude and landscape structure. *Bull Entomol Res* 104: 1–11
- Bauer B, Gitau D, Oloo FP, Karanja SM (2006) Evaluation of a preliminary title to protect zero-grazed dairy cattle with insecticide-treated mosquito netting in western Kenya. *Trop Anim Health Prod* 38:29–34
- Bauer B, Mehlitz D, Clausen P (2012) Impact of insecticide-treated nets on insects of medical and veterinary relevance. In: Mehlhorn H (ed) *Arthropods as vectors of emerging diseases*. Springer, Heidelberg, pp 137–150
- Becker N (1997) Microbial control of mosquitoes: Management of the upper rhine mosquito population as a model programme. *Parasitol Today* 13:485–487
- Beresford D, Sutcliffe J (2009) Local infestation or long-distance migration? The seasonal recolonization of dairy farms by *Stomoxys calcitrans* (Diptera: Muscidae) in South Central Ontario. *Can J Econ Entomol* 102:788–798
- Beresford D, Sutcliffe J (2012) Field measurements of stable fly (Diptera: Muscidae) demography, fecundity, and survival based on daily trap catches at a beef farm in Southern Ontario over a 5-yr period. *J Med Entomol* 49:1262–1269
- Berry I, Nelson A, Broce A (1986) Effects of weather on capture of stable flies (Diptera: Muscidae) by Alysint fiber glass traps. *Environ Entomol* 15:706–709
- Blahó M, Egri Á, Barta A, Antoni G, Kriska G, Horváth G (2012) How can horseflies be captured by solar panels? A new concept of tabanid traps using light polarization and electricity produced by photovoltaics. *Vet Parasitol* 189:353–65
- Bond JG, Marina CF, Williams T (2004) The naturally derived insecticide spinosad is highly toxic to *Aedes* and *Anopheles* mosquito larvae. *Med Vet Entomol* 18:50–56
- Bouyer J, Lefrançois T (2014) Boosting the sterile insect technique to control mosquitoes. *Trends Parasitol* 30:271–3
- Bouyer J, Stachurski F, Kaboré I, Bauer B, Lancelot R (2007) Tsetse control in cattle from pyrethroid footbaths. *Prev Vet Med* 78:223–38
- Bouyer J, Stachurski F, Gouro A, Lancelot R (2008) On-station cattle insecticide treatment against tsetse flies using a footbath. *Rev Elev Med Vet Pays Trop* 61:153–160
- Bouyer J, Stachurski F, Gouro AS, Lancelot R (2009) Control of bovine trypanosomosis by restricted application of insecticides to cattle using footbaths. *Vet Parasitol* 161:187–93
- Bouyer F, Hamadou S, Adakal H, Lancelot R, Stachurski F, Belem AMG, Bouyer J (2011a) Restricted application of insecticides: a promising tsetse control technique, but what do the farmers think of it? *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 5:e1276
- Bouyer J, Grimaud Y, Pannequin M (2011b) Importance épidémiologique et contrôle des stomoxes à la Réunion. *Bull Epidémiologique, Santé Anim Aliment* 43:53–58

- Bouyer J, Bouyer F, Donadeu M, Rowan T, Napier G (2013) Community- and farmer-based management of animal African trypanosomiasis in cattle. *Trends Parasitol* 29:519–22
- Broce A, Hogsette J, Paisley S (2005) Winter feeding sites of hay in round bales as major developmental sites of *Stomoxys calcitrans* (Diptera: Muscidae) in pastures in spring and summer. *J Econ Entomol* 98: 2307–2312
- Campbell J, Berry I (1987) Effects of stable flies (Diptera: Muscidae) on weight gain and feed efficiency of feedlot cattle. *J Econ Entomol* 80: 117–119
- Campbell JB, Skoda SR, Berkebile DR, Boxler DJ, Thomas GD, Adams DC, Davis R (2001) Effects of stable flies (Diptera: Muscidae) on weight gains of grazing yearling cattle. *J Econ Entomol* 94:780–783
- Carpenter S, Mellor PS, Torr SJ (2008) Control techniques for *Culicoides* biting midges and their application in the U.K. and northwestern Palaeartic. *Med Vet Entomol* 22:175–187
- Catangui MA, Campbell JB, Thomas GD, Boxler DJ (1997) Calculating economic injury levels for stable flies (Diptera: Muscidae) on feeder heifers. *J Econ Entomol* 90:6–10
- Cilek J (2003) Attraction of colored plasticized corrugated boards to adult stable flies, *Stomoxys calcitrans* (Diptera: Muscidae). *Florida Entomol* 86:420–423
- de Oca-Aguilar ACM, Moo-Llanes D, Rebollar-Téllez EA (2013) Adult Sand fly species from diurnal resting sites on the Peninsula of Yucatan. *México Southwest Entomol* 38:241–250
- del Río R, Barceló C, Lucientes J, Miranda M (2014) Detrimental effect of cypermethrin treated nets on *Culicoides* populations (Diptera; Ceratopogonidae) and non-targeted fauna in livestock farms. *Vet Parasitol* 199:230–234
- Dyck, V., J. Hendrichs, and A. Robinson. 2005. *Sterile Insect Technique*. V.A. Dyck, J. Hendrichs, and A.S. Robinson, editors. Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg
- Ehler L (2006) Integrated pest management (IPM): Definition, historical development and implementation, and the other IPM. *Pest Manag Sci* 62:787–789
- Gerry, A. 2007. Predicting and controlling stable flies on California dairies. In *Agricultural and Natural Resources catalog*. University of California, Oakland (CA), USA. 11
- Gerry A, Higginbotham G, Periera L (2011) Evaluation of surveillance methods for monitoring house fly abundance and activity on large commercial dairy operations. *J Econ Entomol* 104:1093–1102
- Gilles J, David J (2007) Efficiency of traps for *Stomoxys calcitrans* and *Stomoxys niger niger* on Reunion Island. *Med Vet Entomol* 21:65–69
- Gilles J, David J-F, Duvallet G, Tillard E (2008) Potential impacts of climate change on stable flies, investigated along an altitudinal gradient. *Med Vet Entomol* 22:74–81
- Goffredo M, Meiswinkel R (2004) Entomological surveillance of bluetongue in Italy: Methods of capture, catch analysis and identification of *Culicoides* biting midges. *Vet Ital* 40:260–265
- Goffredo M, Buttigieg M, Meiswinkel R, Delécolle J, Chircop S (2004) Entomological surveillance for bluetongue on Malta: First report of *Culicoides imicola* Kieffer. *Vet Ital* 40:278–281
- Gough J, Akhurst R, Ellar D, Kemp D, Wijffels G (2002) New isolates of *Bacillus thuringiensis* for control of livestock ectoparasites. *Biol Control* 23:179–189
- Gubler DJ (2002) The global emergence/resurgence of arboviral diseases as public health problems. *Arch Med Res* 33:330–342
- Guglielmone AA, Volpogni MM, Mangold AJ, Anziani OS, Castelli MC (2000) Evaluation of a commercial pour-on formulation of 1 % fipronil for control of *Haematobia irritans* in naturally infested Holstein heifers. *Vet Argent* 17:108–113
- Hertlein MB, Mavrotas C, Jousseume C, Lysandrou M, Thompson GD, Jany W, Ritchie SA (2010) A review of spinosad as a natural product for larval mosquito control. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc* 26:67–87
- Hoffmann B, Scheuch M, Höper D, Jungblut R, Holsteg M, Schirrneier H, Eschbaumer M, Goller KV, Wernike K, Fischer M, Breithaupt A, Mettenleiter TC, Beer M (2012) Novel orthobunyavirus in Cattle, Europe, 2011. *Emerg Infect Dis* 18:469–72
- Hogsette J (1993) The sticky card: Device for studying the distribution of adult house fly (Diptera: Muscidae) populations in closed poultry houses. *J Econ Entomol* 86:450–454
- Ivana S, Campeanu G, Bogdan A, Danes M, Ipate J, Popescu A, Baraitareanu S, Sandu M, Costache D (2009) Serological and entomological monitoring of bluetongue in Romania. *Sci Work Univ Sci Vet Med Bucharest* 55:294–298
- Kaaya GP, Munyinyi DM (1995) Biocontrol potential of the entomogenous fungi *Beauveria bassiana* and *Metarhizium anisopliae* for tsetse flies (*Glossina* spp.) at developmental sites. *J Invertebr Pathol* 66:237–41
- Lacková Z, Bireš J, Kočišová A, Tinák M, Mandelík R (2009) Výsledky monitoringu choroby modrého jazyka v chove prežúvavcov. *Slov Veterinársky Časopis* 34:376–378
- Leclercq M (1971) Les mouches nuisibles aux animaux domestiques. Un problème mondial. Presses agronomiques de Gembloux, Louvain
- Lysyk T (1993) Adult resting and larval developmental sites of stable flies and house flies (Diptera: Muscidae) on dairies in Alberta. *J Econ Entomol* 86:1746–1753
- Maia M, Clausen P-H, Mehlitz D, Garms R, Bauer B (2010) Protection of confined cattle against biting and nuisance flies (Muscidae: Diptera) with insecticide-treated nets in the Ghanaian forest zone at Kumasi. *Parasitol Res* 106:1307–13
- Mattioli RC, Pandey VS, Murray M, Fitzpatrick JL (2000) Immunogenetic influences on tick resistance in African cattle with particular reference to trypanotolerant N'Dama (*Bos taurus*) and trypanosusceptible Gobra zebu (*Bos indicus*) cattle. *Acta Trop* 75: 263–277
- McGraw EA, O'Neill SL (2013) Beyond insecticides: New thinking on an ancient problem. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 11:181–93
- Mehlhorn H, Schmahl G, D'Haese J, Schumacher B (2008a) Butox 7.5 pour on: a deltamethrin treatment of sheep and cattle: pilot study of killing effects on *Culicoides* species (Ceratopogonidae). *Parasitol Res* 102:515–518
- Mehlhorn H, Schmahl G, Schumacher B, D'Haese J, Walldorf V, Klimpel S (2008b) Effects of Bayofly on specimens of *Culicoides* species when incubated in hair taken from the feet of previously treated cattle and sheep. *Parasitol Res* 102:519–522
- Miller JA, Beadles ML, Palmer JS, Pickens MO (1977) Methoprene for control of the horn fly: a sustained-release bolus formulation for cattle. *J Econ Entomol* 70:589–591
- Mosqueira B, Chabi J, Chandre F, Akogbeto M, Hougard J-M, Carnevale P, Mas-Coma S (2010a) Efficacy of an insecticide paint against malaria vectors and nuisance in West Africa—part 2: field evaluation. *Malar J* 9:341
- Mosqueira B, Duchon S, Chandre F, Hougard J-M, Carnevale P, Mas-Coma S (2010b) Efficacy of an insecticide paint against insecticide-susceptible and resistant mosquitoes—Part 1: laboratory evaluation. *Malar J* 9:340
- Mullens B, Gerry A, Monteys V (2010) Field studies on *Culicoides* (Diptera: Ceratopogonidae) activity and response to deltamethrin applications to sheep in Northeastern Spain. *J Med Entomol* 47: 106–110
- Ndeledje N, Bouyer J, Stachurski F, Grimaud P, Belem AMG, Molélé Mbaïndingatoloum F, Bengaly Z, Oumar Alfaroukh I, Cecchi G, Lancelot R (2013) Treating cattle to protect people? Impact of footbath insecticide treatment on tsetse density in Chad. *PLoS One* 8:e67580
- Ninio C, Augot D, Dufour B, Depaquit J (2011) Emergence of *Culicoides* obsoletus from indoor and outdoor breeding sites. *Vet Parasitol* 183: 125–129

- OJEC. 2009. DIRECTIVE 2009/128/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides (Text with EEA relevance)
- OJEC. 2012. REGULATION (EU) No 528/2012 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 22 May 2012 concerning the making available on the market and use of biocidal products
- Pickens L (1991) Battery-powered, electrocuting trap for stable flies (Diptera: Muscidae). *J Med Entomol* 28:822–830
- Pooda SH, Mouline K, de Meeûs T, Bengaly Z, Solano P (2013) Decrease in survival and fecundity of *Glossina palpalis gambiensis vanderplank 1949* (Diptera: Glossinidae) fed on cattle treated with single doses of ivermectin. *Parasitol Vectors* 6:165
- Purse BV, Mellor PS, Rogers DJ, Samuel AR, Mertens PPC, Baylis M (2005) Climate change and the recent emergence of bluetongue in Europe. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 3:171–181
- Ramilo D, Diaz S, Pereira da Fonseca I, Delécolle J, Wilson A (2012) First report of 13 species of *Culicoides* (Diptera: Ceratopogonidae) in mainland Portugal and Azores by morphological and molecular characterization. *PLoS One* 7:e34896
- Rouet S (2011) Dynamique des populations de *Stomoxys calcitrans* dans un site urbain, l'École Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse. Université de Toulouse, France
- Samish M (2006) Biocontrol of Ticks. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 916:172–178
- Savini G, MacLachlan NJ, Sanchez-Vizcaino J-M, Zientara S (2008) Vaccines against bluetongue in Europe. *Comp Immunol Microbiol Infect Dis* 31:101–120
- Schmahl G, Walldorf V, Klimpel S (2008) Efficacy of Oxyfly™ on *Culicoides* species—the vectors of bluetongue virus—and other insects. *Parasitol Res* 103:1101–1105
- Schmahl G, Klimpel S, Walldorf V, Al-Quraishy S, Schumacher B, Jatzlau A, Mehlhorn H (2009) Pilot study on deltamethrin treatment (Butox 7.5, Versatrine) of cattle and sheep against midges (*Culicoides* species, Ceratopogonidae). *Parasitol Res* 104:809–813
- Serfling R (1952) Entomological survey methods. *Public Health Rep* 67: 1020–1025
- Skovgård H, Nachman G (2004) Biological control of house flies *Musca domestica* and stable flies *Stomoxys calcitrans* (Diptera: Muscidae) by means of inundative releases of *Spalangia cameroni* (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae). *Bull Entomol Res* 94:555–567
- Talley J, Broce A, Zurek L (2009) Characterization of stable fly (Diptera: Muscidae) larval developmental habitat at round hay bale feeding sites. *J Med Entomol* 46:1310–1309
- Taylor D, Berkebile D (2006) Comparative efficiency of six stable fly traps. *J Econ Entomol* 99:1415–1419
- Taylor D, Moon R, Mark D (2012a) Economic impact of stable flies (Diptera: Muscidae) on dairy and beef cattle production. *J Med Entomol* 49:198–209
- Taylor DB, Friesen K, Zhu JJ, Sievert K (2012b) Efficacy of cyromazine to control immature stable flies (Diptera: Muscidae) developing in winter hay feeding sites. *J Econ Entomol* 105:726–731
- Vale GA, Grant IF (2002) Modelled impact of insecticide-contaminated dung on the abundance and distribution of dung fauna. *Bull Entomol Res* 92:251–263
- Vale GA, Grant IF, Dewhurst CF, Aigreau D (2007) Biological and chemical assays of pyrethroids in cattle dung. *Bull Entomol Res* 94:273–282
- Vargas-Terán M, Hursey BS, Cunningham EP (1994) Eradication of the screwworm from Libya using the sterile insect technique. *Parasitol Today* 10:119–122
- Venail R, Mathieu B, Setier-Rio M (2011) Laboratory and field-based tests of deltamethrin insecticides against adult *Culicoides* biting midges. *J Med Entomol* 48:351–357
- Viennet E, Garros C, Lancelot R, Allène X, Gardès L, Rakotoarivony I, Crochet D, Delécolle J-C, Moulia C, Baldet T, Balenghien T (2011) Assessment of vector/host contact: comparison of animal-baited traps and UV-light/suction trap for collecting *Culicoides* biting midges (Diptera: Ceratopogonidae), vectors of Orbiviruses. *Parasitol Vectors* 4:119
- Viennet E, Garros C, Rakotoarivony I, Allène X, Gardès L, Lhoir J, Fuentes I, Venail R, Crochet D, Lancelot R, Riou M, Moulia C, Baldet T, Balenghien T (2012) Host-seeking activity of bluetongue virus vectors: endo/exophagy and circadian rhythm of *Culicoides* in Western Europe. *PLoS One* 7:e48120
- Vitela M, Cruz-Vasquez D, Solano J, Orihuela A (2007) A note on the associations between the prevalence of stable flies (*Stomoxys calcitrans*) and the behaviour of dairy cows under semiarid conditions. *J Anim Vet Adv* 6:1284–1290
- Vreysen MJB, Seck MT, Sall B, Bouyer J (2013) Tsetse flies: their biology and control using area-wide integrated pest management approaches. *J Invertebr Pathol* 112:S15–S25. doi:10.1016/j.jip.2012.07.026
- Vreysen MJB, Saleh K, Mramba F, Parker A, Feldmann U, Dyck VA, Msangi A, Bouyer J (2014) Sterile insects to enhance agricultural development: the case of sustainable tsetse eradication on Unguja Island, Zanzibar, using an area-wide integrated pest management approach. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 8:e2857
- Wilson A, Mellor P (2008) Bluetongue in Europe: Vectors, epidemiology and climate change. *Parasitol Res* 103:S69–S77
- Wyss JH (2000) Screw worm eradication in the Americas. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 916:186–193