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ABSTRACT<br>Role of P-glycoprotein in Haemonchus contortus<br>Anthelmintic Resistance. (August 2007)<br>Pamela Donn Garretson, B.S., Colorado State University<br>Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Patricia Holman

The gastrointestinal parasite, Haemonchus contortus, is of major concern in the sheep and goat industry as well as in zoological settings. Over the years this parasite has developed resistance to the three classes of anthelmintics, benzimidazoles, imidazothiazoles and macrocyclic lactones, that are currently used for treatment. One of the mechanisms proposed to be involved in this resistance is the efflux transporter P-glycoprotein (Pgp). In this study, the resistance status of several strains of H. contortus was evaluated using the larval development assay DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$. After documenting the resistance status of these strains, transcription of Pgp in $L_{3}$ larvae after exposure to anthelmintics was quantitated using polymerase chain reaction (PCR). Of the strains analyzed, only one was determined to be susceptible to all of the anthelmintics tested, while the others showed variable levels of resistance to one or more. A Haemonchus strain acquired from a giraffe at a zoo in Florida was the most resistant, showing extremely high levels of resistance to benzimidazoles and levamisole. Molecular characterization of the 18 S rRNA gene and the internal transcriber spacer region (ITS) were performed on the giraffe strain to identify the species. Although there were variations in the isolate sequences, the most likely species for the giraffe strain was H. contortus. No transcription of Pgp was identified in H. contortus $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larvae under the
conditions of this study. Thus, increased Pgp does not appear to be a primary mechanism of drug resistance in this stage of the worm.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

For the sheep and goat industry, the parasitic nematode Haemonchus contortus is of great concern. Commonly known as the barber's pole worm, H. contortus can inflict a considerable amount of damage to a flock or herd in a short span of time.

Haemonchosis, the disease associated with H. contortus infections, may be chronic, resulting in minor clinical signs, acute or hyperacute, resulting in death. Treatment and control of this gastrointestinal parasite have been successful through the use of anthelmintics, such as benzimidazoles, levamisole, and ivermectin. However, resistance to these anti-parasitic drugs has developed worldwide and is becoming an area of increasing concern. This has led to an influx of research to determine the mechanisms employed by $H$. contortus that enables them to be highly efficient in drug resistance. By understanding the mechanisms involved, better methods of treatment as well as prevention may be developed.

Haemonchus contortus was first described in 1803 by Rudolphi. The classification is as follows: Class Nematoda, Order Strongylida, and Family Trichostrongylidae. Originally, the parasite was called Strongylus contortus and over the years has been referred to as Strongylus falicollis (Molin, 1861), Filaria dendiculata (Simmonds, 1881) and Strongylus placei (Place, 1893) (as cited in Morgan, 1949). It wasn't until the 1900s that $H$. contortus became the preferred nomenclature (Morgan, 1949). There have been several common names associated with $H$. contortus.
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These include barber's pole worm, twisted stomach worm, and wire worm (Soulsby, 1982; Kassai, 1999; Anderson, 2000).

The adult female $H$. contortus ranges in size from $2.0-3.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ in length and the males from 1.5-2.5 cm (Dunn, 1978). Haemonchus contortus are blood sucking parasites that possess a slender dorsal lancet within the buccal cavity for accessing the host blood supply (Soulsby, 1982). The appearance of the female, in which the red, blood filled intestine intertwines with the white reproductive organs, gave rise to the common name barber's pole worm (Morgan, 1949). The males are red in color and possess a characteristic three-lobed copulatory bursa consisting of two symmetrical lateral lobes and one asymmetrical dorsal lobe (Morgan, 1949; Soulsby, 1982). The adults are found in the abomasum, the fourth digestive compartment of the ruminant stomach, where they feed and sexually reproduce.

Haemonchus contortus is distributed throughout the world in tropical and subtropical regions. Approximately 60 different species of ruminants, both domestic and wild, have been identified as hosts for this gastrointestinal worm (Dunn, 1978). Sheep and goats tend to be the preferred host, however, H. contortus has been found in cattle, white-tailed deer, bison, antelope, giraffes, and camels to name a few (Hoberg et al., 2004). According to McGhee et al. (1981), cross-transmission is possible between wild and domestic hosts, as was seen in their studies on white-tailed deer and domestic cattle and sheep. Although H. contortus has a wide host range, domestic sheep appear to be the most drastically affected, which may be due, in part, to their grazing behaviors. Most sheep exhibit strong flocking habits where they remain in close proximity to each
other while grazing. This concentrates the area of parasite contamination increasing the chance for infection (Dunn, 1978).

Haemonchus contortus has a direct life cycle in the natural hosts. The females are prolific egg layers and can deposit 5,000 to 10,000 eggs per day, which are released into the environment via the host's feces (Morgan, 1949). Once the eggs are released into the environment, larval development occurs and the $\mathrm{L}_{1}$ stage larvae hatch within 24 hours. The $L_{1}$ larvae molt into the $\mathrm{L}_{2}$ stage larvae soon after and within 3-5 days, molt into the $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ stage larvae (Veglia, 1916). The resilient $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larvae is the infective stage and proceeds to migrate up damp vegetation during early morning and late evening hours in order to increase the chance of ingestion by the ruminant host (Morgan, 1949). This larval migration is highly dependent upon the combination of ideal temperature, humidity and light (Anderson, 2000). Once inside the rumen of the host, the $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larvae exsheath, migrate to the abomasum and molt into the $\mathrm{L}_{4}$ larval stage, followed by the $\mathrm{L}_{5}$. The $\mathrm{L}_{5}$ are the immature adults, which develop into mature adults within the abomasum approximately 15 days post infection (Morgan, 1949; Urquhart et al., 1987). Females will begin to produce eggs within 25-35 days post infection (Morgan, 1949).

Warm, rainy weather is essential for the survival and development of the freeliving larval stages of H. contortus (Kassai, 1999). Larval development is hindered by extremely dry or cold conditions (Kassai, 1999; Anderson, 2000). However, in temperate climates $H$. contortus overcome these adverse conditions through a process called hypobiosis, where the $L_{4}$ stage larvae enter into a state of dormancy within the host. Michel (1974) defines hypobiosis as "the temporary cessation of development of
nematodes at a precise point in early parasitic development, where such an interruption contains a facultative element, occurring only in certain hosts, certain circumstances, or at certain times of the year and often affecting only a portion of the worms."

There are at least two types of arrested development that occur in nematodes. The first is termed immune mediated arrest and is considered to be non-specific and of immunological origin. It may arise at any time of the year and be triggered by either host-related or parasite-related factors. The second is termed seasonally induced arrest and occurs at the same time each year. This type of hypobiosis is similar to diapause in insects and is most often triggered by an external environmental stimulus (Horak, 1981; Gibbs, 1986a). The latter appears to be the predominant form of hypobiosis in H. contortus (Blitz and Gibbs, 1971; Gibbs, 1986b).

There are three categories of factors that have been suggested as triggers for hypobiosis. These triggers may act independently or in combination with each other to induce an arrested development of the nematode larvae. The first category consists of host-related factors including host resistance, acquired immunity, and age (Blitz and Gibbs, 1972a; Connan, 1975; Horak, 1981; Gibbs, 1982). The second category is parasite-related factors, which include population density and genetic predisposition (Horak, 1981; Gibbs, 1986a). The final category consists of environmental factors including temperature, humidity, and photoperiod length. Since hypobiosis in H. contortus appears to be more seasonal than immunological, environmental factors are most likely to be the triggers involved (Blitz and Gibbs, 1972a; Michel, 1974; Horak, 1981; Soulsby, 1982; Gibbs, 1986a, 1986b).

The external triggers for hypobiosis probably act upon the $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larval stage in the environment prior to ingestion by the host. These include a decrease in photoperiod from 14.25 to 12.5 hours and an average temperature of $17^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in temperate climates (Blitz and Gibbs, 1972a; Gibbs, 1982). In tropical and arid climates, H. contortus may also utilize hypobiosis to withstand hot dry conditions (Gibbs, 1982). However, parasite genetics may also play a significant role in triggering an arrest in development.

Hypobiosis in H. contortus, as well as other nematodes, closely resembles the arrested development phenomenon known as diapause in insects. Diapause is an inhibition of development triggered by environmental factors and considered to be genetically controlled. This arrest in development is temporarily irreversible and may continue until either a specific stimulus presents itself or a predetermined period of time has elapsed (Horak, 1981; Sommerville and Davey, 2002).

Once conditions become suitable for parasite survival, the $L_{4}$ larvae come out of arrest and continue to develop into the mature adult. By undergoing hypobiosis, H. contortus reaches the reproductive stage at a time when it is most beneficial to the parasite and the eggs are released into the environment during conditions that are more favorable for the free-living larval stages (Soulsby, 1982; Urquhart et al., 1987).

There are several factors that may trigger the hypobiotic larvae to emerge from their dormant state and continue development. These include photoperiod, temperature, humidity, and host immune system relaxation due to periparturition and/or lactation. However, the larval development may also recommence spontaneously after a predetermined length of time without the influence of a stimulus (Blitz and Gibb, 1972b;

Horak, 1981; Gibbs, 1982, 1986a). This aspect further demonstrates the similarity between hypobiosis in H. contortus and diapause in insects (Horak, 1981).

The resumed development of the arrested larvae often results in the events known as "spring rise" and "periparturient rise." Both are characterized by a sudden marked increase in nematode egg counts as a result of the arrested larvae reaching the reproductive adult stage en masse (Brunsdon, 1964; Procter and Gibbs, 1968). Spring rise, as its name suggests, occurs during the spring and although it is commonly associated with parturition, it is also seen in non-reproducing hosts (Crofton, 1958; Brunsdon, 1964). On the other hand, periparturient rise per se coincides with parturition, and is most evident during the spring lambing/kidding season but may also occur at other times of the year.

The combination of the short life cycle and the survivability of the larvae has enabled $H$. contortus to be a highly infective parasite able to cause a considerable amount of damage to an entire host population. Characteristic clinical signs of a H. contortus infection are anemia, edema, bottle jaw (intermandibular edema), lethargy, emaciation, weakness, wool loss, and even death (Dunn, 1978). Anemia is the most common clinical sign resulting from the adult worms feeding on host blood. An adult can consume as much as 0.5 cc of blood in one day (Urquhart et al., 1987). In addition to this, $H$. contortus adults are mobile feeders and move from one feeding site to another, leaving behind wounds that continue to hemorrhage, contributing to the anemia (Soulsby, 1982). The amount of blood that is lost with a high worm burden may result in the death of the host.

The disease associated with $H$. contortus infections is known as haemonchosis, which may be categorized into three forms based on the worm burden and the associated clinical signs. The first, hyperacute haemonchosis, is rare, but also the most severe and tends to affect young and/or unhealthy individuals (Barriga, 1997). In this form of the disease, the worm burden is extremely high (> 10,000 worms) and the only sign of infection is the sudden death of the animal. Death often occurs within a week and is brought on by a severe anemia due to the large number of worms consuming the host blood (Dunn, 1978).

In the acute form of haemonchosis, the worm burden is moderate, $1,000-10,000$ individuals, and all ages of animals are affected, regardless of current health status. The signs of infection are visible and include anemia, edema, lethargy, and wool loss. Anemia develops rapidly and the host mounts an erythropoietic response resulting in the production of red blood cells (Soulsby, 1982). Ewes often suffer from agalactia in which their ability to produce milk is lost and suckling lambs will often die due to malnutrition. Death may occur with acute haemonchosis, but may take several weeks to transpire (Dunn, 1978).

The third and final form of the disease is chronic haemonchosis. This is the most widespread of the three disease forms and often affects the entire flock or herd. Chronic haemonchosis is a result of a low worm burden, 100-1,000 individuals, and the most prominent clinical sign is the appearance of malnutrition (Soulsby, 1982). Anemia and edema are not usually present, and death is rare (Dunn, 1978). This type of haemonchosis is most often seen during dry periods when the pasture is in poor
condition and the host immune system is already being compromised by poor nutrition (Urquhart et al., 1987).

Early diagnosis of haemonchosis is essential for the treatment and survival of a flock or herd afflicted by this invasive parasite. Generally, a diagnosis for the acute and chronic forms of this disease is based on clinical signs as well as history. Fecal testing can also be performed to support the diagnosis. For hyperacute haemonchosis, the only way a diagnosis may be made is by performing a necropsy and looking for H. contortus adults in the abomasum of the deceased animal (Urquhart et al., 1987).

Many sheep do not develop an effective acquired immunity to $H$. contortus infections. However, some breeds, such as the Florida Native, St. Croix and Barbados Blackbelly, are less susceptible than others, such as the Rambouillet (Courtney et al., 1985). Amarante et al. (1999a, 1999b) crossed Florida Native sheep, which are small and resistant to $H$. contortus infection, and Rambouillet sheep, which are larger, faster growing, good wool producers and susceptible to $H$. contortus infections, to investigate if the offspring would possess the more desirable characteristics and show resistance to H. contortus infections. Upon challenge with the parasite, the $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ generation did show a level of resistance. When the $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ generation was crossed with each other, the resulting $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ generation showed an even higher level of resistance (Amarante et al., 1999a, 1999b), which shows that crossing resistant breeds with susceptible ones could be valuable in developing a line of sheep with desirable production characteristics that is resistant to H. contortus infections.

Conflicting evidence questions the role of hemoglobin type in H. contortus resistance within certain breeds. In one study, Scottish Blackface and Finn Dorset sheep with type A hemoglobin possessed lower worm burdens and fecal egg counts and presented with less severe clinical signs than those with type B hemoglobin (Altaif and Dargie, 1978a, 1978b). However, many of the breeds that are considered to be highly resistant to $H$. contortus are predominantly type B while others, such as the Florida Native, are predominantly type A (Jilek and Bradley, 1969; Agar et al., 1972). Thus, the role of hemoglobin type is not clear in resistance of sheep to $H$. contortus infections.

To cope with gastrointestinal parasitic infections, sheep may undergo a phenomenon known as "self-cure" in order to alleviate the burden of $H$. contortus adults. Self-cure is a process in which the majority of adult parasites are expelled from the host when induced experimentally by a challenge dose of infective larvae or by the natural ingestion of a large number of infective larvae (Soulsby, 1982). As the larvae develop from the $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ stage to the $\mathrm{L}_{4}$ stage, an immediate-type hypersensitivity reaction develops to $H$. contortus antigens, leading to the expulsion of the adult worms. The host as well as the parasite each benefit from the self-cure process. The host is temporarily relieved of feeding adults and the damage that they cause, while the adult parasite population is replenished with a new generation (Urquhart et al., 1987).

Treatment of haemonchosis is accomplished by targeting the parasite itself. Today, this is accomplished through the use of anthelmintics, but over the past 200 years, several methods have been tried. Some of the earliest forms of treatment included arsenic and turpentine. These were highly toxic to the host, so new forms of treatment
were constantly being tested. One of the earliest and most significantly efficient forms of treatment was an oral dose of copper sulphate, which was widely used from the late 1800s to around 1940 (Gibson, 1975). When administered correctly, copper sulphate had very few toxic effects on the host and was effective against the adult worms but not the immature larval stages (Morgan, 1949). However, copper must be administered with caution since sheep are sensitive to chronic copper toxicity. Current evidence has shown that small doses (0.5-2 grams) of copper oxide wire particles given annually may be effective in controlling $H$. contortus infections in lambs without being toxic (Miller et al., 2005; Burke and Miller, 2006; Fleming et al., 2006).

In 1940, phenothiazine was introduced and replaced copper sulphate as the drug of choice. This drug proved to be highly effective for not only eliminating infections, but also for controlling outbreaks. Administration of phenothiazine was often through the use of a salt lick with the ideal concentration of a 1:10 phenothiazine to salt concentration. This proved to be a highly efficient dosing method with minimal toxic side effects (Gibson, 1975).

However, by the 1960s H. contortus began to show signs of resistance to phenothiazine, leading to the development of new anthelmintics. In 1961, the first to be introduced was a benzimidazole called Thiabendazole (Gibson, 1975). Although highly effective against both the adult and immature stages, $H$. contortus began to show signs of resistance to this anthelmintic after being in use for just a few years (Drudge et al., 1964; Soulsby, 1982). Several other anthelmintics followed, including additional
benzimidazoles, imidazothiazoles (levamisole), and macrocyclic lactones (ivermectin). These three classes of drugs are currently used to treat $H$. contortus infections.

Each class of anthelmintics possesses a distinct mode of action against parasites (Kohler, 2001). The target of benzimidazoles is the tubulin within the parasite intestinal cells, which forms into microtubules that are necessary for nutrient acquisition (Sangster and Dobson, 2002). Benzimidazoles bind to the $\beta$-tubulin component preventing it from forming microtubules within the intestinal cells of the helminth. This impairs the uptake of nutrients and inhibits the transportation of necessary digestive enzymes resulting in parasite death due to starvation (Kohler, 2001; Mansour, 2002). Imidazothiazoles, such as levamisole, are acetylcholine agonists that affect the nervous system of the parasite (Kohler, 2001). These drugs cause muscle contraction and paralysis in the helminth, resulting in the eventual expulsion of the parasite from the body (Craig, 1993; Mansour, 2002). Finally, macrocyclic lactones act on glutamate-gated chloride channels (GluCl). These drugs cause paralysis of the parasite neuromusculature, including the pharynx, preventing the worm from feeding (Kohler, 2001; Winterrowd et al., 2003). Benzimidazoles and macrocyclic lactones are effective against the adult and immature stages of the parasite, while the imidazothiazoles are effective against the adults and the later stages of immature larvae. These three classes of anthelmintics have proven to be successful in treating $H$. contortus infections.

Resistance to anthelmintics continues to be a growing concern in the treatment and control of $H$. contortus throughout the world. Anthelmintic resistance is defined as a genetically transmittable trait in which the sensitivity to a particular drug is lost in a
population of worms over time (Kohler, 2001). Through the use of anthelmintics, susceptible populations are being removed from the gene pool allowing the resistant populations to pass on their genes to successive generations. By 1994, resistance to the majority of the anthelmintics including the benzimidazoles, levamisole, and ivermectin was reported (Barriga, 1997). In addition, H. contortus populations are showing resistance to multiple anthelmintics (Sangster et al., 1999). Extensive use of drug treatments, whether proper or improper, and the ability of $H$. contortus to adapt to and overcome the deleterious effects of the drugs, have led to the development of drug resistance and, therefore, to the success of the parasite.

The key to controlling anthelmintic resistance in H. contortus is to understand the many mechanisms that may be involved, since each class of anthelmintics has a known different target. There are three main groups of mechanisms: those that change the binding sites of drugs, those that detoxify, and those that involve the active efflux of drugs by membrane transporters (Kerboeuf et al., 2003). The mechanism involved in resistance to each class of anthelmintic may be different or there may be a common one amongst all three classes.

In 1995 , Kwa et al. suggested that a mutation in the $\beta$-tubulin is most likely the cause of resistance to the class of benzimidazoles. This mutation results in a single amino acid substitution from Phe200 to Tyr200 in the $\beta$-tubulin isotype 1 allele of resistant $H$. contortus strains. This mutation causes a decrease in the high affinity binding of the anthelmintic allowing for microtubule formation to occur in the presence
of the drug (Prichard, 1994). Without the inhibitory action of the anthelmintic, the parasite is capable of acquiring nutrients that are essential to its survival.

Resistance to levamisole in $H$. contortus is believed to be associated with an alteration in the nicotinic acetylcholine receptor found on the body muscles of nematodes. Responsible for the conduction of sodium, potassium and calcium through the muscle membranes, this receptor consists of five subunits $(2 \alpha, 1 \beta, 1 \gamma$ and $1 \delta)$ arranged around a central ion-channel (Martin et al., 1997). Under normal conditions, the channel is closed, but in the presence of a ligand, such as levamisole, the channel may be opened. This opening of the channel allows ions to pass through, aiding in the muscle contraction and paralysis of the helminth (Martin and Robertson, 2000). Alterations in the acetylcholine receptor may lead to fewer receptors for levamisole to bind to or to a reduction in the receptor's sensitivity, which could prevent the channel from opening (Prichard, 1994). These alterations may also result in the shut down of the channel or in a blockage of the channel by the large levamisole molecule, interfering with the effectiveness of levamisole as an anthelmintic (Martin and Robertson, 2000).

The mechanisms involved with macrocyclic lactone resistance are not fully understood (Kohler, 2001). Blackhall et al. (1998a) correlated the selection of an altered GluCl gene with resistance to ivermectin. Glutamate-gated chloride channels are believed to be similar in structure to acetylcholine receptors in that they consist of five subunits ( $\alpha$ and $\beta$ ) that come together to form a central ion-channel (Martin et al., 1997, 1998). The $\alpha$-subunits contain the glutamate binding site and the $\beta$-subunits contain the ivermectin binding sites (Martin et al., 1997). The selection of a single allele of the
$\alpha$-subunit was found in increased frequency in resistant strains of $H$. contortus (Blackhall et al., 1998a). The mutation that results from this allelic selection may interfere with the conformational changes induced by the drug binding and may not actually inhibit the binding itself (Kerboeuf et al., 2003). The $\gamma$-aminobutyric acid (GABA) receptor gene has also been suggested as a mechanism for macrocyclic lactone resistance. Its function is similar to GluCl and so an alteration in its gene may also contribute to resistance (Blackhall et al., 2003).

The mechanism that is primarily considered to be involved in resistance to macrocyclic lactones is the detoxification process of P-glycoproteins. P-glycoproteins (Pgp) are efflux transporters that belong to the ATP binding cassette (ABC) superfamily which actively transport compounds, including drugs, across membranes (Sangster and Dobson, 2002). The hydrolysis of ATP is required for the efflux of xenobiotics (chemicals foreign to the organism) by Pgp to occur (Sharom, 1997). P-glycoproteins are predominately confined to the digestive tract and are highly expressed on the membranes of intestinal and pharyngeal cells (Smith and Prichard, 2002). The primary function of Pgp is to protect the organism by actively pumping toxic substances out of its cells (Sangster, 1994; Geick et al., 2001; Thompson and Geary, 2002).

P-glycoproteins are highly conserved transmembrane proteins (Sangster and Dobson, 2002). They are made up of two homologous halves, each with six transmembrane domains (TM) and one nucleotide binding domain (NBD) (Sangster, 1994; Sharom, 1997; Ambudker et al., 1999). The highly conserved NBDs are separated by an internucleotide binding domain (IBD) which allows both halves to interact and
work together as a single transporter (Ambudker et al., 1999; Sangster et al., 1999). Anthelmintic binding occurs within the TM while ATP binding and hydrolysis occur in the NBD (Sangster, 1994; Sharom, 1997; Ambudker et al., 1999; Sangster et al., 1999). The normal function of Pgp in nematodes is not fully understood, but due to its capability to bind a wide range of substrates including anthelmintics, the function of Pgp may be to protect the organism from toxic substances (Sharom, 1997; Ambudker et al., 1999).

P-glycoproteins have been identified in $H$. contortus and the full cDNA sequence has been obtained ( Xu et al., 1998). At least 7 genes are known to be involved in encoding Pgp in H. contortus, allowing for numerous isoforms (Kerboeuf et al., 2003). In addition to the full cDNA sequence, numerous internucleotide binding domains (IBD) within Pgp have also been sequenced (Sangster, 1994; Sangster et al., 1999). Each IBD is sequentially different, and one IBD in particular, correlates with resistance to the macrocyclic lactone avermectin/milbemycin (Sangster et al., 1999). The combinations of the different genes and their variable IBDs allow for considerable variation in the Pgp of $H$. contortus. This may contribute to the binding of a wide variety of substrates and possibly to the development of anthelmintic resistance (Xu et al., 1998; Sangster et al., 1999).

In vertebrates, Pgp is encoded for by the multidrug resistance gene, MDR1. This gene is activated by a family of nuclear receptors that includes the human SXR (steroid and xenobiotic receptor) and its animal homolog PXR (pregnane X receptor) (Xie et al., 2000; Geick et al., 2001; Synold et al., 2001). These nuclear receptors are found in the
intestine and enhance the removal of xenobiotics by Pgp. This is accomplished through the regulation of the transcription of the cytochrome $\mathrm{P} 450(\mathrm{CYP})$ gene product CYP3A, which is involved in the oxidative metabolism of a variety of steroid hormones and xenobiotics (Xie et al., 2000; Synold et al., 2001, Ding and Staudinger, 2005). The receptors, SXR/PXR, must form a heterodimer with RXR (retinoic acid receptor) which enables the molecule to bind to specific DNA sequences, including those of CYP3A (Kliewer et al., 1998; Masuyama et al., 2001). The activation of SXR/PXR by a variety of agents may contribute to pharmaceutical resistance as well as regulate multidrug resistance (Synold et al., 2001).

Currently, a SXR/PXR homolog has not been identified in nematodes. The complete genome of Caenorhabditis elegans, a free-living nematode, has been sequenced and the RXR, or a homolog, is not present or has not yet been determined (Enmark and Gustafsson, 2000; verified by a protein-protein BLAST). However, numerous CYP genes have been identified in nematodes. Gotoh (1998) determined that C. elegans possesses at least 60 potentially active CYP genes. These genes are closely related to the CYP genes in vertebrates and may function in the catabolism of xenobiotics.

The activity of CYP in $H$. contortus may depend on the environment in which the parasite lives. Cytochrome P 450 has the ability to catalyze substrates as a monooxygenase, which requires molecular oxygen, or as a peroxygenase, which does not. In 1997, Kotze found that the monooxygenase catalysis of certain substrates by CYP was readily detectable in the free-living stages of $H$. contortus, but considerably
lower or absent in the adult stages and attributed this to the level of oxygen present. In oxygen-poor environments, CYP may function as a peroxygenase, thereby utilizing hydroperoxide to catalyze substrate oxidations without requiring molecular oxygen (Kotze, 1999). The role of CYP in metabolizing xenobiotics in H. contortus is not yet fully understood, but may play a role in anthelmintic resistance.

Since H. contortus has developed resistance to each of the classes of anthelmintics, a common mechanism may be involved. The mechanism believed to be associated with anthelmintic resistance in H. contortus is the overexpression of Pgp. Benzimidazoles, levamisole and ivermectin possess characteristics that are common to Pgp substrates. These include a planar shape, at least one ring structure, hydrophobic properties and they are amphiphilic (a molecule possessing a polar, water-soluble group attached to a non-polar, water-insoluble hydrocarbon chain) (Ford and Hait, 1990; Ambudkar et al., 1999).

Both benzimidazole-resistant and ivermectin-resistant strains of H. contortus have been found to possess Pgp alleles in higher frequency than susceptible strains. For benzimidazoles, Pgp may modulate drug concentration at the target site (Kerboeuf et al., 2003). In humans, it has been determined that benzimidazoles bind to Pgp in multidrugresistant (MDR) lymphoma cells (Nare et al., 1994). A relationship between Pgp and benzimidazole resistance was indirectly demonstrated through the use of the Pgp inhibitor verapamil (Beugnet et al., 1997). Verapamil is a calcium channel blocker, which actively inhibits the Pgp drug-binding domain. When given in conjunction with an anthelmintic, the efflux of the drug is reduced, resulting in its increased efficacy
(Molento and Prichard, 1999). The experiments conducted by Beugnet et al. (1997) showed that, in the presence of verapamil, the toxicity of the drug increased and that benzimidazole resistance could be partially reversed.

The role of Pgp in macrocyclic lactone resistance, especially ivermectin, is better understood. Ivermectin has been described as a possible substrate for Pgp in nematodes (Xu et al., 1998; Blackhall et al., 1998b). In 1998, Xu et al. found higher levels of Pgp in ivermectin-resistant $H$. contortus populations than in susceptible populations. They also found alterations in the structure and/or transcription of Pgp that resulted in its overexpression, which may modulate drug concentration at the target site. When verapamil was given to ivermectin-resistant strains of $H$. contortus, the efficacy of ivermectin was increased, similar to that seen in the benzimidazole resistant strains ( Xu et al., 1998). The role of Pgp in resistance to levamisole is not known, however, levamisole may act as a substrate for Pgp much like ivermectin (Kerboeuf et al., 2003) Based on this information, Pgp transport may be an important mechanism in anthelmintic resistance.

Since Pgp appears to play a role in resistance to different drugs, the occurrence of multidrug-resistance (MDR) may be explained by this one mechanism. The overexpression of Pgp has been associated with MDR in tumor cells in humans and has been suggested as the mechanism of resistance in nematodes (Kerboeuf et al., 2002). Through the use of MDR-reversing agents, such as verapamil, reversal of resistance can be accomplished (Molento and Prichard, 1999).

There are several methods available to determine the presence of anthelmintic resistance in a population of $H$. contortus. These methods include in vivo as well as in vitro tests and there are advantages as well as disadvantages associated with each one. In vivo tests are time consuming, expensive and not very reliable. In vitro tests are more technically demanding, but are more accurate and may be used to detect resistance to multiple anthelmintics at one time (Craven et al., 1999).

The most commonly used in vivo method is the fecal egg count reduction test (FECRT) and is considered to be the gold standard. The FECRT utilizes the modified McMaster technique to compare egg counts before and after anthelmintic treatment to give an estimate of anthelmintic efficacy. This is a simple test and may be used to detect resistance to all classes of anthelmintics (Coles et al., 1992; Craven et al., 1999; Fleming et al., 2006). However, the FECRT may give false indications of levamisole resistance due to the development of immature larvae which are not affected by treatment (Grimshaw et al., 1996; Taylor et al., 2002; Coles et al., 2006). The results of the FECRT are subject to interpretation and the parasitic species present can not be directly determined; therefore, the sample must also be cultured in order to identify the species present (Vizard and Wallace, 1987; Coles et al., 2006).

The egg hatch test (EHT), the larval development assay (LDA), and the recently developed molecular testing are the prominent methods used for in vitro testing. The EHT is used for testing resistance to the benzimidazoles. First described by Le Jambre (1976), eggs are hatched in serial dilutions of anthelmintic and the level of resistance is determined. There are several factors which can influence the outcome of this test
including the age of the feces and the development level of the eggs at the start of testing (Taylor et al., 2002; Coles et al., 2006). One advantage to the EHT is that the larvae which hatch can be identified to determine the parasitic species which is resistant. However, similar to the FECRT, the results of the EHT are subject to interpretation (Taylor et al., 2002).

Larval development assays (LDA) are capable of determining the level of resistance to all three classes of anthelmintics simultaneously. One such test is the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ Assay (CSIRO) in which eggs are loaded onto a 96-well microtiter plate containing agar with serial concentrations of each drug. Resistance is determined by analyzing the level of larval development after a period of incubation (Tandon and Kaplan, 2004). In 2001, Terrill et al. showed that results obtained from the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay were consistent with FECRT, which is considered to be the gold standard. Larvae can be identified directly from the plate in order to determine the resistant species present (Coles et al., 2006).

In recent years, molecular diagnosis of anthelmintic resistance has become a focus of research. Several studies have shown polymerase chain reactions (PCR) to be highly accurate and sensitive in determining resistance. However, this type of testing is very expensive and must be conducted on an adequate sample size to provide significant results, which is not always possible. The development of a molecular test, which is capable of determining the level of resistance in a parasitic population from a pooled DNA sample, will be fundamental to the advancement of molecular testing of anthelmintic resistance (Coles et al., 2006; von Samson-Himmelstjerna, 2006).

Prevention of $H$. contortus infections is difficult. Since there are no vaccines available, the best preventative method is good pasture management. If a flock or herd has been diagnosed with $H$. contortus infections, then in addition to treatment with anthelmintics, the flock or herd should be moved to a non-infested pasture (Urquhart et al., 1987). The infested pasture should not be used until there is no longer evidence of the presence of $H$. contortus, which is impossible. Also, limiting the number of individuals and alternating the species grazing on a pasture may be helpful in controlling infections (Dunn, 1978). It is not recommended that the pasture be treated, since this will only increase the incidence of resistance by eliminating susceptible worms leaving behind only resistant worms to infect hosts and treatment of the pasture is difficult (Barriga, 1997).

Haemonchus contortus is a very problematic parasite. Found worldwide, this parasitic nematode can inflict a significant amount of damage to a population of ruminants in a short period of time. High parasitism levels are possible, due to the proficiency of the females as egg layers, the efficiency of the life cycle, and the high survivability of the larvae. Haemonchosis can often lead to the death of a significant number of individuals within a flock/herd if not properly diagnosed and treated. Many classes of anthelmintics are used as treatments with varying modes of action. Benzimidazoles, imidazothiazoles and macrocyclic lactones are the most commonly used due to their effectiveness. However, resistance to the majority of anthelmintics used today is developing rapidly in H. contortus. Several studies have been conducted
to determine the mechanisms responsible for drug resistance. Hopefully, these studies will aid in the development of new methods for the control of this devastating parasite.

The objectives of this study were to determine the anthelmintic
resistance/susceptibility status of $H$. contortus strains using a larval development assay and to compare the levels of transcription of the transporter protein, P-glycoprotein, in these strains before and after exposure to anthelmintics. Our hypothesis was that P-glycoprotein will be expressed in higher levels upon exposure to anthelmintics and that higher levels will be seen in anthelmintic resistant populations of $H$. contortus compared to susceptible populations.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Parasite strains

A total of seven strains of $H$. contortus were evaluated in this study (Table 1). Four strains suspected to be anthelmintic susceptible were obtained from mixed sheep/goat farms in Texas. These included H. contortus - Eldorado Sheep (Hc-ES), H. contortus - Eldorado Goat (Hc-EG), H. contortus - Ozona Sheep (Hc-OS) and H. contortus - Ozona Goat (Hc-OG). For all of these strains, $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larvae were inoculated into helminth-free sheep and goats and housed in a controlled environment at the Texas A\&M University Research Farm.

Three of the seven strains were suspected to be anthelmintic resistant. Two of these were obtained from animals on the Texas A\&M University Research Farm. The first, Hc-H992, was obtained approximately ten years ago and has been maintained in a controlled environment without exposure to anthelmintics. The second, Hc-RFR, was recently acquired from a mixed population of sheep and goats on the Research Farm, which had been continuously exposed to anthelmintics. For both strains, $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larvae were inoculated into helminth-free sheep and goats and housed in a controlled environment. The third suspected resistant strain (Hc-GRF) was submitted by a zoo in Florida to the Texas A\&M University Diagnostic Parasitology Laboratory for diagnostic evaluation. The sample was from a giraffe housed at the zoo that had previously been diagnosed and treated for $H$. contortus and was currently not responding to anthelmintic treatment. The strain was inoculated into a helminth-free sheep housed at the Research Farm and housed in a controlled environment.

Table 1
Haemonchus contortus strains

| Strain | Host | Geographic Origin | Suspected <br> Anthelmintic <br> Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hc-ES | Sheep | Eldorado, Texas | Susceptible |
| Hc-EG | Goat | Eldorado, Texas | Susceptible |
| Hc-OS | Sheep | Ozona, Texas | Susceptible |
| Hc-OG | Goat | Ozona, Texas | Susceptible |
| Hc-RFR | Sheep/Goat | College Station, Texas | Resistant |
| Hc-H992 | Sheep/Goat | College Station, Texas | Resistant |
| Hc-GRF | Giraffe | Loxahatchee, Florida | Resistant |

### 2.2 Modified McMaster test

For each strain of $H$. contortus, feces were collected directly from the rectum (except for the Hc-GRF strain, which was collected from the ground). A modified McMaster test was conducted on the feces to determine the eggs per gram (EPG) using a McMaster slide. This provided an estimate of the quantity of eggs present in the fecal sample to determine whether sufficient eggs were present for conducting a larval development assay (DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$, Horizon Technology Pty Limited, Roseville, NSW, Australia). A fecal solution was made in a vial by combining 28 ml of saturated sodium chloride (specific gravity 1.2) with 2 grams of feces. The feces were carefully broken apart and the solution was mixed by gentle inversion. Immediately following mixing, a sample of the fecal solution was pulled from the center of the vial and the two chambers
of the McMaster slide were filled with the solution. At 100X magnification, the number of eggs that fell within the grid of each chamber was counted and EPG was calculated as follows:

$$
\frac{\text { Grid } 1+\operatorname{Grid} 2}{2} \times 100=\text { EPG }
$$

The EPG was then multiplied by the weight of the remaining feces to provide an estimate of the number of eggs in the fecal sample.

### 2.3 Copro culture, Baermann technique, and larval identification

Since worm identification cannot be determined based on the trichostrongyle egg, copro cultures of feces were performed to allow for the development of $L_{3}$ larvae, which can be identified to genus. For each strain, approximately 20 grams of feces were placed in the center of a piece of cheesecloth and the sides were tied together using cotton string to form a fecal packet. The bottom of a culture jar was filled with approximately 25-30 ml of tap water and the fecal sample was suspended $5-6 \mathrm{~cm}$ above the surface of the water by tightening the lid on the string (Fig. 1A). The jar was incubated at room temperature for 7 days to allow parasite development to the $L_{3}$ larval stage.

Upon completion of the incubation, the fecal sample was transferred to a Baermann apparatus for larval collection. The gauze containing the feces was placed into a funnel attached to a 15 ml conical tube by rubber tubing and the entire set-up was set in a graduated cylinder which served as a funnel stand (Fig. 1B). Warm tap water
was added to the funnel until the fecal sample was adequately covered. The larvae were allowed to emerge from the feces and collect in the bottom of the conical tube for approximately 2-3 h.


Fig. 1. (A) Drawing of a copro culture set-up. (B) Drawing of a Baermann apparatus.

Larvae were transferred to a glass slide using a transfer pipette, cover-slipped, and immobilized with a dilute solution of Lugol's iodine for identification. The larvae were examined under 400 X and 1000 X magnification and identification was based on morphological characteristics using a $L_{3}$ identification key (from The Manual of Veterinary Parasitological Laboratory Techniques modified by C.G. Wade, Texas A\&M University, Appendix A). The first step was to determine if the esophagus was rhabditiform or non-rhabditiform. For $H$. contortus, the esophagus is non-rhabditiform. Next, it was determined 1) whether there was a sheath present, 2) if the esophagus was $1 / 4$
or $1 / 2$ the length of the body and 3 ) if the tail was notched or tapered. For H. contortus, there is a sheath present, the esophagus is $1 / 4$ the length of the body and the tail is tapered. The length of the tail of the sheath was then determined to be either short ( $<50 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ), medium (>50 $\mu \mathrm{m}<100 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ), or long (> $100 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ). Finally, the anterior of the larvae was examined for the presence of refractive bodies or a bright transverse band between the buccal cavity and the esophagus. The tail of the sheath for $H$. contortus larvae is medium length, and is often kinked, and the larvae do not possess refractive bodies or a bright transverse band at the anterior end. The remaining larvae were dispensed in aliquots of 50 larvae, washed extensively, and stored at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for later use in molecular analysis.

### 2.4 Egg isolation

A modified protocol of the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ User Manual was followed to isolate the eggs from the feces for each of the strains tested. The weight of the feces was determined in grams and combined with 1 ml of tap water per gram of feces in a plastic beaker and allowed to soak for 30 min . The feces were broken up using a wooden tongue depressor and at least 2 ml of tap water per gram of feces was added to make a fecal slurry.

The fecal slurry was first washed with tap water and passed through a $250 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve. The debris retained on the sieve was saved until it was determined that an adequate quantity of eggs had been isolated. The filtrate was collected and allowed to settle for 30 min , and then the top $2 / 3$ was decanted and discarded. The resulting
sediment was similarly washed through a $180 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve followed by a $75 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve with tap water and the filtrate was collected for each wash and allowed to settle for 30 min . The top $2 / 3$ of the filtrate was decanted and discarded as before and the debris on the sieves was saved for each step. Depending on the condition of the feces, additional washings through the $75 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve were conducted to remove as much debris as possible. The final sediment was filtered through a $37 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve and washed with tap water. The material containing the eggs that was collected on the $37 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve was back washed with a minimal volume of tap water into a clean beaker and allowed to settle for 30 min . Using a 30 cc syringe, excess water was carefully removed from the sediment.

A sugar gradient was used to separate the eggs from any residual debris. The gradient was prepared in a 50 ml conical tube using $10 \%, 25 \%$ and $40 \%$ sugar solutions. First, 10 ml of the $10 \%$ sugar solution (yellow solution in DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ protocol) was added to the tube using a large bore Luerlock needle and a 20 cc syringe. Next, 10 ml of the $25 \%$ sugar solution (blue) was added beneath the $10 \%$ solution. Then, 15 ml of the $40 \%$ sugar solution (red) was added beneath the $25 \%$ sugar solution. Finally, $10-15 \mathrm{ml}$ of the egg slurry was carefully layered on top of the sugar gradient. The tube was placed in a bench top centrifuge and centrifuged for 7 min at 2450 Xg . The eggs were collected from the sugar gradient using a 1 ml transfer pipette at the yellow/blue interface where a distinct white band could be seen in a green area of the gradient. The eggs were transferred to a plastic cup, and then washed on a $37 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ sieve with distilled water to remove the sugar. The eggs were then back washed into a plastic cup with
distilled water, transferred to several 15 ml conical tubes, and placed in $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight to allow the eggs to settle.

Once the eggs had settled to the bottom, excess water was removed from each of the 15 ml conical tubes and the eggs were pooled into a single tube. The eggs were allowed to settle for 30 minutes and excess water was removed until the final volume was 2 ml . The eggs were resuspended by vortexing and $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ was transferred to a glass slide and cover-slipped. An egg count was conducted at 100X magnification to determine the concentration of eggs isolated. The egg concentration was then adjusted to $\sim 50$ eggs per $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ and Fungizone (provided in kit) was added per the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ protocol and the solution was mixed well.

### 2.5 DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay

The larval development assay, DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}(\mathrm{DR})$, is an in vitro assay to determine anthelmintic resistance in gastrointestinal parasitic nematodes of ruminants The DR assay consists of wells in a 96-well microtiter plate containing agar with increasing concentrations of benzimidazole (BZ), levamisole (LEV), avermectin/milbemycin (AVM) or benzimidazole/levamisole in combination (BZ/LEV) across the rows (Fig. 2). There are duplicate wells for each anthelmintic concentration, except for the avermectin/milbemycin group, and the plate is color-coded: clear for control wells (no anthelmintic), green for susceptible, yellow for weak resistant, and pink for resistant.

Each DR plate was removed from the aluminum pouch and examined for dehydrated wells and varying agar amounts. For any dehydrated well, $10 \mu 1$ of distilled water was added to the well. Based on observation, the perimeter wells were often dehydrated or would become dehydrated within the first 24 hours of the assay, so $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of distilled water was automatically added to these wells for each plate.


Fig. 2. Diagram of the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay plate. (Adapted from the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ Manual).

For each strain, $20 \mu$ l of the egg suspension ( $\sim 50$ eggs) described above was added to each well of the plate. The suspension was vortexed after dispensing into every $4^{\text {th }}$ well to keep the mixture homogeneous. The eggs in each well were counted under 10-45X magnification on a dissecting scope and the count was recorded on a log sheet (Appendix B). The plate was placed in a humidified $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ incubator. Any remaining
egg solution was transferred to a 250 ml canted neck flask and placed in the incubator alongside the plate. Distilled water was added to the flask until the bottom was adequately covered.

The plate was checked for dehydration and larval development approximately 20 h after adding the eggs. If any of the wells were dehydrated, $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of distilled water was added to the well. After 24-48 h of incubation, $20 \mu$ l of growth medium (included in kit) was added to each well of the plate and 1-2 ml was added to the flask. The plate was checked daily for dehydration and to monitor larval development. After 168 h (approximately 7 d ) of incubation, the plate was ready for interpretation.

### 2.6 DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ larval counts and collection

Each well of the assay plate was inspected and the $L_{1} / L_{2}$ larvae and $L_{3}$ larvae were counted under 10-45X magnification on a dissecting scope. The DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ protocol recommended adding a dilute solution of Lugol's iodine to each well to kill the larvae. However, for the purpose of this study, the larvae were not killed so the larvae could be collected and used for molecular analysis. For each well, the $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ larvae were counted in the well and the number was recorded on the log sheet (Appendix B).

Starting with the control wells (A1-H1), the $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larvae from each well were transferred to a 3-well depression slide (one well per depression) using a $100 \mu$ l pipette with a wide-bore tip. The $L_{3}$ were counted and the surviving $L_{3}$ count was recorded separate from the count of any $L_{3}$ larvae that had died. The surviving $L_{3}$ were then collected from the slide using a $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ pipette with a fine tip. Aliquots of 50 larvae were
transferred to 2 ml tubes starting with the first well (A1) and pulling from the next well (B1) and so on down the control wells to complete the 50 until all surviving $L_{3}$ larvae had been transferred to a tube.

The $L_{3}$ larvae for the wells containing anthelmintic (wells 2-12) were treated in much the same way. Starting with the BZ larvae in wells A2 and B2, the larvae were counted, the number was recorded on the log sheet, and the surviving larvae were collected. If there were not 50 larvae between wells A2 and B2, then larvae from well A3 were added, then B3 and so on until there were 50 larvae in the tube. The larvae were pooled according to the groupings in the plate: wells 2-5 (susceptible), wells 6-8 (weak resistant) and wells 9-10 (resistant). If there were not 50 surviving larvae in a group, then the number in the tube was recorded and the next group started anew. Once all the BZ larvae were counted and collected, the LEV, BZ/LEV combination and AVM larvae were counted and collected in the same manner.

After all of the $L_{3}$ larvae were collected from the plate, then the tubes were labeled and the larvae were washed. Dulbecco's phosphate buffered saline (PBS) with $500 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{ml}$ penicillin, $500 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ streptomycin, $1.25 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ amphotericin B (Antibiotic/Antimycotic, Invitrogen, Carlsbad, California, USA) (PBS-AB/AM) was prepared and $500 \mu \mathrm{l}$ was added to each tube of larvae and mixed. The tubes were placed on ice for a few minutes to allow the active larvae to become immobilized and collect in the bottom of the tube so that the PBS-AB/AM could be removed without loss of larvae. The PBS-AB/AM was transferred to a 3-well depression slide and examined under 10-45X magnification to ensure that no larvae had been removed. Any larvae that had
been removed were then returned to the tube using a $100 \mu 1$ pipette. This was repeated with a second wash with PBS-AB/AM, followed by a third wash with PBS without antibiotics. After the final wash, as much PBS as possible was removed without losing any larvae. The tubes were centrifuged briefly to bring the contents to the bottom, flash frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored in $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until RNA isolation.

### 2.7 Determination of resistance

The level of resistance to each anthelmintic in the DR assay was determined for each strain tested based on the counts obtained above (Appendix B). The percentage of $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ larvae in each well was calculated as follows:

Controls, BZ (wells 2 - 4), LEV, AVM and BZ/LEV:

$$
\frac{\text { \# of } \underline{L}_{1} / \underline{L}_{2} \text { larvae }}{\text { Total \# of larvae }} \quad \mathrm{X} \quad 100=\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}
$$

BZ (wells 5 - 12):

$$
\# \text { of } \mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2} \frac{\text { larvae }+\# \text { of unhatched eggs }}{\text { Total \# of eggs }} \quad \mathrm{X} \quad 100=\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}
$$

The percentage of $L_{3}$ larvae for all wells was calculated as follows:

$$
\text { Total \# of } L_{3} \text { larvae } \quad X \quad 100=L_{3}
$$

Total \# of larvae
The critical well, in which $50 \%$ of larval development to the $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ stage was blocked, was estimated to the nearest half-well.

### 2.8 RNA isolation

Hc-OS, Hc-OG, Hc-EG, Hc-RFR, Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF were selected for molecular analysis based on the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay results. For each strain, the anthelmintic exposure status of the tubes of larvae collected from the DR plate was designated as indicated in Figure 3 and several tubes containing 50 larvae each were selected for molecular analysis as shown in Table 2.


Fig. 3. The anthelmintic exposure designations for the tubes of larvae based upon the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledast}$ assay plate. ( $\mathrm{SS}=$ super susceptible (well 2), HS = highly susceptible (wells 2 and 3 ), MS = moderately susceptible (wells 3 and 4), LS = low susceptible (wells 4 and 5), WR = weakly resistant (wells 6, 7 and 8), MR = moderately resistant (wells 9 and 10), HR $=$ highly resistant (wells 11 and 12).

Total RNA was isolated from the larvae samples selected for each strain of H. contortus using the TōTALLY RNA ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ kit (Ambion, Austin, Texas, USA). For each tube, the larvae were ground to a powder under liquid nitrogen using a plastic pestle powered by a cordless motor (Kontes Glass Company, Vineland, New Jersey, USA). Denaturation Solution ( $200 \mu \mathrm{l}$ ) was added to the tube and the pestle was rinsed into the tube with an additional $200 \mu$ l of Denaturation Solution. The volume of the resulting lysate was measured and this volume was referred to as the Starting Volume. The RNA was then isolated following the Ambion protocol. The final RNA pellet was resuspended in $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of DEPC Water/0.1mM EDTA (Ambion), placed in a $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ water bath for 15 min , and then stored at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

## 2.9 cDNA synthesis

Reverse transcription to generate $3^{\prime}$ cDNA was accomplished from the larvae total RNA preparations (above) using the SMART ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ RACE cDNA Amplification Kit (Clontech, Mountain View, California, USA). Similarly, 3'-RACE-Ready cDNA was synthesized from total RNA isolated from adult $H$. contortus for use as a positive control. Following the kit protocol, $3 \mu \mathrm{l}$ total RNA (approximately $125-225 \mathrm{ng}$ ) was used for each sample, the reactions were mixed gently by stirring after each step, and a hot-lid thermal cycler programmed to the appropriate temperatures was used for all incubations. In the final step, the reactions were diluted with $20 \mu 1$ of Tricine-EDTA Buffer and incubated at $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 min . Once the reactions were complete, the firststrand cDNA was transferred to a 0.5 ml microcentrifuge tube and stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Table 2
Tubes selected for molecular analysis of P-glycoprotein transcription

|  | Hc-EG | He-OS | Hc-OG | He-RFR | Hc-H992 | Hc-GRF | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Controls | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
| BZ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SS |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| HS | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 7 |
| WR | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 8 |
| HR |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| LEV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SS |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| HS |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| MS | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 9 |
| HR |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| AVM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HS | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| WR | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 8 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 65 |

The cDNA concentration was determined for each sample using a NanoDrop ND-1000 Spectrophotometer (NanoDrop Technologies, Inc., Wilmington, Delaware, USA). After all of the concentrations had been measured, dilutions of the cDNA were made to obtain a concentration of approximately $150 \mathrm{ng} / \mu 1$, which had been previously
determined to be an appropriate concentration for molecular analysis. The concentration of the dilutions was then confirmed by NanoDrop spectrophotometry and the exact volume of cDNA suspension that would give 150 ng was calculated for molecular analysis (Appendix C).

### 2.10 P-glycoprotein molecular analysis

The cDNA samples for each strain were analyzed by quantitative polymerase chain reactions (PCR) to determine the level of Pgp transcription. To amplify the entire gene, primers Pgp003-20F and PgpAF003-HcR were designed from a complete H. contortus Pgp gene sequence in GenBank (accession no. AF003908) (Table 3). Primers Hc18S-620F and Hc18S-1010R were also designed from the H. contortus 18S ribosomal RNA (rRNA) gene (GenBank accession no. L04153) for use as a housekeeping gene internal standard (Table 3). Due to the different optimal conditions, reactions for the Pgp and 18S PCR were set up separately for each strain, and included a negative (sterile water) and positive control (cDNA from adult worms). The PCR reactions were performed according to manufacturer's instructions (Advantage 2 PCR Enzyme System, Clontech, Mountain View, California, USA), except using 150 ng cDNA in a $12.5 \mu \mathrm{l}$ volume. The Pgp PCR cycling parameters were 30 cycles of $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 s and $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 min , followed by a cycle of $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min and then held at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The 18 S PCR cycling parameters were 30 cycles of $96^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 s and $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min , followed by a cycle of $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min and then held at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The Pgp

Table 3
Primers for P-glycoprotein transcription analysis

| Primer | Sequence (5' to 3') | $\mathrm{T}_{\text {A }}$ | Expected length |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pgp003-20F | AGAGATCGTTCTCAAGCTGGT |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PgpAF003- } \\ & \text { HcR } \end{aligned}$ | TCATTGTGATTCAACGAGTCGT | $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 3852 bp |
| Pgp003-3250F | ATGGCGTTGTTGGAACGGTTT |  |  |
| Pgp003-3400R | GGTACAGTCGAACAGCGTTGGTTCC | $56{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 141 bp |
| Hc18S-620F | GAGTTACATGCAGTGATTCGCCTTTGGCGTTAATCGCTGTTG |  |  |
| Hc18S-1010R | GCTCCTCGACAAGGCAACTATACCCCATCGGAT | $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 423 bp |

and 18 S PCR products were co-loaded and visualized on a $1 \%$ agarose gel, stained with ethidium bromide, and viewed under UV transillumination. The samples for each individual strain were amplified and evaluated under identical conditions.

Amplification of a smaller fragment of Pgp was also evaluated for some of the experimental samples. The primers Pgp003-3250F and Pgp003-3400R were designed from the $H$. contortus Pgp gene sequence in GenBank (accession no. AF003908) (Table 3). Reactions were set up as for the larger amplicon using 150 ng per reaction. The PCR cycling parameters were 30 cycles of $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 56^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 s and $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 min , followed by a cycle of $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min and then held at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The products were
visualized on a $1 \%$ agarose gel, stained with ethidium bromide, and viewed under UV transillumination.

### 2.11 Molecular characterization of Hc-GRF strain

The 18 S rRNA gene and the internal transcribed spacer 1 (ITS 1) and ITS 2 regions were analyzed from $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ and the $H$. contortus strain obtained from the giraffe (Hc-GRF).

### 2.11.1 Genomic DNA extraction

Genomic DNA (gDNA) was extracted from Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF strain $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larvae using a standard phenol-chloroform extraction method facilitated by the use of the Phase-Lock Gel tubes (Eppendorf Scientific, Inc., Westbury, New York, USA). The larvae were ground to a powder as described above. A $100 \mu 1$ volume of PBS was added to the sample and the pestle was rinsed with an additional $50 \mu 1$ of PBS. An equal volume of lysis buffer ( 10 mM Tris-chloride ( pH 8.0 ), 0.1 M EDTA ( pH 8.0 ), $0.5 \%$ SDS) was added to the tube and the lysate was transferred to a Light Phase-Lock Gel tube. RNAse A was added to the lysate at a final concentration of $50 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ and the tube was incubated in a $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ water bath for 1 h . Then, Proteinase K was added to a final concentration of $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ concentration and incubated in a $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ water bath for 3 h with occasional swirling. The sample was cooled to room temperature.

A volume of Tris-equilibrated phenol equal to the sample volume was added to the tube and mixed gently on a rocker for 30 min then centrifuged at $10,000 \mathrm{X} g$ for

8 min . The volume of the top aqueous phase was estimated and an equal volume of Tris-equilibrated phenol was added. The tube was mixed gently on a rocker for 10 min then centrifuged at $10,000 \mathrm{X} g$ for 8 min . The top aqueous phase was measured and transferred to a Heavy Phase-Lock Gel tube. An equal volume of 50:50 chloroform:phenol was added to the sample and mixed for 5 min . The tube was centrifuged at $10,000 \mathrm{X} g$ for 8 min . The volume of the top aqueous phase was estimated and an equal volume of chloroform/iso-amyl alcohol was added. The sample was mixed for 5 min , and then centrifuged at $10,000 \mathrm{X} g$ for 8 min . The top aqueous phase was transferred to a 2 ml RNAse/DNAse free tube, the volume was measured and sodium acetate to a final concentration of 0.3 M was added. The tube was mixed gently and 3 volumes of cold absolute ethyl alcohol ( EtOH ) were pipetted down the side of the tube and mixed. The sample was placed in $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to precipitate overnight.

The sample was centrifuged for 30 min at $12,000 \mathrm{Xg}$ at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The EtOH was carefully removed from the pellet and $500 \mu \mathrm{l}$ cold $70 \% \mathrm{EtOH}$ was added, and then centrifuged for 10 minutes at $12,000 \mathrm{X} g$ at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The EtOH was removed, the pellet was allowed to dry, and 20-50 $\mu \mathrm{l}$ of Tricine-EDTA Buffer was added directly to the pellet for resuspension. To ensure that the pellet was fully resuspended, the tube was placed in a $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ water bath for 1 h . The concentration of the gDNA was measured on a NanoDrop Spectrophotometer.

### 2.11.2 18S rRNA standard PCR

Polymerase chain reactions were conducted for the 18 S small subunit rRNA gene (18S) and the ITS region of the Hc-GRF and Hc-H992 gDNA. For the 18S PCR, primers AN and B were designed from a conserved region of the gene (Sogin, 1990; Schoelkopf et al., 2005) and used for amplification (Advantage 2 PCR Enzyme System, Clontech, Mountain View, California, USA) (Table 4). PCR reactions contained 10 ng Hc-GRF gDNA, $30 \mathrm{ng} \mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992 \mathrm{gDNA}$, and water as a negative control. The thermal cycler program was as follows: 1 cycle of $96^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 min , then 30 cycles of $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min , followed by a cycle of $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min and then held at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The products were visualized on a $1 \%$ agarose gel, stained with ethidium bromide, and viewed under UV transillumination.

### 2.11.3 ITS region standard PCR

For the ITS region, 1055F forward primer designed from a conserved region of the 18 S rRNA gene (Sogin, 1990) and ITSR reverse primer designed from a conserved region of the 28 S rRNA gene (Aktas et al., 2007) (Table 4) were used to amplify the genomic region spanning the ITS1-5.8S gene-ITS2 region. Primary PCR reactions were prepared using $10 \mathrm{ng} \mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{GRF}$ gDNA, $30 \mathrm{ng} \mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992 \mathrm{gDNA}$, and water as a negative control. The PCR was conducted in a thermal cycler programmed with the following conditions: 1 cycle of $96^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 min , then 30 cycles of $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 s , $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min , followed by a cycle of $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min , and then held at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Table 4
Primers for 18 S rRNA gene and ITS genomic region amplification

| Primer | Sequence (5' to 3') | $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{A}}$ | Expected <br> length |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18S Primary PCR |  |  |  |
| AN | GCTTGTCTTAAAGATTAAGCCATGC | $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1727 bp |
| B | GATCCTTCTGCAGGTTCACCTAC |  |  |
| ITS Primary PCR |  | $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1981 bp |
| 1055F | GGTGGTGCATGGCCG |  |  |
| ITSR | GGTCCGTGTTTCAAGACGG |  |  |
| ITS Nested PCR |  | $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 872 bp |
| ITSF | GAGAAGTCGTAACAAGGTTTCCG |  |  |
| 28SRN2 | CGGGTAACCTCGCCTG |  |  |

The products were visualized on a $1 \%$ agarose gel and viewed under UV transillumination.

A nested PCR was performed for the ITS reactions using primers ITSF (located in the 18 S rRNA gene) (Aktas et al., 2007) and 28SRN2 (designed from the 28S rRNA gene) and $1 \mu$ l of a 1:10 dilution of the primary PCR reactions as template (Table 4). The thermal cycler conditions were: 1 cycle of $96^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 min , then 30 cycles of $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $10 \mathrm{~s}, 55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $10 \mathrm{~s}, 72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min , followed by a cycle of $72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min and then held at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The products were visualized on a $1 \%$ agarose gel, stained with ethidium bromide, and viewed under UV transillumination.

### 2.11.4 Ligation and transformation

The Hc-GRF and Hc-H992 products from the 18S rRNA PCR and the nested ITS PCR were ligated using the $\mathrm{TOPO}^{\circledR}$ TA Cloning Kit and transformed into One Shot ${ }^{\circledR}$ competent $E$. coli cells (Invitrogen). Following the $\mathrm{TOPO}^{\circledR}$ protocol, 2-4 $\mu \mathrm{l}$ (approximately 600-800 ng) of each PCR product was ligated into the $\mathrm{TOPO}^{\circledR}{ }^{\circledR}$ vector, and then transformed into the competent cells. The samples were plated on LB agar with $50 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ kanamycin and incubated in a $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ incubator overnight.

### 2.11.5 Colony PCR

For each transformation, colonies were analyzed by PCR to determine if the gene fragment of interest was successfully incorporated into the vector. The reactions were performed using M13 forward and M13 reverse primers (located in the vector) and the following thermal cycler conditions: 1 cycle of $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min , then 30 cycles of $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for $30 \mathrm{~s}, 50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 s , and $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min , followed by a cycle of $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min , and then held at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The products were visualized on a $1 \%$ agarose gel and viewed under UV transillumination. Colonies that possessed the appropriate sized insert for each transformation were inoculated into 6 ml LB broth containing $6 \mu \mathrm{l}$ ampicillin and incubated overnight in a $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ shaker incubator at 200 rpm .

### 2.11.6 Plasmid DNA preparation

For select colonies, plasmid DNA (pDNA) for each of the samples was prepared using the QIAprep Spin Mini Kit (Qiagen Inc.,Valencia, California, USA). The bacteria
cells from the broth cultures were pelleted by centrifuging at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min at $720 \mathrm{X} g$. The pDNA was purified following the kit protocol and eluted in $50 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of sterile water. The pDNA was visualized on a $1 \%$ agarose gel, stained with ethidium bromide, and viewed under UV transillumination to verify the presence of the insert. The concentration of the pDNA was determined using the NanoDrop Spectrophotometer.

### 2.11.7 Sequencing and analysis

The cloned Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF 18S and ITS genes were sequenced by Davis Sequencing (Davis, California, USA). The sequences were analyzed using Sequencher 3.11 software (Gene Codes Corporation, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA). BLAST similarity searches (Altschul et al., 1990) were performed for all 18S rRNA gene and ITS region sequences obtained (GenBank database, National Center for Biotechnology Information, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA). The sequences were aligned and compared using the ClustalW 1.8 Program (EMBLEBI, 2007).

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1 Modified McMaster test and larval identification

For all of the $H$. contortus strains, the EPG determined that adequate quantities of eggs were present in the fecal sample for conducting the DR assay (Table 5). The larval identification determined that $H$. contortus was the only species of nematode present in all of the fecal samples.

Table 5
Results of the modified McMaster test and the larval identification for each strain of H. contortus

| H. contortus <br> Strain | EPG | Fecal Weight <br> (grams) | Estimated <br> egg count | Larval Identification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hc-ES | 4,266 | 26.80 | 114,329 | $100 \%$ H. contortus |
| Hc-EG | 300 | 5.02 | 1,506 | $100 \%$ H. contortus |
| Hc-OS | 900 | 13.40 | 12,060 | $100 \%$ H. contortus |
| Hc-OG | 4,200 | 8.90 | 37,380 | $100 \%$ H. contortus |
| Hc-RFR | 1,000 | 6.92 | 6,920 | $100 \%$ H. contortus |
| Hc-H992 | 500 | 10.71 | 5,355 | $100 \%$ H. contortus |
| Hc-GRF | 16,700 | 224.70 | $3,752,490$ | $100 \%$ H. contortus |

### 3.2 DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay

### 3.2.1 Hc-ES strain

The Hc-ES strain was susceptible to BZ/LEV combination and AVM with critical wells 4 and 2.5 respectively (Table 6; Fig. 2). The strain approached the weak resistance level to BZ with critical well 5. The critical well for LEV was well 7.5, which falls within the weakly resistant range. Due to the level of resistance to LEV, this strain was not included in the molecular analysis of the P-glycoprotein.

Table 6
The critical wells $(\mathrm{Cw})$ and corresponding levels of resistance for the $H$. contortus strains as determined by the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay. ( $\mathrm{S}=$ susceptible, $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{W}=$ bordering on susceptible and weakly resistant, $\mathrm{W}=$ weakly resistant, $\mathrm{W} / \mathrm{R}=$ bordering on weakly resistant and highly resistant, $\mathrm{R}=$ highly resistant)

|  | Suspected Susceptible |  |  |  | Suspected Resistant |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | He-ES | He-EG | He-OS | He-OG | He-RFR | He-H992 | He-GRF |
| BZ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=6 \\ \mathrm{~W} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=4.5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=4.5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=7.5 \\ \mathrm{~W} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=8.5 \\ \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{R} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=11 \\ \mathrm{R} \end{gathered}$ |
| LEV | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=7.5 \\ \mathrm{~W} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=8.5 \\ \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{R} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C w=5.5 \\ S / W \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=5.5 \\ \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{W} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=10.5 \\ \mathrm{R} \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{B Z} / \\ & \mathbf{L E V} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=4 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=4.5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C w=5 \\ S \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C w=6 \\ W \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C w=5.5 \\ S / W \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=8.5 \\ \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{R} \end{gathered}$ |
| AVM | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=2.5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} C w=5.5 \\ S / W \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=3 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=3.5 \\ \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=6.5 \\ \mathrm{~W} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=6.5 \\ \mathrm{~W} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Cw}=6.5 \\ \mathrm{~W} \end{gathered}$ |

### 3.2.2 Hc-EG strain

The Hc-EG strain was susceptible to the BZ/LEV combination with a critical well of 5 , which is nearing the weakly resistant range (Table 6; Fig. 2). The critical well for AVM was 5.5 , which borders between the susceptible and weakly resistant ranges. For BZ, the critical well was determined to be well 6 , which falls within the weakly resistant range and the LEV critical well was 8.5 , which falls on the border between the weakly resistant and the highly resistant ranges. This strain was included in the Pgp molecular analysis because it demonstrated a higher level of resistance to LEV.

### 3.2.3 Hc-OS strain

The Hc-OS strain was susceptible to BZ, BZ/LEV combination and AVM, with critical wells 4.5, 4.5, and 3, respectively (Table 6; Fig. 2). The critical well for LEV was 5.5 , which falls on the border between the susceptible and weakly resistant range. This strain was predominantly susceptible with the LEV bordering on weak resistance and was included in the molecular analysis.

### 3.2.4 Hc-OG strain

The Hc-OG strain was susceptible to all anthelmintics tested. The critical wells were as follows: well 4.5 for BZ, well 5 for LEV, well 5 for BZ/LEV combination, and well 3.5 for AVM (Table 6; Fig. 2). However, the levels of resistance to LEV, as well as the BZ/LEV combination, are approaching the weakly resistant level. This strain was
determined to be the most susceptible in this study and was included in the molecular analysis.

### 3.2.5 Hc-RFR strain

The Hc-RFR critical well for LEV was 5.5, which falls on the border between the susceptible and weakly resistant ranges (Table 6; Fig. 2). For the other anthelmintics tested, the critical wells were within the weakly resistant range and were as follows: well 7.5 for BZ, well 6 for BZ/LEV combination, and well 6.5 for AVM. This strain was determined to be predominantly weakly resistant, with LEV on the border between susceptible and weakly resistant and was included in the molecular analysis.

### 3.2.6 Hc-H992 strain

The Hc-H992 was susceptible for LEV with a critical well of 5, which is nearing the weakly resistant range (Table 6; Figure 2). The critical well was 5.5 for the BZ/LEV combination, which falls on the border between the susceptible and weakly resistant ranges. This strain was weakly resistant to AVM with a critical well of 6.5 , but bordered on the weakly and highly resistant ranges for BZ with a critical well of 8.5. This strain was not as resistant as originally suspected, but still showed a level of resistance to BZ and AVM and was included in the molecular analysis.

### 3.2.7 Hc-GRF strain

The Hc-GRF strain was weakly resistant to AVM with a critical well of 6.5 , but bordered on the weakly and highly resistant ranges for the BZ/LEV combination with a critical well of 8.5 (Table 6; Figure 2). This strain was highly resistant to BZ and LEV with critical wells of 11 and 10.5 respectively. This strain was determined to be the most resistant strain in the study, being either weakly or highly resistant to all of the anthelmintics tested and was included in the molecular analysis.

### 3.3 P-glycoprotein molecular analysis

None of the H. contortus strains showed transcription levels of Pgp at levels detectable in the PCR assay used in this study (represented by Fig. 4). Using the same amount of cDNA in the reactions, the housekeeping gene for each of the samples was amplified at detectable levels. The smaller amplicon of Pgp showed similar results.

### 3.4 Hc-GRF molecular characterization

### 3.4.1 $18 S r R N A$

The 18S rRNA sequences obtained from isolates for $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ and Hc -GRF were compared to the sequences available in the GenBank database for $H$. contortus (accession no. L04153), Haemonchus placei (accession no. L04154) and Haemonchus similis (accession no. L04152) (Fig. 5). The three reference sequences were 100\%


Fig. 4. A) Gel image of the P-glycoprotein analysis for the $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ strain. B) Gel image of the Pglycoprotein analysis for the Hc-OS strain. For both images: the Pgp positive (G079) and negative (water) are shown on the right of each gel at 3850bp and the housekeeping gene for each sample tested is shown at 450bp. There was not amplification of Pgp for the test samples. These gels are representative for all of the strains evaluated.
identical when aligned using a Lalign program (EMBNET.CH, 2007). The Hc-H992 consensus sequence showed an identity of $99.4 \%$ to $H$. contortus, H. placei and H. similis and $99.5 \%$ to the Hc-GRF. In comparison, the Hc-GRF showed a 99.9\% identity to all three of the reference sequences. Several base differences (designated in bold below) occurred in the $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ isolates, however at position $1165(\downarrow)$, there was a nucleotide inserted for both $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ and $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{GRF}$. Based on the similarity of the $\mathrm{Hc}-$ GRF sequences to the other known Haemonchus spp, it was confirmed to be a species of Haemonchus.

|  | Primer AN $\rightarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L04153-HC | GCTCAGTTTAAAGATTAAGCCATGCATGTCGAGTTCATCTTTGAAGAGAAACTGCGAACG | 60 |
| HC-GRF-6 | -AGATTAAGCCATGCATGTCGAGTTCATCTTTGAAGAGAAACTGCGAACG | 49 |
| HC-GRF-8 | GCTTGTCTTAAAGATTAAGCCATGCATGTCGAGTTCATCTTTGAAGAGAAACTGCGAACG | 60 |
| HC-H992-2 | GCTTGTCTTAAAGATTAAGCCATGCATGTCGAGTTCATCTTTGAAGAGAAACTGCGAACG | 60 |
| Hc-H992-3 | GCTTGTCTTAAAGATTAAGCCATGCATGTCGAGTTCATCTTTGAAGAGAAACTGCGAACG | 60 |
| L04154-Hp | GCTCAGTTTAAAGATTAAGCCATGCATGTCGAGTTCATCTTTGAAGAGAAACTGCGAACG | 60 |
| L04152-Hs | GCTCAGTTTAAAGATTAAGCCATGCATGTCGAGTTCATCTTTGAAGAGAAACTGCGAACG **************************************************** | 60 |
| L04153-Hc | GCTCATTAGAGCAGATGTCATTTATTCGGAACGTCCTTTTGGATAACTGCGGTAATTCTG | 120 |
| HC-GRF-6 | GCTCATTAGAGCAGATGTCATTTATTCGGAACGTCCTTTTGGATAACTGCGGTAATTCTG | 109 |
| HC-GRF-8 | GCTCATTAGAGCAGATGTCATTTATTCGGAACGTCCTTTTGGATAACTGCGGTAATTCTG | 120 |
| HC-H992-2 | GCTCATTAGAGCAGATGTCATTTATTCGGAACGTCCTTTTGGATAACTGCGGTAATTCTG | 120 |
| Hc-H992-3 | GCTCATTAGAGCAGATGTCATTTATTCGGAACGACCTTTTGGATAACTGCGGTAATTCTG | 120 |
| L04154-Hp | GCTCATTAGAGCAGATGTCATTTATTCGGAACGTCCTTTTGGATAACTGCGGTAATTCTG | 120 |
| L04152-Hs | GCTCATTAGAGCAGATGTCATTTATTCGGAACGTCCTTTTGGATAACTGCGGTAATTCTG | 120 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | GAGCTAATACATGCAAATAAACCCTGACTTTTGAAAGGGTGCAATTATTAGAGCAAATCA | 180 |
| HC-GRF-6 | GAGCTAATACATGCAAATAAACCCTGACTTTTGAAAGGGTGCAATTATTAGAGCAAATCA | 169 |
| HC-GRF-8 | GAGCTAATACATGCAAATAAACCCTGACTTTTGAAAGGGTGCAATTATTAGAGCAAATCA | 180 |
| HC-H992-2 | GAGCTAATACATGCAAATAAACCCTGACTTTTGAAAGGGTGCAATTATTAGAGCAAATCA | 180 |
| HC-H992-3 | GAGCTAATACATGCGAATAAACCCTGACTTTTGAAAGGGTGCAATTATTAGAGCAAATCA | 180 |
| L04154-Hp | GAGCTAATACATGCAAATAAACCCTGACTTTTGAAAGGGTGCAATTATTAGAGCAAATCA | 180 |
| L04152-Hs | GAGCTAATACATGCAAATAAACCCTGACTTTTGAAAGGGTGCAATTATTAGAGCAAATCA | 180 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | ATCACTTTCGGGTGCAGTTTGCTGACTCTGAATAACGCAGCATATCGGCGGCTTGTTCGC | 240 |
| HC-GRF-6 | ATCACTTTCGGGTGCAGTTTGCTGACTCTGAATAACGCAGCATATCGGCGGCTTGTTCGC | 229 |
| HC-GRF-8 | ATCACTTTCGGGTGCAGTTTGCTGACTCTGAATAACGCAGCATATCGGCGGCTTGTTCGC | 240 |
| HC-H992-2 | ATCACTTTCGGGTGCAGTTTGCTGACTCTGAATAACGCAGCATATCGGCGGCTTGTTCGC | 240 |
| HC-H992-3 | ATCACTTTCGGGTGCATTTTGCTGACTCTGAATAACGCAGCATATCGGCGGCTTGTTCGC | 240 |
| L04154-Hp | ATCACTTTCGGGTGCAGTTTGCTGACTCTGAATAACGCAGCATATCGGCGGCTTGTTCGC |  |
| L04152-Hs | ATCACTTTCGGGTGCAGTTTGCTGACTCTGAATAACGCAGCATATCGGCGGCTTGTTCGC <br>  | 240 |
| L04153-HC | CGATATTCCGAAAAAGTGTCTGCCCTATCAACCTGATGGTAGTCTATTAGTCTACCATGG | 300 |
| HC-GRF-6 | CGATATTCCGAAAAAGTGTCTGCCCTATCAACCTGATGGTAGTCTATTAGTCTACCATGG | 289 |
| HC-GRF-8 | CGATATTCCGAAAAAGTGTCTGCCCTATCAACCTGATGGTAGTCTATTAGTCTACCATGG | 300 |
| HC-H992-2 | CGATATTCCGAAAAAGTGTCTGCCCTATCAACCTGATGGTAGTCTATTAGTCTACCATGG | 300 |
| HC-H992-3 | CGATATTCCGAAAAAGTGTCTGCCCTATCAACCTGATGGTAGTCTATTAGTCTACCATGG | 300 |
| L04154-Hp | CGATATTCCGAAAAAGTGTCTGCCCTATCAACCTGATGGTAGTCTATTAGTCTACCATGG | 300 |
| L04152-Hs | CGATATTCCGAAAAAGTGTCTGCCCTATCAACCTGATGGTAGTCTATTAGTCTACCATGG | 300 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | TTATTACGGGTAACGGAGAATAAGGGTTCGACTCCGGAGAGGGAGCCTTAGAAACGGCTA | 360 |
| Hc-GRF-6 | TTATTACGGGTAACGGAGAATAAGGGTTCGACTCCGGAGAGGGAGCCTTAGAAACGGCTA | 349 |
| HC-GRF-8 | TTATTACGGGTAACGGAGAATAAGGGTTCGACTCCGGAGAGGGAGCCTTAGAAACGGCTA | 360 |
| HC-H992-2 | TTATTACGGGTAACGGAGAATAAGGGTTCGACTCCGGAGAGGGAGCCTTAGAAACGGCTA | 360 |
| HC-H992-3 | TTATTACGGGTAACGGAGAATAAGGGTTCGACTCCGGAGAGGGAGCCTTAGAAACGGCTA | 360 |
| L04154-Hp | TTATTACGGGTAACGGAGAATAAGGGTTCGACTCCGGAGAGGGAGCCTTAGAAACGGCTA | 360 |
| L04152-Hs | TTATTACGGGTAACGGAGAATAAGGGTTCGACTCCGGAGAGGGAGCCTTAGAAACGGCTA <br> ******************************************************************** | 360 |

Fig. 5. The Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF 18 S rRNA gene sequence alignment with denotation of primer location. The reference sequences are designated by the GenBank accession numbers as follows: L04153-Hc for H. contortus, L04154-Hp for H. placei and L04152-Hs for H. similis. Single base substitutions are designated in bold type. A single base insertion at position 1165 ( $\downarrow$ ) occurred in both the $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ and Hc -GRF sequences.

| L04153-HC | CCACATCCAAGGAAGGCAGCAGGCGCGAAACTTATCCAATCTTGAACAGATGAGATAGTG | 420 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HC-GRF-6 | CCACATCCAAGGAAGGCAGCAGGCGCGAAACTTATCCAATCTTGAACAGATGAGATAGTG | 409 |
| HC-GRF-8 | CCACATCCAAGGAAGGCAGCAGGCGCGAAACTTATCCAATCTTGAACAGATGAGATAGTG | 420 |
| HC-H992-2 | CCACATCCAAGGAAGGCAGCAGGCGCGAAACTTATCCAATCTTGAACAGATGAGATAGTG | 420 |
| HC-H992-3 | CCACATCCAAGGAAGGCAGCAGGCGCGAAACTTATCCAATCTTGAACAGATGAGATAGTG | 420 |
| L04154-Hp | CCACATCCAAGGAAGGCAGCAGGCGCGAAACTTATCCAATCTTGAACAGATGAGATAGTG | 420 |
| L04152-Hs | CCACATCCAAGGAAGGCAGCAGGCGCGAAACTTATCCAATCTTGAACAGATGAGATAGTG | 420 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | ACTAAAAATAAAAAGACCATTCCTATGGAACGGTCATTTCAATGAGTTGATCATAAACCT | 480 |
| HC-GRF-6 | ACTAAAAATAAAAAGACCATTCCTATGGAACGGTCATTTCAATGAGTTGATCATAAACCT | 469 |
| HC-GRF-8 | ACTAAAAATAAAAAGACCATTCCTATGGAACGGTCATTTCAATGAGTTGATCATAAACCT | 480 |
| HC-H992-2 | ACTAAAAATAAAAAGACCATTCCTATGGAACGGTCATTTCAATGAGTTGATCATAAACCT | 480 |
| HC-H992-3 | ACTAAAAATAAAAAGACCATTCCTATGGAACGGTCATTTCAATGAGTTGATCATAAACCT | 480 |
| L04154-Hp | ACTAAAAATAAAAAGACCATTCCTATGGAACGGTCATTTCAATGAGTTGATCATAAACCT | 480 |
| L04152-Hs | ACTAAAAATAAAAAGACCATTCCTATGGAACGGTCATTTCAATGAGTTGATCATAAACCT | 480 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | TTTTTCGAGGATCAAGTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTGCCAGCAGCCGCGGTAATTCCAGCTCC | 540 |
| HC-GRF-6 | TTTTTCGAGGATCAAGTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTGCCAGCAGCCGCGGTAATTCCAGCTCC | 529 |
| HC-GRF-8 | TTTTTCGAGGATCAAGTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTGCCAGCAGCCGCGGTAATTCCAGCTCC | 540 |
| HC-H992-2 | TTTTTCGAGGATCAAGTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTGCCAGCAGCCGCGGTAATTCCAGCTCC | 540 |
| HC-H992-3 | TTTTTCGAGGATCAAGTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTGCCAGCAGCCGCGGTAATTCCAGCTCC | 540 |
| L04154-Hp | TTTTTCGAGGATCAAGTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTGCCAGCAGCCGCGGTAATTCCAGCTCC | 540 |
| L04152-Hs | TTTTTCGAGGATCAAGTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTGCCAGCAGCCGCGGTAATTCCAGCTCC | 540 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | ACTAGTGTAAATCGTCATTGCTGCGGTTAAAAAGCTCGTAGTTGGATCTGAGTTACATGC | 600 |
| HC-GRF-6 | ACTAGTGTAAATCGTCATTGCTGCGGTTAAAAAGCTCGTAGTTGGATCTGAGTTACATGC | 589 |
| HC-GRF-8 | ACTAGTGTAAATCGTCATTGCTGCGGTTAAAAAGCTCGTAGTTGGATCTGAGTTACATGC | 600 |
| HC-H992-2 | ACTAGTGTAAATCGTCATTGCTGCGGTTAAAAAGCTCGTAGTTGGATCTGAGTTACATGC | 600 |
| Hc-H992-3 | ACTAGTGTAAATCGTCATTGCTGCGGTTAAAAAGCTCGTAGTTGGATCTGAGTTACATGC | 600 |
| L04154-Hp | ACTAGTGTAAATCGTCATTGCTGCGGTTAAAAAGCTCGTAGTTGGATCTGAGTTACATGC | 600 |
| L04152-Hs | ACTAGTGTAAATCGTCATTGCTGCGGTTAAAAAGCTCGTAGTTGGATCTGAGTTACATGC | 600 |
|  | *********************************************************** |  |
| L04153-HC | AGTGATTCGCCTTTGGCGTTAATCGCTGTTGTAACTATTTGCTGGTTTTCTATTGAGGTT | 660 |
| HC-GRF-6 | AGTGATTCGCCTTTGGCGTTAATCGCTGTTGTAACTATTTGCTGGTTTTCTATTGAGGTT | 649 |
| HC-GRF-8 | AGTGATTCGCCTTTGGCGTTAATCGCTGTTGTAACTATTTGCTGGTTTTCTATTGAGGTT | 660 |
| HC-H992-2 | AGTGATTCGCCTTTGGCGTTAATCGCTGTTGTAACTATTTGCTGGTTTTCTGTTGAGGTT | 660 |
| HC-H992-3 | AGTGATTCGCCTTTGGCGTTAATCGCAGTTGTAACTATTTGCTGGTTTTCTGTTGAGGTT | 660 |
| L04154-Hp | AGTGATTCGCCTTTGGCGTTAATCGCTGTTGTAACTATTTGCTGGTTTTCTATTGAGGTT | 660 |
| L04152-Hs | AGTGATTCGCCTTTGGCGTTAATCGCTGTTGTAACTATTTGCTGGTTTTCTATTGAGGTT | 660 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | TCGGCTTCTTTAGTGGCTAGCGAGTTTACTTTGAATAAATTAGAGTGCTCAGAACAAGCG | 720 |
| HC-GRF-6 | TCGGCTTCTTTAGTGGCTAGCGAGTTTACTTTGAATAAATTAGAGTGCTCAGAACAAGCG | 709 |
| HC-GRF-8 | TCGGCTTCTTTAGTGGCTAGCGAGTTTACTTTGAATAAATTAGAGTGCTCAGAACAAGCG | 720 |
| HC-H992-2 | TCGGCTTCTTTAGTGGCTAGCGAGTTTACTTTGAATAAATTAGAGTGCTCAGAACAAGCG | 720 |
| Hc-H992-3 | TCGGCTTCTTTAGTGGCTAGCGAGTTTACTTTGAATAAATTAGAGTGCTCAGAACAAGCG | 720 |
| L04154-Hp | TCGGCTTCTTTAGTGGCTAGCGAGTTTACTTTGAATAAATTAGAGTGCTCAGAACAAGCG | 720 |
| L04152-Hs | TCGGCTTCTTTAGTGGCTAGCGAGTTTACTTTGAATAAATTAGAGTGCTCAGAACAAGCG | 720 |
|  | * |  |
| L04153-HC | TTTGCTTGAATGGTCGATCATGGAATAATAAAAGAGGACTTCGGTTCTATTTATTGGTTC | 780 |
| HC-GRF-6 | TTTGCTTGAATGGTCGATCATGGAATAATAAAAGAGGACTTCGGTTCTATTTATTGGTTC | 769 |
| HC-GRF-8 | TTTGCTTGAATGGTCGATCATGGAATAATAAAAGAGGACTTCGGTTCTATTTATTGGTTC | 780 |
| HC-H992-2 | TTTGCTTGAATGGTCGATCATGGAATAATAAAAGAGGACTTCGGTTCTATTTATTGGTTC | 780 |
| Hc-H992-3 | TTTGCTTGAATGGTCGATCATGGAATAATAAAAGAGGACTTCGGTTCTATTTATTGGTTC | 780 |
| L04154-Hp | TTTGCTTGAATGGTCGATCATGGAATAATAAAAGAGGACTTCGGTTCTATTTATTGGTTC | 780 |
| L04152-Hs | TTTGCTTGAATGGTCGATCATGGAATAATAAAAGAGGACTTCGGTTCTATTTATTGGTTC | 780 |
|  |  |  |

Fig. 5. Continued.

| L04153-HC | AGGAACTGAAATAATGGTTAAGAGGGACAATTCGGGGGCATTCGTATCCCTGCGCGAGAG | 840 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HC-GRF-6 | AGGAACTGAAATAATGGTTAAGAGGGACAATTCGGGGGCATTCGTATCCCTGCGCGAGAG | 829 |
| HC-GRF-8 | AGGAACTGAAATAATGGTTAAGAGGGACAATTCGGGGGCATTCGTATCCCTGCGCGAGAG | 840 |
| HC-H992-2 | AGGAACTGAAATAATGGTTAAGAGGGACAATTCGGGGGCATTCGTATCCCTGCGCGAGAG | 840 |
| Hc-H992-3 | AGGAACTGAAATAATGGTTAAGAGGGACAATTCGGGGGCATTCGTATCCCTGCGCGAGAG | 840 |
| L04154-Hp | AGGAACTGAAATAATGGTTAAGAGGGACAATTCGGGGGCATTCGTATCCCTGCGCGAGAG | 840 |
| L04152-Hs | AGGAACTGAAATAATGGTTAAGAGGGACAATTCGGGGGCATTCGTATCCCTGCGCGAGAG <br>  | 840 |
| L04153-HC | GTGAAATTCGTGGACCGCAGGGGGACGCCCTAAAGCGAAAGCATTTGCCAAGAATGTCTT | 900 |
| HC-GRF-6 | GTGAAATTCGTGGACCGCAGGGGGACGCCCTAAAGCGAAAGCATTTGCCAAGAATGTCTT | 889 |
| HC-GRF-8 | GTGAAATTCGTGGACCGCAGGGGGACGCCCTAAAGCGAAAGCATTTGCCAAGAATGTCTT | 900 |
| HC-H992-2 | GTGAAATTCGTGGACCGCAGGGGGACGCCCTAAAGCGAAAGCATTTGCCAAGAATGTCTT | 900 |
| HC-H992-3 | GTGAAATTCGTGGACCGCAGGGGGACGCCCTAAAGCGAAAGCATTTGCCAAGAATGTCTT | 900 |
| L04154-Hp | GTGAAATTCGTGGACCGCAGGGGGACGCCCTAAAGCGAAAGCATTTGCCAAGAATGTCTT | 900 |
| L04152-Hs | GTGAAATTCGTGGACCGCAGGGGGACGCCCTAAAGCGAAAGCATTTGCCAAGAATGTCTT | 900 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | CATTAATCAAGAACGAAAGTCAGAGGTTCGAAGGCGATTAGATACCGCCCTAGTTCTGAC | 960 |
| HC-GRF-6 | CATTAATCAAGAACGAAAGTCAGAGGTTCGAAGGCGATTAGATACCGCCCTAGTTCTGAC | 949 |
| HC-GRF-8 | CATTAATCAAGAACGAAAGTCAGAGGTTCGAAGGCGATTAGATACCGCCCTAGTTCTGAC | 960 |
| HC-H992-2 | CATTAATCAAGAACGAAAGTCAGAGGTTCGAAGGCGATTAGATACCGCCCTAGTTCTGAC | 960 |
| Hc-H992-3 | CATTAATCAAGAACGAAAGTCAGAGGTTCGAAGGCGATTAGATACCGCCCTAGTTCTGAC | 960 |
| L04154-Hp | CATTAATCAAGAACGAAAGTCAGAGGTTCGAAGGCGATTAGATACCGCCCTAGTTCTGAC | 960 |
| L04152-Hs | CATTAATCAAGAACGAAAGTCAGAGGTTCGAAGGCGATTAGATACCGCCCTAGTTCTGAC | 960 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | CGTAAACTATGCCATCTAGCGATCCGATGGGGTATAGTTGCCTTGTCGAGGAGCTTCCCG | 1020 |
| HC-GRF-6 | CGTAAACTATGCCATCTAGCGATCCGATGGGGTATAGTTGCCTTGTCGAGGAGCTTCCCG | 1009 |
| HC-GRF-8 | CGTAAACTATGCCATCTAGCGATCCGATGGGGTATAGTTGCCTTGTCGAGGAGCTTCCCG | 1020 |
| HC-H992-2 | CGTAAACTATGCCATCTAGCGATCCGATGGGGTATAGTTGCCTTGTCGAGGAGCTTCCCG | 1020 |
| HC-H992-3 | CGTAAACTATGCCATCTAGCGATCCGATGGGGTATAGTTGCCTTGTCGAGGAGCTTCCCG | 1020 |
| L04154-Hp | CGTAAACTATGCCATCTAGCGATCCGATGGGGTATAGTTGCCTTGTCGAGGAGCTTCCCG | 1020 |
| L04152-Hs | CGTAAACTATGCCATCTAGCGATCCGATGGGGTATAGTTGCCTTGTCGAGGAGCTTCCCG <br> ****************************************************************** | 1020 |
| L04153-HC | GAAACGAAAGTCTTTCGGTTCCTGGGGTAGTATGGTTGCAAAGCTGAAACTTAAAGAAAT | 1080 |
| HC-GRF-6 | GAAACGAAAGTCTTTCCGTTCCTGGGGTAGTATGGTTGCAAAGCTGAAACTTAAAGAAAT | 1069 |
| HC-GRF-8 | GAAACGAAAGTCTTTCGGTTCCTGGGGTAGTATGGTTGCAAAGCTGAAACTTAAAGAAAT | 1080 |
| HC-H992-2 | GAAACGAAAGTCTTTCGGTTCCTGGGGTAGTATGGTTGCAAAGCTGAAACTTAAAGAAAT | 1080 |
| HC-H992-3 | GAAACGAAAGTCTTTCGGTTCCTGGGGTAGTATGGTTGCAAAGCTGAAACTTAAAGAAAT | 1080 |
| L04154-Hp | GAAACGAAAGTCTTTCGGTTCCTGGGGTAGTATGGTTGCAAAGCTGAAACTTAAAGAAAT | 1080 |
| L04152-Hs | GAAACGAAAGTCTTTCGGTTCCTGGGGTAGTATGGTTGCAAAGCTGAAACTTAAAGAAAT | 1080 |
|  |  |  |
| L04153-HC | TGACGGAATGGCACCACCAGGAGTGGAGCCTGCGGCTTAATTTGACTCAACACGGGAAAA | 1140 |
| HC-GRF-6 | TGACGGAATGGCACCACCAGGAGTGGAGCCTGCGGCTTAATTTGACTCAACACGGGAAAA | 1129 |
| HC-GRF-8 | TGACGGAATGGCACCACCAGGAGTGGAGCCTGCGGCTTAATTTGACTCAACACGGGAAAA | 1140 |
| HC-H992-2 | TGACGGAATGGCACCACCAGGAGTGGAGCCTGCGGCTTAATTTGACTCAACACGGGAAAA | 1140 |
| Hc-H992-3 | TGACGGAATGGCACCACCAGGAGTGGAGCCTGCGGCTTAATTTGACTCAACACGGGAAAA | 1140 |
| L04154-Hp | TGACGGAATGGCACCACCAGGAGTGGAGCCTGCGGCTTAATTTGACTCAACACGGGAAAA | 1140 |
| L04152-Hs | TGACGGAATGGCACCACCAGGAGTGGAGCCTGCGGCTTAATTTGACTCAACACGGGAAAA | 1140 |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| L04153-HC | CTCACCCGGCCCGGACACCGTAAG-ATTGACAGATTGAAAGCTCTTTCTCGATTTGGTGG | 1199 |
| HC-GRF-6 | CTCACCCGGCCCGGACACCGTAAGGATTGACAGATTGAAAGCTCTTTCTCGATTTGGTGG | 1189 |
| HC-GRF-8 | CTCACCCGGCCCGGACACCGTAAGGATTGACAGATTGAAAGCTCTTTCTCGATTTGGTGG | 1200 |
| HC-H992-2 | CTCACCCGGCCCGGACACCGTAAGGATTGACAGATTGAAAGCTCTTTCTCGATTTGGTGG | 1200 |
| HC-H992-3 | CTCACCCGGCCCGGACACCGTAAGGATTGACAGATTGAAAGCTCTTTCTCGATTTGGTGG | 1200 |
| L04154-Hp | CTCACCCGGCCCGGACACCGTAAG-ATTGACAGATTGAAAGCTCTTTCTCGATTTGGTGG | 1199 |
| L04152-Hs | CTCACCCGGCCCGGACACCGTAAG-ATTGACAGATTGAAAGCTCTTTCTCGATTTGGTGG | 1199 |
|  |  |  |

Fig. 5. Continued.

| L04153-HC | TTGGTGGTGCATGGCCGTTCTTAGTTGGTGGAGCGATTTGTCTGGTTTATTCCGATAACG | 1259 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HC-GRF-6 | TTGGTGGTGCATGGCCGTTCTTAGTTGGTGGAGCGATTTGTCTGGTTTATTCCGATAACG | 1249 |
| Hc-GRF-8 | TTGGTGGTGCATGGCCGTTCTTAGTTGGTGGAGCGATTTGTCTGGTTTATTCCGATAACG | 1260 |
| Hc-H992-2 | TTGGTGGTGCATGGCCGTTCTTAGTTGGTGGAGCGATTTGTCTGGTTTATTCCGATAACG | 1260 |
| HC-H992-3 | TTGGTGGTGCATGGCCGTTCTTAGTTGGTGGAGCGATTTGTCTGGTTTATTCCGATAACG | 1260 |
| L04154-Hp | TTGGTGGTGCATGGCCGTTCTTAGTTGGTGGAGCGATTTGTCTGGTTTATTCCGATAACG | 1259 |
| L04152-Hs | TTGGTGGTGCATGGCCGTTCTTAGTTGGTGGAGCGATTTGTCTGGTTTATTCCGATAACG | 1259 |
|  | ************************************************************ |  |
| L04153-Hc |  | AGCGAGACTCTAGCCTGCTAAATAGTGGCTGGATTTTTGAGTCCAGTCTACTTCTTAGAG |

Fig. 5. Continued.

```
L04153-HC TATCGAGGCCTTCGGGTCGCGGTATGGCGGGAAACAGTTCAATCGCAATGGCTTGAACCG 1679
HC-GRF-6 TATCGAGGCCTTCGGGTCGCGGTATGGCGGGAAACAGTTCAATCGCAATGGCTTGAACCG 1669
HC-GRF-8
HC-H992-2
HC-H992-3
L04154-Hp
L04152-Hs
L04153-HC
HC-GRF-6
HC-GRF-8
HC-H992-2
HC-H992-3
L04154-Hp
L04152-Hs
TATCGAGGCCTTCGGGTCGCGGTATGGCGGGAAACAGTTCAATCGCAATGGCTTGAACCG 1680
TATCGAGGCCTTCGGGTCGCGGTATGGCGGGAAACAGTTCAATCGCAATGGCTTGAACCG 1680
TATCGAGGCCTTCGGGTCGCGGTGTGGCGGGAAACAGTTCAATCGCAATGGCTTGAACCG 1680
TATCGAGGCCTTCGGGTCGCGGTATGGCGGGAAACAGTTCAATCGCAATGGCTTGAACCG 1679
TATCGAGGCCTTCGGGTCGCGGTATGGCGGGAAACAGTTCAATCGCAATGGCTTGAACCG 1679
    \leftarrow \mp@code { P r i m e r ~ B }
    GGTAAAAGTCGTAACAAGGTATCTGTAGGTGAACCTGCAGATGGATC 1726
GGTAAAAGTCGTAACAAGGTATCTGTAGGTGAACCTGCAGAAGGATC 1716
GGTAAAAGTCGTAACAAGGTATCTGTAGGTGAACCTGCAGAAGGATC 1727
GGTAAAAGTCGTAACAAGGTATCTGTAGGTGAACCTGCAGAAGGATC 1727
GGTAAAAGTCGTAACAAGGTATCTGGAGGTGAACCTGCAGAAGGATC 1727
GGTAAAAGTCGTAACAAGGTATCTGTAGGTGAACCTGCAGATGGATC 1726
GGTAAAAGTCGTAACAAGGTATCTGTAGGTGAACCTGCAGATGGATC 1726
```

Fig. 5. Continued.

### 3.4.2 ITS region

The ITS sequences obtained from isolates for Hc -H992 and Hc -GRF were compared to the sequences available in GenBank for $H$. contortus and $H$. placei ITS regions. There were no GenBank sequences available for $H$. similis to include in the comparisons.

The ITS 1 sequence in GenBank for H. contortus (accession no. AF044927) shows a $99.0 \%$ identity with H. placei (accession no. AF044929) with a total of 3 base substitution differences between the species. The Hc-H992 consensus sequence showed an identity of $97.5 \%$ to the Hc-GRF sequence, $100 \%$ to the $H$. contortus reference sequence and $99.0 \%$ to $H$. placei. In comparison, the Hc-GRF showed a $97.5 \%$ identity to $H$. contortus and a $97.0 \%$ identity to $H$. placei.

The sequences for the Hc-H992 and the Hc-GRF isolates contained a few minor differences (Fig. 6). Single base substitutions occurred in the Hc-H992 isolates as well
as in the Hc-GRF isolates (designated in bold type). There was a single base insertion at position $134(\downarrow)$ in only one of the $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ isolates and at position 270-273 ( $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow)$ there was a four base deletion in two of the Hc-GRF isolates and a single base deletion in one of the Hc-H992 isolates (position 270). All of the Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF sequences matched $H$. contortus in two out of the three nucleotide differences between H. contortus and H. placei. At the third position, two of the Hc-H992 isolates and one of the Hc-GRF isolates matched with $H$. contortus while the other three isolates matched with H. placei. The Hc-H992 and the Hc-GRF are most likely H. contortus based on these results.

```
AF044927-Hc TCGAAACCTAAACACAAGGTTCCTTTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAGCTATGTTTTACGACT 60
6-GRF-ITS1
7-GRF-ITS1
10-GRF-ITS1
9-H992-ITS1
12-H992-ITS1
14-H992-ITS1
AF044929-Hp
AFO44927-HC
6-GRF-ITS1
7-GRF-ITS1
10-GRF-ITS1
9-H992-ITS1
12-H992-ITS1
14-H992-ITS1
AF044929-Hp
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { TCGAAACCTAAACACAAGGTTCCTTTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAGCTATGTTTTACGACT } & 60 \\
\text { TCGAAACCTAAACACAAGGTTCCTTTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAGCTATGTTTTACGACT } & 60 \\
\text { TCGAAACCTAAACACAAGGTTCCTTTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAGCTATGTTTTACGACT } & 60 \\
\text { TCGAAACCTAAACACAAGGTTCCTTTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAGCTATGTTTTACGACT } & 60 \\
\text { TCGAAACCTAAACACAAGGTTCCTTTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAGCTATGTTTTACGACT } & 60 \\
\text { TCGAAACCTAAACACAAGGTTCCATTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAACTATGTTTTACGACT } & 60 \\
\text { TCGAAACCTGAACACAAGGTTCCTTTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAGCTATGTTTTACGACT } & 60 \\
\text { TCGAAACCTAAACACAAGGTTCCTTTGATCACGAGAAACCAACAGCTATGTTTTACGACT } & 60 \\
\star \star \star \star \star \star \star \star * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * & \\
\text { TTGTCGTAAAAGTTGGGAGTATCACCCCCGTTAAAGCTCTATTACATGAGGTGTCTATGT } & 120 \\
\text { TTGTCGTACAAGTTGGGAGTATCACCCCCGTTAAAGCTCTATTACATGAGGTGTCTATGT } & 120 \\
\text { TTGTCGTAAAAGTTGGGAGTATCACCCCCGTTAAAGCTCTATTACATGAGGTGTCTATGT } & 120 \\
\text { TTGTCGTACAAGTTGGGAGTATCACCCCCGTTAAAGCTCTATTACATGAGGTGTCTATGT } & 120 \\
\text { TTGTCGTAAAAGTTGGGAGTATCACCCCCGTTAAAGCTCTATTACATGAGGTGTCTATGT } & 120 \\
\text { TTGTCGTAAAAGTTGGGAGTCTCACCCCCGTTAAAGCTCTATTACATGAGGTGTCTATGT } & 120 \\
\text { TTGTCGTAAAAGTTGGGAGTATCACCCCCGTTAAAGCTCTATTACATGAGGTGTCTATGT } & 120 \\
\text { TTGTCGTAAAAGTTGGGAGTATCACCCCCGTTAAAGCTCTATTACMTGAGGTGTCTATGT } & 120
\end{array}
\] \(\star * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~ * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~\)
```

Fig. 6. The Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF ITS 1 alignment with single base substitutions designated in bold type. The reference sequences are designated by the GenBank accession numbers as follows: AF044927-Hc for H. contortus and AF044929-Hp for H. placei. A single base insertion at position $134(\downarrow)$ occurred in both the Hc - H 992 and Hc -GRF isolates. In two of the Hc-GRF isolates, a four base deletion occurred at position 270-273 and a single base deletion occurred in one of the Hc-H992 isolates at position $270(\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow)$. The Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF isolates matched two out of three substitutions between H. contortus and H. placei $(\boldsymbol{\nabla})$.

|  | $\nabla$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AF044927-HC | ATGACATGAGCCG-TTCGAGAGTGGCGGCTGTGATTGTTCATGCGAAGTTCCTATCATTG | 179 |
| 6-GRF-ITS1 | ATGACATGAGCCG-TTCAAGAGTGGTGGCTGTGATTGTTCATGCGAAGTTCCTATCATTG | 179 |
| 7-GRF-ITS1 | ATGACATGAGCCG-TTCGAGAGTGGCGGCTGTGATTGTTCATGCGAAGTTCCTATCATTG | 179 |
| 10-GRF-ITS1 | ATGACATGAGCCG-TTCAAGAGTGGTGGCTGTGATTGTTCATGCGAAGTTCCTATCATTG | 179 |
| 9-H992-ITS1 | ATGACATGAGCCG-TTCGAGAGTGGCGGCTGTGATTGTTCATGCGAAGTTCCTATCATTG | 179 |
| 12-H992-ITS1 | ATGACACGAGCCGCTTCAAGAGTGGCGGCTGTGATTGTTCATGCGAAGTTCCTATCATTG | 180 |
| 14-H992-ITS1 | ATGACATGAGCCG-TTCGAGAGTGGCGGCTGTGATTGTTCATGCGAAGTTCCTATCATTG | 179 |
| AF044929-Hp | ATGACATGAGCCG-TTCGAGAGTGGCGGCTGTGATTGTTCATGCGAAGTTCCTATCAGTG | 179 |
|  |  |  |
|  | V V |  |
| AF044927-HC | ATGGTTGAGCTTGAGACTTAATAAGTATTGCTATAATACTGCCTCACCGTTTATTAATGG | 239 |
| 6-GRF-ITS1 | ATGGTTGAGCTTGAGACTTAATAAGTATTGCTATAATACTGCCTCGCCGTTTATTAATGG | 239 |
| 7-GRF-ITS1 | ATGGTTGAGCTTGAGACTTAATAAGTATTGCTATAATACTGCCTCACCGTTTATTAATGG | 239 |
| 10-GRF-ITS1 | ATGGTTGAGCTTGAGACTTAATAAGTATTGCTATAATACTGCCTCGCCGTTTATTAATGG | 239 |
| 9-H992-ITS1 | ATGGTTGAGCTTGAGACTTAATAAGTATTGCTATAATACTGCCTCACCGTTTATTAATGG | 239 |
| 12-H992-ITS1 | ATGGTTGAGCTTGAGACTTAATAAGTATTGCTATAATACTGCCTCGCCGTTTATTGATGG | 240 |
| 14-H992-ITS1 | ATGGTTGAGCTTGAGACTTAATAAGTATTGCTATAATACTGCCTCACCGTTTATTAATGG | 239 |
| AF044929-Hp | ATAGTTGAGCTTGAGACTTAATAAGTATTGCTATAATACTGCCTCGCCGTTTATTAATGG | 239 |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$ |  |
| AF044927-HC | TGGTTAAGTACGAACCAAATTACTTCTTGAAGTATGTGGTGTACTGTACCCGATTATATC | 299 |
| 6-GRF-ITS1 | TGGTTAAGTACGAACCAAATTACTTCTTGA----TGTGGTGTACTGTACCCGATTATATC | 295 |
| 7-GRF-ITS1 | TGGTTAAGTACGAACCAAATTACTTCTTGAAGTATGTGGTGTACTGTACCCGATTATATC | 299 |
| 10-GRF-ITS1 | TGGTTAAGTACGAACCAAATTACTTCTTGA----TGTGGTGTACTGTACCCGATTATATC | 295 |
| 9-H992-ITS1 | TGGTTAAGTACGAACCAAATTACTTCTTGAAGTATGTGGTGTACTGTACCCGATTATATC | 299 |
| 12-H992-ITS1 | TGGTTAAGTACGAACCAAATTACTTCTTGA-GTATGTGGTGTACTGTACCCGATTATATC | 299 |
| 14-H992-ITS1 | TGGTTAAGTACGAACCAAATTACTTCTTGAAGTATGTGGTGTACTGTACCCGATTATATC | 299 |
| AF044929-Hp | TGGTTAAGTACGAACCAAATTACTTCTTGAAGTATGTGGTGTACTGTACCCGATTATATC | 299 |
|  | ****************************** |  |
| AF044927-HC | GGGGAACCTTAATGATCACGCGTAGACGCCATTATAAAACACAAACATTCATTTTTACAG | 359 |
| 6-GRF-ITS1 | GGGGAACCTTAATGATCATGCGTAGACGCCATTGTAAAACACAAACATTCATTTTTACAG | 355 |
| 7-GRF-ITS1 | GGGGAACCTTAATGATCACGCGTAGACGCCATTATAAAACACAAACATTCATTTTTACAG | 359 |
| 10-GRF-ITS1 | GGGGAACCTTAATGATCATGCGTAGACGCCATTGTAAAACACAAACATTCATTTTTACAG | 355 |
| 9-H992-ITS1 | GGGGAACCTTAATGATCACGCGTAGACGCCATTATAAAACACAAACATTCATTTTTACAG | 359 |
| 12-H992-ITS1 | GGGGAACCTTAATGATCATGCGTAGACGCCATTATAAAACACAAACATTCATTTTTACAG | 359 |
| 14-H992-ITS1 | GGGGAACCTTAATGATCACGCGTAGACGCCATTATAAAACACAAACATTCATTTTTACAG | 359 |
| AF044929-Hp | GGGGAACCTTAATGATCACGCGTAGACGCCATTATAAAACACAAACATTCATTTTTACAG | 359 |
|  | ****************** ************** |  |
| AFO44927-HC | TTTGCAGAACTTAGTGTTCACATTCATTTGTGTCACAAATATCGA 404 |  |
| 6-GRF-ITS1 | TTTGCAGAACTTAGTGTTCACATTCATTTGTGTCACAAATATCGA 400 |  |
| 7-GRF-ITS1 | TTTGCAGAACTTAGTGTTCACATTCATTTGTGCCACAAATATCGA 404 |  |
| 10-GRF-ITS1 | TTTGCAGAACTTAGTGTTCACATTCATTTGTGTCACAAATATCGA 400 |  |
| 9-H992-ITS1 | TTTGCAGAACTTAGTGTTCACATTCATTTGTGTCACAAATATCGA 404 |  |
| 12-H992-ITS1 | TTTGCAGAACTTAGTGTTCACATTCATTTGTGTCACAAATATCGA 404 |  |
| 14-H992-ITS1 | TTTGCAGAACTTAGTGTTCACATTCATTTGTGTCACAAATATCGA 404 |  |
| AF044929-Hp | TTTGCAGAACTTAGTGTTCACATTCATTTGTGTCACAAATATCGA 404 |  |
|  | * ********** |  |

Fig. 6. Continued.

The ITS 2 sequence in GenBank for H. contortus (accession no. AY647245) showed a $94.9 \%$ and $94.5 \%$ identity with H. placei (accession nos. X78812 and AJ577466 (99.6\% identity)). The consensus sequence for $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ showed an identity of $96.5 \%$ to the Hc-GRF sequence, $97.0 \%$ to $H$. contortus, $97.8 \%$ to $H$. placei (X78812) and $97.4 \%$ to H. placei (AJ577466). The consensus sequence for the Hc-GRF showed an identity of $93.6 \%$ to $H$. contortus, $96.1 \%$ to H. placei (X78812) and $95.7 \%$ to H. placei (AJ577466).

Differences occurred in both the Hc-H992 isolates and the Hc-GRF isolates (Fig. 7). At position $32(\downarrow)$, there is a single base insertion in two of the Hc-GRF isolates and one of the Hc-H992 isolates. There was a six base deletion in the Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF isolates at position 95-100 ( $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow)$ compared to the $H$. contortus reference sequence, which is similar to $H$. placei. At positions 129 and $202(\dagger)$, some of the Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF isolates matched with the H. placei sequence. These positions were variable within H. placei isolates with two bases, T/C and T/A substituted at these positions; therefore the differences were not significant (Stevenson et al., 1995).

Stevenson et al. (1995) demonstrated that the ITS 2 sequence for $H$. contortus differed by only three bases $(\boldsymbol{\nabla})$ from H. placei. The sequences for all of the $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ and Hc-GRF isolates matched the sequence for $H$. contortus at these positions. Therefore, both isolates are most likely $H$. contortus.

```
AY647245-HC 6-GRF-ITS2 7-GRF-ITS2 10-GRF-ITS2 9-H992-ITS2 12-H992-ITS2 14-H992-ITS2 X78812-Hp AJ577466-Hp
```

AY647245-HC 6-GRF-ITS2
7-GRF-ITS2
10-GRF-ITS2
9-H992-ITS2
12-H992-ITS2
14-H992-ITS2
X78812-Hp
AJ577466-Hp

AY647245-HC
6-GRF-ITS2
7-GRF-ITS2
10-GRF-ITS2
9-H992-ITS2
12-H992-ITS2
14-H992-ITS2 X78812-Hp AJ577466-Hp

AY647245-HC
6-GRF-ITS2
7-GRF-ITS2
10-GRF-ITS2
9-H992-ITS2
12-H992-ITS2 14-H992-ITS2 X78812-Hp AJ577466-Hp
-----------AACCATATACTACAATGTGG-CTAATTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 48 ------------AACCATATACTACAATGAGGGC-AATTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 48 ------------AACCATATACTACAATGTGG-CTAATTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 48 ------------AACCATATACTACAATGAGGGC-AATTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 48 ------------AACCATATACTACAATGTGG-CTAATTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 48 ------------AACCATATACTACAATGAGGGCTAATTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 49 ------------AACCATATACTACAATGTGG-CTAATTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 48 ------------AACCATATACTACAATGTGG-CTAGTTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 48 TCAGGGTTGTTAACCATATACTACAATGTGG-CTAGTTTCAACATTGTTTGTCAAATGGC 59 $\star * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ~$
$\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$
ATTTGTCTTTTAGACAATTCCCATTTCAGTTCAAGAACATATACATATACATGCAACGTG 108 ATTTGTCTTTGAGATAATTCCCATTTCAGCTCAAGAACATATACAT------GCAACGTG 102 ATTTGTCTTTTAGACAATTCCCATTTCAGTTCAAGAACATATACAT------GCAACGTG 102 ATTTGTCTTTGAGATAATTCCCATTTCAGCTCAAGAACATATACAT------GCAACGTG 102 ATTTGTCTTTTAGACAATTCCCATTTCAGTTCAAGAACATATACAT------GCAACGTG 102 ATTTGTCTTTAAGACAATTCCCATTTCAGTTCAAGAACATATACAT------GCAACGTG 103 ATTTGTCTTTTAGACAATTCCCATTTCAGTTCAAGAACATATACAT------GCAACGCG 102 ATTTGTCTTTTAGACAATTCCCATTTCAGTTCAAGAACATATACAT------GCAACGTG 102 ATTTGTCTTTTAGACATTTCCCATTTCAGTTCAAGAACATATACAT------GCAACGTG 113
$\dagger$
ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATTCCTGAATGATNTGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 168 ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATCCCTGAATGATATGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 162 ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATTCCTGAATGATATGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 162 ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATCCCTGAATGATATGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 162 ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATTCCTGAATGATATGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 162 ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATCCCTGAATGATATGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 163 ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATTCCTGAATGATATGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 162 ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATCCCTGAATGATATGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 162 ATGTTATGAAATTGTAACATCCCTGAATGATATGAACATGTTGCCACTATTTGAGTGTAC 173 ******************** ********** ****************************

TCAGCGAATATTGAGATTGACTTAGATAGTGACTTGTATGGCGACGATGTTCTTTTATCA 228 TCAGCGAATATTGAGATTGACTTAGATAGTGACATGTATGGCGACGATGTTCTTTTATCA 222 TCAGCGAATATTGAGATTGACTTAGATAGTGACTTGTATGGCGACGATGTTCTTTTATCA 222 TCAGCGAATATTGAGATTGACTTAGATAGTGACATGTATGGCGACGATGTTCTTTTATCA 222 TCAGCGAATATTGAGATTGACTTAGATAGTGACTTGTATGGCGACGATGCTCTTTTATCA 222 TCAGCGAATATAGAGAT-GACCTAGATAGTGACATGTATAGCGACGATGTTCTTTTATCA 222 TCAGCGAATATTGAGATTGACTTAGATAGTGACTTGTATGGCGACGATGTTCTCTTATCA 222 TCAGCGAATATTGAGATTGACTTAGATAGTGACATGTATGGCAACGATGTTCTTTTGTCA 222 TCAGCGAATATTGAGATTGACTTAGATAGTGACATGTATGGCAACGATGTTCTTTTGTCA 233 *********** ***** *** *********** ***** ** ****** *** ** ***

Fig. 7. The Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF ITS 2 alignment with single base substitutions designated in bold type. The reference sequences are designated by the GenBank accession numbers as follows: AY647245-Hc for H. contortus and X78812-Hp and AJ577466-Hp for H. placei. A single base insertion at position $32(\downarrow)$ occurred in one of the Hc - H 992 isolates and two of the Hc-GRF isolates. In all of the Hc-H992 and Hc-GRF isolates, a six base deletion occurred at position 95-100 ( $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow)$ which matches with H. placei. At positions 129 and $202(\dagger)$, the $\mathrm{Hc}-$ H992 and Hc-GRF isolates match with H . placei, however these are areas of variable bases. The $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ and Hc-GRF isolates matched H. contortus at the three bases where H. contortus differs from H. placei ( $\mathbf{\nabla})$ as determined be Stevenson et al., 1995.

| AY647245-HC | TTTGTATAA---------------------------- 237 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6-GRF-ITS2 | TTTGTATAATGCAACCTGAGCTCAGGCGAGGTTACCC 259 |
| 7-GRF-ITS2 | TTTGTATAATGCAACCTGAGCTCAGGCGAGGTTACCC 259 |
| 10-GRF-ITS2 | TTTGTATAATGTAACCTGAGCTCAGGCGAGGTTACCC 259 |
| 9-H992-ITS2 | TTTGTATAATGCAACCTGAGCTCAGGCGAGGTTACCC 259 |
| 12-H992-ITS2 | TTTGTATAATGCAACCTGAGCTCAGGCGAGGTTACCC 259 |
| 14-H992-ITS2 | TTTGTATAATGCAACCTGAGCTCAGGCGAGGTTACCC 259 |
| X78812-Hp | TTTGTATAA---------------------------- 231 |
| AJ577466-Hp | TTTGTATAATGCAACCTGAGCTCAGGCGTGATTACCC 270 |

Fig. 7. Continued.

## 4. DISCUSSION

Seven isolates of $H$. contortus were evaluated for anthelmintic resistance at the outset of this study. The isolates were passaged through experimental sheep and/or goats, the eggs recovered and allowed to develop to larvae for worm identification. The results of the larval identification confirmed the recovery of the Texas strains of H. contortus. These were the expected results since the parasites had been administered to known helminth-free sheep/goats housed in a controlled environment and the feces had been collected directly from the rectum. Only H. contortus was identified in the giraffe sample, although it was anticipated that the giraffe would have a multiple infection based upon the condition of the feces and since the host was not housed in a controlled environment. It was also expected that free-living nematodes would be found in the giraffe fecal sample since the feces were collected from the ground, but none were present in the sample evaluated.

At the onset of this study, it was anticipated that resistant and susceptible strains of $H$. contortus would be acquired for molecular comparison. However, acquiring a completely susceptible strain of $H$. contortus proved to be a challenge in this study due to the extensive use of anthelmintics and the ensuing development of resistance. Of the suspected susceptible strains evaluated, only one, Hc-OG, was determined to be susceptible to all of the anthelmintics. The other strains were susceptible to at least one of the anthelmintics, but were bordering on or were weakly resistant to the others.

As for the resistant strains, the Hc-RFR was believed to be highly resistant to all of the anthelmintics and the $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ was believed to be highly resistant to
benzimidazoles. However, the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay determined both of these strains to be only moderately resistant to the anthelmintics evaluated. Fortunately, the submission of a giraffe fecal sample to the Texas A\&M University Diagnostic Parasitology Laboratory for evaluation provided us with a highly resistant Haemonchus strain for inclusion in this study.

This sample was from a young, male giraffe that had recently been acquired by the Florida zoo from a zoo in New Jersey. Upon arriving in Florida, an initial fecal sample was submitted to the Texas A\&M University diagnostic laboratory. The EPG was 850 and the larvae were identified as $H$. contortus and several free-living nematode species. A DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay was performed and the results were inconclusive, possibly due to residual anthelmintics given prior to sample collection.

The giraffe was then successfully treated with ivermectin in conjunction with fenbendazole by the zoo and eventually introduced into the resident giraffe population. Initially, the giraffe was placed in a pasture with a larger population, but was quickly relocated to a smaller pasture with a feeder group consisting of four giraffes (three castrated males and one intact female). Approximately 2 months later, the giraffe presented with diarrhea and a fecal sample was submitted to Texas A\&M University for evaluation. The EPG at this time was 16,700 ; the larvae were identified as $H$. contortus, and the DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay demonstrated resistance to all of the anthelmintics.

The young giraffe most likely acquired the highly resistant $H$. contortus infection while in the feeder group. Other giraffes that were previously placed in this group have also shown signs of severe infection (two of which died due to a heavy parasitemia).

Unfortunately, due to the resistance to all of the anthelmintics, the options available to treat $H$. contortus infections are limited. However, the zoo was successful in treating the young giraffe with a topical dose of moxidectin in conjunction with fenbendazole, followed 15 d later with a dose of ivermectin and ending with a second dose of topical moxidectin 27 d later. The use of these drugs in combination most likely enabled the clearing of the infection.

Upon reviewing the deworming schedule implemented by the zoo, it is clear how the $H$. contortus developed resistance to all three classes of anthelmintics. For more than 5 years, pyrantel tartrate (levamisole-like in activity) was administered daily in the feed, while ivermectin, fenbendazole and albendazole were rotated on a monthly basis. This allowed for the elimination of the highly susceptible parasites but did not allow enough time for the removal of the more resistant parasites. Therefore, only highly resistant parasites were present to reproduce, which compounded the problem and contributed to even stronger resistance development.

Transcription of Pgp was not detected in any larval worms in this study, whether exposed or not to anthelmintics, and even the smaller Pgp amplicon, which was located at the $3^{\prime}$ end of the gene sequence, was not detected. Unfortunately, the quality of the total RNA was not determined due to small sample volume and may have been a factor in the outcome of this study.

Our results would suggest that Pgp efflux is not involved in anthelmintic resistance in this stage of $H$. contortus. However, its importance in anthelmintic resistance should not be ruled out. P-glycoprotein is encoded for by at least seven
different genes which allows for a considerable amount of variability between the different isoforms. In this study, primers for the amplification of Pgp were designed from a sequence derived from adult $H$. contortus worms, which at the start of the study was the only complete sequence available in GenBank. However, this may not be the sequence of the Pgp isoform transcribed in the larval stage and not every Pgp isoform confers resistance (Sangster et al., 1999).

The mechanism of resistance to all three classes of anthelmintics may be explained by the overexpression of $\operatorname{Pgp}$ due to its ability to bind a wide range of substrates. The binding affinity of Pgp may be important in eliminating toxins from the parasites. However, the primary target of anthelmintics is the adult parasite and there may be stage-related differences in the expression of Pgp (Geary et al., 1999). There are also a number of other possible resistance mechanisms that may be employed by the larvae to combat the effects of anthelmintics.

Currently, there are three species of Haemonchus (H. contortus, H. placei and H. similis) that have been identified in North American ruminants (Lichtenfels et al., 1994). Both H. placei and H. similis are predominately found in cattle, while H. contortus is found in sheep, goats and many other domestic and wild ruminants. There is some controversy over whether these are indeed separate species. Morphologically, these species are slightly different, so molecular analysis has been conducted to determine species specific differences. Stevenson et al., (1995) identified only three single base differences between the ITS 2 region of $H$. contortus and H. placei.

The 18 S rRNA gene sequence from the nematode acquired from the giraffe shared $99.9 \%$ identity with each of three Haemonchus species (GenBank accession nos. L04153, L04154 and L04152). This genus identity was supported by the 5.8S rRNA gene sequence analysis which matched the sequence for H. contortus (GenBank accession no. AY190133-5).

The analysis of the ITS 1 sequence showed that the parasite had a slightly higher identity $(97.5 \%)$ to H. contortus than to H. placei $(97.0 \%)$. There were three base differences identified in ITS 1 sequences previously reported from $H$. contortus (GenBank accession no. AF044927) and H. placei (GenBank accession no. AF044929) in this study. However, all three do not appear to be defining differences. Although all of the sequences for the $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$ and Hc -GRF isolates matched two of these positions with $H$. contortus, the third position was variable with three of the isolates (one $\mathrm{Hc}-$ H992 and $2 \mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{GRF}$ ) matching H. contortus while the other three matched $H$. placei.

The ITS 2 sequence was more similar to $H$. placei ( $96.1 \%$ and $95.7 \%$ ) than to H. contortus ( $93.6 \%$ ). However, based on the 3 base differences between H. contortus and H. placei as described by Stevenson et al. (1995), the species from the giraffe is most likely H. contortus due to a $100 \%$ identity at these positions. Additional isolates should be evaluated to determine if there is truly a lack of variability in bases at these positions.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Haemonchus contortus continues to be a problematic parasite in the sheep and goat industry due to its increased resistance to anthelmintics. As is evidenced by the case of the giraffe, $H$. contortus is also becoming a problem in zoo settings where a number of ruminant species are at risk of acquiring this devastating parasite. Although Pgp transcription was not evident in the larvae in this study, the possible role of Pgp isoforms should not be ruled out in anthelmintic resistance in $H$. contortus.
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APPENDIX A

KEY FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE $3^{\text {RD }}$ STAGE LARVAE OF SOME COMMON GASTRO-INTESTINAL NEMATODES OF SHEEP

1. a. Esophagus rhabditiform $\qquad$ free living nematode
b. Esophagus not rhabditiform

(a)

(b)
2. a. Without sheath, esophagus nearly $1 / 2$ the length of the body, L3 with notched tail $\qquad$ Strongyloides
b. With sheath, esophagus less than $1 / 4$ the length of the body, tapered posterior $\qquad$ 3
(a)

(b)


3 a. Tail of sheath short (less than 50 um ) or medium length (more than 50 um \& less than 100 um )
b. Tail of sheath very long (greater than 100 um ) ..................................................... 7
(a)

short tail < 50 um
medium tail $>50 \mathrm{um}<100 \mathrm{um}$
(b)

long tail $>100 \mathrm{um}$

Fig. A. 1 The $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ larval identification key modified from The Manual of Veterinary Parasitological Laboratory Techniques, 1977.
4. a. Two refractive bodies or a bright transverse band visible between buccal cavity and esophagus $\qquad$ Cooperia
b. Refractive bodies or band absent 5
(4b)

5. a. Sender larva, tail of sheath medium length ( $>50 \mathrm{um}$
$<100 \mathrm{um}$ ), tapering to point, often kinked . $\qquad$ Haemonchus
b. Tail of sheath very short (<50 um), conical .............................................................. 6
(5a)

$\qquad$ 6
6. a. Larva of medium or large size with distinct rounded tail in short sheath $\qquad$ Ostertagia
b. Small larva, tail being indistinctly rounded $\qquad$ Trichostrongylus
(6a)

(6b)


Fig. A. 1 Continued.
7. a. Very large larva, 8 gut cells, tail notched, bilobed or trilobed

Nematodirus
b. Larva of medium size, 32 pentagonal gut cells, lumen of gut wavy $\qquad$ Oesophagostomum
c. Larva medium size 32 square gut cells, lumen of gut straight Chabertia
d. Very small larva with 16 gut cells

Bunostomum


Fig. A. 1 Continued.

APPENDIX B

Table B. 1
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay counts for Hc-ES. ** Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| Hc-ES | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BZ - A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5^{\star *}$ | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 20 | 21 | 13 | 0 | 21 | 27 | 25 | 15 | 17 | 26 | 20 | 30 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 10 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 15 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 19 | 16 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Final egg | 5 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 24 | 20 | 30 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 27 | 21 | 25 | N/A | 76 | 85 | 92 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 73 | 79 | 75 | N/A | 24 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BZ - B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5^{* *}$ | 6** | $7{ }^{* *}$ | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 14 | 26 | 22 | 18 | 24 | 20 | 23 | 27 | 21 | 22 | 29 | 32 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 9 | 16 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 11 | 18 | 14 | 12 | 19 | 16 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Final egg | 3 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 25 | 16 | 20 | 29 | 32 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 0 | 11 | 14 | 25 | 63 | 70 | 83 | 93 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 100 | 89 | 86 | 75 | 37 | 30 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LEV - C | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 23 | 17 | 25 | 15 | 27 | 19 | 18 | 21 | 19 | 16 | 22 | 23 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 5 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 17 | 16 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 14 | 4 | 14 | 7 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Total Larvae | 19 | 10 | 21 | 9 | 16 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 16 | 12 | 18 | 19 |
| Final egg | 4 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 26 | 50 | 29 | 22 | 6 | 27 | 27 | 55 | 44 | 58 | 94 | 84 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 74 | 50 | 71 | 78 | 94 | 73 | 73 | 45 | 56 | 42 | 6 | 16 |
| LEV - D | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 23 | 19 | 15 | 18 | 10 | 25 | 18 | 17 | 21 | 19 | 17 | 20 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 13 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Total Larvae | 15 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 19 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 13 |
| Final egg | 8 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 7 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 13 | 11 | 18 | 67 | 12 | 58 | 58 | 73 | 67 | 60 | 64 | 62 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 87 | 89 | 82 | 33 | 88 | 42 | 42 | 27 | 33 | 40 | 36 | 38 |

Table B. 1 Continued

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Wells |  |  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BZ/LEV - E | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Starting Egg | 19 | 15 | 23 | 25 | 17 | 21 | 24 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 26 | 20 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 4 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 18 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 18 | 10 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 7 | 8 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 11 | 10 | 17 | 20 | 12 | 15 | 18 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 18 | 10 |
| Final egg | 8 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 10 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 36 | 20 | 18 | 50 | 83 | 87 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 64 | 80 | 82 | 50 | 17 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BZ/LEV - F | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 19 | 18 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 20 | 17 | 24 | 24 | 14 | 18 | 18 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 11 | 16 | 15 | 9 | 13 | 10 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 11 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 12 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 16 | 15 | 9 | 13 | 10 |
| Final egg | 7 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 8 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 0 | 11 | 30 | 44 | 67 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 100 | 89 | 70 | 56 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM - G | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 23 | 17 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 20 | 15 | 22 | 26 | 22 | 18 | 25 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 4 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 21 | 19 | 12 | 18 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 13 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 18 | 10 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 21 | 19 | 12 | 18 |
| Final egg | 5 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 7 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 22 | 30 | 64 | 88 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 78 | 70 | 36 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM - H | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 27 | 17 | 15 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 24 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 32 | 20 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 10 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 27 | 13 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 11 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 22 | 10 | 8 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 27 | 13 |
| Final egg | 5 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 7 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 45 | 50 | 50 | 83 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 55 | 50 | 50 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 2
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay averages for Hc-ES. ${ }^{* *}$ Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hc-ES } \\ & \hline \text { BZ AVG } \end{aligned}$ | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5^{* *}$ | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 34 | 47 | 35 | 18 | 45 | 47 | 48 | 42 | 38 | 48 | 49 | 62 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 21 | 25 | 21 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 19 | 26 | 18 | 9 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 26 | 32 | 22 | 12 | 35 | 35 | 27 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Final egg | 8 | 15 | 13 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 21 | 35 | 29 | 44 | 49 | 62 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 15 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 69 | 79 | 88 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 85 | 84 | 82 | 75 | 31 | 21 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 46 | 36 | 40 | 33 | 37 | 44 | 36 | 38 | 40 | 35 | 39 | 43 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 14 | 10 | 14 | 15 | 13 | 24 | 24 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 27 | 12 | 22 | 11 | 20 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 12 | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| Total Larvae | 34 | 19 | 32 | 21 | 24 | 30 | 23 | 22 | 28 | 22 | 29 | 32 |
| Final egg | 12 | 17 | 8 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 11 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 21 | 32 | 25 | 48 | 8 | 47 | 43 | 64 | 54 | 59 | 83 | 75 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 79 | 68 | 75 | 52 | 92 | 53 | 57 | 36 | 46 | 41 | 17 | 25 |
| BZ/LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 38 | 33 | 43 | 39 | 37 | 41 | 41 | 44 | 45 | 36 | 44 | 38 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 4 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 18 | 27 | 29 | 31 | 29 | 23 | 31 | 20 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 18 | 16 | 20 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 23 | 19 | 27 | 29 | 24 | 29 | 29 | 31 | 29 | 23 | 31 | 20 |
| Final egg | 15 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 13 | 13 | 18 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 17 | 16 | 22 | 48 | 75 | 93 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 83 | 84 | 78 | 52 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 50 | 34 | 30 | 40 | 35 | 41 | 39 | 42 | 41 | 42 | 50 | 45 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 14 | 8 | 11 | 22 | 23 | 32 | 28 | 28 | 32 | 33 | 39 | 31 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 24 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 40 | 20 | 19 | 26 | 23 | 32 | 28 | 28 | 32 | 33 | 39 | 31 |
| Final egg | 10 | 14 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 9 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 14 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 35 | 40 | 58 | 85 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 65 | 60 | 42 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 3
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay counts for Hc-EG. ** Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| Hc-EG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BZ - A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 34 | 32 | 32 | 44 | 30 | 26 | 42 | 35 | 36 | 41 | 35 | 47 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 1 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 12 | 20 | 14 | 14 | 8 | 11 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 29 | 26 | 19 | 25 | 16 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 31 | 30 | 25 | 34 | 22 | 23 | 34 | 23 | 21 | 18 | 14 | 3 |
| Final egg | 3 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 23 | 21 | 44 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 3 | 10 | 20 | 24 | 37 | 58 | 67 | 74 | 81 | 76 | 91 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 97 | 90 | 80 | 76 | 63 | 42 | 33 | 26 | 19 | 24 | 9 | 0 |
| BZ - B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5^{\star *}$ | 6** | 7** | $8^{\star *}$ | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 28 | 22 | 39 | 34 | 21 | 37 | 42 | 36 | 38 | 42 | 24 | 32 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 5 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 2 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 14 | 12 | 23 | 16 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 21 | 14 | 33 | 22 | 20 | 32 | 36 | 28 | 19 | 23 | 5 | 1 |
| Final egg | 7 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 31 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 24 | 14 | 24 | 27 | 29 | 57 | 52 | 64 | 82 | 76 | 88 | 97 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 76 | 86 | 76 | 73 | 71 | 43 | 48 | 36 | 18 | 24 | 12 | 3 |
| LEV - C | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 31 | 37 | 36 | 27 | 30 | 26 | 49 | 34 | 43 | 32 | 52 | 35 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 20 | 18 | 35 | 28 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 20 | 32 | 24 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 28 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 4 |
| Total Larvae | 25 | 33 | 28 | 21 | 23 | 22 | 40 | 25 | 32 | 27 | 45 | 34 |
| Final egg | 6 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 1 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 16 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 17 | 14 | 20 | 48 | 63 | 67 | 78 | 82 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 84 | 97 | 89 | 90 | 83 | 86 | 80 | 52 | 73 | 33 | 22 | 18 |
| LEV - D | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 18 | 31 | 24 | 47 | 43 | 34 | 37 | 34 | 46 | 38 | 42 | 31 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 28 | 24 | 23 | 22 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 13 | 26 | 15 | 31 | 32 | 27 | 23 | 16 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| Total Larvae | 14 | 27 | 20 | 34 | 34 | 29 | 32 | 29 | 35 | 31 | 29 | 25 |
| Final egg | 4 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 13 | 6 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 0 | 25 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 22 | 38 | 80 | 77 | 79 | 88 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 93 | 100 | 75 | 94 | 94 | 93 | 78 | 62 | 20 | 23 | 21 | 12 |

Table B. 3 Continued


Table B. 4
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay averages for Hc-EG. ${ }^{* *}$ Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| Hc-EG <br> BZ AVG | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 62 | 54 | 71 | 78 | 51 | 63 | 84 | 71 | 74 | 83 | 59 | 79 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 6 | 5 | 13 | 14 | 8 | 28 | 36 | 29 | 26 | 21 | 13 | 3 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 43 | 38 | 42 | 41 | 30 | 22 | 24 | 13 | 9 | 14 | 3 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 52 | 44 | 58 | 56 | 42 | 55 | 70 | 51 | 40 | 41 | 19 | 4 |
| Final egg | 10 | 10 | 13 | 22 | 9 | 8 | 14 | 20 | 34 | 42 | 40 | 75 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 12 | 11 | 22 | 25 | 33 | 57 | 60 | 69 | 81 | 76 | 90 | 99 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 88 | 89 | 78 | 75 | 67 | 43 | 40 | 31 | 19 | 24 | 10 | 1 |
| LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 49 | 68 | 60 | 74 | 73 | 60 | 86 | 68 | 89 | 70 | 94 | 66 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 23 | 48 | 42 | 58 | 50 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 33 | 58 | 39 | 50 | 49 | 44 | 51 | 28 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 7 |
| Total Larvae | 39 | 60 | 48 | 55 | 57 | 51 | 72 | 54 | 67 | 58 | 74 | 59 |
| Final egg | 10 | 8 | 12 | 19 | 16 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 22 | 12 | 20 | 7 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 13 | 2 | 17 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 21 | 43 | 72 | 72 | 78 | 85 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 87 | 98 | 83 | 93 | 89 | 90 | 79 | 57 | 28 | 28 | 22 | 15 |
| BZ/LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 67 | 59 | 76 | 62 | 74 | 69 | 76 | 133 | 90 | 78 | 86 | 77 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 3 | 2 | 13 | 20 | 33 | 38 | 57 | 119 | 70 | 59 | 63 | 57 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 42 | 47 | 56 | 32 | 22 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 45 | 51 | 70 | 54 | 60 | 49 | 65 | 121 | 70 | 59 | 63 | 57 |
| Final egg | 22 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 20 | 11 | 12 | 20 | 19 | 23 | 20 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 4 | 19 | 37 | 55 | 78 | 88 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| $\% L_{3}$ | 93 | 96 | 81 | 63 | 45 | 22 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 59 | 68 | 78 | 65 | 69 | 85 | 77 | 147 | 78 | 63 | 69 | 76 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 4 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 27 | 36 | 50 | 97 | 62 | 53 | 53 | 61 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 40 | 42 | 44 | 36 | 27 | 28 | 11 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 47 | 52 | 60 | 47 | 55 | 65 | 61 | 118 | 66 | 54 | 54 | 61 |
| Final egg | 12 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 20 | 16 | 29 | 12 | 9 | 15 | 15 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 9 | 19 | 25 | 23 | 49 | 55 | 82 | 82 | 94 | 98 | 98 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 91 | 81 | 75 | 77 | 51 | 45 | 18 | 18 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

Table B. 5
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay counts for Hc-OS. ** Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{OS} \\ & \mathrm{BZ}-\mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | $6^{* *}$ | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 45 | 20 | 29 | 25 | 26 | 20 | 30 | 25 | 65 | 27 | 36 | 18 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 14 | 18 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 30 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 34 | 18 | 19 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 22 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Final egg | 11 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 55 | 23 | 34 | 16 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 9 | 6 | 16 | 27 | 62 | 75 | 87 | 96 | 100 | 100 | 97 | 94 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 91 | 94 | 84 | 73 | 38 | 25 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| BZ - B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | $6^{* *}$ | 7** | 8** | $9^{* *}$ | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 30 | 29 | 32 | 33 | 42 | 46 | 36 | 37 | 48 | 44 | 32 | 45 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 23 | 25 | 21 | 14 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 20 | 18 | 24 | 16 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 25 | 21 | 27 | 22 | 39 | 34 | 24 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Final egg | 5 | 8 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 21 | 37 | 40 | 31 | 40 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 16 | 10 | 11 | 18 | 62 | 80 | 92 | 95 | 96 | 98 | 100 | 96 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 84 | 90 | 89 | 82 | 38 | 20 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| LEV - C | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 54 | 34 | 39 | 26 | 88 | 37 | 48 | 41 | 38 | 39 | 37 | 41 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 29 | 16 | 27 | 29 | 37 | 27 | 28 | 32 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 31 | 21 | 17 | 16 | 36 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total Larvae | 37 | 27 | 25 | 23 | 70 | 24 | 37 | 35 | 37 | 31 | 31 | 33 |
| Final egg | 17 | 7 | 14 | 3 | 18 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 8 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 16 | 22 | 32 | 26 | 41 | 67 | 73 | 83 | 100 | 87 | 90 | 97 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 84 | 78 | 68 | 74 | 59 | 33 | 27 | 17 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 3 |
| LEV - D | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 34 | 31 | 36 | 24 | 37 | 46 | 54 | 31 | 26 | 34 | 36 | 49 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 26 | 33 | 20 | 24 | 32 | 27 | 37 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 23 | 22 | 28 | 19 | 22 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total Larvae | 25 | 25 | 32 | 23 | 35 | 34 | 38 | 23 | 24 | 32 | 28 | 39 |
| Final egg | 9 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 16 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 8 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 34 | 76 | 87 | 87 | 100 | 100 | 96 | 95 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 92 | 92 | 91 | 87 | 66 | 24 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |

Table B. 5 Continued


Table B. 6
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay averages for Hc-OS. ${ }^{* *}$ Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{OS}$ <br> BZ AVG | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 75 | 49 | 61 | 58 | 68 | 66 | 66 | 62 | 113 | 71 | 68 | 63 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 34 | 39 | 39 | 19 | 19 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 50 | 33 | 39 | 32 | 22 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 59 | 39 | 46 | 44 | 60 | 53 | 46 | 22 | 21 | 8 | 3 | 7 |
| Final egg | 16 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 8 | 13 | 20 | 40 | 92 | 63 | 65 | 56 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 12 | 8 | 13 | 23 | 62 | 79 | 89 | 95 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 95 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 88 | 92 | 87 | 77 | 38 | 21 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 88 | 65 | 75 | 50 | 125 | 83 | 102 | 72 | 64 | 73 | 73 | 90 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 8 | 8 | 11 | 9 | 41 | 42 | 60 | 49 | 61 | 59 | 55 | 69 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 54 | 43 | 45 | 35 | 58 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Total Larvae | 62 | 52 | 57 | 46 | 105 | 58 | 75 | 58 | 61 | 63 | 59 | 72 |
| Final egg | 26 | 13 | 18 | 4 | 20 | 25 | 27 | 14 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 18 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 13 | 15 | 19 | 20 | 39 | 72 | 80 | 84 | 100 | 94 | 93 | 96 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 87 | 85 | 81 | 80 | 61 | 28 | 20 | 16 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 4 |
| BZ/LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 96 | 123 | 83 | 97 | 82 | 84 | 84 | 86 | 102 | 102 | 107 | 84 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 11 | 9 | 7 | 27 | 54 | 68 | 80 | 82 | 89 | 81 | 104 | 74 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 63 | 79 | 57 | 43 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 74 | 90 | 65 | 73 | 72 | 73 | 80 | 82 | 89 | 81 | 104 | 74 |
| Final egg | 22 | 33 | 18 | 24 | 10 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 21 | 3 | 10 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 15 | 10 | 11 | 37 | 75 | 93 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 85 | 90 | 89 | 63 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 89 | 98 | 148 | 65 | 151 | 126 | 88 | 75 | 121 | 116 | 104 | 110 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 9 | 12 | 60 | 42 | 109 | 95 | 81 | 66 | 110 | 97 | 101 | 92 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 46 | 56 | 47 | 17 | 17 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 55 | 70 | 111 | 60 | 126 | 103 | 83 | 68 | 111 | 97 | 101 | 92 |
| Final egg | 34 | 28 | 37 | 5 | 25 | 23 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 19 | 3 | 18 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 16 | 17 | 54 | 70 | 87 | 92 | 98 | 97 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 84 | 83 | 46 | 30 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 7
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay counts for Hc-OG. ** Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{OG} \\ & \mathrm{BZ}-\mathrm{A} \end{aligned}$ | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5^{\star *}$ | $6^{* *}$ | 7** | $8^{* *}$ | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 59 | 44 | 32 | 37 | 41 | 46 | 37 | 51 | 41 | 46 | 43 | 32 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 7 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 13 | 14 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 20 | 21 | 17 | 16 | 10 | 21 | 16 | 22 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Final egg | 39 | 23 | 15 | 21 | 31 | 25 | 21 | 29 | 23 | 41 | 41 | 31 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 35 | 33 | 12 | 25 | 80 | 80 | 89 | 78 | 80 | 96 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 65 | 67 | 88 | 75 | 20 | 20 | 11 | 22 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| BZ - B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | $6^{* *}$ | 7** | 8** | $9^{* *}$ | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 62 | 59 | 45 | 36 | 45 | 49 | 55 | 48 | 50 | 64 | 48 | 38 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 12 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 14 | 22 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 2 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 21 | 23 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 33 | 30 | 21 | 15 | 21 | 29 | 26 | 27 | 19 | 19 | 5 | 2 |
| Final egg | 29 | 29 | 24 | 21 | 24 | 20 | 29 | 21 | 31 | 45 | 43 | 36 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 36 | 13 | 38 | 33 | 69 | 71 | 78 | 90 | 88 | 97 | 96 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 64 | 87 | 62 | 67 | 31 | 29 | 22 | 10 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| LEV - C | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 57 | 66 | 67 | 23 | 32 | 53 | 77 | 49 | 42 | 61 | 59 | 45 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 6 | 7 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 21 | 34 | 23 | 14 | 28 | 31 | 20 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 16 | 22 | 27 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total Larvae | 22 | 29 | 30 | 21 | 18 | 26 | 38 | 28 | 18 | 30 | 32 | 22 |
| Final egg | 35 | 37 | 37 | 2 | 14 | 27 | 39 | 21 | 24 | 31 | 27 | 23 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 27 | 24 | 10 | 67 | 61 | 81 | 89 | 82 | 78 | 93 | 97 | 91 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 73 | 76 | 90 | 33 | 39 | 19 | 11 | 18 | 22 | 7 | 3 | 9 |
| LEV - D | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 69 | 40 | 49 | 44 | 55 | 63 | 48 | 53 | 41 | 63 | 52 | 49 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 20 | 24 | 22 | 19 | 19 | 27 | 15 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 9 | 9 | 14 | 16 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 16 | 17 | 21 | 24 | 24 | 29 | 27 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 28 | 16 |
| Final egg | 53 | 23 | 28 | 20 | 31 | 34 | 21 | 30 | 19 | 41 | 24 | 33 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 31 | 35 | 33 | 33 | 42 | 69 | 89 | 96 | 86 | 86 | 96 | 94 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 69 | 65 | 67 | 67 | 58 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 14 | 14 | 4 | 6 |

Table B. 7 Continued

| Hc-OG | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BZ/LEV - E | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 65 | 61 | 47 | 60 | 55 | 59 | 50 | 63 | 49 | 57 | 46 | 51 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 23 | 29 | 21 | 26 | 26 | 21 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 28 | 24 | 11 | 18 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 38 | 31 | 21 | 27 | 23 | 30 | 23 | 29 | 21 | 26 | 26 | 21 |
| Final egg | 27 | 30 | 26 | 33 | 32 | 29 | 27 | 34 | 28 | 31 | 20 | 30 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 21 | 23 | 38 | 26 | 43 | 90 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 79 | 77 | 62 | 74 | 57 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BZ/LEV - F | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 61 | 75 | 60 | 57 | 64 | 52 | 45 | 53 | 53 | 44 | 57 | 53 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 6 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 20 | 19 | 26 | 26 | 15 | 11 | 23 | 28 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 29 | 18 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 36 | 24 | 27 | 26 | 35 | 22 | 26 | 26 | 15 | 11 | 23 | 28 |
| Final egg | 25 | 51 | 33 | 31 | 29 | 30 | 19 | 27 | 38 | 33 | 34 | 25 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 17 | 25 | 33 | 38 | 57 | 86 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 83 | 75 | 67 | 62 | 43 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM - G | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 54 | 70 | 57 | 50 | 51 | 62 | 57 | 54 | 45 | 58 | 49 | 52 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 2 | 12 | 13 | 22 | 25 | 31 | 31 | 32 | 24 | 28 | 27 | 28 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 18 | 21 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 20 | 33 | 26 | 32 | 27 | 34 | 32 | 32 | 24 | 28 | 27 | 28 |
| Final egg | 34 | 37 | 31 | 18 | 24 | 28 | 25 | 22 | 21 | 30 | 22 | 24 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 10 | 36 | 50 | 69 | 93 | 91 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 90 | 64 | 50 | 31 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM - H | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 42 | 49 | 60 | 53 | 34 | 61 | 50 | 44 | 48 | 42 | 72 | 72 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 6 | 11 | 10 | 22 | 17 | 34 | 24 | 13 | 17 | 14 | 31 | 31 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $L_{3}$ Alive | 12 | 15 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 18 | 28 | 34 | 27 | 21 | 34 | 25 | 13 | 18 | 14 | 31 | 31 |
| Final egg | 24 | 21 | 26 | 26 | 13 | 27 | 25 | 31 | 30 | 28 | 41 | 41 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 33 | 39 | 29 | 81 | 81 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 94 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 67 | 61 | 71 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 8
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay averages for Hc-OG. ** Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hc-OG } \\ & \hline \text { BZ AVG } \end{aligned}$ | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5^{* *}$ | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 121 | 103 | 77 | 73 | 86 | 95 | 92 | 99 | 91 | 110 | 91 | 70 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 19 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 27 | 26 | 33 | 23 | 20 | 5 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 34 | 37 | 28 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 53 | 51 | 38 | 31 | 31 | 50 | 42 | 49 | 37 | 24 | 7 | 3 |
| Final egg | 68 | 52 | 39 | 42 | 55 | 45 | 50 | 50 | 54 | 86 | 84 | 67 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 36 | 22 | 26 | 29 | 74 | 76 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 96 | 98 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 64 | 78 | 74 | 71 | 26 | 24 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 126 | 106 | 116 | 67 | 87 | 116 | 125 | 102 | 83 | 124 | 111 | 94 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 11 | 13 | 10 | 22 | 21 | 41 | 58 | 45 | 33 | 47 | 58 | 35 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 25 | 31 | 41 | 23 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total Larvae | 38 | 46 | 51 | 45 | 42 | 55 | 65 | 51 | 40 | 52 | 60 | 38 |
| Final egg | 88 | 60 | 65 | 22 | 45 | 61 | 60 | 51 | 43 | 72 | 51 | 56 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 29 | 28 | 20 | 49 | 50 | 75 | 89 | 88 | 83 | 90 | 97 | 92 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 71 | 72 | 80 | 51 | 50 | 25 | 11 | 12 | 17 | 10 | 3 | 8 |
| BZ/LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 126 | 136 | 107 | 117 | 119 | 111 | 95 | 116 | 102 | 101 | 103 | 104 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 14 | 13 | 17 | 17 | 30 | 46 | 49 | 55 | 36 | 37 | 49 | 49 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 57 | 42 | 27 | 32 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 74 | 55 | 48 | 53 | 58 | 52 | 49 | 55 | 36 | 37 | 49 | 49 |
| Final egg | 52 | 81 | 59 | 64 | 61 | 59 | 46 | 61 | 66 | 64 | 54 | 55 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 19 | 24 | 35 | 32 | 52 | 88 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 81 | 76 | 65 | 68 | 48 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 96 | 119 | 117 | 103 | 85 | 123 | 107 | 98 | 93 | 100 | 121 | 124 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 8 | 23 | 23 | 44 | 42 | 65 | 55 | 45 | 41 | 42 | 58 | 59 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $L_{3}$ Alive | 30 | 36 | 35 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 38 | 61 | 60 | 59 | 48 | 68 | 57 | 45 | 42 | 42 | 58 | 59 |
| Final egg | 58 | 58 | 57 | 44 | 37 | 55 | 50 | 53 | 51 | 58 | 63 | 65 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 21 | 38 | 38 | 75 | 88 | 96 | 96 | 100 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 79 | 62 | 62 | 25 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 9
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay counts for Hc-RFR. ${ }^{* *}$ Final egg count included in $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$.

| Hc-RFR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BZ - A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 54 | 36 | 33 | 50 | 53 | 47 | 35 | 53 | 47 | 44 | 37 | 34 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 9 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 5 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 21 | 19 | 21 | 29 | 27 | 30 | 13 | 26 | 28 | 12 | 8 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 32 | 23 | 23 | 34 | 35 | 32 | 17 | 34 | 31 | 23 | 17 | 7 |
| Final egg | 22 | 13 | 10 | 16 | 18 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 16 | 21 | 20 | 27 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 28 | 13 | 9 | 15 | 45 | 36 | 60 | 47 | 38 | 70 | 73 | 94 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 72 | 87 | 91 | 85 | 55 | 64 | 40 | 53 | 62 | 30 | 27 | 6 |
| BZ - B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | $7{ }^{* *}$ | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 61 | 42 | 47 | 42 | 40 | 46 | 56 | 68 | 58 | 47 | 56 | 43 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 15 | 17 | 8 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 25 | 24 | 29 | 24 | 19 | 22 | 29 | 27 | 28 | 18 | 9 | 2 |
| Total Larvae | 37 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 24 | 25 | 35 | 38 | 32 | 35 | 28 | 11 |
| Final egg | 24 | 13 | 18 | 14 | 16 | 21 | 21 | 30 | 26 | 12 | 28 | 32 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 16 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 50 | 50 | 43 | 54 | 52 | 57 | 80 | 93 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 84 | 90 | 100 | 96 | 50 | 50 | 57 | 46 | 48 | 43 | 20 | 7 |
| LEV - C | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 45 | 49 | 38 | 56 | 54 | 44 | 37 | 42 | 51 | 47 | 45 | 43 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 3 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 22 | 16 | 17 | 29 | 29 | 40 | 28 | 31 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 27 | 29 | 26 | 23 | 17 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total Larvae | 30 | 30 | 29 | 36 | 41 | 22 | 21 | 33 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 32 |
| Final egg | 15 | 19 | 9 | 20 | 13 | 22 | 16 | 9 | 21 | 7 | 15 | 11 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 10 | 3 | 7 | 33 | 54 | 73 | 81 | 88 | 97 | 100 | 93 | 97 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 90 | 97 | 93 | 67 | 46 | 27 | 19 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 3 |
| LEV - D | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 53 | 35 | 42 | 45 | 43 | 44 | 44 | 37 | 42 | 46 | 41 | 37 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 4 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 19 | 27 | 28 | 21 | 31 | 22 | 29 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 29 | 21 | 28 | 23 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 34 | 23 | 31 | 32 | 31 | 21 | 29 | 31 | 22 | 31 | 22 | 29 |
| Final egg | 19 | 12 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 23 | 15 | 6 | 20 | 15 | 19 | 8 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 12 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 35 | 90 | 93 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 88 | 100 | 94 | 75 | 65 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 9 Continued


Table B. 10
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay averages for Hc-RFR. ** Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| Hc-RFR <br> BZ AVG | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 115 | 78 | 80 | 92 | 93 | 93 | 91 | 121 | 105 | 91 | 93 | 77 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 15 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 25 | 24 | 13 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 8 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 46 | 43 | 50 | 53 | 46 | 52 | 42 | 53 | 56 | 30 | 17 | 2 |
| Total Larvae | 69 | 52 | 52 | 62 | 59 | 57 | 52 | 72 | 63 | 58 | 45 | 18 |
| Final egg | 46 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 34 | 36 | 39 | 49 | 42 | 33 | 48 | 59 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 22 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 47 | 43 | 49 | 51 | 46 | 64 | 77 | 94 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 78 | 88 | 96 | 90 | 53 | 57 | 51 | 49 | 54 | 36 | 23 | 6 |
| LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 98 | 84 | 80 | 101 | 97 | 88 | 81 | 79 | 93 | 93 | 86 | 80 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 33 | 35 | 44 | 57 | 50 | 71 | 50 | 60 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 56 | 50 | 54 | 46 | 33 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total Larvae | 64 | 53 | 60 | 68 | 72 | 43 | 50 | 64 | 52 | 71 | 52 | 61 |
| Final egg | 34 | 31 | 20 | 33 | 25 | 45 | 31 | 15 | 41 | 22 | 34 | 19 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 11 | 2 | 7 | 29 | 46 | 81 | 88 | 89 | 96 | 100 | 96 | 98 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 89 | 98 | 93 | 71 | 54 | 19 | 12 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| BZ/LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 115 | 101 | 101 | 99 | 82 | 95 | 87 | 78 | 111 | 94 | 81 | 84 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 10 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 30 | 59 | 45 | 77 | 48 | 52 | 53 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 65 | 61 | 62 | 50 | 39 | 19 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 77 | 76 | 73 | 61 | 52 | 52 | 66 | 53 | 77 | 48 | 52 | 53 |
| Final egg | 38 | 25 | 28 | 38 | 30 | 43 | 21 | 25 | 34 | 46 | 29 | 31 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 13 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 21 | 58 | 89 | 85 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 87 | 86 | 88 | 89 | 79 | 42 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 137 | 122 | 99 | 77 | 98 | 106 | 109 | 74 | 133 | 101 | 125 | 105 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 6 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 19 | 57 | 42 | 68 | 58 | 67 | 60 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 76 | 69 | 63 | 43 | 47 | 36 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 85 | 86 | 74 | 53 | 61 | 56 | 67 | 51 | 70 | 60 | 67 | 60 |
| Final egg | 52 | 36 | 25 | 24 | 37 | 50 | 42 | 23 | 63 | 41 | 58 | 45 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 19 | 14 | 19 | 21 | 34 | 85 | 82 | 97 | 97 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 93 | 81 | 86 | 81 | 79 | 66 | 15 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 11
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay counts for $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$. ** Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { HC-H992 } \\ \text { BZ - A } \end{gathered}$ | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 58 | 55 | 49 | 66 | 69 | 65 | 80 | 75 | 77 | 57 | 75 | 79 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 6 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 16 | 26 | 44 | 10 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 36 | 29 | 39 | 37 | 42 | 34 | 38 | 41 | 25 | 7 | 8 | 2 |
| Total Larvae | 43 | 33 | 43 | 45 | 54 | 43 | 52 | 55 | 44 | 37 | 53 | 13 |
| Final egg | 15 | 22 | 6 | 21 | 15 | 22 | 28 | 20 | 33 | 20 | 22 | 66 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 14 | 9 | 5 | 18 | 36 | 46 | 50 | 41 | 64 | 81 | 88 | 96 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 86 | 91 | 95 | 82 | 64 | 54 | 50 | 59 | 36 | 19 | 12 | 4 |
| BZ - B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | $7{ }^{* *}$ | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 59 | 52 | 65 | 58 | 83 | 67 | 85 | 83 | 76 | 75 | 58 | 59 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 1 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 20 | 21 | 19 | 26 | 21 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 37 | 32 | 43 | 35 | 64 | 44 | 47 | 36 | 32 | 24 | 4 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 38 | 36 | 50 | 44 | 74 | 54 | 62 | 58 | 57 | 49 | 31 | 23 |
| Final egg | 21 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 23 | 25 | 19 | 26 | 27 | 36 |
| $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 3 | 8 | 8 | 18 | 20 | 28 | 42 | 54 | 53 | 60 | 91 | 97 |
| $\% L_{3}$ | 97 | 92 | 92 | 82 | 80 | 72 | 58 | 46 | 47 | 40 | 9 | 3 |
| LEV - C | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 58 | 73 | 49 | 43 | 42 | 51 | 62 | 57 | 61 | 48 | 57 | 46 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 2 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 20 | 29 | 36 | 39 | 44 | 39 | 40 | 41 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 37 | 53 | 38 | 26 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total Larvae | 40 | 61 | 41 | 34 | 31 | 33 | 38 | 42 | 44 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
| Final egg | 18 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 18 | 24 | 15 | 17 | 8 | 16 | 4 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 5 | 13 | 5 | 21 | 65 | 88 | 95 | 93 | 100 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 95 | 87 | 95 | 79 | 35 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| LEV - D | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 56 | 49 | 42 | 43 | 50 | 47 | 36 | 53 | 55 | 46 | 50 | 47 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 2 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 23 | 23 | 34 | 38 | 36 | 38 | 42 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $L_{3}$ Alive | 39 | 31 | 31 | 27 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 42 | 38 | 40 | 32 | 23 | 30 | 28 | 38 | 39 | 37 | 38 | 42 |
| Final egg | 14 | 11 | 2 | 11 | 27 | 17 | 8 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 12 | 5 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 5 | 16 | 20 | 16 | 52 | 77 | 82 | 89 | 97 | 97 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 95 | 84 | 80 | 84 | 48 | 23 | 18 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 11 Continued

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992 \\ & \hline \mathrm{BZ} / \mathrm{LEV}-\mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 50 | 61 | 55 | 52 | 67 | 55 | 53 | 64 | 66 | 59 | 60 | 44 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 16 | 27 | 39 | 49 | 49 | 39 | 45 | 30 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 35 | 45 | 35 | 38 | 33 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 39 | 49 | 40 | 44 | 51 | 35 | 40 | 49 | 49 | 39 | 45 | 30 |
| Final egg | 11 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 16 | 20 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 15 | 14 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 10 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 31 | 77 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 90 | 92 | 90 | 89 | 69 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BZ/LEV - F | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 48 | 60 | 61 | 70 | 66 | 39 | 54 | 44 | 49 | 56 | 58 | 60 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 9 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 25 | 39 | 35 | 38 | 37 | 46 | 45 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 30 | 28 | 43 | 50 | 31 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 40 | 31 | 47 | 58 | 48 | 32 | 39 | 36 | 38 | 37 | 46 | 45 |
| Final egg | 8 | 29 | 14 | 12 | 18 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 19 | 12 | 15 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 23 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 29 | 78 | 100 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| $\% \mathrm{~L}_{3}$ | 77 | 90 | 91 | 90 | 71 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM - G | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 61 | 58 | 54 | 52 | 77 | 55 | 62 | 51 | 49 | 57 | 70 | 42 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 7 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 15 | 10 | 33 | 31 | 32 | 45 | 55 | 28 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 40 | 45 | 38 | 33 | 44 | 27 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 48 | 47 | 43 | 36 | 59 | 37 | 44 | 36 | 37 | 45 | 55 | 28 |
| Final egg | 13 | 11 | 11 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 14 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 15 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 25 | 27 | 75 | 86 | 86 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 85 | 98 | 91 | 92 | 75 | 73 | 25 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM - H | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 47 | 50 | 67 | 50 | 60 | 68 | 67 | 63 | 55 | 80 | 60 | 40 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 2 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 14 | 15 | 33 | 48 | 38 | 62 | 47 | 29 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 32 | 36 | 43 | 38 | 41 | 37 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 35 | 41 | 52 | 42 | 55 | 53 | 43 | 51 | 39 | 63 | 47 | 29 |
| Final egg | 12 | 9 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 24 | 12 | 16 | 17 | 13 | 11 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 6 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 25 | 28 | 77 | 94 | 97 | 98 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 94 | 90 | 85 | 93 | 75 | 72 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 12
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay averages for $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{H} 992$. ${ }^{* *}$ Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| Hc-H992 |  |  |  |  |  | Wells |  |  | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BZ AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** |  |  |  |  |
| Starting Egg | 117 | 107 | 114 | 124 | 152 | 132 | 165 | 158 | 153 | 132 | 133 | 138 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 6 | 6 | 16 | 18 | 14 | 25 | 31 | 37 | 45 | 70 | 31 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 73 | 61 | 82 | 72 | 106 | 78 | 85 | 77 | 57 | 31 | 12 | 2 |
| Total Larvae | 81 | 69 | 93 | 89 | 128 | 97 | 114 | 113 | 101 | 86 | 84 | 36 |
| Final egg | 36 | 38 | 21 | 35 | 24 | 35 | 51 | 45 | 52 | 46 | 49 | 102 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 9 | 9 | 6 | 18 | 28 | 37 | 46 | 48 | 58 | 69 | 89 | 96 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 91 | 91 | 94 | 82 | 72 | 63 | 54 | 52 | 42 | 31 | 11 | 4 |
| LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 114 | 122 | 91 | 86 | 92 | 98 | 98 | 110 | 116 | 94 | 107 | 93 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 4 | 14 | 10 | 12 | 32 | 52 | 59 | 73 | 82 | 75 | 78 | 83 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 76 | 84 | 69 | 53 | 19 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Total Larvae | 82 | 99 | 81 | 66 | 54 | 63 | 66 | 80 | 83 | 77 | 79 | 84 |
| Final egg | 32 | 23 | 10 | 20 | 38 | 35 | 32 | 30 | 33 | 17 | 28 | 9 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 5 | 14 | 12 | 18 | 59 | 83 | 89 | 91 | 99 | 97 | 99 | 99 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 95 | 86 | 88 | 82 | 41 | 17 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| BZ/LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 98 | 121 | 116 | 122 | 133 | 94 | 107 | 108 | 115 | 115 | 118 | 104 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 13 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 30 | 52 | 78 | 84 | 87 | 76 | 91 | 75 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 65 | 73 | 78 | 88 | 64 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 79 | 80 | 87 | 102 | 99 | 67 | 79 | 85 | 87 | 76 | 91 | 75 |
| Final egg | 19 | 41 | 29 | 20 | 34 | 27 | 28 | 23 | 28 | 39 | 27 | 29 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 16 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 30 | 78 | 99 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 84 | 91 | 91 | 89 | 70 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 108 | 108 | 121 | 102 | 137 | 123 | 129 | 114 | 104 | 137 | 130 | 82 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 9 | 5 | 12 | 6 | 29 | 25 | 66 | 79 | 70 | 107 | 102 | 57 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $L_{3}$ Alive | 72 | 81 | 81 | 71 | 85 | 64 | 21 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 83 | 88 | 95 | 78 | 114 | 90 | 87 | 87 | 76 | 108 | 102 | 57 |
| Final egg | 25 | 20 | 26 | 24 | 23 | 33 | 42 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 28 | 25 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 11 | 6 | 13 | 8 | 25 | 28 | 76 | 91 | 92 | 99 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 89 | 94 | 87 | 92 | 75 | 72 | 24 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 13
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay counts for Hc-GRF. ** Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hc-GRF } \\ & \hline B Z-A \end{aligned}$ | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 36 | 46 | 26 | 59 | 46 | 73 | 47 | 41 | 58 | 54 | 44 | 37 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 6 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 9 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 16 | 27 | 15 | 33 | 25 | 41 | 28 | 24 | 30 | 24 | 19 | 4 |
| Total Larvae | 23 | 31 | 18 | 41 | 30 | 47 | 34 | 31 | 41 | 38 | 33 | 13 |
| Final egg | 13 | 15 | 8 | 18 | 16 | 26 | 13 | 10 | 17 | 16 | 11 | 24 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 26 | 13 | 17 | 20 | 46 | 44 | 38 | 41 | 48 | 52 | 50 | 89 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 74 | 87 | 83 | 80 | 54 | 56 | 62 | 59 | 52 | 48 | 50 | 11 |
| BZ - B | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5** | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 52 | 69 | 61 | 47 | 47 | 72 | 48 | 42 | 56 | 59 | 56 | 54 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 16 | 7 | 16 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 25 | 39 | 35 | 33 | 23 | 39 | 32 | 18 | 33 | 30 | 17 | 5 |
| Total Larvae | 32 | 46 | 43 | 41 | 32 | 48 | 38 | 23 | 43 | 49 | 28 | 21 |
| Final egg | 20 | 23 | 18 | 6 | 15 | 24 | 10 | 19 | 13 | 10 | 28 | 33 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 22 | 11 | 16 | 17 | 51 | 46 | 33 | 57 | 41 | 44 | 63 | 91 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 78 | 89 | 84 | 83 | 49 | 54 | 67 | 43 | 59 | 56 | 37 | 9 |
| LEV - C | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 55 | 78 | 65 | 46 | 45 | 66 | 57 | 50 | 58 | 74 | 52 | 52 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 8 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 17 | 12 | 15 | 24 | 28 | 21 | 26 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 24 | 42 | 31 | 31 | 26 | 23 | 18 | 19 | 12 | 27 | 14 | 12 |
| Total Larvae | 32 | 54 | 44 | 39 | 35 | 42 | 32 | 35 | 38 | 57 | 37 | 42 |
| Final egg | 23 | 24 | 21 | 7 | 10 | 24 | 25 | 15 | 20 | 17 | 15 | 10 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 25 | 20 | 30 | 21 | 23 | 40 | 38 | 43 | 63 | 49 | 57 | 62 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 75 | 80 | 70 | 79 | 77 | 60 | 63 | 57 | 37 | 51 | 43 | 38 |
| LEV - D | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 69 | 50 | 45 | 42 | 51 | 71 | 75 | 51 | 73 | 46 | 61 | 45 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 10 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 16 | 12 | 29 | 13 | 25 | 23 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 44 | 33 | 28 | 22 | 25 | 33 | 37 | 20 | 21 | 17 | 11 | 8 |
| Total Larvae | 54 | 39 | 36 | 31 | 39 | 49 | 53 | 32 | 52 | 30 | 38 | 34 |
| Final egg | 15 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 22 | 22 | 19 | 21 | 16 | 23 | 11 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 19 | 15 | 22 | 23 | 28 | 31 | 30 | 37 | 56 | 43 | 66 | 68 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 81 | 85 | 78 | 77 | 72 | 69 | 70 | 63 | 44 | 57 | 34 | 32 |

Table B. 13 Continued

| Hc-GRF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BZ/LEV - E | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 101 | 66 | 58 | 77 | 34 | 65 | 59 | 46 | 53 | 65 | 51 | 61 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$ | 12 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 20 | 42 | 32 | 36 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 61 | 39 | 30 | 49 | 20 | 24 | 24 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| Total Larvae | 73 | 51 | 44 | 62 | 30 | 38 | 35 | 19 | 24 | 42 | 36 | 40 |
| Final egg | 28 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 4 | 27 | 24 | 27 | 29 | 23 | 15 | 21 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 16 | 20 | 30 | 18 | 30 | 32 | 20 | 37 | 83 | 100 | 89 | 90 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 84 | 80 | 70 | 82 | 70 | 68 | 80 | 63 | 17 | 0 | 11 | 10 |
| BZ/LEV - F | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 54 | 66 | 46 | 45 | 55 | 59 | 76 | 54 | 71 | 48 | 47 | 64 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 14 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 30 | 32 | 39 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 32 | 34 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 31 | 30 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| Total Larvae | 46 | 43 | 32 | 31 | 33 | 39 | 45 | 36 | 31 | 30 | 36 | 45 |
| Final egg | 8 | 23 | 14 | 14 | 22 | 20 | 31 | 18 | 40 | 18 | 11 | 19 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 30 | 21 | 28 | 19 | 24 | 15 | 27 | 44 | 61 | 100 | 89 | 87 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 70 | 79 | 72 | 81 | 76 | 85 | 73 | 56 | 39 | 0 | 11 | 13 |
| AVM - G | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 67 | 53 | 32 | 53 | 44 | 45 | 53 | 55 | 47 | 45 | 68 | 59 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 34 | 41 | 36 | 33 | 38 | 37 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 31 | 25 | 20 | 22 | 16 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 39 | 37 | 25 | 38 | 28 | 31 | 41 | 43 | 36 | 33 | 38 | 37 |
| Final egg | 28 | 16 | 7 | 15 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 30 | 22 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 18 | 27 | 20 | 39 | 39 | 42 | 83 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| $\% \mathrm{~L}_{3}$ | 82 | 73 | 80 | 61 | 61 | 58 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AVM - H | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 45 | 46 | 62 | 50 | 51 | 51 | 64 | 40 | 69 | 88 | 64 | 58 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 7 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 14 | 13 | 30 | 29 | 39 | 56 | 41 | 38 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 23 | 22 | 38 | 23 | 29 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 30 | 33 | 47 | 28 | 44 | 34 | 43 | 29 | 41 | 56 | 41 | 38 |
| Final egg | 15 | 13 | 15 | 22 | 7 | 17 | 21 | 11 | 28 | 32 | 23 | 20 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 23 | 30 | 19 | 18 | 32 | 38 | 70 | 100 | 95 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| \% $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ | 77 | 70 | 81 | 82 | 68 | 62 | 30 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table B. 14
DrenchRite ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay averages for Hc-GRF. $* *$ Final egg count included in $\% \mathrm{~L}_{1} / \mathrm{L}_{2}$.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Hc-GRF } \\ \hline \text { BZ-AVG } \end{gathered}$ | Wells |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5^{* *}$ | 6** | 7** | 8** | 9** | 10** | 11** | 12** |
| Starting Egg | 88 | 115 | 87 | 106 | 93 | 145 | 95 | 83 | 114 | 113 | 100 | 91 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 13 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 11 | 12 | 21 | 28 | 18 | 25 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 41 | 66 | 50 | 66 | 48 | 80 | 60 | 42 | 63 | 54 | 36 | 9 |
| Total Larvae | 55 | 77 | 61 | 82 | 62 | 95 | 72 | 54 | 84 | 87 | 61 | 34 |
| Final egg | 33 | 38 | 26 | 24 | 31 | 50 | 23 | 29 | 30 | 26 | 39 | 57 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 24 | 12 | 16 | 18 | 48 | 45 | 36 | 49 | 45 | 48 | 57 | 90 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 76 | 88 | 84 | 82 | 52 | 55 | 64 | 51 | 55 | 52 | 43 | 10 |
| LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 124 | 128 | 110 | 88 | 96 | 137 | 132 | 101 | 131 | 120 | 113 | 97 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 18 | 17 | 21 | 15 | 19 | 32 | 28 | 27 | 53 | 41 | 46 | 49 |
| $L_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 68 | 75 | 59 | 53 | 51 | 56 | 55 | 39 | 33 | 44 | 25 | 20 |
| Total Larvae | 86 | 93 | 80 | 70 | 74 | 91 | 85 | 67 | 90 | 87 | 75 | 76 |
| Final egg | 38 | 35 | 30 | 18 | 22 | 46 | 47 | 34 | 41 | 33 | 38 | 21 |
| $\% L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 21 | 18 | 26 | 21 | 26 | 35 | 33 | 40 | 59 | 47 | 61 | 64 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 79 | 82 | 74 | 79 | 74 | 65 | 67 | 60 | 41 | 53 | 39 | 36 |
| BZ/LEV AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 155 | 132 | 104 | 122 | 89 | 124 | 135 | 100 | 124 | 113 | 98 | 125 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 26 | 19 | 22 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 23 | 39 | 72 | 64 | 75 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 93 | 73 | 53 | 74 | 45 | 55 | 54 | 24 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
| Total Larvae | 119 | 94 | 76 | 93 | 63 | 77 | 80 | 55 | 55 | 72 | 72 | 85 |
| Final egg | 36 | 38 | 28 | 29 | 26 | 47 | 55 | 45 | 69 | 41 | 26 | 40 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 22 | 20 | 29 | 18 | 27 | 23 | 24 | 42 | 71 | 100 | 89 | 88 |
| \% $L_{3}$ | 78 | 80 | 71 | 82 | 73 | 77 | 76 | 58 | 29 | 0 | 11 | 12 |
| AVM AVG | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Starting Egg | 112 | 99 | 94 | 103 | 95 | 96 | 117 | 95 | 116 | 133 | 132 | 117 |
| $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 14 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 25 | 26 | 64 | 70 | 75 | 89 | 79 | 75 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Dead | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{L}_{3}$ Alive | 54 | 47 | 58 | 45 | 45 | 38 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Larvae | 69 | 70 | 72 | 66 | 72 | 65 | 84 | 72 | 77 | 89 | 79 | 75 |
| Final egg | 43 | 29 | 22 | 37 | 23 | 31 | 33 | 23 | 39 | 44 | 53 | 42 |
| \% $L_{1} / L_{2}$ | 20 | 29 | 19 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 76 | 97 | 97 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| $\% \mathrm{~L}_{3}$ | 80 | 71 | 81 | 70 | 65 | 60 | 24 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

APPENDIX C

Table C. 1
The cDNA concentrations (original and dilutions) from NanoDrop Spectrophotometer. The dilution factor is the dilution that was made on the sample to obtain 150 ng per reaction. The volume per reaction is the adjusted volume to obtain 150 ng per reaction.

| Sample ID | cDNA concentration (ng/ul) | $\div 150$ | Dilution Factor (1:X) | Dilution concentration (ng/ul) | Volume per reaction ( $\mu \mathrm{I}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hc-OS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control 1 | 652.15 | 4.35 | 4.5 | 131.25 | 1.14 |
| Control 2 | 461.53 | 3.08 | 3.0 | 154.46 | 0.97 |
| Control 3 | 528.43 | 3.52 | 3.5 | 144.05 | 1.04 |
| BZ HS 1 | 570.70 | 3.80 | 4.0 | 107.45 | 1.40 |
| BZ HS 2 | 469.15 | 3.13 | 3.0 | 152.61 | 0.98 |
| LEV HS 1 | 537.08 | 3.58 | 3.5 | 126.97 | 1.18 |
| LEV HS 2 | 543.63 | 3.62 | 3.5 | 128.22 | 1.17 |
| LEV MS 1 | 544.45 | 3.63 | 3.5 | 142.17 | 1.06 |
| LEV MS 2 | 587.38 | 3.92 | 4.0 | 127.96 | 1.17 |
| AVM HS 1 | 573.86 | 3.83 | 4.0 | 112.68 | 1.33 |
| AVM HS 2 | 560.14 | 3.73 | 4.0 | 126.98 | 1.18 |
| $\mathrm{Hc}-\mathrm{OG}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control 1 | 755.74 | 5.04 | 5.0 | 167.03 | 0.90 |
| Control 2 | 694.90 | 4.63 | 5.0 | 126.74 | 1.18 |
| Control 3 | 576.75 | 3.85 | 4.0 | 135.78 | 1.10 |
| BZ HS 1 | 483.13 | 3.22 | 3.0 | 155.76 | 0.96 |
| BZ HS 2 | 493.02 | 3.29 | 3.5 | 132.93 | 1.13 |
| BZ WR 1 | 552.84 | 3.69 | 3.5 | 137.70 | 1.09 |
| LEV HS 1 | 593.26 | 3.96 | 4.0 | 121.54 | 1.23 |
| LEV HS 2 | 538.20 | 3.59 | 3.5 | 133.09 | 1.13 |
| LEV MS 1 | 515.94 | 3.44 | 3.5 | 134.90 | 1.11 |
| LEV MS 2 | 478.72 | 3.19 | 3.0 | 166.28 | 0.90 |
| AVM HS 1 | 568.85 | 3.79 | 4.0 | 110.99 | 1.35 |
| AVM HS 2 | 540.63 | 3.60 | 3.5 | 113.90 | 1.32 |

Table C. 1 Continued

| Sample ID | cDNA concentration (ng/ul) | $\div 150$ | Dilution <br> Factor <br> (1:X) | Dilution concentration (ng/ul) | Volume per reaction ( $\mu \mathrm{l}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hc-EG |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control 1 | 556.36 | 3.71 | 4.0 | 129.37 | 1.16 |
| Control 2 | 637.51 | 4.25 | 4.5 | 123.27 | 1.22 |
| Control 3 | 541.05 | 3.61 | 3.5 | 140.54 | 1.07 |
| BZ HS 1 | 506.29 | 3.38 | 3.5 | 128.84 | 1.16 |
| BZ WR 1 | 477.91 | 3.19 | 3.0 | 154.82 | 0.97 |
| LEV MS 1 | 524.48 | 3.50 | 3.5 | 140.11 | 1.07 |
| AVM HS 1 | 535.91 | 3.57 | 3.5 | 139.96 | 1.07 |
| AVM WR 1 | 523.81 | 3.49 | 3.5 | 142.81 | 1.05 |
| Hc-RFR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control 1 | 486.22 | 3.24 | 3.5 | 137.08 | 1.09 |
| Control 2 | 697.67 | 4.65 | 4.5 | 134.14 | 1.12 |
| Control 3 | 527.50 | 3.52 | 3.5 | 129.91 | 1.15 |
| BZ HS 1 | 518.68 | 3.46 | 3.5 | 137.05 | 1.09 |
| BZ WR 1 | 425.40 | 2.84 | 3.0 | 141.91 | 1.06 |
| BZ WR 2 | 476.19 | 3.17 | 3.0 | 159.87 | 0.94 |
| BZ HR 1 | 564.28 | 3.76 | 4.0 | 120.39 | 1.25 |
| LEV MS 1 | 481.46 | 3.21 | 3.5 | 137.52 | 1.09 |
| LEV MS 2 | 549.14 | 3.66 | 3.5 | 148.41 | 1.01 |
| AVM HS 1 | 461.65 | 3.08 | 3.0 | 150.58 | 1.00 |
| AVM WR 1 | 506.89 | 3.38 | 3.5 | 144.98 | 1.03 |
| Hc-H992 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control 1 | 613.91 | 4.09 | 4.0 | 132.79 | 1.13 |
| Control 2 | 607.36 | 4.05 | 4.0 | 130.38 | 1.15 |
| Control 3 | 488.74 | 3.26 | 3.5 | 125.74 | 1.19 |
| BZ HS 1 | 616.21 | 4.11 | 4.0 | 128.74 | 1.17 |
| BZ WR 1 | 483.58 | 3.22 | 3.5 | 137.64 | 1.09 |
| BZ WR 2 | 548.08 | 3.65 | 3.5 | 144.34 | 1.04 |
| BZ WR 3 | 524.58 | 3.50 | 3.5 | 126.55 | 1.19 |

Table C-1 Continued

| Sample ID | cDNA <br> concentration <br> $(\mathbf{n g} / \mathbf{u l})$ | $\div \mathbf{1 5 0}$ | Dilution <br> Factor <br> $(\mathbf{1 : X})$ | Dilution <br> concentration <br> $(\mathbf{n g} / \mathbf{u l})$ | Volume per <br> reaction <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu l})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hc-H992 |  |  |  |  |  |
| BZ WR 4 | 480.52 | 3.20 | 3.5 | 129.30 | 1.16 |
| BZ HR 1 | 504.86 | 3.37 | 3.5 | 136.36 | 1.10 |
| LEV HS 1 | 547.53 | 3.65 | 3.5 | 128.12 | 1.17 |
| LEV MS 1 | 572.96 | 3.82 | 4.0 | 123.97 | 1.21 |
| LEV MS 2 | 574.43 | 3.83 | 4.0 | 127.22 | 1.18 |
| AVM HS 1 | 519.82 | 3.47 | 3.5 | 136.49 | 1.10 |
| AVM WR 1 | 500.04 | 3.33 | 3.5 | 142.26 | 1.05 |
| Hc-GRF |  |  |  |  |  |
| Con 1 | 426.03 | 2.84 | 3.0 | 151.92 | 0.99 |
| Con 2 | 468.40 | 3.12 | 3.0 | 164.98 | 0.91 |
| Con 3 | 431.70 | 2.88 | 3.0 | 151.21 | 0.99 |
| BZ SS | 448.72 | 2.99 | 3.0 | 159.84 | 0.94 |
| BZ HR | 445.48 | 2.97 | 3.0 | 154.60 | 0.97 |
| LEV SS | 451.38 | 3.01 | 3.0 | 155.95 | 0.96 |
| LEV HR | 445.17 | 2.97 | 3.0 | 161.92 | 0.93 |
| AVM HS | 402.68 | 2.68 | 2.5 | 170.09 | 0.88 |
| AVM WR | 412.15 | 2.75 | 3.0 | 142.14 | 1.06 |
| Positive control | 143.19 | 0.95 | N/A | N/A | 1.05 |
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