

## Population sizes and dispersal pattern of tsetse flies : rolling on the river ?

J. Bouyer, T. Balenghien, Sophie Ravel, L. Vial, I. Sidibé, S. Thevenon,  
Philippe Solano, Thierry De Meeûs

► **To cite this version:**

J. Bouyer, T. Balenghien, Sophie Ravel, L. Vial, I. Sidibé, et al.. Population sizes and dispersal pattern of tsetse flies : rolling on the river ?. *Molecular Ecology Notes*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, 18 (13), pp.2787-2797. <10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04233.x>. <ird-01224878>

**HAL Id: ird-01224878**

**<http://hal.ird.fr/ird-01224878>**

Submitted on 5 Nov 2015

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Population sizes and dispersal pattern of tsetse flies: rolling on the river?

J. BOUYER,\*† T. BALENGHIEN,\* S. RAVEL,‡ L. VIAL,\* I. SIDIBÉ,† S. THÉVENON,‡ P. SOLANO†† and T. DE MEEÛS†§

\*Cirad, UMR CIRAD-INRA Contrôle des maladies animales, Campus International de Baillarguet, F34398, Montpellier, France,

†Centre International de Recherche-développement sur l'Élevage en Zone Subhumide (CIRDES), BP 454, Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina

Faso, ‡Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, Unité mixte de Recherche IRD-CIRAD 177, Campus International de Baillarguet,

34398 Montpellier Cedex 5, France, §Génétique et Evolution des Maladies Infectieuses, UMR CNRS/IRD 2724, Centre IRD de

Montpellier, 911 Avenue d'Agropolis, BP 64501, 34394 Montpellier Cedex 5, France

## Abstract

The West African trypanosomoses are mostly transmitted by riverine species of tsetse fly. In this study, we estimate the dispersal and population size of tsetse populations located along the Mouhoun river in Burkina Faso where tsetse habitats are experiencing increasing fragmentation caused by human encroachment. Dispersal estimated through direct (mark and recapture) and indirect (genetic isolation by distance) methods appeared consistent with one another. In these fragmented landscapes, tsetse flies displayed localized, small subpopulations with relatively short effective dispersal. We discuss how such information is crucial for designing optimal strategies for eliminating this threat. To estimate ecological parameters of wild animal populations, the genetic measures are both a cost- and time-effective alternative to mark–release–recapture. They can be applied to other vector-borne diseases of medical and/or economic importance.

**Keywords:** dispersal, mark–release–recapture experiment, population genetics, population size, tsetse

Received 19 November 2008; revision received 23 March 2009/8 April 2009; accepted 9 April 2009

## Introduction

Comparisons between direct and indirect estimates of dispersal and population size are scarce (Watts *et al.* 2007) and cross-validations are needed to provide confidence in these estimates before indirect methods can be generalized, especially when analysing vector-borne diseases affecting human health and/or economy. The African trypanosomoses are among the most seriously neglected tropical diseases (Schofield & Kabayo 2008). The World Health Organization has recently launched the Human African Trypanosomiasis (HAT, or sleeping sickness) elimination programme following recent signs of declining incidence due to increased efforts in case detection and treatment, notably in Central Africa (WHO 2006). However the situation in West Africa is much less clear because only a small proportion of the population at risk are under surveillance (Courtin *et al.* 2006). The Food and Agriculture Organization estimates

the economic cost of animal trypanosomoses in Africa at US\$4.75 billion per year (FAO 1999). In 2001, the African Union launched the Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign (PATTEC) to increase efforts to manage this plague, which is considered one of the root causes of hunger and poverty in most sub-Saharan African countries ([http://www.africa-union.org/Structure\\_of\\_the\\_Commission/depPattec.htm](http://www.africa-union.org/Structure_of_the_Commission/depPattec.htm)) and constitutes a serious impediment to sustainable agricultural rural development in the area. *Glossina palpalis s.l.* is currently one of the most important vectors of human and animal trypanosomoses in West Africa. In Guinea, the subspecies *Glossina palpalis gambi-ensis* transmits sleeping sickness, with prevalence reaching 2 to 5% in villages of the coastal mangrove area (Dubreka focus; Camara *et al.* 2005). In Burkina Faso, it is a major vector of animal trypanosomes, particularly in the Mouhoun river basin, where the described study was conducted (Bouyer *et al.* 2006). The riverine forests of this river basin, the natural habitat of this species (Bouyer *et al.* 2005), are experiencing increasing fragmentation caused by human encroachment, which have

a major impact on the fly's distribution and densities (Guerrini *et al.* 2008), and, presumably, on the structuring of its population (Bouyer *et al.* 2007a).

Knowledge of gene flow patterns and dispersal rates are necessary to develop effective control strategies for vector species (Tabachnick & Black 1995). Tsetse dispersal is generally modelled as a diffusion process with a diffusion coefficient between 0.002 and 0.500 km<sup>2</sup>/day (Rogers & Randolph 1984; Hargrove & Lange 1989; Hargrove 2000; Bouyer *et al.* 2007b). For tsetse flies, as for other vector species, direct methods for estimating dispersal using mark–release of individuals is expensive and time-consuming, and the use of laboratory-reared flies can lead to nonrepresentative estimates of certain parameters, since they might behave differently than wild flies (Terblanche & Chown 2007). Polymorphic markers provide an important indirect alternative (De Meeûs *et al.* 2007).

In this study, we used genetic variation at microsatellite DNA loci, together with a mark–release–recapture experiment, to assess population densities and dispersal capacities of *Glossina palpalis gambiensis* along the Mouhoun river in Burkina Faso (Fig. 1). The results of the two studies appear consistent with each other. In these fragmented landscapes, tsetse flies are shown to consist of small localized subpopulations with relatively short effective dispersal (~1 km/generation), in contrast to the high dispersal capacities observed 20 years ago in similar river section in the absence of any fragmentation (Cuisance *et al.* 1985). An increase in genetic distance may imply a smaller dispersal coefficient than previously estimated, which in turn would lower the efficiency of some control techniques. For example, the effective use of fixed insecticide targets might be compromised, and the risk of re-invasion after successful elimination of the vector might be reduced. Such information thus appears crucial for designing optimal strategies of elimination of these tsetse populations along these riverine habitats.

## Materials and methods

### Description of study sites

The Mouhoun river basin in Burkina Faso is undergoing landscape fragmentation through human-driven changes of peririverine landscapes (principally cropping and cattle grazing) (Guerrini *et al.* 2008). The part of the Mouhoun river under study is called the Western Branch, and extends from the Dinderesso Forest (4°26'W, 11°13'N), to the Sourou dam (3°26'W, 12°44'N). Four sites, roughly oriented from south to north, were sampled at intervals of 74, 61, and 81 km upstream to downstream, totalling 216 km between the first and the fourth location. The within-site distance sampled was 3 km for the first two samples and 10 km for the remaining sites (Fig. 1).

### Genetic study

Entomological surveys were conducted using georeferenced, standardized biconical traps operated one day during the 2002 hot dry season (14, 18, 21 and 16 traps in sites A, H, C and D, respectively) (Bouyer *et al.* 2005) (Fig. 1). One hundred twenty *G. p. gambiensis* were genotyped using a DNA analysis system from LI-COR at seven microsatellite loci [B104, C102, B11, kindly supplied by A. Robinson; ppg13, ppg11, ppg24 (Luna *et al.* 2001) and CAG133 (Baker & Krafur 2001)], following a protocol described before (Bouyer *et al.* 2007a): 30 in sample A (the most upstream) with 13 females and 17 males, and 30 females from each of the three other samples.

Population structure was assessed using the *F* statistics of Wright (1965):  $F_{IS}$  measures the homozygosity due to nonrandom union of gametes within subpopulations and  $F_{ST}$  measures differentiation among subpopulations. It is often more informative to convert  $F_{ST}$  into its value corrected for polymorphism  $F'_{ST} = F_{ST} / (1 - H_s)$  (Hedrick 1999) where  $H_s$  is the genetic diversity as measured by Nei's unbiased estimator (Nei & Chesser 1983). The quantity  $1 - H_s$  indeed corresponds to the maximum possible differentiation between populations that do not exchange any migrants in which case the relative probability to sample at random two identical genes from one population approximately equals 1 minus the probability to sample different genes ( $H_s$ ). *F* statistics were estimated using the method of Weir & Cockerham (1984) and tested by randomizations. Similarly, genotypic linkage disequilibrium (LD) between pairs of loci was tested by randomizations. *FSTAT* 2.9.3 software (Goudet 1995) was used for all estimation and testing. For three loci located on the heterosome X (Pgp11, Pgp13 and B104), males were coded either homozygous ( $F_{ST}$  and LD analyses) or as missing data ( $F_{IS}$  analyses).

We tested for isolation by distance between pairs of individuals as described by Rousset (2000) and Watts *et al.* (2007). This method uses a regression of the genetic distance between individuals as a function of geographic distance. The slope of this regression is then used for demographic inferences. Genetic distances between individuals were estimated with  $\hat{a}$ , estimator of  $a$ , a between individuals analogue of  $F_{ST} / (1 - F_{ST})$  that shares the same properties (Rousset 1997). These are related to the slope  $b$  from the regression between geographic distances  $D_G$  (in meters, computed out of the georeferenced coordinates of each trap) by the equation  $\hat{a} = b \times D_G + \text{Constant}$ , where  $b = 1/4D\sigma^2$  (for a one-dimensional model of population structure as along the Mouhoun river), and where  $D\sigma^2$  is the product of the effective population density (i.e. ~density of reproducing adults per meter) by the dispersal surface that separates them from their parents (Rousset 1997). The significance of the regression was tested by a Mantel test with 1 million




Fig. 1 Study area. Distribution of the four trapping sites and of traps along the Mouhoun river. The number of flies by trap is given next to the trapping points. Some trap numbers are given between brackets for each site.

randomizations (Mantel 1967). Isolation-by-distance procedures and testing were all implemented using GenePop version 4 (Rousset 2008). Considering that each site (A, H, C, D) represents an independent replicate, we combined the results obtained in each of the four sites by averaging the slopes over sites and using a Fisher procedure (Fisher 1970) to obtain a global  $P$  value. Because here  $4D\sigma^2$  was below 10 000 in at least one site (A), we used  $\hat{a}$  instead of  $\hat{e}$ , as recommended by Watts *et al.* (2007). To obtain a global representation, we regressed  $\hat{a}$  against  $D_G$  and site (A, H, C, D) with multiple regression using S-Plus 2000 Professional Release 3 (MathSoft Inc., 2000). This allowed representing the partials for  $\hat{a}$  (corrected for site effect) as a function of geographical distance.

Effective population sizes were computed with three methods. Estim (Vitalis & Couvet 2001a) uses the connection between migration and effective population size with heterozygosity and linkage disequilibrium between loci and was implemented in Estim 1.2 (Vitalis & Couvet, 2001b). Linkage disequilibrium is connected to effective population size, a property exploited by the method from Bartley *et al.* (1992), Hill (1981), and Waples (1991). The method relies on the fact that in a system where gametes are distributed at random among a small number of zygotes, there will be departures from expected genotype frequencies, and departures from expected gametic frequencies, both of which can be used to estimate  $N_e$  (England *et al.* 2006). Hill (1981) showed that the disequilibrium method has low precision unless tightly linked loci are used, in which case the estimate is strongly affected by historical, rather than recent,  $N_e$ . Hill's method was modified by Waples (1991) for use exclusively with unlinked loci (England *et al.* 2006). He pointed out that the method has greater power when the effective size of a population is small (because the signal from  $N_e$  becomes large relative to various sources of noise), and therefore, may be useful for evolutionary biologists or conservation biologists, who often are concerned with low (or potentially low)  $N_e$  (Waples 2006).

Waples also suggested that if data for a number of unlinked loci are available, collectively they might provide enough information for the method to be useful. From Bartley *et al.*'s (1992) equation 2, modified as in NeEstimator Help file, allelic correlations ( $r$ ) can be estimated as  $r = D/\sqrt{[p(1-p)q(1-q)]}$ , where  $p$  and  $q$  are frequencies of allele A at a first locus and allele B at a second locus, respectively, and where  $D$  is Burrow's [e.g. Bartley *et al.* (1992) and Waples (2006)] composite measure of disequilibrium (Weir 1979). For each pair of loci, the correlation  $r$  is calculated for each pair of alleles at the two loci. The  $r^2$  values across all pairs of alleles are averaged to yield a single  $r^2$  for each pair of loci. Finally, an arithmetic mean of the  $r^2$  values for all pairs of loci is used to obtain a single correlation coefficient and to obtain an  $N_e$  estimate using the equation  $N_e = 1/[3(r^2 - 1/S)]$ , where  $S$  is the harmonic mean of the sample sizes of each pairwise comparison between loci (Bartley *et al.* 1992; England *et al.* 2006). The 14 males contained in site A were coded homozygous for X-linked loci, which should not be a problem for a composite-based linkage disequilibrium measure and data. Autosomal loci did not provide different results for this site.

The method was implemented with NeEstimator (Peel *et al.* 2004). Heterozygote excess method from Pudovkin *et al.* (1996; see also Luikart & Cornuet 1999) corrected by Balloux (2004) uses the fact that, in dioecious (or self-incompatible) populations, alleles from females can only combine with alleles contained in males and a heterozygote excess is expected as compared to Hardy-Weinberg expectations, and this excess is proportional to the effective population size. This method was implemented using Weir and Cockerham estimator of  $F_{IS}$  in the equation  $N_e = 1/(-2F_{IS} - F_{IS}/(1 + F_{IS}))$  (Balloux 2004) and was only applicable in subsamples with heterozygote excess, thus with very few null alleles. This probably provides overestimates in our case.

To optimize the number of biologically relevant results, we combined the data from the closest traps that had too few tsetse individuals (see Table 1). For heterozygote excess

Site	Traps	$n_{\text{Traps}}$	Estim	Linkage disequilibrium	Heterozygote excess
A	(1,2,3)	1, 2, 2		1.6 (0.0101)	
A	(4,5,6)	2, 1, 4		5 (0.0316)	
A	8	4	2.06 (0.039)		3.4 (0.0653)
A	(9,10,11)	2, 1, 2		1.3 (0.0082)	4.7 (0.0295)
A	12	3		0.3 (0.0057)	
H	(3,4)	1, 2			25.0 (0.237)
H	(16,17)	1, 2	2.08 (0.0197)		
C	(7,8)	1, 2			3.8 (0.0361)
D	(2,3,4)	1, 3, 2		2.2 (0.0139)	
D	6	3		2.4 (0.0455)	
D	8	3		1.5 (0.0284)	
D	11	2			7.5 (0.1428)

**Table 1** Estimation of effective population sizes. Results of the three methods described in the text are presented here, for given subsets of traps for which the computations were possible (e.g. output different from 0, infinity or NA) (empty squares correspond to such results). Numbers of genotyped individuals per traps ( $n_{\text{Traps}}$ ) are indicated. Densities (in individuals per metre) are represented between brackets and correspond to  $N_e/(DU*n_{\text{Traps}})$ , where  $N_e$  is the corresponding effective population size,  $DU$  the distance unit defined in the text and  $n_{\text{Traps}}$  the number of traps contained in the subsets used to compute  $N_e$ .

method, X-linked loci were coded as missing data in males.  $N_e$  values were then used to compute tsetse densities. The minimum distance between two traps observed in our pooled subsets was between traps 5 and 6 of site C (105.55 m). The distance unit around a trap was then defined as  $DU = 105.55/2 = 52.775$  m, which is the distance from upstream and downstream to the focal trap that is assumed to define the neighbourhood around this trap. Density was then computed as  $N_e/(DU * n_{Traps})$ , where  $n_{Traps}$  is the number of traps in the subset used to compute  $N_e$ . This probably represents an underestimate of flies' density and certainly a very rough approximation.

### Dispersal study

Mark–release–capture (MRR) was conducted in one of the sites (A) using 4-day-old male *Glossina palpalis gambiensis* from insectariums of the Centre International de Recherche-Développement sur l'Élevage en zone Subhumide (CIRDES) in Bobo-Dioulasso (Burkina Faso). Before release, they were fed twice with bovine blood containing isometamidium (Trypamidium, Merial SAS) at the dose of 0.5 mg/L, irradiated (11 krad) and marked with acrylic paint on the thorax (one colour by cohort). Five cohorts (containing 1918 flies each) and four cohorts (containing 1951 flies each) were released at different sites on 20 April 2005 and 11 May 2005, respectively, along a 10-km river section. The flies were trapped every 500 m from 0800 to 1200 h. Recapture events occurred at days 3, 8, 13, 18 and 6, 10, 15, 21 after release, respectively. Collected flies were counted and released at the capture site.

For both release series, the daily survival probability,  $s$ , and the diffusion coefficient  $\Delta$  were estimated using a simple one-dimensional diffusion model with a constant mortality rate (Okubo & Levin 2001), allowing the computation of the total population size,  $N$ , and the mean dispersal

distance (Codling *et al.* 2008) for wild flies using field daily mortality probabilities from 1 to 3% (Hargrove 2003).

## Results

### Within-trap, within-site genetics


Statistical independence between loci allows using each locus as a reasonably independent replicate. None of the linkage disequilibrium tests gave a significant result (over all traps, no  $P$  value is below 0.1). The global analysis over all traps and loci on local heterozygosity gave a highly significant positive  $F_{IS} = 0.153$  ( $P$  value = 0.001) (95% bootstrap confidence interval: 0.064–0.219). These excess of homozygosity come from four loci (PgpX11, Pgp24, B11 and BX104; Fig. 2).

Because only a few individuals were available per trap, null allele signature could not be assessed using classical methods such as is implemented in MicroChecker (Van Oosterhout *et al.* 2004) and was deduced through a correlation study between  $F_{IS}$  and missing genotypes (blanks) frequency. Indeed, if null allele frequency increases, so must the frequency of null homozygotes. The correlation is expected to be strongly positive if null alleles represent a relevant explanation. The rho\_Spearman correlation ( $r_s = 0.499$ ) is highly significant ( $P$  value = 0.005) (Fig. 3), although a large part of the variance remains to be explained (~75%).


These heterozygote deficits were unrelated to allele size for any locus (multiple regression technique as described in De Meeüs *et al.* (2007),  $P$  values > 0.17).

### Genetic differentiation between traps and sites

Isolation by distance between individuals was highly significant (Fig. 4). The slopes of the regressions ( $b$ ) provided an estimate of  $D\sigma^2 = 1/4b$  of 776, 31 211, 39 936



**Fig. 2** Average homozygosity index ( $F_{IS}$ ) by locus and overall loci (All) estimated for tsetse flies sampled within each trap or overall loci for the case in which sites A, H, C and D are considered as population units (Sites). The 95% confidence intervals were obtained by jackknife resampling over populations for each locus and by 5000 bootstrap samples taken over loci for all loci and Sites values.  $P$  values obtained after 10 000 randomizations are represented within brackets. It can also be seen that pooling traps within sites increases  $F_{IS}$  (Wahlund effect). Even if the difference does not appear significant (Wilcoxon signed rank test for paired loci,  $P$  value = 0.15), we chose not to pool traps for further analyses. X-linked loci are indicated by a letter X.



**Fig. 3** Graphic representation of the correlation between number of missing genotypes in each site (A,H,C,D) and the mean  $F_{IS}$  found in the corresponding traps. The correlation coefficient (Spearman) and the  $P$  value are indicated. Loci and samples where missing genotypes are the most numerous have the highest  $F_{IS}$ .

and 30 413 individuals  $\times$  m for sites A, H, C and D, respectively, with a mean of 2902 individuals  $\times$  m.  $D\sigma^2$  is the product of the effective density of adults per metres by the dispersal surface that separates them from their parents (Rousset 1997). Removing all loci


with significant heterozygote deficits did not particularly alter these results (mean slope of 0.00005) despite an apparent drop in power ( $P$  value = 0.048).

Slope in Fig. 4 is very small and there is great variance in the pairwise genetic distances among flies at any chosen physical distance. This has biological significance: local populations encompass genetically diverse flies, and geographically disparate flies can be genetically quite similar.

*Inference of densities of reproducing tsetse and effective distance between adults and their parents*

There was no difference in the number of captured tsetse per trap across sites (log-linear regression,  $P$  value = 0.443). Flies appeared randomly distributed (Kolmogorov–Smirnov,  $P$  values > 0.3). The different effective population sizes ( $N_e$ ) and corresponding densities ( $N_e/DU \times n_{Traps}$ ) are presented in Table 1. Densities extend from 0.04 fly/m for A to 0.02 fly/m for H with Estim, 0.01 fly/m for A and 0.03 fly/m for D with linkage disequilibrium, 0.05 fly/m for A, 0.24 flies/m for H and 0.14 fly/m for D with heterozygote excess methods (unweighted means). These densities may appear small but if we use mean estimates computed over methods ( $D_e$ ), this results in number of reproducing tsetse that range around 85, 368, 284 and 579 flies in sites A, H, C and D, respectively.

The linkage disequilibrium method gives biased results when real  $N_e$  is bigger than sample size (England *et al.* 2006;



**Fig. 4** Relationship between geographical distance ( $G_D$ ) and genetic distance  $\hat{a}$  (partials corrected for sampling sites effects) along the Mouhoun river, with 95% confidence intervals obtained through the linear regression  $\hat{a} \sim G_D + \text{Sampling Site} + \text{Constant}$  under SPlus 2000 Professional release 3 (Mathsoft Inc.). For parameter estimates, the mean slope  $b$ , averaged over sites, was 0.00009, with a global  $P$  value = 0.003 (Fisher’s procedure on Mantel test  $P$  values across sites).

Waples 2006). This bias is probably not very important here as the heterozygote excess method, which is based on Weir and Cockerham unbiased estimator of  $F_{IS}$ , provides very similar and very small values. We unfortunately could not use unbiased LD-based estimates of  $N_e$  with Waples and Do's method implemented in LDNe version 1.31 (Waples & Do 2008) as this only outputted negative  $N_e$ . We nevertheless undertook a simulation exploration with EasyPop 2.0.1 (Balloux 2001) to check this issue. We simulated an island model of 100 populations of 100 individuals each (50/50 sex ratio and random mating) for 10 000 generations starting with maximum diversity. Mutation rate  $u$  was set to  $10^{-5}$  with an IAM model of mutation and 99 possible allelic states for eight independent loci. We then sampled 20 populations with either 100, 10, 5 or 3 individuals sampled in each population. Simulations were replicated 20 times. We then estimated  $N_e$  with Bartley's (LD-based), Balloux ( $F_{IS}$  based) and Waples and Do's (LD-based) methods. For convenience, LD-based methods were only applied to the first population of each replicate while  $F_{IS}$  was averaged over the 20 sampled populations with `FSTAT`. Results are presented in Fig. S1 Supporting information, where it can be seen that all methods are sample-size-sensitive, especially Bartley's, while Balloux's method seems poorly affected. If we simulate smaller subpopulations ( $N = 30$ ) with a similar isolation-by-distance pattern as the one found for tsetse flies (10 000 populations in a one-dimensional stepping stone,  $m = 0.5$ ), the bias is much reduced and even very small for the  $F_{IS}$ -based method (Fig. S2, Supporting information). We can also notice that variances are big, especially so for LD-based methods. We can conclude that because the two kinds of methods provide consistent results, the  $N_e$  estimated from tsetse flies along the Mouhoun river are probably not far from real  $N_e$ , at least in terms of magnitude, despite the small size of our samples. Nevertheless, further studies should ideally use more flies (more than 5 and desirably 10) per trap.

When we use density estimates as  $D_c$  in the  $D\sigma^2$  values we computed from the isolation-by-distance approach, we get estimates of dispersal distance between reproducing individuals and their parents by  $\sigma = \sqrt{D\sigma^2 / D_c}$ . Note that because  $D_c$  probably represents an underestimate,  $\sigma$  will consequently be overestimated. Table 2 gives different  $\sigma$  inferences for the different sites and overall. Values extend from 153 to 1053 m. According to Krafur (2009), there are at most about eight generations per year in tsetse flies. Under these conditions, a gene would require ~200 tsetse generations (~25 years) to travel all the width of the sampled area. Nevertheless, genetic differentiation between nearest sites appears relatively weak with an  $F_{ST}$  ranging from 0.02 (between C and D) to 0.07 (between H and C), probably as a result of a too-recent fragmentation, combined with a very slow genetic drift in each site (due to isolation by distance at a smaller scale).

**Table 2** Estimates of dispersal distances  $\sigma$  (in metres) between reproducing adults and their parents using the isolation by distance estimates  $D\sigma^2$  and mean densities  $D_c$  (tsetses per metre). Estimates were obtained by the effective population size approaches (averaged over the three methods) in each site of the Mouhoun river and averaged over all sites (All). Corresponding values obtained with the MRR study (MRR) are given for comparison

Site	$D\sigma^2$	$D_c$	$\sigma$
A	776.277	0.033	153
H	31210.986	0.128	493
C	39936.102	0.036	1053
D	30413.625	0.086	596
All	2902.421	0.071	574
MRR		0.2	(1245; 2392)

An alternative way to compute densities can be obtained by multiplying the mean effective population size averaged over methods by the total number of traps and dividing it by the total length of the corresponding sampling site. As can be seen from Table S1, this simplification does not dramatically change the results. Now a third method would use the direct estimation of density (0.2 fly/m) from the MRR study in site A (see below) as a maximum possible value. In that case, minimum possible values for  $\sigma$  would be 62, 396, 447 and 390 for sites A, H, C and D, respectively.

Significant heterozygote deficits seem to be a generality in tsetse populations (see Krafur (2009) for review) and in *Glossina palpalis* in particular either because of null alleles, Wahlund effect or both (Solano *et al.* 2000, 2009; Ravel *et al.* 2007). Here, null alleles explain some proportions of the heterozygote deficits (~25% at best, Fig. 3) and the very small effective population sizes found with linkage disequilibrium based methods also suggest a Wahlund effect because in a one-dimensional dispersal framework, such small subpopulations would have led to much greater isolation-by-distance slopes. This Wahlund effect probably reflects that dispersal for mating and larviposition (tsetse flies are ovoviviparous) is much smaller than feeding dispersal capabilities (e.g. De Meeus *et al.* (2007)). As the heterozygote excess method only gives results when there is indeed an heterozygote excess (when  $F_{IS} > 0$  the method outputs  $N_e < 0$ ), it is likely that strong heterozygote excess were obtained by chance with small sample sizes (leading to small  $N_e$ ), giving a few opportunity to weight LD-based estimates.

Several exploratory simulations undertaken with EasyPop 2.0.1 (Balloux 2001) suggest that  $N_e \sim 30$  with appropriate Wahlund and subsample sizes (similar to our data) easily reach the required slopes (in order of magnitude) of isolation by distance. In that case, this would give a tsetse density of about 0.3–0.5 fly/m (i.e. 800–3400 individuals in the






Fig. 5 Cumulated presence probabilities at various distances from the release point and for all trapping dates: observations are presented as points and model outputs as histograms (left: first release experiment, right: second release experiment).

sampling area) and a dispersal of ~43–375 m that is not so different from raw values (~153–1053 m) but is smaller than the mark–release–recapture (MRR) estimates (1245–2392 m) (see below). Obtaining more accurate values will need to sample flies at much smaller scales (e.g. a trap every 40 m and more genotyped tsetse flies per trap).

#### *Dispersal capacity of tsetse and direct estimation of effective distances*

For each series, the estimated daily mortality probabilities for marked males were 6% and 9.1%, the recapture rates 1.3% and 1.7%, and the diffusion coefficients 57 006 and 45 964 m<sup>2</sup>/j. The Pearson correlation coefficients between the observed and predicted data (Fig. 5) were 0.76 and 0.74 ( $P$  value  $< 10^{-3}$ ,  $ddl = 23$ ). The mean dispersal distances were 987 and 727 m for mean lifespan of the marked flies of 17 and 11 days, respectively. According to recapture rates, the natural density in site A is 1995 flies for a 10-km-long river section (95% CI, 1614–2375), i.e. 0.2 fly/m of river course (509 flies for the sampling area). Considering that the field daily mortality probability is an upper bound for marked flies and comprised between 1% and 3% for wild flies (Hargrove 2003), the mean dispersal distance for a natural population would lie between 1245 and 2392 m/tsetse generation. All these values appear consistent with results from genetic data.

#### **Discussion**

A significant population structuring of tsetse flies was observed at a very fine scale along the Mouhoun river,

confirming previous studies (Solano *et al.* 2000) and suggesting a strong impact of landscape fragmentation on tsetse dispersal capacities. This was also confirmed by the MRR experiment: the diffusion coefficient were 8 to 10 times lower that what was observed 20 years ago in a homogeneous riverine forest along a very similar tributary of the Mouhoun river and using the same protocol (Cuisance *et al.* 1985; Bouyer *et al.* 2007b). The reduction of the dispersal capacities of *Glossina palpalis gambiensis* by riverine forest fragmentation is thus probably due to its avoidance of disturbed river sections, where the microclimate (temperature, hygrometry and shadow) is not such as to warrant their survival. It may also be explained by specific behaviours evolved to ensure they remain in such heterogeneous landscapes.

The estimates of population effective sizes along site A (25–178) were smaller to that obtained from the MRR experiment (407–611). The small difference between population density and effective population density is not surprising, since not all individuals have the same reproduction success and, as explained above, Wahlund effects might have lowered the estimates that relied on LD-based methods. The estimates of dispersal distance between reproducing individuals and their parents obtained from the genetic analyses were also close to the mean dispersal distance computed from MRR data. Keep in mind that a linear random walk oversimplifies riverine tsetse dispersal (Bouyer *et al.* 2007b). The pattern of spatial genetic structure thus provides quantitative information on population densities and dispersal rates, which are very important parameters for designing efficient control strategy (Vreysen *et al.* 2007). For example, the density of traps or targets impregnated

with insecticides needed to reduce tsetse densities will depend on the dispersal capacities of the flies (Hargrove 2003). The number of sterile males and the distance between release sites to achieve a sterile insect technique campaign will also depend on the abundance and dispersal capacities (Cuisance *et al.* 1984; Dyck *et al.* 2005).

The genetic measures are all the more interesting in that they take into account even rare events (e.g. one migration episode) that occurred in the past and that left a genetic signature, events that would be extremely difficult to observe with MRR methods. Moreover, MRR protocols are more expensive and time-consuming than the effort required for the genetic analyses. Our genetic results show that, unless dispersal is limited by density-dependent factors, an elimination of all tsetse from one site (say D) might last for at least 10 years (with the highest dispersal from Table 2) before being recolonized by flies from site C (81 km), corresponding to an average recolonization rate of 7.5 km/year, which is compatible with invasion fronts observed in other tsetse species (Rogers 1977).

This methodology also could be applied to other important vectors and vector-borne diseases affecting human and/or animal health, especially when the insects are small, difficult to handle and to breed, like culicoides for example.

## Acknowledgements

This work benefited from international collaboration through the Leverhulme Trust Tsetse Research Network. It was carried out with the support of a Fonds de Solidarité Prioritaire project (France), Wellcome Trust project 075824 and EU INCO-DEV project 031849. We are indebted to the director general of CIRDES, Professor Abdoulaye Gouro, for provision of excellent working conditions; to Félix Sanou, Wilfried Yoni, Bila Cene, Adama Sana, Moïse Zoungrana, and Boureima Sanou for assistance during the field studies. Finally, we are very grateful to Steven Peck, Brigham Young University, and two anonymous referees who allowed a significant improvement of the manuscript.

## References

- Baker MD, Krafur ES (2001) Identification and properties of microsatellite markers in tsetse flies *Glossina morsitans sensu lato* (Diptera: Glossinidae). *Molecular Ecology Notes*, **1**, 234–236.
- Balloux F (2001) EasyPop (version 1.7): a computer program for population genetic simulations. *Journal of Heredity*, **92**, 301–302.
- Balloux F (2004) Heterozygote excess in small populations and the heterozygote-excess effective population size. *Evolution*, **58**, 1891–1900.
- Bartley D, Bagley M, Gall G, Bentley B (1992) Use of linkage disequilibrium data to estimate effective size of hatchery and natural fish populations. *Conservation Biology*, **6**, 365–375.
- Bouyer J, Guerrini L, César J, de la Rocque S, Cuisance D (2005) A phyto-sociological analysis of the distribution of riverine tsetse flies in Burkina Faso. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*, **19**, 372–378.
- Bouyer J, Guerrini L, Desquesnes M, de la Rocque S, Cuisance D (2006) Mapping African animal trypanosomosis risk from the sky. *Veterinary Research*, **37**, 633–645.
- Bouyer J, Ravel S, Vial L *et al.* (2007a) Population structuring of *Glossina palpalis gambiensis* (Diptera: Glossinidae) according to landscape fragmentation in the Mouhoun river, Burkina Faso. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **44**, 788–795.
- Bouyer J, Sibert A, Desquesnes M, Cuisance D, de la Rocque S (2007b) A model of diffusion of *Glossina palpalis gambiensis* (Diptera: Glossinidae) in Burkina Faso. In: *Area-wide Control of Insect Pests. From Research to Field Implementation* (eds Vreysen MJB, Robinson AS, Hendrichs J), pp. 221–228. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Camara M, Kaba D, Kagbadouno M *et al.* (2005) La Trypanosomose Humaine Africaine en zone de mangrove en Guinée: caractéristiques épidémiologiques et cliniques de deux foyers voisins. *Médecine Tropicale*, **65**, 155–161.
- Codling EA, Plank MJ, Benhamou S (2008) Random walk models in biology. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, **5**, 813–834.
- Courtin F, Jamonneau V, Oke E *et al.* (2006) Towards understanding the presence/absence of Human African trypanosomosis in a focus of Cote d'Ivoire: a spatial analysis of the pathogenic system. *International Journal of Health Geographics*, **13**, 334–344.
- Cuisance D, Politzar H, Merot P, Tamboura I (1984) Les lâchers de mâles irradiés dans la campagne de lutte intégrée contre les glossines dans la zone pastorale de Sidéradougou, Burkina Faso. *Revue d'Elevage et de Médecine Vétérinaire des Pays Tropicaux*, **37**, 449–468.
- Cuisance D, Février J, Dejardin J, Filledier J (1985) Dispersion linéaire de *Glossina palpalis gambiensis* et *G. tachinoides* dans une galerie forestière en zone soudano-guinéenne (Burkina Faso). *Revue d'Elevage et de Médecine Vétérinaire des Pays Tropicaux*, **38**, 153–172.
- De Meeùs T, McCoy KD, Prugnolle F *et al.* (2007) Population genetics and molecular epidemiology or how to 'débusquer la bête'. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, **7**, 308–332.
- Dyck VA, Hendrickx G, Robinson AS (2005) *Sterile Insect Technique*. Springer, IAEA, Vienna, Austria.
- England PR, Cornuet JM, Berthier P, Tallmon DA, Luikart G (2006) Estimating effective population size from linkage disequilibrium: severe bias in small samples. *Conservation Genetics*, **7**, 303–308.
- FAO (1999) Impacts of trypanosomiasis on African agriculture. *PAAT Technical and Scientific Series*, **2**, 46.
- Fisher RA (1970) *Statistical Methods for Research Workers*, 14th edn Oliver, Boyd, Edinburgh, UK.
- Goudet J (1995) FSTAT (version 1.2): a computer program to calculate F-statistics. *Journal of Heredity*, **86**, 485–486.
- Guerrini L, Bord JP, Ducheyne E, Bouyer J (2008) Fragmentation analysis for prediction of suitable habitat for vectors: the example of riverine tsetse flies in Burkina Faso. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **45**, 1180–1186.
- Hargrove JW (2000) A theoretical study of the invasion of cleared areas by tsetse flies (Diptera: Glossinidae). *Bulletin of Entomological Research*, **90**, 201–209.
- Hargrove JW (2003) *Tsetse Eradication: Sufficiency, Necessity and Desirability*. Centre for Tropical Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.
- Hargrove JW, Lange K (1989) Tsetse dispersal viewed as a diffusion process. *Transactions of the Zimbabwe Scientific Association*, **64**, 1–8.

- Hedrick PW (1999) Perspective: highly variable loci and their interpretation in evolution and conservation. *Evolution*, **53**, 313–318.
- Hill WG (1981) Estimation of effective population size from data on linkage disequilibrium. *Genetical Research*, **38**, 209–216.
- Krafsur ES (2009) Tsetse flies: genetics, evolution, and role as vectors. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, **9**, 124–141.
- Luikart G, Cornuet JM (1999) Estimating the effective number of breeders from heterozygote excess in progeny. *Genetics*, **151**, 1211–1216.
- Luna C, Bonizzoni M, Cheng Q *et al.* (2001) Microsatellite polymorphism in tsetse flies (Diptera: Glossinidae). *Journal of Medical Entomology*, **38**, 376–381.
- Mantel N (1967) The detection of disease clustering and a generalized regression approach. *Cancer Research*, **27**, 209–220.
- Nei M, Chesser RK (1983) Estimation of fixation indices and gene diversities. *Annals of Human Genetics*, **47**, 253–259.
- Okubo A, Levin SA (2001) *Diffusion and Ecological Problems: Modern Perspectives*, 2nd edn. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Peel D, Ovenden JR, Peel SL (2004) NeEstimator version 1.3: software for estimating effective population size, version 1.3. Queensland Government, Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, Queensland.
- Pudovkin AI, Zaykin DV, Hedgecock D (1996) On the potential for estimating the effective number of breeders from heterozygote excess in progeny. *Genetics*, **144**, 383–387.
- Ravel S, de Meeus T, Dujardin JP *et al.* (2007) The tsetse fly *Glossina palpalis palpalis* is composed of several genetically differentiated small populations in the sleeping sickness focus of Bonon, Côte d'Ivoire. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, **7**, 116–125.
- Rogers D (1977) Study of a natural population of *Glossina fuscipes* Newstead and a model of fly movement. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **46**, 309–330.
- Rogers JD, Randolph SE (1984) Local variation in the population dynamics of *Glossina palpalis palpalis* (Robineau-Desvoidy) (Diptera: Glossinidae). I. Natural population regulation. *Bulletin of Entomological Research*, **74**, 403–423.
- Rousset F (1997) Genetic differentiation and estimation of gene flow from *F*-statistics under isolation by distance. *Genetics*, **145**, 1219–1228.
- Rousset F (2000) Genetic differentiation between individuals. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **13**, 58–62.
- Rousset F (2008) GenePop '007: a complete re-implementation of the GenePop software for Windows and Linux. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, **8**, 103–106.
- Schofield CJ, Kabayo JP (2008) Trypanosomiasis vector control in Africa and Latin America. *Parasites and Vectors*, **1**, 24.
- Solano P, de La Roque S, de Méeus T *et al.* (2000) Microsatellite DNA markers reveal genetic differentiation among populations of *Glossina palpalis gambiensis* in the agropastoral zone of Sideradougou, Burkina Faso. *Insect Molecular Biology*, **9**, 433–439.
- Solano P, Ravel S, Bouyer J *et al.* (2009) The population structure of *Glossina palpalis gambiensis* from island and continental locations in coastal Guinea. *Plos Neglected Tropical Diseases*, **3**, e392.
- Tabachnick WJ, Black WC (1995) Making a case for molecular population genetic-studies of arthropod vectors. *Parasitology Today*, **11**, 27–30.
- Terblanche JS, Chown SL (2007) Factory flies are not equal to wild flies. *Science*, **317**, 1678.
- Van Oosterhout C, Hutchinson WF, Wills DPM, Shipley P (2004) Micro-Checker: software for identifying and correcting genotyping errors in microsatellite data. *Molecular Ecology Notes*, **4**, 535–538.
- Vitalis R, Couvet D (2001a) Estimation of effective population size and migration rate from one- and two-locus identity measures. *Genetics*, **157**, 911–925.
- Vitalis R, Couvet D (2001b) Estim 1.0: a computer program to infer population parameters from one- and two-locus gene identity probabilities. *Molecular Ecology Notes*, **1**, 354–356.
- Vreysen M, Robinson AS, Hendrichs J (2007) *Area-Wide Control of Insect Pests, from Research to Field Implementation*. Springer, Vienna, Austria.
- Waples RS (1991) Genetic methods for estimating the effective size of cetacean populations. In: *Genetic Ecology of Whales and Dolphins* (ed. Hoelzel AR), pp. 279–300. International Whaling Commission (Special Issue no. 13).
- Waples RS (2006) A bias correction for estimates of effective population size based on linkage disequilibrium at unlinked gene loci. *Conservation Genetics*, **7**, 167–184.
- Waples RS, Do C (2008) LDNE: a program for estimating effective population size from data on linkage disequilibrium. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, **8**, 753–756.
- Watts PC, Rousset F, Saccheri IJ *et al.* (2007) Compatible genetic and ecological estimates of dispersal rates in insect (*Coenagrion mercuriale*: Odonata: Zygoptera) populations: analysis of 'neighbourhood size' using a more precise estimator. *Molecular Ecology*, **16**, 737–751.
- Weir BS (1979) Inferences about linkage disequilibrium. *Biometrics*, **35**, 235–254.
- Weir BS, Cockerham CC (1984) Estimating *F*-statistics for the analysis of populations structure. *Evolution*, **38**, 1358–1370.
- WHO (2006) Human African Trypanosomiasis (sleeping sickness): epidemiological update. *Weekly Epidemiological Record*, **82**, 71–80.
- Wright S (1965) The interpretation of population structure by *F*-statistics with special regard to system of mating. *Evolution*, **19**, 395–420.

---

J. Bouyer is interested in insect ecology, behaviour and conservation and in area-wide integrated pest management. T. Balenghien is interested in ecology and control of vectors. S. Ravel is interested in tsetse population genetics and vectorial competence. L. Vial is interested in vector population genetics and prediction models for the presence of soft ticks. I. Sidibé is interested in epidemiology and integrated control of African trypanosomoses, and molecular diagnosis of trypanosomes and their chemoresistance. S. Thévenon is specialised in the genetics of cattle trypanotolerance. P. Solano is a specialist of tsetse population genetics and trypanosomes molecular diagnosis. T De Méeus is a senior researcher specialised in population genetics in host parasite systems with special interests for the evolution of habitat specialisation and population genetics tools for empirical data.

---

### Supporting information

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article:

**Fig. S1** Simulation results for  $N_e$  estimation with three different methods (Balloux 2004; Bartley *et al.* 1992; Waples & Do 2008).

**Fig. S2** Results obtained with different methods for  $N_e$  estimation for different sample sizes (Balloux 2004; Bartley *et al.* 1992;

Waples & Do 2008) for a one dimensional stepping stone of 10 000 populations of size 30.

**Table S1** Results obtained with alternative method to compute tsetse densities from population genetics data

Please note: Wiley-Blackwell are not responsible for the content or functionality of any supporting information supplied by the authors. Any queries (other than missing material) should be directed to the corresponding author for the article.