

Larvicidal Activities of N-(2-hydroxyl) Propyl-3-Trimethyl Ammonium Chitosan Chloride (HTCC) and Silver Nanoparticles Against Two Mosquito Species, *Aedes* and *Culex*: A Comparative Study

Vanitha Priya D¹, Pandima Devi MK¹, Arumugam P², Sudersan K³, Anuradha V^{1*}

¹PG & Research Department of Zoology, JBAS College for Women, Teynampet, Chennai

²Armats Biotek Training & Research Institute (ABTRI)

³Centre for Biotechnology, Anna Univeristy, Guindy, Chennai

Abstract—This paper mainly focuses on using biopolymer as a potential larvicide. This work initially starts with extracting chitosan from the shrimp waste by a chemical method and it was characterized further. Chitosan is a natural carbohydrate biopolymer derived by deacetylation (DA) of chitin that is nontoxic, biodegradable, and biocompatible. But usually chitosan will not completely dissolved in water at normal conditions. Therefore, to increase the solubility and reaction rate, quaternized derivative of chitosan, N-(2-hydroxyl) propyl-3-trimethyl ammonium chitosan chloride (HTCC), is obtained and characterized. It highly dissolves in water and has more positive charge (quaternary ammonium groups) compared with chitosan. Next, the larvicidal activity of the obtained HTCC against two mosquito species, *Aedes* and *Culex*, is evaluated. Next part of the work continues with synthesizing silver nanoparticles from the plant *Euphorbia Antiquorum* and characterized by UV Spec, FTIR, and SEM; then the larvicidal activity is examined similar to HTCC and the results obtained are compared with each other; Though both, silver nanoparticles and HTCC, show similar larvicidal activity, this study suggests HTCC as a better larvicidal agent having in mind the drastic effects of silver nanoparticles on aquatic ecosystem; Nanoparticles in aquatic systems are responsible for agglomeration and aggregation, dissolution, redox reactions, and transformation into new solid phases, whereas chitosan and chitosan derivatives are completely degradable, biocompatible, and nontoxic to plants, animals, or human.

Keywords—*Aedes aegypti*, biopolymer, chitosan, *Culex quinquefasciatus*, N-(2-hydroxyl) propyl-3-trimethyl ammonium chitosan chloride (HTCC), silver nanoparticles

Introduction

World health organization has declared mosquitoes as a public health pest throughout the world as they are responsible for the transmission of various dreadful disease-causing pathogens (WHO 1992; 1996). Though over 3,500 species of mosquitoes exist (Jaeger and Edmund, 1959), only few of them are found to be awful, which act as vectors for a number of infectious diseases, belong to the genera *Culex*, *Aedes*, and *Anopheles*.

Therefore, control over mosquito population is vital. It is more easier to control mosquitoes when they are in larval stages than controlling the dispersed adults (El Hag et al., 2001) All the three stages of mosquito, i.e., egg, larvae, and pupa, need water for their growth and survival. Since a brood of larval mosquito can be killed while they concentrate in a pool of water. Using chemical pesticides such as DDT, organochlorines, organophosphates, methoprene, etc, were one of the methods followed in killing mosquitoes. Despite high cost, food safety concerns, and environmental hazardous (Yang et al., 2002) (Junwei et al., 2006), mosquitoes also develop genetic resistance

(Hartzell et al., 1941; Jacobson, 1971) to these chemicals. Therefore, alternative vector control strategies, especially effective, environmental safe, biodegradable, low cost, and indigenous methods are extremely imperative (Amer et al., 2006; Chowdhury et al., 2008; Piyarat et al., 1974; Kalyanasundaram and Das, 1985). Thereof, investigations and searching of natural and environmental friendly insecticidal substances are ongoing worldwide (kuo et al., 2007; Balandrin., et al 1985; Ghosh, 2006).

Biopolymers as Larvicidal agent

Though silver nanoparticles are ecosynthesized, one of the effective methods widely used, they are researched to be responsible for biomagnification and heavy metal toxicity. Therefore, to overcome the issues of silver nanoparticle, biopolymer materials are used. One among the most applicable biopolymer is chitosan, extracted from the crustacean wastes, that has well-known antibacterial and antifungal activities. More than that, after treatment they break down into monomers and at particular time completely disintegrates. Therefore, this work attempts to examine the larvicidal activity of N-(2-hydroxyl) propyl-3-

trimethyl ammonium chitosan chloride (HTCC), synthesized from the chitosan extracted from shrimp shell wastes which is highly positively charged and easily soluble in water against two mosquito species *Culex* and *Aedes*. The obtained results are compared with the activity of silver nanoparticles synthesized from the plant *Euphorbia Antiquorum*

Materials and Methods

Synthesis of Silver Nanoparticles:

Ten grams of fresh plant was washed and chopped in to pieces, later it was boiled in 100 ml deionized water for 10 minutes. The extract was then cooled and filtered using Whatman No 1 filter paper. 10 ml of this plant extract was added 90 mL of 1M silver nitrate solution. The solution was allowed to react at room temperature, after 24 h color change was observed from pale yellow to brick red. The reduction mechanism of silver ions in to nanoparticles was confirmed through the UV-visible spectrophotometer analysis at 420nm. It is centrifuged at 13000rpm and the pellet was air dried and collected in a air-tight eppendorf tube. Thus-obtained silver nanoparticles were characterized using UV-Vis spectrometer and SEM.

Extraction and Characterization of Chitosan

10 g of shrimp shell powder is mixed with 4% NaOH for 21 h and washed several times until neutral pH and dried at 60 °C for 3 hours. It was followed by demineralization using 2% HCl for 2 h at 70 °C. It was washed several times and the left out thus obtained is chitin. Thus-obtained chitin is deacetylated using 60% NaOH for 72 hours. After deacetylation samples are cooled at room temperature and washed several times using distilled water until neutral pH, the remaining is the chitosan that is oven-dried completely for further use.

Selection and culturing of mosquito species:

Mosquito species *Aedes aegypti* and *Culex* were selected for this study. Entire analyses were carried out against laboratory-reared vector mosquitoes, which are free of insecticidal and pathogenic exposure.

Larvicidal Bioassay of Silver Nanoparticles

Larvicidal activity of silver nanoparticles was performed using a standard protocol of WHO. Synthesized nanoparticles were diluted to 5.0, 4.0, 2.0, 1.0, and 0.5 mg/l using double distilled water. Ten larvae of each species is added to each test solution with beakers containing 200 ml of water, and control is a beaker with distilled water. The mortality was recorded after 24 and 48 h and the experiment was repeated for four times for average value. Percentage mortality of both experiments was recorded using Abbott's formula.

$$\% \text{ Mortality} = \frac{\% \text{test mortality} - \% \text{control mortality}}{100 - \% \text{control mortality}}$$

Larvicidal Bioassay of Chitosan

Larvicidal bioassay of chitosan was carried out according to WHO standard procedures with slight modifications. Different concentrations ranging from 200 to 1000ppm of HTCC were redissolved in 200 ml of tap water of 250 ml beakers and 10 larvae per concentration were used for all

the experiments. A control was 200 ml of water. The number of dead larvae at the end of 24 and 48 h was recorded.

Results

Characterization of Silver Nanoparticles

Color Conformation

Change of the solution color from pale yellow to brick color after 48 hours initially confirms the formation of silver nanoparticles, as shown in Fig 1

UV-VIS Spectrometer

Figure 2 shows the absorption spectra of AgNPs formed in the reaction media that have absorption maxima at 450 nm due to surface plasmon resonance of AgNPs confirmed the formation of silver nanoparticles.

SEM

Figure 3 shows the SEM of silver nanoparticles synthesized from *Euphorbia Antiquorum*. The silver nanoparticles were spherical in shape with particle size range from 5 to 40 nm and they are aggregated to each other.

Characterization of Chitosan

Table 1 shows color, yield percentage, ash content, molecular weight, degree of deacetylation, solubility, water and oil absorbing percentage, pH and viscosity of the extracted and obtained chitosan

FTIR of Chitosan and HTCC

Figure 4 shows FTIR peak of chitosan. There is a broad band at 3438 cm⁻¹ that is because of -NH₂ groups, -OH groups, and intermolecular hydrogen bonds overlap each other. The peak at 2991 cm⁻¹ represents the CH stretch (Alipour et al., 2009). Peak at 1639 cm⁻¹ shows the presence of carbonyl group, which is due to incomplete deacetylation of chitin to chitosan. A significant peak is also observed at 1560 cm⁻¹ indicates N-H bending of the primary amine.

Figure 5 shows FTIR of HTCC with a new peak at 1470 cm⁻¹ represents the C-H bending of trimethylammonium group of HTCC. It should also be noted that the peak at 1560 cm⁻¹ in chitosan is disappeared in HTCC due to the change of primary amine in chitosan to secondary amine in HTCC. The peak at 3430 cm⁻¹ confirms the N-H stretching of a secondary amine and this peak proves the synthesis of HTCC by forming N-H group.

From the experiments carried out, *Aedes* was found to be resistive than *Culex* to both silver nanoparticles and HTCC and the rate of mortality was dose- and time dependent.

Table 2 shows the larvicidal activity of silver nanoparticles on *Aedes* and *Culex* at 24 and 48 h, respectively. It can be seen that percentage of mortality increases with increasing concentration. In *Culex*, at least concentration, 0.5ppm, the mortality was 10%; whereas at highest concentration, 5ppm, mortality was 100%. In case of *Aedes*, it was 6% and 100% at 0.5 and 5ppm, respectively. Therefore, at all concentrations, *Culex* is more susceptible than *Aedes*.

Table 3 shows the percentage mortality of HTCC against *Aedes* and *Culex*. As before, *Culex* is more susceptible than *Aedes* and mortality increased with increasing concentration. *Culex* showed 12% mortality at low concentration and 100% at highest concentration. *Aedes*

showed 10% mortality at low concentration and 100% at highest concentration, respectively.

Both Silver nanoparticles and HTCC showed 50% mortality at 2ppm and 600ppm, respectively.

Table 4 shows lethal concentration (LC50 and LC90) values of the silver nanoparticles and HTCC on *Culex quinquefasciatus* and *Aedes aegypti*. The LC50 values of silver nanoparticles and HTCC on *Culex quinquefasciatus* were 1.179 and 2.212, respectively; 2.392 and 2.097, respectively, for *Aedes aegypti*. The LC90 values are 4.555 and 4.521 for *Culex*, and 5.129 and 4.428 for *Aedes* treated with Silver nanoparticles and HTCC, respectively, and the chi-square values are significant at p.

Discussion

Larvicidal activity of silver nanoparticles was already reported by Patil et al., 2012; Salunkhe et al., 2011; Subarani et al., 2012; Veerakumar et al., 2014; Muthukumaran et al., 2014; Priyadarshini et al., 2012; Shanmugasundaram and Balagurunathan, 2013; Veerakumar et al., 2014. Besides the larvicidal activity, negative impact of silver nanoparticles on the aquatic life after treatment is more concerned. The most important processes affecting the fate of nanoparticles in aquatic systems are agglomeration and aggregation, dissolution, redox reactions and transformation into new solid phases (Handy et al., 2008; Klaine et al., 2008; Navarro et al., 2008; Nowack and Bucheli, 2007), though used in very less quantity. The use of nanomaterials and their potential environmental and human health risks (Helfenstein et al., 2008; Andujar et al., 2009) are of increasing concern and social debate (Feder, 2006; RS/RAE, 2004) and have been the subject of many government reports.

There are several reports evidenced the drastic effects of nanoparticles on aquatic environment. Julia Fabrega., et al reported that concentrations of Ag NPs, as low as, just a few ng/L, can affect prokaryotes, invertebrates, and fish and also they also studied the mechanisms of toxicity. Janes and Playle, 1995; Wood et al., 1996; and Zhou et al., 2005 researched Ag ion toxicity in vivo in freshwater fish species with LC10 values as low as 0.8 µg/ L had effect on certain freshwater fish species (Birge and Zuiderveen, 1995).

Therefore, completely nontoxic biocomponent is indeed for treating mosquito larvae, which reside in water bodies. Chitosan is a polysaccharide that forms the basis of the main constituent of the outer skeleton of insects and

crustaceans like shrimp, crabs, and lobster (Kumar et al, 2005). There are several studies evidenced the antimicrobial activity of chitosan (Chen et al., 1998). Assis et al., 2008 also reported that chitosan has effective antifungal activity that inhibits spore germination, germ tube elongation, and radial growth. Few works also evidenced antiprotozoal activity of chitosan (Tavassoli et al., 2012; Shin, W.Shin et al., 2006). The killing mechanism is due to the interaction mediated by the electrostatic forces between the protonated NH₃⁺ groups and the negative residues (Rejane et al, 2009), presumably by competing with Ca²⁺ for electronegative sites on the membrane surface of the microbes .

To improve further the solubility of chitosan in water, various derivatives of chitosan were prepared. Among the various chitosan derivatives, the derivatives with quaternary ammonium groups have shown higher efficient activity against microbes compared to those of chitosan (Ignatova et al., 2007; Ignatova et al., 2006; Li et al., 2008). This may be due to enhanced positive charged quaternary amine group, known to targeted on the negatively charged cytoplasmic membrane of microbes, altering membrane properties and impeding nutrients entering the cells (Li et al., 2008; Rabea et al., 2003). Therefore, same mechanism may occur in killing mechanism of mosquito larvae.

From the results, it can be concluded that HTCC has equivalent and better larvicidal activity when compared with silver nanoparticles, which shows 100% mortality 1000ppm in both *Aedes* and *Culex*. And the activity can also further enhanced by synthesizing HTCC nanoparticles.

Conclusion

This study compares the larvicidal activity of three silver nanoparticles and HTCC. Despite equal efficacy, this study suggests using HTCC as a larvicidal agent is advisable and more beneficial; because chitosan is completely degradable, biocompatible, and nontoxic to plants, animals, or human. This study can be further extended in future by synthesizing HTCC nanoparticles and examining its larvicidal activity. This work also aims to explore the aniparasitic activity of HTCC in future studies.

Acknowledgment

Author would like to thank Armats biotec for providing the lab facilities to carry out the research and also would like to thank Department of Environmental Technology, Central Leather Research Institute, Guindy and NIOT, Chennai for providing the instrumentation facilities for completing this research.

References

- [1] Andujar, P., Lanone, S., Brochard, p. and Boczkowski J. Rev. Mal. Respir. 2009, 26, 625–637.
- [2] Amer A., and Mehlhorn H. Parasitology Research. 2006, 230-234.
- [3] Assis O. B. G. Iran J Parasitol. 2008, 7, 92–96.
- [4] Balandrin M., Klocke J., Wurtele E.S., and Bollinger W.H. Science. 1985, 228, 1154–1160

- [6] Birge W., and Zuiderveen J. The comparative toxicity of silver to aquatic biota. Proceedings, 3rd Argentum International Conference on the Transport, Fate, and Effects of Silver in the Environment, Washington, DC, 1995.
- [7] Chen C. S., Liao W. Y., and Tsai G. J. *J. Food Prot.* 1998, 61, 124-1128.
- [8] Chowdhury N., Ghosh A., and Chandra, G. *BMC Complementary Altern. Med.* 2008, 8, 10.
- [9] El Hag, E., Nadi A., Zaitoon A.H. *Phytother Res.* 1999, 13, 388-392.
- [10] Ghosh A., Chowdhury N., Chandra G. *Parasitol Res*, 2008, 103, 271-277.
- [12] Handy R.D., von der Kammer F., Lead J.R., Hassellöv M, Owen R., and Crane M. *Ecotoxicology*, 2008, 17, 287-314.
- [13] Hartzell, A., and Wilcoxon F. *Contrib Boyce Thompson Institute.* 1941, 12, 127.
- [14] Helfenstein M., Miragoli, M.S. Rohr, L. Muller, P. Wick., and M. Mohr. *Toxicology.* 2008, 253, 70-78.
- [15] Ignatova M., Starbova K., Manolova N., Manolova N., and Rashkov I. *Carbohydrate Research.* 2006, 341, 2098-2107.
- [16] Ignatova M., Manolova N., and Rashkov I. *European Polymer Journal.* 2007, 43, 1112-1122.
- [17] Jacobson, M. and Crosby D. G. Marcel Dekker Inc. 1971, 585.
- [18] Jaeger, and Edmund C, 1959, A Source-Book of Biological Names and Terms. Springfield. Ill: Thomas. 0-398-06179-3.
- [19] Janes N., and Playle R.C, 1995, Modeling silver-binding to gills of rainbow trout (*Onchorrhynchus mykiss*). *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 14, pp 1847-1858.
- [20] Julia Fabrega, Samuel N. Luoma., Charles R., Tyler., Tamara S., Galloway., Jamie R., Lead B., Feder, 2006, Technology's future: A look at the dark side. *The New York Times.*
- [21] Junwei Z., Z. Xiaopeng, T.L. Yanma, L. Ting, Q. Kuen, H. Yuhua, X. Suqin and T. Brad, 2006. Adult repellency and larvicidal activity of five plant essential oils against mosquitoes. *J. Amer. Mosq. Cont. Assoc.*, 3: 515-522.
- [22] Kaliyan V., Marimuthu G., Hoti S.L, 2014, Evaluation of plant-mediated synthesized silver nanoparticles against vector mosquitoes. *Parasitology Research*, pp 4567-4577
- [23] Kalyanasundaram M., and Das P.K. *Indian J. Med. Res.* 1985, 82, 19-23.
- [24] Klaine S.J., Alvarez P.J., Batley G.E., Fernandes T.F., Handy R.D., Lyon D.Y., Mahendra S., McLaughlin M.J., and Lead J.R. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry.* 2008, 27(9), 1825-1851.
- [25] Kuo P.M., Chu F.H., Chang S.T., Hsiao W.F., and Wang S.Y. *Hilzforschung.* 2007, 61, 595-599
- [26] Kumar A. B. V., Varadaraj M. C., Gowda L. R., and Tharanathan R. N. *Biochem. J.* 2005, 391, 167-175
- [27] Li Y., Chen X.G., Liu N., Liu C.S., Liu C.G., Meng X.H., Yu L.J., and Kenedy J.F. *Carbohydrate Polymers.* 2007, 67, 227.
- [28] Muthukumar U., Govindarajan M., Rajeswary M. *Parasitol Res.* 2015, 114(3), 989-999.
- [29] Navarro E., Baun A., Behra R., Hartmann N.B., Filser J., Miao A.J., Quigg A., Santschi P.H., and Sigg L. *Ecotoxicology.* 2008, 17, 372-386.
- [30] Nowack B., and Bucheli T.D. *Environmental Pollution.* 2007, 150(1), 5-22.
- [31] Patil C.D., Borase H.P., Patil S.V., Salunkhe R.B., and Salunke B.K. *Parasitol Res.* 2012, 111(2), 555-562.
- [32] Piyarat S.W.K., Freed M., and Roy S. *Mosq. News.* 1974, 34, 398.
- [33] Priyadarshini K.A., Murugan K., Panneerselvam C., Ponarulselvam S., Hwang J.S., Nicoletti M. *Parasitol Res.* 2012, 111(3), 997-1006.
- [34] Rabea E.I., Badawy M.E.T., Stevens C.V., Smagghe G., and Steurbaut W. *Biomacromolecules.* 2003, 4, 1457-1465.
- [35] Rejane C., Goy; Douglas de Britto., and Odilio B. G. *Polímeros.* 2009,19(3).
- [36] RS/RAE, 2004, Nanosciences and nanotechnologies: opportunities and uncertainties.
- [37] Salunkhe R.B., Patil S.V., Patil C.D., and Salunke B.K. *Parasitol Res.* 2011, 109(3), 823-831.
- [38] Shanmugasundaram T., and Balagurunathan R. *Journal of Parasitic Diseases.* 2015, 677-684.
- [39] Shin W. S., Kil J.C., and Park G.M. *J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 2006, 16, 1984-1989
- [40] Subarani S., Sabhanayakam S., Kamaraj C. *Parasitol Res.* 2013, 112(2), 487-499.
- [41] Tavassoli M., Imani A., Tajik H., Moradi M., and Pourseyed S.H. *Iranian J Parasitol.* 2012, 7(1), 92-96.
- [42] Veerakumar K., Govindarajan M., Rajeswary M. *Parasitol Res.* 2013, 112(12), 4073-4085.
- [43] Veerakumar K., Govindarajan M., Rajeswary M., Muthukumar U. *Parasitol Res.* 2014, 113(6), 2363-2373.
- [44] W.H.O. *Lymphatic Filariasis. The disease and its control.* WHO Report, Geneva, 1992.
- [45] W.H.O. Report of the WHO informal consultation on the evaluation and testing of insecticides. CTD/ WHOPES/IC/96. 1. Control of Tropical Diseases Division. Geneva, 1996.
- [46] Wood C.M., Hogstrand C., Galvez F., and Munger R.S. *Aquat. Toxicol.* 1996, 35, 93.
- [47] Yang Y.C., Lee S.G., Lee H.K., Kim M.K., Lee S.H., and Lee H.S. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 2002, 50, 3765-3767
- [48] Zhou B., Nichols J., Playle R.C., and Wood C.M. *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.* 2005, 202, 25.

Figure 1: Formation of silver nanoparticles by color changing from pale yellow to brick red after 48 h



Figure 2 UV Spectroscopy of silver nanoparticles synthesized from *Euphorbia Antiquorum*




Figure 3 SEM Image of Silver nanoparticles synthesized from *Euphorbia Antiquorum*




Figure 4 FTIR peak of Chitosan Synthesized from Shrimp waste




Figure 5 FTIR peak of HTCC synthesized from Chitosan




Table 1 Physical Properties of Chitosan and HTCC extracted from shrimp shell

S.NO	Properties	Chitosan	HTCC
1	Color	Creamy White	Creamy White
2	Yield	21	-
3	Ash content	0.8%	-

4	Molecular weight	10,197.49	-
5	Degree of Deacetylation ¹	76%	-
6	Solubility	35%	98%
7	WBC%	498.7%	864.8%
8	OBC%	356%	665.9%
9	Ph	8.9	7.2
10	Viscosity	298cps	

Mosquito species	Treatment	LC ₅₀ (ppm)	95% confidence limit	LC ₉₀ (ppm)	95% confidence limit	Intercept ± SE	Slop pt ± SE	χ ²
------------------	-----------	------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------	----------------	--------------	----------------

Table 2 Percentage Mortality of Silver Nanoparticles on *Culex* and *Aedes* at 24h

Concentration	<i>Culex</i>	<i>Aedes</i>
	24h	24h
5.0	100%	100%
4.0	82	78%
2.0	60	58%
1.0	33	28
0.5	10	6

Table 3 Percentage Mortality of HTCC on *Culex* and *Aedes* at 24h

Concentration	<i>Aedes</i>	<i>Culex</i>
	24h	24h
5.0	100%	100%
4.0	82	70%
2.0	54	50%
1.0	28	20
0.5	10	10

Table 4 Lethal concentration (LC50 and LC90) values of the silver nanoparticles and HTCC on *Culex quinquefasciatus* and *Aedes aegypti*.

			LL	UL		LL	UL			
<i>Culex quinquefasciatus</i>	Silver nanoparticles	1.179	0.837	1.456	4.555	3.812	6.001	3.6 ± 0.26	3.95 ± 0.56	6.9*
	HTCC	2.212	1.882	2.532	4.521	3.810	5.880	3.57 ± 0.27	4.12 ± 0.58	5.1*
<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	Silver nanoparticles	2.392	2.034	2.749	5.129	4.243	6.954	3.53 ± 0.27	3.86 ± 0.56	7.3*
	HTCC	2.097	1.766	2.414	4.428	3.711	5.811	3.73 ± 0.25	3.94 ± 0.56	5.4*

IJSER