# GLOBAL COLLABORATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PESTICIDES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH (GCDPP)

### Challenges of Chagas Disease Vector Control in Central America

Position Paper by: Dr C. J. Schofield



World Health Organization
Communicable Disease Control, Prevention and Eradication
WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)

RABLES.

#### WHO/CDS/WHOPES/GCDPP/2000.1 ENGLISH ONLY

DISTR.: LIMITED

## GLOBAL COLLABORATION FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PESTICIDES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH (GCDPP)

Challenges of Chagas Disease Vector Control in Central America

Position Paper By: Dr C. J. Schofield

World Health Organization
Communicable Disease Control, Prevention and Eradication
WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)

#### © World Health Organization

This document is not a formal publication of the World Health Organization (WHO) and all rights are reserved by the Organization. The document may, however, be freely reviewed, abstracted, reproduced and translated, in part or in whole, but not for sale or for use in conjunction with commercial purposes. The views expressed in the document by the named authors are solely the responsibility of those authors.

#### WHO/CDS/WHOPES/GCDPP/2000.1

#### Page 1

#### **Table of Contents**

|     |                                   |                               | Page |          |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|----------|
| Ack | nowled                            | gements                       |      |          |
| 1.  | intro                             | duction                       | 3    |          |
| 2.  | Chag                              | as Disease in Central America | 3    |          |
| 3.  | Chagas Disease Vectors in Central |                               |      |          |
|     |                                   | America                       |      |          |
| 4.  | Control of Domestic Triatominae   |                               | 8    |          |
|     | 4.1                               | Rhodnius prolixus             | 8    |          |
|     | 4.2                               | Triatoma dimidiata            | 11   |          |
|     | 4.3                               | Rhodnius pallescens           | 13   |          |
| 5.  | Control Interventions             |                               | 14   |          |
|     | 5.1                               | Geographical Reconnaissance   | 14   |          |
|     | 5.2                               | Operational Strategy          | 16   |          |
|     | 5.3                               | Residual House Spraying       | 19   |          |
|     | 5.4                               | Control of Peridomestic       |      |          |
|     |                                   | Populations                   | 22   |          |
|     | 5.5                               | Epidemiological Vigilance     | 24   |          |
|     | 5.6                               | Reference Collections         | 25   |          |
| 6.  | Summary of Challenges             |                               | 25   |          |
| 7.  |                                   | rences Cited                  | 28   | N. 6. 10 |

#### Acknowledgements

The WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES) wishes to thank the following for their critical review of the document and for their valuable comments and suggestions:

- ◆ Dr A. Rojas de Arias, Instituto de Ciencias de la Salud, Ministry of Health, Asuncion, Paraguay
- ♦ Dr J.P. Dujardin, IRD/INLASA, La Paz, Bolivia
- ◆ Dr F. Noireau, Departamento de Entomologia, Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- ◆ Dr A. M. Oliveira-Filho, Lab. de Biologia, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- ◆ Dr G. Schmunis, World Health Organization, Regional Office for the Americas, Washington D.C., USA

WHOPES also wishes to thank Dr C. J. Schofield, Coordinator of the ECLAT network (European Community Latin American Triatominae research network), a Concerted Action Programme of the European Commission, based at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK, and other ECLAT members for preparation of the position paper.

#### 1. Introduction

With the continuing success of the Southern Cone Initiative against Chagas disease, launched in 1991 by the governments of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, two further regional initiatives against Chagas disease were launched in 1997 in the Andean Pact countries (Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela) and in Central America (Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama) (WHO, 1997, 1998). In each case, the basic control strategy involves strengthening national systems for screening blood donors to avoid the risk of transfusional transmission, together with measures to eliminate domestic populations of the insect vectors (Triatominae) in order to eliminate vector-borne transmission. To these are added improved health education, and measures to provide at least supportive treatment for those already infected with *Trypanosoma cruzi* – causative agent of Chagas disease.

This paper discusses the current status of vector-borne transmission of *T. cruzi* in Central America, seeking to identify technical aspects that could merit particular attention.

#### 2. Chagas Disease in Central America

At the time of writing, the prevalence of *T. cruzi* infection in Central American countries is not precisely known, since few large-scale surveys have been completed. Currently available data suggest a combined prevalence of around 2.3 million people infected in Central America and Mexico (Table 1) which, using the model of Hayes & Schofield (1990) would indicate an overall incidence of over 70,000 new infections per year in the absence of control measures. However, recent studies in parts of Guatemala (Cordon-Rosales *et al.*, 1997; Paz Bailey, 1998; Tabaru *et al.*, 1999a,b) and Honduras (Ponce *et al.*, 1995) show that village prevalence rates can exceed 40%, with a calculated

#### WHO/CDS/WHOPES/GCDPP/2000.1 Page 4

incidence rate of nearly 5% per year in some areas (Paz Bailey, 1998).

Table 1. Estimated prevalence and annual incidence of Chagasic infection in Mexico and Central America

| Country     | Seroprevalence <sup>1</sup> | Annual                 |               |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
|             |                             | Incidence <sup>2</sup> | Main vector   |
| Mexico      | 540 000                     | 10 854                 | Various       |
| Belize      | 600                         | 26                     | T. dimidiata  |
| Guatemala   | 730 000                     | 28 387                 | R. prolixus   |
|             |                             |                        | T. dimidiata  |
| Honduras    | 300 000                     | 11 490                 | R. prolixus   |
|             |                             |                        | T. dimidiata  |
| El Salvador | 322 000                     | 10 594                 | T. dimidiata  |
| Nicaragua   | 67 000                      | 2 660                  | R. prolixus   |
| _           |                             |                        | T. dimidiata  |
| Costa Rica  | 130 000                     | 3 320                  | T. dimidiata  |
| Panama      | 220 000                     | 5 346                  | R. pallescens |
|             |                             |                        | T. dimidiata  |
| TOTAL       | 2 309 600                   | 72 677                 |               |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Mexico according to Guzmán Bracho *et al.* (1998); other countries from WHO estimates.

There are no studies that directly illustrate the economic impact of Chagas disease in Central America. However, we can use recent data from Argentina on the costs and benefits of Chagas disease control (Rasambrio et al. 1998) to estimate that the

预览已结束,完整报告链接和二维码如下:

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5\_30502



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Incidence calculated according to the model of Hayes & Schofield (1990).