

**FURTHER STUDIES ON INSECTICIDES  
RESISTANCE IN THE COWPEA APHID**

**BY**

**EL-SAYED MOHAMMAD SOLIMAN MOKBEL**

**B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Pesticides), Fac. Agric., Zagazig Univ., 1991**

**M.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Pesticides), Fac. Agric., Zagazig Univ., 2007**

**THESIS**

**Submitted in Partial fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**In**

**Agricultural Science  
(Pesticides)**

**Department of Economic Entomology and Pesticides  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Cairo University**

**EGYPT**

**2013**

# APPROVAL SHEET

## FURTHER STUDIES ON INSECTICIDES RESISTANCE IN THE COWPEA APHID

PH.D. Thesis  
In  
Agric. Sci. (Pesticides)

By  
**EL-SAYED MOHAMMAD SOLIMAN MOKBEL**

B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Pesticides), Fac. Agric., Zagazig Univ., 1991  
M.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Pesticides), Fac. Agric., Zagazig Univ., 2007

### APPROVAL COMMITTEE

**Dr. MAHER IBRAHIM ALI** .....  
Professor of Pesticides Chemistry and Toxicology, Fac. Agric., Alexandria University

**Dr. MONEER DAOOD ABD-ALLA** .....  
Professor of Pesticides, Fac. Agric., Cairo University

**Dr. EMAN SAED HASSAN SWELAM**.....  
Associate Professor of Pesticides, Fac. Agric., Cairo University

**Dr. MOHAMMAD ABD-ELHADY KANDIL**.....  
Professor of Pesticides, Fac. Agric., Cairo University

Date: / / 2013

# **SUPERVISION SHEET**

## **FURTHER STUDIES ON INSECTICIDES RESISTANCE IN THE COWPEA APHID**

**Ph.D. Thesis**

**In  
Agricultural Sci. (Pesticides)**

**By**

**EL-SAYED MOHAMMAD SOLIMAN MOKBEL**

**B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Pesticides), Fac. Agric., Zagazig Univ., 1991**

**M.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Pesticides), Fac. Agric., Zagazig Univ., 2007**

### **SUPERVISION COMMITTEE**

**Dr. MOHAMMAD ABD-ELHADY KANDIL**

**Professor of Pesticides, Fac. Agric., Cairo University**

**Dr. EMAN SAED HASSAN SWELAM**

**Associate Professor of Pesticides, Fac. Agric., Cairo University**

**Dr. EMAN MOHAMMAD MOSTAFA RADWAN**

**Head Research, Agricultural Research Center**

**Name of Candidate:** El-Sayed Mohammad Soliman Mokbel **Degree:** Ph.D.  
**Title of Thesis:** Further Studies on Insecticides Resistance in the Cowpea Aphid  
**Supervisors:** Dr. Mohamed Abd-Elhady Kandil  
Dr. Eman Saed Hassan Swelam  
Dr. Eman Mohammad Mostafa Radwan  
**Department:** Department of Economic Entomology and Pesticides **Branch:** Pesticides  
**Approval:** 28 / 8 / 2013

### ABSTRACT

The cowpea aphid, *Aphis craccivora* (Koch) is an important pest of legumes crops in Egypt. Aphid has developed resistance to many insecticides. Organophosphates are considered important group of insecticides being used against piercing insects, in addition to neonicotinoids which introduced to the market science 1990. This study was carried out to explore resistance characteristic of cowpea aphid to chlorpyrifos-methyl and acetamiprid and studying some biochemical and genetic differences. Selection pressure was used to build up resistance within 24- generations with both insecticides. Resistance to acetamiprid increased to 38.6 -fold compared with susceptible strain(S-strain), while chlorpyrifos-methyl reached to about 82 fold in the same period. Cross resistance patterns, in acetamiprid resistant strain (R-acetamiprid) showed that, all tested members of neonicotinoids, as well as the synthetic pyrethroid lambda-cyhalothrin and s-fenvalerate possess obvious resistant level. However, the rest of tested insecticides didn't show obvious cross resistance. On the other hand, Cross resistance patterns, in chlorpyrifos-methyl showed that, the organophosphate compound, malathion as well as the synthetic pyrethroid, lambda-cyhalothrin possess obvious resistant level. While the other tested insecticides except for acetamiprid and thiamethoxam exhibited various levels of tolerance. Selection pressure produced some differences in total protein content and SDS-protein banding patterns. The analysis of esterase patterns and esterase bands classification by inhibitors obtained by the native-PAGE and by using two substrates revealed differences as a result for selection. Acetylcholinesterase (AChE), total esterase activity and glutathione-s-transferase (GST) activity was also measured. Total esterase and (GST) activity demonstrate a significant role for these enzymes in chlorpyrifos-methyl resistance. Synergistic studies showed that, esterase play the key role of resistance in chlorpyrifos-methyl selected strain and the monooxygenase also play a potent role. In acetamiprid selected strain, P450 mediated detoxification plays a substantial role in acetamiprid resistance but other secondary mechanism(s) may be involved. DNA polymerase chain reaction (PCR) is a less expensive and rapid molecular method. The size and number of PCR products obtained using multiprimer sets, the multiplex PCR method, can be used for distinguishing several strains. Then the amount of genetic variation within and among strains, using a molecular assay that rapidly distinguishes the species. The results confirmed that RAPD profiling is a powerful method for identification and distinguishing for pesticides resistance between different strains.

**Keywords:** *Aphis craccivora*, acetamiprid, chlorpyrifos-methyl, resistance, synergists, esterases, P 450- monooxygenase, SDS protein, polymerase chain reaction (PCR).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Firstly, ultimate thanks to **Allah**.

I would like to acknowledge all the help, guidance and support of my dissertation advisory committee:

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my major Professor, **Dr. Mohammad Abd-Elhady Kandil**, Professor of Pesticides, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University, my advisor, for his help throughout my study, helpful suggestions, critical evaluation of my research, the countless hours he spent helping with my research and dissertation.

I would like to thank **Dr. Eman Saed Hassan Swelam**, Associate Professor of Pesticides, Fac. Agric., Cairo University, for all the encouragement and insightful discussions of my research from the scientific point of view. I wish I have a better word than 'thank you' for her invaluable suggestions and critical review of this dissertation.

I am deeply indebted to **Dr. Eman Mohammad Mostafa Radwan**, Head Research, Central Agricultural Pesticides Laboratory, for overseeing my biochemical and molecular studies, providing laboratory facilities and reviewing the manuscript.

My sincere thanks are also due to **Dr. Wafaa Mohamed Hassan El-Deeb** Head Research, Central Agricultural Pesticides Laboratory, for all the expert advice, technical assistance, reviewing the manuscript and encouragement during the preparation of this work.

In addition, I would like to express my very special thanks to all of the staff members of my department "Standard Rearing research" for their support and encouragement during the whole course of this work.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

### Abbreviation

A-St.	Acetamiprid resistant strain
AChE	Acetylcholinesterase
ATC	Acetylthiocholine
ATChI	Acetylthiocholine iodide
BLRV	Bean leaf roll virus
BPH	Brown plant hopper
CbE	Carboxylesterase
CDNB	1-chloro-2-4-dinitrobenzene
Ch-m St.	Chloropyrifos-methyl strain
CL	Confidence limit
DBM	Diamond back moth
DEF	Tribufos (S, S, S-tributyl phosphorotrithioate)
DEM	Diethyl malate
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
FBNYV	Faba bean necrotic yellows virus
F-St.	Field strain
GABA	$\gamma$ - amino butyric acid
MFO	Mixed function oxidase
MACE	Modification of acetylcholine esterase
ng	Nano gram
1-NA	$\alpha$ -naphthyl acetate
N <sub>o</sub>	Number
PBO	Piperonyl butoxide
PAGE	Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
R H	Relative humidity
Rm	Relative mobility
SE	Standard error
S-St.	Susceptible strain
SR	Synergistic ratio
TPP	Triphenyl phosphate

# CONTENTS

	Page
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>REVIEW OF LITERATURE</b> .....	5
<b>1. Aphids as agricultural pests</b> .....	5
<b>2. Insecticide resistance in aphids</b> .....	8
a. Resistance to organophosphates (OPs) .....	10
b. Resistance to neonicotinoids .....	12
<b>3. Cross resistance</b> .....	16
a. Cross resistance to organophosphates (Ops) .....	17
b. Cross resistance to neonicotinoids.....	17
<b>4. Biochemical assay</b> .....	19
a. Protein assay.....	19
b. Esterase activity.....	20
c. Glutathione-S-transferase (GST) activity.....	21
d. Esterase bands patterns.....	22
<b>5. Identification the role of certain enzymes in resistance by using synergists</b> .....	24
<b>6. Molecular assay by random amplified polymorphic DNA polymerase chain reaction (RAPD-PCR)</b> .....	27
<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b> .....	30
<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b> .....	55
<b>1. Susceptibility of field population of the cowpea aphid</b> .....	55
a. Base line susceptibility of laboratory strain.....	55
b. Effect of tested insecticides against field population of the cowpea aphid.....	57
c. Resistance status of field strain in relation to susceptible laboratory strain.....	58
d. Resistance coefficient and resistance classification of tested insecticides in field strain.....	60
<b>2. Insecticides resistance selection</b> .....	65
a. Chloropyrifos-methyl resistance selection.....	66
b. Acetamiprid resistance selection.....	68
<b>3. Cross resistance</b> .....	72
a. Cross resistance of chloropyrifos-methyl resistant strain..	72
b. Cross- resistance of Acetamiprid resistant strain.....	74
<b>4. Biochemical assays</b> .....	79
a. Electrophoretic pattern of protein and esterases in	79

susceptible, field and resistant strains of the cowpea aphid, <i>A. craccivora</i> (Koch).....	
1. Total protein assay.....	79
2. Refractionation of protein bands patterns.....	80
3. Esterase profile with $\alpha$ - naphthyl acetate.....	84
4. Esterase profile with $\beta$ - naphthyl acetate.....	87
5. Enzyme Inhibition and types of esterase enzyme bands	88
a. Esterase profile with $\alpha$ - naphthyl acetate.....	88
b. Esterase profile with $\beta$ - naphthyl acetate.....	88
6. Possible use of isozymes in resistance-grading.....	88
<b>b. Enzymes activity</b> .....	<b>101</b>
1. Esterases activity.....	101
a. Acetylcholinesterase (AChE) activity.....	101
b. Total esterase (ESTs) activity.....	106
2. Glutathione-s-transferase (GST) activity.....	108
<b>5. Identification the role of certain enzymes in resistance by using synergists</b> .....	<b>111</b>
a. Chloropyrifos-methyl selected strain.....	111
b. Acetamiprid selected strain.....	115
<b>6. Random amplified polymorphic DNA polymerase chain reaction (RAPD-PCR) of tested strains</b> .....	<b>117</b>
a. RAPD- PCR product analysis.....	117
b. Nei's similarity coefficient.....	130
c. Specific DNA markers.....	132
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>137</b>
<b>SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>139</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>148</b>
<b>ARABIC SUMMARY</b> .....	



## LIST OF TABLES

No.	Title	Page
1.	Details of used insecticides.....	35
2.	Classification of esterase bands according to Augustinsson, (1961). .....	51
3.	List of primers used for RAPD analysis.....	53
4.	Toxicity of the used insecticides against the adults of cowpea aphid, <i>A. craccivora</i> , laboratory strain.....	56
5.	Toxicity of the used insecticides against adults of <i>A. craccivora</i> , field strain .....	58
6.	Resistance status of field strain in relation to susceptible strain.....	59
7.	Susceptibility levels of cowpea aphid to the tested insecticides (Results expressed in LC <sub>95</sub> and RC).....	62
8.	Development of resistance in the cow pea aphid <i>A. craccivora</i> exposed to laboratory selection pressure with chloropyrifos-methyl.....	67
9.	Development of resistance in the cow pea aphid <i>A. craccivora</i> exposed to laboratory selection pressure with Acetamiprid.....	69
10.	Cross- resistance of chloropyrifos-methyl resistant strain of the cowpea aphid <i>A. craccivora</i> to the tested insecticides.....	73
11.	Cross- resistance of acetamiprid resistant strain of the cowpea aphid <i>A. craccivora</i> to the tested insecticides.....	77
12.	Total protein content (mg/ g.bw) of adults from susceptible, field, Chloropyrifos-methyl-resistant and acetamiprid-resistant strains of the cowpea aphid <i>A. craccivora</i> . .....	80
13.	Protein bands patterns detected in susceptible, field, Chloropyrifos-methyl and acetamiprid- resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> .....	83

14.	Rm values of esterase bands and staining behavior in susceptible, field, Chlorpyrifos-methyl -resistant and acetamiprid-resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> with $\alpha$ -naphthyl acetate as substrate.....	86
15.	Rm values of esterase bands and staining behavior in susceptible, field, Chlorpyrifos-methyl -resistant and acetamiprid-resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> with $\beta$ -naphthyl acetate as substrate.....	87
16.	Response of non-specific esterase bands to specific inhibitors in susceptible, field, Chlorpyrifos-methyl-resistant and acetamiprid-resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> using $\alpha$ - naphthyl acetate as substrate.....	89
17.	Types of esterase bands in susceptible, field, Chlorpyrifos-methyl-resistant acetamiprid-resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> using $\alpha$ - naphthyl acetate as substrate.....	91
18.	Response of non-specific esterase bands to specific inhibitors in susceptible, field, Chlorpyrifos-methyl-resistant acetamiprid-resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> using $\beta$ - naphthyl acetate as substrate .....	93
19.	Types of esterase bands in susceptible, field, Chlorpyrifos-methyl resistant and acetamiprid resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> using $\beta$ - naphthyl acetate as substrate.....	93
20.	Acetyl cholinesterase activity (AChE) in susceptible, field, Chlorpyrifos-methyl-resistant and acetamiprid resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> .....	102
21.	Total esterase activity to $\alpha$ - naphthyl acetate as model substrate in susceptible, field and resistant strains.....	106
22.	Glutathion-s-transferase activity (GST-activity) in susceptible, field, chlorpyrifos-methyl-resistant and acetamiprid-resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> .....	108
23.	Synergistic effect of PBO and DEF to susceptible, chlorpyrifos-methyl resistant and acetamiprid resistant strains of <i>A. craccivora</i> .....	113

24.	Banding patterns of RAPD-PCR for susceptible, field, chloropyrifos-methyl resistant and acetamiprid resistant strains of the cowpea aphid <i>A. craccivora</i> .....	122
25.	The commonality band ratios between the susceptible, field, chloropyrifos-methyl resistant and acetamiprid resistant strains of the cowpea aphid <i>A. Craccivora</i> .....	127
26.	Similarity Indices of bands between the susceptible, field, chloropyrifos-methyl resistant and acetamiprid resistant strains of the cowpea aphid <i>A. craccivora</i> .....	127
27.	Scorable DNA bands of susceptible(S-strain) generated by 11 random primers through RAPD-PCR .....	128
28.	Scorable DNA bands of field -strain generated by 11 random primers through RAPD-PCR.....	138
29.	Scorable DNA bands of Chloropyrifos-methyl -strain generated by 11 random primers through RAPD-PCR .....	129
30.	Scorable DNA bands of R-acetamiprid -strain generated by 11 random primers through RAPD-PCR.....	129
31.	Similarity coefficient values among the four studied <i>A. craccivora</i> strains.....	130
32.	Specific markers resulting from <i>A. craccivora</i> strains by RAPD-PCR analysis.....	133

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Title	Page
1.	SDS-Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of protein bands patterns and its molecular weights in a mass homogenate of aphid adults from the different strains: Protein marker (M), susceptible strain(S), field strain (F), chloropyrifos-methyl -resistant strain (Ch-m) and acetamiprid resistant strain (A).....	82
2.	Native polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of esterase isozyme patterns in different tested strains of the cowpea aphid with $\alpha$ and $\beta$ -naphthyl acetate as substrates. Susceptible strain (Sus), Field strain (F), Chloropyrifos-methyl -resistant strain (Chl) and acetamiprid-resistant strain (Aceta).....	85
3.	Polyacrylamide gel zymogram of esterase isozyme patterns in the different treated strains of the cowpea aphid with $\alpha$ -naphthyl acetate as substrates. Susceptible strain (Sus), Field strain (F), Chloropyrifos-methyl -resistant strain (Chl) and acetamiprid-resistant strain (Aceta) after using Eserin, Dursban, Asodrin and Paraoxon as inhibitors.....	90
4.	Polyacrylamide gel zymogram of esterase isozyme patterns in the different treated strains of the cowpea aphid with $\beta$ -naphthyl acetate as substrates. Susceptible strain (Sus), Field strain (F), Chloropyrifos-methyl -resistant strain (Chl) and acetamiprid-resistant strain (Aceta) after using Eserin, Dursban, Asodrin and Paraoxon as inhibitors .....	92
5.	DNA polymorphism of cow pea aphid tested strains using RAPD-PCR with eleven primers.....	121
6.	Dendrogram demonstrating the relationships among the four studied Aphis craccivora strains.....	131

## INTRODUCTION

Cowpea aphid (*Aphis craccivora* Koch) is a major insect pest on leguminous food crops. When aphid infestation level is large; it may stunt or kill plants. As a result of aphid feeding, a considerable amount of honeydew is produced upon which sooty mold grows. Such black sooty mold reduces photosynthesis and may render leaves unpalatable to livestock. Honeydew also makes the plants sticky, and causes problems at harvest. Cowpea aphid causes major yield losses, due to transmission of two major viruses; faba bean necrotic yellows virus (FBNYV) and bean leaf roll virus (BLRV) (Laamari *et al.*, 2009). It has become a serious pest on a variety of legumes such as faba bean, cow pea and pea in Egypt (El-Ghareeb *et al.*, 2002).

Insecticide resistance is one of the major obstacles to the control of agricultural pests. This worldwide problem has been documented for over 500 arthropod species which include over 20 resistant aphid species (Georghiou, 1990). The continuous use of insecticides to control insect infestations and the ability of aphids to travel over long distances could lead to widely distributed insecticide resistant populations. Resistance results in increased pesticide application frequencies and dosages, decreased yields, together with likely risks of more residues in food and environmental damages due to side effects on beneficial organisms, as well as to the increased release of xenobiotics in air, soil and water. Due to the great difficulty and large investments associated with the development of new insecticides; there is always a need to preserve the efficacy of current and future developed active ingredients. It is important,

therefore to monitor the presence of insensitive specimens and to understand which resistance mechanisms are co-selected, so that strategies to delay their diffusion can be designed (Criniti *et al.*, 2008).

The use of organophosphorus (Ops) insecticides in the agricultural and urban settings is still high and is expected to remain so, at least in the near future, because of the efficacy of OPs, their relatively low cost and their lack of bioaccumulation in the ecosystems. Meanwhile, other classes of insecticides are gaining a considerable market share (*e.g.*, pyrethroids) and new classes have been developed such as neonicotinoids (Costa, 2006). Neonicotinoids insecticides represent a relatively new group of chemicals with novel mode of action that includes imidacloprid, thiamethoxam, clothianidin, acetamprid and dinotefuran. The increasing popularity of these compounds reflects their rapid action, high systemicity, generally long residual activity, potency against pests at low concentration active ingredients, and effectiveness against species already resistant to other insecticide classes (Ambrose, 2003).

Rotating insecticides with novel mode of action is one of the most commonly recommended approaches to delay the occurrence of insecticide resistance. However successful implementation of this technique hinges on a good understanding of resistance and cross-resistance patterns in the populations of target pests. The idea behind the rotation of insecticides is that, when an insecticide is withdrawn, the susceptibility of resistant insects will be restored within several generations allowing the insecticide to be reincorporated again into pest management programs. However, in certain cases, resistance

persists over many generations after the withdrawal of selection pressure and such stable resistance prevents the successful reuse of an insecticide for pest management (Ninsin and Tanaka, 2005).

Insecticide resistance can be ascribed to three general mechanisms. One mechanism is modifying behavior to reduce exposure to toxic compounds. A second physiologically based mechanism involves alteration of absorption, excretion, transport, or sequestration of insecticides. A third biochemically based mechanism entails change in target-site binding activity and enhanced detoxification by several types of metabolic enzymes (Wilson and Ashok, 1998). Understanding the mechanisms by which insects develop resistance to insecticides is crucial for designing a successful resistance management program. As a preliminary investigation to elucidating the mechanisms of resistance, we determined the involvement of metabolic enzymes in the resistance to pesticides by using the synergist piperonyl butoxide (PBO), an inhibitor of cytochrome p<sub>450</sub> monooxygenase, and s,s,s-tributyl phosphorotrithioate (EDF), an inhibitor of esterases.

Random amplified polymorphic DNA-Polymerase chain reaction technique (RAPD-PCR) has been previously used for population genetics studies of a number of insects including aphids. RAPDs are viewed as having several advantages over other molecular markers and DNA fingerprints as the technique randomly samples the genome and hence multiple amplifiable fragments are present for each primer. Amplification of genomic DNA by the RAPD-PCR was used to differentiate between deltamethrin resistant and susceptible *Culex pipiens pallens* (Zhu *et al.*,