

**BIOEFFECT OF *BACILLUS THURINGIENSIS* AS  
BACTERICIDE AGAINST SOME COTTON PESTS**

**BY**

**SALIM MOHAMED TAHER KHOJA**

B.Sc., Agric. Sc., (Plant Protection), Aleppo University, Syria, 1993

M.Sc., Agric. Sc., (Plant Protection), Aleppo University, Syria, 2000

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment**

**of**

**the requirements for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**In**

**Agricultural Science**

**(Entomology)**

**Department of Plant Protection,**

**Faculty of Agriculture,**

**Ain Shams University**

**2005**

# **BIOEFFECT OF *BACILLUS THURINGIENSIS* AS BACTERICIDE AGAINST SOME COTTON PESTS**

**BY**

**SALIM MOHAMED TAHER KHOJA**

B.Sc., Agric. Sc., (Plant Protection), Aleppo University, Syria, 1993

M.Sc., Agric. Sc., (Plant Protection), Aleppo University, Syria, 2000

**Under the supervision of:**

**Prof. Dr. George Nasralla Rezk**

Prof. Emeritus of Economic Entomology, Department of Plant  
Protection , Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University,  
(Principal Supervisor)

**Prof. Dr. Madiha Aboul Makarem Rizk**

Prof. of Economic Entomology, Department of Plant Protection,  
Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University

**Dr. Hamdy El-Said Mohamed Hanafy**

Assistant Prof. of Economic Entomology, Department of  
Plant Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University

## **Approval Sheet**

### **BIOEFFECT OF *BACILLUS THURINGIENSIS* AS BACTERICIDE AGAINST SOME COTTON PESTS**

**BY**

**SALIM MOHAMED TAHER KHOJA**

B.Sc., Agric. Sc., (Plant Protection), Aleppo University, Syria, 1993

M.Sc., Agric. Sc., (Plant Protection), Aleppo University, Syria, 2000

**This thesis for Ph.D. degree has been approved by:**

**Prof. Dr. Ahmed Raouf Hamed .....**

Head of Research, Biological Control Research Department, Plant  
Protection Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center

**Prof. Dr. Roushdy Rizkalla Iss-Hak .....**

Prof. Emeritus of Economic Entomology, Faculty of  
Agriculture, Ain Shams University

**Prof. Dr. Madiha Aboul Makarem Rizk.....**

Prof. of Economic Entomology, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain  
Shams University

**Prof. Dr. George Nasralla Rezk.....**

Prof. Emeritus of Economic Entomology, Faculty of  
Agriculture, Ain Shams University

Date of Examination: 26 / 10 / 2005

## ABSTRACT

**Salim Mohamed Taher Khoja, Bioeffect of *Bacillus thuringiensis* as Bactericide Against Some Cotton Pests. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Ain Shams University, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Plant Protection, Egypt, 2005.**

The present work is an attempt to throw some light on the natural bio-agents; entomopathogenic bacteria (*B. thuringiensis* Berl.) which cause diseases to the larvae of both pink bollworm *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saund.) and spiny bollworm *Earias insulana* (Boisd.).

Percentages of bolls' infestation with bollworms in the field are progressively increased toward the end of season and after harvest. While mean percentages of infected bollworms larvae with natural bacteria was higher after harvest comparing with cotton growing season.

Laboratory experiments were carried out to investigate the effect of two bacterial commercial products of *B. thuringiensis* sub sp. *Kurstaki* (Dipel 2x and Protecto) on the eggs and newly hatched larvae of both pink and spiny bollworms. Also the isolated bacterial strains were tested to evaluate their efficiency on the newly hatched larvae. Results showed that the treatment of eggs did not affect, significantly, while the mortality percentage of newly hatched larvae produced from the treated eggs was high according to the used concentrations. Percentage of larval mortality increased by increasing the applied concentration. Also LC50s values had been calculated after 3-7 days of treatment by the two tested bacterial commercial products of *B. thuringiensis* sub sp. *Kurstaki* (Dipel 2x and Protecto).

Histopathological studies on uninfected and infected larvae with Dipel 2x, Protecto, and isolated bacteria, showed certain

histopathological changes in the midgut of treated larvae by comparing with untreated.

Biochemical studies showed that, the difference in total protein bands patterns were found in uninfected and infected larvae as well as the tested entomopathogenic bacteria.

**Key word:** *Bacillus thuringiensis*, pink bollworm; *Pectinophora gossypiella* and spiny bollworm; *Earias insulana*.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

All praises are due to God, and to Syrian Government who blessed me with kind professors and colleagues in Egypt, and gave me the support to prepare this thesis at Ain Shams university.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude and my sincere appreciations to **Prof. Dr. G. N. Rezk**, Professor of Economic Entomology, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University whose supervision, help, valuable suggestion ,continuous encouragement, unlimited guidance and his endless support enriched this work. I am deeply indepted to **Prof. Dr. Madiha, A. Rizk**, Professor of Economic Entomology, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, her supervision, enthusiastic encouragement and invaluable help were the real skelton of this work.Thanks are also due to **Dr. H.E.M. Hanafy**, Lecturer in the Plant Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, for supervising this work, kind attention, and make through the preparation of this thesis. Thanks are also due to **Prof. Dr. N. Y. Abd El-Ghaffar** Prof. of Plant Pathology Faculty. of Agriculture., Ain Shams University, for his kind supervision, assistance sincer, his effort in identification of isolated bacteria and his help which was of utmost importance.

My thanks have to be extended to all my professors and colleagues at the Plant Protection Dept., Plant Pathology Dept. and Microbiology Dept., Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams Univ.

I am indebted forever to my parents and all my family for their help, support and continuous encouragement.

Finally to this woman who gave me everything to prepare this script, my wife. To my future my daughter.

# LIST OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Effect of <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> on lepidopterous insects...	5
2.2. Bioeffect of <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> on the pink bollworm, <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> and spiny bollworm, <i>Earias insulana</i>	13
2.3. Effect of isolated <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> on lepidopterous insects.....	23
2.4. Histopathological changes in different insect pests treated with <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> .....	25
2.5. Biochemical studies of changes caused by <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> in treated insect pests.....	30
<b>3. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....</b>	<b>34</b>
3.1. Percentages of cotton bolls infestated with the bollworms in the field and of infected bollworm larvae with bacteria...	34
3.2. Rearing of both pink bollworm, <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> and spiny bollworm, <i>Earias insulana</i> on artificial diet.....	34
3.3. Diet preparation.....	35
3.4 .Toxicological studies.....	36
3.4.1. Bioassay experiments.....	36
3.4.2. Egg treatment.....	36
3.4.3. Larval treatment.....	37
3.4.4. Biological studies.....	38
3.4.5. Statistical analysis.....	39
3.5. Histopathological studies.....	39
3.6. Itelological studies.....	40
3.6.1. Isolation and purification of the natural entomogenaus bacteria.....	40

3.6.2. Pathogenicity test.....	40
3.6.3. Identification of the isolated bacteria .....	41
3.6.3.1. Morphological characteristics.....	41
3.6.3.2. Biochemical and physiological characteristics	41
3.6.3.3. BIOLOG automated microbial identification	
method.....	41
3.6.3.4. Growth media.....	42
3.7. Biochemical Studies.....	44
3.7.1. Total protein electrophoresis of pink bollworm <i>P.</i>	
<i>gossypiella</i> and spiny bollworm <i>E. insulana</i> larvae.....	45
3.7.2. Stock solutions.....	45
3.7.3. Extraction of protein.....	48
3.7.3.1. Extraction of protein in (pink bollworm, <i>P.</i>	
<i>gossypiella</i> and spiny bollworm, <i>E. insulana</i> )tested	
larvae.....	48
3.7.3.2. Casting of gel.....	48
3.7.3.3. Gel preparation.....	50
3.7.3.4. Electrophoresis conditions.....	50
3.7.3.5. Gel staining.....	50
3.7.3.6. Gel distaining.....	50
<b>4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>51</b>
4.1. Percentages of bolls infestation with bollworms in the	
field and infected bollworm larvae with local bacteria	
either pathogenic or non pathogenic ones.....	51
4.2. Toxicological studies.....	59
4.2.1. Effect of egg treatments of pink bollworm	
<i>P. gossypiella</i> and spiny bollworm <i>E. insulana</i> with	
different concentrations of <i>B. thuringiensis</i> commercial	
products (Dipel 2x and protecto).....	59
4.2.2. Bioassay of two commercial products of <i>B.</i>	
<i>thuringiensis</i> sub sp. <i>Kurstaki</i> (Dipel 2x and protecto); on	



larvae of both pink bollworm, <i>P. gossypiella</i> and spiny bollworm, <i>E. insulana</i> .....	66
4.2.3. Effect of LC50 concentration of two commercial products of <i>B. thuringiensis</i> sub sp. <i>Kurstaki</i> (Dipel 2x and protecto) on larval, pupal and adult stages of both the pink bollworm <i>P.gossypiella</i> , and spiny bollworm <i>E. insulana</i> .....	74
4.3. Itelological studies.....	80
4.3.1. Symptoms of infection.....	80
4.3.2. Pathogenicity test.....	80
4.3.3. Identification of bacteria isolates.....	81
4.3.3.1. Morphological and cultural characters.....	81
4.3.3.2. Biochemical and physiological characters.....	81
4.3.3.3. BIOLOG automated microbial identification method.....	83
4.4. Histopathological studies.....	92
4.6. Biochemical studies.....	103
4.6.1. Total protein electrophoresis of pink bollworm <i>P. gossypiella</i> larvae infected with entomopathogenic bacterial .....	103
4.6.2. Total protein electrophoresis of infected spiny bollworm <i>E. insulana</i> larvae with entomopathogenic bacterial.....	107
<b>SUMMARY</b> .....	111
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	117
<b>ARABIC SUMMARY</b> .....	135

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page</b>
Table (1): Composition of 15% resolving gel and stacking gel...	49
Table (2): Percentage of cotton bolls infested with bollworms ( <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> and <i>Earias insulana</i> ) and percentage of bollworms infected with local bacteria spp. after harvest season 2002 .....	53
Table (3): Percentage of cotton bolls infested with bollworms ( <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> and <i>Earias insulana</i> ) and percentage of bollworms infected with local bacteria spp. after harvest season 2003.....	54
Table (4): Percentage of cotton bolls infested with bollworms ( <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> and <i>Earias insulana</i> ) and percentage of bollworms infected with local bacteria spp. during season 2003.....	55
Table (5): Table (4): Percentage of cotton bolls infested with bollworms ( <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> and <i>Earias insulana</i> ) and percentage of bollworms infected with local bacteria spp. during season 2004.....	56
Table (6): Effect of eggs treatment of pink bollworm <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> with different concentrations of two commercial products of <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> sub sp. <i>Kurstaki</i> (Dipel 2x, Protecto), on hatchability.	61
Table (7): Effect of eggs treatment of spiny bollworm <i>Earias insulana</i> with different concentrations of two commercial products of <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> sub sp. <i>Kurstaki</i> (Dipel 2x, Protecto), on hatchability.....	62
Table (8): Mortality percentages among newly hatched pink and spiny bollworms larvae when eggs treated with <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> sub sp. <i>Kurstaki</i> commercial products (Dipel 2x and Protecto).....	63

Table (9): Mean corrected mortality percentages among the newly hatched larvae of pink bollworm <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> when left feeding on artificial diet treated with <i>B.thuringiensis</i> sub sp. <i>Kurstaki</i> products (Dipel 2x and Protecto).....	68
Table (10): Mean Corrected mortality percentages among the Newly hatched larvae of spiny bollworm <i>Earias Insulana</i> when left feeding on artificial diet treated with, <i>B. thuringiensis</i> sub sp. <i>Kurstaki</i> products (Dipel 2x and Protecto).....	69
Table(11): Effect of treating newly hatched larvae of the bollworms larvae ( <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> and <i>Earias insulana</i> ) with LC50 concentration of the Dipel 2x and Protecto on the biotic potential ...	76
Table(12 ): Corrected mortality percentages among the newly hatched larvae of the pink and spiny bollworms when left feeding on artificial diet treated, with different concentrations of natural isolated bacteria.	84
Table(13):Morphological characterization of isolated bacteria from infected samples of the pink and spiny bollworms .....	85
Table (14): Biochemical and physiological characterizations of isolated bacteria from infected samples the pink and spiny bollworms larvae .....	86
Table(15): Relative mobility values and molecular weight of SDS protein bands detected in body of treated and untreated of the pink bollworm ( <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> ) larvae .....	105
Table(16): Relative mobility values and molecular weight of SDS protein bands detected in body of treated and untreated of the spiny bollworm( <i>Earias insulana</i> ) larvae.....	109

## LIST OF FIGURS

	<b>Page</b>
Fig.(1): Percentage of infested cotton bolls with bollworms larvae after harfest seasons 2002& 2003, and during growing seasons 2003&2004.....	57
Fig.(2): Percentage of infected bollworms larvae with bacteria during two successive cotton seasons 2002& 2003 after harvest and during growing seasons 2003&2004.....	58
Fig.(3): Effect of eggs treatmrnt of pink bollworm with different concentrations of <i>B.thuringiensis</i> formulations (Dipel 2x and Protecto), on hatched of eggs (%)......	64
Fig.(4): Effect of eggs treatment of spiny bollworm with different concentrations of <i>B.thuringiensis</i> formulations (Dipel 2x and Protecto), on hatched of eggs (%)......	65
Fig.(5): Toxicity lines of Dipel 2x and Protecto on pink bollworm after 3 days from treatment.....	70
Fig.(6): Toxicity lines of Dipel 2x and Protecto on spiny bollworm after 3 days from treatment.....	71
Fig.(7): Toxicity lines of Dipel 2x and Protecto on pink bollworm after 7 days from treatment.....	72
Fig.(8): Toxicity lines of Dipel 2x and Protecto on spiny bollworm after 7 days from treatment.....	73
Fig.(9): Twelve days old larvae of pink bollworm uninfected and infected with <i>B. thuringiensis</i> .....	77
Fig.(10): Twelve days old larvae of spiny bollworm uninfected and infected with <i>B. Thuringiensis</i> .....	77
Fig.(11): Malformed pupae of pink bollworm infected with	

<i>B. thuringiensis</i> .....	78
Fig.(12): Malformed pupae of spiny bollworm infected with <i>B. thuringiensis</i> .....	78
Fig.(13): Malformed moths of pink bollworm infected with <i>B. thuringiensis</i> .....	79
Fig.(14): Malformed moths of spiny bollworm infected with <i>B. thuringiensis</i> .....	79
Fig.(15): Cumulative percentage mortality of pink bollworm larvae after 7days of treatment (highest & lowest concentration) with <i>Pseudomonas pyrocinia</i> (A1) , <i>Serratia marcescens</i> (M3), <i>Serratia rubidaea</i> (E3), <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> (S2), and Dipel2X.....	87
Fig. (16): Cumulative percentage mortality of spiny bollworm larvae after 7 days of treatment (highest & lowest concentration) with <i>Pseudomonas pyrocinia</i> (A1), <i>Serratia rubidaea</i> (E3), <i>Serratia marcescens</i> (M3), <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> (S2), and Dipel 2X.....	88
Fig.(17): Computer sheet showing species identification of <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> (S2) , using BIOLOG - Microplate system.....	89
Fig.(18): Computer sheet showing species identification of <i>Serratia marcescens</i> (M3), using BIOLOG Microplate system.....	90
Fig.(19): Computer sheet showing species identification of <i>Serratia rubidaea</i> (E3), using BIOLOG Microplate system.....	91
Fig.(20): T.s. of uninfected midgut of spiny bollworm larvae as a control .....(×: 400).	94
Fig.(21): T.s. of uninfected midgut of spiny bollworm larvae as a control .....(×: 600).	94

Fig.(22): T.s. of infected midgut of spiny bollworm larvae infected with naturally bacteria .....(×: 200).	95
Fig.(23): T.s. of infected midgut of spiny bollworm larvae infected with naturally bacteria .....(×: 400).	95
Fig.(24): T.s. of infected midgut of spiny bollworm larvae treated with Protecto .....(×: 200).	96
Fig.(25): T.s. of infected midgut of spiny bollworm larvae treated with Protecto..... (×: 600).	96
Fig.(26): T.s. of infected midgut of spiny bollworm larvae treated with Dipel 2x ..... (×: 200).	97
Fig.(27): T.s. of infected midgut of spiny bollworm larvae treated with Dipel 2x showing complete destructive (×: 200).	97
Fig.(28): T.s. of uninfected midgut of pink bollworm larvae as a Control..... (×: 200).	98
Fig.(29): T.s. of uninfected midgut of pink bollworm larvae as a Control.....(×: 400).	98
Fig.(30): T.s. of uninfected midgut of pink bollworm larvae as a Control .....(×: 600).	99
Fig.(31): T.s. of infected midgut of pink bollworm larvae treated with naturally bacteria ..... (×: 200).	99

Fig.(32): T.s. of infected midgut of pink bollworm larvae treated with Dipel 2x .....	(×: 200).	100
Fig.(33): T.s. of infected midgut of pink bollworm larvae treated with Dipel 2x .....	(×: 400).	100
Fig.(34): T.s. of infected midgut of pink bollworm larvae treated with Protecto .....	(×: 200).	101
Fig.(35): T.s. of infected midgut of pink bollworm larvae treated with naturally bacteria .....	(×: 600).	101
Fig.(36): T.s. of infected midgut of pink bollworm larvae treated with Dipel 2x .....	(×: 400).	102
Fig.(37): Polyacrylamide gel of SDS protein patterns in tissues of untreated and treated larvae of pink bollworm (Protein band numbers are indicating on the left side of the gel).....		106
Fig.(38): Polyacrylamide gel of SDS protein patterns in tissues of untreated and treated larvae of spiny bollworm (Protein band numbers are indicating on the left side of the gel).....		110