

**POTENCY OF SOME BIOCONTROL AGENTS IN SUPPRESSING
THE POPULATION OF THE AMERICAN BOLLWORM,
HELIOTHA ARMIGERA (HUB.)**

BY

HEND ALASHRY ALSAYED ALASHRY

B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Economic Entomology) Cairo University, 2000

Master in Environmental Science, Ain –Shams University, 2012.

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of

The Requirements for the doctor of Philosophy Degree

in

Environmental Sciences

Department of Environmental Agricultural Sciences

Institute of Environmental Studies & Research,

Ain –Shams University

2018

APPROVAL SHEET

POTENCY OF SOME BIOCONTROL AGENTS IN SUPPRESSING THE POPULATION OF THE AMERICAN BOLLWORM, *HELIOverPA ARMIGERA* (HUB.)

BY

HEND ALASHRY ALSAYED ALASHRY

B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Economic Entomology), Cairo University, 2000

Master in Environmental Science, Ain –Shams University, 2012.

**This Thesis Towards a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Environmental
Science has been approved by:**

Name:

Signature

Dr. Ramadan Mostafa Abdo El- Kholy, Prof. of Pesticides, Faculty of
Agriculture, Cairo Al-Azhar University.

Dr. Mohamed Salem Abdel-Wahed, Prof. of Economic Entomology,
Plant Protection Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams
University,

Dr. Kadry Washahy Mahmoud, Prof. of Pesticides chemistry and
Toxicology, Plant Protection Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Ain
Shams University,

Dr. Abdel- Aziz Abouel- Ela Khidr, Prof. of Plant Protection,
Bollworms

Research Department, Plant Protection Research Institute.

Dr. Lotfy Abdel- Hameed, Yousif, Prof. of Economic Entomology,
Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University,

**POTENCY OF SOME BIOCONTROL AGENTS IN SUPPRESSING
THE POPULATION OF THE AMERICAN BOLLWORM,
HELICOVERPA ARMIGERA (HUB.)**

BY

HEND ALASHRY ALSAYED ALASHRY

B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Economic Entomology), Cairo University, 2000

Master in Environmental Science, Ain –Shams University, 2012.

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of

The Requirements for the doctor Philosophy Degree

in

Environmental Sciences

Department of Environmental Agricultural Sciences

Institute of Environmental Studies & Research,

Ain –Shams University

Under the supervision of:

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Salem Abdel-wahed, Professor of Economic Entomology, Plant Protection Department, Faculty of Agric., Ain Shams University,

Prof. Dr. Kadry Washahy Mahmoud, Professor of Pesticides chemistry and Toxicology, Plant Protection Department, Faculty of Agric., Ain Shams University,

Prof. Dr. Abdel- Aziz Abouel- Ela Khidr, Professor of Plant Protection, Bollworms Research Department, Plant Protection Research Institute.

2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, gratitude and thanks to **ALLAH** who always helps and guides me.

The author presentable special acknowledgement must be made to **Prof. Dr. Mohamed Salem Abdel- Wahed, Professor** of Economic Entomology, Plant Protection Department, Faculty of Agric., Ain Shams University, for his supervision, suggesting the point and for continuous aids through the work, valuable scientific help, reviewing this work, advice and encouragement.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to **Prof. Kadry Weshahy Mahmoud, Professor of Pesticides chemistry and Toxicology**, Plant Protection Department, Faculty of Agric. Ain Shams University, for his help during the investigation, encouragement, and valuable suggestion reviewing this work, advice and encouragement.

The author wishes to express her sincere and gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Abdel- Aziz Abouel –Ela Khidr, Professor** of Plant protection, Bollworms Research Department, Plant Protection Research Institute, for suggesting the research work, for his kind supervision, generous assistance, continuous support, encouragement, constructive criticism, helpful advice and reviewing the manuscript.

Also, thanks to all the staff members of Economic Entomology, Plant Protection Department, Faculty of Agric., Ain Shams University, and many thanks to all staff members Bollworms Research Department, Plant Protection Research Institute.

Finally, deep thanks to my mother, my husband and my daughters.

ABSTRACT

Hend Alashry Alsayed Alashry. Potency of Some Biocontrol Agents in Suppressing the Population of the American bollworm, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.)

Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in Environmental Agricultural Sciences, Institute of Environmental Studies and Research, Ain Shams University, 2018.

The activities of the tested enzymes included acetylcholinesterase, alkaline and acid phosphatases, α and β - esterases, glutathione S- transferase, mixed function oxidase in the whole homogenates of the different instar larvae from the 3rd to the 6th of the field colony of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) were higher than the corresponding of the laboratory strain. The levels of enzymes activity increased gradually from the 3rd to the 6th instar larvae. Similarity in the total protein content which recorded higher in the different instar larvae of the field colony than the laboratory strain. The toxicity of the tested insecticides was higher against the 2nd instar larvae than the 4th instar larvae. Dipel was the most effective compound against the two instars larvae, whereas Bio-power recorded the least toxic compound. For toxicity index, Dipel DF the most toxic compound was selected as standard insecticides, whereas based on relative potency level, bio power the least toxic one was chosen as standard material. Bio power and Dipel DF showed the steepest toxicity line. According to the quantal scoring Dipel DF was the most pronounced insecticide for pupation. Based on inhibition of the adult emergence Proclaim recorded the most effective one. Tafaban exhibited the highest level of resistance in the 4th instar larvae of the field colony by using laboratory discriminating concentration. The highest reduction rates in the male moths caught in the pheromone traps and the larval infestation in tomato fruits were noticed in fields treated with egg parasitoid *Trichogramma evanescens* supported with additional belt of the same parasitoid. Predator's populations were much higher in the untreated plot than the treated plots with different control methods. The highest numbers of predators were noticed in plots treated with *Trichogramma . evanescens* followed by plots treated with entomopathogenic fungi and bacteria, whereas the least predator's number were associated to insecticidal application.

Key words: *Helicoverpa armigera*, *Trichogramma evanescens*, Entomopathogenic fungi and bacteria, predators, Insecticides, Tomato.

CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	3
1. Biochemical assays.....	3
1.2. Biological control agents against pests.....	5
1.3. Evaluation of the egg parasitoid, <i>Trichogramma evanescens</i> and predacious insects for pest control.....	5
1.4. Entomopathogenic bacteria and fungi as tools for controlling different pests.....	12
1.5. Evaluation of conventional insecticides for controlling bollworms.....	19
III. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	26
1. Rearing technique.....	26
2. The tested compounds.....	26
2.1 Organophosphates.....	26
2.2 Bioinsecticides.....	27
2.3 Entomopathogenic bacteria.....	28
2.4 Entomopathogenic fungi.....	28
2.5. Egg parasitoid, <i>Trichogramma evanescens</i> West.....	29
2. Biochemical aspects.....	29
2.1. Preparation of the insect homogenates.....	29
2.2. Hydrolases activity.....	30
a. Determination of Acetylcholinesterase (AChE) activity.....	30
b. Determination of alkaline and acid phosphatases activity.....	30
c. Determination of non-specific esterase's activity.....	30
d. Determination of glutathione S- transferase.....	31
e. Determination of total proteins.....	31

1- Preparation of protein reagent.....	31
2- Protein assay.....	31
3. Susceptibility of 2 nd and 4 th larval instars of laboratory strain to the tested toxicants.....	32
4. Discriminating concentration technique.....	33
5. Field trials.....	34
6. Population density of some predators in tomato fields treated with different control methods.....	36
3. Statistical analysis.....	36
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	37
1. Hydrolases activity in different stages of field colony and laboratory Strain of the American bollworm, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner).....	37
1.1. Acetylcholinesterase (AChE) activity.....	37
1.2. Alpha and beta nonspecific esterase's activity.....	40
1.3. Alkaline and acid phosphatases activity.....	40
1.4. Glutathion S- transferases Activity.....	45
1.5. Mixed function oxidases.....	50
1.6. Total protein contents.....	55
2. Efficacy of different insecticides against the 2 nd and 4 th instar larvae of the American bollworm, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>	59
2.1. Comparison on basis of LC ₅₀ , LC ₉₀ , LC ₉₉ and toxicity ratio values.....	59
2.2. Comparison on basis of toxicity index and potency levels.....	64
2.3. Evaluating the latent effect of the tested products on basis of quantal scoring and inhibition of the adult emergence.....	70
2.4. Monitoring insecticidal resistance in the 4 th instar larvae of the field colony strain treated with different toxicants by using discriminating technique.....	77

3. Efficiency of different control agents and the population density of <i>H. armigera</i> male moths caught in pheromone baited traps placed in tomato fields.....	80
3.1. Potency of different control methods on tomato infestation percentages with the larvae of <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>	83
3.2. Comparative evaluation between different control methods against the fruit worm, <i>H. armigera</i> on the basis of reduction percentages in the larval infestation rates, control index and potency levels of their efficacy as a mean average of two season 2014 and 2015.....	93
3.3. Toxicity effect of different control methods on some predators on treated tomato plants.....	97
V. SUMMARY	121
VI. REFERENCES	127

LIST OF TABLES

NO.	Title	Page
(1)	Acetyl cholinesterase activity in the different larval instars of field colony and laboratory strain of the American bollworm, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>	38
(2)	Alpha esterases activity in the different larval instar of field colony laboratory strain of the American bollworm, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>	41
(3)	Beta- esterases activity in the different larval instars of field colony and laboratory strain of the American bollworm, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>	43
(4)	Alkaline phosphatase activity in the larval instar of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>	46
(5)	Acid phosphatase activity in the different larval instars of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	48
(6)	Glutathione S. transfers activity in of different larval instars of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	51
(7)	Mixed function oxidases activity in the different larval instars of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	53
(8)	Amount of total protein content in the different larval instars of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	56
(9)	Susceptibility status of the 2 th instar larvae of <i>H.armigera</i> laboratory strain fed on lettuce leaves treated with different insecticides.....	60
(10)	Susceptibility status of the 4 th instar larvae of <i>H.armigera</i> laboratory strain on lettuce leaves treated with different insecticides.....	62
(11)	Toxicity index of different insecticides applied against both 2 nd and 4 th instar larvae of <i>H. armeigera</i> laboratory strain fed and treated lettuce leaves....	65

(12)	Relative potency levels of different insecticides applied against both 2 nd and 4 th instar larvae of <i>H. armigera</i> laboratory strain fed on treat lettuce leaves.....	68
(13)	Latent effect of the tested compounds on the pupation and the adult emergence of <i>H. armigera</i> resulted from the treated 2 nd instar larvae.....	71
(14)	Latent effect of the tested compounds on the pupation and the adult emergence of <i>H. armigera</i> resulted from the treated 4 th instar larvae.....	72
(15)	Latent effect of different insecticides against both 2 nd and 4 th instar larvae of <i>H. armigera</i> laboratory strain fed on treated leaves of lettuce on basis of quantal scoring.....	73
(16)	Latent effect of different insecticides against both 2 nd and 4 th instar larvae of <i>H. armegeera</i> laboratory strain fed on treated leaves of lettuce on basis of inhibition of adult emergency.....	75
(17)	Monitoring resistance in the 4 th instar larvae of <i>H. armiigera</i> field colony to some entomopathogenic agents and insecticidal application using discriminating concentration of the laboratory strain.....	78
(18)	Population density of <i>H. armigera</i> meals moth caught in pheromone baited traps placed in tomato field plots applied with different control agents in Menoufia Governorate during the season, 2014.....	81
(19)	Population density of <i>Helicverpa armigera</i> meals moth caught in pheromone baited traps placed in tomato field plots applied with different control agents in Menoufia Governorate during the season, 2015.....	84
(20)	Potency of the egg parasitoid, <i>Trichogramma evanescens</i> release, entomopathogenic agents in sequences and conventional insecticides in rotation against <i>H.armigera</i> in tomato fields during Autumn plantation , 2014 in Menoufia Governorate.....	86
(21)	Potency of the egg parasitoid, <i>Trichogramma evanescens</i> release, entomopathogenic agents in sequences and conventional insecticides in rotation against <i>Helicverpa armigera</i> in tomato fields during autumn plantation, 2015 in Menoufia Governorate.....	89

(22)	Potency of different control methods the egg parasitoid, <i>T. evanescens</i> release, entomopathogenic agents in sequences and conventional insecticides in rotation against <i>H. armigera</i> in tomato fields in Menoufia Governorate as mean averages of tow season, 2014 and 2015.....	92
(23)	Relative comparison between different control methods against <i>H. armigera</i> in tomato fields on the basis of general mean reduction percentages in the infestation rats, control index and potency levels as a mean average of the two seasons, 2014 and 2015.....	95
(24)	Weekly numbers of predators fluctuated in <i>T. evanescens</i> and untreated experimental plots in Menoufia Governorate during tomato season, 2014...	99
(25)	Weekly numbers of predators fluctuated in Entomopathogenic agents and Insecticides experimental plots in Menoufia Governorate during tomato season, 2014.....	101
(26)	Total number and percentages of reduction of the population density of the main predators induced by different control methods in tomato fields, 2014.	103
(27)	Weekly numbers of predators fluctuated in <i>Trichogramma evanescens</i> and untreated experimental plots in Menoufia Governorate during tomato season, 2014.....	106
(28)	Weekly numbers of predators fluctuated in Entomopathogenic agents and Insecticides experimental plots in Menoufia Governorate during tomato season, 2015.....	108
(29)	Total number and percentages of reduction of the population density of the main predators induced by different control methods in tomato fields, 2015.	110

LIST OF FIGURES

NO.	Title	Page
(1)	Acetyl cholinesterase activity in the different larval instars of field colony and laboratory strain of the American bollworm, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> ...	39
(2)	Alpha esterases activity in the different larval instar of field Colony laboratory strain of the American bollworm, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>	42
(3)	Beta- esterases activity in the different larval instars of field colony and laboratory strain of the American bollworm, <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>	44
(4)	Alkaline phosphatase activity in the larval instar of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	47
(5)	Acid phosphatase activity in the different larval instars of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	49
(6)	Glutathione S .transfers activity in the different larval instars of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	52
(7)	Mixed function oxidases activity in the different larval instars of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	54
(8)	Amount of total protein mg/gram content in the different larval instars of the field colony and laboratory strain of <i>H. armigera</i>	57
(9)	Toxicity regression lines of 6 six compounds applied against the 2 nd larvae <i>H.armigera</i> laboratory strain.....	61
(10)	Toxicity regression lines of 6 six compounds applied against the 4 th instar larvae of <i>H. armigera</i> laboratory strain.....	63
(11)	Toxicity index of different insecticides applied against 2 nd and 4 th instar larvae of <i>H. armeigera</i> laboratory strain fed and treated lettuce leaves.....	66
(12)	Relative potency levels of different insecticides applied against 2 nd instar larvae of <i>H. armigera</i> laboratory strain fed on treated lettuce leaves.....	69

(13)	Relative potency levels of different insecticides applied against 4 th instar larvae of <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> laboratory strain fed on treat lettuce leave.	69
(14)	Toxicity regression lines of 6 six compounds against pupal stage of <i>H. armigera</i> laboratory strain resulted from treatment of 2 nd instar larvae.....	74
(15)	Toxicity regression lines of 6 six compounds against pupal stage of <i>H.armigera</i> laboratory strain resulted from treatment of 4 th instars larvae...	74
(16)	Toxicity regression lines of 6 six compounds applied against adult emergency of <i>H. armigera</i> laboratory strain resulted from treatment of 2 th instar larvae.	76
(17)	Toxicity regression lines of 6 six compounds applied against adult emergency of <i>H. armigera</i> laboratory strain resulted from treatment of 4 th instar larvae...	76
(18)	Response of the 4 th instar larvae of the field colony strain of <i>H. armigera</i> to the discrimination concentrations of the five tested compounds.....	79
(20)	Population density of <i>H. armigera</i> meals moth caught in pheromone baited traps placed in tomato field plots applied with different control agents in Menoufia Governorate during the season, 2014.....	82
(21)	Population density of <i>H. armigera</i> meals moth caught in pheromone baited traps placed in tomato field plots applied with different control agents in Menoufia Governorate during the season, 2015.....	85
(22)	Potency of the egg parasitoid, <i>Trichogramma evanescens</i> release, entomopathogenic agents in sequences and conventional insecticides in rotation against <i>H. armigera</i> in tomato fields during autumn plantation, 2014 in Menoufia Governorate.....	87
(23)	Potency of the egg parasitoid, <i>Trichogramma evanescens</i> release, entomopathogenic agents in sequences and conventional insecticides in rotation against <i>H.armigera</i> in tomato fields during autumn plantation, 2015 in Menoufia Governorate.....	89
(24)	Relative comparison between different control methods against <i>H. armigera</i> in tomato fields on the basis of general mean reduction percentages in the	

	infestation rats, mean average of the two seasons, 2014 and 2015.....	95
(25)	Relative comparison between different control methods against <i>H. armigera</i> in tomato fields on the basis of general mean, control index of the two seasons, 2014 and 2015.....	96
(26)	Relative comparison between different control methods against <i>H. armigera</i> in tomato fields on the basis of general mean, Potency levels of the two seasons, 2014 and 2015.....	96
(27)	Weekly numbers of predators fluctuated in <i>T. evanescens</i> and untreated experimental plots in Menoufia Governorate during tomato season, 2014....	99
(28)	Weekly numbers of predators fluctuated in Entomopathogenic agents and Insecticides experimental plots in Menoufia Governorate during tomato season, 2014.....	101
(29)	Total number and percentages of reduction of the population density of the main predators induced by different control methods in tomato fields, 2014.	103
(30)	Weekly numbers of predators fluctuated in <i>T. evanescens</i> and untreated experimental plots in Menoufia Governorate during tomato season, 2015....	106
(31)	Weekly numbers of predators fluctuated in Entomopathogenic agents and Insecticides experimental plots in Menoufia Governorate during tomato season, 2015.....	109
(32)	Total number and percentages of reduction of the population density of the main predators induced by different control methods in tomato fields, 2015.	111

List of abbreviations and acronyms involved in This Thesis

No.	Abbreviation	Meaning	Page
1	WPTC	World Processing Tomato Council,	1
2	<i>et al.</i>	<i>et alii</i> = and others (authors)	3
3	h.a.	Hectare = 10000 m²	7
4	Spp.	Plural species	7
5	IOBC	International Organization for Biological Control	11
6	IPM	Integrated pest management	12
7	w/v,	Weight per volume	13
8	ml./ha	Milligrams/ hectare	15
9	cv.	Cultivar variety	15
10	L./ha	Liter / hectare	15
11	gm.	Gram	16
12	PBW	Pink Bollworm	17