# SIDE EFFECT OF CERTAIN SEX PHEROMONE FORMULATIONS AND / OR PROFENOFOS INSECTICIDE ON SOME NON TARGET INSECTS.

Mohamed, I.G.

Plant Protection Research Institute, Agriculture Research Center

# ABSTRACT

Field experiments were carried out at the Experimental Farm, Faculty of Agriculture, Saba Basha, Alexandria University during two successive growing cotton seasons 1999 and 2000 to evaluate the side effect of three pheromone Formulations and / or profenofos insecticide in special regimes on spiny bollworm *Earias insulana* (Boisd.) as non target insect. In addition the side influence of the treatments were assessed on some predators. The experiments revealed the following results:

- It was found that the lowest seasonal mean numbers of inspected spiny bollworm Larvae (4.03, 4.42 larvae / 100 bolls) in the profenofos (Curacron) insecticide treatment while it was (4.16,5.15 in T<sub>1</sub>, 5.33, 6.06 in T<sub>2</sub> and 5.39,5.52 larvae / 100 bolls in T<sub>3</sub> during the seasons of 1999 and 2000, respectively ).
- 2. There was no significant difference between the three cultivars of cotton (Giza70 , Giza88 and Giza89).
- 3. The results showed that the population densities of prevailing and common predators were about 3-7 folds in pheromone / insecticide treated areas compared with the insecticide treatment during the study. The highest percent values of the total inspected predators were (22.39, 21.81 and 21.02) during season 1999, and (23.23, 22.51 and 23.4%) during season 2000 on Giza70, Giza88 and Giza89 in T<sub>1</sub> (PB- Rope / curacron / selibate / curacron ) follwed by 18.91, 18.76, 20.2% in T<sub>3</sub> (selibate / curacron/last flight / curacron ) in season 1999; 19.01 , 18.1 and 19.0% in season 2000 in Giza 70, Giza 88 and Giza 89 , respectively. The lowest percent values were obtained in insecticide treatment were (13.9,13.47 and 13.36) in season 1999; 10.29, 11.27 and 11.29 in season 2000 on the three mentioned cultivars respectively.
- 4. True spiders, *Chrysopa* spp. And *Orius* spp. were dominant in pheromone and / or insecticide- treated areas. The most susceptible species of predators for the insecticide application were *peadrus* spp., *Coccinella* spp. And *Scymnus* spp.

# INTRODUCTION

The extensive use of pesticides in cotton fields has seriously affected the population densities of natural enemies to develop resistance to certain pesticides. Therefore, pheromones could be applied as a part of population suppression programme, for cotton pests, especially against pink bollworm. Since they are specific for the target insect-pest without causing drastic side effect on beneficial insects, i.e., parasitoids and predators (EI-AdI *et al.*, 1998 and Moawad *et al.*, 1992).

This study aims to evaluate one of the modern concepts of pest control in defending the cotton crop against the spiny bollworm, whereas three sex pheromone formulations were used early in the season followed by two applications of conventional insecticies to see their effect on the non

# Mohamed, I.G.

targat pest spiny bollworm and their resulting side effects on some perdatory insects (Al-Beltagy, 1999; Kostandy, 1995).

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 1. Field trials :

The field experiments were carried out at the Agriculture Research Farm, Faculty of Agriculture (Saba Basha), Alexandria. University, Egypt. The experimental area was cultivated with three cotton varieties (cultivars); Giza70, Giza88 and Giza89,on April 1999 and 2000 seasons.

The experiments was designed for evaluating three commercially registered slow release pheromone formulations and / or organophosphrous insecticide (curacron) against the pink bollworm; *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders), and the spiny bollworm, *Earias insulana* (Boisd.).

#### 2. Treatment and rate of application in the field trials:

Table (1) shows the treatments, dates and rates of application during the growing seasons of 1999 and 2000.

Treatment And dates	Арр	lication No. (Date - R	ate of application / fee	ddan)
T1	Rope- PBW	Profenophos72% E.C	Selibate	Profenophos72% EC
	300 dispensers	750ml	100 rings	750ml
1999	19-6	5-8	22-8	9-9
2000	19-6	8-8	23-8	9-9
T2	Last-Flight	Profenophos72%E.C	Selibate	Profenophos72% EC
1999and	300 drops	750m1	100 rings	750m!
2000	19-6	25-7	13-8	9-9
Т3	Selibate	Profenophos72%E.C	Last-Flight	Profenophos72% EC
1999 and	100 rings	750 ml	300 drops	750ml
2000	19-6	25-7	13-8	29-8
T4	Profenophos72%E.C	Profenophos72%E.C	Profenophos72%E.C	Profenophos72%E.C
1999 and	750 ml	750 ml	750 ml	750 ml
2000	10-7	31-7	19-8	4-9
T5				
Check	-	-	-	-
Untreated				

## Table(1): Treatments and rate of application in field trials.

# 2.1. Treatment 1 (T1):

- A. An application of PB-rope was applied at the rate of 300 dispensers/ feddan throughout the period from 19<sup>th</sup> June, to 5<sup>th</sup> August in season 1999 and to 8<sup>th</sup> august in 2000 season.
- B. Profenophos (Curacron 72% E.C) was sprayed at the rate of 750 ml/ feddan as recommended.
- C. Selibate pheromone was applied on 22<sup>th</sup> August in the season of 1999 and on 23<sup>rd</sup> August in the 2000 season. Selibate was applied at the rate of 100 rubber rings /feddan.

D. Spraying (curacron) profenophos at the rate of 750 ml / feddan on 9<sup>th</sup> Sept. during the 1999 and 2000 seasons.

Treatment T1 was applied for the three cotton cutlivars (Giza70, Giza88 and Giza89).

## 2.2 Treatment (T2):

- A. The Last filght pheromone was applied in from of drops on the top of cotton leaf at a rate of 300 drops / feddan during the two seasons.
- B. Selibate pheromone was applied first followed by profenophos at the rate of 750 ml/feddan on the 29<sup>th</sup> August, for the two seasons. Treatment t2 was applied for the three cotton cultivars.

## 2.3 Treatment (T3)

Selibate was applied at the rate of100 rings / feddan then the insecticide at the rate of 750 ml / feddan on 25<sup>th</sup> July of the two seasons. Finally profenophos was sprayed on 29<sup>th</sup> August of 1999 and 2000 seasons. This treatment was applied for the 3 cultivars of cotton (Giza70,Giza88 and Giza89).

## 2-4 Treatment (T4):

Profenophos at a rate of 750ml/ feddan was sprayed on July, 10<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup>, on August 19<sup>th</sup> and Sept., 4<sup>th</sup> during the two growing seasons. This treatment was applied for the 3 cotton cultivars of cotton.

## 2-5- Treatment (T5):

Check untreated: neither pesticide nor pheromone was incorporated during the study.

## 3. Estimation of cotton bollworms infestation :

The infestation levels of the studied pests were determined by taking random samples of green bolls. Sampling lasted for a period of 12 weeks.

The samples were examined externally before dessection and internal inspection. Infestation records were based on the existence of injury symptoms regardless the presence of Larvae.

Analysis of variance using "F" and "L.S.D" tests was used for the comparisons amonge treatments.

# 4.Impact of the treatments upon certain predators of the cotton pests :

Weekly inspections were carried out in the field for detecting the main prevailling predators in cotton fields. The direct counting method (Hafez, 1960) was applied in sampling of 20 cotton plants at random for each replicate. The inspected. Predators were *chrysopa carnea* (egg and Larvae), *Coccinella spp, Orius spp., Scymnus Spp., Paederus alfierii* and true spiders. Counts were done weekly along the sampling periods of 14 weeks during the growing Seasons of 1999 and 2000.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

I- Influence of consequent application of sex pheromone formulations and/or insecticide on spiny bollworm infestation.

The data given in Table (2) show the seasonal mean numbers of spiny bollworm during the growing cotton seasons of 1999 and 2000.

# Mohamed, I.G.

. . .

The results indicated that there were significant difference between the seasonal mean numbers of spiny bollworm larvae in the areas treated with the insecticide alone, the other area treated with pheromone/insecticide and untreated check and also between the three cultivars (Giza70, Giza88 and Giza89). It is evident that T4 treatment (insecticide alone) was the most effective treatment to protect the bolls from infestation, (spiny bollworm larvae were 4.03&4.42 larvae/ 100 bolls).

... ..

. . . . . . . . . . . . .

.....

The remaining treatments,  $T_1$ (Rope-PBW/ curacorn /selibate/ curacron), T3 (selibate / curacron / last flight / curacron) and T2 (last flight / curacron / selibate / curacron) gave (4.16&5.15) , (5.39&5.52) and 5.33&6.06) (larvae/100 bolls ) compared with those of 7.80 & 7.51 larvae/ 100 bolls in the untreated check treatment in both seasons, respectively.

# Table (2): Mean numbers of Earias insulana (Boisd.) larvae at the<br/>different treatments in the three cultivars during season<br/>1999 And 2000.

	1999			
Tre stre subs		Variety		Mean
Treatments	Giza70	Giza88	Giza89	Treatments
Rope PBW/Curacron/Selibate/ Curacron(T1)	4.00	3.25	5.25	4.16(a)
Last-flight/Curacron/Selibate/ Curacron(T2)	5.58	4.42	6.00	5.33(b)
Selibate/Curacron/Last.Flight/ Curacron(T3)	5.00	5.17	6.00	5.39(b)
Curacron(T4)	4.33	4.25	3.50	4.03(a)
Untreated Check(T5)	7.75	7.08	8.58	7.80(c)
Mean cultivar	5.33(a)	4.83	5.87(a)	• • •
Treat v Mor Eat 74***				

1	10	μι.	Α.	¥	aı	. 🗖		.,, -1	•
L	.s	D.	0.	.0	2=	=0.	89		

	2000			
Treatmonto		Variety		Mean
rreautients	Giza70	Giza88	Giza89	Treatments
Rope PBW/Curacron/Selibate/ Curacron(T1)	4.83	4.75	5.83	5.15(b)
Last-flight/Curacron/Selibate/ Curacron(T2)	5.67	5.91	6.58	6.06(c)
Selibate/Curacron/Last.Flight/ Curacron(T3)	5.67	5.08	5.83	5.52(b)
Curacron(T4)	4.58	3.75	4.92	4.42(a)
Untreated Check(T5)	7.67	6.67	8.25	7.15(d)
Mean cultivar	5.68(a)	5.22(a)	<u>6.29(a)</u>	5.73

2000

Treatments:F=52.97\*\*\*

L.S.D.0.02=0.4457

On the other hand, the infestation with the spiny bollworm *Eairias insulana* in the pheromone / insecticide- treated areas was higher than that obtained in the treatment of insecticide alone. These findings may due to the following reasons:

1. The spiny bollworm infest vegetable fields severely, so the rate of its activity and spreading in Alexandria Governorate is high.

# J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 28 (3), March, 2003

- 2. The Rope- PBW pheromone was not specific for the spiny bollworm.
- 3. The areas treated with pheromone/insecticide were sprayed twice only, whereas the insecticide treated area was sprayed four times.

These results are in agreement with those obtained by Critchley et.al. (1987) and Nackache et.al. (1992).

## 2- Effect of Sex pheromone and/or insecticides on the population of predatory insects:

The results in Tables (3 and 4) show the influence of pheromone/insecticide alternatively and insecticide alone treatments on the inspected predators during the growing cotton seasons of 1999 and 2000. The data clearly elucidate that the populations of the predators in seasons of 1999 and 2000 were much high in pheromone/insecticide treatments as compared with the insecticide treatment. The highest percent values of totals inspected predators (22.39,21.81,21.05 in 1999 and 23.4,22.51, 23.23% in 2000 on the cultivars Giza70, Giza88 and Giza89, respectively). These values were recorded in T<sub>1</sub>(Rop-PBW/ curacron / selibate / curacron) followed by T<sub>3</sub> then T<sub>2</sub>. The lowest percent value was recorded in the insecticide treatment (13.19,13.47 and 13.36 in 1999 and 11.29,11.27 and 10.29) in season 2000 on Giza70, Giza88, and Giza89, respectively).

The weekly average of the individuals/20 plants in pheromone / insecticide plots prior spraying was firstly around 3-5 times more than that of insecticide- treated area in the two seasons.

The following are the prevailing predators in the inspected areas during the course of investigation.

# a.Orius spp.

Table (6) shows that there were no significant differences between the cotton cultivars in seasonal mean numbers of total counted predators / 20 plants. The results in table (5) show that there are asignificant difference between treatments in both seasons where the highest seasonsal mean number was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> (PBW- Rope/curacron / selibate/ curacron in 1999 season) followed by T<sub>2</sub> and T<sub>3</sub>, whereas the lowest mean number (3.09)was recorded in T<sub>4</sub> (insecticide alone). In 2000 season the highest mean number of *orius* Spp. (4.83) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> followed by T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>, respectively. On the other hand the mean number in the untreated check is 5.86.

# b. Scymnus Spp

Table (6) Shows no significant difference between varieties while table (5) shows a high significant difference between treatments, where the highest seasonal mean numbers of total *scymnus spp.* /20 plants, were (5.17 & 4.71) individuals /20 plants in T<sub>1</sub> at 1999 and 2000 seasons respectively. The lowest count however, T<sub>5</sub> (untreated check) gave 5.86 and 5.46 during the growing seasons of 1999 and 2000, respectively.

i.

 Table (3): Total number of predators/ 20 plants weekly counted in the different regimes program on the three varieties throughout the growing seasons of 1999

Varieties		Giza70								Giza 88			Total Giza79						Total
Treat.	*1No	Tı	T <sub>2</sub>	T3	T,	T <sub>5</sub>	Of totals	T <sub>1</sub>	T <sub>2</sub>	T3	T4	T₅	Of totals	T1	T <sub>2</sub>	Тз	T4	Ts	Of totals
**12-6	19	20	16	17	20	22	95	18	19	17	23	19	96	21	18	19	19	21	98
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	30	25	23	29	30	137	26	24	26	31	34	141	30	23	28	28	31	140
	3rd	31	29	29	40	38	167	39	32	35	41	36	183	31	25	39	35	38	168
	4 <sup>th</sup>	44	39	32	47	45	207	47	43	46	47	42	225	42	35	40	44	45	206
	5 <sup>th</sup>	48	45	44	50	51	238	55	47	47	50	57	256	49	46	45	50	45	235
	6 <sup>th</sup>	46	46	48	6	55	201	48	50	47	11	48	204	44	46	52	12	49	203
	7 <sup>1h</sup>	48	40	52	10	49	199	52	47	51	13	42	205	52	44	51	12	52	211
	8 <sup>th</sup>	45	11	12	16	51	135	47	7	13	14	41	122	35	11	13	16	47	122
	9 <sup>th</sup>	14	12	14	4	44	88	10	10	13	6	43	82	12	12	16	6	42	88
	10 <sup>th</sup>	18	20	22	7	38	105	11	15	19	7	41	93	12	18	21	8	33	92
	11 <sup>m</sup>	22	25	27	2	31	107	20	19	21	5	40	105	19	23	22	2	33	99
	12 <sup>th</sup>	27	_27	28	7	26	115	24	22	22	10	39	117	24	23	23	9	37	116
	13 <sup>m</sup>	31	_6	7	14	23	81	24	5	5	2	39	75	24	4	5	10	32	75
	14 <sup>th</sup>	7	7	9	2	25	50	8	6	7	5	36	62	3	6	5	2	24	40
Total of totals		431	348	364	254	528	1925	429	346	369	265	557	1967	398	334	379	253	529	1893
		22.39	18.08	18.91	13.19	27.43		21.81	17.59	18.76	13.47	28.32		21.05	17.64	20.02	13.36	27.9	
	} 	%	_%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	1
T1= PB-RO	op/ curac	ron/seli	bate/cu	racron		*1.No.=	inspec	ction nu	Imber		$T_2 = 1$	.ast flio	ht/ cur	acron/s	elibate	/curacr	on		

T<sub>1</sub>= PB-Rop/ curacron/selibate/curacron. \*\* 12-6 = starting date of inspection

T<sub>3</sub>= Selibate / curacron / last flight / curacron

T<sub>4</sub>= Curacron

T<sub>5</sub>= Untreated check

Table (4):	Total number	r of p	predators/	20	plants	weekly	counted	in	the	different	regimes	program	on the three
	varieties thro	ugho	ut the grou	ving	j seaso	ns of 20	00						

varieties	arieties Giza70							al Giza 88						Total Giza79					Total
Treat.	*INo	T <sub>1</sub>	T₂	T,	T	T <sub>5</sub>	Of totals	T,	T <sub>2</sub>	Тз	T4	T5	Of totals	T <sub>1</sub>	Τ2	T <sub>3</sub>	T4	T <sub>s</sub>	Of Totais
**13-6	15	23	19	18	23	24	107	28	25	22	18	27	120	21	20	20	19	28	108
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	29	29	25	32	27	142	30	27	27	27	32	143	30	26	25	28	33	142
	3 <sup>rd</sup>	35	28	31	38	34	166	36	35	35	42	44	192	35	32	31	42	32	172
	4 <sup>th</sup>	36	37	38	40	39	190	36	38	41	51	39	207	33	34	33	32	42	174
	5 <sup>m</sup>	44	31	43	8	39	165	44	36	46	13	46	185	40	34	43	8	47	172
	6 <sup>in</sup>	39	38	47	9	32	165	47	39	45	12	44	187	42	46	47	9	44	188
	7 <sup>th</sup>	47	47	47	14	35	190	44	50	45	11	42	192	45	37	47	13	46	188
	8 <sup>lh</sup>	40	11	12	3	44	110	45	12	9	4	44	119	44	13	12	5	41	115
	9 <sup>m</sup>	41	13	12	6	36	108	38	16	13	6	37	110	37	12	15	8	43	115
	10 <sup>th</sup>	11	17	17	12	35	92	14	13	12	4	42	85	12	17	17	4	39	89
	11 <sup>th</sup>	19	21	22	3	45	110	16	11	15	6	37	85	15	18	23	5	27	88
	12 <sup>m</sup>	24	29	_24_	9	41	127	14	11	12	3	40	80	_22	6	9	6	43	86
	13 <sup>in</sup>	28	18	4	2	38	80	11	3	5	6	42	67	27	8	8	4	_34	81
	14 <sup>th</sup>	9	7	6	6	36	64	4	4	2	2	34	46	10	8	8	0	34	60
Total		425	335	346	205	505	1816	4.9	320	329	205	555	1818	413	311	338	183	533	1778
		23.4	18.45	19.05	11 29	27.8	<u> </u>	22.51	17.6	18.1	11.27	30.53		23.23	17.49	19.01	10.29	30	{
		%	%	%	%	%	l	%	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	%	

T<sub>1</sub>= PB-Rop/ curacron/selibate/curacron. \*\* 13-6 = starting date of inspection

•

\*1.No.= inspection number  $T_2$ = Last flight/ curacron/selibate / curacron  $T_3$ = Selibate / curacron / last flight / curacron  $T_4$ = Curacron  $T_5$ = Untreated check

."

.

## Mohamed, I.G.

### c.Coccinella Spp.

- -----

There was no significant difference between cotton varieties in 1999 and low significant difference in 2000 Season, where Giza88 showed the highest mean number followed by Giza70 ( table 6).

Table (5) shows significant difference between treatments. It is noiticed that  $T_1$  (PB-Rope/ curacron/ selibate/curacron) had the highest effect in comparison with  $T_2$  and  $T_3$ .

The curacron treatment (T4) had the lowest seasonal mean number in both seasons 1999&2000.

#### d. Chrysopa spp.

Results in table (6) shows that there was no significant difference between varieties in 1999 season , while the mean numbers were significantly low between varieties in 2000 season, where Giza88 had the highest mean number; 5.36 individual 20 plants, followed by Giza89 (5.24) comparing with Giza70 (4.97). The seasonal mean numbers of counted *chrysopa spp.*/ 20 plants were significantly differed between treatments. T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>3</sub> were comparable to T<sub>2</sub> and all treatments were copmarable to T<sub>4</sub> insecticide alone in 1999, whereas T<sub>1</sub> was comparable to all treatments. In addition, the lowest mean number was recorded in T<sub>4</sub> (insecticide alone ) and all treatments were comparable to T<sub>4</sub> season 2000.

#### e. Paedrus alfireii

There was no significant difference between the three varieties in both 1999 and 2000 seasons. All the treatments were comparable to  $(T_4)$ insecticide alone which had the lowest seasonal mean numbers in both seasons of 1999 and 2000 and the highest were in  $T_1$  which was comparable to  $T_2$  and  $T_3$  in season 2000 only, (table 5)

#### f. True spiders.

Data in Table (6) revealed that there was low significant difference between the seasonal mean numbers of spiders / 20 plants during 1999 as Giza88 slightly exceeded the other two varieties. Mean while, there was no significant difference between varieties during season 2000. The seasonal mean number of total counted spiders/ 20 plants differed significantly between treatments in 1999 and 2000, where  $T_1$  (PB- Rope / Curacron / selibate/ curacron) was comparable to the other treatments followed by  $T_3$ and  $T_2$ , while  $T_4$  (only insecticide) had the lowest seasonal mean number, (Table 5).

From the above mentioned results it could be concluded that  $T_1$  (PB-Rope / curacron / selibate / curacron ) was superior to the other treatments and was approximately equal to untreated check in affecting the predators.

On the other hand during the whole period of investigation,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  achieved better results and proved to be soft on predators than  $T_2$ . In addition all gossyplure/ insecticide treatments proved to be better than  $T_4$  pesticide (curacron) treatment.

Similar results were obtained by Gaston, *et al* (1977), Critchley *et al*, (1985), El-Adl, *et al.* (1986). El- Heneidy, *et al.* (1986), Moawad, *et al.* (1992), Al- Beltagy(1994), Abdel- Meguid *et al.* (1999) and Abdel- Rahman, (1999).

## J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 28 (3), March, 2003

Table (5): Seasonal mean numbers of total counted predators/20 Plants in pheromone/ insecticide (T1, T2 and T3), only insecticide (T4) and untreated check (T5) during the growing season of 1999 and 2000

_ •							
Treatmente		Me	ean numbers	of predator	s/20 plant	s	
Treatments	Orius	Scymnus	Coccinella	True spiders	Chrysopa	Peadrus	mean
1	5.17c	5.17c	3.81c	6.81c	6.52c	2.50b	5.00
T2	4.30b	3.64b	3.19b	5.74b	5.38b	2.19b	4.07
ТЗ	4.43b	3.43b	3.48c	6.07b	6.43c	2.58b	4.40
Τ4	3.09a	2.76a	2.18a	<b>4</b> .71a	4.09a	1.50a	3.05
Т5	5.80a	5.86d	5.74d	8.90d	8.50d	3.62c	6.40
F	47.93***	82.61***	111.49***	117.02***	91.74***	39.83***	
L.S.D0.05	0.4039	0.3960	0.3400	0.4000	0.4700	0.3400	
			2000				
Treatmonte		Me	ean numbers	of predator	s/20 plant	S	
reatments	Orius	Scymnus	Coccinella	True spiders	Chrysopa	Peadrus	mean
T1	4.83c	4.71c	4.07c	6.71c	6.37c	2.93c	4.94
T2	4.19b	3.31b	3.20b	5.50b	4.51b	2.29b	3.83
Т3	4.36b	3.48b	3.10b	5.81b	4.86b	2.48b	4.02
T4	2.50a	2.26a	1.83a	3.43a	2.69a	1.40a	2.35
T5	2.86d	5.46d	6.26d	8.50d	7.52d	4.38d	6.33
F	86.93***	83.27***	180.198***	192.44***	121.16**	89.27***	
	0.265	0 294	0.240	0 272	0 469	0 320	

Table (6): Seasonal mean numbers of total counted predators/20 Plantsin the three cultivars of cotton G70 , G88 and giza89throughout the growing season of 1999 and 2000

pred Cult.	Ori	us True sp	iders	Scymnus	Coccinella	Peadrus	Chrysopa	mean					
G70	4.6	6.34	3a	4.26	3.42	2.53	6.21	4.576					
G88	4.7	71 6.74	3b	4.03	3.93	2.42	6.24	4.679					
G89	4.2	29 6.25	7a	4.23	3.69	2.49	6.10	4.510					
F	N.	S 20.16	50*	N.S	N.S	N.S	N.S	N.S					
L.S.D0.05		0.3	5										
	2000												
Pred Cult.	Orius	True spiders	Scym	inus Co	ccinella	Peadrus	Chrysopa	mean					
G70	4.50	6.10	3.7	9 3	.714b	2.90	4.97a	4.33					
G88	4.39	5.93	3.7	6 3	.790b	2.73	5.36b	4.33					
G89	4.16	5.94	3.9	9 3	.585a	2.46	5.24b	4.33					
F	<u>N.S</u>	<u>N.S</u>	<u>N.</u>	<u>S 3</u>	7.750*	<u>N.S</u>	21.64*						
L.S.D0.05				(	).100		0.26						

1999

2383

# REFERENCES

- Abdel-meguid, A.M., N. A. Badr and A.M. Hossain (1999). Comparative effects of synthetic pheromones and conventional insecticides in cotton fields. 2<sup>nd</sup> int. Conf Peat Control, Mansoura, 1:241-249.
- Abd El-Rahman, A.Kh. (1999). New approach for the control of the pink bollworm *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saund.) (Lepidoptera Gelechiidae) using pheromones and insectides. Ph. D. Thesis fac. Agric., Saba Basha, Alex. Univ.
- Al-Beltagy, A.M.; A.M. Hamid and I.M. Galal (1999). Population density and dynamics of some common predators under alternative pink bollworm control programs. 2<sup>nd</sup> int. Conf. Pest Control, Mansoura., 1:105-117.
- Critchley, B.R ; D.G.Campion; L.J.McVigh;E.M. McVeigh; G.G.Cavanagh; M.M. Hosny; El-Sayeda A. Nasr;A.A. Khidr and M. Naguib(1985). Control of pink bollworm, Pectinophora gossypiella
- (Saund.)( Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) in Egypt by mating disruption using hollow fibre, Laminate flake and microencapsulated formulations of synthetic pheromone.Bull.Ent.Res., 75:329-345.
- Critchley, B.R.; D.G.Campion; G.G.Cavanag and D.J.Chamberln (1987).control of three major bollworm pests of cotton in Pakistan by single application of their combined sex pheromones. Trop.Pest. Management, (34): 374-377.
- EI-Adl,M.A. and A.M. Ghanem (1986). Relation between Gossyplore treatment and beneficial arthropods in diminishing injurious insect attacking cotton plants.J.Agric.Sci., Mansoure Univ., 11(1):398-401.
- El-Adl, M.A.; M.M. Hosny and D.G.Campion (1988).Mating disruption for the control of PBW *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saund) in the delta cotton growing area of Egypt.Tropical Pest Management, 34(2):210-214.
- El-Heneidy, A.H.; T.SM. Abbas and A.A. Khidr (1986). Comparative population densities of certain predators in cotton fields treated with sex pheromones and insecticides in Menofia Governorate. Egypt Bull. Ent. Soc. Egypt, Ser., 16:181-190.
- Gaston, L.K.;Kaae:H.H.Shorey and D.Sellers(1977).Controlling the R.S. PBW by disruption sex pheromone communication between adult moths. Science, 196:904-905.
- Kostandy,S.N.(1995). The Simultaneous effect of early using of insecticides on cotton pests and its related natural enemies. Annals Agric. Sci., Ain Shams Univ., Cairo, 40(2):877-889.
- Moawad, G.M.; R.Z.Sawires; A.M.El-Hamaky and F.M.Gergis(1992).The impact of sex pheromones and insecticides on the natural enemies in cotton fields in Middle Egypt. Bull. Ent. Soc. Egypt, Ser., 19:231-242.
- Nackache, J.; E. Dunkelblum; M. Kehat; Anshelevich and M. Harel (1992). Mating disruption of the spiny bollworm, *Earias insulan*. Boisd. With shin etsu twist-tie ropes in israel. Bull. Ent. Res., 82(3):369-373.

J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 28 (3), March, 2003

التأثيرات الجانبية لبعض تجهيزات الفرمونات ومبيد البروفينوفوس أو مبيد البروفينوفوس منفردا على بعض الحشرات الغير مستهدفه . إبراهيم جلال محمد معهد بحوث وقاية النباتات – مركز البحوث الزراعية

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

لقد أجريت التجارب الحقلية في مزرعة كلية الزراعة – سابا باشا – جامعة الإسكندرية خلال موسمي ١٩٩٩، ٢٠٠٠ ، وذلك لتقييم التأثيرات الجانبية لثلاث تجــهيزات مـن الفرمـون (جوسيبلور) بالتكامل تبادليا مع رشتين من مبيد الكور اكرون على دودة اللوز الشوكية وكذلك علـى بعض المفترسات الشائعة في حقول القطن ومقارنتها بفاعلية استخدام المبيدات فقط ( أربع رشات ) . ولقد تم دراسة تأثير هذه المعاملات على ٣ أصناف من القطن المصري خلال موسـمي ١٩٩٩، ٢٠٠٠ ، وهي جيزة ٧٠ ، جيزة ٨٨ ، جيزة ٩٩ ن ولقد أوضحت التجارب النتائج التالية :

- أظهرت النتائج أن استخدام السبيد فقط حقق مستوى جيد من الإصابية (٢، ٢، ٢، ٢، ٤، ٢، ٤، ٢ يرقية / ١٠٠ لوزة) بالمقارنة مع استخدام الفرمونات والمبيد تبادلياً ٢٠ . حيث كان مستوى الإصابية ( ٤,١٦ ، ٥،١٥ يرقه / ١٠٠ لوزة) في المعاملة الأولى ، ( ٣، ٥، ٣٦ / ١.٢ / يرقه / ١٠٠ لوزة) في المعاملة الثانية ، ( ٥,٣٩ ، ٢٥, ٥ ، ٢٥, ديرقة / ١٠٠ لوزة) في المعاملة الثالثية خيلال موسمي ١٩٩٩، ٢٠٠٠ على الترتيب .
- ٢) ولقد تأكدت هذه النتائج بإظهار الاختلافات المعنوية بين المتوسطات الموسمية لمعاملات الفرمونات مع المبيد ومعاملة المبيد منفرد ومن جهة أخرى لم تكن هناك أية فروق معنوية بين متوسسطات الإصابسة بديدان اللوز الشوكية بين الأصناف الثلاثة.
- ٣) أظهر الفحص الدوري الذي أجري على مدى ١٤ أسبوع خلال موسمي ١٩٩٩، ٢٠٠٠ أن الكثافة. العددية لأنواع المفترسات المختلفة في المساحات المعاملة بالفرمون مع المبيد بالتبادل بلغمنت حوالمي ٣-٧ أمثال الكثافة العددية لهذه المفترسات في المساحة المعاملة بالمبيد فقط خلال فثرة التطبيق . حيمة كانت أعلى نسبة منوية لمجموع المفترسات بالنسبة لتعدادها الكلى في معاملة السب بسي بسي روب – كور أكرون – سليبت - كور اكسرون – اى المعاملة الأولى ٢٢,٣٧ ، ٢١,١٧ ، ٢٢,١٧ % موسم كور أكرون – سليبت - كور اكسرون – اى المعاملة الأولى ٢٢,٣٣ ، ٢٢,١٧ ، ٢٢,٧ % موسم مه، جيزة ٩٨ على الترتيب يليها في ذلك المعاملة الثالثة ( سليبت – كور اكرون – لامست فلايست – كور أكرون ) ١٩,٨ ، ٢٢,٥ ، ٢٣,٤ % موسم ٢٠٠٠ على أصناف القطن الثلاثة جسيزة ٢٠، جميزة كور أكرون ) ١٩,٩ ، ٢٢,٥ ، ٢٠,٢ % موسم ١٩٩٩ ، ١٩,٠ ، ١٨،١ ، ١٩,٠ % موسب كور أكرون ) ١٩,٨ ، ٢٢,٥ ، ٢٠,٠ % موسم ١٩٩٩ ، ١٩,٠ ١٨،٠ ، ١٩،٠ % موسب كور أكرون ) ١٩,٩ ، ٢٠,٠ ، ٢٠,٠ % موسم ١٩٩٩ ، ١٩,٠ ، ١٨،٠ ، ٥،٠ % موسب كور أكرون ) ١٩,٩ ، ٢٠,٠ ، ٢٠,٠ % موسم ١٩٩٩ ، ١٩،٠ ، ١٨،٠ ، ما معارفة موسب منوية لمجموع المفترسات بالنسبة لتحادها الكلى وهمي الترتيب وذلك مقارنة مع أقسل نسبة منوية لمجموع المفترسات بالنسبة لتحادها الكلى وهم ٢٠٠٠ على أصناف القطن جيزة ٢٠، جسيزة ٨٨ ، منوية لمجموع المفترسات بالنسبة لتحادها الكلى وهما ١٣٠٩ ، ١٦,١٠ % ما ١٣، ٢٠،٠ منوية لمجموع المفترسات بالنسبة لتحادها الكلى وهم ٢٠٠٠ على أصناف القطن جيزة ٢٠، هم ، ١٩٩٩ ، ٢٠,٠ ٠ م منوية لمجموع المفترسات بالنسبة لتحادها الكلى وهما ١٣٠٩ ، ١٣,٠ ٢، ١٣،٢ % ، ٢٠٠ % موسم م جيزة ٩٩ على الترتيب في معاملة المبيد منفرد .
- ٤) كانت أنواع العناكب الحقوقية True spiders ، وأسبب المبن Chrysopa spp أكبير أنسواع المفترسات شيوعا في حقول القطن يليها جندي البق Orius s pp وكانت أكبير الأنسواع حساسية لتطبيق المبيد هي مفترسات الرواغيبيب Peadrus spp وأبسو العيسد Coccinella spp والأحكمنس Scymnus spp