

Mansoura University  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Economic Entomology Department



# Ecological and biological studies on the main insect pests infesting sugar beet plants and their associated natural enemies

By

**Hala Helmy Zaki Hawila**

B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Economic Entomology) Fac. of Agric. Kafr El-Sheikh Univ., 2010  
M.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Economic Entomology) Fac. of Agric. Kafr El-Sheikh Univ., 2016

**Thesis**

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
**Doctor of philosophy**

In

**Agricultural Sciences**  
(Economic Entomology)

**SUPERVISORS**

**Prof. Dr.**

*Samir S. Awadalla*

Professor of Economic Entomology,  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Mansoura University

**Prof. Dr.**

*Fahmy E. Abdallah*

Head of Research,  
Plant Protection Research Institute,  
Agriculture Research Center

**Prof. Dr.**

*Mohamed H. Bayoumy*

Professor of Economic Entomology,  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Mansoura University

Arab Republic of Egypt

Mansoura University

2021

# CONTENTS

Page

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.1. The main insect pests.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1.1. Aphid species.	5
2.1.2. The southern green stink bug, <i>Nezara viridula</i> (L.)	6
2.1.3. The cotton leafworm, <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i> (Boisd.).	8
2.1.4. The cotton mealy bug, <i>Phenacoccus solenopsis</i> Tinsley.	9
2.1.5. The sugar beet fly, <i>Pegomya mixta</i> Vill.	10
2.1.6. The sugar beet beetle, <i>Cassida vittata</i> Vill.	16
2.1.7. The sugar beet moth, <i>Scrobipalpa ocellatella</i> Boyd.	21
<b>2.2. The main predatory insects.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>2.3. The associated insect parasitoids.....</b>	<b>28</b>
2.3.1. The parasitoid of the beet fly <i>P. mixta</i> , <i>Opius nitidulator</i> .	28
2.3.2. The parasitoids of the tortoise beetle, <i>Cassida vittata</i> .	30
2.3.3. The parasitoids of the beet moth <i>S. ocellatella</i> .	32
2.3.4. The parasitoid of the southern green stink bug, <i>Nezara viridula</i> (L.).	35
<b>2.4. Effect of different insecticides on certain sugar beet insect pests.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>2.5. Biology of <i>Pegomyia mixta</i> and <i>P. hyoscami</i>.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>3. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.1. The main insect pests.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.2. The associated insect predators.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.3. The associated insect parasitoids.....</b>	<b>47</b>
3.3.1. The parasitoid of the beet fly <i>P. mixta</i> , <i>Opius nitidulator</i> .	47
3.3.2. The parasitoids of the tortoise beetle, <i>Cassida vittata</i> .	47
3.3.3. The parasitoids of the beet moth, <i>S. ocellatella</i> .	48
3.3.4. The parasitoid of the southern green stink bug, <i>Nezara viridula</i> , <i>Trissolcus basalis</i> .	48
<b>3.4. Effect of different insecticides on certain sugar beet insect pests.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>3.5. Biology of <i>Pegomyia mixta</i> and <i>P. hyoscami</i>.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>3.6. Statistical analysis.....</b>	<b>50</b>

	<b>Page</b>
<b>4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>4.1. The main insect pests.....</b>	<b>52</b>
4.1.1. The cowpea aphids, <i>Aphis craccivora</i> Koch.	52
4.1.2. The green peach aphids, <i>Myzus persicae</i> (Sulzer).	60
4.1.3. The southern green stink bug, <i>Nezara viridula</i> (L.)	68
4.1.4. The cotton leafworm, <i>Spodoptera littoralis</i> (Boisd.)	76
4.1.5. The cotton mealy bug, <i>Phenacoccus solenopsis</i> Tinsley.	84
4.1.6. The sugar beet fly, <i>Pegomia mixta</i> Vill.	93
4.1.7. The sugar beet beetle, <i>Cassida vittata</i> Vill.	102
4.1.8. The sugar beet moth, <i>Scrobipalpa ocellatella</i> Boyd.	110
<b>4.2. The associated insect predators.....</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>4.3. The associated insect parasitoids.....</b>	<b>122</b>
4.3.1. The parasitoid of the beet fly <i>P. mixta</i> , <i>Opius nitidulator</i> .	122
4.3.2. The parasitoids of the toroise beetle, <i>Cassida vittata</i> .	128
4.3.2.1. The egg parasitoid, <i>Monorthocheata nigra</i> .	128
4.3.2.2. The larval pupal parasitoid, <i>Tetrastichus</i> sp.	131
4.3.3. The parasitoids of the beet moth <i>S. ocellatella</i> .	135
4.3.3.1. The larval parasitoid, <i>Agathis</i> sp.	135
4.3.3.2. The pupal parasitoid, <i>Diadegma</i> sp.	136
4.3.4. The parasitoid of the southern green stink bug, <i>Nezara viridula</i> (L.).	138
<b>4.4. Effect of different insecticides on certain sugar beet insect pests.....</b>	<b>141</b>
4.4.1. On the cotton leaf worm, <i>S. littoralis</i> .	141
4.4.2. On the beet fly, <i>P. mixta</i> .	143
4.4.3. On the toroise beetle, <i>C. vittata</i> .	145
4.4.4. On the beet moth, <i>S. ocellatella</i> .	147
<b>4.5. Biology of <i>P. mixta</i> and <i>P. hyoscami</i>. .....</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>5. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>6. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>7. REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>8. ARABIC SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>---</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

No.	Title	Page
Table 1.	Trade name, common name and the rate of application for each compound.....	49
Table 2.	The weekly mean of temperature (°C) as well as the mean of relative humidity (%) and rain (mm/day) at Sakha Agricultural Research Station during sugar beet plantations seasons, 2018/19 and 2019/20.....	51
Table 3.	Seasonal average number of the cowpea aphid, <i>A. craccivora</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19.....	54
Table 4.	Seasonal average number of the cowpea aphid, <i>A. craccivora</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20.....	55
Table 5.	Simple correlation coefficient between the population density of the cowpea aphid, <i>A. craccivora</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	59
Table 6.	Simple regression coefficient between the population density of the cow pea aphid, <i>A. craccivora</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	59
Table 7.	Seasonal average number of the green peach aphid, <i>M. persicae</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19.....	61
Table 8.	Seasonal average number of the green peach aphid, <i>M. persicae</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20.....	65
Table 9.	Simple correlation coefficient between the population density of the green peach aphid, <i>M. persicae</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	67
Table 10.	Simple regression coefficient between the population density of the cow pea aphid, <i>M. persicae</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	68
Table 11.	Seasonal average number of The green stink bug, <i>N. viridula</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19.....	69

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 12.	Seasonal average number of The southern green stink bug, <i>N. viridula</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20....	73
Table 13.	Simple correlation coefficient between the population density of the southern green stink bug, <i>N. viridula</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	75
Table 14.	Simple regression coefficient between the population density of the southern green stink bug, <i>N. viridula</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	76
Table 15.	Seasonal average number of the cotton leaf worms, ( <i>S. littoralis</i> ) in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19.....	79
Table 16.	Seasonal average number of the cotton leaf worms ( <i>S. littoralis</i> ) in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20.....	80
Table 17.	Simple correlation coefficient between the population density of the cotton leafworm, <i>S. littoralis</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	84
Table 18.	Simple regression coefficient between the population density of the cotton leafworm, <i>S. littoralis</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	84
Table 19.	Seasonal average number of the cotton mealy bug, <i>P. solenopsis</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19.....	87
Table 20.	Seasonal average number of the cotton mealy bug, <i>P. solenopsis</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20.....	88
Table 21.	Simple correlation coefficient between the population density of the cotton mealy bugs, <i>P. solenopsis</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	92
Table 22.	Simple regression coefficient between the population density of the cotton mealy bugs, <i>P. solenopsis</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	92

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 23.	Seasonal average number of the sugar beet fly, <i>P. mixta</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during the first season, 2018/19 at Kafr El-Sheikh region.....	94
Table 24.	Seasonal average number of the sugar beet fly, <i>P. mixta</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during the first season, 2019/20 at Kafr El-Sheikh region.....	98
Table 25.	Simple correlation coefficient between the population density of the sugar beet fly, <i>P. mixta</i> larvae and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	101
Table 26.	Simple regression coefficient between the population density of the sugar beet fly, <i>P. mixta</i> larvae and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	102
Table 27.	Seasonal average number of immature stages of the sugar beet beetle, <i>C. vittata</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19.....	104
Table 28.	Seasonal average number of immature stages of the sugar beet beetle, <i>C. vittata</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20.....	105
Table 29.	Simple correlation coefficient between the population density of the immature stages of the sugar beet beetle, <i>C. vittata</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	109
Table 30.	Simple regression coefficient between the population density of the immature stages of the sugar beet beetle, <i>C. vittata</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	109
Table 31.	Seasonal average number of the sugar beet moth, <i>S. ocellatella</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19.....	112
Table 32.	Seasonal average number of the sugar beet moth, <i>S. ocellatella</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20.....	113

No.	Title	Page
Table 33.	Simple correlation coefficient between the population density of the sugar beet moth, <i>S. ocellatella</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	117
Table 34.	Simple regression coefficient between the population density of the sugar beet moth, <i>S. ocellatella</i> and the mean temperature and relative humidity in different sugar beet plantations during the two successive seasons.....	117
Table 35.	The average number of the associated insect predators in different sugar beet plantations during the first season, 2018/19.....	120
Table 36.	The average number of the associated insect predators in different sugar beet plantations during the first season, 2019/20.....	121
Table 37.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the larval pupal parasitoid, <i>O. nitidulator</i> parasitized <i>P. mixta</i> in different planting dates during the first season 2018/19.....	127
Table 38.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the larval pupal parasitoid, <i>O. nitidulator</i> parasitized <i>P. mixta</i> in different planting dates during the first season 2019/20.....	127
Table 39.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the egg parasitoid, <i>M. nigra</i> parasitized <i>C. vittata</i> eggs in different planting dates during the first season 2018/19.....	130
Table 40.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the egg parasitoid, <i>M. nigra</i> parasitized <i>C. vittata</i> eggs in different planting dates during the first season 2019/20.....	131
Table 41.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the larval pupal parasitoid, <i>Tetrastichus</i> sp parasitized <i>C. vittata</i> larvae in different planting dates during the first season 2018/19.....	134
Table 42.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the larval pupal parasitoid, <i>Tetrastichus</i> sp parasitized <i>C. vittata</i> larvae in different planting dates during the first season 2019/20.....	134
Table 43.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the larval parasitoid, <i>Agathis</i> sp. in different planting dates during the first season 2018/19.....	136

No.	Title	Page
Table 44.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the pupal parasitoid, <i>Diadegma</i> sp. in different planting dates during the first season 2018/19.....	136
Table 45.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the larval parasitoid, <i>Agathis</i> sp. in different planting dates during the first season 2019/20.....	138
Table 46.	The average number and the percentage of parasitism caused by the pupal parasitoid, <i>Diadegma</i> sp. in different planting dates during the first season 2019/20.....	138
Table 47.	Number of <i>N. viridula</i> eggs, healthy eggs, parasitized eggs and the successful parasitism caused by the egg parasitoid, <i>T. basalis</i> in different sugar beet plantations during the first season 2018/19.....	139
Table 48.	Number of <i>N. viridula</i> eggs, healthy eggs, parasitized eggs and the successful parasitism caused by the egg parasitoid, <i>T. basalis</i> in different sugar beet plantations during the first season 2019/20.....	140
Table 49.	Effect of different insecticides on <i>S. littoralis</i> under field conditions during 2018/19 treatment in August plantation, sprayed in Sep.....	142
Table 50.	Side effect of different insecticides on <i>Solenopsis</i> sp., <i>C. carnea</i> and <i>Scymnus</i> sp. under field conditions during 2018/19 treatment in August plantation, sprayed in Sep.....	142
Table 51.	Effect of different insecticides on <i>P. mixta</i> under field conditions during 2018/19 treatment in September plantation, sprayed in Jan.....	144
Table 52.	Side effect of different insecticides on <i>Orius</i> sp., <i>C. carnea</i> and <i>Solenopsis</i> sp. under field conditions during 2018/19 treatment in September plantation, sprayed in Jan.....	144
Table 53.	Effect of different insecticides on <i>C. vittata</i> under field conditions during 2018/19 treatment in November plantation, sprayed in Apr.....	146
Table 54.	Side effect of different insecticides on <i>C. undecimpunctata</i> , <i>P. alferii</i> and <i>Solenopsis</i> sp. under field conditions during 2018/19 treatment in November plantation, sprayed in Apr.....	146



<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 55.	Effect of different insecticides on <i>S. ocellatella</i> under field conditions during 2018/19 treatment in November plantation, sprayed in Mar.....	148
Table 56.	Side effect of different insecticides on <i>C. undecimpunctata</i> and <i>Solenopsis</i> sp. under field conditions during 2018/19 treatment in November plantation, sprayed in Mar.....	149
Table 57.	Effect of host plants on the female egg-laying and hatchability of <i>P. mixta</i> and <i>P. hyoscami</i> under fluctuated conditions.....	151
Table 58.	Effect of host plants on the larval, pupal and total immature stages duration of <i>P. mixta</i> and <i>P. hyoscami</i> under fluctuated conditions...	151

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Title	Page
Figure 1.	Population density of <i>A. craccivora</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	53
Figure 2.	Population density of <i>A. craccivora</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	56
Figure 3.	Population density of <i>M. persicae</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	62
Figure 4.	Population density of <i>M. persicae</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	64
Figure 5.	Population density of <i>N. viridula</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	70
Figure 6.	Population density of <i>N. viridula</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	72
Figure 7.	Population density of <i>S. littoralis</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	78
Figure 8.	Population density of <i>S. littoralis</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	81
Figure 9.	Population density of <i>P. solenopsis</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	86
Figure 10.	Population density of <i>P. solenopsis</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	89

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
Figure 11.	Population fluctuation of <i>P. mixta</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	95
Figure 12.	Population fluctuation of <i>P. mixta</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	97
Figure 13.	Population density of the immature stages of <i>C. vittata</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	103
Figure 14.	Population density of the immature stages of <i>C. vittata</i> in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	106
Figure 15.	Population fluctuation of <i>S. ocellatella</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	111
Figure 16.	Population fluctuation of <i>S. ocellatella</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	114
Figure 17.	The seasonal activity of <i>O. nitidulator</i> parasitized <i>P. mixta</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	123
Figure 18.	The seasonal activity of <i>O. nitidulator</i> parasitized <i>P. mixta</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: August plantation, B: September plantation, C: October plantation and D: November plantation).....	125
Figure 19.	The seasonal activity of the egg parasitoid, <i>M. nigra</i> parasitized <i>C. vittata</i> eggs in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: October plantation and B: November plantation).....	128

<b>No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
Figure 20.	The seasonal activity of the egg parasitoid, <i>M. nigra</i> parasitized <i>C. vittata</i> eggs in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: October plantation and B: November plantation).....	129
Figure 21.	The seasonal activity of the larval pupal parasitoid, <i>Tetrastichus</i> sp parasitized <i>C. vittata</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2018/19 (A: October plantation and B: November plantation).....	132
Figure 22.	The seasonal activity of the larval pupal parasitoid, <i>Tetrastichus</i> sp parasitized <i>C. vittata</i> larvae in different sugar beet plantations during season 2019/20 (A: October plantation and B: November plantation).....	133
Figure 23.	The effect of host plants on the longevity of <i>P. mixta</i> and <i>P. hyoscami</i> .....	152

## 5. SUMMARY

The present experiments were carried out at the experimental farm of Sakha Agricultural Research Station, Kafr El-Sheikh governorate during the two successive sugar beet seasons, 2018/19 and 2019/20.

The aim of the present studies were conducted to investigate the following objectives:

1. The population density of the main insect pests infesting sugar beet in different planting dates.
2. The relationship between the population density and the abiotic factors (temperature and relative humidity) during the two successive seasons.
3. The seasonal activity of the main associated predators.
4. The percentage of parasitism caused by the main insect parasitoids associated with the main insect pests.
5. The efficiency of some insecticides on certain sugar beet insect pests.
6. Effect of the host plants on the female fecundity and fertility, immature development and adult longevity of *P. mixta* and *P. hyoscami* under lab conditions.

**The obtained results can be summarize as follow:**

### **5.1. The main insect pests.**

#### **5.1.1. The cowpea aphids, *Aphis craccivora* Koch.**

The cowpea aphid, *A. craccivora* reached the highest peak of abundance during the first season, 2018/19 (58, 27, 1264 and 5591 indiv./100 leaves) in August, September, October and November plantations, respectively. Meanwhile, during the second season, 2019/20 *A. craccivora* reached the highest peak of abundance which represented by 50, 35, 485 and 25027 indiv./100 leaves in the four plantations, respectively.

In respect to, the seasonal average number of *A. craccivora* in different sugar beet plantations, the obtained results revealed that, the highest seasonal average number recorded in November plantation (682.1±420.1 and 2232.1±1542.1 indiv.) followed by October plantation, and presented by 115.3±111.2 and 70.1±53.0 indiv., respectively during the two seasons. Statistical analysis revealed that, highly significant differences among different plantation during the two successive seasons 2018/19 and 2019/20.

In the first season, 2018/19, the mean temperature was effected positively significant on *A. craccivora* in all planting dates. The relationship between *A. craccivora* and relative humidity was a negative significant in August and November plantation. While in the second season 2019/20, temperature was effected negatively significant effects in August and September plantation, positively significant in November plantation. The relationship between *A. craccivora* in and relative humidity was a negative significant in October plantation.

### **5.1.2. The green peach aphids, *Myzus persicae* (Sulzer).**

The green peach aphid, *M. persicae* reached the highest peak of abundance during the successive seasons (55, 47, 182 and 71 indiv./100 leaves) and (73, 49, 332 and 487 indiv./100 leaves), in August, September, October and November plantation, respectively.

Concerning the seasonal average number of *M. pesicae* in different sugar beet plantations, the obtained results revealed that, the highest seasonal average number recorded in October plantation (33.3±17.9 and 76.9±41.4 indiv.) followed by November represented by 21.2±6.2 and 63.3±48.6 indiv. during the two seasons, respectively .

During the first season, there is no effect of temperature as well as relative humidity in *M. persicae* population. While in the second season, *M. persicae* was a negatively correlated with temperature being highly

significant in September and November plantation and a negatively correlated being significant in October plantation. There was a significant correlated with relative humidity in October and November plantation.

### **5.1.3. The southern green stink bug, *Nezara viridula* (L.)**

The southern green stink bug, *N. viridula* reached the highest peak of abundance during the first and the second seasons which represented by (13, 15 47 and 64 indiv./100 leaves) and (28, 28, 54 and 210 indiv./100 leaves) in August, September, October and November plantation, respectively.

Regarding the seasonal average number of *N. viridula* in different sugar beet plantations, the obtained results indicated that, the highest seasonal average number recorded in November plantation ( $19.8 \pm 7.2$  and  $39.6 \pm 26.7$  indiv.) followed by October presented by  $14.3 \pm 5.8$  and  $15.8 \pm 5.7$  indiv. during the two seasons, respectively.

In the first season, the mean temperature was effected a highly positive significant on *N. viridula* in October and November plantation. Concerning to relative humidity, in November plantation it was a negative which was highly significant. While, in the second season, temperature effect positively significant in August, September and November plantation, Concerning to relative humidity, there was a highly significant negative effect in October and November plantation.

### **5.1.4. The cotton leafworm, *Spodoptera littoralis* (Boisd.)**

The cotton leafworm, *S. littoralis* reached the highest peak of abundance during the two seasons of study represented by (108, 30, 23 and 25 larvae./100 leaves) and (356, 97, 66 and 33 larvae/100 leaves) in August, September, October and November plantation, respectively.

With regard to the seasonal average number of *S. littoralis* in different sugar beet plantations, it was obvious that, the highest seasonal average number recorded in August plantation ( $16.9 \pm 7.5$  and  $66.4 \pm 38.6$

larvae.) followed by September presented by  $8.5\pm 4.2$  and  $19.4\pm 10.4$  larvae., during the two seasons, respectively.

There was a positive highly significant effects between *S. littoralis* and temperature in August and September plantation and was a negative highly significant in November plantation. On the other hand, the relationship between *S. littoralis* and relative humidity was significantly negative in August plantation during the first season. In the second season, there was a positive highly significant effects between *S. littoralis* and temperature in August and September plantation and a negative significant in November plantation. On the other hand, the relationship between *S. littoralis* and relative humidity was highly significantly positive in November plantation.

### **5.1.5. The cotton mealy bugs, *Phenacoccus solenopsis* Tinsley**

The cotton mealy bug, *P. solenopsis* reached the highest peak of abundance during the first and the second season (24, 45, 13 and 28 indiv./100 leaves) and (36, 32, 20 and 41 indiv./100 leaves) in August, September, October and November plantation, respectively.

Regarding to the seasonal average number of *P. solenopsis* in different sugar beet plantations, the obtained results indicated that, the highest seasonal average number recorded in August plantation ( $13.5\pm 3.4$  and  $14.9\pm 3.8$  indiv.) followed by September represented by  $11.9\pm 5.5$  and  $12.7\pm 2.9$  indiv. during the two seasons, respectively.

There was a positive significant correlation between *P. solenopsis* and temperature in August and September plantation. But there was a highly negative significant correlation in November plantation. There was a highly positive significant correlation between *P. solenopsis* and relative humidity in November plantation during the first season. There was a highly positive significant correlation between *P. solenopsis* and temperature in August plantation and a highly negative significant



correlation in November plantation, in the second season. There was a positive significant correlation between *P. solenopsis* and relative humidity in September and November plantation, a negative significant correlation in August plantation, during the second season.

### **5.1.6. The sugar beet fly, *Pegomia mixta* Vill.**

The sugar beet fly, *P. mixta* reached the highest peak of abundance during the first season 186, 367, 466 and 390 larvae/100 leaves in August, September, October and November plantations, respectively. Meanwhile, during the second season *P. mixta* reached the highest peak of abundance which represented by 220, 142, 253 and 400 larvae/100 leaves in the four plantations, respectively.

In respect to, the seasonal average number of *P. mixta* in different sugar beet plantations, the obtained results revealed that, the highest seasonal average number recorded in November plantation ( $181.4 \pm 44.4$  and  $138.2 \pm 40.2$  larvae) during the two seasons followed by September, plantation and presented by  $168.5 \pm 52.3$  larvae in the first season and October plantation presented by  $111.3 \pm 18.8$  larvae in the second season.

There were a highly negative significant effects between *P. mixta* and the mean temperature in August, September and November plantation. The relationship between *P. mixta* and relative humidity was a positive significant in September and November plantation during the first season 2018/19. In the second season, there was no effect of Temperature in *P. mixta* population in all planting dates. The relationship between *P. mixta* and relative humidity was a negative significant in October plantation.

### **5.1.7. The sugar beet beetle, *Cassida vittata* Vill.**

The sugar beet beetle, *C. vittata* reached the highest peak of abundance (224 and 128 indiv./100 leaves) and (216 and 199 indiv./100

leaves) in October and November plantations, during the two successive seasons, respectively.

In respect to, the seasonal average number of immature stages of *C. vittata* in different sugar beet plantations, the obtained results revealed that, the highest seasonal average number recorded in October plantation ( $30.6 \pm 29.0$  indiv.) followed by November plantation ( $29.5 \pm 19.5$  indiv.) during the first season. Moreover the highest seasonal average number of *Cassida vittata* recorded in November plantation ( $54.4 \pm 32.3$  indiv.) followed by October plantation ( $35.1 \pm 30.3$  indiv.) during the second season.

The relationship between *C. vittata* and temperature was a highly positive significant in October and November plantation. There was a highly negative significant effects between *C. vittata* and relative humidity in November plantation during the first season. While it As for the second season, temperature was a highly positive significant in November plantation. On the other hand, there was a highly negative significant effects between *C. vittata* and relative humidity in October and November plantation.

### **5.1.8. The sugar beet moth, *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* Boyd.**

The sugar beet moth, *S. ocellatella* reached the highest peak of abundance during the two seasons, (10, 10, 35 and 24 larvae/ 5 plants) and (20, 11, 18 and 45 larvae/5 plants), in August, September, October and November plantation, respectively.

Regarding to the seasonal average number of *S. ocellatella* larvae in different sugar beet plantations, the obtained results revealed that, the highest seasonal average number recorded in October plantation ( $12.3 \pm 4.4$  larvae) followed by November plantation presented by  $9.5 \pm 3.5$ , larvae, respectively. Moreover, the highest seasonal average number of the larvae recorded in November plantation ( $8.1 \pm 4.0$  larvae) followed by

October plantation represented by  $4.7 \pm 2.3$  larvae during the second season.

There was a negative significant correlation between *S. ocellatella* and temperature in August plantation. There was no effect of relative humidity on the pest during the first season. In the second season, there was a negative highly significant correlation with temperature in August plantation and positive significant correlation in November plantation. In respect to relative humidity, there was a negative significant in October and November plantation.

### **5.2. The associated insect predators.**

November plantation exhibited the highest average number of the associated insect predators followed by August plantation during the two seasons. On the other hand, it can be noticed that, *C. carnea* and *C. undecimpunctata* were the most dominant insect predators during the two seasons. Analysis of variance showed that highly significant differences in different insect predators among the different plantation during seasons, 2018/19 and 2019/20.

### **5.3. The associated insect parasitoids.**

#### **5.3.1. The parasitoid of the beet fly *P. mixta*, *Opius nitidulator*:**

The highest seasonal activity of *O. nitidulator* during the first season 2018/19 in September plantation represented by 113 indiv. in 7<sup>th</sup> of March 2019. Meanwhile, the lowest seasonal activity for the parasitoid recorded in October plantation with 67 indiv. in 28<sup>th</sup> of March. While in the second season, the highest seasonal activity of *O. nitidulator* in November plantation and represented by 72 in 4<sup>th</sup> of April. Meanwhile, the lowest seasonal activity for the parasitoid recorded in August plantation with 43 indiv. in 22<sup>nd</sup> of November 2019.

The highest average number of emerged parasitoid *O. nitidulator* recorded in September plantation during the first season and in November plantation during the second season and presented by  $64.2 \pm 7.00$  and  $36.9 \pm 5.20$  indiv., respectively.

The percentage of parasitism caused by *O. nitidulator* ranged between 18.3% in November plantation and 34.7% in September plantation during the first season. During the second season 2019/20, the percentage of parasitism caused by *O. nitidulator* ranged between 21.2% in August plantation and 35.9% in October plantation. The highest percentage of parasitism caused by *O. nitidulator* was recorded in September plantation and in October plantation during the two seasons, respectively.

### **5.3.2. The parasitoids of the toroise beetle, *Cassida vittata***

#### **5.3.2.1. The egg parasitoid, *Monorthochaeta nigra***

November plantation attractive *C. vittata* females to egg-laying the highest average number during the two seasons and presented by  $55.1 \pm 18.98$  and  $21.8 \pm 7.68$  eggs, respectively. Also the average number of parasitized eggs caused by *M. nigra* as well as the percentage of parasitism were the highest in November plantation during the two seasons and presented by  $5.3 \pm 1.92$  eggs (9.7%) and  $2.0 \pm 0.70$  eggs (9.2%), respectively.

#### **5.3.2.2. The larval pupal parasitoid, *Tetrastichus* sp.**

October plantation recorded the highest average number of the total full grown larvae and pupae ( $9.8 \pm 5.95$  indiv.), while the highest average number of parasitized pupae and the highest percentage of parasitism recorded in November plantation during the first season and presented by  $1.4 \pm 0.53$  and 16.3%, respectively. While in the second season, November plantation recorded the highest average number of the total full grown larvae and pupae, the highest average number of parasitized pupae and

the highest percentage of parasitism during the second season and presented by  $26.9 \pm 9.43$ ,  $2.9 \pm 1.00$  and  $11.0\%$ , respectively. Statistical analysis revealed that, a significant difference occurred in these parameters according to the different plantations.

### **5.3.3. The parasitoids of the beet moth *S. ocellatella*.**

#### **5.3.3.1. The larval parasitoid *Agathis* sp.**

The highest average number of the total *S. ocellatella* larvae and the highest average number of the healthy larvae were recorded in October plantation and presented by  $20.1 \pm 1.75$  and  $14.4 \pm 1.68$  indiv. On the other hand, the average number of the parasitized larvae caused by *Agathis* sp. was ranged between  $0.3 \pm 0.33$  indiv. in September plantation and  $0.8 \pm 0.24$  indiv. in November plantation during the first season. while in the second season, the highest average number of the total *S. ocellatella* larvae and the highest average number of the healthy larvae were recorded in August plantation and presented by  $14.4 \pm 2.01$  and  $9.4 \pm 2.29$  indiv. On the other hand, the average number of the parasitized larvae caused by *Agathis* sp. was ranged between  $1.0 \pm 0.58$  indiv. in September plantation and  $1.6 \pm 0.40$  indiv. in August plantation.

#### **5.3.3.2. The pupal parasitoid, *Diadegma* sp.**

The highest average number of the total *S. ocellatella* pupae and the highest average of emerged moth were recorded in October plantation and represented by  $17.3 \pm 1.72$  and  $14.4 \pm 1.68$  indiv. Furthermore, the average number of parasitized pupae caused by *Diadegma* sp. was ranged between  $0.6 \pm 0.24$  indiv. in August plantation and  $2.5 \pm 0.42$  indiv. in October plantation in the first season. While in the second season, the highest average number of the total *S. ocellatella* pupae and the highest average of emerged moth were recorded in August plantation and represented by  $11.2 \pm 1.93$  and  $9.4 \pm 2.29$  indiv. Furthermore, the average

number of parasitized pupae caused by *Diadegma* sp. was ranged between  $0.7 \pm 0.67$  indiv. in September plantation and  $1.0 \pm 0.32$  indiv. in August plantation.

### **5.3.4. The parasitoid of the southern green stink bugs, *Trissolcus basalis***

The highest percentage of parasitism recorded in August plantation (73.4%) during the first season and in September plantation (100%) during the second season. Moreover, the successful parasitism percentage were recorded in August plantation (60.1%) during the first season and in September plantation (91.6) during the second season.

### **5.4. Effect of different insecticides on certain sugar beet insect pests.**

The anti-moulting compounds caused high reduction in *S. littoralis* larvae and *P. mixta* population, which was almost the same effect of the chemical insecticides, respectively. For *C. vittata* and *S. ocellatella*, the anti-moulting compounds (88.3% and 88.8%) and (88.3%), respectively. proved that to be less efficient in comparison to the chemical insecticides (97.3% and 98.8%) and (97.3% and 97.5%), respectively. The safest treatment on the considered predators was the anti-moulting compounds. The chemical insecticides proved to be the most toxic against the considered predators.

### **5.5. Biology of *P. mixta* and *P. hyoscami*.**

The highest average number of egg-laying of *P. mixta* and *P. hyoscami* were recorded in sugar beet, followed by fodder beet plants. Also, the highest period of incubation were recorded in table beet plants followed by chard plants. The highest percentage of hatchability in *P. mixta* was in fodder beet plants. As for *P. hyoscami*, it was in sugar beet plants.

## *Summary*

---

The shortest larval duration, pupal duration and the total immature stages recorded when reared *P. mixta* on sugar beet plants. While, when reared *P. mixta* in table beet recorded the highest larval, pupal and total immature stages. Also, for *P. hyoscami*, the shortest larval duration and pupal duration recorded when reared *P. hyoscami* on sugar beet plants, but the shortest total immature stages duration recorded when reared *P. hyoscami* on fodder beet. While, when reared *P. hyoscami* in table beet recorded the highest larval, pupal and total immature stages. Sugar beet and fodder beet recorded the longest adult longevity.

Analysis of variance showed that significant differences among the host plants in the biological aspects for both insect pests