

### "Studies on the important insect pests and natural enemies on the sugar beet plants"

By

Nahed Abdel-Dayem Fetoh El-Mahalawy

B.Sc. (Economic Entomology), Fac., of Agric., Kafr El-Sheikh, Tanta Univ., 2004

M.Sc. (Economic Entomology), Fac., of Agric., Tanta Univ., 2011

Thesis Submitted in Partial fulfillment of the requirements For the PhD. degree of Agriculture Sciences

In

(Economic Entomology)

#### Supervision

Prof.Dr

**Fayez Aly. M. Abou-Attia** Professor Emeritus of Economic Entomology Economic Entomology Department Faculty of Agriculture Kafr El-Sheikh University

#### Prof.Dr Asmhan El- Said Youssef

Professor Emeritus of Economic Entomology Economic Entomology Department Faculty of Agriculture Kafr El-Sheikh University

#### Prof.Dr

Gamal Abd El Gawad Shalaby Head Researcher of Economic Entomology Sugar Crops Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt

#### Economic Entomology Department Faculty of Agriculture Kafrelsheikh University

#### (2021)

	<u>CONTENTS</u>	page
I. INT	RODUCTION	1
II. RE	VIEW OF LITERATURE	4
1.	Susceptibility of sugar beet cultivars to insect pest infestations	4
	and biochemical and molecular markers	
2.	Host preference for sugar beet insects and feeding	6
3.	The role of addition silica in reducing the infestations caused	17
	by the insect pests on sugar beet plants	
4.	Effect of application anhydrous ammonia on sugar beet insect	23
	infestation	
III. MA	ATERIALS AND METHODS	26
1.	Susceptibility of the eight sugar beet cultivar types in insect	26
	pest infestation	
1.1	Experimental field procedures	26
1.2	Biochemical and molecular analysis	26
1.3	SDS Protein Electrophoresis	26
1.4	PCR based molecular marker analysis	26
2.	Effect of the different host plants on the population density of	27
	the main insect pests	
3.	Role of silica in reducing sugar beet insect infestations	28
4.	Effect of anhydrous ammonia on arthropods infestation	29
	seedling sugar beet fields	
4.1	Experimental area preparation	29
4.2	Treatments on plots (Nitrogenous fertilization)	29
4.3	Cultural practices	29
4.4	Pitfall traps and survey	30
5.	Statistical analysis	30

IV. KE	SULTS AND DISCUSSION	31
Ι.	Susceptibility of the eight sugar beet cultivar types to insect pest infestations	31
1.1.	The Sugar beet fly, <i>P. mixta</i>	31
1.2.	C. vittata	31
1.3.	S. Littoralis	32
1.4.	Cropping qualities for Sugar beet varieties	34
1.5.	Impurity ratios for tested sugar beet varieties:	36
1.6.	Relationship between insect infestations and Sugar beet varieties components and impurities	38
1.6.1.	Cropping components	38
1.7.	Biochemical and Molecular analysis	42
1.7.1.	Total soluble protein analysis	42
1.7.2.	DNA Marker Analysis	44
1.7.3.	Molecular analysis of polymorphism based on RAPD marker	44
1.7.4.	Clustering of RAPD variations	53
2.	Effect of different host plants on population density of the main insect pests	54
2.1.	Monthly average number of <i>Pegomia mixta</i> larvae on different host plants	57
2.2.	Monthly average number of <i>Cassida vittata</i> (L&A) on different host plants	60
2.3.	Monthly average number of Scrobipalpa ocellatella on different host plants	63
2.4.	Effect of chemical components of four host plants on insect pest infestations:	66
2.5.	The numbers of Predators occurring on four host plant:	70

2.5.1.	Chrysoperla carnea	70
2.5.2.	Coccinella undecimpunctata	70
2.5.3.	Scymnus sp	70
2.5.4.	predatory ants	71
2.5.5.	Pardosa sp& Lycosa sp	71
3.	Role of added silica for Sugar beet plants in reducing some insect pests infestation	74
3.1.	Effect of silica addition on Sugar beet yield and yield components	80
4.	Effect of anhydrous ammonia on Sugar beet insects and associated predators	84
4.1.	Insect populations	84
4.1.1.	Colembolla	84
4.1.2.	Mole Cricket and its effected by anhydrous ammonia	85
4.1.3.	cut worm infestation	86
4.2.	Predators population	87
4.2.1.	True spiders	87
4.2.2.	Predatory ants	88
4.2.3	Staphylinidae, Peadrous alferii	90
4.2.4.	Carabidae predators	92
V. SUM	MARY	94
VI. REFERENCES		100

## List of Tables

NO.	Title	Page
Table 1:	The different 10-mer Oligonucleotide RAPD primers used in this study were as follows:	27
Table 2:	Susceptibility of some Sugar beet varieties to insect infestation at Kafr El-Sheikh region throughout two successive seasons 2015/2016 and 2016/2017	33
Table 3:	The relationship between some varieties of sugar beet and their cropping qualities in Kafr El-Sheikh region during 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 seasons.	36
Table 4:	The content of juice are impediments to extract sugar (impurities) for the tested sugar beet varieties at Kafr El-Sheikh region during 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 seasons.	39
Table 5:	Effect of insect infestation on cropping components of some sugar beet varieties in Kafr El-Sheikh region during 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 seasons.	40
Table 6:	Correlation of insect infestation on cropping components of some sugar beet varieties in Kafr El-Sheikh region during 2014/2015 and 2015/2016	40
Table 7:	Relationship of insect infestations to impurities in extracted juice for some of sugar beet varieties at Kafr El-Sheikh region during 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 seasons.	41
Table 8:	Correlation of insect infestations to impurities in extracted juice for some of sugar beet varieties at Kafr El-Sheikh region during 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 seasons.	42
Table 9:	Presence (1) versus absence (0) of SDS-PAGE protein bands of soluble protein extracted from eight sugar beet genotypes.	43
Table 10:	Presence (1) versus absence (0) of DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer1.	45
Table 11:	Presence (1) versus absence (0) of DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer2.	47
Table 12:	Presence (1) versus absence (0) of DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer3.	48
Table 13:	Presence (1) versus absence (0) of DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer4.	49
Table 14:	Presence (1) versus absence (0) of DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer5.	50
Table 15:	Presence (1) versus absence (0) of DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer6.	51
Table 16:	Effect of different host plants on population density of the main insect pests during the first season 2013-14 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	54
Table 17:	Effect of different host plants on population density of the main insect pests during the first season 2014-15 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	55
Table 18:	Monthly average number of <i>Pegomia mixta</i> larvae on different host plants during	57

	the first season 2013-14 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	
Table 19:	Monthly average number of <i>Pegomia mixta</i> on different host plants during the second season 2014-15 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	58
Table 20:	Monthly average number of <i>Cassida vittata</i> (adult and larvae) on different host plants during the first season 2013-2014 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	61
Table 21:	Monthly average number of <i>Cassida vittata</i> (adult and larvae) on different host plants during the second season 2014-2015 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	62
Table 22:	Monthly average number of <i>Scrobipalpa ocellatella</i> larvae on different host plants during the first season 2013-2014 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	64
Table 23:	Monthly average number of <i>Scrobipalpa ocellatella</i> larvae on different host plants during the second season 2014-2015 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	65
Table 24:	Estimation of some elements (Chlorophyll, protein, carbohydrate and total phenol for different host plants during seasons 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	68
Table 25:	Relationship between chemical components on sugar beet plants and insect infestation in two successive seasons 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 at Kafr El-Sheikh region	69
Table 26:	Correlations between chemical components on sugar beet plants and insect infestation in two successive seasons 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 at Kafr El-Sheikh region	69
Table 27:	Correlations between chemical components on sugar beet plants and predators species in two successive seasons 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 at Kafr El-Sheikh region.	70
Table 28:	The number of predators occurring on Sugar beet, Fodder beet, Table beet and Chard during season 2013/2014 in Kafr El- Sheikh region	72
Table 29:	The numbers of Predators occurring on Sugar beet, Fodder beet, Table beet and Chard during season 2014/2015 in Kafr El- Sheikh region	73
Table 30:	Reduction % of number of <i>Cassida vittata</i> and <i>Scrobipalpa ocellatella</i> on Sugar beet plants treated with silica foliar spray during two seasons 2013 /2014 and 2014/2015.	75
Table 31:	Chemical analysis for sugar beet leaves treated with silica foliar spray on sugar beet plants during season 2013/2014 and 2014/2015	77
Table 32:	Yield and yield component du to silica application at Sugar beet plants at Kafr el-sheikh region during 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons	81
Table 33:	Relationship between silica content and complex insects with some of plants content and characters	83
Table 34:	Correlations between silica content and complex insects with some of plants content and characters	83
Table 35:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia on Colembolla population in sugar beet at Kafr El-Sheikh region 2015-2016 season.	84

<b>T</b> 11 26		07
Table 36:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia on Colembolla population in sugar beet at Kafr El-Sheikh region 2016-2017 season.	85
Table 37:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia on Mole Crickets in sugar beet at Kafr El-Sheikh region 2015-2016 season.	85
Table 38:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia on Mole Crickets in sugar beet at Kafr El-Sheikh region 2016-2017 season.	86
Table 39:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia on cut worms in sugar beet at Kafr El-Sheikh region 2015-2016 season.	87
Table 40:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia on cut worms in sugar beet at Kafr El-Sheikh region 2016-2017 season.	87
Table 41:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia in reducing numbers of Spider /5 traps at Kafr El-Sheikh governorate 2015-2016 season.	89
Table 42:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia in reducing numbers of Spider /5 traps at Kafr El-Sheikh governorate 2016-2017 season.	89
Table 43:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia in reducing numbers of Formcidae /5 traps at Kafr El-Sheikh governorate 2015-2016 season.	89
Table 44:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia in reducing numbers of Formcidae /5 traps at Kafr El-Sheikh governorate 2016-2017 season.	90
Table 45:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia in reducing numbers of Staphylinidae /5 traps at Kafr El-Sheikh governorate 2015-2016 season.	91
Table 46:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia in reducing numbers of Staphylinidae /5 traps at Kafr El-Sheikh governorate 2016-2017 season.	91
Table 47:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia in reducing numbers of Carabidae /5 traps at Kafr El-Sheikh governorate 2015-2016 season.	92
Table 48:	Effect of anhydrous ammonia in reducing numbers of Carabidae /5 traps at Kafr El-Sheikh governorate 2016-2017 season.	93

## List of Figures

NO.	Title	Page
Figure 1:	SDS-PAGE of protein banding patterns for eight sugar beet genotypes.	43
Figure 2:	DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer1.	45
Figure 3:	DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer2.	46
Figure 4:	DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer3.	47
Figure 5:	DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer4.	48
Figure 6:	DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer5.	49
Figure 7:	DNA polymorphism for eight genotypes with RAPD primer6.	50
Figure 8:	Dendrogram of Sugar beet genotypes based on the cluster analysis of Nei and Li's genetic distance (1979) of 6 RAPD loci.	52
Figure 9:	Effect of different host plants on population density of the main insect pests during the first season 2013-2014 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	55
Figure 10:	Effect of different host plants on population density of the main insect pests during the first season 2014-2015 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	56
Figure 11:	Monthly average number of <i>Pegomia mixta</i> larvae on different host plants during the first season 2013-2014 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	58
Figure 12:	Monthly average number of <i>Pegomia mixta</i> larvae on different host plants during the first season 2014-2015in Kafr El-Sheikh region	59
Figure 13:	Monthly average number of <i>Cassida vittata</i> (adult and larvae) on different host plants during the first season 2013-2014 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	62
Figure 14:	Monthly average number of <i>Cassida vittata</i> (adult and larvae) on different host plants during the first season 2014-2015 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	63
Figure 15:	Monthly average number of <i>Scrobipalpa ocellatella</i> larvae on different host plants during the first season 2013-2014 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	65
Figure 16:	Monthly average number of <i>Scrobipalpa ocellatella</i> larvae on different host plants during the first season 2014-2015 in Kafr El-Sheikh region	66
Figure 17:	Reduction% of number of <i>Cassida vittata</i> and <i>Scrobipalpa ocellatella</i> on sugar beet plants treated with silica foliar spray during two seasons 2013 /2014 and 2014/2015.	76
Figure 18:	Chemical analysis for sugar beet leaves treated with silica foliar spray on sugar beet plants during season 2013/2014.	78
Figure 19:	Chemical analysis for sugar beet leaves treated with silica foliar spray on sugar beet plants during season 2014/2015.	79
Figure 20:	yield and yield component du to silica application at sugar beet plants at Kafr el-Sheikh region during 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons	82

#### **SUMMARY**

This work was carried out at Sakha Agricultural Experimental Station Farm in Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate during four sugar beet growing seasons, 2013/2014, 2014/2015, 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 respectively.

#### The current study was aimed to:

- 1. Susceptibility of some sugar beet varieties to the main insect pests infestation and using molecular and biochemical markers to identify resistance varieties to insect infestation.
- 2. Investigate the effect of host plant preference for sugar beet insects and feeding using Sugar beet, Fodder beet, Table beet and Chard on insect populations infesting leaves of sugar beet plants, and their predators under field conditions.
- Study the effect of addition of silica (sodium silicate and magnesium silicate), as sources of silica, against sugar beet insects as sprayed on sugar beet plants.
- 4. Using anhydrous ammonia to control sugar beet insects and to determine the optimum rate of application for increasing the number of natural enemies.

# **1.** Susceptibility of the eight sugar beet cultivars to insect pest infestations:

The susceptibility of eight sugar beet cultivar; Tarbelli, Pepite, Amina, Sarah, Asketa, Karima, Dina and Paeikles to the main insect pests *Pegomia mixta*, *Cassida vittata* and *Spodoptera littoralis* and the values of estimated plant characters of the tested cultivars were studied during two successive seasons; 2014/2015 and 2015/2016. The obtained results were as follow: -

#### 1.1. <u>P. mixta:</u>

The sugar beet cultivar Sarah attracted the highest mean number of *P. mixta* larvae blotches during the two seasons 2014-15 and 2015-16 (208.3 Larvae blotches and 183.7 Larvae / 10 plants. Followed by Paeikles, Amina, Asketa,

94

Pepite, Dina, Tarbelli and Karima cultivars (187, 178.7, 170.3, 169.7, 142, 135.7 and 109.3 larval blotches / 10 plants), respectively, for the season 2014-15.

On the other hand, Karima cultivar was the relatively resistant, and then the other seven tested cultivars to the fly infestation as it received the least number 107.3 larval blotches / 10 plants.

#### 1.2. <u>C. vittata:</u>

Data revealed that the Paeikles cultivar was moderate resistant for *C. vittata* and highly resistant than the Tarbelli cultivar. The Paeikles cultivar recorded (110.7 and 116 (A&L) of *C. vittata* /10 plants for the season 2014-15 and 2015-16 respectively. On other hand the Tarbelli cultivar recorded (300 and 298.3 (A&L) *C. vittata* /10 plants for the season 2014-15 and 2015-16 respectively. Also the data showed that the beetle infestations were higher in the 1<sup>st</sup> season than in the 2<sup>nd</sup> one.

#### 1.3. <u>S. Littoralis:</u>

Females of the cotton leaf-worm were attracted to Asketa cultivar plants more than the other cultivars. The recorded larvae on the considered cultivar plants were (266.7 L and 232.7 L / 10 plants) for the season 2014 -15 and 2015 – 16, respectively. The Pepite cultivar was less susceptible for *S. Littoralis* recorded (41.7 L and 21.3 L/10 plants) for the season 2014 -2015 and 2015 – 2016 respectively. The *S. Littoralis* infestations were higher in the 1<sup>st</sup> season than in the 2<sup>nd</sup> one.

#### 1.4. <u>Biochemical and Molecular analysis</u>

Regarding *Cassida vittata*, the band with Mw 115 KDa and 85 KDa were present in Paeikles variety the high resistant varieties and was absent in Tarbelli the high susceptible genotype, these bands can be considered as positive markers for resistance to *Cassida vittata*.

Concerning *Pegomyia mixta*, the band with Mw 37 KDa was found in Karima variety the high resistant genotype and was absent in Sarah the high susceptible genotype, the band can be considered as positive marker for resistance to *Pegomyia mixta*, on other hand the band with Mw 23 KDa was present in Sarah and was absent in Karima, this band can be considered as a negative marker for *Pegomyia mixta*.

For the *Spodoptera littoralis* the band with Mw 160 KDa was not found in Pepite variety the high resistant genotype and was present in Asketa the high susceptible genotype, the band can be considered as negative marker for resistance to *Spodoptera littoralis*.

A high level of DNA polymorphism was detected by RAPD technique. For the eight genotypes, RAPD markers amplified using RAPD primer.

With regard primer NO.1 (AGG GGT CTT G). The bands has Mw 755 bp and 675 bp can be considered as positive markers for *Cassida vittata* infestation.

Regarding the *Spodoptera littoralis* the band with Mw 170 bp and 155 bp the bands can be considered as positive markers for resistance to *Spodoptera littoralis*.

For the eight genotypes with RAPD markers amplified using primer NO.2 (CAG GCC CTT C) the bend has Mw 110 bp can be considered as positive markers for *Cassida vittata* infestation. On other hand the band with Mw 85 bp can be considered as potential negative marker for *Cassida vittata* infestation.

Concerning the *Spodoptera littoralis* with primer NO.2 (CAG GCC CTT C) the bands with Mw 495 bp and 360 bp can be considered as positive markers for resistance to *Spodoptera littoralis*.

For *Pegomyia mixta* with primer NO.3, the bands with Mw 935 bp and 815 bp can be considered as potential negative markers for *Pegomyia mixta* infestation.

For *Pegomyia mixta* with primer NO.5, the band with Mw 605 bp can be considered as a positive marker for *Pegomyia mixta* infestation.

Concerning the eight genotypes with RAPD markers amplified using primer NO.6 (CTG CTG GGA C) the bend has Mw 353 bp can be considered as positive marker for *Cassida vittata* infestation.

#### **Clustering of RAPD variations:**

The genetic distance matrix was utilized for cluster analysis based on UPGMA. The dendrogram showed two major clusters. Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 were separated from a cluster1 of susceptible for insect infestation to Cluster 2 resistance for insect infestation.

# 2. Effect of different host plants on population density and monthly average number of the main insect pests:

The effect of the four host plants; Sugar beet, Fodder beet, Table beet and Chard on the infestation rate with the most serious insect pests; *Pegomia mixta*, *Cassida vittata* and *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* was studied in two sugar beet growing seasons; 2013/14 and 2014/15.

For the total monthly average number of *Pegomia mixta*, Fodder beet showed the highest average followed by Sugar beet; Table beet and Chard indicate the lowest average number for the seasons 2013-14 and 2014-15. Also the maximum population density of *P. mixta* reached its peak in Feb., and the lowest population density was recorded in April.

Concerning *Cassida vittata*, the Fodder beet harbored the is highest average number (2.78) followed by Sugar beet, Chard and Table beet which recorded 2.72, 0.92 and 0.45 average number for *Cassida vittata* respectively during season 2013-14. The same result found in the season 2014-15 with the no significant with fodder beet and sugar beet average number for *Cassida vittata* during season 2014-15. Also, data appeared that the highest population density was recorded in Feb.

Regarding *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* also, the Fodder beet is highest average number (1.78) followed by Sugar beet, Table beet and Chard which recorded 1.69, 1.22 and 0.09 insect of *Scrobipalpa ocellatella*, respectively during season 2013-14. The same result found in the season 2014-15. (1.88, 1.7, 1.36 and 0.12) for Fodder beet, Sugar beet, Table beet and Chard respectively. Also, data showed the highest population density was apper in March, while the lowest population density was found in April.

# 3. Role of added silica for Sugar beet plants in reducing some insect pest's infestation:

Sugar beet plants are severely attacked by *Cassida vittata* and *Scrobipalpa ocellatella*, the current investigation was conducted to test the role of silica in reducing infestation by *Cassida vittata* and *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* in sugar beet during 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 seasons.

Data indicated that the sugar beet plants treated with Magnesium silicate 3 g / L followed by Magnesium silicate 6 g / L showed the highest reduction percent of insect infestation during 2014 and 2015 seasons, whereas the all average of reduction for *Cassida vittata* 42.08 and 38.6% respectively. On the other hand, the all average of reduction for *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* was 69.05 and 50.79% for Sodium silicate 6 g / L followed by Sodium silicate 3 g / L respectively.

Concerning Si element for sugar beet leaves treated with Silica foliar spray showed the highest concentration for magnesium silicate treatment (0.83 and 0.63) for 6 g / L and 3 g / L respectively, and 0.43 for sodium silicate 3 g / L and 6 g / L.

Results revealed that Silica seems to enhance sugar beet plants in controlling the *Cassida vittata* and *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* in sugar beet plants.

# 4. Effect of anhydrous ammonia on Sugar beet insects and their associated predators:

Effect of anhydrous ammonia on populations of seedling sugar beet insects and associated natural enemies was studied at Kafr El Sheikh region, El Ryaid district.

#### 1- Colembolla:

Anhydrous ammonia levels were more effective in reducing the insect population after 10 and 20 days from treatment followed by 30, 40 and 50 days respectively.

Also, from the same data it can observed that the 90 unit/feddan of anhydrous ammonia level was more effective in reducing the insect populations (followed by 80 unit/ feddan and 70 unit/ feddan).

98

#### 2- Crickets:

Results revealed that the total reduction of insects population was observed with all levels of ammonia after 10 and 20 days of application (0.00) insect / traps.

The percent of reductions were reached the highest, when ammonia applied by level of 90 unit/feddan (79.31%) and the lowest was recorded at 70 unit/ feddan (62.07%).

#### 3- Cut worms:

Reductions values in insect population recorded, 80.65, 93.55 and 83.87 insect/trap when the soil treated by ammonia at 70, 80 and 90 unit/feddan, respectively.

The statically analysis revealed that there were significant differences between three levels of ammonia treatment. In the second season 2016/2017 the same similar results were found.

#### 4- Predators population:

The average number of predators increased after 40 and 50 days from injection. On the other hand, reduction percent reached the highest value when the soil injected by 90 unit/fed. followed by 80 and 70 unit/fed. of ammonia, respectively.