# Journal of Plant Protection and Pathology

Journal homepage: <u>www.jppp.mans.edu.eg</u> Available online at: <u>www.jppp.journals.ekb.eg</u>

Impact of Sowing Dates and *Nasonia vitripennis* (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae) as a New Identified Parasitoid of the Sugar Beet Fly, *Pegomyia Mixta* 

# Hassan, H. M.<sup>1</sup> and K. G. Bazazo<sup>2\*</sup>

Cross Mark

<sup>1</sup>Department of Economic Entomology, Faculty of Agriculture, Kafr El-Sheikh University, 33516, Kafr El-Sheikh, Egypt. <sup>2</sup>Plant Protection Research Department, Sugar Crops Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt.

# ABSTRACT



Sugar beet, *Beta Vulgaris* L. is a strategic crop of sugar industry in Egypt. Sugar-beet fly, *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. (Diptera: Anthomyiidae), is considered to be the most serious insect pest attacking sugar-beet all over the world. The intensive use of chemical insecticides led to suppress the role of parasitoids in sugar beet fields. Thus, this work was undertaken at the experimental farm of Sakha Agricultural Research Station – kafr Elsheikh Governorate during two successive seasons 2019/ 2020 and 2020/ 2021, to examine the influence of agricultural and biological control methos in reducing populations of *P. mixta*. Results proved that the third plantation date had the highest populations of *P. mixta* larvae compared with the first and second plantation dates during the two seasons of the study. As far as we know, the larval-pupal parasitoid, *Nasonia vitripennis* (Walker) is identified for the first time from *P. mixta* larvae in Egyptian sugar beet fields. Percentages of larval parasitism of *P. mixta* that caused by *N. vitripennis* were 38.23, 36.76 and 35.77% in the first, second, and third plantation dates, respectively in 2019/2020 season. While, they were were 48.27, 56.94 and 32.74%, respectively in 2020/2021 season. In Integrated Pest Management programs, *N.vitripennis* and sowing dates might be taken in consideration for reducing populations of *P. mixta*.

Keywords: Agricultural and biological control, Integrated Pest Management, larva-pupal parasitoids, sugar beet

# INTRODUCTION

Sugar beet, *Beta Vulgaris* L. is a strategic crop of sugar industry in Egypt. This crop comes in the second rank after sugarcae in its importace as a sugar crop. It is cultivated in 608.6 thousand feddans with an average yield of about 18.5 tons/ feddan in 2018/2019 (Annual report of sugar crops council, 2020). Recently, the gap between sugar production and consumption estimated to be 5000 tons (Afifi, 2001). Acorrdingly, the current policy of the Egyptain ministry of agriculture is to increase the cultivated area and to maximize yield production of sugar beet. The importance of this crop is not only to produce sugar but also to use its top parts in feeding animals due to the high nutritive value of the sugar beet canopy.

The sugar beet fly, *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. (Diptera: Anthomyiidae), is considered to be the most serious insect pest attacking sugar beet all over the world including Egypt (Abdel - Moniem, 2014; AL- Habshy, 2018; Awadalla *et al.* 2018). The yield losses by this insect pest reached up to 40% (Salama *et al.* 1991). Abo-Saied (1998) estimated the leaf consumption by an individual larva of all instars to be 23.6 cm<sup>2</sup> ( about 25 % of leaf area ). Further, Metwally *et al.* (1987) recorded the reductions in root weight and sugar content by *P. mixta* to be 31.50% and 40.50% respectively.

The intensive use of chemical insecticides led to suppress the role of parasitoids in sugar beet fields. In contrast, biological control approach is considered as a main component of the Integrated Pest Management programs (IPM). Many researchers have reported the efficiency of insect parasitoids in regulating populations of sugar beet insects (Hassanein *et al.*, 1993; Awadalla, 1997; El- Serwy, 2008; Mousa, 2005; Bazazo *et al.* 2017). They found that the larval-pupal parasitoid *Opius nitidulator* (Nees) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) seems to be an important biocontrol agent in decreasing populations of *P. mixta*. Percentages of parasitism by this parasitoid ranged between 3.2 to 56.50%.

Khalifa (2018) recorded that *P. mixta*, populations were low in the first and second plantation dates, but high in the third ones. Sowing dates are fundamental component in IPM programs against sugar beet insects. In Egypt, several studies have examined the influence of different sugar beet cultivars, sowing dates, several of foliar, mineral, and biofertlizers on sugar beet traits (Ismail and Abo El-Ghait, 2005; Osman, 2005; Ismail *et al.*, 2006 and Abdel-Razek, 2006). However, few data are available regarding their influence sugar beet pests. Therefore, the objectives of this study were to estimate the suitable sowing date for minmising infestation by the sugar beet fly and the role of parasitoids in reducing populations of *P. mixta*.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The current study was done at the experimental farm at Sakha Agricultural Research Station, Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate for two successive Seasons; 2019 / 2020 and 2020 / 2021. The experimental area was about one and half feddan. The first half was planted on 15th August, the second half was cultivated on 15th September, and the third one was sowing on 15th October in both seasons. Sugar beet

# Hassan, H. M. and K. G. Bazazo

variety, Karam was sown in three plantation dates, and all cultural practices were followed as recommended, but without any insecticide applications. Every half was divided into thre replicates. Each sample consisted of 30 plants that were collected randomly (10 plants / replicate).

Numbers of larvae and infested plants were visually counted. Afterwards, larvae were put into Petri dishes (9 cm<sup>2</sup> in diameter) with filter paper and a piece of cotton staturated with water The larvae were fed with pieces of sugar beet leaves and these leveas replaced daily till pupation. Larvae werekept under laboratory conditions ( $25 \pm 2 \text{ C}$ ,  $65 \pm 5\%$  R.H.). Afterwards, the pupae were transferred into another Pertri dishes till emergency (Adult or parasitoids). The parasitoids were recorded daily and counted and preservered in 75% ethyl alcohol.

Percentages of parasilism were calculated every sampling date according to the following formula:

% Parasitism= number of parasitoids / number of larva × 100 Parasitoids were identified through the department of insect taxonomy at the plant Protection Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt.

#### Statistical analysis :

Data were subjected to analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and means were compared using Duncan's Multiple Range Test (1955) and Least Significant Differences (LSD) at 5% probability level.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Tables (1 and 2) indicate that the third plantation had the highest populations of *P. mixta* larvae and numbers of infested plants with this insect in comparison with the first and second plantations during the two seasons 2019/2020 and 2020/2021.

In 2019/2020, means of *P. mixta* larvae were 11:33, 22.66 and 36.33 for the three cultivation dates, respectively, whereas, means of infested plants were 6.00, 11.00 and 15.66 in the three cultivation dates, respectively. In 2020/2021 season, means of *P. mixta* larvae were. 9.66, 24.00 and 37.66 in the three culvation dates, respectively. While, means of infested plants were 5.00, 10.66 and 17.00 in the three cultivation dates, respectively.

Statistical analysis proved that significant differences among the three cultivation dates throughout the two seasons.

A similar results were obtained by Awadalla (1997) who indicated that the larval populations of *P. mixta* were high in beginning of March. Abo-Saied Ahmed (1998) concluded that the third plantations were severely affected by this insect. Also, El- Khouly (2006) detected *P.mixta* larvae from November, with a progressive increase towards the end of the season. Thus, it is recommended to cultivate sugar beet plants in the first and second plantations to avoid the highest infestations of *P. mixta*.

 Table 1. Mean number of P. mixta larvae and its infested plants according to different planting date during 2019/2020 season.

		1 <sup>st</sup> cı	ıltivatio	n		2 <sup>nd</sup> cultiv	vation		3 <sup>rd</sup> cultivation			
date	Larvae		Infeste	Infested plants Larvae Infested plants Larvae		arvae	e Infested plants					
	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean
15/11/2019	2	0.66	1	0.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30/11	3	1.00	2	0.66	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15/12	6	2.00	2	0.66	8	2.66	3	1.00	-	-	-	-
30/12	7	2.33	3	1.00	8	2.66	4	1.33	-	-	-	-
15/1/2020	7	2.33	5	1.66	10	3.33	6	2.00	9	3.00	5	1.66
30/1	9	3.00	5	1.66	10	3.33	6	2.00	9	3.00	6	2.00
15/2	-	-	-	-	14	4.66	7	2.33	15	5.00	8	2.66
29/2	-	-	-	-	18	6.00	7	2.33	18	6.00	8	2.66
15/3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	8.66	10	3.33
30/3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	10.66	10	3.33
Total	34	11.33	18	6.00	68	22.66	33	11.00	109	36.33	47	15.66
L.S.D 0.05% Value	6.10 (Larvae) 5.19 (Infested plants)											s)

 Table 2. Mean number of P. mixta larvae and its infested plants according to different planting date during 2020/2021 season.

		1 <sup>st</sup> Cu	ltivation	1		2 <sup>nd</sup> Cultivation					3 <sup>rd</sup> Cultivation			
date	La	rvae	Infeste	ed plants	La	rvae	Infest	ed plants	La	Larvae		Infested plants		
	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean		
14/11/2020	1	0.33	1	0.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
29/11	2	0.66	1	0.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
14/12	3	1.00	3	1.00	6	2.00	2	0.66	-	-	-	-		
28/12	5	1.66	3	1.00	7	2.33	3	1.00	-	-	-	-		
13/1/2021	8	2.66	3	1.00	12	4.00	5	1.66	8	2.66	6	2.00		
28/1	10	3.33	4	1.33	12	4.00	6	2.00	9	3.00	6	2.00		
14/2	-	-	-	-	15	5.00	8	2.66	16	5.33	9	3.00		
29/2	-	-	-	-	20	6.66	8	2.66	20	6.66	10	3.33		
14/3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	9.00	10	3.33		
30/3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	11.00	10	3.33		
Total	29	9.66	15	5.00	72	24.00	32	10.66	113	37.66	51	17.00		
L.S.D 0.05% Value	70.10 (Larvae) 6.02 (Infe										sted pla	nts)		

Tables (3 and 4) shows the percentages of larvalpupal parasitism in *P.mixta* population that caused by *N.vitripennis* were 38.23, 36.76 and 35.77% in the first, second, and third sowing date, respectively in 2019/2020. In

the second season (2020/2021), they were 48.27, 56.94 and 32.74% in the first, second, and third sowing date, respectively.

In the first season, parasitism (%) ranged between 0.00 and 44.44%; 25.00 and 44.44% and 22.22 and 42.30%

in the first, second, and third sowing date, respectively. In the second season (2020/2021), parasitism% ranged between 40.00 and 100 %; 50.00 and 83.33%; and 30.00 and 40.74% in the first, second, and third sowing date, respectively.

Table 3. The percentage of parasitism caused by larval-pupal *parasitoid N. vitripennis* on the sugar beet fly *P. mixta* during 2019/2020 season.

		1 <sup>st</sup> (	Cultivation			2 <sup>nd</sup>	Cultivation	l	3 <sup>rd</sup> Cultivation				
Date	No. Larvae	No. pupae	No. Parasitoid	Parasitism	No. Larvae	No. pupae	No. Parasitoid	Parasitism	No. Larvae	No. pupae	No. Parasitoid	Parasitism	
15/11/2019	2	2	0	0.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
30/11	3	3	1	33.33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
15/12	6	5	2	33.33	8	6	2	25.00	-	-	-	-	
30/12	7	5	3	42.85	8	6	3	37.50	-	-	-	-	
15/1/2020	7	7	3	42.85	10	8	3	30.00	9	7	2	22.22	
30/1	9	7	4	44.44	10	8	4	40.00	9	8	3	33.33	
15/2	-	-	-	-	14	12	5	35.71	15	13	4	26.66	
29/2	-	-	-	-	18	15	8	44.44	18	16	6	33.33	
15/3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	23	11	42.30	
30/3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	29	13	40.62	
Total	34	29	13	38.23	68	55	25	36.76	109	96	39	35.77	

Table 4. The percentage of parasitism caused by larval-pupal *parasitoid N. vitripennis* on the sugar beet fly *P. mixta* during 2020/2021 season.

		1 <sup>st</sup>	Cultivation			2 <sup>nd</sup>	Cultivation		3 <sup>rd</sup> Cultivation				
Date	No. Larvae	No. pupae	No. Parasitoid	Parasitism	No. Larvae	No. pupae	No. Parasitoid	Parasitism	No. Larvae	No. pupae	No. Parasitoid	Parasitism	
14/11/2020		1	1	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
29/11	2	1	1	50.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
14/12	3	3	2	66.66	6	6	5	83.33	-	-	-	-	
28/12	5	5	2	40.00	7	6	4	57.14	-	-	-	-	
13/1/2021	8	7	4	50.00	12	11	6	50.00	8	8	3	37.50	
28/1	10	9	4	40.00	12	11	6	50.00	9	8	3	33.33	
14/2	-	-	-	-	15	13	10	66.66	16	15	6	37.50	
29/2	-	-	-	-	20	18	10	50.00	20	18	6	30.00	
14/3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27	26	11	40.74	
30/3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	31	13	39.39	
Total	29	26	14	48.27	72	65	41	56.94	113	106	37	32.74	

Eshuis van der Voet (1975) recorded that 48.8 % of *Protocalliphora* spp. pupae were infested by *N.vitripennis* in in Holland, while in the USA, 20.1 % of this species pupae found to be parasitized by the same wasp (Gold *et al.*, 1989). The parasitization of *N. vitripennis* reported was 42.1% in *Protocalliphora azurea* pupae and 15.8% in *Protocalliphora falcozi* pupae (Peters, 2006).

In such concern, Raychoudhury *et al.* (2010) modicated that the hymemopterous parasitoid, *N. vitripennis* an important parasitoid against Diptera in North America. Duan *et al.* (2020) proved that *N. vitripennis* play a vital role in controlling flies in agroecosystems.

### REFERENCES

- Abd El-Razek, A.M.; Al-Labbody, A.H.S. and Beshay, M.G. (2006) Relative performance of some sugar beet varieties under three Geographic locations in Egypt. J. Appl. Sci., 21 (6 B): 564-578.
- Abdel-Moniem, A.; M. Abdel-Raheem and M. El-Kholy (2014). Biological and ecological studies on the sugar beet fly, *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. (Diptera. Anthonyiidae) on Sugar beet in Egypt. Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection, 47 (13): 1557 - 1562.

Abo-Saied Ahmed, A. (1998). Economic injury level of the main defoliator insects on sugar beet plants. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 23 (1); 405-418.

- Afifi, F. (2001). Developing of cultivation and production of sugar corps in Egypt (1981- 2000) present and future vision of sugar industry. Egyptian Society of Sugar Technologists, the 31st Annual Conference, Luxor, Egypt, 27-29 January, pp 7-19.
- Al- Habshy, A. (2018). Ecological studies on beet fly, Pegomyia mixta Vill. infesting sugar beet plants and their associated predators in Sharkia Governorate, Egypt. Egypt. A Cad. J. Biolog. Sci. 11 (6): 51 - 61.
- Awadalla, S. (1997). Opius nitidulator (Nees) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae), as internal larval parasitoid on the sugar beet fly, *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. 1st National Conf. of Applied Using of Natural Enemies for Controlling Insect and Mite Pests. Mansoura Univ., 4-5 March, pp. 131-138.
- Awadalla, S.; H. El- Serafi; S. El-Fakharany and S. Abou Attia (2018). Effect of different host plants on the Sugar beet fly, *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. and its associated parasitoid, *Opius nitidulator* (Nees). J. Plant Prot. and Path., Mansoura Univ., 9 (6) : 363-367.

### Hassan, H. M. and K. G. Bazazo

- Bazazo, K.; R. Besheit and E. Mashaal, (2007). Role of Opius nitidulator (Nees) (Hymenoptera : Braconidae) and Biocide Gold (Abamectin) in biological control of beet fly, *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. (Diptera : Anthomyvidae) in sugar beet fields. Egy. J. Plant Pro. Res, 5 (1): 16- 30.
- Duan, R.; H. Xu; S. Gao and N. Wang (2020). Effects of different hosts on bacterial communities of parasitic wasp, *Nasonia* Vitripennis. Frontiers in Microbiology, Vol. 11 (1435) : 1-13.
- Duncan, D. (1955). Multiple Range and Multiple-F- test. Biometrics, 1: 1 -17.
- El- Khouly, M. (2006). Population fluctuations of the beet fly, *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. and the tortoise beetle, *cassida vittata* Vill. in relation to certain associated natural enemies in sugar beet fields at Kafr El-Sheikh Governorale, Egypt. Egyptian Journal of Biological Pest Control, 16(1): 25-28.
- El-Serwy, S. (2008). A sturdy on the incidence of diapanse and parasitism of *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. (Diptera: Anthomyidae) in Kafr El-Sheikh and Daqahlia Governorates. Egypt. J. Agric. Res, 86 (2): 441-456.
- Eshuis-van der Voet CW. (1975). Parasitism by Protocalliphora Verh Akad Wet Amst Afd Natuurk Tweede Reeks 66: 81-84.
- Gold CS, Dahlsten DL. (1989). Prevalence, habitat selection and biology of *Protocalliphora* (Diptera: Calliphoridae) found in nests of Mountain and Chestnut-backed Chickadees in California. *Hilgardia*: 57(2):1–5.
- Hassanein, F.; A. Shoukry; A. Sarhan and M. Ewais, (1993). Biological studies on Opius nitidulator (Nees) (Hymenoptera. Braconidae). A newly record parasitoid on *Pegomyia mixta* Vill. in Egypt. J. Biol. P. Cont. 3 (2) : 187-194.
- Ismail, A.M.A. and Abo El-Ghait, R.A. (2005) Effect of nitrogen sources and levels on yield and quality of sugar beet. Egypt. J. Agric. Res. 83 (1), 229-239.

- Ismail, A.M.A., A.H.S. Al-Labbody and N.M.S. Shalaby (2006). Variability and traits relationship in nine sugar beet varieties under three sowing dates. Egypt. J. Plant Breed. 10 (1): 387-406.
- Khalifa, A. (2018). Natural enemies of certain insect pests attacking sugar beet plants at Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate. J. Plant Prot. and path. Mansoura Univ., 9 (8): 507-510.
- Metwally, S.; R. El-Sufty; N. El- Dakhakhay and A. Bassioury (1987). Effect of infestations with certain insect pests on some sugar beet-Properties. J. Agric. Res. Tanta Univ., 13 (4) : 132 139.
- Mousa, E. (2005). Studies on sugar beet main insects and their safety control methods. Ph. D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Mansoura Univ., 302 pp.
- Osman, A.M.H. (2005). Influence of nitrogen and potassium fertilization on yield and quality of two sugar beet varieties. Egypt. J. Agric. Res., 83 (3): 1237-1254.
- Peters S. (2006). Interactions between hosts and parasitoids: food web structure, host spectra and host finding using the example of species of bird nests (Insecta: Diptera: Cyclorrhapha and Hymenoptera: Chalcidoidea). Dissertation. The Faculty of Mathematics, Computer Science and Natural Sciences at the University of Hamburg, 159 p.
- Raychoudhury, R.; B. Gillenberger; J. Gadau and L. Beukeboom (2010). Phylogeography of *Nasonia Vitripennis* (Hymenoptera: Pleromalidae)indicates a mitochondrial - Wolbachia Sweep in North America. Heredity, 104 : 318- 326.
- Salama, R. A. Ibtisam and F. Farouk (1991). Seasonal fluctuations of the beet fly, *Pegomyia mixta* and the effect of infestation on Sugar beet yield. Fayoum, J. Agric. Res. 5: 33-41.

# تأثير مواعيد الزراعة والطفيل Nasonia vitripennis كأحد الطفيليات الجديدة في مكافحة ذبابة البنجر. هاني محمد حسن<sup>1</sup> و كمال جابر بظاظو<sup>2</sup>\* <sup>1</sup>قسم الحشرات الاقتصادية ، كلية الزراعة – جامعة كفرالشيخ ، 33516 كفرالشيخ – مصر. <sup>2</sup>قسم بحوث وقاية النبات ، معهد بحوث المحاصيل السكرية ، مركز البحوث الزراعية – مصر.

يعتبر بنجر السكر أحد المحاصيل الاستر اتيجية الصناعية الهامة في مصر. يهدد هذا المحصول بالعديد من الأفات الحشرية من أهمها ذبابة البنجر. الاستخدام المفرط للمبيدات الكيماوية يقلل دور الطفيليات الحشرية في حقول بنجر السكر. لذلك، أجري هذا البحث في المزرعة البحثية لمحطة البحوث الزراعية بسخا – محافظة كفر الشيخ – خلال موسمي 2020/2019م و 2021/2020م. أثبتت النتائج ما يلي: عدد اليرقات لذبابة البنجر وكذلك عدد النباتات المصابة أعلي في العروة الثالثة عن الثانية والأولي خلال الموسمين. أيضاً، كان المتوسط العام للتطفل طوال الموسم 1020/302 البنجر وكذلك عدد النباتات المصابة أعلي في العروة الثالثة عن الثانية والأولي خلال الموسمين. أيضاً، كان المتوسط العام للتطفل طوال الموسم هو 2020/38,23، 36,76 و2021/2020 هي العروة الثالثة عن الثانية والأولي خلال الموسمين. أيضاً، كان المتوسط العام للتطفل و 38,23، 36,76 و2021/2020م هي العروة الثالثة عن الثانية والأولي منها كانت القيم خلال موسم 2020/2020م هي 75,94 و 38,27 وكذلك عد النباتات المصابة أعلي في العروة الثالثة عن الثانية والأولي منها كانت القيم خلال موسم 2020/2020م هي 2020/30,94 و 38,22 و36,76 وذلك بسبب الطفيل اليرقي – العذراء Nasonia كانت القيم خلال موسم 2020/2020م هي 2020/30,94 و 32,74 للثلاث عروات وذلك بسبب الطفيل اليرقي – العذراء Nasonia vitripennis مولي بحر عن هذا الطفيل في حقول بنجر السكر المصرية. في النهاية، يعتبر الطفيل معامية مناتوالي مواعيد الزراعة عوامل هامة جداً في برنامج المكافحة المتكاملة لهذه الأفة الخطيرة.