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ABSTRACT

The application of nanomaterials in agriculture aims in particular to reduce insecticides in plant protection, minimize nutrient losses in fertilization, and increase yields through optimized nutrient management. So, it could be looked for alternative method to control Spodoptera littoralis Boisd. This experiment was conducted out at El-Riad region, Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate, during two successive seasons 2014 and 2015 to compare the efficacy of silica nanoparticles (SiNPs) at three rates (20, 40 and 60 g/fed) with two pathogens dipel DF at 200 g/fed and biofly 300 ml/fed in controlling S. littoralis in early sugar beet plantation. Also, this study aimed to show the negative side effects on some associated natural enemies; true spider, Chrysoperla carnea (Stephens) and Coccinella spp. Results showed the highest rate of SiNPs (60 g/fed) was the highest effectiveness in reducing the numbers of S. littoralis; 59.75 and 61.77% reduction in larvae during two season, respectively. While the two tested insect pathogens came in the second category in controlling the insect. On the other hand biofly showed the highest side negative effect on associated predators followed the dipel DF, while the lowest effect recorded from SiNPs at low rate (20 g/fed).
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INTRODUCTION

Sugar beet, Beta vulgaris L., is one of two principal sugar crops and provides about 40 % of the world sugar production and represents the second source, after sugar-cane. This crop is annually planted in Egypt and 55% of the cultivated area is concentrated in Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate (Abou El-Kassem, 2010).

Sugar beet plants attract numerous insect species during growing season. These insects vary in their feeding processes, needs of living and some of them can cause economic damage when they feed on the plants during their early growth stages (Shalaby, 2001).

However, in some cases, some common insect pests like the cotton leafworm, Spodoptera littoralis Bioso. could be more dangerous than specific ones. Because the climate change that keeps the temperature relatively high throughout September, S. littoralis can severely attack the seedlings of sugar beet causing large bare batches in the field and results in high economic losses (Abou El-Kassem, 2010 and El-Mahalawy, 2011).

A knowledge of the sugar beet ecosystem is essential to develop an insect control strategies which from a backbone of integrated pest management (IPM) program. control of sugar beet insects can be achieved through optimizing the cultural practices such as planting dates, susceptibility of sugar beet varieties, fertilization and addition to insect pathogens and the beneficial insect inhabiting sugar beet crop (Amin et al., 2008 and Tohamy et al., 2008).

Nanotechnology draws its name from the prefix "nano". A nanometer is one-billionth of a meter—a distance equal to two to twenty atoms (depending on what type of atom) laid down next to each other. Nanotechnology refers to manipulating the structure of matter on a length scale of some small number of nanometers, interpreted by different people at different times as meaning anything from 0.1 nm (controlling the arrangement of individual atoms) to 100 nm or more (anything smaller than microtechnology). Richard Feynman was the first scientist to suggest that devices and materials could someday be fabricated to atomic specifications. "The principles of physics, as far as I can see, do not speak against the possibility of maneuvering things atom by atom." This concept was expanded and popularized in a 1986 book Engines of Creation by K Eric Drexler, who applied the term nanotechnology to Feynman's vision (Drexler et al., 1992).

In research experiments nano silica has been reported to provide insecticide activity on its own, through desiccation of insects’ cuticles. It has also been successfully applied as a thin film to boost cereal germination and decrease fungal growth (Qoboshane et al., 2001). However, nano silica is not a preferred auxiliary in crop protection products due to the adverse effect upon inhalation.

The efficiency of the fungus Beauveria bassiana Vuill. As biological control agent against sugar beet insect pests were tested in the laboratory and in the field on Scrobipalpa ocellatella (Boyd) (El-Sufy, 1987 and Mansour, 1999) or mixing the fungus, B. bassiana with the conventional insecticides (El-Sufy and Abbasy, 1987)

The efficacy of B. bassiana were recorded using the fungus (Biofly) at a rate of 3×10⁷ conidia/ml which gave 43.63 and 47.91% for S. ocellatella twenty days after treatment (Metwally et al., 2004). Also, the insect population of S. ocellatella reduced by 36.32 and 42.13% in the two seasons of study in using Bacillus thuringiensis.

Therefore the aim of this study to evaluate the efficiency of silica nanoparticles compared with two insect pathogens in controlling the cotton leafworm, S. littoralis in early plantation of sugar beet and the side effect on some associated predators.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

This experiment was carried out at El-Riad region, Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate, during two successive seasons 2014 and 2015. The experimental area was prepared, and sown with Pleno sugar beet cultivar on mid of August every season. This date of sowing was selected to mimic the infestation of cotton leafworm, *S. littoralis* occurs in sugar beet fields, while the temperature is high. All recommended cultural practices were applied along the growing seasons without insecticide applications. Efficacy of the examined materials against target insect started when the egg masses reach to 10 per 100 plant, coincide almost one month after sowing.

To evaluate the reduction of *S. littoralis* larvae dipel DF at 200 g/fed (6.4% WP) a bio preparation of *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *kurstaki* and Biofly at 300 ml/fed (3×10⁷ conidia/ml) having *Beauveria bassiana*. The silica nanoparticles (SiNPs) was obtained from Nanotech Egypt Company Limited, Cairo, Egypt. It's size was approximately 18 nm with a purity of 95 %. The Transmission Electronic Microscope (TEM) image of the silica nanoparticles is shown in Fig. 1. (rates of SiNPs 20, 40 and 60 g/fed.). The experimental area was divided into 24 plots [5 treatments + control] × 4 replications] in Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). The first treatment was the control which sprayed with water. The others were treated with the different concentrations of SiNPs and two pathogens (Dipel DF and Biofly) using CP3 sprayer at 200 liter water per feddan. The normal cultural practices of growing were applied as usual without using any insecticides.

The sugar beet plants were examined before and after 1, 3, 7 and 10 days after treatments for each examination, 10 plants/plot were inspected to count the life larvae. Population reductions due to treatments were calculated and compared with the insect numbers in untreated plots (control).

Percentage of infestation reduction was estimated according to the formula of Henderson and Tilton (1955) as follows:

\[
\text{Reduction} \% = 1 - \frac{\text{Treatment after} \times \text{control before}}{\text{Treatment before} \times \text{control after}} \times 100
\]

To study the effect of these treatments on the associated predators, numbers of true spiders, *Coccinella* sp. (adults and larvae) and *C. carnea* (larvae) were counted per 10 sugar beet plants just before treatments, and then 1, 3, 7 and 10 days after treatments. Also, the reductions in natural enemies were calculated with the same equation.

The obtained data were treated statistically according to the method of Duncan Multiple Range Test (Duncan, 1955).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Application of two pathogens, *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Dipel DF) and *Beauveria bassiana* (Biofly) compared with silica nanoparticles (SiNPs) in controlling *S. littoralis* larvae in early sugar beet plantation during the two successive seasons, 2014 and 2015.

**a. Reduction in Spodoptera littoralis Boisd. larvae:**

Data illustrated in Table (1) showed the reduction percentage of *S. littoralis* resulted from using SiNPs (three concentrations), dipel DF and biofly during the first season 2014.

After one day of treatments the high concentration of SiNPs was highly effective which recorded 35.54% reduction of larvae numbers followed by medium rate of SiNPs (40 g/fed) reduced 22.35%. After three, seven and ten days SiNPs (60 g/fed) were recorded 68.44, 65.72 and 69.31% reduction in larvae numbers, respectively. While the lowest reductions were recorded by using SiNPs with low concentrations 20 and 40 g/fed. The two insect pathogen showed moderately reduction in *S. littoralis* larvae followed by the high rate of SiNPs.

Fig. (1): Transmission electron micrograph (TEM) of silica nanoparticle

![Image of silica nanoparticle TEM micrograph](image-url)
The population reduction as overall average of *S. littoralis* larvae in early sugar beet plantation was shown in Fig. 2. The statistical analysis showed significant differences between all treatments. The highest reduction was obtained in using the high concentration of SiNPs (59.75%) followed by dipel DF and biofly with 34.30 and 30.11%, respectively. There are not significant differences among SiNPs 20 and 40 g/fed which recorded 24.43 and 27.41%, respectively.

### Table (1): Reduction percentage of *S. littoralis* in early sugar beet plantation at El-Riad region, Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate during the first season 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Rate/fed.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silica nanoparticles</td>
<td>20 g</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>20.62</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>33.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 g</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>24.65</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td>25.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 g</td>
<td>35.54</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>65.72</td>
<td>69.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipel DF</td>
<td>300 g</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>54.35</td>
<td>55.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biofly</td>
<td>300 ml</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>39.43</td>
<td>48.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. (2): Overall population reduction percentage of the cotton leafworm, *S. littoralis* in early sugar beet plantation during the first season 2014.**

Means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT

In the second season 2015, data in Table (2) showed after one day of treatments the SiNPs; 60, 40 and 20 g/fed. were recorded 40.14, 20.15 and 16.21% reduction in *S. littoralis* larvae, respectively followed by dipel and biofly at 13.44 and 10.26%, respectively. After one week the high concentration of SiNPs (60 g/fed) was recorded 66.57% followed by dipel DF which recorded 55.23%, while biofly recorded 33.56%.

The overall averages of population reduction percentage of the cotton bollworm, *S. littoralis* numbers after treatments were shown in Fig. 3. The statistical analysis showed significant differences between treatments. The highest effectiveness was recorded by high rate of SiNPs (60 g/fed.) 61.77% reduction followed by dipel DF and SiNPs (40 g/fed.) with 35.48 and 29.74% reduction, respectively. The biofly and lowest SiNPs (20 g/fed.) were recorded 24.09 and 23.94% reduction, respectively without significantly.

The silica nanoparticles enhanced the plant tolerance against cotton leafworm, *S. littoralis* which increase the hardness plants (Borei *et al.*, 2014 and El-Samahy, 2015). So, the hardness on sugar beet leaves reduce the ability of larvae eat.

### Table (2): Reduction percentage of *S. littoralis* in early sugar beet plantation at El-Riad region, Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate during the second season 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Rate/fed.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silica nanoparticles</td>
<td>20 g</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>35.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 g</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>35.81</td>
<td>37.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 g</td>
<td>40.14</td>
<td>69.52</td>
<td>66.57</td>
<td>70.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipel DF</td>
<td>300 g</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>55.23</td>
<td>57.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biofly</td>
<td>300 ml</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>33.56</td>
<td>39.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81
b. Reduction in true spiders, *Chrysoperla carnea* (Stephens) and *Coccinella* spp.

The reduction percentage in some natural enemies associated with cotton leafworm, *Spodoptera littoralis* in early sugar beet plantation during two seasons; 2014 and 2015 were shown in Table (3).

The highest negative side effect of tested materials on true spiders, *C. carnea* and *Coccinella* spp.

**Table (3): Reduction in some natural enemies associated with cotton leafworm, *Spodoptera littoralis* in early sugar beet plantation at El-Riad region, Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate during two seasons 2014 and 2015.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silica nanoparticles</td>
<td>20 g</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>17.67a</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>18.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 g</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>21.47b</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>25.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 g</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>24.80c</td>
<td>35.44</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>26.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipel DF</td>
<td>200 g</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>24.15c</td>
<td>37.23</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>36.20</td>
<td>40.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biofly</td>
<td>300 ml</td>
<td>38.22</td>
<td>35.89</td>
<td>37.06d</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>51.65</td>
<td>41.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means followed by a common letter are not significantly different at the 5% level by DMRT

Data showed SiNPs have moderately negative effects on associated natural enemies; true spiders, *C. carnea* and *Coccinella* spp. and can be control the cotton leafworm, *Spodoptera littoralis* in early sugar beet plantation. The obtained results agreement with the results obtained from El-Samahy *et al.*, 2015 who found that SiNPs in 20 nm with purity 99.99% in high concentration reduced the number of *S. littoralis* and associated predators, while the low concentration give satisfied control and low-risk in associated predators.
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