## Evaluation of some commercial formulations against Spodopteralittoralis and Hyperabrunneippennis larvae.

#### Narmen A. Youssef and Atef A. Abd-ELgayed

Dept. of Plant Protection, Fac. of Agriculture, Fayoum University, Fayoum, Egypt.

#### Abstract

The insecticidal activity of three commercial Bt – formulations and one fungus; namelyDipelDf, W- Bus andProtecto ( $Bacillus\ thuringiensisvar.kurstaki$ ) and Biofly (Bacuveriabassiana) were tested against  $2^{nd}$  and  $4^{th}$  instar larvae of Spodopteralittoralis(Boisd) and Hyperabrunneipennis(Boheman) were studied under laboratory conditions. Results revealed that Bt- formulations caused the larval mortality after treatment of S.  $littoralis 2^{nd}$  and  $4^{th}$  larval instars ranged from 40 to 100 % and 32.5 to 92.5 % and reached 100 ,85 and 100 % for H.brunneipennis, respectively at the highest concentration after 7 days of treatment compared to 77.5 % and 60 % for S. littoralis and 95 and 85 % for S0 for S1 billionalis and S1 Protecto, respectively. Based on the LC50 values, DipelDfwas the highest toxic to S1 littoralis and S2 for S3 billionalis and S3 for S4 billionalis and S5 billionalis and S5 billionalis and S6 billionalis and S6 billionalis and S6 billionalis and S7 billionalis and S8 billionalis and S9 bill

**Key words:** Spodopteralittoralis, Hyperabrunneippennis, commercial products, efficiency

(Lepidoptera:

insect

#### Introduction

Among

(Dhiret al., 1992; Prayogoet al., 2005) in crops based on crop stage and its population level in the Egyptian alfalfa The (EAW), Hyperabrunneipennis (Boheman) (Coleoptera :Curculionidae) is considered to be the most serious and destructive pest of alfalfa in Egypt (Al-Doghairi and Elhag, 2003). One annual generation is recorded in Egypt for the EAW (Hammadet al., 1967). The larval stage is the most damaging during the weevil life cycle. By feeding on the alfalfa plant's growing tips, the larvae cause skeletonization of leaves, stunting, reduced plant growth, and ultimate reduction in yield. The adults are also, foliar feeders, causing additional, but less significant, damage. The widespread and intensive use of different synthetic insecticides for controlling this pest increased environmental problems such as insect resistance, excessive persistence of residues, human health hazards and harmful effect on the non-target organisms. From this point of view, it is necessary to minimize the application of pesticides that considered as a main source of environmental pollution and use other compounds may proof as good alternatives of insecticides. In recent years, crop protection based on biological control of crop pests with microbial pathogens as virus, bacteria, fungi and nematodes were considered as valuable tools in pest management (Bhattacharya et al., 2003). Entomopathogenic fungi may proof, also, as valuable and play an important role in integrated pest management programs. (El- Hawary and Abd El-

chewing

Noctuidae) is considered as an important sporadic

pest in the world. It causes 25-100 % economic loss

pests, Spodopteralittoralis (Boisd)

Salam, 2009) reported that fungal biological control agents have demonstrated efficacy against a wide range of insect pests including S.litura . Successful use of fungal pathogens in pest control depends on selection of right virulent fungal strain formulated in proper way and applied at an appropriate dose against susceptible host stage under favorable environmental conditions(Asiet al., 2012). Among the entomopathogenic agents, also, the most widely used biopesticides are subspecies and strains of Bacillus thuringensis (Bt). B. thuringensis is a spore-forming bacterium well- known for its insecticidal properties due to its ability to produce crystal inclusions during sporulation. Each strain of this bacterium specifically kills one or a few related species of insect larvae Lepidopteran, Dipteran such as Coleopteran(Haggag, 2013). Commercial products, generally, consist of a mixture of spores and crystals, produced in large fermenters and applied as foliar sprays, much like synthetic insecticides (Sanchiset al., 1999). It is known that most Bt formulations have a very short residual activity. The persistence of Bt. spores show an obvious reduction after few days of exposure to weather, and reduction in its viability was progressively correlated with the time elapsed after exposure in the field. The pathogen is not mobile and under the unfavorable cannot escape conditions.(Mohamed et al., 2010).

In the present experiments, the effectiveness of several bioinsecticides against the cotton leafworm *S. littoralis* and alfalfa weevil, *H. brunneipennis* was determined with the intention to find out the best compounds for controlling these economic pests in an integrated pest management program.

#### Material and Methods Tested insects:

**A-** S.littoralis

The cotton leafworm larvae of *S.littoralis* were obtained from Agricultural Research Centre, Cairo, Egypt, and were reared on fresh leaves of caster bean (*Ricinuscommunis*) under laboratory conditions of  $25\pm2\text{C}^{\circ}$  and  $65\pm5$  % R.H..(Adhamet al., 2009 and Kamelet al., 2010). As larvae reached the  $2^{\text{nd}}$  and  $4^{\text{th}}$  instars, they were used in the experiments.

#### **B-** *H.brunneipennis*

Alfalfa weevil larvae were collected, early in the morning, by using an insect sweepnet in analfalfa field at Fayoum Government. Insects, were reared on fresh alfalfaplants ( MedicagosativaL. ) at laboratory conditions of 25  $\pm$  2  $C^{\circ}$ ,65 $\pm$ 5% R.H.and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>instars of the weevils larvae were selected for experiments.

#### **Tested compounds**

formulations of the following Commercial insecticides tested against 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae ofS.littoralis and H. brunneipennis were obtained from the Agricultural Research Centre, Cairo, Egypt. : commercial DipelDf (WP)6.4%formulation contains 32X10<sup>3</sup> IU/ mg of Bacillus *thuringiensisvar.kurstaki*; W-Bus(WP) commercial product formulation contains 8X10<sup>3</sup> IU/ mg of Bacillus thuringiensisvar.kurstaki, Protecto (WP)9.4%: commercial product formulation contains  $32X10^{6}$ IU/ mg **Bacillus** thuringiensisvar.kurstakiandBiofly WP) commercial product formulation contains 30X10<sup>6</sup> spores/ mg of Beauverabassiana.

#### **Bioassay**

The insecticidal activities of the tested Btformulations and fungi, each at four concentrations were prepared in distilled water and tested against 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4th instar larvae of S.littoralis and H. brunneipennis larvae using the dipping leaf technique (Ahmed, 2009). The leaves were first washed with distilled water and dipped in solution of the desired concentration of Btor fungi commercial formulations (DipelDf, W-Bus, Protecto and Biofly ). Each leaf was dipped for 30 seconds, then placed individually in Petri- dishes ( 9 cm diameter ) containing moistened filter papers to avoid desiccation of leaves. other castor bean leaves for treatment of S. littoralis and alfalfa for H. brunneipennus were treated with sterile distilled water for control. Then, ten larvae from each 2<sup>nd</sup>/ or 4<sup>th</sup> instars larvae were separately placed in each Petri dish for each treatment. Four Petri- dishes were used

as replicates for each treatment and control. Larvae were allowed to feed for 48h. on treated leaves. Then these leaves were removed and replaced by another untreated ones. All Petri -dishes were kept at the above mentioned conditions. Larvae were examined daily for 7 days after treatment to determine the mortality percentages. Accumlative larval mortality was recorded and corrected using Abbott's formula (1925). Afterwards, the corresponding concentration probit lines were estimated in addition to determining 50% mortalities and slope values of tested compounds were also estimated. Data were analyzed by ANOVA and the means were separated using the Duncan's multiple range test (**Duncan**, 1955).

Fourty newly hatched 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of each *S.lttoralis* and *H. brunneipennis* were fed as previously described (ten larvae/ four replicates) on leaves treated with the calculated LC<sub>50</sub>starting of exposure was 2 days after application for each of these compounds. The initial (2 days after application) and residual effect of Bt and fungi formulations at (4,6 and 8 days) after application against larvae were recorded at the end of the experiment (6) days.

The surviving larvae were transferred to other clean Petri- dishes, and supplied with untreated fresh castor bean leaves until pupation. Pupation and adult emergence percentages after treatment by the  $LC_{50}$ , and control were also determined.

#### **Results and Discussion**

# Toxic effect of Bt andfungual formulations against 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of *S.littoralis* and *H. brunneipennis*

Efficacies of the four concentrations of all tested insecticides on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of *S.littoralis* and H. brunneipennis at 7 day after treatment are presented in table 1. DipelDf, W-Bus and Protecto caused 100% mortality after treatment by highest concentration on the  $2^{nd}$  instar larvae of H. brunneipenniswhile treatment of 4th instar larvae caused 100, 90 and 85%, respectively and 95, 85%mortality at Biofly. While the larval mortality was in the range 40 to 100 and 32.5 to 92.5 % on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of *S.littoralis*, respectively at Bt formulations and 77.5, 60 % at Biofly. There were significant differences between the tested insecticides of both insects (F=75.08;df=3 for S. littoralis) and (F= 21.31; df= 3 for *H. brunneipennus*), respectively at 7 days post treatment. Also, there were significant betweenconcentrations differences significant between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of both insect species (F=38.18,; df=3 for S. littoralis) and (F= 30.2, ; df=3 for *H. brunneipennis*), respectively

Annals of Agric. Sci., Moshtohor, Vol. 53 (2) 2015.

**Table 1.** Accumulated corrected mortality percentages after 7 days of treatment by some commercial Bt and fungi formulations against *S. littoralis* and *H. brunneipennis*2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae.

Formulations	Conc.gm/L	Spodopterali	eipennis2*** and 4*** ttoralis	Hyperabrur	neipennis				
			Mortality %						
		2 <sup>nd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>				
Dipel DF	0.5	55 <sup>def</sup>	45 <sup>cde</sup>	90 <sup>ab</sup>	75 <sup>cd</sup>				
	1	62.5 <sup>bcde</sup>	60 <sup>bc</sup>	92.5ª	82.5 <sup>bc</sup>				
	2	87.5 <sup>ab</sup>	85ª	100 <sup>a</sup>	100 <sup>a</sup>				
	4	100 <sup>a</sup>	92.5ª	100 <sup>a</sup>	100 <sup>a</sup>				
Mean		76.25 <sup>a</sup>	70.63 <sup>a</sup>	95.63ª	89.38 <sup>a</sup>				
W-Bus	0.5	52.5 <sup>defg</sup>	40 <sup>cde</sup>	70b <sup>c</sup>	60 <sup>efg</sup>				
	1	57.5 <sup>cdef</sup>	50 <sup>cd</sup>	90 <sup>ab</sup>	75 <sup>cd</sup>				
	2	60 <sup>cdef</sup>	55 <sup>bc</sup>	100 <sup>a</sup>	82.5 <sup>bc</sup>				
	4	82.5 <sup>abc</sup>	77.5 <sup>ab</sup>	100 <sup>a</sup>	90 <sup>ab</sup>				
Mean		63.13 <sup>b</sup>	55.63 <sup>b</sup>	90 <sup>ab</sup>	76.88 <sup>b</sup>				
Protecto	0.5	15 <sup>g</sup>	12.5 <sup>g</sup>	60°	50 <sup>gh</sup>				
	1	22.5 <sup>fg</sup>	17.5 <sup>fg</sup>	65°	52.5 <sup>fgh</sup>				
	2	27.5 <sup>g</sup>	25 <sup>efg</sup>	70 <sup>bc</sup>	65 <sup>def</sup>				
	4	40 <sup>efg</sup>	32.5 <sup>defg</sup>	100 <sup>a</sup>	85 <sup>bc</sup>				
Mean		26.25°	21.88 <sup>d</sup>	73.75°	63.13°				
Biofly	1	40 <sup>efg</sup>	30 <sup>defg</sup>	70 <sup>bc</sup>	45 <sup>h</sup>				
	2	50 <sup>efg</sup>	35 <sup>def</sup>	80 <sup>abc</sup>	57.5 <sup>efgh</sup>				
	4	55 <sup>def</sup>	42.5 <sup>cde</sup>	90 <sup>ab</sup>	67.5 <sup>de</sup>				
	8	77.5 <sup>abcd</sup>	60 <sup>bc</sup>	95ª	85b <sup>c</sup>				
Mean		55.63 <sup>b</sup>	41.88°	83.75 <sup>bc</sup>	63.75°				
F between treat.		1.37	1.52	1.28	1.06				
concen. and ages									
Df	15								
F between concentrations	38.18			30.2					
Df	3			3					
F between treatment	75.08		21.31						
Df	3			3					

Data presented in **table 1** indicate that the mortality percentage after treatment of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of *S.littoralis* and *H. brunneipennis* increased gradually with increasing concentrations of all the insecticides.

The present results revealed that the tested Bt and fungus formulations had insecticidal activity against2<sup>nd</sup>and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of S.littoralis and H. brunneipennis larvae, where DipelDfhighly killed the insect larvae both insect species, followed by W-Bus, Biofly and Protecto, respectively. These results agree with Haggag, (2013)who reported that DipelDf, Dipel 2xand Delfin killedS.littoralislarvae, followed by Agry, Protecto and Agerin, respectively. Kaur (2000), also, reported that B.thuringiensisapplied for controlling of lepidopteran, dipteran and coleopteran insects for

decades. HerrnstadtandSoares (1989) reported that *B.thuringiensis* 7.6x10<sup>7</sup> spores/ml solution, caused 80% mortality against alfalfa weevil. The surviving weevil larvae were stunted and ceased feeding. Lower concentrations resulted in minimal levels of mortality, but caused significant levels of feeding inhibition, these inhibited larvae will not survive to adulthood in the field. *B.thuringiensis* produced more than 93% mortality on first instar larvae of *Spodopterafrugiperda* and

Peridromasaucia(Alvarezet al., 2009). B. thuringensis Berliner is a promising agent for microbial control of agriculturally and medically important insects (Souzaet al., 2009). The difference in activity might be due to the presence or absence of biologically active Cry toxins, their relative amounts and additive/ synergistic effect of these toxins in the formulations. Shelton et al., (1993). Karthikeyan

**andSelvanarayanan** (2011) reported that the bioassay with *B. bassiana*against*S. litura*, percent mortality increased from 33.33 to 86.67 as the dose was increased from 0.15 to 0.25 %.

#### Susceptibility test

**Table (2)** reveals the LC<sub>50</sub> values of the tested compounds against 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of *S.littoralis* and *H. brunneipennis* recording 1.13&1.47; 2.75&6.47; 9.08& 14.90 and 2.015,5.05 gm/l, for DipelDf, W-Bus, Protecto and Bioflyagainst2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>instar larvae of *S.littoralis*, respectively while those were 0.84, 0.14; 0.59, 0.44; 1.94& 1.41 and 2.53& 5.20 for *H. brunneipennis*, respectively.

According to the  $LC_{50}$  values, DipelDfwas the highest toxic to *S.littoralis* and *H. brunneipennis* than the other 3 compounds. The toxicity values of DipelDfwas significantly higher than that others.

# Effects of LC<sub>50</sub> of Bt and *B.bassiana* formulations on pupation and adult emergence percentage.

The initial and residual effects of Btand B.bassiana formulations at four time intervals (2, 4, 6, and 8 days ) post application against 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of S.littoralis and H. brunneipennus( at 6 days after treatment ) are shown in tables (3 and 4). Data in table (3) revealed that, treatment with all the tested compounds reduced pupation and adults emergence percentages and ,also, reduced the population of S. littoralis larvae compared to the control at initial and residual time intervals (2, 4,6 and 8 days ) to record 51, 43.6, 35.9 and 38.5 at 2 time; 37.5, 30, 25 and 27.5 at 4 days; 30, 27.5,15 and 20 at 6 days and 25.6, 20.5,7.7 and 12.8 % larval mortalities at the 8 days, respectively on 2<sup>nd</sup> instar larvae andrecored 42.5, 37.5, 30and 32.5; 30, 25, 20 and 20; 20, 17.5, 7.5 and 12.5; 17.5, 15, 5 and 10 at(2, 4, 6, and 8 days), respectively on 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae

The results in **Table (3)** indicated also that DipelDf and W-Bus decreased both pupation and adult

emergence percentages at (2, 4, 6, and 8 days) more than Biofly and Protectocompared to the control which recorded pupation and emergence rates of 97.5 and 100%, respectively.

The results of reduction percentage of H. brunneipennispopulation, pupation and emergence percentages after four indicating time intervals are summarized in Table (4). Data showed that the mean percentage ofcumulative larval mortality, pupation and adult emergence percentages of H. brunneipennisafter four indicating time intervals of application(2, 4, 6, and 8 days ) varied among the all treatments and control. The reduction was 60, 55, 40, and 45; 45, 37.5, 20 and 25% larval mortality on the 2<sup>nd</sup> instar larvae and 52.5, 47.5, 35 and 47.5; 27.5, 20, 10 and 15 % larval mortality on the 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae at theinitial time interval (2 day) and 6 days of application for DipelDf, W-Bus, Protecto and Biofly, respectively. These results agree with El-Gharet al., (1995) working with thuringiensis and Abamectin Bacillus S.littoralis, with a pronounced decrease of pupation (36%) after Abamectin treatment. Mohamed and Mahmoud, (2008) reported that the rates of pupation and the emergence of mothsof S.littoraliswere reduced by all tested insecticides (Dipel 2x, Agrin, BioGuard, Biofly and Spinosad ), respectively as compared to the control. Beauveriabassianacaused significant decrease in pupal survival with the malformation among S. littoralis pupae (Emara and Hefnawy,2000). Hyphomycete fungi cause fatal infection to the immature stages of S. littoralis, this may due to the disruption of normal metabolism, and damage of target tissues such as fat body or alter hormone balance(Meshrifet al., 2007).

From the above results and based on the  $LC_{50}$  values, DipelDf, proved as the highest toxic to S. littoralis and H. brunneipennis than that of the other compounds, followed by ,W-Bus,Biofly and Protecto.

Table 2: Lethal concentration of Bt and fungi formulations against S. littoralis and H. brunnipennus larvae

Formulation	S. littorali				H. brunnipennus					
	gm/L (spo	res/ml)		gm/L (spo	gm/L (spores/ml)					
		2 <sup>nd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>		2 <sup>nd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>				
Dipel DF	LC <sub>50</sub>	1.13	1.47	LC <sub>50</sub>	0.14	0.84				
	Slope	3.07	2.34	slope	0.69	1.34				
W-Bus	$LC_{50}$	2.015	5.05	$LC_{50}$	0.44	0.59				
	Slope	1.03	0.85	slope	0.39	1.48				
Protecto	LC <sub>50</sub>	9.08	14.90	LC <sub>50</sub>	1.41	1.94				
	Slope	0.90	0.80	slope	1.12	1.24				
Biofly	LC <sub>50</sub>	2.75	6.47	LC <sub>50</sub>	1.20	1.53				
	Slope	1.23	1.01	slope	1.40	1.63				

Table 3: Initial and residual effect of the tested Bt and fungual formulations against 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of *S. littoralis* at 6 days after treatment

Formu	Accumulative larvae mortality % after indicated time intervals(days)													
lations	Initial k		ii vae iiio	Residual effect										
		ulative 2	dav		ulative 4	dav	Accumulative 6 days			Accumulative 8 days				
	%Cor	%Pu	%	%Cor	%Pu	%	%Cor	%Pu	%	%Cor	%Pu	%		
	rected	patio	Adult	rected	patio	Adult	rected	patio	Adult	rected	patio	Adult		
	morta	n	S	morta	n	S	morta	n	S	morta	n	S		
	lity		emer	lity		emer	lity		emer	lity		emer		
			gence			gence			gence			gence		
Dipel DF														
2 <sup>nd</sup>	51	47	58	37.5	62	64	30	70	68	25.6	72	76		
4 <sup>th</sup>	42.5	58	61	30	70	71	20	80	75	17.5	82	78		
W-Bus														
2 <sup>nd</sup>	43.6	55	63	30	70	68	27.5	72	72	20.5	78	77		
4 <sup>th</sup>	37.5	62	68	25	75	76	17.5	82	79	15	85	79		
Protect														
o 2 <sup>nd</sup>	35.9	63	76	25	75	80	15	85	82	7.7	90	89		
4 <sup>th</sup>	30	70	86	20	80	84	7.5	92	89	5	95	92		
Biofly				ı	I		ı		1			l.		
2 <sup>nd</sup>	38.5	60	71	27.5	73	76	20	80	84	12.8	85	88		
4 <sup>th</sup>	32.5	67	81	20	80	81	12.5	87	83	10	90	91		
Contro 1		•	•			•		•	•	•		•		
2 <sup>nd</sup>	-	95	94.7	-	97	95	-	97.5	94.9	-	97.5	100		
4 <sup>th</sup>	-	97.5	97.4	-	92.5	94.5	-	97.5	100	-	97.5	100		

**Table 4:** Initial and residual effect of the tested Bt and B.bassiana formulations against  $2^{nd}$  and  $4^{th}$  instar larvae of H. brunneipennis at 6 days after treatment

	brunnelpennis at 6 days after treatment											
Form	Accumulative larvae mortality after indicating time intervals(days)											
ulatio	Initial l	Residual										
ns	Accumulative zero			Accumulative 2 day			Accumulative 4 days			Accumulative 6 days		
	day											
	%Co	%Pu	%	%Corre	%Pu	%	%Corre	%Pu	%	%Corre	%Pu	%
	rrecte	patio	Adul	ctedlarv	patio	Adul	ctedlarv	patio	Adul	ctedlarv	patio	Adul
	d	n	ts	al	n	ts	al	n	ts	al	n	ts
	larval		emer	mortalit		emer	mortalit		emer	mortalit		emer
	mort		genc	у		genc	у		genc	y		genc
	ality		e			e			e			e
Dipel												
DF												
2 <sup>nd</sup>	60	40	44	52.5	47	47	50	50	60	45	55	64
4 <sup>th</sup>	52.5	47	53	45	55	59	32.5	67	63	27.5	72	69
W-												
Bus												
2 <sup>nd</sup>	55	45	50	47.5	52	52	45	55	55	37.5	62	68
4 <sup>th</sup>	47.5	52	57	40	60	62	27.5	72	66	20	80	72
Protec												
to												
2 <sup>nd</sup>	40	60	56	40	60	58	27.5	73	69	20	80	78
4 <sup>th</sup>	35	65	65	27.5	72	69	20	80	75	10	90	81
Biofly												
2 <sup>nd</sup>	45	55	54	40	60	58	32.5	67	63	25	75	73
4 <sup>th</sup>	47.5	52	62	35	65	69	25	75	70	15	85	76
Contr		•	•	•	•				•		•	•
ol												

2 <sup>nd</sup>	-	95	97	-	92.5	97	-	95	100	-	92.5	100
4 <sup>th</sup>	-	95	100	-	97.5	92	-	97.5	100	-	97.5	100

#### References

- Abbott, W.S. (1925). Amethod for computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. J. Econ. Entoml., 18(2): 256-267.
- Adham, K. Fatma; Eman, M.Rashad; S.F. Ibrahim and Enas, E. Nasr, 2009. Host plants shifting affects the biology and biochemistry of *Spodopteralittoralis*( Boisd.) ( Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) .Egypt. Acad. J. Biolog. Sci., 2(1): 63-71.
- Ahmed, M. 2009. Observed potentiation between pyrethroid and organosphosphours insecticides for the management of *Spodopteralitura*(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Crop Protection, 28: 264-268.
- AL- Doghairi, M. A. and E. A. EL-Hag,2003. Effect of several biopesticides on alfalfa weevil larvae, *Hyperabrunneipennis*(Boheman). Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences. 6 (8) 777- 781.
- Alvarez, A.; Virla, E. G.; Pera, L. M. and Baigori, M. D. 2009. Characterization of native *Bacillusthuringiensis* strains and selection of an isolate active against *Spodopterafrugiperda* and *Peridromasaucia*. Biotechnol. Lett., 31: 1899-
- Asi, M.R., M.H.Bashir, M. Afzal, B.S. Khan, M.A.Khan, M.D. Gogi, K. Zia and M. Arshad, 2012. Potential of entomopathogenic fungi against larvae and eggs of *Spodopteralitura*(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Pak. Entomol., 34(2): 151-156.
- Bhattacharya, A.K.; Mondal, P.; Ramamurthy, V.V. and Srivastava, R.P. 2003. *Beauveriabassiana*, A potential bioagent for innovative integrated pest management programme. In: Srivastava, R.P. (Ed.), Biopesticides and Bioagents in Integrated Pest Management of Agricultural Crops. International Book Distributing Co. Lucknow 860pp.
- Dhir, B.C., H.K. Mohapatra and B. Senapati, 1992. Assessment of crop loss in groundnut due to tobacco catterpiller, *Spodopteralitura* (F.) Indian J. Plant Prot., 20 (7-10): 215-217.
- Duncan, D. B. 1955. The Multiple Range and Multiple F- Test. Biometrics 11: 1 42.
- El- Ghar, G.E.S.A.; Radwan, H. A. S.; El- Bermany, Z. A.; Zidan, L. T. M. 1995. Sublethal effects of avermectin B1, betaexotoxin of *Bacillus thuringiensis* and diflubenzuron against cotton leafworm(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) . J. Appl. Entomol., 119: 309 313.
- El Hawary, F. M. and Abd El- Salam, A. M. E. 2009. Laboratory bioassay of some entomopathogenic fungi on

- Spodopteralittoralis(Boisd.) and Agrotisipsilon (Hufn.) larvae (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) Egypt. Acad. J. Biolog. Sci., 2(2): 1 4.
- Emara, T. E. and Hefnawy, M. A. 2000. Biological activity of some fungal extract against the development of the cotton leafworm *Spodopteralittoralis* J. Egypt. Ger. Soc. Zool., 33(E): 217-225.
- Finney, D. F. 1971. Probit analysis 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Cambridge University, London.318PP.
- Haggag, Karima,H. E.2013. Changes in protein profile of cotton leafworm ,*Spodopteralittoralis* , induced by Bt formulations stored at cold and hot storage conditions. Nature and Science ,11 (7): 77-85.
- Hammad,S. M., S. El- Sherif, M. M. Hosny and A. I. El- Deeb. 1967. The biology of *Hyperabrunneipennis*Boh. Bull. Soc. Ent. Egypte. Li.: 251 256.
- Herrnstadt, CorinnaandGeorge ,G.Soares,. 1989. Cotton boll weevil, alfalfa weevil, and corn rootworm via contact with a strain of *Bacillus thuringensis*:4, 797, 276.
- Kamel, Aida S.; Mona, Ab El Aziz F. and Nehad, El- Barky M.. 2010. Biochemical effects of three commercial formulations of *Bacillus thuringiensis*(Agerin, Dipel 2x and DipelDf) on *Spodopteralittoralis*larvae. Egypt. Acad. J. Biolog. Sci., 3 (1): 21-29.
- Karima, H. E. Haggag, 2013. Changes in protein profile of cotton leafworm, *Spodopteralittoralis* , induced by Bt formulations stored at cold and hot storage conditions. Nature and Science 11 (7) 77-85.
- Karthikeyan, A. and Selvanarayanan, V. 2011. In vitro efficacy of *Beauveriabassiana*(Bals.) Vuill. And *Verticilliumlecanii* (Zimm) Viegas against selected insect pests of cotton. Science and Technology, 3 (2): 142-143.
- Kaur, S. 2000. Molecular approaches towards development of novel *Bacillus thuringiensis* biopesticides. World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology, 16: 781-793.
- Meshrif, W. S.; Barakat, E. M. S.; Rohlfs, M.; Shehata, M. G.; Seif, A. I. and Hegazi, M. A., M. 2007. Evaluation of testing four hyphomycete fungi against the development of the cotton leafworm. Spodopteralittoralis (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). J. Egypt. Acad. Soc. Environ. Develop., 8(3): 11-20.
- Mohammed A. Al- Doghairi and Eltayeb El Hag. 2003. Effect of several biopesticides on alfalfa weevil larvae, *Hyperabrunnipennus* (Boheman). Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences. 6 (8) 777-781.

- Mohamed, E. M. ,Hanan, F. Abdel- Hafez and MahasenA. Abdel Aziz. 2010. Effect of some chemical additives on the potency of *Bacillus thuringiensis* against the cotton leafworm*Spodopteralittoralis*. Egypt. J. Agric. Res., 88(1), 103-112.
- Mohamed, A. M. and Mahmoud, F. M. 2008. Effect of biorational insecticides on some biological aspects of the Egyptian cotton leafworm *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) . Plant Protect. Sci., 44: 147-154.
- Prayogo, Y., W.Tengkano and D. Marwoto, 2005.

  Prospect of entomopathogenic fungus

  Metarhiziumanisopliaeto control

  Spodopteralittoralison soybean.

  LitbangPertanian, 24(1): 19-26.
- Sanchis V.; Gohar, M.; Chaufaux, J.; Arantes, O.; Meier, A.; Agaisse, H.; Cayley, J. and

- Lereclus, D. 1999. Development and field performance of a Broad-Spectrum Nonviable Asporogenic Recombinant Strain of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Greater Potency and UV Resistance. Applied Environmintal Microbiology, 65 (9): 4032-4039.
- Shelton, A. M.; Robertson, J. L.; Tang, J. D.; Perez, C.; Eigenbrode, S. D.; Preisler, H. K.; Wilsey, W. T. and Cooley, R. J. 1993. Resistance of diamondback moth (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae) to *Bacillus thuringiensis* subspecies in the "eld. Journal of Economic Entomology, 86: 697-705
- Souza, Jr, J. D. A. de; Jain, S.; de Oliveira, C. M. F.; Ayres, C. F. and Lucena, W. A. 2009. Toxicity of *Bacillus thuringiensis* israeliensis like strain against *Spodopterafrugiperda*. BioControl, 54: 467-473.

### الملخص العربي

تقييم لبعض المستحضرات التجارية على دودة ورق القطن وسوسة ورق البرسيم

نارمين أحمد يوسف و عاطف عبد الجيد السلامين أحمد يوسف و عاطف عبد الجيد قسم و قاية النبات - كلية الزراعة جامعة الفيوم - الفيوم - مصر

تم تقیم فاعلیة بعض المستحضرات البکتیریة ( الداییل دی إف ، دابیلو بص، بروتیکتو ) والفطریة بیوفلای ضد کل من العمر الیرقی الثانی والرابع لدودة ورق القطن و سوسة ورق البرسیم تحت الظروف المعملیة. وأوضحت النتائج ان نسب الموت عند استخدام المستحضرات البکتیریة علی کل من العمر الیرقی الثانی والرابع لدودة ورق القطن تراوحت بین 0.100 - 0.100 الموسة 0.100 الموسة ورق البرسیم علی التوالی عنداستخدام أعلی ترکیز بعد 0.100 ایام من المعاملة مقارنة ب0.100 و 0.100 البیوفلای. 0.100 علی دودة ورق القطنو 0.100 المستحضرات المستخدمة ضد کل مندودة ورق القطن و وبناء علی قیم کان الدایبل افضل المستحضرات المستخدمة ضد کل مندودة ورق القطن و سوسة ورق البرسیم مقارنة بالمستحضرات الاخری.

كما إنخفضت نسب خروج كل من العذارى والحشرات الكاملة عند المعاملة بالمستحضرات السابقة مقارنة بالكنترول.