





EFFICACY OF NEW AND STANDARD INSECTICIDES FOR CONTROL OF THE HELIOTHINE COMPLEX IN SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS COTTON

Jeremy K. Greene and Chuck Capps¹

RESEARCH PROBLEM



The Heliothine complex, comprised of the cotton bollworm, *Helicoverpa zea* (Boddie), and the tobacco budworm, *Heliothis virescens* (F.), was the major pest complex of conventional cotton varieties in southeast Arkansas during 2001. The development of resistance to organophosphates, carbamates, and pyrethroids has facilitated the development of new chemistries of insecticides that may aid in controlling this pest complex, and our trials addressed the effectiveness of these new insecticides when compared with existing materials.



BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The development of new pest control measures is necessary for successful cotton production in southeast Arkansas. The Heliothine (cotton bollworm, *Helicoverpa zea*, and the tobacco budworm, *Heliothis virescens*) pest complex continues to develop resistance to over-used classes of insecticides, but the development of new insecticides such as Denim, Steward, Tracer, Intrepid, and advanced pyrethroids should help ease the resistance problem. Previous research has addressed some of these new products (Kharboutli, 2001; Reaper et al., 2001; Leonard et al., 2001), but their effectiveness needs evaluation over time. In trials conducted at the Southeast Branch Experiment Station, the effectiveness of these new insecticides was compared with that of existing standards.

¹ Extension entomologist and pest management technical support specialist, Southeast Research and Extension Center, Monticello.

RESEARCH DESCRIPTION

Plots of cotton (Stoneville 474) planted on 4 June 2001 in loam soil at the Southeast Branch Experiment Station near Rohwer, Arkansas, consisted of four rows (38 in) by forty feet. Treatments were randomly assigned to plots and were replicated four times. Standard field preparation and fertilization procedures were followed using Arkansas recommendations (Chapman, 2000). Standard irrigation practices included four irrigations applied as needed according to the irrigation scheduler model.

An ovicide trial was conducted on the Mar Miles farm near Monticello, Arkansas. Cotton (Stoneville 4691B) was planted on 4 May 2001 on 38-in row spacing. Treatments were randomly assigned to plots that were four rows by thirty feet.

Insecticides applied on 21, 27, and 29 August and 6 September for the Heliothine Trial (Test 1), 17, 24, and 29 August 2001 for the Tank-mix Trial (Test 2), and 19 July for the Assail Ovicide Trial (Test 3) included the following: emamectin benzoate (Denim 0.16, Syngenta, Greensboro, NC, 0.0075 and 0.01 lb [ai]/acre); indoxacarb (Steward 1.25, DuPont, Wilimington, DE, 0.104 lb ai/acre); spinosad (Tracer 4, Dow AgroSciences, Indianapolis, IN, 0.067 lb ai/acre); lambda-cyhalothrin (Karate 2.08, Syngenta, 0.025 lb ai/acre); F0570 (FMC, Philadelphia, PA, 0.016 lb ai/acre); bifenthrin (Capture 2, FMC, 0.05 lb ai/acre); cyfluthrin (Baythroid 2, Bayer, Kansas City, MO, 0.025 lb ai/acre); imidacloprid/cyfluthrin (Leverage 2.7, Bayer, 0.0634 lb ai/acre); methoxyfenozide (Intrepid 2F, Rohm and Haas, Philadelphia, PA, 0.2 lb ai/acre); XR-225 (Dow AgroSciences, 0.00974 lb ai/acre); acetamiprid (Assail 70WP, Aventis Crop Science, Research Triangle Park, NC, 0.05 lb ai/acre); esfenvalerate (Asana XL, DuPont, 0.036 lb ai/acre); profenofos (Curacron 8E, Syngenta, 0.5 lb ai/acre); thiodicarb (Larvin 3.2, Aventis, 0.25 lb ai/acre); and methomyl (Lannate LV, DuPont, 0.25 lb ai/acre). Insecticides were applied using a 4-row CO₂-powered plot boom attached to a hi-cycle sprayer calibrated to apply 10 GPA at 42 psi. Insect and damage data were collected by examining 25 terminals, 25 squares (below the terminal), and 25 bolls in each plot. Treatments were applied to the ovicide trial by CO₂ backpack sprayer calibrated to apply 12.7 GPA. Eggs were collected (attempted to collect 100 eggs per treatment) the day after treatment and transported to the laboratory for observation for four days. Data were processed using Agriculture Research Manager (ARM, Gylling Data Management, Inc., Brookings, SD), and means were separated using Least Significant Difference (LSD) procedures following significant F tests using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Test 1 (Heliothine)

A large moth flight near the end of August resulted in trap counts that were approximately 55% tobacco budworm and 45% bollworm. All insecticide treatments provided significant suppression of budworm/bollworm larval populations at three

days after the first application (3DAT1), while the compound F0570 and both rates of Denim provided the best control (Table 1). On the same date, all treatments resulted in significantly lower damage levels when compared with the UTC. Two days after the second application (2DAT2), both rates of Denim along with XR-225 provided the best control of Heliiothines. On the same date, applications of Steward and XR-225 resulted in the lowest damage levels. Overall, some of the newest insecticides (XR-225, F0570, Denim, and Steward) demonstrated potential for use as budworm/bollworm materials while most of the other materials did not provide satisfactory control of mixed budworm/bollworm populations. Similar results were seen for most of these new chemistries in other tests conducted (Kharboutli, 2001; Reaper et al., 2001; Leonard et al., 2001).

Test 2 (Tank-Mix)

At four days after the first application (4DAT1), Denim + Baythroid (0.01 + 0.025) provided good control of mixed populations of budworm (55%) and bollworm (45%), while Steward + Asana, Lannate + Baythroid, and Tracer + Baythroid provided significant control as well (Table 2). All tank-mixed insecticides provided adequate control of Heliiothines following the second application (3DAT2), with Tracer, Denim, and Steward (all with Baythroid) all providing the best control. In a test conducted in 2000 at the same location, Tracer, Denim, and Steward were effective treatments in reducing worm count and damage (Kharboutli, 2001).

Test 3 (Ovicide)

All treatments significantly reduced the percentage of eggs that hatched while increasing the mortality of the eggs when compared to the untreated check (Table 3).

PRACTICAL APPLICATION

Overall, Denim, Steward, XR-225, and F0570 provided good control of the Heliiothine pest complex, especially when tank-mixed with a pyrethroid such as Baythroid or Asana. Larvin provided numerically the best ovicidal control of the Heliiothine pest complex while Calypso and Assail also provided control.

DISCLAIMER

The mention of trade names in this report is for informational purposes only and does not imply an endorsement by the University of Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the staff at the Southeast Branch Experiment Station, Rohwer Branch, for their assistance. We also thank Syngenta, DuPont, Dow AgroSciences, FMC, Bayer, and Aventis for their support.

LITERATURE CITED

- Chapman, S.L. 2000. Soil Test Recommendations Guide. University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture publication 39.
- Kharboutli, M.S. 2001. Efficacy of new and traditional insecticides against the heliothine complex in southeast Arkansas cotton fields. *In: Proc. Beltwide Cotton Conf., National Cotton Council, Memphis, TN. 2:1105-1107.*
- Leonard, B.R., K. Emfinger, R. Gamble, J. Gore, and H. Jones. 2001. Insecticide efficacy against Louisiana populations of bollworm and tobacco budworm during 2000. *In: Proc. Beltwide Cotton Conf., National Cotton Council, Memphis, TN. 2:927-930.*
- Reaper, J., J.D. Hopkins, D.R. Johnson, and G.M. Lorenz. 2001. Heliothine control in cotton with new chemistry. *In: Proc. Beltwide Cotton Conf., National Cotton Council, Memphis, TN. 2:1122-1125.*

Table 1. Average number of larvae and damage counts (damaged terminals, squares, and bolls) per 25 plants from Heliothine Trial 2001.

Treatment (lb ai/acre)	Insecticide costs ^x (\$/acre)	15 Aug 01 (PT) ^z		24 Aug 01 (3DAT1) ^y		29 Aug 01 (2DAT2)	
		Avg. larvae	Total damage	Avg. larvae	Total damage	Avg. larvae	Total damage
UTC	N/A	2.0 a	8.3 a	19.0 a	27.0 a	15.0 a	16.8 ab
Denim (0.0075)	\$8.64	2.8 a	7.0 a	6.8 cd	12.0 b	7.8 cd	11.3 bc
Denim (0.01)	\$11.53	4.5 a	6.3 a	6.5 cd	11.3 b	6.8 d	11.3 bc
Steward (0.104)	\$13.77	2.3 a	5.0 a	7.0 cd	16.0 b	10.5 bcd	9.8 c
Tracer (0.0670)	\$12.26	3.3 a	6.5 a	10.3 bc	12.0 b	9.8 bcd	11.8 bc
Karate Z (0.025)	\$4.96	2.8 a	5.5 a	7.3 cd	11.8 b	10.0 bcd	12.5 abc
FO570 (0.016)	N/A	4.3 a	5.3 a	5.5 d	10.3 b	11.0 a-d	18.5 a
Capture (0.05)	\$9.20	3.3 a	6.0 a	8.3 bcd	17.3 b	13.0 ab	13.8 abc
Baythroid (0.025)	\$4.52	3.0 a	6.3 a	10.0 bc	13.3 b	8.3 cd	11.3 bc
Leverage (0.0634)	\$9.04	3.0 a	6.0 a	7.0 cd	15.5 b	8.5 cd	10.0 c
Intrepid (0.2)	\$18.60	2.3 a	4.8 a	9.8 bcd	14.0 b	11.8 abc	12.3 bc
XR-225 (0.00974)	N/A	2.3 a	5.0 a	8.8 bcd	13.3 b	7.5 cd	9.3 c
Assail (0.05)	N/A	3.5 a	6.3 a	12.3 b	14.8 b	9.5 bcd	14.8 abc

^z PT = pretreatment

^y DAT = days after treatment

^x not including application costs

Table 2. Average number of larvae and damage counts (damaged terminals, squares, and bolls) per 25 plants from Tank-Mix Trial 2001.

Treatment (lb ai/acre)	Insecticide costs ^x (\$/acre)	16 Aug 01 (PT) ^z		21 Aug 01 (4DAT1) ^y		27 Aug 01 (3DAT2)	
		Avg. larvae	Total damage	Avg. larvae	Total damage	Avg. larvae	Total damage
UTC	N/A	3.3 a	5.5 ab	7.5 a	12.3 a	13.5 a	20.3 a
Intrepid (0.06) + Baythroid (0.025)	\$10.10	2.5 a	5.3 b	4.3 abc	4.8 c	3.5 c	8.0 bc
Steward (0.09) + Asana (0.036)	\$16.83	4.3 a	7.5 ab	2.3 bc	6.0 bc	4.0 c	6.3 c
Tracer (0.0626) + Baythroid (0.025)	\$15.98	3.8 a	5.0 b	2.5 bc	5.3 bc	3.3 c	5.3 c
Denim (0.01) + Baythroid (0.025)	\$16.05	3.5 a	4.5 b	1.5 c	5.3 bc	3.8 c	6.0 c
Assail (0.05) + Baythroid (0.025)	N/A	4.3 a	6.3 ab	3.5 bc	5.3 bc	5.0 bc	8.8 bc
Curacron (0.5) + Karate (0.025)	\$10.98	4.0 a	6.0 ab	4.8 abc	6.3 bc	4.3 c	9.8bc
Larvin (0.25) + Baythroid (0.025)	\$8.90	5.5 a	6.5 ab	5.5 ab	9.0 ab	5.3 bc	10.5 bc
Lannate (0.25) + Baythroid (0.025)	\$9.68	3.8 a	6.3 ab	2.3 bc	3.3 c	4.0 c	10.0 bc
Baythroid (0.025)	\$4.52	3.8 a	8.5 a	3.3 bc	6.3 bc	7.5 b	12.5 b

^z PT = pretreatment

^y DAT = days after treatment

^x not including application costs

Table 3. Average number of eggs, percentage of eggs hatched, percentage of eggs dead, and percentage of eggs parasitized from Ovicide Trial 2001.

Treatment	Avg. # of eggs	% hatched	% dead	% parasitized
UTC	19.50 a ^z	86.95 a	4.97 c	8.08 ab
Assail 0.05 lb ai/acre	20.80 a	45.30 b	52.52 ab	2.17 b
Assail 0.05 lb ai/acre + surfactant 0.25%	16.30 a	33.80 bc	51.15 ab	15.02 a
Assail 0.075 lb ai/acre + surfactant 0.25%	15.30 a	49.00 b	48.60 b	2.40 b
Larvin 0.25 lb ai/acre	19.30 a	20.85 c	71.78 a	6.28 b
Calypso 0.047 lb ai/acre	21.80 a	31.55 bc	66.27 ab	2.17 b

^z Means followed by same letter do not significantly differ (P=0.05, LSD)