

Biological Studies and Life Table Parameters of *Phytoseiulus persimilis* and *Amblyseius swirskii* and Their Efficiency in Controlling *Tetranychus urticae*

Wafaa M. Gaber

Plant Protection Research Institute, Agriculture Research Center Dokki, Giza, Egypt

Abstract: Predatory mites belonging to Phytoseiidae are one of the main natural enemies of phytophagous mites, thus allowing for their use as a biological control. *Phytoseiulus Presimilis* and *Amblyseius swirskii* Athias- Henriot (Acari: Phytoseiidae) are the main species of predatory mites used for this purpose. *Tetranychus urticae* kotch (Acari: Tetranychidae) is considered to be one of the most important species of mite pests attacking over 1, 100 species of plants in 140 families with economic value. The objective of the present study was to investigate the life table parameters and the biological aspects of the predatory mites *P. persimilis* and *A. swirskii* when fed on *T. urticae*. The study showed that, the longevity of *P. persimilis* and *A. swirskii* were 30, 33 & 27.67 respectively and the fecundity was higher in *P. persimilis* than in *A. swirskii* and the life table parameter was (R, (T), (rm), (exp rm) were 32.76, 17.10 & 12.11, 13.91 & 0.67, 0.54, for two species respectively and the Efficiency of predatory mite *P. persimilis* was more than *A. swirskii* it was 67.78 & 55.56 respectively, but when combined the two species the total mortality was 86.67.

Key words: *Tetranychus* spp. • *Phytoseiulus persimilis* and *Amblyseius swirskii* • Life table • Agriculture acarology

INTRODUCTION

The two-spotted spider mites, *Tetranychus urticae* Koch (Acari: Tetranychidae) is a major pest of greenhouse and farms around the world [1, 2]. Chemical control is the most efficient method to control two-spotted spider mite damages on crops [3, 4]. However, this management approach can be hazardous to water, environment, soil and health of human society [5, 6]. Therefore, biological control tactics are crucial to manage the populations of two-spotted spider mite [7].

Among their predators, phytoseiid mites are effective biological control agents that are commercially used in IPM programs and biological control [8].

Several species of phytoseiid mites are specialists and feed mainly on tetranychid mites but others are generalists and can feed on different types of preys (mites and insects such as thrips and whiteflies) and plant pollens [9]. Field observations showed that *Amblyseius swirskii* Athias-Henriot (Acari: Phytoseiidae) is often found in association with phytophagous tetranychid mites, whiteflies and scale insects [10].

Behavioural evidence that the predatory mite *P. persimilis* is attracted to *T. urticae*-induced plant volatiles has been presented for lima bean (Fabaceae), tomato (Solanaceae), cucumber (Cucurbitaceae), gerbera (Asteraceae), ground ivy (Lamiaceae), cotton (Malvaceae) and for rose, pear and apple (Rosaceae) [11-13]. Moreover, it was shown that the predatory mite *P. persimilis* is not attracted to odours from the spider mite *T. urticae* [14]. This means that the attraction of the predatory mite *P. persimilis* to *T. urticae*-infested plants cannot be explained by herbivore-derived volatiles but is caused by plant-derived volatiles.

The present work was aimed to evaluate the life cycle and life table parameters of *P. persimilis* and *Amblyseius swirskii* when fed on *T. urticae* and their predaceous efficiency of the two predators.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Rearing Mites: *T. urticae* were collected from unsprayed vegetable fields and reared, in laboratory, at 25± 2°C and 60± 5%RH.

Application Method

The Experiment on Predator Efficiency Individually with the Prey Was Conducted as Follow: Leaf discs of castor plant (4 cm in each) were placed singly with upper surface down on cotton wool saturated with water, in Petri dishes as for the stock cultures for spider mites as prey *T. urtica*. newly emerged protonymphs or deutonymphs of spider mites, *T. urticae* were used. Newly-emerged protonymphs and deutonymphs were harvested directly from the laboratory reared population. A stock colony of *P. persimilis* and *A. swirskii* were obtained from Plant Protection Research Institute, Agriculture Research Center. For biological experiment there are three replicates for each predator (leaf discs of castor plant 4 cm) to experimentation neonate adult females [maximum 2 days old; distinguished from older mites by their appearance (white, slim, even dorsal shield)] of *A. swirskii* and *P. persimilis* were taken from the rearing to be individually transferred to a smaller rearing arenas (diameter: 2 cm) for starvation for 24 h.

For the Experiment of Existence the Two Predators with Each Other: After egg deposition, females for each predator were transferred to stock culture. Hatched larvae were reared during their life span. rearing individual were examined daily and the developmental stages: The durations of egg, larval, protonymphal, duetonymphal stages were calculated, in addition to the time periods of total immatures, life cycle, longevity period

were measured. The number of eggs laid per female was counted. The individuals were transferred to new leaf discs upon the first sign of deterioration. Tested two predators were used with the prey to show the effect of each one on the other.

Results were analyzed by life table program [15] and L.S.D. values were calculated by costat program [16].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Biological Aspects: Data in Table (1) showed that, the incubation period, total immature stages and the total life cycle of *A. swirskii* increased than *P. persimilis*. The incubation period was 1.9 and 1.7 days with *A. swirskii* than *P. persimilis*, respectively, but the increase was not significant. The total immature stages with *A. swirskii* and *P. persimilis* were 5.4 and 3.5 days, respectively and this increase was significant. Also, the total life cycle of *A. swirskii* increased significantly than that of *P. persimilis* which was 7.3 and 5.2 days for *A. swirskii* and *P. persimilis* respectively.

Also, in Table (1) generation period increased significantly with *A. swirskii* than *P. persimilis* which was 9.97 and 8.53 days, respectively. While life span increased non significantly with *P. persimilis* than *A. swirskii* and it was 35.53 and 34.9, respectively. Least significant difference (L.S.D.) was also detected for all stages as described in Table (1). The obtained results were in agreement with Heung [17].

Table 1: The difference between different stages of *P. persimilis* and *A. swirskii*.

Stages	<i>Phytoseiulus persimilis</i>	<i>Amblyseius swirskii</i>	L.S.D
Incubation period	1.7 ± 0.48 a	1.9 ± 0.32 a	0.38
Larvae duration	1.2 ± 0.42 a	1.0 ± 0.00 a	0.28
Protonymph	0.9 ± 0.21 b	2.3 ± 0.48 a	0.35
Dutonymph	1.4 ± 0.52 b	2.1 ± 0.32 a	0.40
Total immature	3.5 ± 0.47 b	5.4 ± 0.52 a	0.46
Life cycle	5.2 ± 0.35 b	7.3 ± 0.48 a	0.40
Longevity	30.33 ± 0.58 a	27.67 ± 1.15 b	2.07
Generation period	8.53 ± 0.57 b	9.97 ± 0.58 a	1.31
Life span	35.53 ± 0.58 a	34.9 ± 1.15 a	2.07

Table 2: The difference between longevity and fecundity of *P. persimilis* and *A. swirskii*.

Stages		<i>Phytoseiulus persimilis</i>	<i>Amblyseius swirskii</i>	L.S.D.
Average duration (days)	Pre oviposition Period	3.33 ± 0.58 a	2.67 ± 0.58 a	1.31
	Oviposition period	20.33 ± 0.56 a	19.00 ± 1.00 a	1.85
	Post oviposition Period	6.67 ± 0.56 a	6.00 ± 1.00 a	1.85
Longevity (Days)		30.33 ± 0.57 a	27.67 ± 1.15 b	2.07
Fecundity	Egg / Female	60.67 ± 3.06 a	31.67 ± 3.10 b	6.93
	Daily Rate	2.98 ± 0.08 a	1.66 ± 0.08 b	0.17

Table 3: The difference between life table of *P. persimilis* and *A. swirskii*.

Parameters	<i>Phytoseiulus persimilis</i>	<i>Amblyseius swirskii</i>
Net reproduction rate (R_0)	32.76	17.10
Mean generation time (T)	12.11	13.91
Intrinsic rate of increase (r_m)	0.67	0.54
Finite rate of increase ($\exp_m$)	1.95	1.71
Generation doubling time (days)*	2.11	2.62
Generation doubling time (days) = $\ln_2 / r_m$		

Table 4: Efficiency of the two predators *P. persimilis* and *A. swirskii* individually and combined:

	Mortality after treatments				Total Mortality %
	Five days	Ten days	Fifteen days	Total	
<i>Phytoseiulus persimilis</i>	7	11	2	20	67.78
	8	10	2	20	
	7	13	1	21	
Total	22	34	5	61	
<i>Amblyseius swirskii</i>	6	8	3	17	55.56
	5	6	4	15	
	6	8	4	18	
Total	17	22	11	50	
<i>Phytoseiulus persimilis</i> + <i>Amblyseius swirskii</i>	14	6	6	26	86.67
	15	7	5	27	
	11	6	8	25	
Total	40	19	19	78	

In Table (2), the female longevity of *P. persimilis* increased significantly than *A. swirskii* which was 30.33 and 27.67 days, respectively. Fecundity of female and the number of eggs/ female of *P. persimilis* increased very significantly with *P. persimilis* than *A. swirskii* which were 60.67 and 31.67, respectively. Souza [18] proved that also.

Table (3) showed that, the net reproductive rate (R_0) was high with *P. persimilis* than *A. swirskii* which was 32.76 and 17.10, respectively. Also, the intrinsic rate of increase (r_m) (0.67 and 0.54) and finite rate of increase ($\exp_m$) (1.95 and 1.71) were high with *P. persimilis* than *A. swirskii*, respectively. While the mean generation time (T) increased with *A. swirskii* than *P. persimilis* and was 13.91 and 12.11, respectively. Also, generation doubling time was high with *A. swirskii* than *P. persimilis* and was 2.62 and 2.11 days, respectively. Souza [18]. proved same results.

Existence the Two Predators with Each Other:

In Table (4), the total mortality increased when *P. persimilis* used individually on *T. urticae* which reached 67.78 %. While *A. swirskii*, when used individually on *T. urticae*, it recorded 55.56% mortality and this percent was low. However, when the two predators used with each other, the mortality percent

become very high, 86.67%. So the application of the predators with each other is very useful in control of *T. urticae*. Van der [5] proved that *P. persimilis* attracted to *T. urticae*. Alberto [19] proved that both of *P. persimilis* and *A. swirskii* were very effective in control of *T. urticae*.

REFERENCES

1. Zhang, Z.Q., 2003. Mites of greenhouses: identification, biology and control. CABI Publishing, UK, pp: 244.
2. Xu, C., B. Qiu, A.G.S. Cuthbertson, Y. Zhang and S. Ren, 2012. Adaptability of sweet potato whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) on seven marginal host plants. Inter. J. Pest Management, 58: 297-301.
3. Immaraju, J.A., T.D. Paine, J.A. Bethke, K.L. Robb and J.P. Newman, 1992. Western flower thrips (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) resistance to insecticides in coastal California greenhouses. J. Econ. Entomol., 85: 9-14.
4. Liatti, M.M., E. Botto and R.A. Alzogaray, 2005. Insecticide resistance in argentine populations of *Tuta absoluta* (Meyrick) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae). Neotropical Entomol., 34: 113-119.

5. Van Der Werf, H.M., 1996. Assessing the impact of pesticides on the environment. *Agric. Ecosys. & Environ.*, 60: 81-96.
6. Albajes, R., M.L. Gullino, G.C.V. Lenteren and Y. Elad, 1999. Integrated Pest and disease management in greenhouse crops. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht. The Netherlands, pp: 545.
7. Gerling, D., S. Alomar and J. Arno, 2001. Biological control of *Bemisia tabaci* using predators and parasitoids. *Crop Protection*, 20: 779-799.
8. Gerson, U. and P.G. Weintraub, 2012. Mites (Acari) as a factor in greenhouse.
9. McMurtry, J.A., G.J.D. Moraes and N.F. Sourassou, 2013. Revision of the lifestyles of phytoseiid mites (Acari: Phytoseiidae) and implications for biological control strategies. *Syst. & Appl. Acarol.*, 18(4): 297-320.
10. Juan-Blasco, M., J.A. Qureshi, A. Urbaneja and P.A. Stansly, 2012. Predatory mite, *Amblyseius swirskii* (Acari: Phytoseiidae), for biological control of Asian citrus psyllid, *Diaphorina citri* (Hemiptera: Psyllidae). *Florida Entomologist*, 95(3): 543-551.
11. Bruin, J., M. Dicke and M.W. Sabelis, 1992. Plants are better protected against spider-mites after exposure to volatiles from infested conspecifics. *Experientia*, 48: 525-529.
12. Takabayashi, J., M. Dicke and M.A. Posthumus, 1994. Volatile herbivore-induced terpenoids in plant-mite interactions: variation caused by biotic and abiotic factors. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 20: 1329-1354.
13. Krips, O.E., P.E.L. Willems and M. Dicke, 1996. Suitability of the ornamental crop *Gerbera jamesonii* for spider mites and the attraction of predators in response to spider mite damage. *Bulletin IOBC/WPRS*, 19: 81-87.
14. Sabelis, M.W., A. Janssen, A. Pallini, M. Venzon, J. Bruin, B. Drukker and P. Scutareanu, 1999. Behavioral responses of predatory and herbivorous arthropods to induced plant volatiles: From evolutionary ecology to agricultural applications, pp: 269-296 in Agrawal, A.A., Tuzun, S. & Bent, E. (Eds) *Induced plant defenses against pathogens and herbivores: biochemistry, ecology and agriculture*, St Paul, Minnesota, APS Press.
15. Abou-Setta, M.M., R.W. Sorrel and C.C. Childers, 1986. Life 48: ABASIC computer program to calculate life table parameters for an insect or mite species *Florida Entomology*, 69(4): 690-697.
16. Costat Software, 2004. Co Stat. www.cohort.com Monterey, California, USA.
17. Heung-Su Lee and R. David, 2011. Life tables and development of *Amblyseius swirskii* (Acari: Phytoseiidae) at different temperatures. *Exp. Appl. Acarol.*, 53: 17-27.
18. Souza-Pimentela, G.C., P.R. Reisb, C.R. Bonattoc, J.P. Alvess and M.F. Siqueira, 2017. Reproductive parameters of *Phytoseiulus macropilis* (Banks) fed with *Tetranychus urticae* Koch (Acari: Phytoseiidae, Tetranychidae) in laboratory. *Braz. J. Biol.*, 77(1): 162-169.
19. Alberto, L., M. Roberta and P. Fabio, 2017. Mechanical release of *Phytoseiulus persimilis* and *Amblyseius swirskii* on protected crops. *Bulletin of Insectology*, 70(2): 245-250.