

**The integration of the parasitoid *Microplitis demolitor* Wilkinson (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) into integrated pest management systems in Australian cotton**

**Robert Andrew Annetts**

**B.Sc. (Honours)**

**The University Of New England**

**October 2000**

**A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of  
New England**

## **Declaration**

I certify that the contents of this thesis have not been submitted for any other degree and are not currently submitted for any other degree.

I certify that all sources of information used have been acknowledged in this thesis.



**Robert Annetts.**

## Acknowledgments

Very special thanks to my supervisor Dr. David Murray, who provided guidance, advice, encouragement and whose knowledge and patience is unquestionable. Thanks also to my University based supervisor associate Professor Peter Gregg who provided excellent advice and ideas, especially when correcting the final manuscript. Thanks to Natalie Martin for reading and correcting early drafts, and David Annetts and Matt Cahill for correcting later drafts and providing valuable criticism.

It is impossible to name everyone who has contributed in some way to this work. So if I've forgotten anyone who has contributed, sorry. I would especially like to thank Kristen Latimer for providing expert assistance in the field during 1996/97. Special thanks also to Sue Maclean, Brad Scholz and Richard Lloyd for technical assistance, support and encouragement throughout my term. I would also like to thank Andrea Gerrard, Angela Doherty and Kerry Rynne for technical assistance, Simon Hoyle and Kerry Bell for statistical analysis and Ian Newton for help with ascovirus literature and sharing ideas on this topic.

I would like to thank Dow AgroSciences and Rohm and Haas for providing technical grade spinosad and methoxyfenoxzide insecticides respectively, when they were early in development. Also Crop Care, Bayer and NSW Agriculture (Neil Forrester) for providing other technical grade products. Thanks to Murray Boshammer (Total AGricultural Services, TAGS) for allowing me to use *Helicoverpa* spp. data and the Farming Systems Institute, Queensland Department of Primary Industry (QDPI), and John Marshall, then with the QDPI, Dalby, for contributing data.

The manual for CAPTURE (White *et al.*, 1982) and an associated publication (Otis *et al.*, 1978) were kindly supplied by G. White. Thanks also to G. White for analysing the capture/recapture data.

Thanks on a personal note to my parents for support and encouragement, and to Raisa Silvonon for support, encouragement and putting up with me. Thanks also to Dr. Mary Notosteine, my honours supervisor, who really encouraged me to do a Ph.D. in the first place.

Thanks to Jeff and Marilyn Bidstrup for cooperation and support at the Warra trial site and Bill Arthur for cooperation and support at the Nandi site. I would like to thank the CRC for Sustainable Cotton Production, who funded this project (DPIQ223).

# Table of contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
<b>Cotton Production in Australia.....</b>	<b>4</b>
Introduction.....	4
What is cotton?.....	4
Why is cotton cultivated?.....	4
Where is cotton grown in Australia?.....	4
How is cotton grown in Australia?.....	5
Conclusions.....	6
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	
<b><i>Helicoverpa</i>: A review .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Introduction.....	7
Why are <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. such devastating pests?.....	7
<i>Identification</i> .....	7
<i>Distribution</i> .....	7
<i>Crops attacked</i> .....	8
<i>Feeding habits</i> .....	8
<i>Fecundity and development</i> .....	9
<i>Diapause</i> .....	9
<i>Mobility</i> .....	10
<i>Resistance in Helicoverpa spp.</i> .....	10
<i>Resistance management strategy</i> .....	11
Economic impact of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp.....	11
Future.....	12
Conclusions.....	12
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	
<b>Integrated Pest Management of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. in Australian cotton .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Introduction.....	13
Insecticides in IPM.....	14
Chemical control of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp.....	14
<i>Side-effects of insecticide use targeted at Helicoverpa spp.</i> .....	14
Cultural control.....	15

<i>Crop management</i> .....	15
<i>Other methods of cultural control</i> .....	15
Host plant resistance.....	16
<i>Genetically modified or Ingard® cotton</i> .....	16
<i>Compensation</i> .....	17
Natural mortality.....	17
Biological control of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp.....	17
<i>Pathogens of Helicoverpa spp.</i> .....	18
<i>Natural enemies of Helicoverpa spp.</i> .....	18
<i>Classical biological control</i> .....	19
<i>Augmentation</i> .....	19
<i>Naturally occurring beneficials</i> .....	21
<i>Predators</i> .....	22
<i>Parasitoids</i> .....	23
<i>M. demolitor</i> .....	24
<i>Managing beneficials</i> .....	25
Conclusions.....	27

## CHAPTER 4

<b><i>M. demolitor</i>: A key component of IPM in Australian cotton</b> .....	<b>28</b>
Introduction.....	28
Biology and ecology of <i>M. demolitor</i> .....	29
<i>Host range</i> .....	29
<i>Life-cycle</i> .....	29
<i>Sex determination</i> .....	31
<i>Mate location</i> .....	32
<i>Host location</i> .....	33
<i>Superparasitism</i> .....	34
<i>Effects on the host</i> .....	35
<i>Ascoviruses</i> .....	35
<i>Diurnal Behavior</i> .....	36
Estimating populations in the field .....	37
<i>Monitoring in the field</i> .....	37
<i>Percent parasitism</i> .....	37
Effects of pesticides .....	37
Conclusions.....	38

## CHAPTER 5

### Food consumption and weight gain of *H. armigera* larvae after parasitisation by *M.*

<b><i>demolitor</i></b> .....	<b>39</b>
Abstract.....	39
Introduction.....	39
Materials and Methods .....	40
<i>Insects</i> .....	40
<i>Trial</i> .....	40
Results.....	42
Discussion .....	44
Conclusions.....	46

## CHAPTER 6

### Monitoring *M. demolitor* in the field.....

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<i>Methods of monitoring parasitoids in the field</i> .....	<b>48</b>
<i>Attractive colours</i> .....	48
<i>Suction machines</i> .....	48
<i>Percent parasitism of the host</i> .....	49
<i>Pheromones</i> .....	49
<i>Direct observations</i> .....	50
<b>Materials and Methods</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<i>Field sites</i> .....	<b>50</b>
<i>Farming Systems Institute, QDPI, IPM trial site (Appendix 4)</i> .....	51
<i>Biological data</i> .....	<b>51</b>
<i>Plant measurements</i> .....	51
<i>Helicoverpa spp. egg and larval counts</i> .....	51
<i>Spray histories</i> .....	51
<i>Sampling methods</i> .....	<b>52</b>
<i>Suction samples</i> .....	52
<i>Yellow coloured traps</i> .....	52
<i>Traps based on host insects</i> .....	53
<i>Sticky traps baited with virgin female M. demolitor</i> .....	53
<i>Percent parasitism</i> .....	54
<i>Direct observations</i> .....	55
<b>Results</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<i>Biological data</i> .....	<b>55</b>
<i>Plant data</i> .....	55
<i>Helicoverpa spp. egg and larvae counts</i> .....	55

<i>Spray history</i> .....	60
<b>Sampling methods</b> .....	60
<i>Suction samples, yellow coloured water traps and sticky traps baited with H. armigera larvae</i> .....	60
<i>Sticky traps baited with virgin females</i> .....	62
<i>Fate of collected larvae and percent parasitism</i> .....	71
<i>Direct observations</i> .....	77
<b>Discussion</b> .....	79
<i>Sticky traps baited with virgin females</i> .....	80
<i>Percent parasitism</i> .....	82
<i>Direct observations</i> .....	84
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	85

## CHAPTER 7

### **Preliminary estimation of adult populations of *M. demolitor* in an unsprayed cotton field** 86

Abstract.....	86
Introduction.....	86
Materials and methods.....	87
Results.....	87
Discussion .....	90
Conclusions.....	93

## CHAPTER 8

### **Diurnal activity of *M. demolitor* adults in the cotton crop** .....95

Abstract.....	95
Introduction.....	95
Materials and methods.....	96
<i>Sampling dates</i> .....	96
<i>Sampling methods</i> .....	96
<i>Direct observations (sweep netting)</i> .....	96
<i>Sticky traps baited with virgin female <i>M. demolitor</i></i> .....	97
Results.....	97
Discussion.....	101
Conclusions.....	102

## CHAPTER 9

### **Preliminary study of the release-recapture of male *M. demolitor* adults** ..... 104

Abstract.....	104
Introduction.....	104
Materials and methods.....	105



<i>Sampling methods</i> .....	105
Results and Discussion .....	106
Conclusions.....	110

## CHAPTER 10

<b>Base-line susceptibility and calibration of discriminating doses for <i>H. armigera</i> larvae to selected insecticides.....</b>	<b>111</b>
Abstract.....	111
Introduction.....	111
Materials and methods.....	115
<i>Insects</i> .....	115
<i>Bioassay</i> .....	115
<i>Stomach poisons</i> .....	116
<i>Topical testing</i> .....	116
<i>Analysis</i> .....	117
<i>Sub-lethal effects</i> .....	118
Results.....	118
<i>Bioassay</i> .....	118
<i>Stomach insecticides</i> .....	118
<i>Contact insecticides</i> .....	120
<i>Sub-lethal effects after exposure to insecticides</i> .....	121
Discussion .....	127
<i>Bioassay</i> .....	127
<i>Sub-lethal effects</i> .....	129
Conclusions.....	131

## CHAPTER 11

<b>Toxicity of insecticides to adult and pupal <i>M. demolitor</i>.....</b>	<b>132</b>
Abstract.....	132
Introduction.....	132
Materials and Methods .....	137
<i>Insects</i> .....	137
<i>Bioassay</i> .....	137
Results.....	139
<i>Adult stage</i> .....	139
<i>Wasp weights</i> .....	140
<i>Pupal stage</i> .....	141
Discussion .....	142

Conclusions.....	149
<b>CHAPTER 12</b>	
<b>Development and survival of larval <i>M. demolitor</i> in host <i>H. armigera</i> larvae exposed to selected insecticides.....</b>	<b>150</b>
Abstract.....	150
Introduction.....	150
Materials and methods.....	156
<i>Insects</i> .....	156
<i>Bioassay</i> .....	157
<i>Topical testing</i> .....	157
<i>Stomach poisons</i> .....	157
<i>Analysis</i> .....	157
Results.....	158
Discussion .....	159
Conclusions.....	165
<b>CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	
<b>Insect rearing .....</b>	<b>195</b>
<i>M. demolitor</i> .....	195
<i>H. armigera</i> and <i>C. argentifera</i> .....	195
<i>Diet preparation</i> .....	196
<i>Standard Heliothis diet</i> .....	196
<i>Mould inhibitor preparation</i> .....	196
<i>Sugar solution for moths</i> .....	196
References .....	196
<b>APPENDIX 2</b>	
<b>Insecticides.....</b>	<b>198</b>
Topical testing.....	198
Stomach poisons.....	198
<b>APPENDIX 3</b>	
<b>Equipment register .....</b>	<b>200</b>

**APPENDIX 4**

<b>Field sites.....</b>	<b>202</b>
1994/95 .....	202
<i>Warra site</i> .....	202
<i>Yield and brief review</i> .....	203
<i>Nandi site</i> .....	203
<i>Yield and brief review</i> .....	204
1995/96 .....	205
<i>Warra</i> .....	205
<i>Yield and brief review</i> .....	206
<i>Dalby</i> .....	206
1996/1997 .....	207
<i>Warra</i> .....	207
<i>Yield and brief review</i> .....	209

**APPENDIX 5**

<b>Spray histories for trial sites.....</b>	<b>210</b>
---	------------

**List of Figures**

Figure 4-1. Life cycle of <i>M. demolitor</i> (drawn by Dr. D. Murray).....	30
Figure 4-2. Diagrammatic representation distinguishing the sexes of <i>M. demolitor</i> . Abdomen of male and female <i>M. demolitor</i> , showing ovipositor protruding in the female. ....	32
Figure 5-1. Diet consumption by second instar (at day 0) <i>H. armigera</i> larvae unparasitised and parasitised by <i>M. demolitor</i> (error bars are standard errors of the means).....	42
Figure 5-2. <i>H. armigera</i> larval weights, larvae unparasitised and parasitised by <i>M. demolitor</i> (error bars are standard errors of the mean). ....	43
Figure 5-3. Numbers of <i>M. demolitor</i> larvae emerging from <i>H. armigera</i> hosts (days after parasitisation). ....	43
Figure 6-1. Cotton development calendar from a dryland crop at Warra, southeast Queensland during 1994/95 (Data courtesy of Dr. D. Murray, Farming Systems Institute, QDPI). Boxed area is the critical period for insect control.....	56
Figure 6-2. Number of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. per metre in the unsprayed block at Warra during 1994/95 (data courtesy of M. Boshammer, Total Agricultural Services (TAGS)).....	57
Figure 6-3. Number of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. per metre at the unsprayed block at Nandi during 1994/95 (data courtesy of QDPI, Farming Systems Institute and John Marshall, QDPI, Dalby).....	57
Figure 6-4. Number of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. per metre at the unsprayed block at Warra during 1995/96 (data courtesy of TAGS). ....	58

Figure 6-5. Number of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. per metre at the unsprayed block at Warra during 1996/97 (data courtesy of TAGS). .....	58
Figure 6-6. Number of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. per metre at the refuge block at Warra during 1996/97 (data courtesy of TAGS). .....	59
Figure 6-7. Number of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. per metre at the refuge block at Witu during 1996/97 (data courtesy of TAGS). .....	59
Figure 6-8. Number of male <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sticky traps, baited with virgin females. Warra 1994/95, results from Warra IPM trial. See Table 6-8. ....	65
Figure 6-9. Number of male <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sticky traps, baited with virgin females, at Nandi during 1994/95. See Table 6-8 for number of traps on each sampling occasion. Numbers refer to application of possible disruptive insecticides, see Table 6-2. ....	66
Figure 6-10. Number of male <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sticky traps baited with virgin females from Warra IPM trial site during 1995/96. See Table 6-5 for number of traps on each sampling occasion. Numbers refer to application of possible disruptive insecticides, see Table 6-3. ....	68
Figure 6-11. Number of male <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sticky traps baited with virgin females at the Warra IPM site and Warra refuge site during 1996/97. See Table 6-7 for number of traps on each sampling occasion. Numbers refer to application of possible disruptive insecticides, see Table 6-4. ....	70
Figure 6-12. Number of male <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sticky traps baited with virgin female at the Witu refuge site during 1996/97. See Table 6-7 for number of traps on each sampling occasion. ....	70
Figure 6-13. Fate of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae collected from the unsprayed block at Warra during 1994/95. ....	72
Figure 6-14. Fate of collected <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae collected at Nandi during 1994/95. ....	72
Figure 6-16. Fate of collected <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae at the unsprayed block at the Warra IPM trial site, during 1995/96. ....	74
Figure 6-17. Fate of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae collected at unsprayed block at Nandi during 1995/96. ....	74
Figure 6-18. Fate of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae collected from the unsprayed block at the Warra IPM trial site, during 1996/97. ....	76
Figure 6-19. Fate of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae collected at the Warra refuge block during 1996/97. ....	76
Figure 6-20. Fate of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae collected at the Witu refuge site during 1996/97. ....	77
Figure 6-21. Number of <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sweep net per 30 minutes (100m) searching at the unsprayed block at the Warra IPM trial site during 1996/97. ....	78
Figure 6-22. Number of <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sweep net per 30 minutes (100m) searching at the Warra refuge site during 1996/97. ....	78
Figure 6-23. Number of <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sweep net per 30 minutes (100m) of searching at the Witu refuge site during 1996/97. ....	79
Figure 7-1. Number of male and female <i>M. demolitor</i> adults caught in sweep netting and percent parasitism of collected <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae from unsprayed refuge block at Warra during 1996/97. These data were presented in Chapter 6. ....	90

Figure 8-1. Diurnal activity of male and female <i>M. demolitor</i> in a conventionally sprayed block at Warra on the 31 January 96 (1 observer).....	98
Figure 8-2. Diurnal activity of male and female <i>M. demolitor</i> in and unsprayed block at Dalby on the 19 March 96 (average of 3 observers). .....	98
Figure 8-3. Diurnal activity of male and female <i>M. demolitor</i> in an unsprayed block at Warra refuge on the 15 January 97 (average of 3 observers). .....	99
Figure 8-4. Diurnal activity of male and female <i>M. demolitor</i> in unsprayed refuge block at Witu on 4 April 97 (1 observer). .....	99
Figure 8-5. Diurnal activity of male and female <i>M. demolitor</i> , average of all studies. ....	100
Figure 8-6. Average number of male <i>M. demolitor</i> caught per trap per hour from 0600 to 0600 the following day in an unsprayed irrigated block at Dalby (19 March 96). Sampling was carried out hourly from 0600 to 1800, and traps were sampled at 0600 the following day.....	100
Figure 8-7. Average number of male <i>M. demolitor</i> caught per trap per day (19 to 21 March 96) in an unsprayed irrigated block at Dalby (Number of traps on each sampling occasion is displayed in each graph).....	101
Figure 9-1. Arrangement of sticky traps baited with virgin females (view from above). R= release point. ....	106
Figure 9-2. Arrangement of mark-recapture grid relative to the normal traps showing the number of wasps caught in these traps. ....	107
Figure 9-3. Total number for each axis of the grid of male <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sticky traps baited with virgin females. ....	109
Figure 10-1. Weight and mortality of <i>H. armigera</i> larvae, after dosing with <i>B. thuringiensis</i> . Error bars for larval weight are standard errors of the means and error bars for percent mortality are 95% confidence limits. 123	
Figure 10-2. Weight and mortality of <i>H. armigera</i> larvae, after dosing with chlorfluazuron. Error bars for larval weight are standard errors of the means and error bars for percent mortality are 95% confidence limits. 123	
Figure 10-3. Weight and mortality of <i>H. armigera</i> larvae, after dosing with lufenuron. Error bars for larval weight are standard errors of the means and error bars for percent mortality are 95% confidence limits. ....	124
Figure 10-4. Weight and mortality of <i>H. armigera</i> larvae, after dosing with spinosad (NAF-85). Error bars for larval weight are standard errors of the means and error bars for percent mortality are 95% confidence limits. 124	
Figure 10-5. Weight and mortality of <i>H. armigera</i> larvae, after dosing with spinosad (XDE-105). Error bars for larval weight are standard errors of the means and error bars for percent mortality are 95% confidence limits. ....	125
Figure 10-6. Weight and mortality of <i>H. armigera</i> larvae, after dosing with methoxyfenozide. Error bars for larval weight are standard errors of the means and error bars for percent mortality are 95% confidence limits. 125	
Figure 10-7. Weight and mortality of <i>H. armigera</i> larvae, after dosing with profenofos. Error bars for larval weight are standard errors of the means and error bars for percent mortality are 95% confidence limits. ....	126
Figure 10-8. Weight and mortality of <i>H. armigera</i> larvae, after dosing with thiodicarb. Error bars for larval weight are standard errors of the means and error bars for percent mortality are 95% confidence limits. ....	126

Figure 10-9. Days after dosing with sub-lethal concentrations of chlorfluazuron until pupation of second instar <i>H. armigera</i> larvae .....	127
Figure Appendix 4-1. Layout and treatment sizes for the Warra IPM trial site, 1994/95. ....	203
Figure Appendix 4-2. Layout and plot sizes for trial site at Nandi, 1994/95.....	204
Figure Appendix 4-3. Layout and plot sizes of the Warra IPM trial site, 1995/96. ....	206

## List of Tables

Table 6-1. Number of <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in suction samples (500 metres), at Warra IPM trial site, during the 1994/95 season.....	61
Table 6-2. Number of <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in yellow coloured water traps in the unsprayed block at Warra IPM trial site, during the 1994/95 season.....	62
Table 6-3. Number of <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in traps baited with live <i>H. armigera</i> larvae in unsprayed Ingard® refuge blocks, during the 1995/96 season. ....	62
Table 6-4. Number of sticky traps at Warra and Nandi during 1994/95. 1 female/trap unless noted, checked after 7 days.....	65
Table 6-5. Number of sticky traps at the IPM site at Warra during 1995/96. 1 female/trap, checked after a day.....	67
Table 6-7. Average number of <i>M. demolitor</i> caught in sticky traps baited with virgin females at Dalby during 1995/96.....	68
Table 6-7. Number of sticky traps baited with virgin females at the Warra IPM site, Warra refuge site and Witu refuge site during the 1996/97. 1 female per trap, checked after 1 day. ....	69
Table 6-8. Number of larvae collected on each sampling occasion at Warra and Nandi during 1994/95.....	71
Table 6-10. Number of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae collected at the Warra IPM trial site and Nandi during 1995/96. ....	73
Table 6-12. Number of <i>Helicoverpa</i> spp. larvae collected from the unsprayed block at the Warra IPM trial site, Warra refuge and Witu refuge during 1996/97.....	75
Table 7-1 Number of male and female <i>M. demolitor</i> caught over 4 consecutive days. ....	88
Table 7-2. Capture/recapture of male <i>M. demolitor</i> over 4 consecutive days. ....	88
Table 7-3. Estimations of the population of <i>M. demolitor</i> using 5 models in the computer program CAPTURE. These models are discussed below. ....	89
Table 9-1. The number of male <i>M. demolitor</i> adults caught in sticky traps baited with virgin females after release of males marked with florescent dust. Raw data.....	108
Table 10-1. Response of 4-5 mg <i>H. armigera</i> larvae to selected stomach poisons (LC :g ai/100 mL insecticide/diet mixture). ....	120
Table 10-2. Response of <i>H. armigera</i> treated topically with contact insecticides ( $\mu\text{g ai/larva}$ ).....	122
Table 11-1. Response of male <i>M. demolitor</i> adults to topically applied insecticides ( $\mu\text{g ai/wasp}$ ). ....	141

Table 11-2. Mortality of <i>M. demolitor</i> pupae (%) dosed with acetone, one, 10, and 100 times the LD <sub>50</sub> determined for <i>M. demolitor</i> adults (see Table 11-1). .....	142
Table 12-1. Egression of <i>M. demolitor</i> (%) from parasitised <i>H. armigera</i> larvae and host mortality (%) from unparasitised <i>H. armigera</i> larvae (number treated) treated with the LC <sub>99</sub> (see Chapter 10, Table 10-1) of selected stomach insecticides. ....	161
Table 12-2. Egression of <i>M. demolitor</i> from parasitised <i>H. armigera</i> larvae or host mortality (%) from unparasitised <i>H. armigera</i> larvae treated with the LD <sub>99</sub> (see Chapter 10, Table 10-2) of selected contact insecticides. .	162
Table Appendix 3-1. Equipment used in this thesis. ....	200
Table Appendix 5-1. Spray history of the IPM site at Warra during 1994/95. Trade name (active ingredient).	210
Table Appendix 5-2. Spray history for Nandi during 1994/95. Trade name (active ingredient).....	211
Table Appendix 5-3. Spray history for the IPM site at Warra during 1995/96. Trade name (active ingredient).	212
Table Appendix 5-4. Spray history for the IPM site at Warra during 1996/97. Trade name (active ingredient).	213

## Abstract

Cotton production in Australia, the ecology of the key pests of Australian cotton, *Helicoverpa* spp., and integrated pest management (IPM) in Australian cotton were reviewed. *Microplitis demolitor* Wilkinson (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) is a key beneficial and a critical component for the success of IPM in Australian cotton. The ecology of *M. demolitor* and effects of insecticides on the life stages of *M. demolitor* were studied, in an attempt to promote conservation and increase the role of *M. demolitor* in IPM.

This study showed that *Helicoverpa* spp. larvae parasitised by *M. demolitor* cause insignificant damage compared to unparasitised larvae, with a parasitised larva consuming approximately 5% of that consumed by a healthy larva. This means that parasitised larvae should be tolerated and not counted in larvae checks to determine spray decisions. *M. demolitor* larvae took 10 days to complete larval development at 25°C, 60-70% relative humidity and a 14:10 light:dark photoperiod. These data contribute to the basic understanding of the ecology of *M. demolitor*.

*M. demolitor* was the dominant larval parasitoid in southeast Queensland and was present in the cotton crop at the critical stage of the crop's development. *M. demolitor* appeared in the crop early November to December, and occurred in significant numbers in the crop from early to mid December until the end of the season. High rates of parasitism of *Helicoverpa* spp. (between 50% and 90%) of second to third instar *Helicoverpa* spp. larvae by *M. demolitor* were recorded. Relatively large numbers of *M. demolitor* adults were found in sprayed fields compared to unsprayed fields.

Methods of monitoring *M. demolitor* adults and the impact of *M. demolitor* on *Helicoverpa* spp. larvae in the field were studied. It was determined that an estimate of percent parasitism, sticky traps baited with virgin females and direct observations were useful tools for research or for ongoing monitoring of *M. demolitor*. Suction sampling, yellow coloured water traps and traps baited with *H. armigera* larvae proved unsuccessful at monitoring *M. demolitor*.

The diurnal behaviour of *M. demolitor* adults was studied. Large numbers of adult *M. demolitor* were observed in the field. Both male and female *M. demolitor* were inactive early in the



morning and late evening, but were equally active throughout the day. There was a distinct diurnal pattern in catches from sticky traps baited with virgin females. Males were caught most often early in the morning, declining during the afternoon. None were captured during the night. Disruptive insecticides should be applied when *M. demolitor* are inactive. In a monitoring program, adult *M. demolitor* could be monitored at any time of the day without biasing results.

A mark-recapture study estimated the *M. demolitor* population in an unsprayed cotton field. The population of *M. demolitor* males present in the 5 ha. block of unsprayed cotton was estimated to be between 1503 and 2421 (ca. 300-484 wasps/ha.), and the female population was estimated at 365 by extrapolating from the ratio of male wasps to female wasps at the time of the study numbers. At the time of the study there was approximately 60% parasitism of *H. armigera* larvae. This study showed that a small number of female *M. demolitor* in the field contributed to high parasitism rates of the host. This indicates that inundative releases of female *M. demolitor* may be a economically feasible control option for *Helicoverpa* spp. The mark-recapture method used in this study is useful for investigating the effects of pesticide treatments, by allowing estimation of the population present before and after insecticide application.

A release-recapture study of male *M. demolitor* was carried out. This study showed that fluorescent powder could be successfully used in a release-recapture study of *M. demolitor*, and most likely any medium sized Hymenoptera. This study showed that catch efficiency of the sticky traps baited with virgin females was reduced after 2 days in the field. Male *M. demolitor* were most likely to be caught in the closest sticky trap baited with virgin female, with male *M. demolitor* males not moving very far in response to these traps. This study showed that there was a large natural population of male *M. demolitor* wasps (ca. 62.5 male *M. demolitor* adults/ha.) present in a field sprayed only with biologically active insecticides.

*M. demolitor* prefer to parasitise second and third instar *Helicoverpa* spp. larvae. In order to study the interactions between *M. demolitor* larvae, host larvae and insecticides, baseline dose-response data were generated on second instar *Helicoverpa* spp. larvae. The IGR compounds, chlorfluazuron and lufenuron, as well as the MAC compound, methoxyfenozide, and Naturalyte, spinosad were the most effective stomach (ingestion-active) compounds tested against *H.*

*armigera*. These data are a useful reference tool and were used in the study on the interactions between *M. demolitor* larvae, host larvae and insecticides. The results are significant for IPM. The sub-lethal data generated in this trial show that although affected larvae do not die, their weights are significantly reduced, demonstrating reduced damage in the crop. This means that larvae affected by sub-lethal doses will cause negligible damage in the crop, and may be suitable sources of food for predators or hosts for parasitoids. The implications for insecticide resistance management are discussed.

A study examining the effects of commonly used cotton insecticides on *M. demolitor* throughout its life cycle was carried out. It was found that adult *M. demolitor* is tolerant of some insecticides. The toxicities of tested compounds for adult *M. demolitor*, in ascending order, were: chlorfluazuron = methoxyfenozide < pirimicarb < endosulfan ≤ dimethoate ≤ cyhalothrin < profenofos < deltamethrin ≤ bifenthrin < spinosad. This study showed that *M. demolitor* was relatively more tolerant of certain insecticides during its larval and pupal stages. *M. demolitor* pupae were protected from the effects of insecticides, except the pyrethroids. This study showed *M. demolitor* larvae developing within parasitised host larvae were unaffected by insecticide applications. However, larval parasitoids were indirectly affected by insecticides through host mortality. Larval parasitoids did not increase the susceptibility of their host to the insecticides, and parasitisation actually reduced the susceptibility of the host larvae to stomach insecticides, and to a lesser degree to contact insecticides.

This study showed that only the IGR compounds and the carbamate, pirimicarb, were of lower toxicity to the parasitoid than the larval pest. None of the other insecticides tested in the present study were acceptable for use in an IPM program. However, targeting insecticide applications when *M. demolitor* is in the pupal or larval stage will reduce the impact of most disruptive insecticides. The use of insecticides with slow rates of kill may promote parasitism by allowing parasitoid larvae enough time to complete development.