Nontarget Effect of Entomopathogenic Nematodes on Larvae of Twospotted Lady Beetle (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae) and Green Lacewing (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae) Under Laboratory Conditions

HELENA ROJHT,¹ MILICA KAČ,² and STANISLAV TRDAN^{1,3}

ABSTRACT The nontarget effect of *Steinernema feltiae*, *Steinernema carpocapsae*, *Heterorhabditis bacteriophora*, and three mixed suspensions of two species of entomopathogenic nematodes on the larvae of the twospotted lady beetle, *Adalia bipunctata* (L.) (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae), and on the larvae of the lacewing *Chrysoperla carnea* (Stephens) (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae), were studied in a laboratory bioassay. The assay was performed at three temperature (15, 20, and 25°C) and at three different concentrations of the suspension (500, 2,500, and 5,000 infective juveniles [IJs]/ml). The larvae of *A. bipunctata* were more susceptible to nematode attack than the larvae of *C. carnea*. Four days after treatment, significantly the lowest mortality of *A. bipunctata* and *C. carnea* larvae was recorded at 15°C, whereas no significant differences were noted between 20 and 25°C. At 500 IJs/ml, the nematodes had significantly the lowest nontarget effect on the larvae of both aphid predators, whereas no significant differences under investigation exhibit a pronounced nontarget effect on the larvae of both predators mentioned.

KEY WORDS *Chrysoperla carnea, Adalia bipunctata, laboratory bioassay, predators, entomopatho*genic nematodes

Entomopathogenic nematodes have been proven effective in controlling some foliar pests (Trdan et al. 2009), but they do have some negative properties, e.g., the wide spectrum of their efficacy includes a negative influence on beneficial organisms (Hazir et al. 2003). Up to now, studies on the nontarget effects of entomopathogenic nematodes have been performed on various species of nontarget organisms, and a large range-from complete harmlessness to pronounced harmful effect-was established (Bathon 1996, Farag 2002, Powell and Webster 2004). The results of some field trials show a moderate influence of entomopathogenic nematodes on nontarget arthropods or even the absence of such an effect (Georgis et al. 1991). Bathon (1996) reported that mortality can be observed among the nontarget organisms, but the influence of these agents should be temporary and local and so only a part of the population is under attack. Georgis et al. (1991) demonstrated a negligible influence of entomopathogenic nematodes on nontarget

organisms if they are used only in short term pest control.

Farag (2002) reported a high mortality of the larvae of Coccinella undecimpunctata L. caused by Heterorhabditis taysearae Shamseldean and Steinernema car*pocapsae* strain S2 in a laboratory assay, so Farag does not recommend the use of entomopathogenic nematodes when these predators are present on the plants in high number. Likewise, Heterorhabditis bacteriophora Poinar and Steinernema carpocapsae (Weiser) were-under laboratory conditions-very harmful to the following predators: Coleomegilla maculata (De Geer), Olla v-nigrum (Mulsant), Harmonia axyridis (Pallas), and *Coccinella septempunctata* L. In contrast, Shapiro-Ilan and Cottrell (2005) found lady beetles to be substantially less susceptible to nematode infection compared with a known susceptible insect, the black cutworm [Agrotis ipsilon (Hüfnagel)].

The twospotted lady beetle, Adalia bipunctata (L.), and the lacewing Chrysoperla carnea (Stephens) are important beneficials in agriculture. A. bipunctata lives on trees higher that 2 m, so it is used in biological control against aphids (Aphididae) in orchards, vineyards, and ornamental plants (Pervez 2005). The larvae of C. carnea are predators of some pests on cultivated plants, such as aphids, mites (Acarina), thrips (Thysanoptera), the greenhouse whitefly [Trialeurodes vaporariorum (Westwood)], small caterpillars, coleopteran larvae, and some other species (Milevoj

J. Econ. Entomol. 102(4): 1440–1443 (2009)

¹ Biotechnical Faculty, Department of Agronomy, Chair of Phytomedicine, Agricultural Engineering, Crop Production, Grassland, and Pasture Management, University of Ljubljana, Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1111 Ljubljana, Slovenia.

² Biotechnical Faculty, Department of Food Science and Technology, Chair of Biochemistry and Food Chemistry, University of Ljubljana, Jamnikarjeva 101, SI-1111 Ljubljana, Slovenia.

³ Corresponding author, e-mail: stanislav.trdan@bf.uni-lj.si.

1999). Because data on the nontarget effect of entomopathogenic nematodes on the mentioned two predators are scarce, we wanted to provide such data with our investigation.

Our investigation was aimed at establishing the degree of the nontarget effect of selected species of entomopathogenic nematodes on the larvae of two of the most important predators of aphids in Europe. The assay was performed under laboratory conditions because the species of entomopathogenic nematodes under investigation—at the time of the experiment still had the status of exotic organisms. This investigation established the foundations for studying the nontarget effect of entomopathogenic nematodes on beneficial organisms in Europe. This can be upgraded by field assays because of the recent finding of entomopathogenic nematodes species that are new in Slovenia (Laznik et al. 2008a,b). Such studies will yield valuable information on more rational use of entomopathogenic nematodes in growing food, fodder, or ornamental plants.

Materials and Methods

Entomopathogenic Nematodes, Predators, and Aphids. Three species of entomopathogenic nematodes were used in this study: Steinernema feltiae (Filipjev), S. carpocapsae, and Heterorhabditis bacterio*phora* Poinar; larvae of the lacewing and twospotted lady beetle were treated. All the agents were provided by Koppert B. V. (Berkel en Rodenrijs, The Netherlands) as commercial bioinsecticides Entonem, Capsanem, Larvanem, Chrysopa, and Aphidalia. The following leaf aphids from the following cultivated and wild-growing plants (collected at the Experimental Field of the Biotechnical Faculty in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 46° 04'N, 14° 31'E, 299 m above sea level) were used as the main food source of the twospotted lady beetle and lacewing larvae during laboratory bioassay: Brevicoryne brassicae (L.) from Brassica oleracea L. variety gemmifera DC./Zenk, Macrosiphoniella millefolii (De Geer) from Achillea millefolium L., and Aphis craccivora Koch from Vicia cracca L.

Laboratory Bioassay. The assay was carried out in special petri dishes (7 cm in diameter; for details regarding the special petri dishes and the bioassay procedure, see Rojht 2007 and Trdan et al. 2009), which were placed into a rearing chamber at 85% RH and constant darkness. Nematode treatments included single species treatments and mixed species treatments (1:1) (S. feltiae \times S. carpocapsae, S. feltiae \times H. bacteriophora, and S. carpocapsae \times H. bacteriophora.) at concentrations of 500, 2,500, and 5,000 infective juveniles [IJs]/ml, and each treatment \times concentration was replicated five times at 15, 20, and 25°C. Five control petri dishes (just water was added with no nematodes) were evaluated at each rearing temperature. Efficacy was evaluated by counting dead larvae 4 d after application. If necessary, food for larvae was added 2 d after treatment.

Statistical Analysis. A multifactor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine differ-

 Table 1. ANOVA results for corrected mortality of A. bipunctata larvae 4 d after treatment

Source	df	F	Р
Temp	2	70.80	< 0.0001
Nematode species	5	4.39	0.0008
Dose of nematodes	2	86.69	< 0.0001
Temp \times nematode species	10	3.43	0.0003
Temp \times dose of nematodes	4	1.18	0.3222
Nematode species \times dose of nematodes	10	2.30	0.0135

ences in mortality rates (percentage) between the larvae of both predators, assayed with different treatments at three different temperature. Before the analysis, each variable was tested for homogeneity of treatment variances. Mortality rate data were corrected for control mortality using Abbott's formula (Abbott 1925) and normalized using the arcsine square-root transformation before analysis. Duncan's multiple range test ($P \leq 0.05$) was used to separate mean differences among the parameters in all the treatments (Hoshmand 2006). All statistical analyses were performed with Statgraphics Plus for Windows 4.0 (Statistical Graphics Corp., Manugistics, Inc., Rockville, MD). The data are presented as untransformed means.

Results and Discussion

All main effects as well as their associated interactions (except temperature × dose of nematodes for *A. bipunctata* and nematode species × dose of nematodes for *C. carnea*) were significant at P < 0.05 (Tables 1 and 2). Four days after treatment significantly the lowest mortality of *A. bipunctata* and *C. carnea* larvae was recorded at 15°C, whereas no significant differences were noted between 20 and 25°C. At 500 IJs/ml the nematodes had significantly the lowest nontarget effect on the larvae of both aphid predators, whereas no significant differences in this regard were established between 2,500 and 5,000 IJs/ml. Between the larvae of both studied predators, those of *C. carnea* was generally less susceptible to attack of entomopathogenic nematodes.

The mortality rate for the twospotted lady beetle larvae at 25°C was >93% with the exception of the lowest concentration. At both higher concentration and at 20°C, the lowest mortality rate for the larvae of the same predatory species was 75%. The mortality rate for the lacewing larvae at the both higher temperatures was over 42%. These results confirm that the

 Table 2. ANOVA results for corrected mortality of C. carnea

 larvae 4 d after treatment

Source	df	F	Р
Temp	2	80.09	< 0.0001
Nematode species	5	15.33	< 0.0001
Dose of nematodes	2	26.38	< 0.0001
Temp \times nematode species	10	5.67	< 0.0001
Temp \times dose of nematodes	4	3.23	0.0124
Nematode species \times dose of nematodes	10	1.51	0.1326

Temp (°C)	Nematode	Nematode concn (IJs/ml)					
		A. bipunctata			C. carnea		
	(0)	species	500	2,500	5,000	500	2,500
15	S. feltiae	$73.79 \pm 8.93c$	$80.19 \pm 9.52 b$	$75.47 \pm 7.24 \mathrm{ab}$	$18.36\pm6.71\mathrm{b}$	$54.38 \pm 14.75 \mathrm{c}$	$85.24\pm7.84d$
	S. carpocapsae	$60.64 \pm 10.01 c$	$73.14 \pm 13.53 ab$	$70.35 \pm 2.70a$	$6.0 \pm 4.0a$	$13.98 \pm 2.32b$	$50.99 \pm 10.69 bc$
	H. bacteriophora	$38.96 \pm 3.65 \mathrm{b}$	$82.56\pm7.48b$	$74.51 \pm 10.90 \mathrm{ab}$	$1.82 \pm 1.82a$	$4.86\pm3.05a$	$4.0 \pm 4.0a$
	$SF \times SC$	$8.14 \pm 5.86 \mathrm{a}$	$67.68 \pm 7.04 \mathrm{ab}$	$87.44 \pm 5.13 \mathrm{b}$	$41.0 \pm 15.36 \mathrm{c}$	$54.48 \pm 8.46 \mathrm{c}$	$58.91 \pm 5.73 \mathrm{c}$
	SF imes HB	$34.76 \pm 5.85b$	$70.82 \pm 5.50 \mathrm{ab}$	$78.37 \pm 7.33 ab$	$4.86 \pm 3.05a$	$46.60 \pm 7.38c$	$48.02 \pm 10.88 bc$
	SC imes HB	$30.93 \pm 9.70 \mathrm{b}$	$60.23 \pm 7.91 \mathrm{a}$	$84.13 \pm 5.81 \mathrm{b}$	$30.89 \pm 10.73 \mathrm{bc}$	$40.67 \pm 7.57 \mathrm{c}$	$38.0 \pm 11.58 \mathrm{b}$
20	S. feltiae	$95.92 \pm 2.50 \mathrm{c}$	$100 \pm 0.00 \mathrm{b}$	$100.0\pm0.00\mathrm{b}$	$21.86 \pm 2.65a$	$81.67 \pm 13.02 ab$	$50.71 \pm 20.71a$
	S. carpocapsae	$48.07 \pm 10.32 \mathrm{a}$	$84.81 \pm 5.71 \mathrm{a}$	$100.0\pm0.00b$	$68.44 \pm 11.88 \mathrm{c}$	$84.50\pm7.68b$	$94.67 \pm 3.43 \mathrm{c}$
	H. bacteriophora	$68.48 \pm 9.42 \mathrm{b}$	$91.38 \pm 4.19a$	$75.80 \pm 7.58 \mathrm{a}$	$41.08 \pm 9.08 \mathrm{b}$	$54.67 \pm 15.08 \mathrm{a}$	$67.50 \pm 19.20 \mathrm{ab}$
	$SF \times SC$	$76.53 \pm 10.41 \mathrm{b}$	$92.91 \pm 4.62a$	$100\pm0.00\mathrm{b}$	$65.91 \pm 4.41 \mathrm{c}$	$73.45 \pm 5.06 \mathrm{ab}$	$89.78 \pm 5.48 \mathrm{bc}$
	$SF \times HB$	$75.06 \pm 9.43b$	$83.96 \pm 6.43a$	$86.62 \pm 11.01 \mathrm{ab}$	$38.50 \pm 9.22b$	$70.64 \pm 11.62 ab$	77.33 ± 7.24 ab
	SC imes HB	$79.37 \pm 7.83 \mathrm{b}$	$100 \pm 0.00 \mathrm{b}$	$97.73 \pm 2.27 \mathrm{ab}$	$64.67 \pm 8.57 \mathrm{c}$	$86.29 \pm 5.81 \mathrm{b}$	$83.14 \pm 6.65 \mathrm{b}$
25	S. feltiae	$83.96 \pm 5.72 \mathrm{c}$	$93.21 \pm 2.78a$	$96.99 \pm 3.01a$	$42.12 \pm 14.36a$	$78.59 \pm 2.95 \mathrm{a}$	$65.75 \pm 20.61 \mathrm{ab}$
	S. carpocapsae	$79.53 \pm 11.49 bc$	$97.89 \pm 2.11 ab$	$100 \pm 0.00a$	$89.9 \pm 10.03 \mathrm{b}$	$100 \pm 0.0 \mathrm{c}$	$93.63 \pm 3.95b$
	H. bacteriophora	$43.58 \pm 4.57a$	$95.26 \pm 2.93 ab$	$97.89 \pm 2.11a$	$36.43 \pm 14.77a$	$65.79 \pm 16.63a$	$42.10 \pm 11.79a$
	$SF \times SC$	$88.41 \pm 5.37 \mathrm{c}$	$100\pm0.00\mathrm{b}$	$100\pm0.00a$	$76.81 \pm 13.86b$	$89.55\pm6.61b$	$89.97 \pm 6.14 \mathrm{b}$
	SF imes HB	$60.20 \pm 11.36 \mathrm{b}$	$97.37 \pm 2.63 \mathrm{ab}$	$100\pm0.00a$	$47.71 \pm 11.09a$	$68.81 \pm 10.81 \mathrm{a}$	$59.89 \pm 11.10a$
	SC imes HB	$61.54 \pm 11.66 \mathrm{b}$	$96.99 \pm 3.01 \mathrm{ab}$	$100\pm0.00a$	$81.11 \pm 9.94 b$	$100\pm0.0\mathrm{c}$	$89.26\pm10.74b$

Table 3. Mean \pm SE mortality of green lacewing and twospotted lady beetle larvae treated with three different concentrations of three EPN species and three mixed suspension of two EPN species at 15, 20, and 25°C, 4 d after treatment

For each dose, within each temperature, means followed by the same letters are not significantly different ($P \le 0.05$; Duncan's multiple range test).

SF, S. feltiae; SC, S. carpocapsae; HB, H. bacteriophora.

activity of all infective juveniles increases with increasing temperature. They are most effective and act most quickly from 20 to 30°C (Koppenhöfer 2000). Usually, *H. bacteriophora* and a mixed suspension of *S. feltiae* and *H. bacteriophora* were the least nontarget-efficient agents in our study (Table 3), whereas the other four treatments had approximately the same influence to the larvae of both predators.

Mixed suspensions of two nematode species also were used in the assay to prove a possible synergistic effect of two species of entomopathogenic nematodes and consequently a higher nontarget effect. The synergism between various species (Ansari et al. 2006) as well as the synergism between the organism and the pesticide (Koppenhöfer and Kaya 1998) are studied for the intent of introducing different sustainable strategies of pest control. The results of our study do not support a synergism between various entomopathogenic nematode species in most of the experiments presented.

Despite the results of this study, as well as those of the laboratory assay performed, a high susceptibility of the larvae (Farag 2002) and cocoons (Powell and Webster 2004) of the predators to the entomopathogenic nematodes was confirmed, and a field assay is needed to prove or disprove these findings. We note that optimal conditions for the development of entomopathogenic nematodes were established in the laboratory, which is rarely the case in nature.

Acknowledgment

This research was carried out within Horticulture P4– 0013-0481, a program funded by the Slovenian Research Agency, and within the program "Professional tasks from the field of plant protection," funded by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Food of the Republic of Slovenia-Phytosanitary Administration of the Republic of Slovenia.

References Cited

- Abbott, W. S. 1925. A method of computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. J. Econ. Entomol. 18: 265–267.
- Ansari, M. A., F. A. Shah, L. Tirry, and M. Moens. 2006. Field trials against *Hoplia philanthus* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae) with a combination of an entomopathogenic nematode and the fungus *Metarhizium anisopliae* CLO 53. Biol. Control 39: 453–459.
- Bathon, H. 1996. Impact of entomopathogenic nematodes on non-target hosts. Biocontrol Sci. Technol. 6: 421–434.
- Farag, N. A. 2002. Impact of two entomopathogenic nematodes on the ladybird, *Coccinella undecimpunctata* and its pray, *Aphis fabae*. Ann. Agric. Sci. (Cairo). Fac. Agric., Ain Shams Univ., Cairo, Egypt 47: 431–443.
- Georgis, R., H. K. Kaya, and R. Gaugler. 1991. Effect of steinernematid and heterorhabditid nematodes (Rhabditida: Steinernematidae and Heterorhabditidae) on nontarget arthropods. Environ. Entomol. 20: 815–822.
- Hazir, S., H. K. Kaya, S. P. Stock, and N. Keskin. 2003. Entomopathogenic nematodes (Steinernematidae and Heterorhabditidae) for biological control of soil pests. Turk. J. Biol. 27: 181–202.
- Hoshmand, A. R. 2006. Design of experiments for agriculture and the natural sciences, 2nd ed. Chapman & Hall, London, United Kingdom.
- Koppenhöfer, A. M., and H. K. Kaya. 1998. Synergism of imidacloprid and an entomopathogenic nematode: a novel approach to white grub (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae) control in turfgrass. J. Econ. Entomol. 91: 618–623.
- Koppenhöfer, A. M. 2000. Nematodes, pp. 283–301. In H. K. Kaya [ed.], Field manual of techniques in invertebrate pathology. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Laznik, Ž., T. Tóth, T. Lakatos, and S. Trdan. 2008a. Entomopathogenic nematode Steinernema carpocapsae (Weiser)

(Rhabditida: Steinernematidae), a new member of Slovenian fauna. Acta Agric. Slov. 91: 351–359.

- Laznik, Ż., T. Tóth, T. Lakatos, and S. Trdan. 2008b. Entomopathogenic nematode *Steinernema feltiae* (Filipjev) (Rhabditida: Steinernematidae) recorded for the first time in Slovenia. Acta Agric. Slov. 91: 37–45.
- Milevoj, L. 1999. Rearing of the common green lacewing, *Chrysoperla carnea* Stephens, in the laboratory. Res. Rep., Biotech. Fac., Univ. Ljubl., Agric. 73: 65–70.
- Pervez, O. A. 2005. Ecology of two-spotted ladybird, Adalia bipunctata: a review. J. Appl. Entomol. 129: 465–474.
- Powell, J. R., and J. M. Webster. 2004. Interguild antagonism between biological controls: impact of entomopathogenic nematode application on an aphid predator, *Aphidoletes aphidimyza* (Diptera: Cecidomyiidae). Biol. Control 30: 110–118.
- Rojht, H. 2007. Non-target effect of entomopathogenic nematodes (Rhabditida) against selected predators of aphids (Aphididae). M.S. thesis, University of Ljubljana, Biotechnology Faculty, Ljubljana, Slovenia.
- Shapiro-Ilan, D. I., and T. E. Cottrell. 2005. Susceptibility of lady beetles (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae) to entomopathogenic nematodes. J. Invertebr. Pathol. 89: 150– 156.
- Trdan, S., M. Vidrih, L. Andjus, and Ž Laznik. 2009. Activity of four entomopathogenic nematode species against different developmental stages of Colorado potato beetle, *Leptinotarsa decemlineata* (Coleoptera, Chrysomelidae). Helminthologia 46: 14–20.

Received 18 March 2009; accepted 14 May 2009.