

**ECOLOGICAL STUDIES ON MEDITERRANEAN FRUIT FLY,
CERATITIS CAPITATA (WIED.) AND PEACH FRUIT FLY,
BACTROCERA ZONATA (SAUND.) IN MANGO ORCHARDS
AT FAYOUM GOVERNORATE (EGYPT)**

SAAFAN, M. H., S. M. FODA AND T. A. ABDEL-HAFEZ

Plant Protection Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Dokki-Giza, Egypt.

(Manuscript received 11 July 2004)

Abstract

The population dynamics of Mediterranean fruit fly (MFF), *Ceratitis capitata* (Wied.) and Peach fruit fly (PFF), *Bactrocera zonata* (Saund.) were studied in mango orchards at Sinuris and Ibshaway districts, Fayoum Governorate (Egypt) during the two successive seasons, 2002 and 2003. In the meantime, rate of infestation in mango fruits with MFF and PFF together and separately were estimated in six locations. During the two successive seasons, MFF was very low compared to PFF population. Captured per trap per day "CTD" of MFF ranged between 0.09 - 0.81 fly, with a mean of 0.26 fly, and between 0.09 - 1.59 flies, with a mean of 0.57 fly, during the two successive seasons, respectively. The "CTD" of PFF ranged between 59.5 - 275.0 flies, with a mean of 129.49 flies and between 21.97 - 147.32 flies, with a mean of 95.79 flies, during the two successive seasons, respectively. Total percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together at the six locations, during the 1st season ranged between 4.78 - 27.15 %, with a mean of 18.20 %. Percentages of infestation with MFF separately were zero % (because no any MFF was emerged from incubated mango fruits), and percentages of infestation with PFF were the same total percentages of infestation. During the 2nd season, total percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together ranged between 8.75 % - 16.76 % with a mean of 13.17 %. Percentages of infestation with MFF ranged between 0.10 % - 0.34% with a mean of 0.16 %, and percentages of infestation with PFF ranged between 8.65 % - 16.65 % with a mean of 13.01 %.

INTRODUCTION

The Mediterranean fruit fly, *Ceratitis capitata* (Wied.) (Diptera : Tephritidae) is a major pest all over the world, as many as 200 tropical and subtropical fruit species are attacked (Christenson and Foote, 1960). In the Mediterranean basin, the pest attacks citrus, deciduous fruits (mainly stone fruits) and other cultivated hosts. Crop production is extremely affected and fruit infestation is as high as 80 % (Cramer, 1967).

The pest causes considerable damage which inflicts significantly economic losses to peach, apricot, guava, mango, fig and citrus all over the governorates of Egypt (Awadallah *et al.*, 1974, Saafan, 1986, Hashem *et al.*, 1987 and Saafan *et al.*, 1989).

During the 90's of the last century, the Egyptian ecosystem was attacked by one of the most harmful pest, the peach fruit fly, *Bactrocera zonata* (Saund.) to be a new record in the north of Africa. Peach fruit fly was previously recorded in Egypt in 1924 (Efflatoun, 1924), but it haven't any distribution before the 90's of 20th Century.

Peach fruit fly (PFF) infests different fruit and vegetable hosts (*e.g.* mango, peach, fig, guava, apple, citrus, tomato, ... etc.) (Oakly, 1948: Narayane and Batra, 1960 and Kapoor *et al.*, 1982). El-Minshawy *et al.* (1999) mentioned that larvae of *B. zonata* were found seriously damaging guava fruits in Alexandria. Hashem *et al.* (2001) mentioned that PFF infested mango, apple, guava and citrus in Egypt, and they added that the population increased gradually with fruiting and ripening. Hashem *et al.* (1992) studied population fluctuation and rate of Medfly infestation in peach plantation during two successive seasons (1990 and 1991) at North Sinai Governorate, Egypt. They found that Medfly adults were much abundant during the fruit season (June and July) (CTD : 32 and 40 flies).

For peach fruit fly (PFF), Ahmed (2000) studied the population dynamics peach fruit fly on different host plants at Kalub'ia Governorate. He found that the "CTD" of PFF was ranged between 2.3 - 114.3 flies on mango plantation. Mohamed (2002) studied seasonal fluctuation of *B. zonata* at Sohag Governorate for three successive years 1999, 2000 and 2001 by using McPhail traps baited with di-ammonium phosphate 2 %. Through the first year (1999), the caught fly concentrated at August, September and October, while in the rest of year the flies disappeared or in a few numbers. The same trend mostly had occurred in the second (2000) and in the third (2003) years.

The aim of the present studies is to gain sufficient information about :

- Population dynamics of medfly (MFF) and peach fruit fly (PFF) in mango plantation at Sinuris and Ibshaway districts, Fayoum Governorate during the two successive seasons, 2002 and 2003.
- Percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together and with MFF and PFF separately on mango fruits.

The present investigation is one of a serial investigations carried out on mango plantation (very high population of PFF), on citrus plantation (low population of PFF) and on apricot plantation (medium population of PFF).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Studies were carried out on mango plantations at Sinuris and Ibshaway districts, Fayoum Governorate during the two successive seasons, 2002 and 2003.

Mediterranean fruit fly will be prefix in MFF and peach fruit fly in PFF.

A- Population studies

Eight mango locations (orchards) were chosen at Sinuris and Ibshaway districts to study MFF and PFF population fluctuation. Eight Jackson sticky traps (Harris *et al.*, 1971) baited with trimedlure (pheromone of MFF), and another eight traps baited with methyl eugenol (pheromone of PFF) were distributed in the eight chosen mango locations at a rate of one trap for MFF and one trap for PFF per one location. Traps were inspected weekly, replaced the sheets, and replenished by pheromone and counted the captured male flies. Mean catch per trap per day "CTD" calculated and recorded to compare between population fluctuation of MFF and PFF.

B- Fruit incubation and rate of infestation

Because the symptoms of infestation by MFF or PFF can't be detected separately, the following procedures were conducted:

Six mango locations (orchards) were chosen in the two districts to be the orchards of gathering fallen fruits. In every location, five mango trees were selected, and marked. All the fruits on every selected tree were counted. A cloth bag was hung on every selected tree for gathering the fallen fruits, also label was hung neighbouring to the cloth bag for recording number of fallen fruits.

Every two weeks, fallen fruits were transferred to Plant Protection Research Institute (PPRI) at Giza for fruit incubation in a special wood cages. The produced pupae from the incubated fallen fruits counted and reserved in plastic tube until emergence. The emerged flies were identified to MFF (males and females) and PFF (males and females).

The percentages of infestation in mango fruits with the two flies (MFF and PFF) can be estimated depending on the whole counted fruits on the selected trees and the fallen fruits.

The data obtained from incubation fallen fruits were :

- Number of emerged MFF and / or number of emerged PFF (**B**).
 - Total percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together (**C**).
 - Total number of emerged flies (MFF and PFF together) (**D**).
- To estimate the percentages of infestation with MFF or PFF separately (**A**)

We applied the following equation :

$$A = \frac{B \times C}{D}$$

Degrees of temperature and relative humidity of Fayoum Governorate were obtained from Central Laboratory for Agricultural Climate, ARC, and the correlation coefficient between "CTD" values for MFF and PFF and degrees of temperature and relative humidity during population dynamics studies period on mango plantation were carried out.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A- Population fluctuation : Population fluctuation of MFF and PFF (catch per trap per day "CTD") was studied on mango at eight orchards distributed in Sinuris and Ibsaway districts during the two successive seasons, 2002 and 2003.

1) The first season (2002) :

* **MFF population.** Data in Table 1 indicate that, MFF was very low compared to PFF population. Mean "CTD" was between 0.09 - 0.81 fly with a mean of 0.26 fly during the checking periods. It was noticed that the highest mean of "CTD" was at the end of July and beginning of August (CTD : 0.81 and 0.72 fly, respectively), while the lowest mean of "CTD" at the beginning of October (CTD : 0.09 and 0.00 fly, respectively).

* **PFF population fluctuation.** Data in Table 1 show that PFF population was very high during the whole period of study. Mean of "CTD" ranged between 59.5- 275.0 flies, with a mean of 129.49 flies. The population increased at the end of July and the beginning of August (CTD : 137.5 - 275.0 flies, respectively), while it decreased at the end of September and beginning of October (CTD : 743 – 59.5 flies, respectively).

Table 1 also shows that the correlation coefficient between values of "CTD" of MFF and temperatures was positively insignificant, while it was negatively significant with R.H. %. For PFF, it was positively significant between "CTD" values and the degrees of temperature, while it was negatively insignificant with R.H. %.

2) The second season (2003) :

* **MFF population fluctuation** . Table 1 shows that the comparison between captured MFF during the two successive seasons illustrate that MFF population during the 2nd season was twice the 1st season. In the same time, MFF population was very low compared to PFF population. Mean of "CTD" ranged between 0.09 - 1.59 flies, with a high mean of 0.57 fly during the checking periods. The highest population was during the 2nd week of July until the 1st week of August, where the mean of "CTD" was between 0.80 - 1.59 flies, while the lowest population occurred during the 3rd week of September until the 2nd week of October (CTD : 0.09 - 0.25 fly).

* **PFF population fluctuation**. Data in Table 1 indicate that PFF population was very high compared to MFF population. In the same time, PFF population was relatively lower during the 2nd season than the 1st season. Mean of "CTD" was between 21.97 - 147.32 flies, with high mean of 95.79 flies during the checking periods. The high population occurred during the 2nd week of July until the 4th week of August (CTD : 127.68 - 147.32 flies), while the low population occurred during the 1st week of September until the 2nd week of October (CTD : 21.97-92.86 flies).

Table 1. Mean captured males per trap per day "CTD" of Mediterranean fruit fly (MFF) and Peach fruit fly (PFF) by pheromone traps distributed at eight mango orchards in Sinuris and Ibshaway districts, Fayoum Governorate, during the two successive seasons, 2002 and 2003.

| Date of inspection | | 1 st season (2002) | | | | 2 nd season (2003) | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------|------------|----------|-------------------------------|--------|------------|----------|
| | | CTD | | Average of | | CTD | | Average of | |
| Month | Week | MFF | PFF | Temp. (°C) | R.H. (%) | MFF | PFF | Temp. (°C) | R.H. (%) |
| July | 1 st | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2 nd | - | - | - | - | 1.59 | 141.07 | 30.5 | 53.0 |
| | 3 rd | - | - | - | - | 0.80 | 139.29 | 32.0 | 54.0 |
| | 4 th | 0.81 | 137.5 | 32.4 | 48.0 | 1.00 | 144.64 | 31.5 | 53.0 |
| August | 1 st | 0.72 | 275.0 | 32.7 | 50.0 | 1.09 | 141.97 | 31.0 | 54.0 |
| | 2 nd | 0.11 | 151.8 | 32.8 | 53.0 | 0.63 | 147.32 | 32.5 | 54.0 |
| | 3 rd | 0.05 | 149.1 | 32.7 | 53.0 | 0.37 | 142.95 | 32.5 | 54.0 |
| | 4 th | 0.21 | 139.8 | 32.8 | 54.0 | 0.34 | 127.68 | 32.5 | 54.0 |
| Sept. | 1 st | 0.18 | 99.3 | 32.8 | 53.0 | 0.47 | 92.86 | 32.0 | 55.0 |
| | 2 nd | 0.18 | 115.2 | 32.7 | 50.0 | 0.52 | 50.00 | 31.5 | 52.0 |
| | 3 rd | 0.14 | 93.4 | 29.4 | 56.0 | 0.25 | 31.25 | 27.5 | 58.5 |
| | 4 th | 0.14 | 74.3 | 31.7 | 51.5 | 0.22 | 35.71 | 26.5 | 57.0 |
| Oct. | 1 st | 0.09 | 59.5 | 26.3 | 55.5 | 0.09 | 28.57 | 26.3 | 55.5 |
| | 2 nd | - | - | - | - | 0.09 | 21.97 | 27.5 | 55.5 |
| Mean | | 0.26 | 129.49 | | | 0.57 | 95.79 | | |
| MFF "r" | | 0.28 | -0.74 | | | 0.51 | -0.46 | | |
| PFF "r" | | 0.53 | -0.45 | | | 0.75 | +0.54 | | |

The same table also shows the correlation coefficient between values of "CTD" and temperature and relative humidity, during the study there was a positive correlation between "CTD" values of MFF and degrees of temperature, while it was a negative insignificant correlation between "CTD" values of MFF and R.H. %.

For PFF, there was significant positive correlation between "CTD" values and degrees of temperature, and also, there was significant positive correlation between "CTD" values and R.H. %.

B- Fruit sampling and rate of infestation :

During the study periods, fallen mango fruits were gathered twice a week from six mango locations (orchards) distributed at Sinuris and Ibshaway districts during the two successive seasons (2002 and 2003) to estimate the percentages of infestation of MFF and PFF together. The gathered fallen fruits incubated at Plant Protection Res. Institute laboratory to produce pupae and emerged MFF and PFF flies. The percentages of infestation due to MFF and PFF separately can be estimated.

1) The first season (2002). Table 2 illustrates data about incubation of mango fallen fruits. Total number of fruits on five trees at the six locations were 7940 fruits, and the total number of fallen fruits were 1135 fruits. Total percentages of infestation for the six locations ranged between 4.78 % - 27.15 %, with a mean of 18.20 %. Total number of produced pupae was 10562 pupae, and total number of emerged flies was 6656 flies, with a mean of percentages of emergence of 63.02 %. No any MFF fly emerged from the incubated fallen fruits, but all the emerged flies were PFF (6656 flies : 2983 males and 3673 females).

Table 2. Number of incubated fallen fruits which gathered from six mango orchards at Sinuris and Ibshaway districts, Fayoum Governorate, during the 1st season, 2002.

| Locations (orchards) | Total No. of fruits on five trees | Total No. of fallen fruits | Total % of infestation (MFF and PFF) | Total No. of produced pupae | Total No. of emerged flies | % Emergence | Total No. of MFF | | Total No. of PFF | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|------------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|
| | | | | | | | Male | Female | Male | Female | Total |
| 1 | 490 | 107 | 21.84 | 1444 | 820 | 56.79 | 0 | 0 | 370 | 450 | 820 |
| 2 | 710 | 152 | 21.41 | 3738 | 2003 | 53.58 | 0 | 0 | 802 | 1201 | 2003 |
| 3 | 1570 | 358 | 22.80 | 2278 | 1944 | 85.34 | 0 | 0 | 855 | 1089 | 1944 |
| 4 | 1105 | 177 | 16.02 | 1385 | 942 | 68.01 | 0 | 0 | 473 | 469 | 942 |
| 5 | 3450 | 165 | 4.78 | 704 | 385 | 54.69 | 0 | 0 | 184 | 201 | 385 |
| 6 | 615 | 176 | 27.15 | 1013 | 562 | 55.48 | 0 | 0 | 299 | 263 | 562 |
| Total | 7940 | 1135 | - | 10562 | 6656 | - | 0 | 0 | 2983 | 3673 | 6656 |
| Mean | - | - | 18.20 | - | - | 63.02 | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 3 clarify the percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together and the emerged flies. Because no any MFF fly was emerged, percentages of infestation with MFF were zero %, and percentages of infestation with PFF were the same total percentages of infestation (ranged between 4.78 % - 27.15 %, with mean of 18.20 %).

Table 3. Percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together and separately in mango fruits during the 1st season, 2002.

| Locations (orchards) | Total % of infestation (MFF and PFF) | Total no. of emerged flies | % Emer- gence | MFF | | PFF | | % infestation with MFF | % infestation with PFF |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | No. flies | % Emer- gence | No. flies | % Emer- gence | | |
| 1 | 21.84 | 820 | 56.79 | 0 | 0 | 820 | 56.79 | 0 | 21.84 |
| 2 | 21.41 | 2003 | 53.58 | 0 | 0 | 2003 | 53.58 | 0 | 21.41 |
| 3 | 22.80 | 1944 | 85.34 | 0 | 0 | 1944 | 85.34 | 0 | 22.80 |
| 4 | 16.02 | 942 | 68.01 | 0 | 0 | 942 | 68.01 | 0 | 16.02 |
| 5 | 4.78 | 385 | 54.69 | 0 | 0 | 385 | 54.69 | 0 | 4.78 |
| 6 | 27.15 | 562 | 55.48 | 0 | 0 | 562 | 55.48 | 0 | 27.15 |
| Total | - | 6656 | - | 0 | - | 6656 | - | - | - |
| Mean | 18.20 | - | 63.02 | - | 0 | - | 63.02 | 0 | 18.20 |

2) The second season (2003). Table 4 shows the data about incubation mango fallen fruits. Total number of fruits on five trees at the six locations were 15500 fruits, and the total number of fallen fruits were 1950 fruits. Total percentages of infestation (MFF and PFF) for the six locations ranged between 8.75 % - 16.76 % with a mean of 13.17. Total number of produced pupae was 26358 pupae and total number of emerged flies was 20817 flies, with mean of percentages of emergence of 79.3 %. Total number of emerged MFF flies was 246 flies (123 male and 123 females), and total number of PFF flies was 20571 flies (10074 male and 10497 females).

Table 4. Number of incubated fallen fruits which gathered from six mango orchards at Sinuris and Ibsahway districts, Fayoum Governorate, during the 2nd season, 2002.

| Locations (orchards) | Total No. of fruits on five trees | Total No. of fallen fruits | Total % of infestation (MFF and PFF) | Total No. of produced pupae | Total No. of emerged flies | % Emergence | Total No. of MFF | | Total No. of PFF | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|------------------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|
| | | | | | | | Male | Female | Male | Female | Total |
| 1 | 3600 | 315 | 8.75 | 8739 | 6887 | 78.8 | 37 | 42 | 3347 | 3461 | 6808 |
| 2 | 3200 | 413 | 12.91 | 4433 | 3378 | 76.2 | 24 | 20 | 1654 | 1680 | 3334 |
| 3 | 1800 | 261 | 14.50 | 4735 | 3740 | 79.0 | 17 | 15 | 1842 | 1866 | 3708 |
| 4 | 2000 | 304 | 15.20 | 2520 | 1986 | 78.8 | 11 | 15 | 948 | 1012 | 1960 |
| 5 | 2100 | 352 | 16.76 | 4292 | 3488 | 81.3 | 11 | 12 | 1677 | 1788 | 3465 |
| 6 | 3800 | 305 | 10.89 | 1639 | 1338 | 81.6 | 23 | 19 | 606 | 690 | 1296 |
| Total | 15500 | 1950 | - | 26358 | 20817 | - | 123 | 123 | 10074 | 10497 | 20571 |
| Mean | - | - | 13.17 | - | - | 79.3 | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 5 shows the percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together and the emerged flies. By using the fore-mentioned equation (Materials and Methods), the percentages of infestation with MFF separately ranged between 0.10 % - 0.34 % with a mean of 0.16 %, and the percentages of infestation of PFF separately ranged between 8.65 % - 16.65 %, with a mean of 13.01 %.

From the fore-mentioned data, MFF population was very low compared with PFF population during the two seasons. In the same time, MFF population was twice in the 2nd season than in the 1st one, while PFF population was relatively lower during the 2nd season than the 1st season.

Percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together were relatively higher in the 1st season than in the 2nd season. Percentages of infestation with MFF separately were zero % during the 1st season and 0.16 % during the 2nd season. Percentages of infestation with PFF were relatively higher during the 1st season (18.20 %) than the 2nd season (13.01 %).

The fore-mentioned results are in agreement with the findings of Ahmed (2000) who mentioned that the "CTD" of PFF was between 2.3 - 114.3 flies on mango plantation in Kalubia Governorate.

Table 5. Percentages of infestation with MFF and PFF together and separately in mango fruits during the 2nd season, 2003.

| Locations (orchards) | Total % of infestation (MFF and PFF) | Total no. of emerged flies | % Emer- gence | MFF | | PFF | | % infestation with MFF | % infestation with PFF |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | No. flies | % Emer- gence | No. flies | % Emer- gence | | |
| 1 | 8.75 | 6887 | 78.8 | 79 | 1.15 | 6808 | 98.85 | 0.10 | 8.65 |
| 2 | 12.91 | 3378 | 76.2 | 44 | 1.30 | 3334 | 98.70 | 0.17 | 12.74 |
| 3 | 14.50 | 3740 | 79.0 | 32 | 0.86 | 3708 | 99.14 | 0.12 | 14.38 |
| 4 | 15.20 | 1986 | 78.8 | 26 | 1.31 | 1960 | 98.69 | 0.20 | 15.00 |
| 5 | 16.76 | 3488 | 81.3 | 23 | 0.66 | 3465 | 99.34 | 0.11 | 10.65 |
| 6 | 10.89 | 1338 | 81.6 | 42 | 3.14 | 1296 | 96.86 | 0.34 | 10.55 |
| Total | - | 20817 | - | 246 | - | 20571 | - | - | - |
| Mean | 13.17 | - | 79.3 | - | 1.18 | - | 98.82 | 0.16 | 13.01 |

REFERENCES

- 1- Ahmed, S. M. 2000. Integrated post-management of peach fruit fly, *Bactrocera zonata* (Saunders). Final Report of Project No. 476 (unpublished data).
- 2- Awadallah, A. M., A. G. Hashem. and S. M. Foda. 1974. A trial for testing the sterile male technique as a mean of controlling the Medfly, *Ceratitis capitata* Wied. Egypt. Agric. Res. Rev., Egypt, 52 : 41-49.
- 3- Christnson, L. D. and R. H. Foote. 1960. Biology of fruit flies. Ann. Rev. Entomol., 5 : 171-192.
- 4- Cramer, H. H. 1967. Plant protection and world crop production. Pflanz. J. Bay., 20 : 1-6.
- 5- Efflaton, H. G. 1924. A monograph of Egyptian Trypanidae. Mem. Soc. R. Ent. Egypte, 2 : 1-132.
- 6- El-Minshawy, A. M., M. A. Al-Eryan and A. I. Awad. 1999. Biological and morphological studies on the guava fruit fly, *Bactrocera zonata* (Saunders) (Diptera : Tephritidae) found recently in Egypt. 8th Nat. Conf. of Pests and Dis. of Veg. and Fruits, Ismailia, Egypt, 1999.
- 7- Harris, E. J., S. Nakagawa and T. Urago. 1971. Sticky traps for detection and survey of three tephritids. J. Econ. Entomol., 64 : 62-65.
- 8- Hashem, A. G., E. J. Harries, M. H. Saafan and S. M. Foda. 1987. Control of the Mediterranean fruit fly in Egypt with complete coverage and partial bait sprays. Annals. Agric. Sci., 32 (3) : 1813-1825.
- 9- Hashem, A. G., M. H. Saafan. and S. M. Foda. 1992. Population fluctuation and rate of infestation of medfly, *Ceratitis capitata* (Wied.) in peach orchards at North Sinai. Al-Azhar J. Agric. Res., Cairo, Egypt, 16 : 1-12.
- 10- Hashem, A. G., S. M. Mohamed and M. F. El-Wakkad. 2001. Diversity and abundance of Mediterranean and Peach fruit flies (Diptera : Tephritidae) in different horticultural orchards. Egypt. J. Appl. Sci., 16 (1), 2001.
- 11- Kapoor, V. C. and M. L. Agaewall. 1982. Fruit flies and their increasing host plants in India. Proc. CEC/IOBC Intern. Symp. Athens/Greece, 16-19 Nov., 1982.

- 12- Mohamed, A. M. 2002. Seasonal abundance of peach fruit fly, *Bactrocera zonata* (Saunders) with relation to prevailing weather factors in Upper Egypt. Assiut J. of Agric. Sci., 33 (2) : 195-207.
- 13- Narayana, E. S. and H. N. Batra. 1960. Fruit flies and their control. Indian Coun. Agric. Res., pp. 1-68.
- 14- Oakly, W. 1948. Manual of Foreign Plant Pests, pp. 216-217.
- 15- Saafan, M. H. 1986. Studies on the Mediterranean fruit fly, *Ceratitis capitata* Wied. with emphasis on sterile male technique (SIT) (Diptera : Tephritidae). Ph. D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., Egypt.
- 16- Saafan, M. H., S. M. Foda and A. G. Hashem. 1989. Control of the medfly, *Ceratitis capitata* Wied. using partial bait spray. 3rd Nat. Conf. of Pests and Dis. of Veg. and Fruit in Egypt and Arab Countries, Ismailia, Egypt, pp. 566-580.

دراسات إيكولوجية على ذبابة فاكهة البحر المتوسط وذبابة ثمار الخوخ في حدائق امانجو بمحافظة الفيوم

محمد حسن سعفان ، سلطان محمد فوده ، طارق عبد الحافظ

معهد بحوث وقاية النباتات، مركز البحوث الزراعية ، الدقى - الجيزة، مصر.

تعتبر ذبابة فاكهة البحر الأبيض المتوسط من الآفات الخطيرة في العالم نظراً لتعدد عوائلها ومدى الواسع لانتشارها. وفي مصر تسبب هذه الآفة خسائر كبيرة لثمار المانجو بالإضافة إلى الخوخ والشمش والجوافة والتين والموالح. وفي التسعينات ظهرت حشرة جديدة تسمى بذبابة ثمار الخوخ وهي آفة تصيب كل عوائل ذبابة الفاكهة.

هذا البحث ضمن سلسلة أبحاث أجريت في محافظة الفيوم على المانجو والموالح والشمش خلال المواسم ٢٠٠٢، ٢٠٠٣، و ٢٠٠٤. وهذا هو البحث الأول في سلسلة هذه الأبحاث وقد أجرى لدراسة تنبذ تعداد كل من ذبابة فاكهة البحر المتوسط وذبابة ثمار الخوخ في حدائق المانجو بمركزى سنورس وإشواى بمحافظة الفيوم وذلك في موسمين متتاليين (٢٠٠٢، ٢٠٠٣). وفي نفس الوقت تم تقدير نسبة الإصابة بالحشرتين معا (ذبابة الفاكهة وذبابة ثمار الخوخ) في ثمار المانجو، وكذلك نسبة الإصابة بكل حشرة على حدة.

أظهرت النتائج أن تعداد ذبابة فاكهة البحر المتوسط قليل جداً إذا ما قورن بتعداد ذبابة ثمار الخوخ في كلا الموسمين. تراوحت قيم الـ "CTD" (عدد الذباب المنجذب للمصيدة للوحدة في اليوم الواحد) لذبابة الفاكهة ما بين ٠,٠٩ - ٠,٨١ ذبابة، بمتوسط قدره ٠,٢٦ ذبابة في الموسم الأول، وفي الموسم الثانى تراوحت قيم الـ "CTD" ما بين ٠,٠٩ - ١,٥٩ ذبابة بمتوسط قدره ٠,٥٧ ذبابة، وتراوحت قيم الـ "CTD" لذبابة الخوخ ما بين ٥٩,٥ - ٢٥٧,٠ ذبابة بمتوسط قدره ١٢٩,٤٩ ذبابة في الموسم الأول، وفي الموسم الثانى تراوحت قيم الـ "CTD" لذبابة الخوخ ما بين ٢١,٩٧ - ١٤٧,٤٢ ذبابة بمتوسط قدره ٩٥,٧٩ ذبابة.

تراوحت النسبة الكلية للإصابة في ثمار المانجو بالحشرتين معا ما بين ٤,٧٨ % - ٢٧,١٥ % بمتوسط قدره ١٨,٢٠ % في الموسم الأول، وكانت نسبة الإصابة بذبابة الفاكهة فقط صفر %. وفي الموسم الثانى تراوحت النسبة الكلية للإصابة بكل من ذبابة فاكهة البحر المتوسط وذبابة ثمار الخوخ ما بين ٨,٧٥ % - ١٦,٧٦ % بمتوسط قدره ١٣,١٧ %، وتراوحت نسبة الإصابة بذبابة فاكهة البحر المتوسط فقط ما بين ٠,١٠ % - ٠,٣٤ % بمتوسط قدره ١٣,١٧ %، وتراوحت نسبة الإصابة بذبابة ثمار الخوخ ما بين ٨,٦٥ % - ١٦,٦٥ % بمتوسط قدره ١٣,٠١ %.