



# Efficacy of two biocides on biological aspects of the spider, *Chericanthium jovium* Denis (Araneida: Eutichuridae) at Fayoum Governorate

# El-Khouly, N. M.\*

Plant Protection Dept., Fac. of Agric., Fayoum Univ.

# **ABSTRACT:**

The present work were conducted to determine the effect of two biocides (*i.g.*, Dipel Df and Biofly) on the biological aspects of true spider, *Chericanthium jovium* Denis which collected from tomato fields at laboratory conditions  $(25\pm1^{\circ}C \text{ and } 75\pm5\% \text{ R.H.})$ . Both the biocides not effected on biological parameters of this predator, when reared on treated larvae of *Spodoptera littoralis* Boisd.

**KEYWORDS:** *Chericanthium jovium,* biological parameters, Spodoptera littoralis, Dipel Df and Biofly.

# **1- INTRODUCTION:**

The spiders important are predaceous, feeding mostly on insect pests (Sallam, 1996, El-Khouly, 2016 and Ahmed, 2018). It is important to study the different ecological and biological aspects of the spiders to maximize their important role as biological control agents (Rahil, 1988, Ghabbour et al, 1999 and Mohafez, 2006). The chemical pesticides very harmful and highly effects on the spiders and the other organisms in the environment (Abd-Elgayed, 2004) while the safe biocides, (*i.e.* the fungal pesticides and the bacterial pesicides) neither low effective

nor no effect on this the beneficial organisms (Youssef and Abd-Elgayed, 2015).

Family of the species *Chericanthium jovium* Eutichuridae is one of the big families of spiders, it includes 347 species of 12 genera, distributed all over the world (Rakha et al., 1999 and El-Sebaay, 2003).

The present work was determined to evaluate the efficacy the biocides (Dipel Df and Biofly) on biological aspects of the spider *Chericanthium jovium* at lab. condition.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author Email: : ⊠nma01@fayoum.edu.eg Received: 9 /11 / 2023 - Accepted: 19/12/ 2023 - Published: 22/2/2024

# **2- MATERIALS AND METHODS:**

The present experiments were conducted at laboratory of plant protection Faculty of Agriculture, Department, Fayoum University under conditions of (25±1°C & 75±5%R.H.). Adult females of Chericanthium jovium were collected from tomato plants at Fayoum Governorate and reared during the period from 1<sup>st</sup> March to end of July 2022. For making pure culture from the spider species; adult females were collected and placed in plastic box (3cm dia. &5cm high), supplied with prey, kept to laboratory and lift until deposit eggs. Newly hatched spider lings were transferred to other cells. The number of preying capacity were counted, recorded and replaced by fresh ones. The newly hatched spider lings fed on the prey until molting, then isolated singly in another cell and examined every day (Ahmed, 2018).

### **Rearing of the prey:**

The cotton leaf worm larvae of *S. littoralis* were obtained from Agricultural Research Centre, Cairo, Egypt and were reared on fresh leaves of caster bean (*Ricinus communis*) under laboratory condition (Adham et al., 2009 and Youssef& Abd-Elgayed, 2015). As larvae reached to the 2<sup>nd</sup> instars, they were used in the experiments.

## **Tested compounds:**

Commercial formulations of the following insecticides tested against  $2^{nd}$  instar larvae of *S. littoralis* were obtained from the Agriculture Research Centre, Cairo, Egypt. Dipel-Df (WP) 6.4%: commercial product

# **3- RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:**

# 1. Effect of the Biocides on larvae of *S. littoralis*

Efficacies of four concentrations of all tested insecticides on  $2^{nd}$  instar larvae of *S. littoralis* at 7 days treatment were

formulation contains  $32 \times 10^{3}$ Iu/mg of the bacterium, *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *Kurstaki* and Biofly (WP): commercial product formulation contains  $30 \times 10^{6}$ spores/mg of the fungus *Beauvera bassiana*. (Yousief& Abd-Elgayed, 2015).

## **Bioassay:**

The biological activities of Bt formulation and fungi, each at four concentration were prepared in distilled water and used against  $2^{nd}$  instar of S. littoralis larvae by using the dipping leaf technique (Ahmed, 2009). The clean leaves were dipped in solution of the desired concentration of Bt or biofly commercial formulation Dipel Df, (Bacillus thuringionsis) and Biofly (Beauveria bassiana). Each leaf was dipped for 30 second, then heed individually in petri-dish (9 cm diameter). The castor bean leaves for treatment of S. littoralis were treated with sterile distilled water for control. Then ten larvae from 2<sup>nd</sup> instars were separately placed in each petri dish for each treatment. Four dishes were used as replicates for each treatment and control.

Accumtative larval mortality was recorded and corrected by using Abbott's formula (Abbott, 1925). Afterwards, the corresponding concentration probit line, were estimated in addition to determining 50% mortalities and slope values of tested compound (Finney, 1971). Data were analyzed by ANOVA and the means were separated using the Duncan's multiple range test (Duncan, 1955).

presented in **table** (1). The lowest mortality (55%) was recorded at 0.5gm/L,

while the highest (100%) were recorded at 4gm/L for biocide, Dipel Df. While on the biocide, Biofly, the percentages of mortalities ranged between

#### El-Khouly, N. M.

(40-77.5%) at the concentrations (1-8gm/L).

| Table 1 | : Accumi  | lated     | correct | ed m | ortality | v percentage | s after ' | 7 day             | s of   | treatme | nt by | y          |
|---------|-----------|-----------|---------|------|----------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|--------|---------|-------|------------|
|         | some co   | ommer     | cial Bt | and  | fungi f  | formulations | against   | 2 <sup>nd</sup> i | instar | larvae  | of S  | <u>5</u> . |
|         | littorali | <b>S.</b> |         |      | _        |              | -         |                   |        |         |       |            |

| Formulation | Conc.gm/L | Mortality  |  |
|-------------|-----------|--|--|
|             | 0.5       | 55   |  |
|             | 1         | 62.5   |  |
| DipelDf     | 2         | 87.5   |  |
| -           | 4         | 100  |  |
|             | Mean      | 76.25  |  |
|             | 1         | 40   |  |
| D. CI       | 2         | 50   |  |
| Biofly      | 4         | Mortality           55           62.5           87.5           100           76.25           40           50           55           77.5           55.63 |  |
|             | 8         | 77.5   |  |
|             | Mean      | 55.63  |  |

The LC<sub>50</sub>, values of the tested compound against  $2^{nd}$  instar larvae of *S. littoralis*, recording 1.13 and 2.75 for Dipel and Biofly, respectively. According to the

values of  $LC_{50}$  and slope, Dipel was high toxic on larvae of *S. littoralis* than Biofly. (Table 2)

 Table 2: Lethal concentration of Bt and Biofly formulation against 2<sup>nd</sup> instar larvae of S.

 *littoralis*

| Formulation | LC <sub>50</sub> (gm/L) (spores/ml) | Slope |  |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--|
| Dipel-Df    | 1.13                                | 3.07  |  |
| Biofly      | 2.75                                | 1.23  |  |

These results agree with Meshrief al., (2007), recorded that the et hyphomycete fungi effected on the development of the cotton leaf worm Spodoptera littoralis. Krthikeyan and Selvanarayanan (2011) reported that the bioassay with B. bassiana against S. littoralis percent mortality increased from 33.33 to 86.67% as the dose increased from 0.15 to 0.25%. Haggag, 2013 who reported that Dipel DF, Dipel 2x and Delfin high killed S. littoralis larvae, followed by Agry, Protecto and Agerin, respectively. Also, Youssef and Abd-Elgayed (2015), reported that the bacterial cides (Dipel DF, W.Bus and Protecto) were high toxic to 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> instars larvae of S. littoralis compared with Biofly.

#### 2. Effect of the Biocides on the spider *Chericanthium jovium* 2.1. Opineoition:

# 2.1. Oviposition:

Adult female of the spider, *C. jovium* requires a pre-oviposition period before depositing the egg sacs. The average period was 9.1 days under laboratory conditions  $(25\pm1^{\circ}C \& 75\pm5 \% R.H.)$ . female usually stopped feeding for one day before beginning oviposition and devoated her effort to web silky webbing by her spinnerets. Number of deposited egg sacs per mated females 4.8 egg sac, during the oviposition period under

#### El-Khouly, N. M.

laboratory condition. The oviposition period was 65.4 days while, the postoviposition period was 46.4 days (**table 3**). The total number of eggs average of 120.4 eggs. The female longevity and fecundity of the spider *C. jovium* fed on larvae of *S. littoralis* treated with  $LC_{50}$  of the biocides Dipel DF and Biofly were affected non significantly compared with control.

The values of preoviposition, oviposition, postoviposition, longevity,

#### FJARD VOL. 38, NO. 1. PP. 114-120 (2024)

number of egg sac/female and total number of eggs/females were 9.1 day, 60.2 day, 40.6 day, 110.33 day, 4.1 egg sac and 118.6 eggs for the treatment with Dipel DF and were 8.9 day, 62.1 day, 43.6 day 113.3 day, 4.6 egg sac and 120.4 eggs for the treatment with Biofly. (**Table 3**) Adult longevity differed according to sex. Generally, males lived for a shorter period than females. Adult males longevity was 53.2 days, whereas females 88.5 days.

Table 3: Female longevity and fecundity of spider, *C. jovium* fed on larvae of *S. littoralis* treated with LC<sub>50</sub> of the biocides Dipel DF and Biofly under Laboratory condition.

| condition                    |                 |                 |                 |             |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Parameters                   | <b>Dipel DF</b> | Biofly          | Control         | Duncan test |
| Pre-oviposition              | 9.1±2.1         | 8.9±2.2         | 9.1±2.5         | 2.30        |
| Oviposition                  | $60.2 \pm 2.1$  | 62.1±3.6        | 65.4±3.7        | 4.90        |
| Post-oviposition             | $40.6 \pm 3.1$  | 43.6±2.9        | $46.4 \pm 0.9$  | 7.20        |
| Longevity                    | 110.33±3.6      | 113.3±3.4       | $140.8 \pm 4.7$ | 31.6        |
| Number of egg sac/female     | $4.1 \pm 0.90$  | 4.6±1.2         | $4.8 \pm 0.96$  | 1.2         |
| Total number of eggs/ female | $118.6 \pm 5.2$ | $120.4 \pm 5.3$ | 120.4±6.3       | 2.9         |

# 2.2. Duration of different immature stages of *C. jovium* fed on treated $2^{nd}$ instar larvae of *S. littoralis*

# 2.2.1. Incubation Period:

The incubation periods were 17.2, 16.9 and 17.0 days for females of the spider treated with Dipel DF, Biofly and control, respectively. The means differed insignificantly compared with control, while the respective values for the males were 17.3, 17.0 and 17.0 days.

### FJARD VOL. 38, NO. 1. PP. 114-120 (2024)

# 2.2.2. Total of duration

The total duration of females and males were (92.5, 89.5& 88.5 days) and (58.4, 34.3& 53.2 days), respectively with non-significant differences.

## 2.2.3. Total of life cycle:-

The total of life cycle of the spider, C. jovium females longer than the males. The values recorded 118.3, 110.4 and 109.2 days for the females treated with Dipel DF, Biofly and control. The same values shorted to 91.2, 88.3 and 86.2 days for males. (Table, 4)

#### El-Khouly, N. M.

#### FJARD VOL. 38, NO. 1. PP. 114-120 (2024)

| stages                     | Duration (days) |        |         |        |          |        |         |        |  |  |
|----------------------------|-----------------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|--|--|
|                            | Females         |        |         |        | Males    |        |         |        |  |  |
|                            | Dipel DF        | Biofly | Control | Duncan | Dipel DF | Biofly | Control | Duncan |  |  |
|                            |                 |        |         | test   |          |        |         | test   |  |  |
| Incubation                 | 17.2            | 16.9   | 17.0    | 1.9    | 17.3     | 17.0   | 17.0    | 1.96   |  |  |
| period                     | ±               | ±      | ±       |        | ±        | ±      | ±       |        |  |  |
|                            | 1.2             | 1.3    | 1.9     |        | 1.1      | 0.96   | 1.8     |        |  |  |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> spiderling | 13.7            | 12.8   | 12.6    | 1.8    | 11.9     | 12.0   | 10.9    | 1.66   |  |  |
|                            | ±               | ±      | ±       |        | ±        | ±      | ±       |        |  |  |
|                            | 2.1             | 2.1    | 2.1     |        | .96      | 1.2    | 2.4     |        |  |  |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> spiderling | 20.4            | 19.4   | 19.3    | 2.1    | 15.3     | 13.4   | 14.2    | 1.33   |  |  |
|                            | ±               | ±      | ±       |        | ±        | ±      | ±       |        |  |  |
|                            | 3.1             | 3.1    | 2.3     |        | 0.53     | 0.96   | 2.1     |        |  |  |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> spiderling | 13.6            | 14.1   | 13.2    | 2.9    | 9.4      | 8.7    | 8.6     | 0.98   |  |  |
|                            | ±               | ±      | ±       |        | ±        | ±      | ±       |        |  |  |
|                            | 2.1             | 2.4    | 1.2     |        | 1.02     | 0.93   | 2.3     |        |  |  |
| 4 <sup>th</sup> spiderling | 14.2            | 14.7   | 13.9    | 1.9    | 12.9     | 10.8   | 11.9    | 2.1    |  |  |
|                            | ±               | ±      | ±       |        | ±        | ±      | ±       |        |  |  |
|                            | 3.1             | 3.2    | 2.1     |        | 1.11     | 1.20   | 2.4     |        |  |  |
| 5 <sup>th</sup> spiderling | 15.3            | 15.6   | 14.8    | 0.96   | 13.0     | 13.0   | 12.0    | 1.95   |  |  |
|                            | ±               | ±      | ±       |        | ±        | ±      | ±       |        |  |  |
| _                          | 2.0             | 4.2    | 2.1     |        | 1.31     | 1.6    | 0.96    |        |  |  |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> spiderling | 16.3            | 15.6   | 15.2    | 1.24   | -        | -      | -       | -      |  |  |
|                            | ±               | ±      | ±       |        |          |        |         |        |  |  |
|                            | 1.7             | 2.3    | 1.3     |        |          |        |         |        |  |  |
| Total                      | 92.5            | 89.5   | 88.5    | 6.2    | 58.4     | 54.3   | 53.2    | 7.3    |  |  |
|                            | ±               | ±      | ±       |        | ±        | ±      | ±       |        |  |  |
|                            | 1.8             | 2.3    | 1.6     |        | 3.7      | 2.9    | 3.4     |        |  |  |
| Life cycle                 | 118.3           | 110.4  | 109.2   | 7.3    | 91.2     | 88.3   | 86.2    | 6.4    |  |  |
|                            | ±               | ±      | ±       |        | ±        | ±      | ±       |        |  |  |
|                            | 3.4             | 2.4    | 3.2     |        | 3.2      | 2.6    | 1.2     |        |  |  |

| Table 4: | Duration o | of different  | immature  | stages | of <i>C.</i> | jovium  | fed | on | treated | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | instar |
|----------|------------|---------------|-----------|--------|--------------|---------|-----|----|---------|-----------------|--------|
|          | larvae of  | S. littoralis | under Lat | orator | y cond       | lition. |     |    |         |                 |        |

Generally, the application of Dipel DF or Biofly effected significantly on the larvae of *S. littoralis* and effected insignificantly on the spider *C. jovium.* 

The abovementioned results are agreement with the same treatments that recorded by (Ahmed, 2009; Yousef& Abd-Elgayed, 2015; El-Khouly, 2016 and Ahmed, 2018).

So, used the integrated pest management (IPM) for control the larvae of *S. littoralis* by used the biocides Dipel DF, Biofly and by used the predator, *C. jovium* in tomato fields for production safe foods and protect the environment from the hazard pesticides.

#### **4- REFERENCES:**

- Abbott, W. S. 1925. A method of computing effectiveness of an insecticide, *J. Econ. Entomol*, 18: 265-267.
- Abdel Gayed , A. A. 2004. Studies on effect of some pesticide residues on some pests attacking tomato and associated predators, Ph.D. Thesis , Fayoum Fac. of Agric., Cairo Univ. pp. 141.
- Adham, Fatma K.; Eman, M. Rashad; S.F. Ibrahim and Enas, E. Nasr 2009. Host plants shifting affects the biology and biochemistry of *Spodoptera littoralis* Biosd (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae)., Egypt. Acad. J. Biolog. Sci., 2 (1): 63-71.
- Ahmed, H.S.K. 2018. Biological studies on the true spiders *Chericanthium isiacum* O. Pickard, 1874 (Arachnida: Araneida: Eutichuridae) in Egypt, J. Plant Protec. and Path., Mansoura Univ., 9(5): 321-324.
- Ahmed, M. 2009. Observed potentiation between pyerthroid and organophosphours insecticides for the management of *Spodoptera litura* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Crop protection, 28:264-268.
- **Duncan, D.B. 1955.** The multiple range multiple F. test. Biometrics, 11:1-42.
- El-Khouly, N. M. 2016. Ecological studies on the spiders in Fayoum Governorate with effect of some insecticides on some biological and histological aspects of the spider, *Anelosimus aulicus*, Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. of Agric., Fayoum Univ.
- El-Sebaay, M. M.I. 2003. Studies on some true spider associated with certain fruit trees in Ismailia Governorate, M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Al-Azhar Univ.
- **Finney, D. F. 1971**:Probit analysis, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. *Cambridge Univ., London.*
- Ghabbour, S.I.; Hussein, A.M. and El-Hennawy, H.K. 1999. Spider population associated with different crops in

Menoufyia Governorate, Nile Delta, Egypt. J of Agric. Res., 77(3): 1163-1179.

- Haggag, Karima, H.E. 2013. Changes in profile of cotton leaf worm, *Spodoptera littoralis* induced by Bt formulations stored at cold and hot storage conditions. Nature and Science, 11 (7): 77-85.
- Karthikeyan, A. and Selvanarayanan, V. 2011. In vitro efficacy of *Beauveria bassiana* (Bals) and *Verticillium lecanii* (Zimm) against selected insect pests of cotton. Science and Technology, 3(2):781-793.
- Meshrif, W.S.; Barakat, E.M.S.; Rohifs, M.; Shehata, M.G.; Seif, A.I. and Hegazi, M.A.M. 2007. Evaluation of testing four hyphomycete fungi against the development of the cotton leaf worm *Spodoptera littoralis* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), J. Egypt, Acad. Soc. Environ. Develop., 8(3):11-20.
- Mohafez, M.A.M. 2006.: Life history of *Chericanthium isiacum* O. P. Cambridge, 1874 (Arachnida: Araneida: Miturgidae) in Egypt, Serket, 10(1): 44-47.
- **Rahil, A.A.R. 1988**. Ecological and biological studies on the spiders at Fayoum, M.Sc. Thesis, Cairo Univ.
- Rakha, M.A.; Nawar, M.S. and Sallam, G.M.E. 1999: Biology of the spider, *Chericanthium jovium* (Araneida: Clubionidae), Egypt. J. Agric. Res., 77(4):1619-1625.
- Sallam, G.M.E. 1996. Studies on true spiders in Giza Governorate, M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ.
- Yousef, Narmen, A. and Abd Elgayed, A.A. 2015. Evaluation of some commercial formulations against *Spodoptera littoralis* and *Hypera brunneippennis* larvae. Annals of Agric. Sci. Mashtohor, 53(2): 295-302.