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#### Abstract

The host and stage preference of Acanthaspis pedestris Stal an important reduvid predator of many insect pests in South India were studied using four cotton pests, such as Earias insulana Boisdual, Helicoverpa armigera (Hubner), Pectinophora gossypiella Saunders and Spodoptera litura (Fabricius). The functional response was also studied on $P$. gossypiella. The results revealed that medium sized larvae were preferred in case of $E$. insulana ( $78.87 \%$ ), $H$. armigera $(83.33 \%)$ and $S$. litura ( $66.66 \%$ ) while in case of $P$. gossypiella $(75.0 \%)$, only larger larvae were preferred by the predator. The bug preferred P.gossypiella ( $\mathbf{3 1 . 2 8 \%}$ ) to H. armigera ( $\mathbf{2 9 . 7 4 \%}$ ). Functional response showed a linear relationship between the number of prey offered and the number consumed. The females were found to be better predators than the males.
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Acanthaspis pedestris Stal is an important predator of Earias. insulana, Boisdual, Helicoverpa armigera ( Hbn ) (Ambrose, 1988; and Ambrose and Sahayaraj, 1991), Pectinophora gossypiella Saunders and Spodoptera litura F . (Sahayaraj, 1991). Inundative releases of $A$. pedestris have been found effective against pest population (Ambrose, 1988; Sahayaraj, 1991). Considering its biocontrol potential, studies were conducted to generate information on its preference to prey species and stage of prey and its functional response to $P$. gossypiella.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Nymphs and adults of $A$. pedestris were collected from Sivanthipatti scrub jungle and semiarid zone ecosystems, bordering cotton agroecosystems ( $77^{\circ} .47^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ and $8^{\circ} .39^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ ), Nellai Kattabomman district, Tamil Nadu, India. They were reared under laboratory conditions (temperature $\quad 30-32^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; RH $75-85 \%$; photoperiod 11-13 hours) in separate plastic containers ( $6 \times 5 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) on $H$. armigera. The larvae of E.insulana, H.armigera, P. gossypiet-
la and $S$. litura were reared in the laboratory. To study the stage preference, larvae of above said pest species in 3 different size (small, medium and large) were offered separately to 2 days-old male and female of the predator in a plastic container ( $7 \times 8 \mathrm{~cm}$ ). The experiment was replicated 13 times. Once the stage preference was known, prey preference studies were conducted by introducing the preferred larval stages of the four prey species in plastic container containing 2 day-old male and female of A.pedestris and observations were recorded continuously for 24 hours. The experiment was replicated 13 times.

The functional response was observed at varying densities viz., 1,2,3,4,5 and 6. In each set, a single predator was released. The experiment was run for 24 hours and thereafter the number of prey consumed was counted. The experiment was replicated 10 times. Holling 'disc' equation (Holling, 1959) method was followed to describe the functional response of A. pedestris on P. gossypiella.

Table 1. Stage preference (in \%) of A. pedestris on four cotton pests ( $n=13, X \pm S E$ )

| Name of the pest | Stages of the pest |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Small | Medium | Big |
| E. insulana | 0 | 78.87 | 21.13 |
| L | $0.61 \pm 0.23$ | $0.92 \pm 0.03$ | $1.33 \pm 0.02$ |
| w | $13.92 \pm 0.71$ | $26.67 \pm 2.06$ | $70.40 \pm 3.62$ |
| H. armigera | 23.33 | 83.33 | 16.66 |
| L | $1.30 \pm 0.05$ | $1.71 \pm 0.04$ | $2.47 \pm 0.06$ |
| W | $99.42 \pm 8.99$ | $155.45 \pm 6.87$ | $287.72 \pm 16.23$ |
| P. gossypiella | 0 | 25.00 | 75.00 |
| L | $0.20 \pm 0.01$ | $0.81 \pm 0.05$ | $1.10 \pm 0.04$ |
| W | $8.12 \pm 0.35$ | $19.38 \pm 2.14$ | $33.56 \pm 0.90$ |
| S. litura | 16.66 | 66.66 | 16.66 |
| L | $1.57 \pm 0.08$ | $1.82 \pm 0.02$ | $2.74 \pm 0.13$ |
| W | $20.13 \pm 1.62$ | $87.68 \pm 3.00$ | $165.41 \pm 11.68$ |

L - Length; W - width of the prey (in mm)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results showed that $A$. pedestris preferred medium sized pest viz., E. insulana H. armigera and S. litura respectively (Table 1). Similar observation was made by Bose (1949) and Weseloh (1988). When P. gossypiella was offered to A. pedestris, it preferred larger size prey ( $75.0 \%$ ) which conforms to the observation of Vanderplank (1958) in Platymeris rhadamanthus Gerst, a reduviid predator on Oryctes monoceros (Olive). A. pedestris did not attempt to prey upon $E$. insulana and $P$. gossypiella which were smaller when compared to their own body size. A similar observation was made by Salt (1967) and Wilson (1976).

The host preference was evaluated continuously for 5 days and the mean preference
(in $\%$ ) is presented in table 2 . The preference was significantly higher for $P$. gossypiella followed by $H$. armigera then for S. litura and $E$. insulana. The soft cuticle and slow movements of $P$. gossypiella might have enhanced the prey preference by the predator. Moreover, when the predator captured $H$. armigera, it omitted a viscous defensive fluid which compelled the predator invariably to leave off the prey and only after some time the predator could again hold the same prey and suck the body fluid. Strong (1967) and Nault et al. (1973) observed that the prey species produced defensive.secretion from the cornicle at the time of predatory behaviour. Similar reports were also made by Sahayaraj (1991) in other reduviids viz., Ectomocoris tibialis Distant and Catamiarus brevipennis Serville on $H$. armigera. Even though $H$. armigera produced defensive secre-

Table 2. Prey preference (in \%) of A. pedestris on four cotton pests for five days ( $\mathbf{n}=13$ )

| Day | Name of the pest |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | E. insulana | H. armigera | P. gossypiella | S. litura |
| 1 | 17.94 | 33.33 | 28.20 | 20.52 |
| 2 | 15.38 | 25.64 | 30.77 | 28.20 |
| 3 | 12.82 | 23.07 | 30.77 | 33.33 |
| 4 | 17.94 | 33.33 | 33.33 | 15.38 |
| 5 | 28.20 | 33.33 | 33.33 | 05.13 |
| Mean | 18.45 | 29.74 | 31.28 | 20.51 |

Table 3. Functional response of $\boldsymbol{A}$. pedestris on large sized $P$. gossypiella at six prey densities ( $n=10$ )

| Prey density (x) | Prey attacked (y) | Attack ratio ( $y / x$ ) | Day's per y <br> (b) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Day's } \\ \text { attacked (by) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { searching } \\ \text { Ts=Tt-by } \end{gathered}$ | Rate of discovery $a=y / x / T s$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.06 | 0.93 | 1.07 |
| 2 | 2.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.13 | 0.87 | 1.15 |
| 3 | 3.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.19 | 0.81 | 1.23 |
| 4 | 3.2 | 0.8 |  | 0.20 | 0.80 | 1.00 |
| 5 | 3.6 | 0.72 |  | 0.23 | 0.77 | 0.93 |
| 6 | 3.4 | 0.56 | 0.064 | 0.22 | 0.72 | 0.77 |
| $\begin{gathered} y^{\prime}=1.02(1.0-0.17) x \\ \text { Female } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.04 | 0.96 | 1.04 |
| 2 | 2.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.07 | 0.93 | 1.07 |
| 3 | 3.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.11 | 0.89 | 1.12 |
| 4 | 3.7 | 0.9 |  | 0.14 | 0.86 | 1.07 |
| 5 | 3.9 | 0.8 |  | 0.15 | 0.85 | 0.91 |
| 6 | 3.8 | 0.6 | 0.038 | 0.14 | 0.86 | 0.73 |
| $y^{\prime}=0.99(1.0-0.11) x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

tion, A.pedestris preferred it after $P$. gossypiella suggesting the predator's efficiency.
A.pedestris positively responded to the increasing prey density by effectively suppressing them. The functional response of the A.pedestris was confined to the type 2 model of Holling (1959) and could be explained by a linear relationship between the number of prey consumed and initial number of prey (Table 3). The number of A. gossypiella larvae killed (Y) by the male and female predators increased as the prey density increased and reached its peak at 5 prey density and thereafter the consumption level tended to stabilize (no further increase by "Y" was evident). Similar trend was reported in other assassin bugs (Ables, 1978; Ambrose and Kumaraswami, 1990).

The female predator was found to be more vigorous in suppressing the prey density than male predator which was reflected by the higher K/Tt value ( 3.9 prey) recorded for the female predator. The female also took lesser time ( 0.038 days) for handling the prey than the males ( 0.064 days) (Table 3). The present results are in line with the observation of Bass
and Shepard (1974). This is obviously due to the higher nutritional requirement of the females for reproduction.
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