

In the F<sub>1</sub> generation, the LD<sub>50</sub>'s for permethrin and permethrin:chlordimeform were 4.8 and 4.9 ug/g, respectively, producing a SR of less than one. In the F<sub>12</sub> generation, the LD<sub>50</sub> values for permethrin and permethrin:chlordimeform were 180 and 51 ug/g, respectively, demonstrating a SR of 3.5. The difference at the 95% mortality level was even more striking. LD<sub>95</sub> values for permethrin and permethrin:chlordimeform were 1200 and 200 ug/g, respectively, yielding a 6-fold SR.

### EFFECTS OF INSECTICIDE APPLICATIONS ON PINK BOLLWORM PHEROMONE TRAP CATCHES

R. T. Huber, Entomologist and C. E. Chesser, Graduate Assistant,  
University of Arizona

The effects of trap placement and insecticide applications were evaluated in two Pima cotton fields in the Marana area. Eleven oil-type pink bollworm pheromone traps were placed throughout the interior of each field at least 100 yards from any end/edge, and six traps were placed at the field edges 25 feet from the row ends, or 12 feet from field edges.

All traps were serviced and emptied on a schedule that resulted in each trap catch period being identical relative to pre-spray catches and post-spray catches. Four applications were made at six day intervals. The following table presents the results of this research.

#### Average Pink Bollworm Pheromone Trap Catches

	2 methyl parathion + azinphosmethyl sprays on alternate dates		4 permethrin sprays	
	Borders	Middles	Borders	Middles
average catch/trap 3 days before spray	150	170	192	131
average catch/trap 3 days after spray	256	257	155	80

The data from this research point out a number of interesting problems related to interpreting pheromone trap catches once a spray program has begun.

1. Trap catches increased after the applications of the two organophosphate insecticides and decreased after the applications of the permethrin.
2. Although the trap catches were very different in the two insecticide type comparisons, larval infestation in susceptible bolls in both program fields were maintained at similar low levels. This indicates that pheromone trap catches of male moths do not reflect spray efficacy against female moths and/or larvae.
3. Variability in border trap catches is such that catches can be higher, lower or about equal to middle traps when compared on a pre-spray vs past-spray basis.

#### **Conclusions**

These data indicate that extreme caution should be exercised when pheromone trap catches alone are used to evaluate the efficacy of various insecticides in suppressing pink bollworm infestations in cotton. In addition, the application of insecticides in a cotton field to suppress Heliothis spp. or lygus bugs, may have drastic effects on pink bollworm pheromone trap catches. In either case, the use of pheromone trap data in pink bollworm management and prediction programs is complicated by the effect of insecticide applications in cotton.

We thank Art Pacheco of Evco Farms, Marana, and ICI America for their cooperation and support in this study.

#### **PHEROMONE STUDIES**

**H. M. Flint, Research Entomologist, Western Cotton Research Laboratory, ARS, USDA, Phoenix, Arizona**

The Z,Z-isomer of gossyplure in microencapsulated and laminated flake dispensers depressed trap catches and mating of laboratory females in mating stations equivalent to gossyplure at the same rate. A comparison of large drop (point source) and spray applications of microencapsulated pheromone materials indicated that more active ingredients must be applied by spray to achieve communication disruption.

#### **PHEROMONE**

**L. A. Bariola, Research Entomologist, Western Cotton Research Laboratory, ARS, USDA, Phoenix, Arizona**

In laboratory tests using a wind tunnel 8' x 2' x 2' high, male moths were killed when the pheromone release formulation, applied to potted plants, contained both pheromone and an