

1 **In Press, Pre-Proof Version**

2 **Demographic Performance of *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* (Boyd) (Lepidoptera:**  
3 **Gelechiidae) on Eight Prevalent Sugar Beet Cultivars**

4 Abolfazl Razini<sup>1</sup>, Ali Ahadiyat<sup>1</sup>, Aziz Sheikhi Garjan<sup>3</sup>, and Yaghoub Fathipour<sup>2\*</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup> Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran.

7 <sup>2</sup> Department of Entomology, Faculty of Agriculture, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Islamic Republic  
8 of Iran.

9 <sup>3</sup> Iranian Research Institute of Plant Protection, Agricultural Research, Education and Extension  
10 Organization (AREEO), Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran.

11 **\*Corresponding author; e-mail: fathi@modares.ac.ir**

12 **ABSTRACT**

13 The sugar beet moth, *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* (Boyd) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) is one of the most  
14 serious threats to sugar beet cultivation worldwide causing economically significant yield loss.  
15 The life table parameters of *S. ocellatella* were determined on eight sugar beet cultivars (Dorothea,  
16 Ekbatan, Merak, Palma, Rozier, SBSI 007, Sharif and Shokoofa) under laboratory conditions at  
17 25±1°C, 60±5% RH and 16:8 h (L:D) photoperiod. The longest (15.29 days) and shortest (7.61  
18 days) female longevity was recorded on Shokoofa, and Merak cultivars, respectively. At the same  
19 time, Shokoofa and Merak cultivars had the highest and lowest total fecundity (85.26 eggs/female)  
20 and (32.39 eggs/female), respectively. The net reproductive rate ( $R_0$ ) varied from 9.31  
21 eggs/individual to 39.44 eggs/individual on eight sugar beet cultivars; the lowest value was on  
22 Merak and the highest value was on Shokoofa. The highest intrinsic rate of increase ( $r$ ) (0.102 d<sup>-1</sup>)  
23 and finite rate of increase ( $\lambda$ ) (1.107 d<sup>-1</sup>) were on the Shokoofa cultivar. The results showed that  
24 all life table parameters of *S. ocellatella* were significantly different on the sugar beet cultivars  
25 tested. According to the conducted laboratory experiments, Merak was the most resistant cultivar  
26 to *S. ocellatella* compared with the other cultivars tested.

27 **Keywords:** Host plant resistance, Life table, Sugar beet cultivar, Sugar beet moth.

28  
29 **INTRODUCTION**

30 Sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.) is a very important and specialized agricultural product that is used  
31 in the sugar industry. In addition to sugar, sugar beet is a source of a variety of carbohydrate-based  
32 products (Duraisam *et al.*, 2017). It is an important industrial crop that has been cultivated in many  
33 regions of Iran including Khuzestan province (Yarahmadi *et al.*, 2022). In 2017, the global

34 production of sugar was 179 million tons and it is expected to reach 210 million tons by 2026 with  
35 an average annual growth of 1.7% (Noroozi *et al.*, 2022).

36 A diverse range of pests inflict damage on sugar beet during its lengthy 180-day growing season,  
37 thereby reducing crop yield (Bazazo and Mashaal, 2014; Mansour *et al.*, 2022). Studies have  
38 shown that the sugar beet moth *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* (Boyd, 1858) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae)  
39 has become a serious threat to sugar beet production in recent years (Schrameyer, 2005; Al-  
40 Keridis, 2016; Kandil *et al.*, 2023). The specific pest, *S ocellatella* is an oligophagous insect that  
41 is found in almost all sugar, fodder, and wild beet growing areas in Iran (Ganji and Moharamipour,  
42 2017). The eggs are laid on the central bud as well as the root collar and the larvae damage the  
43 plant on the backside of the young leaves by creating a tunnel and piping the edge of the leaf until  
44 they reach the central bud finally the root. Therefore, this pest reduces the growth and consequently  
45 the quantity and quality of the crop (Valic *et al.*, 2005; Razini *et al.*, 2017). Hitherto, various  
46 researchs have been conducted on sugar beet moth in terms of biology, cold hardiness strategy  
47 (Valich *et al.*, 2005; Ganji and Moharamipour, 2017), biological control and pest management  
48 methods (Kheiri, 1991; Odinkoy *et al.*, 1993; Arnaudov *et al.*, 2012).

49 In Iran, the pest infestation rate ranges from 20% to 25% under field conditions and can reduce  
50 root yield by 2.3 to 3.8 tons per hectare with 0.5% to 1.15% sugar loss (Razini *et al.*, 2016). Studies  
51 on sugar beet moth in Iran showed that the percentage of plants infested with this pest would  
52 reached 85% (Kheiri, 1991). Regarding other countries, it has been reported that *S. ocellatella* can  
53 infest 93.3% of sugar beet fields with 4.6 larvae per plant in Serbia (Camprag *et al.*, 2004). In  
54 Slovenia, the economic injury level of this pest has been determined to be 4–5 larvae per plant  
55 (Valic *et al.*, 2005).

56 Currently, considering the concealed activity of sugar beet larvae in the central bud, it is difficult  
57 to control damage. However, the most important method to control the sugar beet moth is the use  
58 of insecticides, which, in addition to environmental risks, are harmful to beneficial insects. There  
59 are many problems with chemical control of the pest due to the larval behavior as well as and  
60 development of resistance to a wide range of insecticides (Adamski *et al.*, 2005).

61 The use of resistant plant cultivars is an eco-friendly and effective approach within a framework  
62 of integrated pest management, and this approach can be considered as one of the reliable control  
63 methods (La Rossa *et al.*, 2013; Talaei *et al.*, 2017). Knowing about the influencing attributes of  
64 host plants can provide a platform for designing a proper integrated crop management (ICM)

65 program (Fathipour *et al.*, 2019). In addition to being compatible with the environment, resistant  
66 cultivars are also low-cost in a long time (Abbasipour *et al.*, 2012). Considering that the pest  
67 population is affected by many factors such as the quality of the food source, there is a positive  
68 correlation between host plant suitability and the intrinsic population growth rate of the herbivores  
69 (Ghaderi *et al.*, 2017).

70 The life table is one of the most important tools in entomological research because it provides  
71 useful information for organizing age-specific mortality and insect survival, as well as providing  
72 clear details of the true characteristics of a group (Carey, 2001; Kakde *et al.*, 2014). Determining  
73 the life table parameters can deepen our understanding of host plant resistance and facilitate efforts  
74 to reduce pesticide use (Fathipour and Mirhosseini, 2017).

75 The purpose of the research is to investigate the effect of eight commercial sugar beet cultivars on  
76 the demographic parameters of the sugar beet moth *S. ocellatella* in order to find a more resistant  
77 cultivar to this noxious pest.

78

## 79 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 80 **Cultivation of the Host Plant**

81 The seeds of eight sugar beet cultivars, including Ekbatan, Shokoofa, Sharif, SBSI 007, Palma,  
82 Dorothea, Merak, and Rozier (common cultivars in Iran) were obtained from Sugar Beet Seed  
83 Institute (SBSI), Karaj, Iran. The cultivars were grown in 25 cm diameter plastic pots in the SBSI  
84 research greenhouse, with each cultivar's pots arranged separately within a mesh cage. The soil of  
85 the pots included sand, perlite, and clay. No pesticides or fertilizers were used during the  
86 experiments.

87

### 88 **Rearing the Sugar Beet Moth**

89 When the sugar beet seedlings reached the 8–10 leaf stage, the initial population of the sugar beet  
90 moth *S. ocellatella* including various larval instars, was collected from the research area near Karaj  
91 city and transferred to pots (each cultivar in a net cage). Before starting the experiment, the sugar  
92 beet moth was reared in the greenhouse for three generations on each cultivar to ensure their  
93 impact.

94 Preadult duration, adult longevity, total life span, daily and total fecundity, duration of oviposition  
95 period, survival rate, and other parameters were evaluated by demographic tests conducted on each  
96 cultivar (Fathipour and Maleknia, 2016).

97 In the experiments, adult moths that emerged from the larvae reared on different cultivars were  
98 employed. Both sexes of the moth that had been reared on the tested cultivars were kept in  
99 oviposition containers (clear jars containers with a net lid and containing 10% honey cotton for  
100 feeding) and allowed to lay eggs on fresh leaves of each cultivar. The young eggs (less than 24  
101 hours old) were individually transferred to the experimental units. The resistance evaluation test  
102 for each cultivar was carried out by placing 80 same-aged eggs of the sugar beet moth in the central  
103 bud of the sugar beet plant and each unit was individually transferred to a Petri dish and kept under  
104 laboratory conditions at  $25\pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$ ,  $60\pm 5\%$  RH and 16:8 h (L:D) photoperiod. To keep the leaves  
105 fresh, the petioles were wrapped in wet cotton and replaced every three days (Ghaderi *et al.*, 2017).  
106 The Petri dishes were checked daily, and the duration of the embryonic, larval, pupal periods, as  
107 well as survival rate, and adult emergence were recorded. As soon as the adult emerged, a pair of  
108 *S. ocellatella* was transferred to the new oviposition container and kept until death. The adult  
109 population was given a 10% honey solution. Every day, the number of eggs laid and the mortality  
110 rate were recorded in every container.

111 The recorded data were analyzed using the age-stage, two-sex life table theory (Chi and Liu, 1985;  
112 Chi, 1988). TWOSEX-MSChart (Chi, 2023) was used to analysis the data. All of the standard  
113 errors were estimated using the bootstrap technique with 100,000 samples (Huang and Chi, 2013).  
114 He paired bootstrap test was used to determine variations in life table parameters between cultivars  
115 at a probability level of 5%.

## 116 117 **RESULTS**

### 118 **Duration of Life Stages and Fecundity**

119 The egg incubation period was significantly different on the eight cultivars, with the longest period  
120 observed on Merak (4.15 days) and Ekbatan (4.13 days), and the shortest period observed on Palma  
121 (3.79 days) (Table 1). The duration of the larval instars of the sugar beet moth reared on the eight  
122 sugar beet cultivars was significantly different (Table 1). The most extended larval period  
123 belonged to the individuals reared on Merak, while the shortest was on Shokoofa and Sharif. The  
124 longest and shortest preadult period was obtained on Marak (35.52 days) and Shokoofa (28.08  
125 days) respectively. The male and female longevities and total life span of *S. ocellatella* on eight  
126 cultivars of sugar beet are shown in Table 1. The adult longevity showed that while the longest  
127 longevity of males (14.09 days) and females (15.29 days) was observed on the Shokoofa cultivar,

128 the shortest mean longevity was obtained on the Merak cultivar. The total life span varied from  
129 42.17 to 44.23 days on Ekbatan and the longest on Rozier, respectively.

130 The mean adult pre-oviposition period (APOP), total pre-oviposition period (TPOP), oviposition  
131 days, and fecundity of *S. ocellatella* are shown in Table 1. APOP and TPOP were significantly  
132 affected by different cultivars. The adult pre-oviposition period (APOP) in the Dorothea cultivar  
133 was significantly longer than in other cultivars.

134 The longest oviposition days occurred on Palma (7.24 days), while the shortest was recorded on  
135 Merak (3.65 days). The highest and lowest fecundity was related to the Shokoofa and Merak  
136 cultivars, respectively, (Table 1).

137

### 138 **Life Table Parameters**

139 The values of the life table (population growth) parameters of the sugar beet moth on eight different  
140 cultivars are shown in Table 2.

141 In terms of the life table parameters, there was a significant difference among the tested cultivars.

142 The lowest values of the net reproductive rate ( $R_0$ ), intrinsic rate of increase ( $r$ ), and finite rate of  
143 increase ( $\lambda$ ) were calculated on the Merak cultivar to be 9.31 eggs/individual,  $0.054 \text{ day}^{-1}$  and  
144  $1.056 \text{ day}^{-1}$  respectively. The highest values of the above-mentioned parameters were recorded on  
145 Shokoofa cultivar to be 39.44 eggs/individual,  $0.102 \text{ day}^{-1}$ , and  $1.107 \text{ day}^{-1}$ , respectively. In terms  
146 of the mean generation time ( $T$ ) of this pest, a significant difference was observed among the  
147 cultivars tested. The longest period of this parameter was obtained on the Merak cultivar (40.45  
148 days) and the shortest period was obtained on Sharif (35.68 days) and Shokoofa (35.88 days)  
149 (Table 2).

150 The age-stage-specific survival rates ( $s_{xj}$ ) of *S. ocellatella* in different cultivars are shown in Figure  
151 1, which shows the overlap of the survival of different life stages of this pest. The age-specific  
152 survival ( $l_x$ ) and fecundity ( $m_x$ ) rates of *S. ocellatella* fed on various sugar beet cultivars are plotted  
153 in Figure 2. Overall, age-specific survival curves were similar among the tested cultivars, and *S.*  
154 *ocellatella* successfully reproduced and developed on all cultivars.

155 The results showed that the insects raised on different treatments had similar patterns of mortality.

156

### 157 **DISCUSSION**

158 The two-sex life table parameters have been used in entomological studies (Huang and Chi, 2012).

159 Host suitability for specific insects differs in terms of survival and reproduction (Musa and Ren,

160 2005). The longer development time, reduce pupal weight, lower capacity for population growth,  
161 and the longer time to complete the generation are unfavorable indicators for insects that can be  
162 caused by poor food quality (Pereyra and Sanchez, 2006). The results of this research clearly  
163 showed the effect of different cultivars on the biological characteristics of *S. ocellatella* in terms  
164 of differences in the basic population parameters.

165 Researchers have reported that the reproduction of moths can be influenced by the type of food  
166 they are feeding on (Madboni and Pourabad, 2012). In this regard, the fecundity of *S. ocellatella*  
167 showed a significant difference in relation to the type of food eaten by the larvae. The highest  
168 fecundity was observed on the Shokoofa cultivar (85.26 eggs/individual). Various developmental  
169 times of *S. ocellatella* on different cultivars suggested that the host plant can influence the  
170 developmental duration of this pest. Based on the results of Kandil *et al.* (2023), Celnne cultivar  
171 harbored higher population of *S. ocellatella* with significant differences compared with the  
172 Heliospoly cultivar during the two growing seasons.

173 The plant quality can be related to secondary metabolites, and it may influence the insect  
174 performance (Coley *et al.*, 2006). El-Sheikh *et al.*, (2022) showed that Alauda, Maimouna and  
175 Clgogne were the resistant cultivars to *S. ocellatella* whereas; Bts 3980, Bts 8115 and Nefirlitis  
176 were the susceptible cultivars to this pest. A similar conclusion was reported by Razini *et al.*,  
177 (2017) that different cultivars have already been studied in terms of natural infestation to *S.*  
178 *ocellatella* larvae under field condition and the Merk cultivar has been recognized as a resistant  
179 and Dorothea as a susceptible cultivar. The longest larval and total pre-ovipositional periods were  
180 observed on Merak and SBSI 007, which is probably attributed to lower nutritional value of these  
181 cultivars.

182 Our experiment showed variation in adult longevity, preoviposition period, and fecundity of the  
183 sugar beet moth on different cultivars tested. The females reared on Merak had the lowest fecundity  
184 (32.39 eggs/female) and on Dorothea had the longest APOP (3.93 days). Among the influencing  
185 factors on fecundity, the feeding rate of the larvae is mentioned frequently, so that less feeding of  
186 larvae causes a decrease in larval weight and consequently fecundity is decreased (Musmeci *et al.*,  
187 1997). Fast growth rate and higher fertility of insects indicate the suitability of host plants (Van  
188 Lenteren and Noldus, 1990). In the obtained results, it is possible to clearly see the effect of  
189 different cultivars on oviposition days and the pre-oviposition period, which is in agreement with  
190 the results obtained in the studies on *Spodoptera exigua* (Talaee *et al.*, 2017) life table on 24 sugar

191 beet genotypes. Differences in the concentration of primary chemical compounds including protein  
192 and starch and secondary metabolites including phenols and flavonoids among different host plants  
193 can affect the life cycle of the insect. Various aspects of the physical and chemical characteristics  
194 of host plants can be effective on the growth rate statistics of herbivorous insects, such as growth,  
195 development and oviposition, but the characteristics and nutritional quality of the plant are among  
196 the most important factors affecting these statistics (Brodsgaard, 1987; Walde, 1995).  
197 There is a complex interaction between physical properties, micronutrients, and other plant  
198 compounds with the life cycle and reproduction of the pest. The physical properties of plants and  
199 primary metabolites play an important role in the nutrition and development of herbivorous insects  
200 (Naseri and Majd-Marani 2022). The intrinsic rate of increase ( $r$ ) and the finite rate of population  
201 increase ( $\lambda$ ) are commonly used for estimating population growth for inter- and intraspecific  
202 comparisons (Talaee *et al.*, 2017). According to our results, these two parameters showed a similar  
203 trend on different cultivars tested. Among the possible reasons for the resistance of some tested  
204 cultivars, we can point out the existence of some physical (trichomes, wax layer and thickened  
205 layers of the epidermis) and chemical characteristics in the plant (Jabran and Faroog, 2013).  
206 Our research revealed valuable results about the resistance potential of the sugar beet cultivars to  
207 sugar beet moth and presented information about sources of sugar beet resistance to *S. ocellatella*  
208 which could be considered as a supplement to chemicals and other management strategies.  
209 In conclusion, the faster development and more fecundity of *S. ocellatella* suggested that cultivar  
210 'Shokoofa' was suitable (susceptible) as compared with the other cultivars (there may be  
211 adaptations between the pest and the host plant). Furthermore, 'Merak' was unsuitable (resistant)  
212 as compare to other cultivars.

213

## 214 REFERENCES

- 215 1. Abbasipour, H., Mahmoudvand, M., Basij, M. and Lozan, A. 2012. First Report of the  
216 Parasitoid Wasps, *Microchelonus subcontractus* and *Bracon intercessor* (Hym.: Braconidae),  
217 from Iran. *J. Entomol. Soc. Iran.*, **32(1)**: 89–92.
- 218 2. Adamski, Z., Niewadzi, M. and Ziemnicki, K. 2005. Inheritance of Chorionic Malformations  
219 and Insecticide Resistance by *Spodoptera exigua*. *J. Appl. Entomol.*, **129(9–10)**: 526-533.
- 220 3. Al-Keridis, L. A. 2016. Biology, Ecology and Control Studies on Sugar-Beet Mining Moth,  
221 *Scrobipalpa ocellatella*. *Der Pharma Chemica*, **8(20)**: 166–171.

- 222 4. Arnaudov, V., Raykov, S., Davidova, R., Hristov, H., Vasilev, V. and Petkov, P. 2012.  
223 Monitoring of Pest Populations: An Important Element of Integrated Pest Management of Field  
224 Crops. *Agric. Sci and Tec.*, **4(1)**: 77–80.
- 225 5. Bazazo, K. G. I. and Mashaal, R. E. F. 2014. Pests Attacking Post-Harvest Sugar Beet Roots  
226 and Their Adverse Effects on Sugar Content. *J. Plant. Protec and Pathol.*, **5**: 673–678.
- 227 6. Brodsgaard, H. F. 1987. *Frankliniella occidentalis* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) - A New Pest in  
228 Danish Glasshouses. *Tidsskrift foer planteavl.* **93**: 83–91.
- 229 7. Camprag, D., Sekulic, R. and Keresi, T. 2004. Population Dynamics of Major Sugar Beet Pests  
230 in the Vojvodina Province in the Period 1961 - 2003 [Serbian] Razprave - Razred Za  
231 Naravolovne Vede. *Slov. Akad. Znanosti in Umetnosti.*, **45**: 37–48.
- 232 8. Carey, J. R., 2001. Insect Biodemography. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.*, **46**: 79–110.
- 233 9. Chi, H. 1988. Life-Table Analysis Incorporating Both Sexes and Variable Development Rate  
234 Among Individuals. *Environ. Entomol.*, **17**: 26–34.
- 235 10. Chi, H. 2023. TWOSEX-MS Chart: A Computer Program for the Age-Stage, Two-Sex Life  
236 Table Analysis. <http://140.120.197.173/Ecology/>
- 237 11. Chi, H. and Liu, H. 1985. Two New Methods for the Study of Insect Population Ecology. *Bull.*  
238 *Inst. Zool.*, **24**: 225–240.
- 239 12. Coley, P. D., Bateman, M. L. and Kursar, T. A. 2006. The Effects of Plant Quality on  
240 Caterpillar Growth and Defense Against Natural Enemies. *OIKOS.*, **115**: 219–228.
- 241 13. Duraisam, R., Salelgn, K. and Berekete, A. K. 2017. Production of Beet Sugar and Bio-ethanol  
242 from Sugar Beet and it Bagasse: a review. *Int. J. Eng. Tren. Technol.*, **43(4)**: 222–233.
- 243 14. El-Sheikh, M. F., B. M. Eldefrawy, B, M. and Mashaal, E. F. 2022. The Larval-Pupal  
244 Parasitoid, *Encospilus repentinus* (Hol.) and Resistant Varieties as Bio-Agents for Regulating  
245 Populations of *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* Boyd. in the Egyptian Sugar Beet Fields. *Egypt. Acad.*  
246 *J. Biolog. Sci.*, **14(1)**: 55–62.
- 247 15. Fathipour, Y. and Maleknia, B. 2016. Mite Predators. In: Omkar (Ed.), Ecofriendly Pest  
248 Management for Food Security. *Elsevier, San Diego.* 329–366.
- 249 16. Fathipour, Y. and Mirhosseini, M. A. 2017. Diamondback Moth *Plutella xylostella*  
250 Management. In: Reddy, G.V.P (Ed.), Integrated Management of Insect Pests on Canola and  
251 Other Brassica Oilseed Crops. *CABI, Croydon, UK.* 13–43.



- 252 17. Fathipour, Y., Kianpour, R., Bagheri, A., Karimzadeh, J., Hosseinaveh, V. 2019. Bottom-  
253 up effects of Brassica genotypes on performance of diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella*  
254 (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae). *Crop. Protec.*, **115**: 135–141.
- 255 18. Ganji, Z. and Moharramipour, S. 2017. Cold Hardiness Strategy in Field Collected Larvae of  
256 *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae). *J. Entomol. Soc. Iran.*, **36(4)**: 287–296.
- 257 19. Ghaderi, S., Fathipour, Y. and Asgari, Sh. 2017. Susceptibility of Seven Selected Tomato  
258 Cultivars to *Tuta absoluta* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae): Implications for Its Management. *J.*  
259 *Econ. Entomol.*, **110(2)**: 421–429.
- 260 20. Huang, Y. and Chi, H., 2013. Life Tables of *Bactrocera cucurbitae* (Diptera: Tephritidae):  
261 With an Invalidation of the Jackknife Technique. *J. App. Entomol.*, **137**: 327–339.
- 262 21. JABRAN, K. and FAROOQ, M., 2013. Implications of potential allelopathic crops in  
263 agricultural systems. In: Cheema, Z. A., Farooq, M. and Wahid, A. (Eds.). Allelopathy: current  
264 trends and future applications. *Springer, Berlin, Germany*, 349–385.
- 265 22. Huang, Y. B. and H. Chi. 2012. Age-Stage, Two-Sex Life Table of *Bactrocera cucurbitae*  
266 (Coquillett) (Diptera: Tephritidae) With a Discussion on the Problem of Applying Females  
267 Age Specific Life Table to Insect Population. *Insect. Sci.*, **19**: 263–273.
- 268 23. Kakde, A. M., Patel, K. G. and Tayade, S. 2014. Role of Life Table in Insect Pest Management-  
269 A Review. *IOSR J. Agri and Veterin. Sci.*, (IOSR-JAVS). **7**: 40–43.
- 270 24. Kandil, R. S., Fayed A. M. and El-Dessouki, W. A. 2023. Impact of Chemical Composition  
271 and Molecular Diversity of Sugar Beet Cultivars on *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* Boyd  
272 (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) and *Cassida vittata* Vill (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). *J. Plant*  
273 *Protect. Pathol.*, Mansoura Univ., **14(11)**: 353–358.
- 274 25. Kheiri, M. 1991. Important Pests of Sugar Beet and Their Control. Ministry of Agriculture,  
275 Agricultural Research and Education organization. *Kalameh Publication Institute*, Tehran,  
276 Iran, 126 pp. (in Persian).
- 277 26. La Rossa, F. R., Vasicek, A. and Lopez, M.C. 2013. Effects of Pepper (*Capsicum annuum*)  
278 Cultivars on the Biology and Life Table Parameters of *Myzus persicae* (Sulz.) (Hemiptera:  
279 Aphididae). *Neotrop. Entomol.*, **42**: 634–641.
- 280 27. Madboni, M. A. Z. and Pourabad, R. F. 2012. Effect of Different Wheat Varieties on Some of  
281 Developmental Parameters of *Anagasta kuehniella* (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). *Munis Entom and*  
282 *Zool.*, **7**: 1017–1022.

- 283 28. Mansour, M.R.K.; Kandil, R.S.; Atia, Z.M. and Dabour, N.A. 2022. Monitoring of piercing-  
284 sucking insects and their associated predators as well as their relation- ship with weather  
285 factors, in egyptian soybean fields. *Medicon Agric. Environ. Sci.*, 2(4): 53–67.
- 286 29. Musa, P. D. and Ren, S X. 2005. Development and Reproduction of *Bemisia tabaci*  
287 (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae) on Three Bean Species. *Insect. Sci.*, **12**: 25–30.
- 288 30. Musmeci, S. R., Ciccoli, R., Gioia, V. D., Sonnino, A. and Arnone, S. 1997. Leaf Effect of  
289 Wild species of Solanum and Interspecific Hybrids on Growth and Behavior of the Potato  
290 Tuber Moth, *Phthorimaea operculella* Zeller. *Potato. Res.*, **40**: 417-430.
- 291 31. Naseri, B. and Majd-Marani, S. 2022. Different Cereal Grains Affect Demographic Traits and  
292 Digestive Enzyme Activity of *Rhyzopertha dominica* (F.) (Coleoptera: Bostrichidae). *J. Stor.*  
293 *Prod. Res.*, **95**: 101898.
- 294 32. Noroozi, H., Rafiee, H., Hosseini, S. S., Yazdani, S. and Chizari, A. H. 2022. Analysis of  
295 Factors Affecting Sugar Import with Emphasis on the Role of Research and Development  
296 Budgets. *J. Sugar beet.*, **37(2)**: 247-262. [https://jsb.areeo.ac.ir/article\\_125862.html?lang=en](https://jsb.areeo.ac.ir/article_125862.html?lang=en)
- 297 33. Odinkov, V. N., Ishmuratov, G. YU., Sokol'skaya, O. V., Ladenkova, I. M., Gubaidullin, L.  
298 Yu., Muslukhov, R. R. and Tolstikov, G. A. 1993. Insect Pheromones and Their Analogues.  
299 XLV. Synthesis of Mono- and Dienic Components of Insect Pheromones from Isopropyl  
300 Nona-3E,8-dienoate. *Chem. Nat. Compo.*, **29(1)**: 123–127. ht
- 301 34. Pereyra, P. C. and Sanchez, N. E. 2006. Effect of Two Solanaceous Plants on Developmental  
302 and Population Parameters of the Tomato Leaf Miner, *Tuta absoluta* (Meyrick) (Lepidoptera:  
303 Gelechiidae). *Neot. Entomol.*, **35(5)**: 671-676.
- 304 35. Razini, A., Pakyari, H. and Arbab, A. 2017. Estimation of Sugar Beet Lines and Cultivars  
305 Infection to *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* Boyd. (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) Larvae Under Field  
306 Condition with Natural Infection. *J. Sugar Beet*, **32(2)**: 147–155.
- 307 36. Razini, A., Pakyari, H., Arbab, A., Ardeh, M. J. and Ardestani, H. 2016. Study of Infestation  
308 Amount to Beet Moth *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* Among Different Sugar Beet Genotypes in the  
309 Field. *Proceedings of 22nd Iranian Plant Protec Congress*. 23–27 August, Karaj, Iran.
- 310 37. Schrameyer, K. 2005. The sugar beet moth *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* on Beet Root. *Gemüse*  
311 (München), **41(3)**: 14–15.

- 312 38. Talaei, L., Fathipour, Y., Talebi, A, A. and Khajehali, J. 2017. Screening of Potential Sources  
313 of Resistance to *Spodoptera exigua* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in 24 Sugar Beet Genotypes. *J.*  
314 *Econ. Entomol.*, **110(1)**: 250–258.
- 315 39. Valič, N., Vučajnk, F., Ferenčak, B., Mlinarič, M. and Trdan, S. 2005. Monitoring of  
316 *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* Boyd in Slovenia Using Pheromone Traps. *In lectures and papers*  
317 *presented at the 7<sup>th</sup> Slovenian conference on Plant Protec. Zrece, Slovenia.* Društvo Za Varstvo  
318 rastlin Slovenije, 454–458.
- 319 40. Van Lenteren, J. C. and Noldus, L. P. 1990. White Fly-plant Relationships: Behavioural and  
320 Ecological Aspects. In: Gerling White Flies: Their Bionomics, Pest Status and Management.  
321 *Interc. Andover., UK.* 47–89.
- 322 41. Walde, SJ. 1995. How Quality of Host Plant Affects a Predator-Prey Interaction in Biological  
323 Control. *Ecol. Soci. America.*, **76(4)**: 1206–1219.
- 324 42. Yarahmadi, F., Dinarvan, N. and Farkhari, M. 2022. Induction of Sugar Beet Resistance to  
325 *Spodoptera exigua* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) Under Field Conditions. *Sugar Tech.*,  
326 **24(6)**:1845–1850.

**Table 1.** Mean ( $\pm$ SE) duration (day) of adult pre-oviposition period (APOP), total pre-oviposition period (TPOP), oviposition days, adult longevity, total life span, and fecundity (eggs) of *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* on different sugar beet cultivars


Cultivar	Egg duration (day)	Larva (day)	Pre-adult (day)	APOP (day)	TPOP (day)	Oviposition days (day)	Male longevity (day)	Female longevity (day)	Adult longevity (day)	Total life span (day)	Fecundity (eggs/female)
Dorothea	4.03 $\pm$ 0.16abcde	19.49 $\pm$ 0.19e	30.33 $\pm$ 0.18e	3.93 $\pm$ 0.09a	34.34 $\pm$ 0.27c	7.00 $\pm$ 0.28a	12.80 $\pm$ 0.25cd	13.87 $\pm$ 0.20b	13.34 $\pm$ 0.17ab	43.68 $\pm$ 0.24a	68.19 $\pm$ 2.49c
Ekbatan	4.13 $\pm$ 0.04a	21.22 $\pm$ 0.14cd	32.26 $\pm$ 0.20cd	2.99 $\pm$ 0.06f	35.29 $\pm$ 0.27b	4.79 $\pm$ 0.19d	11.34 $\pm$ 0.25e	8.37 $\pm$ 0.27d	9.91 $\pm$ 0.27e	42.17 $\pm$ 0.32b	50.74 $\pm$ 2.23d
Merak	4.15 $\pm$ 0.04a	23.88 $\pm$ 0.20a	35.52 $\pm$ 0.25a	3.08 $\pm$ 0.05ef	38.04 $\pm$ 0.31a	3.65 $\pm$ 0.22e	8.70 $\pm$ 0.39g	7.61 $\pm$ 0.24e	8.07 $\pm$ 0.23g	43.60 $\pm$ 0.35a	32.39 $\pm$ 2.07e
Palma	3.79 $\pm$ 0.08e	18.41 $\pm$ 0.14f	28.89 $\pm$ 0.18f	3.34 $\pm$ 0.13bcde	32.24 $\pm$ 0.31d	7.24 $\pm$ 0.16a	13.28 $\pm$ 0.17bc	14.06 $\pm$ 0.21b	13.65 $\pm$ 0.14bc	42.55 $\pm$ 0.24b	75.68 $\pm$ 1.59b
Rozier	3.95 $\pm$ 0.07bcde	21.39 $\pm$ 0.20c	32.43 $\pm$ 0.24c	3.24 $\pm$ 0.10cde	35.48 $\pm$ 0.38b	6.28 $\pm$ 0.20b	12.66 $\pm$ 0.18d	10.76 $\pm$ 0.26c	11.80 $\pm$ 0.20d	44.23 $\pm$ 0.32a	64.16 $\pm$ 1.59c
SBSI 007	4.10 $\pm$ 0.03ab	23.25 $\pm$ 0.19b	34.72 $\pm$ 0.21b	3.13 $\pm$ 0.17def	38.18 $\pm$ 0.42a	4.81 $\pm$ 0.18cd	9.47 $\pm$ 0.31f	8.68 $\pm$ 0.21d	9.10 $\pm$ 0.20f	43.83 $\pm$ 0.28a	46.59 $\pm$ 1.74d
Sharif	3.82 $\pm$ 0.07de	18.39 $\pm$ 0.12fg	28.53 $\pm$ 0.16fg	3.51 $\pm$ 0.08bd	31.90 $\pm$ 0.20d	7.00 $\pm$ 0.18a	13.46 $\pm$ 0.21b	14.21 $\pm$ 0.19b	13.84 $\pm$ 0.15b	42.38 $\pm$ 0.22b	77.34 $\pm$ 1.41b
Shokoofa	3.89 $\pm$ 0.06cde	18.09 $\pm$ 0.11fg	28.08 $\pm$ 0.13h	3.65 $\pm$ 0.07b	31.78 $\pm$ 0.21d	6.99 $\pm$ 0.14a	14.09 $\pm$ 0.14a	15.29 $\pm$ 0.13a	14.72 $\pm$ 0.21a	42.81 $\pm$ 0.17b	85.26 $\pm$ 1.15a

APOP, adult pre-ovipositional period; TPOP, total pre-ovipositional period (from egg to first oviposition). The means followed by different letters in the same column (are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ , Paired bootstrap test).


**Table 2.** Age-stage, two-sex life table parameters of *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* on different sugar beet cultivars.

Cultivar	$GRR$ (eggs/individual)	$R_0$ (eggs/individual)	$r$ ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ )	$\lambda$ ( $\text{day}^{-1}$ )	$T$ (day)
Dorothea	36.76 $\pm$ 4.67ab (36.75)	27.27 $\pm$ 3.87bc (27.27)	0.086 $\pm$ 0.0038bc (0.0869)	1.090 $\pm$ 0.0042ab (1.0908)	38.02 $\pm$ 0.25 b (38.02)
Ekbatan	27.21 $\pm$ 4.73bc (27.20)	15.23 $\pm$ 2.67de (15.22)	0.071 $\pm$ 0.0047de (0.0714)	1.073 $\pm$ 0.0051de (1.0740)	38.10 $\pm$ 0.27b (38.10)
Merak	23.21 $\pm$ 4.28c (23.22)	9.31 $\pm$ 1.73e (9.31)	0.054 $\pm$ 0.0047f (0.0514)	1.056 $\pm$ 0.0049f (1.0566)	40.45 $\pm$ 0.34a (40.46)
Palma	39.18 $\pm$ 5.10ab (39.18)	30.27 $\pm$ 4.20abc (30.27)	0.093 $\pm$ 0.0040ab (0.0942)	1.098 $\pm$ 0.0044ab (1.0988)	36.17 $\pm$ 0.32c (36.17)
Rozier	34.12 $\pm$ 5.95abc (34.09)	20.05 $\pm$ 3.25cd (20.05)	0.076 $\pm$ 0.0044cd (0.0769)	1.079 $\pm$ 0.0048cd (1.8000)	38.95 $\pm$ 0.43b (38.95)
SBSI 007	28.67 $\pm$ 4.96bc (28.67)	12.81 $\pm$ 2.37de (12.81)	0.061 $\pm$ 0.0046ef (0.0620)	1.063 $\pm$ 0.0049ef (1.0639)	41.13 $\pm$ 0.37a (41.12)
Sharif	40.60 $\pm$ 5.01ab (40.59)	31.90 $\pm$ 4.29ab (31.90)	0.096 $\pm$ 0.0039ab (0.0970)	1.101 $\pm$ 0.0043ab (1.1019)	35.68 $\pm$ 0.22d (35.68)
Shokoofa	45.72 $\pm$ 5.14a (45.70)	39.44 $\pm$ 4.78a (39.43)	0.102 $\pm$ 0.0035a (0.1024)	1.107 $\pm$ 0.0039a (1.1078)	35.88 $\pm$ 0.22d (35.88)

$GRR$  is the gross reproductive rate;  $R_0$  mean the net reproductive rate,  $r$  intrinsic rate of increase,  $\lambda$  finite rate of increase, and  $T$  the mean generation time. The outside the parentheses for each parameter were calculated using the bootstrap procedure with 100,000 and means inside the parentheses were calculated using the original data. The means followed by different letters in the same column (for each area) are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ , Paired bootstrap test).



**Figure 1.** Comparison of age-stage survival rate ( $s_{xj}$ ) of the egg, larva, pupae, male and female of *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* on different sugar beet cultivars.



**Figure 2.** Comparison of age-specific survivorship ( $l_x$ ), age-stage-specific fecundity ( $f_{xj}$ ), and age-specific fecundity ( $m_x$ ) of *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* on different sugar beet cultivars.

ارزیابی پارامترهای زیستی بید چغندر قند: *Scrobipalpa ocellatella* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) (Boyd) روی هشت رقم رایج چغندر قند

ا. رازینی، ع. احدیت، ع. شیخی گرجان، و ی. فتحی پور

### چکیده

بید چغندر قند (*Scrobipalpa ocellatella* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) (Boyd)) یکی از جدی ترین تهدیدها برای کشت چغندر قند در سراسر جهان است که از نظر اقتصادی باعث کاهش عملکرد قابل توجهی می شود. پارامترهای جدول زندگی بید چغندر قند روی هشت رقم چغندر قند (دوروتی، اکباتان، مراک، روزیر، SBSI 007، شریف و شکوفا) در شرایط آزمایشگاهی (دمای  $25 \pm 1$  درجه سلسیوس، رطوبت  $60 \pm 5$  درصد و دوره نوری ۱۶ ساعت روشنایی و ۸ ساعت روشنایی) تعیین شد. طولانی ترین (15/29 روز) و کوتاه ترین (7/61 روز) طول عمر حشرات ماده به ترتیب در ارقام شکوفا و مراک ثبت شد. در عین حال ارقام شکوفا و مراک، به ترتیب بیشترین (85/26 تخم به ازای هر ماده) و کمترین (32/39 تخم به ازای هر ماده) باروری کل را داشتند. نرخ خالص تولید مثل ( $R_0$ ) از 9/31 تخم به ازای هر فرد تا 39/44 تخم به ازای هر فرد در هشت رقم چغندر قند متغیر (کمترین مقدار مربوط به مراک و بیشترین مقدار مربوط به شکوفا) بود. بیشترین نرخ ذاتی افزایش جمعیت ( $r$ ) (0/102 بر روز) و نرخ متنهای افزایش جمعیت ( $\lambda$ ) (1/107 بر روز) در رقم شکوفا دیده شد. نتایج نشان داد تمامی پارامترهای جدول زندگی بید چغندر قند *S. ocellatella* روی ارقام چغندر قند از نظر آماری تفاوت معنی دار داشت که در بین آنها رقم مراک بیشترین مقاومت را در برابر آفت داشت.