HortScience 30(5):997–999. 1995.

Imidacloprid Does Not Enhance Growth and Yield of Muskmelon in the Absence of Whitefly

J.C. Palumbo and C.A. Sanchez
University of Arizona, Yuma Valley Agricultural Center, 6425 West 8th Street, Yuma, AZ 85364

Additional index words. Bemisia tabaci, Bemisia argentifolii, Cucumis melo, relative growth rate, net assimilation rate

Abstract. **Imidacloprid is a new, chloronicotinyl insecticide currently being used to control sweetpotato whitefly [*Bemisia tabaci* Genn, also known as silverleaf whitefly (*Bemisia argentifolii* Bellows and Perring)]. Large growth and yield increases of muskmelon (*Cucumis melo* L.) following the use of imidacloprid have caused some to speculate that this compound may enhance growth and yield above that expected from insect control alone. Greenhouse and field studies were conducted to evaluate the growth and yield response of melons to imidacloprid in the presence and absence of whitefly pressure. In greenhouse cage studies, sweetpotato whiteflies developed very high densities of nymphs and eclosed pupal cases on plants not treated with imidacloprid, and significant increases in vegetative plant growth were inversely proportional to whitefly densities. Positive plant growth responses were absent when plants were treated with imidacloprid and insects were excluded. Results from a field study showed similar whitefly control and yield responses to imidacloprid and bifenthrin + endosulfan applications. Hence, we conclude that growth and yield response to imidacloprid is associated with control of whiteflies and the subsequent prevention of damage, rather than a compensatory physiological promotion of plant growth processes. Chemical names used: 1-[(6-chloro-3-pyridinyl)methyl]-4,5-dihydro-*N*-nitro-1-*H*-imidazol-2-amine (imidacloprid); [2 methyl(1,1´-biphenyl)-3yl)methyl 3-2-chloro-3,3,3-trifluoro-1-propenyl]-2,2-dimethylcyclopropane carboxylate (bifenthrin); 6,7,8,9,10,10-hexachloro-1,5,5a,6,9,9a-hexahydro-6,9-methano-2,4,3-benzodiaxathiepin 3-oxide (endosulfan).**

The sweetpotato whitefly, also known as silverleaf whitefly (Bellows et al., 1994), has recently become a serious economic pest of muskmelons (Perring et al., 1993). Damage by whitefly species to most crops includes a reduction in plant growth caused by the removal of plant assimilates from the phloem during feeding (Buntin et al., 1993) and the excretion of honeydew, which promotes the growth of sooty mold on harvestable plant parts (Byrne and Miller, 1990). Fruit quality and yield of muskmelon can decrease when immature whitefly population densities are not properly controlled (Palumbo, 1994a).

Imidacloprid (Admire 2F, Miles, Kansas City, Kan.) is a new chloronicotinyl insecticide that is toxic to many insect pests (Elbert et al., 1990). It has good systemic insecticidal activity in the plant and performs best when applied to the soil to be absorbed by roots (Mullins, 1993). This chemical has demonstrated exceptional control of sweetpotato whitefly populations in muskmelons (Palumbo et al., 1994). Imidacloprid was first used commercially in the United States in 1993 for sweetpotato whitefly on lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.) and muskmelons in Arizona and California. Because yields improved in most fields following imidacloprid applications (Palumbo, 1994b), observers speculated that imidacloprid may have a plant growth regulator (PGR) effect on plants that can increase yield above that expected from insect control alone.

Plant growth and yield enhancement has been attributed to some insecticides by several investigators (Parrot et al., 1985; Scott et al., 1985). However, in many cases, more rigorous evaluations have shown that plant growth and yield responses are associated entirely with a reduction in insect pressure. For example, early reports that *N´*-(4-chloro-o-tolyl)-*N,N*-dimethylformamidine (chlordimeform) enhanced cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) growth (Campbell et al., 1979) were later shown to be largely associated with a reduction in insect damage (Cathey and Bailey, 1987; Youngman et al., 1990). Because imidacloprid is applied to crops as a prophylactic control measure at planting, the potential for the overuse of this compound is highly possible if growers suspect a plant growth–insecticide interaction. However, if no stimulatory effects on plant growth can be associated with imidacloprid, growers are likely to use the chemical more judiciously. Therefore, the objective of this study was to evaluate the plant growth and yield responses of muskmelons to imidacloprid in the presence and absence of whiteflies.

Received for publication 10 Nov. 1994. Accepted for publication 17 Apr. 1995. A portion of this research was supported by a U.S. Dept. of Agriculture–Agricultural Research Service Cooperative Agreement no. 58-5344-3-456. The cost of publishing this paper was defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. Under postal regulations, this paper therefore must be hereby marked *advertisement* solely to indicate this fact.

Materials and Methods

Greenhouse studies. All plants used in the greenhouse tests were direct-seeded 'Topmark' muskmelons in a 3 soil : 3 perlite : 1 peat mixture in 1.5-liter pots. Each pot contained 500 g of soil mixture and was planted with four to five seeds. Seedlings were grown during Mar. and Apr. 1994 in a glasshouse under natural light with adequate water and nutrients for maximum growth. Upon emergence, seedling plants were thinned to one per pot. Pots were then placed in wooden-frame exclusion cages (1.7 m width × 1.2 m long × 0.6 m high) screened with fine organdy cloth to exclude whitefly adults and other insects. The cages were maintained in the glasshouse at 28 ± 4C.

Whitefly adults used in these studies were of mixed age and from a population originally collected from melons at the Yuma Valley Agricultural Center. The colony was maintained on muskmelon plants in an outdoor insectary under ambient conditions. Samples of our whiteflies that were maintained in the insectary were b-strain sweetpotato whitefly or silverleaf whitefly.

The effects of imidacloprid and whitefly feeding on seedling growth and vigor was investigated in two separate cage studies. In the first trial, imidacloprid was applied to 60 seeded pots by drenching the soil of each pot with 0.00, 0.02, 0.04, or 0.08 g a.i. in 18 ml of water per pot (Mullins, 1993). Immediately following application, each pot was hand-watered to provide adequate moisture and initiate germination of the seed. The experiments were conducted as a randomized complete-block design with five replications. Each exclusion cage served as a replication. Within each cage, three pots of each rate were randomly assigned a position within the cage for a total of 12 plants per treatment. In the second trial, imidacloprid was applied at 0.00, 0.005, 0.010, or 0.020 g a.i., as indicated above.

When plants reached the one true-leaf stage, ≈1200 whitefly adults (100/plant) were collected from the insectary and released into each cage to allow for oviposition and nymphal development. Adults and nymphs were allowed to feed and develop for 35 days and then removed from the cages for assessment of whitefly densities and plant growth. Whitefly densities were estimated by counting the number of eggs, nymphs, and pupal cases from a random 2.5-cm^2 area of the six oldest leaves on each plant. Plant growth responses were based on the dry weights (milligrams) of leaves, petioles, and stems of each plant that had been dried at 70C for 48 h in a forced draft. Leaf area (square centimeters) was measured with a LI-3100 leaf-area meter (LI-COR, Lincoln, Neb.). The dry weight and leaf area measurements were used to calculate mean relative growth rate (R) and mean net assimilation rate (E) according to Hunt (1978).

Plant growth response to imidacloprid in the absence of whitefly was evaluated in ex-

clusion cage studies using the same design as noted above. Imidacloprid was applied to 60 seeded pots by drenching the soil of each pot with 0.00, 0.02, 0.04, or 0.08 g a.i. in 18 ml of water per pot. The experiment was conducted three times under similar greenhouse conditions. Plant growth responses were assessed as explained above.

We calculated mean whitefly densities per square centimeter per leaf, R, and E. Data from all greenhouse studies were analyzed by subjecting mean whitefly densities, mean dry weights, leaf areas, E, and R to trend analysis using General Linear Models procedure of SAS (SAS Institute, 1988).

Field study. 'Top Mark' muskmelons were established on 22 Feb. 1994 in 8- × 30-m-long plots in a randomized complete-block design with four replications. Treatments included 1) a nontreated control, 2) a single sidedress application of imidacloprid (0.28 kg a.i./ha) when the stand was thinned (3–4 leaf stage), and 3) weekly foliar applications of bifenthrin (Capture 2E, FMC Corp., Philadelphia) at 0.1 kg a.i./ha combined with endosulfan (Gowen Endosulfan 3EC, Gowan Co., Yuma, Ariz.) at 1.1 kg a.i./ha. The imidacloprid was sidedressed with water through narrow shanks at a depth of 15 cm and delivered at 140 liters·ha^{-1} total volume immediately preceding furrow irrigation on 21 Mar. Foliar applications of bifenthrin and endosulfan were initiated on 21 Mar. and repeated for 6 weeks using a ground sprayer equipped with two overhead hollow-cone spray tips/bed (TX-18, Spraying Systems Co., Wheaton, Ill.) at 22.1 kg·cm^{-2} CO_2 pressure resulting in ≈560 liters·ha^{-1} spray volume.

Whitefly counts were taken weekly beginning 30 Mar. Nymphs and pupal cases were counted on four 1-cm^2 leaf disks taken from the fourth and 10th leaf proximal to the base of 10 randomly selected plants per plot per sample date. Yield data were collected from four individual harvests over 9 days. Harvested melons were culled, sorted, and assessed for size and quality based on U.S. Dept. of Agriculture standards (Johnson and Mayberry, 1982) that included measurements of total number of mature muskmelon fruit per 10-m section of row, mean circumference (centimeters) of each harvested muskmelon fruit, percentage of soluble sugars (Atago refractometer, Kew Gardens, N.Y.), and the occurrence of sooty mold on fruit. The data were analyzed by subjecting mean whitefly densities and yields to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using ANOVA procedure of SAS employing mean separation with a protected LSD (SAS Institute, 1988).

Results and Discussion

Greenhouse studies. Greenhouse plants exposed to sweetpotato whiteflies for a 35-day infestation period developed very high densities of immatures when not treated with imidacloprid (Table 1). However, the addition of imidacloprid significantly reduced the mean numbers of eggs, nymphs, and pupal cases per square centimeter per leaf. Because no nymphs were found on treated plants (Table 1), the study was repeated using sequentially lower insecticide rates (Table 2). Although a few nymphs were located on plants receiving 0.005 or 0.01 g a.i./pot (Table 2), nymph densities were >70-fold higher in the control plants. This density : rate response is inversely proportional to the insecticidal activity of imidacloprid on whiteflies (Oetting and Anderson, 1990). Pupal cases existed only on the nontreated plants, indicating that whiteflies had completed immature development and adults had emerged during the experimental period. We could not quantify the feeding effects of adults on the plants because of the difficulty in accurately measuring their absolute density. However, because female whiteflies feed and oviposit concomitantly (van Lenteren and Noldus, 1990), low levels of adult feeding likely occurred on imidacloprid-treated plants based on the incidence of eggs (Tables 1 and 2).

Plants treated with imidacloprid and exposed to whitefly feeding pressure grew significantly better than the nontreated controls. In the first test, dry weights and leaf areas were reduced 45% and 20% in control plants, respectively; during the second trial, reductions were 52% and 25%. Dry weights and leaf area measurements for all rates of imidacloprid were similar in both tests. The significant quadratic responses of plant growth measured between the nontreated control and imidacloprid-treated plants were inversely proportional to whitefly densities. This relationship was evident from the reduction in R and E (Tables 1 and 2), both of which can be adversely affected by the feeding of sucking insects (Barlow and Messmer, 1982; Burd and Burton, 1992). Although leaf photosynthetic rates were not measured, the direct effect of whitefly feeding on photosynthesis and leaf-gas exchange likely occurred as evidenced by whitefly-induced chlorosis on the control plants. Buntin et al. (1993) reported that feeding by sweetpotato whitefly nymphs reduced leaf chlorophyll content of tomato (*Lycopersicum esculentum* Mill.) leaflets and adversely affected rates of leaf photosynthesis and CO_2 assimilation.

Imidicloprid induced no positive plant growth responses when insects were excluded from muskmelon plants. Analysis of three separate cage studies showed no significant ($P > 0.05$) increase in plant growth relative to applied rates of imidacloprid (data not shown). Pooled analysis showed that mean plant dry weight (range 0.80 to 0.84 g) and mean total leaf area (200 to 230 cm^2) per plant were similar for each rate of imidacloprid and the control. Similarly, R (0.25 mg·mg^{-1}·day^{-1} for all) and E (0.76 to 0.79 mg·cm^{-2}·day^{-1}) calculated for the duration of each study showed no positive response to rate of imidacloprid. Visible evidence of leaf chlorosis, irregular growth, or necrosis was absent with the exclusion of whiteflies. These findings are similar to those in cotton where 2-methyl-2-(methylthio) propionaldehyde *O*-(methylcarbamoyl)oxime (aldicarb) applied to the potting soil did not increase plant weight or leaf area in the absence of insect feeding (Womack and Shuster, 1986). Consequently, the failure to detect a positive growth response in our study suggests that no PGR effect was associated with soil uptake of imidacloprid.

We suggest that the reductions in plant growth during our study were caused by the effects of whitefly feeding. Because whiteflies feed primarily on carbohydrates and amino acids in the phloem tissue (Byrne and Miller, 1990), the lower E observed in the infested muskmelons (Tables 1 and 2) can be attributed largely to the removal of assimilated carbohydrates and nutrients, which would be destined for new growth and metabolic sinks in the plant. Consequently, the production of new tissue was decreased by the disruption of photosynthetic function and loss of photosynthate to whiteflies.

Table 1. Effect of imidacloprid on whitefly densities (mean/cm^2 per leaf), leaf area, dry weight, relative growth rate (R), and net assimilation rate (E) of muskmelon plants grown in the greenhouse, Spring 1994.

Rate[z] (g)	Eggs	Nymphs	Pupal cases	Leaf area (cm^2)	Dry wt (g)	R (mg·mg^{-1}·day^{-1})	E (mg·cm^{-2}·day^{-1})
0.00	45.5	95.4	65.6	391	1.71	0.212	0.765
0.02	8.8	0.0	0.0	456	3.02	0.229	1.161
0.04	2.0	0.0	0.0	446	3.09	0.230	1.213
0.08	1.4	0.0	0.0	487	3.01	0.228	1.071
Linear	**	**	**	**	**	*	*
Quadratic	**	**	***	**	**	**	**

[z]Rate expressed as the amount of imidacloprid active ingredient applied to the soil of each pot.
*, **, ***Significant at $P \leq 0.05$, 0.01, or 0.001, respectively.

Table 2. Effect of imidacloprid on whitefly densities (mean/cm^2 per leaf), leaf area, dry weight, relative growth rate (R), and net assimilation rate (E) of muskmelon plants grown in the greenhouse, Spring 1994.

Rate[z] (g)	Eggs	Nymphs	Pupal cases	Leaf area (cm^2)	Dry wt (g)	R (mg·mg^{-1}·day^{-1})	E (mg·cm^{-2}·day^{-1})
0.000	34.5	58.2	27.9	268	1.90	0.251	1.351
0.005	1.7	0.8	0.0	356	4.15	0.278	2.255
0.010	1.3	0.3	0.0	390	3.99	0.276	2.189
0.020	1.5	0.0	0.0	360	4.05	0.276	2.177
Linear	**	*	*	**	**	**	**
Quadratic	**	**	**	**	**	**	**

[z]Rate expressed as the amount of imidacloprid active ingredient applied to the soil of each pot.
*, **Significant at $P \leq 0.05$ or 0.01, respectively.

Field study. Seasonal average densities of whitefly nymphs and pupal cases were significantly higher on the nontreated control plants than for those receiving imidacloprid or bifenthrin + endosulfan treatments (Table 3). At harvest, nymph densities on leaves were much higher (>8-fold) in the nontreated plots. Nymph densities in the insecticide-treated plots were significantly lower than in the controls throughout the season. Fruit yield, melon size, and percentage of soluble sugars were all significantly lower for the nontreated plants, whereas yields were similar for the two insecticide-treated plots. Leaf chlorosis and necrosis were evident on older leaves of the control plants. The high percentage of muskmelon fruit from the nontreated control plots that were contaminated with honeydew and associated sooty mold indicates that large amounts of phloem sap were removed from the plant (Byrne and Miller, 1990). We attribute the yield differences between the control and insecticide treatments directly to whitefly feeding damage.

Mean whitefly densities and fruit yields were similar for imidacloprid and the bifenthrin + endosulfan treatments, suggesting that neither treatment had an affect on plant productivity relative to each other. These insecticides differ in terms of chemical composition, mode of action, and their route of entry into the plant (Ware, 1989). Neither bifenthrin nor endosulfan have been shown to enhance plant growth or yield. Trumble et al. (1988) showed that increased yields and fruit size in strawberries (*Fragaria ×ananassa* Duch.) treated with bifenthrin was attributed to suppression of mites and aphids, and did not chemically alter photosynthetic function. Similarly, plant growth in sorghum [*Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench] was not affected by applications of endosulfan (Veeraswamy, 1993). Our data suggest that the similarity in yield obtained from the use of bifenthrin + endosulfan and imidacloprid was due to whitefly control and damage prevention, rather than a physiological enhancement of plant growth. Overall, our results demonstrate that soil applications of imidacloprid to muskmelons does not affect plant growth and fruit yield in the absence of whitefly infestation and increases in seedling growth and yield associated with application of imidacloprid are due directly to a reduction in insect pest damage.

Table 3. Effect of imidacloprid and bifenthrin + endosulfan applications on whitefly infestation, yield, soluble sugars, size, and sooty mold incidence of muskmelons grown in small experimental plots at the Yuma Agricultural Center, 1994.

	Seasonal density		Density at harvest					
Treatment	Nymphs	Pupal cases	Nymphs	Pupal cases	Yield[z] (fruit/10 m)	Soluble sugars (%)	Size[y] (cm)	Sooty[x] mold (%)
Nontreated control	14.9	2.9	26.5	5.2	30.8	10.2	29.4	87.5
Imidacloprid	1.9	1.0	2.5	1.0	50.3	11.5	32.4	5.0
Bifenthrin + endosulfan	2.4	1.5	3.0	1.2	52.1	11.4	32.6	6.5
$LSD_{0.05}$	2.3	0.8	8.5	2.9	16.3	1.2	2.8	17.8

[z]Yield measured as the total number of mature muskmelon fruit per 10-m section of row.
[y]Size measured as the mean circumference (centimeters) of each harvested muskmelon fruit.
[x]Percentage of harvested fruit with >20% of netting contaminated with sooty mold.

Literature Cited

Barlow, C.A. and I. Messmer. 1982. Pea aphid (Homoptera: Aphididae)-induced changes in some growth rates of pea plants. J. Econ. Entomol. 75:765–768.

Bellows, T.S., Jr., T.M. Perring, R.J. Gill, and D.H. Headrick. 1994. Description of a species of *Bemisia* (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae). Ann. Entomol. Soc. Amer. 87:195–206.

Buntin, G.D., D.A. Gilbertz, and R.D. Oetting. 1993. Chlorophyll loss and gas exchange in tomato leaves after feeding injury by *Bemisia tabaci* (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae). J. Econ. Entomol. 86:517–522.

Burd, J.D. and R.L. Burton. 1992. Characterization of plant damage caused by Russian wheat aphid (Homoptera: Aphididae). J. Econ. Entomol. 85:2017–2022.

Byrne, D.N. and W.B. Miller. 1990. Carbohydrate and amino acid composition of phloem sap and honeydew produced by *Bemisia tabaci*. J. Insect Physiol. 36:433–439.

Campbell, W.R., R.C. Counselman, H.W. Ray, and L.I. Terry. 1979. Evaluation of chlordimeform (Galecron) for *Heliothis virescens* control on cotton, p. 122–125. In: J.M. Brown (ed.). Proc. Beltwide Cotton Prod. Res. Conf., Natl. Cotton Council, Memphis.

Cathey, G.W. and J.C. Bailey. 1987. Evaluation of chlordimeform for cotton yield enhancement. J. Econ. Entomol. 80:670–674.

Elbert, A., H. Overbeck, H. Iwaya, and S. Tsuboi. 1990. Imidacloprid, a novel systemic nitromethylene analouge insecticide for crop protection. 1990 Brighton Crop Protection Conf.—Pests and disease. p. 21–28.

Hunt, R. 1978. Plant growth analysis. Inst. Biol. Stud. Biol. 96.

Johnson, H.S., Jr., and K.A. Mayberry. 1982. Cultural practices for melon desert production, p. 85–95. In: T. Baktin (ed.). California melon research progress, 1981 Annu. Rpt. California Melon Res. Board, Dinuba.

Mullins, J.W. 1993. Imidacloprid: A new nitoroguanidine insecticide, p. 183–198. In: Pest control with enhanced environmental safety. Amer. Chem. Soc. Symp. Ser. 524.

Oetting, R.D. and A.L. Anderson. 1990. Imidacloprid for control of whiteflies on greenhouse grown poinsettias. 1990 Brighton Crop Protection Conf.—Pests and diseases. p. 367–372.

Palumbo, J.C. 1994a. Insecticidal control of sweetpotato whitefly on spring melons, p. 106. In: T.J. Henneberry and N.C. Toscano (eds.). Silverleaf whitefly (formerly sweetpotato whitefly) 1994 Supplement to the Five-Year National Research and Action Plan. U.S. Dept. of Agr., Agr. Res. Serv. 125.

Palumbo, J.C. 1994b. Evaluation of Admire for control of sweetpotato whitefly in commercial head lettuce in Arizona, p. 73. In: T.J. Henneberry and N.C. Toscano (eds.). Silverleaf whitefly (formerly sweetpotato whitefly) 1994 Supplement to the Five-Year National Research and Action Plan. U.S. Dept. of Agr., Agr. Res. Serv. 125.

Palumbo, J.C., C.H. Mullis, and F.J. Reyes. 1994. Control of sweetpotato whitefly in cantaloupe with various pesticides. Arthropod Management Tests 19:80–81.

Parrot, W.L, J.N. Jenkins, W.R. Meredith, Jr., J.C. McCarthy, Jr., and J.C. Bailey. 1985. Effects of aldicarb on tarnished plant bug (Hemiptera: Miridae) density and cotton yield. J. Econ. Entomol. 78:155–157.

Perring, T.M., A.D. Cooper, R.J. Rodriguez, C.A. Farrar, and T.S. Bellows. 1993. Identification of a whitefly species by genomic and behavioral studies. Science 259:74–77.

SAS Institute. 1988. SAS/STAT user's guide, release 6.03 ed. SAS Inst., Cary, N.C.

Scott, W.P., J.W. Smith, and G.L. Snodgrass. 1985. Response of cotton arthropods in cotton to various dosages of aldicarb applied in furrow at planting time. J. Econ. Entomol. 78:249–257.

Trumble, J.T., W. Carson, H. Nakakihara, and V. Voth. 1988. Impact of pesticides for tomato fruitworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) suppression on photosynthesis, yield and non target arthropods in strawberries. J. Econ. Entomol. 81:608–614.

van Lenteren, J.C. and L.P.J.J. Noldus. 1990. Whitefly–plant relations: Behavioural and ecological aspects, p. 47–89. In: D. Gerling (ed.). Whiteflies: Their bionomics, pest status and management. Wimborne, UK: Intercept.

Veeraswamy, J. 1993. Effect of selected insecticides on plant growth and mycorrhizal development in sorghum. Agr. Ecosystems Environ. 43:337–343.

Ware, G.W. 1989. The pesticide book. Thompson Publications, Fresno, Calif.

Womack, C.L. and M.F. Schuster. 1986. Testing the reported positive growth response for cotton, *Gossypium hirsutum*, treated with aldicarb. J. Econ. Entomol. 79:1118–1120.

Youngman, R.R., T.F. Leigh, T.A. Kerby, N.C. Toscano, and C.E. Jackson. 1990. Pesticides and cotton: Effects on photosynthesis, growth and fruiting. J. Econ. Entomol. 83:1549–1557.