# The Effect of Alternative Southern Green Stink Bug (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae) Insecticide Controls on Soybean Pest Management, Quality and Yield<sup>1</sup>

R. M. McPherson, D. J. Boethel<sup>2</sup>, J. E. Funderburk<sup>3</sup> and A. T. Wier<sup>2</sup>

> University of Georgia Coastal Plain Experiment Station Tifton, Georgia 31793 USA

ABSTRACT Seven alternative insecticides to methyl parathion were assessed for stink bug control and yield and quality losses in soybean field trials in Georgia, Louisiana and Florida during 1988 and 1989. Several pyrethroid insecticides including lambda-cyhalothrin, cyfluthrin, tralomethrin and cypermethrin controlled the southern green soybean stink bug, Nezara viridula (L.). These insecticides had greater residual control than methyl parathion, the standard for stink bug control, and acephate, another labeled soybean insecticide. The residual control of the pyrethroids also prevented the buildup of green cloverworm, Plathypena scabra (F.), velvetbean caterpillar, Anticarsia gemmatalis Hübner, and bean leaf beetle, Cerotoma trifurcata (Forster). Permethrin, another pyrethroid insecticide, did not provide adequate stink bug control at the rate tested. Yields and 100-seed weights in the alternative insecticide plots were equal to or exceeded those in the standard treatments. Soybean quality (lower percentage of stink bug damaged kernels) was higher in plots treated with pyrethroids. Several alternative insecticides for controlling stink bugs are available to replace methyl parathion in sovbean, should this product become unavailable to producers due to its patent expiration or denial of re-registration.

KEY WORDS Soybean, stink bugs, Nezara viridula, chemical control.

Turnipseed and Kogan (1976) reported that the stink bug complex and the corn earworm, *Helicoverpa zea* (Boddie), were the most serious soybean pod feeders in the United States. Stink bugs cause significant quality and yield losses in soybean annually in Louisiana, Florida and Georgia (Jensen and Newsom 1972, Todd and Turnipseed 1974). It is estimated that stink bugs cost Georgia producers over \$13 million in chemical controls and crop losses in some years (Douce and McPherson 1991). Stink bugs cause economic damage in soybean beginning at initiation of podfill and continuing until plant maturity (Minor 1966).

The soybean stink bug complex in the Southeast consists primarily of the southern green stink bug, *Nezara viridula* (L.), the brown stink bug, *Euschistus servus* 

J. Entomol. Sci. 30(2): 216-236 (April 1995)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Accepted for publication 09 December 1994.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Louisiana State University, Department of Entomology, 402 Life Sciences Building, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-1710.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> University of Florida, North Florida Research and Education Center, Route 3, Box 4370, Qunicy, FL 32351-9529.

(Say), and the green stink bug, Acrosternum hilare (Say) (Panizzi and Slansky 1985). However, N. viridula is generally the most economically damaging species (McPherson et al. 1993). Methyl parathion provides highly effective control of the stink bug complex at a reasonable cost, and has been the preferred insecticide for stink bug control in soybean for at least two decades (Adams and McPherson 1990).

Considerable research has documented stink bug biology and damage in soybean (Harris and Todd 1981, McPherson et al. 1979b). Most of this effort has focused on the southern green stink bug, *N. viridula* (Schumann and Todd 1982, Russin et al. 1987). Methyl parathion has been used almost exclusively as a standard for evaluating stink bug control in field plots (McPherson et al. 1979a). Few research programs have examined alternative chemicals for control of stink bugs. Several candidate pesticides indicate good control of certain stink bug species (Layton and Boethel 1987, Funderburk and Brown 1989, McPherson and Taylor 1989, Mink and Boethel 1989). However, impact of these products on soybean quality and yield is lacking.

In 1987, the patent for methyl parathion was due to expire and the product was a candidate for reregistration by EPA. It was uncertain whether the parent manufacturer would find it profitable to undergo the reregistration process with patent expiration eminent. At present, only one company (Cheminova, Bloomfield, NJ) markets methyl parathion in the United States. Also, concerns about its EPA registration status persist due to its high mammalian toxicity (Delaplane 1993). Therefore, alternatives for controlling stink bugs in soybean need to be identified, and the impact of these alternative controls on soybean production must be evaluated to determine whether crop yield and quality losses will be affected. This study was undertaken to assess the impact of alternative insecticides to methyl parathion for stink bug control in soybean production systems in Louisiana, Florida and Georgia.

#### **Materials and Methods**

Similar field experiments were conducted at agricultural experiment stations in Louisiana, Florida and Georgia during 1988 and 1989. At each test location, either 'Bragg' or 'Braxton' soybean varieties (both maturity group VII) were planted in conventional wide-row cropping systems in mid-May. The experimental design for each site was a randomized block design with 4 replications. Plot size was  $9.1 \text{ m} \times 15.2 \text{ m} (0.014 \text{ ha})$ . Treatments included lambda-cyhalothrin (Zeneca Ag Products, Wilmington, DE), cyfluthrin (Miles Ag Division, Kansas City, MO), tralomethrin (AgrEvo, Wilmington, DE), acephate (Valent USA, Germantown, TN), methyl parathion or a microencapsulated formulation of methyl parathion (Elf Atochem, Philadelphia, PA), and an untreated control. At some test sites, cypermethrin (Zeneca Ag Products or FMC Corp., Philadelphia, PA) and permethrin (Zeneca or FMC) also were included. The plots were sampled weekly using a standard 38-cm diam sweep net, taking 25 sweeps per plot (Kogan and Pitre 1980). The stink bug complex and other pest species including velvetbean caterpillar, Anticarsia gemmatalis Hübner, green cloverworm, Plathypena scabra (F.), and bean leaf beetle, Cerotoma trifurcata (Foster) were monitored. However, because

*N. viridula* was so predominate at all test locations, only its numbers were used in data comparisons. Treatments were applied when stink bug population densities approached an average of 6 per 25 sweeps during soybean growth stages  $R_4$  (pods developing) through  $R_6$  (full green bean developed in the pod, Fehr et al. 1971). Insecticides were applied with a  $CO_2$ -pressurized backpack sprayer calibrated to deliver 140 to 205 liters of finished product per ha at (35-40 psi, 8002 nozzles). In Georgia in 1988, a second application of all products was necessary to control stink bug populations.

All plots were harvested with a small plot combine for yield and seed quality evaluations. Seeds were categorized as having either light, moderate, heavy, or no stink bug damage (McPherson et al. 1979b) from four random 100 seed samples per plot. The percent damaged seed and 100 seed weight was determined. Data were analyzed by analysis of variance (P = 0.05) and each product was compared to the untreated control using Dunnett's test and to the standard (methyl parathion) using single degree-of freedom contrasts (SAS Institute 1985).

### **Results and Discussion**

The four alternative insecticides provided equal or greater residual control than microencapsulated methyl parathion in Georgia on each date evaluated (Tables 1, 2). The stink bug population density at this test site was 3-fold greater than the treatment threshold level of 9 per 25 sweeps in mid-September, 22 days posttreatment, and all products were reapplied. The stink bug population remained below the treatment threshold level in all the treated plots for the remainder of the season, except the methyl parathion plots at two days after the second application (Table 2). Most insecticides significantly reduced the stink bug nymph and adult populations below those in the untreated plots on most sampling dates except 22 days after the first application date, when all populations generally were declining. Only a few significant contrasts were detected when comparing stink bug populations in plots treated with methyl parathion vs those that received alternative insecticides (Tables 1 and 2).

Similar results were obtained at both test sites in Louisiana in 1988 with six alternative insecticides applied to control southern green stink bugs (Tables 3, 4). At test site 1 the population had nearly equal numbers of adults and nymphs that peaked at the treatment threshold level on 8 September (Table 3), two days after the applications were made. At test site 2, the population peaked seven days after treatment and was comprised mostly of nymphs (Table 4). Cypermethrin (0.022 - 0.045 kg AI/ha) provided good to excellent control at both test sites. All insecticides significantly reduced the stink bug populations below those in the untreated plots 2 and 7 days after the applications were made. Significant contrasts between populations in methyl parathion and all the alternative insecticides were detected 14 days after treatment in test 1, indicating that the alternative treatments provided longer residual control. All the alternative insecticides also were effective on stink bugs in Florida soybeans in 1988, although populations never exceeded the treatment threshold Table 1. Control of southern green stink bugs with alternative insecticides applied in Georgia soybeans, 1988, (1 et Annliantion)

						Mean no. days p	per 25 sv osttreatm	veeps* ent			
		Rato		5		•	7			22	
Chemical and	formulation	Kg AL/ha	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated	1	 	22.5	4.5	27.0	31.3	3.5	34.8	17.0	7.8	24.8
Tralomethrin	0.3 E	0.018	1.3 a	0.3 a	1.5 a	4.3 a	0.8	5.0 а	5.0	7.3	12.3
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.022	1.3 a	0.3 a	1.5 a	4.3 a	1.5	5.8 а	9.0	2.8	11.8
Acephate	75 WP	0.84	0.8 a	0.5 a	1.3 a	3.3 а	1.0	4.3 a	23.0	8.5	31.5
Methyl Parathion M**	2 FM	0.56	3.0 а	0.8 a	3.8 а	19.3	2.0	21.3	25.5	5.3	30.8
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.028	0 a	0 a	0 a	1.0 a	0	1.0 a	11.0	5.0	16.0
P > F ANOVA	ł	I	0.0002	0.0120	0.0001	0.0004	0.1260	0.0003	0.4013	0.5570	0.3701
	Methyl Paratl	hion vs:				P > F	' Contras	ts†			
	Tralomethrin		0.6571	0.6729	0.5990	0.0182	0.3091	0.0169	0.0812	0.5601	0.1378
	L cyhalothri	in	0.6571	0.6729	0.5990	0.0182	0.6796	0.0217	0.1531	0.4678	0.1282
	Acephate		0.5690	0.8325	0.5594	0.0128	0.4129	0.0132	0.8227	0.3482	0.9502
	Cyfluthrin		0.4495	0.5281	0.3847	0.0057	0.1128	0.0044	0.2058	0.9416	0.2305
* Means followed by an "	a" are significan	tly different fro	om untreated	check ( $P =$	0.05, Dunn	ett's).					

† Single df contrasts. \*\* Penncap M.

1988,	
soybeans,	
Georgia	
in	
applied	
cides	
sectio	
in.	
ive	
nat	
ter	
alt	
with	
sgno	
k t	
stin	
en	
gre	
E	
the	í.
out	itio
of s	lica
01 (	dd
ntr	ЧV
Ŝ	(2n
બં	
Table	

				¢	Mean no. per days postti	25 sweeps* reatment	r	
Chemical and	formulation	Rate Kg Al/ha	Nymphs	2 Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated	1		16.0	10.3	26.3	7.8	5.3	13.1
Tralomethrin Lcyhalothrin	0.3 E 1 E	0.018 0.022	0.8 a 0.8 a	0.5 a 0 a	1.3 a 0.8 a	0а 0.3а	1.3 a 1.0 a	1.3 a 1.3 a
Acephate Methvl Parathion M**	75 WP 2 FM	0.84 0.56	1.5 a 8 0	0 189	1.5 а 9.8 а	2.0 a 3.3	3.3 3.5	4.3 a 6.8
Cyfluthrin $P > F$ ANOVA	2 E	0.028 _	0.0020	0.3 a 0.0002	0.3 a 0.0005	0.8 a 0.0004	0.5 a 0.0287	1.3 а 0.0035
	Methyl Parathi	on vs:			$P > F \operatorname{Co}$	ntrasts†		
	Tralomethrin L cyhalothrin Acephate Cyfluthrin		0.0562 0.0562 0.0833 0.0374	0.4993 0.3478 0.3478 0.3478 0.4191	0.1039 0.0867 0.1136 0.0721	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0983\\ 0.1246\\ 0.5082\\ 0.1952\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.1218 \\ 0.0884 \\ 0.3766 \\ 0.0450 \end{array}$	0.0631 0.0631 0.3761 0.0631

\* Means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's).
\*\* Penncap M.
† Single df contrasts.

Downloaded from https://prime-pdf-watermark.prime-prod.pubfactory.com/ at 2025-07-04 via free access

220

- 75
- 2
- 2
- 12
15
Б
2
$\mathbf{O}$
-
2
୍ଷ
le 2
ole 2
able 2
able 2

•

					Mean no. per days posttr	25 sweeps* eatment		
		Doto		14			21	
Chemical and	formulation	raue Kg Al/ha	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated	1	-	1.8	2.3	4.1	1.3	1.3	2.6
Tralomethrin	0.3 E	0.018	1.0	0.8	1.8	0	0 a	0 a
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.022	1.8	0.5	2.3	0	0.5	0.5 a
Acephate	75 WP	0.84	1.5	0.5	2.0	0.8	0.5	1.3
Methyl Parathion M**	2 FM	0.56	4.3	0.3	4.6	0	1.5	1.5
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.028	0.8	0.8	1.6	0	0.3	0.3 а
P > F ANOVA	I	ł	0.6491	0.1069	0.6434	0.0826	0.0073	0.0220
	Methyl Parath	iion vs:			$P > F \operatorname{Co}$	ntrasts†		
	Tralomethrin		0.1523	0.4755	0.2221	1.000	0.0011	0.0454
	L cyhalothri Arenhate	ц	0.2642 0.2213	0.7195	0.3138 0.2650	1.000	0.0170	0.1662 0.7211
	Cyfluthrin		0.1252	0.4755	.1849	1.000	0.0043	0.0889
* Means followed by an	a" are significantly differen	nt from untreated check (P	= 0.05. Dunnett's)					

b

\*\* Penncap M. † Single df contrasts.

st	
E.	
ີຜົ	
an	
) Ö	
N	
š	
na	
ia	
iis	
୍ବ	
led	
μ	
de	
ŝ	
de	
:5	
G	
ISE	
Ve	
ati	
ũ.	
ter	
all	
-0	
vit]	
s witl	
ugs witl	
bugs wit]	
nk bugs witl	
stink bugs witl	
n stink bugs witl	
een stink bugs witl	
green stink bugs witl	
n green stink bugs witl	
ern green stink bugs witl	
thern green stink bugs witl	
outhern green stink bugs witl	
f southern green stink bugs witl	
l of southern green stink bugs witl	
rol of southern green stink bugs witl	
ntrol of southern green stink bugs witl	38.
Control of southern green stink bugs witl	1988.
3. Control of southern green stink bugs witl	1988.
le 3. Control of southern green stink bugs witl	1988.
uble 3. Control of southern green stink bugs witl	1988.

						Mean no	. per 25 sv	veeps*			
		Doto		7		l a fam	7			14	
Chemical and	formulation	Kg AI/ha	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated	I	I	3.9	4.8	8.7	4.3	3.9	8.2	3.0	1.3	4.3
Tralomethrin	0.9 E	0.021	0.3 a	0.3 a	0.6 a	0 a	0 a	0 a	0 a	0.3	0.3 a
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.022	0.3 a	0.3 а	0.6 a	0 a	0 а	0 a	0.3	0.1	0.4 a
Acephate	75 WP	0.84	0 a	0.4 a	0.4 a	0.1 a	0.4 a	0.5 a	1.0	0.1	1.1
Methyl Parathion M**	4 E	0.56	0 a	0.1 a	0.1 a	0.3 a	0.4 a	0.7 a	3.3	1.5	4.8
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.028	0 a	0 a	0 a	0 a	0.1 a	0.1 a	0.3	0	0.3 a
Cypermenthrin	3 E	0.045	0.4 a	0.1 a	0.5 a	0.3 а	0.5 a	0.8 a	0.1	0.3	0.4 a
Tralomethrin	0.3 E	0.021	0 a	0.1 a	0.1 a	0 a	0.3 a	0.3 а	0.1	0	0.1 a
P > F ANOVA	I	ł	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0109	0.0406	0.0022
Methyl Par	athion vs:					P > F	Contrast	s+			
Tralometh	rin		0.6600	0.8188	0.6907	0.7013	0.3984	0.4990	0.0050	0.0274	0.0022
L cyhalot	thrin		0.6600	0.8188	0.6907	0.7013	0.3984	0.4990	0.0092	0.0157	0.0028
Acenhate			1.000	0.6471	0.7907	0.8478	1.000	0.8922	0.0476	0.0157	0.0123
Cyfluthrin			1.000	0.8188	0.8944	0.7013	0.5727	0.5883	0.0092	0.0088	0.0022
Cynerment	-hrin		0.5098	1.000	0.6907	1.000	0.7777	0.8922	0.0068	0.0274	0.0028
Tralometh	rin (0.3 E)		1.000	1.000	1.000	0.7013	0.7777	0.6846	0.0068	0.0088	0.0017

\* Means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's).  $\dagger$  Single df contrasts.

ณ์	
st	
Te	
JS,	
ear	
Å	
ŝ	
na	
iaı	
uis	
Lo L	
ii	
pa	
jlie	
Ide	
ŝ	
ide	
tic	
ş	
ins	
ve.	
ativ	
Ĩ	
ltei	
l al	
ith	
8	
ßn	
ā	
h	
sti	
en	
J.	
80	
ler	
lth	
SOI	
of	
<b>o</b>	
ntr	<u>.</u>
20	198
4.	
le	
ab	
H	

				5	Mean no. per days postt	25 sweeps* reatment	7	
<b>Chemical</b> and	formulation	kate Kg Al/ha	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated	I	I	8.1	1.5	9.6	7.3	2.8	10.1
Tralomethrin	0.9 E	0.017	0 a	0 a	0 a	0.3 a	0 а	0.3 a
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.011	0.5 a	0 a	0.5 а	0 a	0.1 a	0.1 a
Acephate	75 WP	0.56	0.5 a	0.6	1.1 a	0.3 a	0. <b>4</b> a	0.6 a
Methyl Parathion	4 E	0.56	0.4 a	0.3 a	0.7 а	0.1 a	0.5 a	0.6 a
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.011	0.8 a	0.1 a	0.9 а	0.3 a	0.5 a	0.8 a
Cypermethrin	3 E	0.022	1.9 a	0.3 a	2.2 a	1.3 a	0.9 a	2.2 а
P > F ANOVA	ł	I	0.0001	0.0024	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
	Methyl Parathic	n vs:			$P > F \operatorname{Co}$	ntrasts†		
	Tralomethrin		0.6743	0.5067	0.5836	0.8729	0.2433	0.6867
	L cyhalothrin		0.8885	0.5067	0.9126	0.8729	0.3800	0.5910
	Acephate		0.8885	0.3207	0.6609	0.8729	0.7690	1.0000
	Cyfluthrin		0.6743	0.7397	0.8262	0.8729	1.000	0.8930
	Cypermethrin		0.0974	1.000	0.1918	0.1543	0.3800	0.1113

\* Means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's).  $\ddagger$  Single df contrasts. throughout the season, except on 4 October (14 days after application) when the untreated plots had 9.3 stink bugs per 25 sweeps and all the treated plots had significantly lower populations of 0.3 to 3.0 per 25 sweeps. Permethrin also was applied at 0.11 kg AI/ha at this test site. This alternate insecticide reduced stink bug populations only slightly relative to those in the untreated plots on all sampling dates except 14 days after treatment, when populations were significantly lower in the permethrin plots (3.0 per 25 sweeps) than in the untreated plots (9.3 per 25 sweeps, F = 6.1, 6 and 18 df, P = 0.01).

The four alternative stink bug insecticides evaluated in Georgia in 1989 provided residual control equal to methyl parathion up to 14 days after treatment (Table 5). Cyfluthrin and tralomethrin continued to provide control for up to 14 days, even though the stink bug population density was rising in the untreated plots to nearly 3-fold the treatment threshold level. No significant contrasts were detected between population densities in the methyl parathion vs alternative insecticides, indicating that the alternatives were equal to the standard in controlling stink bug populations. All treatments had significantly lower stink bug adult populations than those in the untreated plots 3 days after application, and several treatments remained effective 7 and 14 days posttreatment.

All insecticide controls were effective at both test sites in Louisiana in 1989 (Tables 6 and 7). Population densities of southern green stink bugs approached treatment threshold in test 1 and exceeded the threshold by 3-fold in test 2. Very few significant contrasts were detected between methyl parathion and the alternative insecticides, indicating that the alternatives were as effective as the standard.

The residual control of the pyrethroid insecticides prevented the buildup of green cloverworms at the Louisiana test 1 site in 1988. At 14 days after application, the acephate, methyl parathion, and untreated plots had 19.9, 31.1, and 10.6 larvae per 25 sweeps, while all other treatments had significantly lower populations (less than 0.4 larva per 25 sweeps).

The residual activity in all the treatments in the 1989 Georgia test prevented a buildup of velvetbean caterpillars 14 days after application. Samples in the untreated plots averaged over 10 larvae per 25 sweeps on this date (12 September) while all other treatments had fewer than 0.2 larva per 25 sweeps. Bean leaf beetles also were effectively controlled up to 14 days after application in the 1989 test by all treatments except acephate and the lowest rate of methyl parathion. At 14 days after treatment, there were 13.3, 6.0, and 3.8 beetles per 25 sweeps in the untreated, acephate, and methyl parathion plots, respectively, while all other treatments had fewer than 1 beetle per 25 sweeps. At 21 days after treatment, the counts were 20.3, 13.3, and 10.3 beetles per 25 sweeps, respectively, with fewer than 4 per 25 sweeps in the other plots. The residual control of the pyrethroids prevented the buildup of green cloverworms 14 days after application in the Louisiana test 2 sites in 1989. The acephate and methyl parathion treated plots had larval populations approaching those in the untreated control plots (over 20 per 25 sweeps), while the other treatments contained populations below 1 larva per 25 sweeps.

More stink bug-damaged kernels were detected in the untreated plots than in any of the insecticide treated plots in Georgia in 1988 (Table 8). Stink bug Table 5. Control of southern green stink bugs with alternative insecticides applied in Georgia soybeans, 1989.

					Mean no. per davs posttr	25 sweeps* eatment		
		ſ		ę	4		7	
Chemical and	formulation	kate Kg Al/ha	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated		1	15.5	7.3	22.8	3.3	6.0	9.3
Tralomethrin	0.9 E	0.024	0	0 a	0	0	0.8 a	0.8 a
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.017	0	0 a	0	0.8	0.3 a	1.1 a
Acephate	75 WP	0.84	0.5	0 a	0.5	3.3	1.8	5.1
Methyl Parathion M**	2 FM	0.42	2.3	1.8 a	4.1	3.0	3.5	6.5
Methyl Parathion M**	2 FM	0.56	1.3	1.0 a	2.3	3.0	1.8	4.8
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.017	0	0.3 a	0.3	0.8	1.0 a	1.8 a
P > F ANOVA	I	I	0.3377	0.0001	0.0740	0.2265	0.0428	0.0259
								1
	Methyl Parathi	on (0.56) vs:			$P > F \operatorname{Co}$	ntrasts†		
	Tralomethrin		0.8647	0.1662	0.7717	0.0834	0.5615	0.1271
	L cyhalothrir	_	0.8647	0.1662	0.7717	0.1861	0.3866	0.1511
	Acephate		0.9186	0.1662	0.8213	0.8803	1.0000	0.9215
	Cyfluthrin		0.8647	0.2934	0.7964	0.1861	0.6625	0.2458
	M. Parathion N	I	0.8916	0.2934	0.8213	1.0000	0.3142	0.4930
* Means followed by an "a" a ** Penncap M. † Single df contrasts.	re significantly differen	t from untreated check (P	= 0.05, Dunnett's)					

						-		
					Mean no. per days posttr	Z5 sweeps* reatment		
		Dato		14			21	
Chemical and	formulation	Kg AI/ha	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated	1	1	17.5	7.3	24.8	13.3	7.7	21.0
Tralomethrin	0.9 E	0.024	0	0.8 a	0.8	1.0	5.3	6.3
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.017	1.3	2.8	4.1	5.7	10.0	15.7
Acephate	75 WP	0.84	2.0	2.0 a	4.0	6.3	10.3	10.6
Methyl Parathion M**	2 FM	0.42	1.8	4.8	6.6	2.3	9.0	11.3
Methyl Parathion M <sup>**</sup>	2 FM	0.56	3.3	3.8	7.1	1.7	7.3	9.0
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.017	0.5	0.8 a	1.3	2.7	6.3	9.0
P > F ANOVA	I	I	0.3763	0.0179	0.2038	0.6421	0.5740	0.4266
	Methyl Parathi	ion (0.56) vs:			P > F Co	ntrasts†		
	Tralomethrin		0.6940	0.1065	0.5048	0.9274	0.5050	0.7138
	L cyhalothrir	l	0.8084	0.5781	0.7477	0.5896	0.3776	0.3662
	Acephate		0.8795	0.3347	0.7477	0.5271	0.3230	0.3041
	Cyfluthrin		0.7390	0.1065	0.5391	0.8913	0.7371	1.0000
	M. Parathion <b>N</b>	Ţ	0.8557	0.5781	0.9572	0.9274	0.5775	0.7481
	500 E							

\* Means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's).

\*\* Penncap M. † Single df contrasts.

**Table 5. Continued.** 

Table 6. Control of southern green stink bugs with alternative insecticides applied in Louisiana soybeans, (Test 1), 1989.

						Mean no days p	. per 25 sv osttreatm	veeps* ient			
		Rato		2			2			14	
Chemical and	formulation	Kg AI/ha	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated	I	1	2.9	4.8	7.7	3.5	3.8	7.3	2.8	3.8	6.5
Tralomethrin	0.9 E	0.011	0.4 a	0.9 a	1.3 a	0.6	0.9 а	1.5 a	0.8	1.4	2.2
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.011	0.6 a	0.9 a	1.5 a	0.1	1.4 a	1.5 a	1.6	1.8	3.4
Acephate	30 S	0.56	0.4 a	1.3 a	1.7 a	1.4	1.1 a	2.5 a	3.3	1.6	4.9
Methyl Parathion	4 E	0.56	0.1 a	0.1 a	0.2 a	0	0.4 a	0.4 a	3.0	0.6	3.6
Methyl Parathion M**	2 FM	0.28	1.8	2.1	3.9	1.1	1.0 a	2.1 a	2.0	1.5	3.5
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.011	1.8	1.8 a	3.6 а	0.5	1.1 a	1.6 a	0.6	1.9	2.5
Esfenvalerate	0.66 E	0.034	1.1	2.8	3.9	1.3	0.4 a	1.7 a	3.3	1.3	4.6
P > F ANOVA	I	I	0.0194	0.0026	0.0009	0.1981	0.0067	0.0140	0.1690	0.4569	0.5180
	Methyl Parati	hion vs:				P > F	Contras	sts†			
	Tralomethrin		0.7425	0.4328	0.4796	0.6221	0.5193	0.4905	0.0689	0.5639	0.4774
	L cyhalothr	in	0.5128	0.4328	0.3785	0.9213	0.2040	0.4905	0.2545	0.3891	0.9052
	Acephate		0.7425	0.2436	0.3336	0.2836	0.3367	0.1992	0.8334	0.4431	0.5531
	M. Parathion	М	0.0422	0.0449	0.0164	0.3781	0.4218	0.2874	0.4038	0.5014	0.9525
	Cyfluthrin		0.0422	0.0978	0.0293	0.6931	0.3367	0.4442	0.0559	0.3396	0.5931
	Esfenvalerate	0	0.1973	0.0108	0.0164	0.3285	1.0000	0.4442	0.8334	0.6302	0.6773
											1

<sup>\*</sup> Means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's).

<sup>\*\*</sup> Penncap M.

<sup>†</sup> Single df contrasts.

Table 7. Control of 1989.	southern g	green stink	t bugs wit	h altern	ative ins	iecticides	applied	in Louis	siana soyl	beans, (1	ľest 2),
		D.10		6		Mean no days F	. per 25 sv osttreatn 7	veeps* tent		14	
Chemical and	formulation	Kg Al/ha	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total	Nymphs	Adults	Total
Untreated	1	1	18.4	1.5	19.9	19.3	5.1	24.4	13.4	7.3	20.7
Tralomethrin	0.9 E	0.024	2.1 a	0.1	2.2 а	1.3 a	0.4 a	1.7 a	1.0 a	0.4 a	1.4 a
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.017	0.8 a	0.1	0.9 а	0.8 a	0.3 a	1.1 a	0.1 a	0.4 a	0.5 а
Acephate	30 S	0.84	0.8 a	0.1	1.0 a	1.4 a	0.4 a	1.8 a	2.3 а	0.9 a	3.2 а
<b>Methyl Parathion</b>	4 E	0.56	0.3 а	0.1	0.4 a	0.6 a	1.3 a	1.9 a	2.0 а	3.5 а	5.5 a
Methyl Parathion M**	2 FM	0.28	2.1 a	0.8	2.9 а	0.9 а	0.4 а	1.3 a	1.3 а	2.4 а	3.6 а
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.017	1.6 a	0.1	1.7 a	0.8 a	0.3 a	1.1 a	0.3 а	0.6 a	0.9 a
Esfenvalerate	0.66 E	0.034	2.6 а	2.0	4.6 a	3.3 а	1.0 a	4.3 a	2.1 a	1.5 a	3.6 a
P > F ANOVA	ł	I	0.0001	0.0042	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0017	0.0001	0.0001
	Methyl Paratl	hion vs:				P > H	<sup>7</sup> Contras	sts†			
	Tralomethrin		0.2861	1.0000	0.3175	0.7346	0.2407	0.8961	0.7183	0.0165	0.2226
	L cyhalothr	in	0.7188	1.0000	0.7363	0.9459	0.1822	0.6482	0.5005	0.0165	0.1426
	Acephate		0.7188	1.0000	0.7363	0.6843	0.2407	0.9479	0.9280	0.0401	0.4773
•	M. Parathion	M	0.4311	1.0000	0.4611	0.9459	0.1822	0.6482	0.5292	0.0259	0.1734
-	Cyfluthrin		0.2861	0.2337	0.1866	0.8920	0.2407	0.7442	0.7866	0.3589	0.5739
	Esfenvalerate	Â	0.1801	0.0014	0.0344	0.1638	0.7366	0.2228	0.9640	0.1102	0.5739

\* Means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's). \*\* Penncap M.  $\ddagger$  Single df contrasts.

vith	
treated v	
oybeans	
of s	
vields 4	
and	
weights,	
100-seed	88.
seeds,	rgia, 19
umaged	es in Geo
g dê	cide
fnq	ecti
stink	ug ins
of	uk b
nce	stin
cide	tive
e in	rna
The	alte
ø.	
Table	

			2	and and do.		*			
			2 0%	seeus per uai	nage callegor	ĥ			
Chemical and	formulation	Rate Kg Al/ha	None	Light	Mod	Hvy	Damaged seed (%)	100 Seed Wt. (g)*	Yield kg/ha*
Untreated	I	I	11.0	41.0	22.0	25.9	89.0	13.9	1499.2
Tralomethrin	0.3 E	0.018	39.8	40.3	10.4	9.5 a	60.2	16.0 a	1851.1 a
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.022	34.1	46.5	13.2	6.2 a	65.9	15.3 a	1844.4 a
Acephate	75 WP	0.84	35.8	43.9	13.6	6.7 a	64.2	15.8 a	1794.7
Methyl Parathion M**	2 FM	0.56	28.3	45.1	15.8	10.8 a	71.7	14.3	1605.3
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.028	36.2	39.0	16.6	8.2 a	63.8	15.2 a	1854.4 a
P > F ANOVA	I	I	0.0798	0.8853	0.1750	0.0005	0.0798	0.003	0.0279
	Methyl Parathic	:sy nc			I	<pre>&gt; F Contra</pre>	sts†		
	Tralomethrin		0.2394	0.5266	0.2116	0.7233	0.2394	0.0004	0.0496
	L cyhalothrin		0.5456	0.8484	0.5402	0.2160	0.5456	0.0237	0.0553
	Acephate		0.4372	0.8733	0.6078	0.2638	0.4372	0.0013	0.1201
	Cyfluthrin		0.4115	0.4126	0.8547	0.4729	0.4115	0.0347	0.0469

\* Column means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's).

† Single df contrasts.

damage was evident on 89% of the seeds in the untreated plots, and significantly more seeds were heavily damaged in the untreated plots, than in the plots treated with insecticides. One hundred seed weights were significantly higher when alternative insecticides were utilized relative to seed weights in the untreated plots or when methyl parathion was applied. Yields were significantly higher in all insecticide-treated plots than in the untreated plots, except for those treated with acephate and methyl parathion. No significant differences were detected in seed damage, 100-seed weight or yield among treatments in the Louisiana (Table 9) and Florida tests in 1988. However, a trend was apparent for lower yield and higher seed damage in the untreated plots in Louisiana (Table 9).

Stink bug-damaged kernels were high in Georgia in 1989 (Table 10), with most of the damage being in the light category (punctured but not wrinkling). There were significantly more undamaged seeds in the cyfluthrin and tralomethrin plots relative to the untreated plots. Yields tended to be higher in the treated plots although not significantly so (P = 0.07). Differences among treatments were not observed for 100-seed weights (Table 10). In both tests in Louisiana in 1989, stink bug-damaged kernels were not significantly higher in the untreated plots than in the treated plots (Tables 11, 12). These tests were conducted late in the season when the plants were in the  $R_6$  and  $R_5$  growth stages. This might explain why most of the damage was recorded as light in these tests because the seeds were nearing maturity when treatable stink bug populations developed. Yields were significantly higher in the plots treated with methyl parathion or cyfluthrin in test 2 (Table 12); however 100-seed weights were not different at either test site. No differences were noted in seed quality evaluations and yields among treatments in the 1989 Florida test. This was due to low numbers of stink bugs at this test site throughout the entire season.

The results of this series of field tests indicate that several potential alternative insecticides are currently available for controlling stink bugs on soybeans. Subsequent to these studies, other tests have confirmed the efficacy of these insecticides over a wide range of stink bug population levels, at several geographic locations, and at dosages lower than those reported here (Boyd et al. 1994, McPherson and Moss 1990, Weir et al. 1991, 1992, 1993.) Thus, these products not only provide acceptable control, but as the studies reported here indicate, they also maintain soybean quality and yields at or above the levels obtained with the current standard insecticide, methyl parathion. Economic studies have reported that these alternative insecticides are also cost efficient (Chyen et al. 1992). Tralomethrin is labeled for use in soybeans, and the Georgia, Louisiana, and Florida Cooperative Extension Service guidelines now include this product in their recommendations. The companies that produce lambda-cyhalothrin and cyfluthrin are currently pursuing soybean registrations. Permethrin is already labeled for control of certain soybean insect pests, but due to lack of effectiveness against stink bugs, its label should not be expanded to include this pest complex. There is no indication that cypermethrin will be registered for use on soybean in the near future.

with	
treated	
soybeans	
of	
yields	
and	
weights,	
100-seed	1988.
eds,	iana
seeds,	uisiana
ged seeds,	i Louisiana
maged seeds,	s in Louisiana
damaged seeds,	ides in Louisiana
oug damaged seeds,	cticides in Louisiana
ık bug damaged seeds,	nsecticides in Louisiana
stink bug damaged seeds,	ug insecticides in Louisiana
of stink bug damaged seeds,	k bug insecticides in Louisiana
nce of stink bug damaged seeds,	stink bug insecticides in Louisiana
dence of stink bug damaged seeds,	ve stink bug insecticides in Louisiana
incidence of stink bug damaged seeds,	native stink bug insecticides in Louisiana
he incidence of stink bug damaged seeds,	ternative stink bug insecticides in Louisiana
). The incidence of stink bug damaged seeds,	alternative stink bug insecticides in Louisiana
le 9. The incidence of stink bug damaged seeds,	alternative stink bug insecticides in Louisiana
Table 9. The incidence of stink bug damaged seeds,	alternative stink bug insecticides in Louisiana

			s %	eeds per dan	lage category	*^			
Chemical and	formulation	Rate Kg AI/ha	None	Light	Mod	Hvy	Damaged seed (%)	100 Seed Wt. (g)*	Yield kg/ha*
Untreated	1		51.8	34.0	7.0	7.3	48.3	13.3	2626.7
Tralomethrin Lcvhalothrin	0.9 E 1 F	0.021 0.022	56.0 57.3	32.3 32.5	4.3 8.8	7.5 7.5	44.0 42.8	12.8 13.7	2824.6 2944.7
Acephate	$75 \overline{WP}$	0.84	63.0	26.0	6.5	.4 .0	36.9	13.6	2939.9
Metnyi Faratnion Cyfluthrin	2 4 E E	0.056 0.028	60.8 73.3	21.0 18.8	8.0 9.0	6.7 4.0	36.8	12.0	2/40.0 2863.7
Cypermethrin	3 E	0.045	68.0	20.3	5.3	6.8	32.1	12.7	2784.6
Tralomethrin	0.3 E	0.021	68.8	20.8	6.0	4.5	31.3	12.9	2673.9
P > F ANOVA	I	I	0.4693	0.3096	0.3847	0.8304	0.4725	0.7498	0.2266
	Methyl Parathio	.sv n			P	> F Contra	sts†		
	Tralomethrin .9 L cyhalothrin	Е	0.3636 0.4273	0.1722 0.1633	0.4387 0.1293	1.000 1.000	$0.3641 \\ 0.4277$	0.7923 0.1573	0.5689 0.1562
	Acephate		0.7959	0.5367	0.6970	0.3266	0.8058	0.2311	0.1660
	Cyfluthrin		0.4829	0.7802	0.3675	0.2916	0.4833	0.3287	0.3945
	Tralomethrin .3	Е	0.7779	0.9752	0.8966	0.3643	0.7781	0.6932	0.5946
	Cypermethrin		0.8324	0.9258	0.7950	0.8189	0.8411	0.9213	0.7809

\* Column means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's).  $\dagger$  Single df contrasts.

McPHERSON et al.: Alternative Southern Green Stink Bug Control

			3 %	seeds per dar	nage categor.	4*			
Chemical and	formulation	Rate Kg AI/ha	None	Light	poM	Hvy	Damaged seed (%)*	100 Seed Wt. (g)*	Yield kg/ha*
Untreated	1	I	32.0	50.5	16.3	1.3	68.1	17.4	823
Tralomethrin	0.9 EC	0.024	58.5 a	34.8	6.3 a	0.5	41.6 a	19.2	1216
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.017	37.8	55.5	5.3 a	1.5	62.3	18.4	995
Acephate	75 W	0.84	49.3	37.5	8.0 a	5.3	50.8	18.6	1166
M. Parathion M**	2 FM	0.42	35.0	48.5	13.0	3.5	65.0	17.5	974
M. Parathion M**	2 FM	0.56	41.5	48.0	6.8 a	3.8	58.6	18.4	1023
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.017	58.3 a	38.5	2.8 a	0.5	41.8 a	18.9	1279
P > F ANOVA	ł	I	0.0439	0.0521	0.0049	0.0669	0.0439	0.3274	0.0724
	Methyl Parathion	(0.56) vs:			P	> F Contra	sts†		
	Tralomethrin .		0.0866	0.0818	0.7646	0.0586	0.0866	0.3838	0.2026
	L cyhalothrin		0.6893	0.2504	0.6005	0.1466	0.6893	0.9299	0.8472
	Acephate		0.4095	0.1502	0.7492	0.4575	0.4095	0.8603	0.3413
	M. Parathion (0.45	3)	0.4607	0.8673	0.0583	0.8096	0.4607	0.2982	0.7426
	Cyfluthrin		0.0899	0.1974	0.1951	0.0593	0.0899	0.5592	0.0975

Table 10. The incidence of stink bug damaged seeds, 100-seed weights, and yields of soybeans treated with

\* Column means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's). \*\* Penncap M.

† Single df contrasts.

with	
treated	
soybeans	
of	
yields	
and	
weights,	1989.
100-seed	a (Test 1),
seeds,	uisiana
ed	Lo
nag	s in
dan	ide
a Bin	ctic
y pi	use
tinl	lg ii
ofs	s bu
ce o	tinl
len	ves
ncio	lati
le i	tern
Th	ali
11,	
Table	

			% s	seeds per dan	nage categor	۰* ۲			
Chemical and	formulation	Rate Kg Al/ha	None	Light	Mod	Hvy	Damaged seed (%)*	100 Seed Wt. (g)*	Yield kg/ha*
Untreated	I	I	69.0	11.8	10.0	9.3	31.0	10.7	2125.6
M. Parathion	4 E	0.56	74.3	9.3	9.5	7.0	25.8	10.5	2246.1
Tralomethrin	0.9 E	0.011	74.8	10.3	7.5	7.5	25.3	10.8	2108.8
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.011	80.8 a	8.5	6.0	5.0	19.3 а	10.6	2071.6
Acephate	808	0.56	75.5	12.3	8.5	3.8 а	24.5	10.8	2438.2
M. Parathion M**	2 FM	0.28	74.3	10.5	10.0	5.3	25.8	10.6	1950.0
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.011	72.5	12.8	8.8	6.0	27.5	10.6	2121.9
Esfenvalerate	0.66 E	0.034	72.3	9.8	11.8	6.3	27.8	10.8	2115.2
P > F ANOVA	ł	1	0.0430	0.4152	0.2799	0.1473	0.0430	0.9744	0.7122
	Methyl Parath	ion vs:			Р	> F Contra	sts†		
	Tralomethrin .		0.8668	0.6421	0.3590	0.7836	0.8668	0.3415	0.5899
	L cyhalothrin		0.0385	0.7243	0.1156	0.2785	0.0385	0.6057	0.4943
	Acephate		0.6755	0.1719	0.6440	0.0850	0.6755	0.3792	0.4524
	M. Parathion M		1.000	0.5619	0.8169	0.3414	1.0000	0.7119	0.2511
	Cyfluthrin		0.5586	0.1138	0.7286	0.5839	0.5586	0.6057	0.6255
	Esfenvalerate		0.5044	0.8159	0.3034	0.6808	0.5044	0.3415	0.6073

\* Column means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's). \*\* Penncap M.  $\ddagger$  Single df contrasts.

with	
treated	
oybeans	
ofs	
yields	
and	
weights,	, 1989.
100-seed	a (Test 11)
seeds,	ouisiane
lamaged	ides in Lo
o gno	etici
stink b	oug inse
of	nk t
he incidence	lternative stir
2. T	đ
e L	
Tabl	

			% s	eeds per dan	age categor	y*			i i
Chemical and	formulation	Rate Kg Al/ha	None	Light	Mod	Hvy	Damaged seed (%)	100 Seed Wt. (g)*	Yield kg/ha*
Untreated			80.3	19.0	0.0	0.8	19.8	10.1	2753
Tralomethrin	0.9 E	0.024	87.3	10.3	0.0	2.3	12.3	10.7	2768
Lcyhalothrin	1 E	0.017	89.0	10.5	0.3	0.0	11.1	10.5	2953
Acephate	S 06	0.84	91.0	7.8	0.5	0.8	9.1	10.4	2987
M. Parathion	4 E	0.56	85.3	14.3	0.0	0.5	14.8	10.2	2822
M. Parathion M**	2 FM	0.28	86.6	12.8	0.4	0.2	13.4	10.5	3146 a
Cyfluthrin	2 E	0.017	86.8	11.5	1.3	0.5	13.3	10.4	3049 a
Esfenvalerate	0.66 E	0.034	89.5	9.0	0.5	0.8	10.3	10.8	2728
P > F ANOVA	I	I	0.0868	0.0517	0.1840	0.1708	0.0812	0.5883	0.0116
	Methyl Parath	ion vs:			Ρ	> F Contra	sts†		
	Tralomethrin .		0.3284	0.1589	1.0000	0.0228	0.3271	0.1400	0.6518
	L cyhalothrin		0.2613	0.2618	0.5959	0.6863	0.2599	0.3751	0.2727
	Acephate		0.0912	0.0587	0.2988	0.6863	0.0903	0.4934	0.1714
	M. Parathion M		0.8196	0.7615	0.4137	0.6270	0.8191	0.3076	0.0111
	Cyfluthrin		0.6490	0.4073	0.0145	1.0000	0.6480	0.5830	0.0649
	Esfenvalerate		0.2049	0.1214	0.2988	0.6863	0.1814	0.1091	0.4307

\* Column means followed by an "a" are significantly different from untreated check (P = 0.05, Dunnett's). \*\* Penncap M.  $\ddagger$  Single df contrasts.

J. Entomol. Sci. Vol. 30, No. 2 (1995)

Downloaded from https://prime-pdf-watermark.prime-prod.pubfactory.com/ at 2025-07-04 via free access

-

#### Acknowledgments

This study was supported in part through state and Hatch funds allocated to the Agricultural Experiment Stations in Georgia, Louisiana, and Florida. Funding also was received through the competitive grants program of the Southern Region Pesticide Impact Assessment Program.

## **References** Cited

- Adams, D. B. and R. M. McPherson. 1990. Control insects in soybeans. Ga. Coop. Ext. Serv. Circ. 720.
- Boyd, M. L., A. T. Wier, J. D. Thomas, S. Lingren, and D. J. Boethel. 1994. Southern green stink bug control on soybeans in Louisiana, 1993. Insect. Acar. Tests 19: 267.
- Chyen, D., M. E. Wetzstein, R. M. McPherson, and W. D. Givan. 1992. An economic evaluation of soybean stink bug control alternatives for the southeastern United States. So. J. Agric. Econ. 24: 83-94.
- Delaplane, K. S. 1993. Georgia pest control handbook. Univ. Ga. Coop. Ext. Serv. Spec. Bull. 28.
- Douce, G. K. and R. M. McPherson. 1991. Summary of losses from insect damage and costs of control in Georgia, 1989. Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station Spec. Publ. 70: 46 pp.
- Fehr, W. R., C. E. Caviness, D. T. Burmood and J. S. Pennington. 1971. Stages of development descriptions for soybeans, *Glycine max* (L.) Merrill. Crop Sci. 11: 929-931.
- Funderburk, J. and A. L. Brown. 1989. Stink bug control, 1988. Insect. Acar. Tests 14: 273.
- Harris, V. E. and J. W. Todd. 1981. Rearing of the southern green stink bug, *Nezara* viridula, with relevant aspects of its biology. J. Ga. Entomol. Soc. 16: 505-10.
- Jensen, R. L. and L. D. Newsom. 1972. Effect of stink bug-damaged soybean seeds on germination, emergence, and yield. J. Econ. Entomol. 65: 261-264.
- Kogan, M. and H. N. Pitre, Jr. 1980. General sampling methods for above-ground populations of soybean arthropods, Pp. 30-60. *In* M. Kogan and D. C. Herzog [ed.]. Sampling methods in soybean entomology. Springer-Verlag. New York. 587 pp.
- Layton, B. and D. J. Boethel. 1987. Evaluation of insecticides for insect control in Louisiana soybeans, 1986. Insect. Acar. Tests 12: 277.
- McPherson, R. M., G. K. Douce and R. Hudson. 1993. Annual variation in stink bug (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae) seasonal abundance and species composition in Georgia soybean and its impact on yield and quality. J. Entomol. Soc. 28: 61-72.
- McPherson, R. M., J. B. Graves and T. A. Allain. 1979a. Dosage-mortality responses and field control of seven pentatomids associated with soybean exposed to methyl parathion. Environ. Entomol. 8: 1041-1043.
- McPherson, R. M. and R. B. Moss. 1990. Stink bug control with foliar insecticides on soybean, 1989. Insect. Acar. Tests 15: 287.
- McPherson, R. M., L. D. Newson and B. F. Farthing. 1979b. Evaluation of four stink bug species from three genera affecting soybean yield and quality in Louisiana. J. Econ. Entomol. 72: 188-194.
- McPherson, R. M. and J. D. Taylor. 1989. Stink bug control, 1988. Insect. Acar. Tests. 14: 277.
- Mink, J. S. and D. J. Boethel. 1989. Control of southern green stink bug, 1988. Insect. Acar. Tests 14: 279.
- Minor, F. D. 1966. Biology and control of stink bugs on soybeans. Ark. Agric. Expt. Stn. Bull. 708: 40 pp.
- Panizzi, A. R. and F. Slansky, Jr. 1985. Review of phytophagous pentatomids (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae) associated with soybean in the Americas. Florida Entomol. 68: 184-214.

- Russin, J. S., M. B. Layton, D. B. Orr and D. J. Boethel. 1987. Within-plant distribution of and partial compensation for stink bug (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae) damage to soybean seeds. J. Econ. Entomol. 80: 215-220.
- SAS Institute. 1985. SAS User's Guide: Statistics. Version 5 edition. Cary, NC.
- Schuman, F. W. and J. W. Todd. 1982. Population dynamics of the southern green stink bug (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae) in relation to soybean phenology. J. Econ. Entomol. 75: 748-753.
- Todd, J. W. and S. G. Turnipseed. 1974. Effects of southern green stink bug damage on yield and quality of soybeans. J. Econ. Entomol. 67: 421-426.
- Turnipseed, S. G. and M. Kogan. 1976. Soybean entomology. Annu. Rev. Entomol. 21: 247-282.
- Wier, A. T., D. J. Boethel and J. S. Mink. 1991. Control of southern green stink bug on soybean, 1990. Insect. Acar. Tests 16: 225-26.
- Weir, A. T., J. S. Mink, J. D. Thomas and D. J. Boethel. 1992. Control of southern green stink bug on soybean, 1991. Insect. Acar. Tests 17: 280-281.
- Wier, A. T., J. D. Thomas, M. L. Boyd and D. J. Boethel. 1993. Control of southern green stink bug and velvetbean caterpillar on soybean, 1992. Insect. Acar. Tests 18: 277-78.