Spore-Toxin Interactions and Sublethal Effects of Bacillus thuringiensis in Spodoptera frugiperda and Pseudoplusia includens (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae)¹

F. F. R. Nyouki, J. R. Fuxa² and A. R. Richter

Department of Entomology Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station Louisiana State University Agricultural Center Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803 U.S.A.

ABSTRACT Interactions between the spores and δ -endotoxins of *Bacillus* thuringiensis Berliner were tested in a low-susceptibility insect, Spodoptera frugiperda (J. E. Smith). The spores (formulation MYDTM) and one δ endotoxin (formulation MVPTM) had additive effects on mortality at a MVPTM dose of 117,500 µg/g of diet (P < 0.01) and synergistic effects at a MVPTM dose of 235,000 µg/g diet (P < 0.01). The spores and another δ -endotoxin (formulation MYX[™]) were antagonistic at a MYX[™] dose of 117,500 µg/g diet (P < 0.01) and additive at a MYXTM dose of 235,000 µg/g diet (P < 0.01). The two δ -endotoxin formulations were additive with one another (P < 0.01). Sublethal concentrations of MVP[™] fed to larvae retarded the development of larvae and pupae for 5 d (P < 0.01) and 1.2 d (P < 0.01), respectively, and decreased pupal weight by 48 mg (P < 0.01). The spore formulation did not affect (P > 0.05) pupal weight or the life span of larvae or pupae. Median lethal concentrations of MVPTM and MYXTM were 6,904 and 7,561 \times greater, respectively, in S. frugiperda than in Pseudoplusia includens (Walker). In P. includens, sublethal concentrations of MVP[™], MYX[™], and Dipel[™] fed to larvae significantly (P < 0.05) reduced pupal weight and increased pupal life span compared to control insects. MVP[™] and Dipel[™] increased larval life span significantly (P < 0.05), but MYDTM did not.

KEY WORDS Bacillus thuringiensis, Spodoptera frugiperda, Pseudoplusia includens, Bacillus thuringiensis spore, Bacillus thuringiensis δ -endotoxin, Bacillus thuringiensis toxin-spore interaction.

Bacillus thuringiensis Berliner is an insect pathogen active mainly against Lepidoptera, Diptera, and Coleoptera (Beegle and Yamamoto 1992). The insecticidal property of *B. thuringiensis* is due mainly to proteins referred to as δ -endotoxins. Heimpel and Angus (1959) distinguished types of Lepidoptera susceptible to *B. thuringiensis* based on their susceptibility to the δ -endotoxins and spores of the bacterium. Certain lepidoptera are highly susceptible and

J. Entomol. Sci. 31(1): 52-62 (January 1996)

¹ Accepted for publication 08 August 1995.

Approved for publication by the Director of the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station as manuscript number 95-17-9077.

 $^{^{\}rm 2}$ To whom correspondence should be addressed.

are killed by δ -endotoxin alone, whereas other Lepidoptera are less susceptible and require the simultaneous presence of the toxin and the spore (Heimpel and Angus 1959).

Recent techniques have increased the ease of studying separate effects of spores and δ -endotoxins of *B. thuringiensis*. Three known crystal protein genes produce different molecules of δ -endotoxin in *B. thuringiensis* subsp. *kurstaki* (Höfte and Whiteley 1989). Toxins of four of these genes, CryIA(a), CryIA(b), CryIA(c), and CryIIA, are present in the formulation $Dipel^{TM}$ (Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, IL) based on B. thuringiensis subsp. kurstaki strain HD-1 (Marrone and MacIntosh 1993). The formulations MVP[™] and MYXTM (Mycogen Corp., San Diego, CA) are based on CryIA(c) and CryIA(b), respectively, of B. thuringiensis subsp. kurstaki inserted into Pseudomonas fluorescens Migula, and the recombinant bacteria are then killed by heat and iodine (Gelernter 1990). Thus, each of these formulations is comprised of one δ endotoxin and no spores. Many agronomically important lepidopterous pests are more sensitive to CryIA(c) than CryIA(a) or CryIA(b) δ -endotoxins (MacIntosh et al. 1990, Padidam 1992). The formulation MYDTM (Mycogen Corp., San Diego, CA) is a δ -endotoxin-minus mutant of *B. thuringiensis* (Gelernter W., pers. commun.); thus, it is comprised of spores with no δ -endotoxins.

Spodoptera frugiperda (J. E. Smith) is a polyphagous insect that ranks among the major pests of cereal and forage crops (Luginbill 1928). Bacillus thuringiensis has been evaluated for control of this insect, but S. frugiperda generally is not very susceptible to B. thuringiensis strains including B. thuringiensis subsp. kurstaki (Hernandez 1988), the strain used in most B. thuringiensis commercial products (Beegle and Yamamoto 1992).

The purpose of the current study was to take advantage of these spore and endotoxin formulations to assess the relative roles of *B. thuringiensis* spores and toxins in the mortality of the low-susceptibility insect *S. frugiperda*. Additionally, lethal and sublethal effects of *B. thuringiensis* were compared in *S. frugiperda* versus the highly susceptible *Pseudoplusia includens* (Walker).

Materials and Methods

Third instars of S. frugiperda, collected originally from rice, were used in bioassays. Until they pupated, larvae were reared individually in 30-ml plastic cups containing velvetbean caterpillar (Anticarsia gemmatalis Hübner) artificial diet (Greene et al. 1976). Pupae were sexed, and 20 individuals of each sex were placed in 3.78-liter paper containers, covered with cheesecloth as an oviposition substrate. Adults of S. frugiperda were provided with a solution of 150 ml honey, 355 ml beer, 12 g ascorbic acid, and 150 ml distilled water. These insects were reared at approximately 27°C, 50-70% relative humidity (RH), and a photoperiod of 14:10 (L:D) h. Third instars of P. includens, a species susceptible to B. thuringiensis, also were bioassayed. These insects, originally collected from soybean, were reared similarly to S. frugiperda.

Bioassays. Dipel $2X^{TM}$ (*B. thuringiensis* subsp. *kurstaki*), MVPTM, MYXTM, and MYDTM (δ -endotoxin-free spore formulation) were tested in the bioassays. Concentrations of toxins in MVPTM and MYXTM were not available for publication. Appropriate dilutions of each formulation in sterile distilled water

were added to cooling A. gemmatalis artificial diet. The treated diet then was poured into 30-ml plastic cups and allowed to dry for 24 h. One third instar of S. frugiperda or P. includens then was added to each cup. Controls were treated similarly except that the diet had no B. thuringiensis spores or toxins. The larvae that did not eat within 2 d were discarded. Insects were incubated at 27° C and checked daily for mortality for 14 d.

A preliminary experiment was established to estimate median lethal concentrations (LC₅₀) of the four formulations based on *B. thuringiensis* with the above bioassay method. Spodoptera frugiperda or *P. includens* were tested, with 27 to 51 third instars per dose per replication. DipelTM was included in the preliminary assay to directly compare the susceptibility of *S. frugiperda* and *P. includens*.

There were two experiments to test the interactions between spores and δ -endotoxins. The first interactions experiment included single dosages of MVP^{TM} MYX^{TM} (selected at slightly below the LC_{50} in order to maximize the opportunity to detect synergism), two concentrations of MYD[™], and combinations of these treatments. All nine treatments and a control were replicated three times, with 30 larvae per treatment per replication. The second interaction experiment was identical to the first except that there was only one concentration of MYD[™], the concentrations of MVP[™] and MYX[™] were twice as high as in the first experiment (due to unexpectedly low mortality in the Experiment 1), and sublethal effects of the treatments were observed. Higher concentrations of MVP^{TM} and MYX^{TM} were tested in Experiment 2 than in Experiment 1 in order to determine interactions at higher mortality levels. In other words, the two experiments combined allowed for detection of all three interactions (antagonism, additivity, or synergism) between spores and δ -endotoxin. The six treatments and control in Experiment 2 were replicated four times with 30 larvae per treatment per replication.

For sublethal effects, larvae that survived beyond 14 d were checked daily until they died or pupated to determine their life span from the day of exposure to the *B. thuringiensis* formulations to their pupation. The insects that pupated were sexed and weighed on a Mettler H80 balance 5 d after pupation. The life span of pupae from day of pupation to adult emergence was recorded. Sublethal effects also were recorded for *B. thuringiensis*-based formulations in *P. includens.*

Statistical analysis. The preliminary dose-mortality results were analyzed with the probit option of POLO program (Russell et al. 1977) to determine the median lethal concentrations and associated statistics. The percentages of observed mortality were corrected with Abbott's (1925) formula. Replications at each dosage were treated as individual data points for preliminary analysis and then combined into single data points for the final estimate of the LC_{50} . No attempt was made to fit a log-dose-probit regression line to the preliminary data for MYDTM because it was clear that these data did not lend themselves to a dose-dependent regression analysis. Similarly, there were too few data points between 0 and 100% mortality to estimate a log-dose-probit regression line for DipelTM against *S. frugiperda*.

The interactions among formulations based on *B. thuringiensis* were assessed based on the formula $E = O_a + O_b$ (1- O_a), where E is expected

proportion of mortality from combined agents and where O_a and O_b were the observed proportions of mortality due to each agent acting alone (Richter and Fuxa 1984). The expected percentage of mortality (E_1) and the observed percentage of mortality (O_1) for each combination of formulations were tested with the χ^2 statistic: the value of $(O_1-E_1)^2/E_1$ was compared with the χ^2 table value for df = 1 and P < 0.05 (McVay et al. 1977, Gardner et al. 1986).

The effects of *B. thuringiensis*-based formulations on larval life span, pupal weight, and pupal life span data were tested by analysis of variance (ANOVA), and comparisons among means were based on Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) test (SAS Institute 1985).

Results

Preliminary tests. The preliminary results confirmed the relatively low susceptibility of *S. frugiperda* to certain formulations of *B. thuringiensis* compared with *P. includens* (Tables 1, 2). The LC_{50} of DipelTM in *P. includens* was 42.7 µg/g diet, whereas 1,000 µg of DipelTM per g diet killed only 12.5% of *S. frugiperda* larvae. The differences in susceptibility of the two species were even more pronounced with the MVPTM and MYXTM formulations (Table 2). The DipelTM formulation was more virulent than MVPTM and MYXTM to third instars of *S. frugiperda* (Table 1). It was difficult to kill 50% of the *S. frugiperda* larvae with MVPTM and MYXTM, and the spore formulation MYDTM did not kill more than 10% or give a dose response.

Non only did the *B. thuringiensis* formulations cause low rates of mortality in *S. frugiperda*, but the results also were inconsistent in this insect. For example, MYXTM applied at the lower concentrations of 422 and 633 µg/g diet killed 3% of the larvae, whereas none were killed at concentrations two to eight times higher (1,056 to 5,012 µg/g) (Table 1). The LC₅₀ of MYXTM in *S. frugiperda* had to be extrapolated (Tables 1, 2).

Interaction experiments. The interaction between MYD[™] and MYX[™] was antagonistic at the MYX[™] concentration of 117,500 µg/g diet (Experiment 1) and additive at the MYX[™] concentration of 235,000 µg/g diet (Experiment 2) (Table 3). The combination of MVP[™] + MYX[™] was additive in both experiments. The combination of MVP[™] + MYD[™] was additive at the MVP[™] concentration of 117,500 µg/g diet and synergistic at the MVP[™] concentration of 235,000 µg/g diet (Table 3).

Susceptibility of *S. frugiperda* to the *B. thuringiensis* formulations was so low and variable that it proved difficult to kill approximately 40 to 50% of the larvae, the target level of mortality with single-agent treatments. In Experiment 1, mortality ranged from 3.4-13.5% for the spore and the two δ -endotoxin formulations tested individually (Table 3); therefore, dosages were increased in Experiment 2. Mortality was almost 100% with the δ -endotoxin formulation MYXTM in Experiment 2 but was still only 0.1-4.2% with MYDTM and MVPTM, respectively.

In Experiment 2, some larvae survived after 14 d of exposure to B. thuringiensis but died before or during pupation. Four treatments (Control, MVPTM, MYDTM, MVPTM + MYDTM) had a sufficient number of survivors that became adults to monitor sublethal effects of B. thuringiensis formulations Table 1. Virulence of DIPELTM two formulations (MVPTM, MYXTM) based on δ -endotoxins of *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *kurstaki*, and a δ -endotoxin-free mutant spore formulation (MYDTM) of *Bacillus thuringiensis* in third instars of *Spodoptera frugiperda*.

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Concentration (µg/of diet)	n % Mortality (n)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		
$\begin{array}{c cccccc} 1,000 & 12.5(40) \\ 5,000 & 83.3(36) \\ 7,500 & 100.0(39) \\ \hline \\ $	835	97(41)
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	1 000	12.5 (40)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5,000	83.3 (36)
$\begin{array}{c cccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	7 500	100.0 (39)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Control	0 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Control	MVPTM
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	21	0 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	42	25(40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	64	25(40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	85	0 (40)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	107	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	50.000	18.4 (38)
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} 75,000 & 27.5 (51) \\ 75,188 & 34.3 (35) \\ 100,000 & 33.3 (39) \\ 100,000 & 41.5 (41) \\ 125,000 & 55.0 (40) \\ \hline \\ $	50,000	29.7(37)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	75,000	27.5 (51)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	75,188	34 3 (35)
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} 100,000 & 41.5 (41) \\ 125,000 & 55.0 (40) \\ \hline Control & 0 & (40) \\ \hline MYX^{TM} & & \\ \hline & & \\ 105 & 0 & (28) \\ 211 & 0 & (30) \\ 422 & 3.3 (30) \\ 633 & 3.4 (29) \\ 1,056 & 0 & (33) \\ 2,374 & 0 & (27) \\ 2,506 & 0 & (27) \\ 5,012 & 0 & (40) \\ 10,025 & 5.0 (40) \\ 20,050 & 2.5 (40) \\ 0,050 & 2.5 (40) \\ 30,075 & 2.5 (40) \\ 62,000 & 18.9 (37) \\ 62,657 & 14.6 (41) \\ 75,000 & 30.9 (42) \\ 75,188 & 26.3 (38) \\ 100,000 & 36.0 (47) \\ \hline MYD^{TM} & & \\ \hline & & \\ 100 & 10.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \\ \end{array}$	100,000	333(39)
$\begin{array}{c cccccc} 125,000 & 55.0 (40) \\ \hline Control & 0 & (40) \\ \hline MYX^{TM} & & & \\ \hline 105 & 0 & (28) \\ 211 & 0 & (30) \\ 422 & 3.3 (30) \\ 633 & 3.4 (29) \\ 1,056 & 0 & (33) \\ 2,374 & 0 & (27) \\ 2,506 & 0 & (27) \\ 5,012 & 0 & (40) \\ 10,025 & 5.0 (40) \\ 20,050 & 2.5 (40) \\ 30,075 & 2.5 (40) \\ 62,000 & 18.9 (37) \\ 62,657 & 14.6 (41) \\ 75,000 & 30.9 (42) \\ 75,188 & 26.3 (38) \\ 100,000 & 36.0 (47) \\ \hline Control & 0 & (40) \\ \hline 100 & 10.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 36.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \\ \end{array}$	100.000	41.5 (41)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	125.000	55.0 (40)
$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{M}\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}^{TM} & 0 (10) \\ \hline \mathbf{M}\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}^{TM} & 0 (28) \\ 211 & 0 (30) \\ 422 & 3.3 (30) \\ 633 & 3.4 (29) \\ 1,056 & 0 (33) \\ 2,374 & 0 (27) \\ 2,506 & 0 (27) \\ 5,012 & 0 (40) \\ 10,025 & 5.0 (40) \\ 20,050 & 2.5 (40) \\ 20,050 & 2.5 (40) \\ 30,075 & 2.5 (40) \\ 62,000 & 18.9 (37) \\ 62,657 & 14.6 (41) \\ 75,000 & 30.9 (42) \\ 75,188 & 26.3 (38) \\ 100,000 & 36.0 (47) \\ \mathbf{Control} & 0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 10.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 (36) \\ \end{array}$	Control	0 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		MYX TM
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	105	0 (28)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	211	$\overline{0}$ (30)
$ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	422	3.3 (30)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	633	3.4 (29)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1.056	0 (33)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2,374	0 (27)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2,506	0 (27)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5,012	0 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10,025	5.0 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	20,050	2.5 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30,075	2.5 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	62,000	18.9 (37)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	62,657	14.6 (41)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	75,000	30.9 (42)
$\begin{array}{cccc} 100,\!000 & 36.0 (47) \\ Control & 0 & (40) \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ 100 & 10.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 10.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \\ \end{array}$	75,188	26.3 (38)
$\begin{array}{c c} Control & 0 & (40) \\ & MYD^{TM} \\ \hline \\ 100 & 10.0 & (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 & (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 & (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 & (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \\ \end{array}$	100,000	36.0 (47)
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c } MYD^{TM} \\ \hline 100 & 10.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 0 (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 (36) \end{tabular}$	Control	0 (40)
$\begin{array}{ccccc} 100 & 10.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 10.0 (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \end{array}$		MYD^{TM}
$\begin{array}{ccccc} 1,000 & 10.0 \ (40) \\ 1,000 & 5.0 \ (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 \ (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \end{array}$	100	10.0 (40)
$\begin{array}{ccccc} 1,000 & 5.0 & (40) \\ 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 & (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \end{array}$	1,000	10.0 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccc} 3,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 & (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \end{array}$	1,000	5.0 (40)
$\begin{array}{cccc} 5,000 & 0 & (40) \\ 7,500 & 2.5 & (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 & (36) \end{array}$	3,000	0 (40)
$\begin{array}{ccc} 7,500 & 2.5 \ (40) \\ 10,000 & 0 \ (36) \end{array}$	5,000	0 (40)
10,000 0 (36)	7,500	2.5 (40)
	10,000	0 (36)
Control 0 (37)	Control	0 (37)

Formulation	Slope ± SE	LC_{50}^{*}	95% FL*	χ^2
		S. frugiperda		
MVP TM	0.64 ± 0.09	338,290	153,190- 1,348,100	12.626
MYX TM	1.01 ± 0.17	424,910	138,770- 76,779,000	53.406
		P. includens		
Dipel™	1.53 ± 1.61	42.7	34. 9- 53.7	16.659
MVP TM	1.74 ± 0.32	49.0	41.9- 59.6	3.721
MYX TM	2.53 ± 0.24	56.2	50.9- 62.1	8.906

Table 2.	Log-dose-probit parameters of <i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>
	formulations in third instars of Spodoptera frugiperda and
	Pseudoplusia includens.

* µg of the formulation per g of velvetbean caterpillar diet.

(Table 4). The MVPTM and MVPTM + MYDTM treatments of larvae significantly (P < 0.01) increased larval and pupal life span and decreased pupal weight compared to controls. The MYDTM treatments did not significantly (P < 0.01) affect life span or weight. Sublethal effects in *P. includens* were similar to *S. frugiperda* (Table 4). The two toxins and DipelTM fed to larvae decreased pupal weight and increased larval and pupal life spans (P < 0.05) compared to controls, except that the increase in larval life span in the MYXTM treatment was not significant.

Discussion

The interactions among *B. thuringiensis* toxins and spores in *S. frugiperda* were mixed and dose-dependent (Table 3). The MVP^{TM} toxin, CryIA(c), was additive with spores at the low concentration and synergistic at the high concentration. The MYX^{TM} toxin, CryIA(b), was antagonistic with spores at the low concentration. The two toxins were

	<i>uu</i> .			
Treatment*	Observed % mortality (n) ± SE	Expected % mortality	χ ² **	Response
	Expe	riment 1†		
MVP TM	$9.0(90) \pm 1.3$			
MYX TM	$13.5(90) \pm 1.4$			
MYD^{TM}	$3.4(90) \pm 1.6$			
$MYD^{TM}5$	$4.5(90) \pm 2.1$			
$MVP^{TM} + MYX^{TM}$	$23.6(90) \pm 0.5$	21.3	0.25	additivity
$MVP^{TM} + MYD^{TM}$	$12.4(90) \pm 1.9$	12.1	0.01	additivity
$MVP^{TM} + MYD^{TM}_5$	$16.9(90) \pm 3.3$	13.1	1.10	additivity
$MYX^{TM} + MYD^{TM}$	5.6 $(90) \pm 1.9$	16.4	7.11	antagonism
$MYX^{TM} + MYD^{TM}_5$	$9.0(90) \pm 1.3$	17.4	4.06	antagonism
Control	$1.1(90) \pm 0.5$			
	Expe	riment 2 [‡]		
MVP™	$4.2(120) \pm 0.4$			
МҮХ™	$98.3(120) \pm 0.4$			
MYD [™] 1	$0.1(118) \pm 0.4$			
MVP TM + MYX TM	$99.2(120) \pm 0.4$	98.4	0.01	additivity
$MVP^{TM} + MYD^{TM}$	$17.7(120) \pm 1.5$	4.3	41.76	synergism
$MYX^{TM} + MYD^{TM}_{1}$	$79.0(120) \pm 6.0$	98.3	3.79	additivity
Control	$0.8(120) \pm 0.4$			

Table 3.	Interactions of ty	wo δ-endotox	in form	ulations (I	MVP™, Ì	MYX™)
	of Bacillus thuri	ngiensis sub	sp. <i>kurst</i>	<i>taki</i> and s	pores ()	MYD™)
	of a toxin-free	mutant in	third i	instars o	f Spod	optera
	frugiperaa.					

* MYDTM₁ = 1,000 µg spore formulation per g artificial diet. MYDTM₅ = 5,000 µg spore/g.

** Calculated $\chi 2$ compared with table $\chi 2 = 3.84$ (df = 1; P = 0.05).

 \dagger Toxin (MVPTM, MYXTM) concentrations = 117,500 µg per g artificial diet. Three replications with 30 insects per treatment per replication.

 \ddagger Toxin (MVPTM, MYXTM) concentration = 235,000 µg per g artificial diet. Four replications with 30 insects per treatment per replication.

additive with one another. In research of other insect species, *B. thuringiensis* toxins were synergistic in a mosquito but not in seven species of Lepidoptera (Tabashnik 1992). Thus, the tendency toward a positive interaction (additivity or synergism) between spores and toxin increased as dosage of the toxin increased. In Experiment 1, MVPTM was the more effective toxin with spores whereas MYXTM was the more effective toxin without spores; this is similar to research of *Choristoneura fumiferana* (Clemens), in which the presence or absence of spores changed relative toxicity of two δ -endotoxins (Milne et al. 1990).

Table 4. Effect of sublethal doses of δ -endotoxin (MVPTM, MYXTM), spores (MYDTM), and DipelTM on the development of larvae and pupae of Spodoptera frugiperda and Pseudoplusia includens.

	$Mean^{**}(n) \pm SE$				
Treatment*	S. frugiperda	P. includens			
	Larval Life Span (days) [†]				
CONTROL MYD™	10.8 (118) ± 1.0 a 12.0 (109) ± 1.0 a	15.5 (49) ± 0.4 a			
\mathbf{MVP}^{TM} $\mathbf{MVP}^{TM} + \mathbf{MYD}^{TM}$	15.8 (70) \pm 2.2 b 15.9 (54) \pm 2.3 b	$18.3(50) \pm 0.2$ b			
\mathbf{MYX}^{TM} \mathbf{DIPEL}^{TM}		16.1 (49) ± 0.2 a 18.4 (47) ± 0.3 b			
	Pupal Life Span (days)‡				
CONTROL MYD™ MVP™	$11.5 (118) \pm 0.8$ a $11.5 (109) \pm 0.7$ a $12.7 (-70) \pm 1.1$ h	$7.4 (49) \pm 0.2 a$ $9.2 (48) \pm 0.2 b$			
	$12.8(54) \pm 1.2 b$	$9.6 (49) \pm 0.1 \text{ b}$ $12.0 (47) \pm 0.4 \text{ c}$			
	Pupal Weight (mg)§				
CONTROL MYD™	202 (118) ± 20 a 202 (109) ± 22 a	$244(49) \pm 7 c$			
$\mathbf{M} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{P}^{TM}$ $\mathbf{M} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{P}^{TM} + \mathbf{M} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{D}^{TM}$	$\begin{array}{c} 154 (70) \pm 21 \text{ b} \\ 156 (54) \pm 20 \text{ b} \end{array}$	$195(50) \pm 5$ ab			
MYX™ DIPEL™		$\begin{array}{rrr} 215 \ (49) \pm & 5 \ b \\ 176 \ (47) \pm & 6 \ a \end{array}$			

* MYD[™] = 1,000 µg spore formulation per g artificial diet; MVP[™] (S. frugiperda) = 235,000 µg formulation per g diet; MVP[™] (S. includens) = 49 µg formulation per g diet; MYX[™] = 56 µg formulation per g diet; Dipel[™] = 41 µg formulation per g diet.

** Means within each experimental category and insect species, followed by the same letter, are not significantly different (P = 0.01; Turkey's Studentized Range [HSD] test [SAS Institute 1985]).

† S. frugiperda: F = 190.60, df = 3, P < 0.0001; P. includens: F = 31.20, df = 3, P < 0.0001.

S. frugiperda: F = 67.57, df = 3, P < 0.0001; P includens: F = 65.45, df = 3, P < 0.0001.

§ Weight of 5-day-old pupae; S. frugiperda: F = 113.73, df = 3, P < 0.0001; P. includens: F = 23.71, df = 3, P < 0.0001.

It is possible, though unlikely, that the mutant, toxin-free spores (MYD^{TM}) formulation) contained small amounts of δ -endotoxin in the spore coats. Even if this were the case, the amounts undoubtedly were too small to affect the interaction results, particularly in view of the lack of response to MYD^{TM} and the large doses of δ -endotoxin necessary to affect *S. frugiperda* (Table 1).

The current results can be compared to those with Galleria mellonella (L.) (Burges et al. 1976). Galleria mellonella was 10 times more susceptible to a 1:1 combination of spores and δ -endotoxin than to spores alone; δ -endotoxin alone was 10⁴ times less potent than the 1:1 spore-crystal complex (Burges et al. 1976). In another study, *G. mellonella* was sensitive to 1:1 mixtures of spores and δ -endotoxin, while spores coated with toxin or crystal toxins mixed with small amounts of spores were moderately potent (Li et al. 1987). As in the current study, there also have been inconsistent results with *G. mellonella*. Nishiitsutsuji-Uwo and Endo in 1981 (cited in Li et al. 1987) reported that purified δ -endotoxins were almost as potent in *G. mellonella* as a 1:1 sporetoxin mixture. Their purified toxin was derived from oligosporogenous mutants of *B. thuringiensis* and therefore carried few spores.

The δ -endotoxin (MVPTM) and toxin plus spores (MVPTM + MYDTM) but not spores alone (MYD^{TM}) inhibited the development of third instars of S. frugiperda (Table 4). Similarly, MVP^{TM} , MYX^{TM} , and $Dipel^{TM}$ inhibited the development of P. includens (Table 4). Thus, the low-susceptibility and highsusceptibility insects exhibited similar sublethal effects after exposure to B. thuringiensis. Retardation of larval development due to intoxication with B. thuringiensis can result from anorexia subsequent to the destruction of the midgut epithelium (Heimpel and Angus 1959). Retarded development of lepidopterous larvae fed B. thuringiensis toxins has been observed previously in S. frugiperda (Hernandez 1988) as well as other insects (Devriendt and Martouret 1976, Salama and Sharaby 1988, Ramachandran et al. 1993). Retarded development of pupae after larval ingestion of B. thuringiensis was reported in Agrotis ypsilon (Hüfnagel) (Salama and Sharaby 1988). The weight of pupae of A. ypsilon exposed as larvae to sublethal doses of B. thuringiensis was significantly decreased (Salama and Sharaby 1988). However, pupal C. fumiferana survivors of B. thuringiensis did not suffer weight loss even though larvae took longer to pupate than control insects (Ramachandran et al. 1993). Intoxicated larvae were able to recover quickly from gut damage and regain normal weight after a prolonged feeding period (Ramachandran et al. 1993).

Thus, S. frugiperda is not very susceptible to standard formulations of B. thuringiensis and is not the ideal insect to control with DipelTM or, particularly, the products MVP^{TM} or MYX^{TM} . The results indicated that at least one δ -endotoxin could be synergized by B. thuringiensis spores at certain dosages, but not to a degree that would be helpful in microbial control.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. W. D. Gelernter (Mycogen Corp., San Diego, CA) for providing the MVP^{TM} , MYX^{TM} , and MYD^{TM} formulations.

References Cited

- Abbott, W. S. 1925. A method for computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. J. Econ. Entomol. 18: 265-267.
- Beegle, C. C. and T. Yamamoto. 1992. History of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Berliner research and development. Can. Entomol. 124: 587-616.
- Burges, H. D., E. M. Thomson and R. A. Latchford. 1976. Importance of spores and δ endotoxin protein crystals of *Bacillus thuringiensis* in *Galleria mellonella*. J. Invertebr. Pathol. 27: 87-94.
- **Devriendt, M. and D. Martouret. 1976.** Absence de résistance à *Bacillus thuringiensis* chez la teigne des cruciféres, *Plutella maculipennis* (Lepidoptera: Hyponomeutidae). Entomophaga. 21: 189-199.
- Gardner, W. A., A. F. Pendley and G. K. Storey. 1986. Interactions between Bacillus thuringiensis and its β-exotoxin in fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) neonate larvae. Flor. Entomol. 69: 531-536.
- Gelernter, W. D. 1990. Bacillus thuringiensis, bioengineering and the future of bioinsecticides. Brighton Crop Protection Conference-Pests and Diseases. 7A-3: 617-624.
- Greene, G. L., N. C. Leppla and W. A. Dickerson. 1976. Velvetbean caterpillar: a rearing procedure and artificial medium. J. Econ. Entomol. 69: 487-488.
- Heimpel, A. M. and T. A. Angus. 1959. The site of action of crystalliferous bacteria in lepidoptera larvae. J. Insect Pathol. 11: 152-170.
- Hernandez, J. L. L. 1988. Évaluation de la toxicité de Bacillus thuringiensis sur Spodoptera frugiperda. Entomophaga 33: 163-171.
- Li, R. S., P. Jarrett and H. D. Burges. 1987. Importance of spores, crystals, and δ endotoxins in the pathogenicity of different varieties of *Bacillus thuringiensis* in *Galleria mellonella* and *Pieris brassicae*. J. Invertebr. Pathol. 50: 277-284.
- Luginbill, P. 1928. The fall armyworm. USDA Tech. Bull. No. 34.
- MacIntosh, S. C., T. B. Stone, S. R. Sims, P. L. Hunst, J. T. Greenplate, P. G. Marrone, F. J. Perlak, D. A. Fischhoff and R. L. Fuchs. 1990. Specificity and efficacy of purified *Bacillus thuringiensis* proteins against agronomically important insects. J. Invertebr. Pathol. 56: 258-266.
- Marrone, P. G. and S. C. MacIntosh. 1993. Resistance to *Bacillus thuringiensis* and resistance management, Pp. 221-235. *In P. F. Entwistle, J. S. Cory, M. J. Bailey, and* S. Higgs (eds.), *Bacillus thuringiensis*, an environmental biopesticide: theory and practice. Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- McVay, J. R., R. T. Gudauskas and J. D. Harper. 1977. Effect of *Bacillus thuringiensis* nuclear-polyhedrosis virus mixtures on *Trichoplusia ni* larvae. J. Invertebr. Pathol. 29: 367-372.
- Milne, R., A. Z. Ge, D. Rivers and D. H. Dean. 1990. Specificity of insecticidal crystal proteins. Implications for industrial standardization, Pp. 22-35. In L. A. Hickle and W. L. Fitch (eds.), Analytical chemistry of *Bacillus thuringiensis*. ACS Symposium Series 432. Amer. Chem. Soc., Washington, DC.
- Padidam, M. 1992. The insecticidal crystal protein CryIA(c) from Bacillus thuringiensis is highly toxic for Heliothis armigera. J. Invertebr. Pathol. 59: 109-111.
- Ramachandran, R., K. F. Raffa, M. J. Miller, D. D. Ellis and B. H. McCown. 1993. Behavioral responses and sublethal effects of spruce budworm (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae) and fall webworm (Lepidoptera: Arctiidae) larvae to *Bacillus thuringiensis* CryIA(a) toxin in diet. Environ. Entomol. 22: 197-211.
- Richter, A. R. and J. R. Fuxa. 1984. Pathogen-pathogen and pathogen-insecticide interactions in velvetbean caterpillar (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). J. Econ. Entomol. 77: 1559-1564.

- Russell, R. M., J. L. Robertson and N. E. Savin. 1977. POLO: a new computer program for probit analysis. Bull. Entomol. Soc. Am. 23: 209-213.
- Salama, H. S. and A. F. Sharaby. 1988. Effects of exposure to sublethal levels of Bacillus thuringiensis (Berliner) on the development of the greasy cutworm Agrotis ypsilon (Hüfnagel). J. Appl. Entomol. 106: 396-401.
- SAS Institute. 1985. SAS user's guide: statistics. SAS Institute, Cary, NC.
- Tabashnik, B. E. 1992. Evaluation of synergism among *Bacillus thuringiensis* toxins. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 58: 3343-3346.
- Tanada, Y. and H. K. Kaya. 1993. Insect pathology. Academic Press, New York and London.