



Combating resistance to aphicides in UK aphid pests

Project number		RD-2011-3768					
Start date		Apr 2012	End date		Mar 2015		
Drainet aim and chiestives							
Main aim:							
To continue research on aphicide resistance management for the UK farming industries and							
provide up-to-date information for agronomic and regulatory procedures.							
Objectives:							
	crops) to a range of novel applicides and also screen for established forms of resistance. Also						
	to monitor other important aphild pests (potato aphids, <i>Macrosiphum euphorbiae</i> , currant–lettuce						
	aphids, Nasonovia ril	<i>bisnigri</i> , and grain aphids	, Sitobion avenae) represer	nting the interests of		
	the project consortium, and establish baseline bioassay data for relevant insecticides for these						
	and other important a	aphid pests.					
-	Develop new screening tools for novel aphicides for use in regional laboratories or by advisors and growers.						
-	To retain the availabi	lity of effective pesticides	by developing a	opropriate	aphid management		
	strategies and provid	ing robust scientific supp	ort to the regulate	ory decisio	n-making process.		
		na fram tha nucleat					
ĸ	The relatively low put	ng from the project	M paraiana tanta	d in 2012 v	waa dua ta tha yary		
-	- The relatively low number of field samples of <i>M. persicae</i> tested in 2013 was due to the very late spring (latest for 50 years) and wet autumn. This was compensated for by the collection and testing of more samples from protected crops than in previous years.						
-	There continues to be	e no evidence of significa	int resistance (tha	at may con	npromise control) to a		
	range of newer comp	ounds belonging to differ	ent chemical clas	ses. Furth	hermore, there have		
	been no significant sl	een no significant shifts in response to diagnostic doses of newer insecticides that are					
	currently un-resisted	in the UK.					
- Strong pirimicarb res		istance and pyrethroid re	sistance remaine	d prevaler	nt in the <i>M. persicae</i>		
	samples but not in sa	imples of other aphid pes	sts, such as <i>Μ. eι</i>	<i>uphorbiae</i>	(potato aphid).		
-	Our findings suggest	that some aphids in <i>M. p</i>	persicae samples	from prote	ected crops may have		
	come from more gen	etically diverse sexual po	pulations on impo	orted plant	material. Collecting		
	new resistance mech	anisms imported from ou	ras they are more	notectec	d crons also breed		
	faster than those on f	field crops due to higher t	temperatures and	can, there	efore, be treated more		
	frequently with pestic	ides, which increases the	e risk of resistanc	e developr	ment.		
-	Resistance Factors (RFs) shown by neonicoti	noid-resistant SR	(heterozv	gote) and RR		
	(homozygote) M. per	sicae depend on the rout	e of treatment (to	pical vs sy	stemic) and the type		
	of response being me	easured (survival vs abilit	y to reproduce).	This has in	nplications for which		
	resistance genotypes	are ultimately found in the	he UK and wheth	er control i	measures use seed		
	treatments (which are	e currently restricted on s	ome crops throug	IN EU legis	siation) or sprays.		
-	The baseline work or	i important aphid pests o	ther than <i>M. pers</i>	<i>icae</i> contir	nues to add data to the		
	narge database and w	vill allow pests that are in	voivea in tuture re resistance	eports of in	isecticide control		
	problems to be quick	ly screened for potential	resistance.				

The results described in this summary report are interim and relate to one year. In all cases, the reports refer to projects that extend over a number of years.

While the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board, operating through its HGCA division, seeks to ensure that the information contained within this document is accurate at the time of printing, no warranty is given in respect thereof and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board accepts no liability for loss, damage or injury howsoever caused (including that caused by negligence) or suffered directly or indirectly in relation to information and opinions contained in or omitted from this document. Reference herein to trade names and proprietary products without stating that they are protected does not imply that they may be regarded as unprotected and thus free for general use. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is any criticism implied of other alternative, but unnamed, products.





Summary of results from the reporting year

- In 2013, Rothamsted received and successfully reared 12 field and 8 protected *M. persicae* samples (collected by Dewar Crop Protection and ADAS).
- Screening of live aphids from these samples showed no resistance to neonicotinoids, pymetrozine, flonicamid, spirotetramat or cyantraniliprole (the latter is not currently registered in the UK).
- MACE resistance (to pirimicarb) continues to be very common and widespread in *M. persicae* in the UK.
- There is currently a very high frequency (> 90%) on field crops of *M. persicae* carrying a new form of super-kdr in the heterozygous form (which we have shown to confer strong resistanceto some pyrethroids). These are primarily aphids with the very common 'O' and 'P' micro-satellite genotypes, which also carry MACE. It is currently unknown if these super-kdr aphids are repelled by pyrethroids.
- In the field samples, there continues to be an extremely low frequency of *M. persicae* carrying high (R2) or extreme (R3) esterase resistance to organophosphates (OPs), which is most likely due to the disuse of these compounds in the UK and fitness costs associated with resistance. This is in contrast to *M. persicae* in mainland Europe, where samples have contained R2 and R3 aphids. This is probably because OP usage tends to be much greater in this region.
- Compared with field samples, esterase-R2/R3 aphids were more common in the protected samples (collected from crops grown in glasshouses and polytunnels). These samples also contained *M. persicae* with rarer combinations of resistance genotypes (not seen in the field populations in the UK and implying a non-UK origin).
- Neonicotinoid-resistant SR (heterozygote) and RR (homozygote) *M. persicae* standard clones (collected from mainland Europe) showed strong resistance in topical bioassays applying imidacloprid with RFs relative to the susceptible baseline >8000 ppm. Interestingly, the highest dose at which adults produced viable offspring was also in the 1000s for the RR aphids but was only 30 ppm for the SR aphids, highlighting the value of being able to distinguish between genotypes.
- We have continued developing and validating the best bioassay method for various insecticide/aphid species combinations to make susceptible baselines.
- Control experiments revealed endpoints of up to 48 h for a topical glass approach for screening the response of *M. persicae* to different insecticides.

Key issues to be addressed in the next year

Continue to monitor the response of live samples of *M. persicae* (collected from field and protected crops) to a range of aphicides. It will also continue to monitor for established forms of resistance using DNA diagnostics. Other important aphid pests will also be monitored, and we will continue to establish useful insecticide-susceptible baseline data for additional pest/insecticide combinations to allow quick screening for resistance in samples associated with control failures.

l a a d mantinan	Dethemated Desservel		
Lead partner	Rothamsted Research		
Scientific partners	Rothamsted Research		
Industry partners	Bayer, Belchim, DuPont, NuFarm, Sumitomo/InterFarm, Syngenta,		
	AHDB-HGCA, AHDB-Horticulture, AHDB-Potato Council, BBRO		
Government sponsor	Chemicals Regulation Directorate/Defra		

The results described in this summary report are interim and relate to one year. In all cases, the reports refer to projects that extend over a number of years.

While the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board, operating through its HGCA division, seeks to ensure that the information contained within this document is accurate at the time of printing, no warranty is given in respect thereof and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board accepts no liability for loss, damage or injury howsoever caused (including that caused by negligence) or suffered directly or indirectly in relation to information and opinions contained in or omitted from this document. Reference herein to trade names and proprietary products without stating that they are protected does not imply that they may be regarded as unprotected and thus free for general use. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is any criticism implied of other alternative, but unnamed, products.





The results described in this summary report are interim and relate to one year. In all cases, the reports refer to projects that extend over a number of years.

While the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board, operating through its HGCA division, seeks to ensure that the information contained within this document is accurate at the time of printing, no warranty is given in respect thereof and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board accepts no liability for loss, damage or injury howsoever caused (including that caused by negligence) or suffered directly or indirectly in relation to information and opinions contained in or omitted from this document. Reference herein to trade names and proprietary products without stating that they are protected does not imply that they may be regarded as unprotected and thus free for general use. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is any criticism implied of other alternative, but unnamed, products.





	Posters: S Foster & M Williamson. Monitoring resistance to aphicides in the peach-potato aphid, <i>Myzus persicae</i> . <i>AHDB Research Conference</i> . London, September 2013.		
Other			
Revision to: IRAG-I IK Resistance Alert: Knock-down resistance (kdr) in grain aphids (2013)			

Revision to: IRAG-UK Resistance Alert: Knock-down resistance (kdr) in grain aphids (2013). Revision to: Guidelines for preventing and managing insecticide resistance in aphids on potatoes (2013).

The results described in this summary report are interim and relate to one year. In all cases, the reports refer to projects that extend over a number of years.

While the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board, operating through its HGCA division, seeks to ensure that the information contained within this document is accurate at the time of printing, no warranty is given in respect thereof and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board accepts no liability for loss, damage or injury howsoever caused (including that caused by negligence) or suffered directly or indirectly in relation to information and opinions contained in or omitted from this document. Reference herein to trade names and proprietary products without stating that they are protected does not imply that they may be regarded as unprotected and thus free for general use. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is any criticism implied of other alternative, but unnamed, products.