# Effects of host plants on the susceptibility of Cowpea Aphid, *Aphis craccivora* (Hemiptera: Aphididae) to the entomopathogenic fungus, *Beauveria bassiana* (Ascomycota, Hypocreales)

# Z. Ezzatabadipoor<sup>1</sup>, A. Shirvani<sup>2</sup> and M. Rashki<sup>3&\*</sup>

 Department of Plant Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran, 2.Department of Plant Protection, Faculty of Agriculture, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran, 3. Department of Biodiversity, Institute of Science and High Technology and Environmental Sciences, Graduate University of Advanced Technology, Kerman, Iran.
\*Corresponding author, E-mail:ma\_rashkigh@yahoo.com

#### Abstract

In this study, susceptibility of the cowpea aphids, *Aphis craccivora* Koch (Hemiptera: Aphididae) to entomopathogenic fungus, *Beauveria bassiana* strain DEBI008 (Ascomycota, Hypocreales) originated from *Chorthippus brunneus* Tunberg (Orthoptera: Acrididae), fed on the three different bean varieties (pinto bean, kidney bean and cowpea), was investigated under laboratory conditions (at  $25 \pm 1$  °C, 85% RH and a photoperiod of 16L: 8D). One-day-old adult aphids were treated by sublethal concentrations (LC<sub>10</sub>) of the fungus including 7.4 × 10<sup>4</sup>, 4.3 × 10<sup>4</sup>, and 8 × 10<sup>4</sup> calculated on pinto bean, kidney bean, and cowpea, respectively. The biological properties of their progeny were analysed using a two-sex fertility life table and TWOSEX-MSChart software. The results showed that the  $r_m$ , T and  $\lambda$  values of their progeny were significantly different between pinto bean (0.17 ± 0.02, 10.72 ± 0.56 and 1.19 ± 0.02, respectively) and cowpea (0.26 ± 0.01, 9.26 ± 0.25 and 1.30 ± 0.02, respectively). There were no significant differences in the  $R_0$  values among the different plant varieties. We found that the fungal treatment significantly decreases fecundity, longevity and life span of the progeny fed on each plant variety. The results indicated that the most favourable effects of *B. Bassiana* was achieved when the aphids fed on pinto bean, implying the suitability of this variety for integrated management of *A. craccivora*. But the aphids that were fed on cowpea, suffered less fitness costs from fungul infection , which reflected the function of host plant in defence of *A. craccivora* against the pathogen.

Key words: Aphis craccivora, Beauveria bassiana, biological control, biological property, host plant

چکیدہ

اثرات میزبان گیاهی بر حساسیت شته لوبیا چشــم بلبلـی، (Aphis craccivora Koch (Hemiptera: Aphididae بـه قـارچ بیمـارگر حشرات،Ascomycota, Hypocreales) *Beauveria bassiana)* 

# زهره عزتآبادیپور، اصغر شیروانی و مریم راشکی قلعهنو

در این مطالعه، حساسیت شته لوبیا چشمبلبلی (Aphis craccivora Koch (Hemiptera: Aphididae). با منشأ Aphis craccivora Koch (Hemiptera: Aphididae). جدایه Chorthippus brunneus Tunberg 1815 با منشأ DEB1003 با منشأ (Ascomycota, Hypocreales) Beauveria bassiana (رابط من منشأ DEB1003). جدایه DEB1003 با منشأ (Orthoptera: Acrididae)) که روی سه واریته لوبیای مختلف (لوبیا چینی، لوبیا قرمز و لوبیا چشمبلبلی) تغذیه کردند در شرایط (مایشگاهی مورد بررسی قرار گرفت (دمای ۱ ± ۲۰ درجه سلسیوس، رطویت نسبی ۸۵ درصد و دوره نوری ۱۳۰۸ (تاریکی;روشنایی)). شهمهای کامل یک روزه با غلظتهای زیرکشنده (داری) قارچ بیمارگر شامل <sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۲۰<sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۲۰ ۶ و <sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۸ بهترتیب محاسبه شده روی شتههای کامل یک روزه با غلظتهای زیرکشنده (Lo<sup>1</sup>) قارچ بیمارگر شامل <sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۲۰<sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۲۰ ۶ و <sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۸ بهترتیب محاسبه شده روی ویزه سن -مرحله و نرمافزار Tag بیمارگر شامل <sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۲۰<sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۲۰<sup>4</sup> ۲۰ × ۲۰<sup>4</sup> ۶۰ × ۲۰ بهترتیب محاسبه شده روی ویزه سن -مرحله و نرمافزار بعدول زندگی دوجنسی اوبیا چیتی، لوبیا چیتی، لوبیا چیتی اوبیا چیتی، لوبیا چیتی، لوبیا چیتی معار و سپس، خصوصیات بیولوژیکی نتاج آناها با استفاده از روش آنالیز جدول زندگی دوجنسی ویژه سن -مرحله و نرمافزار بعدول زندگی دو تعایم شدند. تنایج نشان داد در شتههای تیمار شده با قارچ، مقادیر ۲۰۰۳ ۲ و ۲۸ ویژه سن -مرحله و نرمافزار بعدول زندگی نتاج آناها بین لوبیا چیتمربلبلی (بهترتیب ۲۰۱۰ ± ۲۲/۲) و ۲۱/۱ ± ۲۱/۱ و ۲۱/۱ ± ۲۱/۱ و ۲۱/۱ ± ۲۱/۱ و ۲۱/۱ ± ۲۱/۱ به ور و در نتاج آناها بین لوبیا چیتم در این از در معنی دار در مقادیر ۲۰۰ که باز در مقادیر و ۲۰/۱ ± ۲۰/۱ و ۲۱/۱ ± ۲۱/۱ و را و بیا چشم بلبلی (به مختلف گیاهی و جود در نام این لوبیا چیم در شد که تیمار قارو معنی دار منفوت بود. با این حال، اوروری من حرم مکامل و طول زندگی نتاج شته با تغذیه شنه روی هر کرد در در مول عمر حشره کامل و طول زندگی نتاج شته با تغذیه شمند روی مر کرام از واریته بدی می مار مار در بین می مرای در وری هر کند مان در نان در مان مار در مار که می مار مار می مار که می مختلف گیاهی برای روی هر کاملی

#### Introduction

Herbivorous insects have a complex relationship with their host plants and any variation among host plants can deeply impact on their survival, growth, dispersal and reproduction abilities (Denno & McClure, 1983), leading to reduction of their fitness with plant toxics or morphological structures (Rosenthal & Berenbaum, 1991).

In a more complex system, the relationships between herbivorous insects and their natural enemies have been frequently suggested to be influenced by different host plants (Brower *et al.*, 1967; Price *et al.*,

1980). Although most studies on the role of host plants on interactions of insects with their natural enemies have been focused on parasitoids and predators (Kennedy, 2003; Ode, 2006), some evidences have shown that the relationships between insects and entomopathogenic fungi may also be affected by host plant properties (Hare & Andreadis, 1983; Tanada & Kaya, 1993; Poprawski & Jones, 2000). For example, populations of the whitefly, Bemisia argentifolii (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae), reared on cotton plants, were more susceptible to infection by the two entomopathogenic fungi, Beauveria bassiana (Bals.) Vuill. (Ascomycota, Hypocreales) and Paecilomyces fumosoroseus Wize (Ascomycota, Hypocreales), than those reared on melon plants. The sequestration of gossypol, and/or probably other cotton plant allelochemicals, has been hypothesized to influence insect's defence against pathogens (Poprawski & Jones, 2000).

Other findings showed that resistant host plants could enhance the susceptibility of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J.E. Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) to nuclear polyhedrosis virus (Hamm & Wiseman, 1986).

The plant quality can be related to secondary produced metabolites and it may influence the insect pathogenocity. Accordingly, some biological properties and resistance of *Diabrotica undecimpunctata howardi* Barber (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) to the pathogenic nematodes were affected by host plant species (Barbercheck, 1993; Barbercheck *et al.*, 1995).

Also, Coley *et al.* (2006) revealed that plant quality could alter the rate of herbivore growth and its resistance to the third trophic level.

The cowpea aphid, *Aphis craccivora* Koch 1854 (Hemiptera: Aphididae) is an important polyphagous pest attacking more than 50 plant species in 19 different families, with preference for legumes (Family Fabaceae) (Palumbo & Tickes, 2001; van Emden & Harrington, 2007). Its damage occurs not only by direct feeding of both nymphs and adults on phloem sap, but also by transmission of more than 30 plant pathogenic viruses as well as production of honeydew excessively,

which underlies the growth of sooty moulds (van Emden & Harrington, 2007).

Therefore, control of many aphid species, including *A. craccivora*, largely depends on the use of chemical insecticides such as chlorinated hydrocarbons, carbamates, organophosphates, and neonicotinoids (Jackai & Daoust, 1986; Pavela *et al.*, 2009; Souleymane *et al.*, 2013). Excessive application of synthetic insecticides, in recent decades, led to explore and adopt more environmentally friendly strategies against pests (Gunning *et al.*, 1991; Haq *et al.*, 2004).

Aphids have a wide variety of natural enemies including predators, parasitoids and pathogens that many of them are commercially available in both greenhouses and open cultivations (Mahr *et al.*, 2001). The entomopathogenic fungus, *B. bassiana*, for example, has long been considered as an important biocontrol agent of aphids (de Faria & Wraight, 2007; Amnuaykanjanasin *et al.*, 2013; Kim *et al.*, 2013).

In addition to biological control, the use of host plant resistance provides an efficient strategy for the control of cowpea aphid due to its low cost and compatibility with other control methods (Ofuya, 1997; Souleymane *et al.*, 2013).

This study was conducted to evaluate the effects of plant varieties on the susceptibility of *A. craccivora* progeny to sublethal concentration ( $LC_{10}$ ) of *B. bassiana* to select the best combination of plant varieties and *B. bassiana* against *A. craccivora*.

# Material and methods

# Host plants

Three leguminous plants, cowpea, *Vigna* unguiculata var. Mahalli, pinto bean, *Phaseolus* vulgaris var. Sadri and red kidney bean, *Ph. vulgaris* var. Akhtar, were used as hosts for rearing *A.* craccivora. Seeds were obtained from Khomein Research Institute, in plastic pots (15 cm in diameter, 18 cm in height) in greenhouse conditions at  $27 \pm 5$  °C,  $60 \pm 10\%$  RH and a photoperiod of 16L: 8D.

#### Insects

Adult stages of *A. craccivora*, were identified on the basis of their waxy black coloration from a native colony on alfalfa in an experimental field located at Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Iran. The aphids were reared and monitored to avoid any contamination by parasitoids. The healthy aphids were separately released on 4-leaf stalks of the three host plants to establish a stock colony on each host plant under controlled conditions at  $25 \pm 1$  °C,  $60 \pm 5\%$  RH and a photoperiod of 16L: 8D.

#### Entomopathogenic fungus

*B. bassiana* strain DEBI008, isolated from a native locust specimen, *Chorthippus brunneus* (Thunberg, 1815), was obtained from the culture collection of the Department of Agricultural Entomology, Iranian Research Institute of Plant Protection. The fungus was cultured in Petri dishes (8 cm in diameters) containing Sabouraud dextrose agar (SDA) medium supplemented with 1% (wt/vol) yeast extract (pH 7.0) (SDAY) and maintained at  $25 \pm 1$  °C. The cultures were scrapped after sporulation to obtain conidia according to the method of Goettel & Inglis (1997).

#### Bioassays

Dry conidia of *B. bassiana* isolate DEIB008 were suspended in 0.02% Tween-80. Initial concentration of conidia was measured using a hemocytometer and further concentrations including  $10^8$ ,  $10^7$ ,  $10^6$ ,  $10^5$  and  $10^4$  conidia/ml prepared to assess the sublethal concentration (LC<sub>10</sub>). We sprayed the third nymphal instars of aphids with 1.5 ml of conidia using a fine mist held above the aphids with 90° angle. For control, the aphids were treated with 0.02% of Tween-80. The treated aphids were air-dried and transferred to Petri dishes containing leaf discs on 2% water-agar. The sealed Petri dishes , after 24 h, were supplied with new lids bearing a 3-cm-diameter hole for ventilation. During the experiment, the aphids were transferred to fresh leaf discs every three days.

#### Life table parameters

Thirty leaf discs for each host plant variety were prepared by placing the leaves on agar 2% in Petri dishes (8 cm diameter) and later, a 1-day-old adult ofA. craccivora sprayed and released on each leaf disc. The aphids were sprayed with the sublethal concentration (LC<sub>10</sub>) of the fungus as determined in the bioassay test. The leaf discs were covered by their lids and maintained in a growth chamber at  $25 \pm 1$  °C, 85% RH and a photoperiod of 16L: 8D. After 12 h, only one newly born nymph was kept in each Petri dish and monitored every 24 h. The progeny were maintained at the same conditions and after adult emergence, the number of nymphs produced by each female recorded dailyuntil the death of all adults. In the control, 1-day-old adultswere sprayed with 0.02% of Tween-80.

#### Data analysis

The lethal concentration (LC10) of the fungus for A. craccivora was calculated for each host plant variety using POLO-PC 2002 software. The pre-adult developmental time, longevity, life span and fecundity were analysed using ANOVA (SAS institute, 2002) and the averages compared with Tukey's test at the 0.05 level. The life table parameters were basedon two-sex life table (Chi & Liu, 1985; Chi, 1988) using TWOSEX-MSChart software (Chi, 2015). We usedpaired bootstrap test to compare differences among the cultivars (Akkopru et al., 2015). The population parameters included agespecific survival rate (lx), age-specific fecundity ( $m_x$ ), net reproductive rate  $(R_0)$ , intrinsic rate of increase  $(r_m)$ , finite rate of increase  $(\lambda)$ , and mean generation time (T). The net reproductive rate  $(R_0)$ :

# $R_0 = \sum l_x m_x$

The intrinsic rate of increase  $(r_m)$  was estimated using the iterative bisection method and the Euler-Lotka equation with the age indexed from 0 (Goodman, 1982):

$$\sum_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-r(x+1)} l_x m_x = 1$$

The finite rate of increase  $(\lambda)$  and the mean generation time (T):

$$\lambda = e^{r}$$
$$T = \frac{\ln (R_{0})}{r}$$

#### Results

The probit analyses for *A. craccivora* treated with *B. bassiana* strain DEBI008 resulted in the  $LC_{10}$ values of 7.4 × 10<sup>4</sup>, 4.3 × 10<sup>4</sup>, and 8 × 10<sup>4</sup> conidia/ml for the aphids reared on pinto bean, kidney bean, and cowpea, respectively after 10 days of exposure of third nymph instars of *A. craccivora* (Table 1).

Effects of the lethal concentration (LC<sub>10</sub>) of the fungus on the biological parameters of *A. craccivora* fed on the three different host plantsand the control (0.02% Tween-80) have been summarized in table 2. Significant differences werefound in pre-adult developmental time of the aphids in both control and *B. bassiana* treatments (df = 96, F = 8.65, P < 0.05). The longest developmental time was observed for the progeny of infected aphids reared on kidney bean followed by pinto bean and cowpea.

The adult longevity of the progeny in the infected aphids was also affected by feeding on different host plant varieties (df = 149, F = 9.04, P < 0.05). The longest longevity was observed in the progeny of the infected aphids fed on kidney bean, while the aphids reared on pinto bean showed the shortest longevity. But, cowpea variety caused elongating the adult longevity compared with pinto bean when the aphids were sprayed with Tween 80.

The progeny life span of the fungus-treated aphids was significantly lower than non-treated ones in all studied host plants (df = 147, F = 10.54, P < 0.05). There were nearly no significant differences in life span of the aphids fed on different host plants in both control and *B. bassiana* treatments (P > 0.05). The shortest life span was related to the progeny fed on pinto bean variety in *B. bassiana* treatment.

The fecundity of *A. craccivora* was also reduced in the progeny of individuals treated by the fungus regardless of the host plant they fed on. However, there was no significant difference in the number of progeny produced by aphids fed on the three host plants in both control and *B. bassiana* treatments (df = 93, F = 8.21, P > 0.05).

The life table parameters of the aphids fed on the three host plants were showed in table 3. The intrinsic rate of increase  $(r_m)$  in progeny of the fungus-treated aphids decreased only in individuals fed on pinto bean and kidney bean. For the aphids fed on cowpea, however, fungal treatment did not affect  $r_m$  value compared with the control. The most reduction in  $r_m$  value was happened in the aphids fed on pinto bean. The progeny net reproductive rate  $(R_0)$  of the aphids treated with the fungus was significantly lower than the control regardless of fedone on different host plant. Similar to  $r_m$ , the most reduction in the  $R_0$  was observed in the aphids fed on pinto bean.

The mean generation time (T) significantly decreased as a result of the fungal treatment only in the aphids fed on cowpea. The shortest generation time was observed in the fungus-treated aphids fed on cowpea as well. The T value was not statistically different among other treatments.

Finally, the finite rate of increase ( $\lambda$ ) was not statistically different among the progeny of the fungustreated aphids fed on pinto and kidney bean. Also, no significant difference was observed in finite rate of increase among these two host plants in control. The finite rate of increase after the fungal treatment significantly decreased only in the aphids fed on pinto bean and kidney bean. The progeny of the fungusinfected aphids fed on cowpea had a significantly higher  $\lambda$  contrasted to pinto and kidney bean.

Changes in the age-specific survival  $(l_x)$  of the aphids fed on the three host plant varieties have been shown in fig. 1. As the figure illustrates, the age-

specific survival  $(l_x)$  of the progeny in the fungustreated aphids is constantly lower than that of nontreated ones irrespective of variety of host plant. In the aphids fed on pinto bean and kidney bean, however, an earlier reduction in age-specific survival was observed compared with those fed on cowpea implying on the role of these host plant varieties on susceptibility of *A. craccivora* to infection by *B. bassiana*. The fungal treatment caused a decrease in the age-specific fecundity  $(m_x)$  of *A. craccivora* progenyon all host plant varieties; however, the  $m_x$  fluctuation of the aphid on the three plant varieties was nearly the same in the fungus-sprayed treatment and control (fig. 2).

Cultivars	n	Slope ± SE	b ± SE	LC <sub>10</sub> (CI) conidia/ml	LC <sub>50</sub> (CI) conidia/ml	$\chi^2$	HF
pinto bean	225	$1.14 \pm 0.20$	$-6.83 \pm 1.30$	$7.4 \times 10^4 (7.0 \times 10^3 - 2.4 \times 10^5)$	$9.9 \times 10^{5}$ (3.3 × 10 <sup>5</sup> -2.0 × 10 <sup>6</sup> )	2.23	0.74
kidney bean	225	$0.99 \pm 0.17$	$-5.87 \pm 1.10$	$4.3 \times 10^4$ (2.9 × 10 <sup>3</sup> -1.6 × 10 <sup>5</sup> )	$8.5 \times 10^{5}$ (2.5 × 10 <sup>5</sup> -1.5 × 10 <sup>6</sup> )	2.15	0.54
cowpea	225	$1.14\pm0.21$	$-6.84 \pm 1.30$	$8 \times 10^4 \\ (5.6 \times 10^3 - 2.7 \times 10^5)$	$1.0 \times 10^{6}$ $(3.2 \times 10^{5} - 2.2 \times 10^{6})$	1.51	0.50

n = number of treated nymphs; b = intercept; CI = confidence intervals (95% probability); HF = heterogeneity factor.

**Table 2.** Effects of host plant variety and sub-lethal concentration ( $LC_{10}$ ) of *B. bassiana* on some biological properties of *Aphis craccivora* progeny.

Danamatan		Tween-80			B. bassiana (LC <sub>10</sub> )	
rarameter	Pinto bean	Kidney bean	Cowpea	Pinto bean	Kidney bean	Cowpea
Pre-adult	$5.61 \pm 0.12^{\circ}$	$5.85 \pm 0.07^{\rm bc}$	$5.90 \pm 0.14^{\rm bc}$	$6.33 \pm 0.14^{ab}$	$6.58\pm0.15^{\rm a}$	$5.11\pm0.15^{\rm d}$
Longevity	$15.22 \pm 0.52^{\rm bc}$	$18.75 \pm 1.19^{ab}$	$20.45 \pm 1.88^{a}$	$10.66 \pm 1.04^{\circ}$	$12.5 \pm 0.76^{\circ}$	$11.76 \pm 1.00^{\circ}$
Life span	$16.12 \pm 1.61^{b}$	$21.08 \pm 1.91^{a}$	$22.08 \pm 2.41^{a}$	$8.64 \pm 1.45^{\circ}$	$12.04 \pm 1.50^{bc}$	$12.60 \pm 1.55^{bc}$
Fecundity	$28.66 \pm 1.70^{a}$	$35.33 \pm 2.98^{a}$	$32.76 \pm 2.81^{a}$	$18.33 \pm 1.99^{b}$	$20.83 \pm 1.76^{b}$	$17.23 \pm 1.70^{b}$

Means followed by the same letter in the same row are not significantly different (Tukey's test, P < 0.05).

**Table 3.** Life table parameters (Mean  $\pm$  SE) of *Aphis craccivora* developed on various host plant varieties and their preceding generation treated with sub-lethal concentration (LC<sub>10</sub>) of *Beauveria bassiana*.

Parameter		Tween-80		B. bassiana (LC <sub>10</sub> )			
	Pinto bean	Kidney bean	Cowpea	Pinto bean	Kidney bean	Cowpea	
r <sub>m</sub>	$0.26 \pm 0.01^{a}$	$0.32 \pm 0.01^{a}$	$0.26 \pm 0.01^{ab}$	$0.17 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$	$0.20\pm0.02^{\rm bc}$	$0.26 \pm 0.01^{ab}$	
$R_0$	$20.62 \pm 2.93^{ab}$	$29.68 \pm 3.63^{a}$	$24.96 \pm 6.63^{a}$	$6.60 \pm 1.67^{\circ}$	$10.00 \pm 2.39^{\rm bc}$	$11.70 \pm 2.07^{\rm bc}$	
Т	$10.40 \pm 0.26^{b}$	$10.54 \pm 0.30^{b}$	$12.13 \pm 0.40^{a}$	$10.72 \pm 0.56^{b}$	$11.14 \pm 0.40^{ab}$	$9.26 \pm 0.25^{\circ}$	
λ	$1.34 \pm 0.02^{ab}$	$1.38 \pm 0.02^{a}$	$1.30 \pm 0.1^{b}$	$1.19 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$	$1.23 \pm 0.02^{\circ}$	$1.30 \pm 0.02^{b}$	

The standard errors were calculated using the bootstrap procedure with 100,000 bootstraps. The means followed by different letters in the same row are significantly different between cultivars using the paired bootstrap test at 5% significance level.  $r_m$ , intrinsic rate of increase,  $R_0$ , net reproductive rate,  $\lambda$ , finite rate of increase, T,mean generation time.



**Fig. 1.** Survival rate (lx) of *Aphis craccivora* that their preceding generation was influenced by sub-lethal concentration (LC<sub>10</sub>) of *Beauveria bassiana* (A) compared to control (B) on different host plant varieties.



**Fig. 2.** Number of females produced per female per day  $(m_x)$  of *Aphis craccivora* that their preceding generation was influenced by sub-lethal concentration (LC<sub>10</sub>) of *Beauveria bassiana* (A) compared to control (B) on different host plant varieties.

## Discussion

The pathogenicity and virulence of the tested isolate in the current study havebeen previously analysed in several studies. For example, studying on of 17 isolates of B. bassiana, the pathogenicity Alizadeh et al. (2007) found that the isolate DEBI008 was the most virulent oneagainst the pistachio psyllid, Agonoscena pistachiae Burckhardt & Lauterer (Hemiptera: Psyllidae). Similarly, TalaeiHasanloui (2005) proposed that the isolate DEBI008 of B. bassiana caused the highest mortality in the two common destructive pests, Leptinotarsa decemlineata (Say) (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) and Pluttella xylostella (Linnaeus, 1758) (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae). As these insects belonged to non-related taxa with independent evolutionary origins, it seemed that this

isolate of *B. bassiana* was not host-specific, but might attack a wide variety of insects including aphids. Feng & Johnson (1990) showed that strain DEBI008 killed the Russian wheat aphid, *Diuraphis noxia* (Mordvilko) (Hemiptera: Aphididae), with a lower dose and in a shorter time compared with the other isolate, SGBB601.

Results of the current study showed that different biological parameters of *A. craccivora* were affected by *B. bassiana*. Additionally, it was discovered that host plant varieties could play an important role in interactions between *A. craccivora* and *B. bassiana*.

The prolonged pre-adult developmental time is favoured by growers because it retards the reproduction of aphids, thus leads to a relatively lower population density in a given time. In contrast with preadult developmental time, the shortened adult life longevity time might decrease the reproductive potential of the aphid, thus it would be favoured for integrated management programs of the pest. Those aphid progeny fed on pinto bean had shortest life span compared with those fed on kidney bean and cowpea in the fungal treatment and control. The evidences might imply on the relative resistance of pinto bean to A. craccivora. Treatment of the aphids with B. bassiana led to significant decrease in their fecundity regardless of the host type they fed on. Duetting et al. (2003) demonstrated that host plant had an influence on mortality of Acyrthosiphon pisum (Harris) (Hemiptera: Aphididae) infected with Pandora neoaphidis (Remaudière & Hennebert) Humber (Zygomycetes: Entomophthorales). Similarly, the other investigation declared that various host plants affected the efficiency of nucleopolyhedrovirus (NPV) to control cotton bollworm and tobacco budworm (Ali et al., 1998). Nevertheless, Ethel (2007) found that various host plants had no impact on interaction between Bemisia afer (Priesner & Hosny) (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) and the two entomopathogenic fungi, P. fumosoroseus and Lecanicillium lecanii (Zimm.) Zare & W. Zare & Gams.(Ascomycota, Hypocreales).

Altogether, results of the current study showed that different biological parameters of A. craccivora progeny wereaffected by B. bassiana, sothat the host plant varieties caused some degrees of differences in susceptibility of the treated aphids. Several researches have revealed that host plants play important roles in the evolution of insect-pathogen interactions, thus a tritrophic view should be included into the investigation of insects and their pathogens (Cory & Hoover, 2006; Brady & White, 2013). Indeed, differences in plant chemistry and/or structure may alter the susceptibility of insects to infection with pathogens. For example, the larvae of gypsy moth, Lymanthria dispar (L.) have been found to be more susceptible to the NPV when fed on white oak Quercus alba Linnaeus (Fagales: Fagaceae)compared with the larvae when fed on red oak *Q. rubra* (Fagales: Fagaceae) (Dwyer *et al.*, 2005). Similarly, the mortality of the Pine Beauty moth, *Panolis flammea*(Denis & Schiffermüller) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), caused by NPV, has been suggested to be affected by the host plantswhich they fed on (Hodgson *et al.*, 2002).

In addition to altering the insect susceptibility, host plant may differentially affect pathogen traits, such as speed of killing, productivity and host mortality (Cory & Hoover, 2006). Even, the suitability of different host plants belonging to the same species may also affect the susceptibility and performance of insects (Cory & Hoover, 2006). An excellent example for this scenario has been documented in the cabbage looper moth, *Trichoplusia ni* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), which the costs of its resistance to the bacterial pathogen, *Bacillus thuringiensis* Berliner (Bacillales: Bacillaceae) increased by lower suitability of the host plant (Janmaat & Myers, 2005).

There exist another experiment clarified that two plant species in family Asteraceae differentially influenced entomopathogenic nematodes on their insect host, *Grammia incorrupta* (=geneura) (Hy. Edwards) (Lepidoptera: Arctiidae). When the larvae fed on *Senecio longilobus* Benth. (Asterales: Compositae), their resistance to the nematodes elevated and caused to be produced lower offspring by entomopathogen (Gassmann *et al.*, 2010).

In this study, the most favourable effects of *B. bassiana* strain DEBI008 were observed in the aphids fed on pinto bean. The aphids fed on cowpea, in contrast, experienced less effects of *B. bassiana*. *A. craccivora* has been considered to be the most important pest of cowpea in the world including Africa and some parts of Asia (Singh & Jackai, 1985; Quan, 1996; Sarutayophat *et al.*, 2007), while it has less importance on other legume plants such as different varieties of bean (*Ph. vulgaris*). Therefore, the suitability of cowpea as a food resource may enable *A. craccivora* progeny to better withstand against the entomopathogenic fungus and suffer less fitness costs

compared with the aphids fed on less suitable hosts such as pinto bean. Results of this study indicated that pinto bean wasthe most suitable host plant, in terms of interaction with *B. bassiana*, thus may be of especial importance in integrated management programs of *A. craccivora*.

#### Acknowledgements

We would like to thankthe Department of Biodiversity, Institute of Science and High Technology and Environmental Sciences, Kerman, Iran to provide us with the fungal strain. Khomein Research Institute generously helped with providing plant seeds for our experiment.

### References

- Akkopru, E. P., Atlihan, R., Okut, H. & Chi, H. (2015) Demographic assessment of plant cultivar resistance to insect pests: A case study of the dusky-veined walnut aphid (Hemiptera: Callaphididae) on five walnut cultivars. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 108 (2), 1-10.
- Ali, M. I., Felton, G. W., Meade, T. & Young, S. Y. (1998) Influence of interspecific and intraspecific host plant variation on the susceptibility of heliothines to baculovirus. *Biological Control* 12, 42-49.
- Alizadeh, A., Kharrazi-Pakdel, A., Talebi-Jahromi, K. H. & Samih, M. A.(2007) Effect of Some Beauveria bassiana (Bals.) Viull. Isolates on Common Pistachio Psylla Aganoscena pistaciae Burck. and Laut.. International Journal of Agricultural Biology 1, 76-79.
- Amnuaykanjanasin, A., Jirakkakul, J., Panyasiri, C., Panyarakkit, P., Nounurai, P., Chantasingh, D., Eurwilaichitr, L., Cheevadhanarak, S. & Tanticharoen, M. (2013) Infection and colonization of tissues of the aphid *Myzus persicae* and cassava mealybug *Phenacoccus manihoti* by the fungus *Beauveria bassiana*. *BioControl* 58, 379-391.
- Barbercheck, M. E. (1993) Tritrophic level effects on entomopathogenic nematodes. Environtal Entomology 22, 1166-1171.
- Barbercheck, M. E., Wang, J. & Hirsh, I. S. (1995) Host plant effects on entomopathogenic nematodes. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* 66, 169-177.
- Brady, C. & White, J. A. (2013) Cowpea aphid (*Aphis craccivora*) associated with different host plants has different facultative endosymbionts. *Ecological Entomology* 38, 433-437.
- Brower, L., van Brower, J. & Corvino, J. (1967) Plant poisons in a terrestrial food chain. *Proceedings of the National* Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 57, 893-898.
- Chi, H. (1988) Life Table Analysis Incorporating both Sexes and Variable Development Rates Among Individuals. Environmental Entomology 17, 26-34.
- Chi, H. (2015) TWOSEX-MSChart: a computer program for the age-stage, two-sex life table analysis. Available from: http://140.120.197.173/Ecology (accessed 8 February 2015).
- Chi,H. & Liu, H. (1985) Two New Methods for the Study of Insect Population Ecology. Bulletin of the Institute of Zoology 24, 225-240.
- Coley, P. D., Bateman, M. L. & Kursar, T. A. (2006) The effects of plant quality on caterpillar growth and defense against natural enemies. *OIKOS* 115, 219-228.
- Cory, J. S. & Hoover, K. (2006) Plant-mediated effects in insect-pathogen interactions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 21, 278-286.
- Denno, R. F. & McClure, M. S. (1983) Variability: A key to understanding Plant-Herbivore interactions. pp. 1-12 in Denno, R. F. & McClure, M. S. (Eds) Variable Plants and Herbivores in Natural and Managed System. 201 pp. Academic Press, New York/USA.
- Duetting, P. S., Ding, H., Neufeld, J. & Eigenbrode, S. D. (2003) Plant waxy bloom on peas affects infection of pea aphids by *Pandora neoaphidis*. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* 84, 149-158.

Dwyer, G., Firestone, J. & Stevens, T. E. (2005) Should models of disease dynamics in herbivorous insects include the effects of variability of host-plant foliage quality? *American Naturalist* 165, 16-31.

van Emden, H. F. & Harrington, R. (2007) Aphids as crop pests. 1st ed. 717 pp. CABI Publishing, London.

- Ethel, C. (2007) Tritrophic interaction between whiteflies, insect pathogenic fungi and host plant. M.Sc. Thesis. Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet (SLU), Sweden.
- de Faria, M. R. & Wraight, S. P. (2007) Mycoinsecticides and mycoacaricides: a comprehensive list with worldwide coverage and international classification of formulation types. *Biological Control* 43, 237-256.
- Feng, M. G. & Johnson, J. B. (1990) Relativevirulence of six isolates of *Beauveria bassiana* on *Diuraphis noxia* (Homop: Aphididae). *Environmental Entomology* 19, 785-790.
- Gassmann, A. J., Stock, S. P., Tabashnik, B. E. & Singer, M. S. (2010) Tritrophic effects of host plants on an herbivore–pathogen interaction. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*103, 371-378.
- Goettel, M. S. & Inglis, G. D. (1997) Fungi: Hyphomycetes. pp. 213-249 in Lacey, L. A. (Ed.) *Manual of Techniques in Insect Pathology*. 409 pp. Academic Press, San Diego, CA-USA.
- Goodman, D. (1982) Optimal life histories, optimal notation, and the value of reproductive value. American Naturalist 119, 803-823.
- Gunning, R. V., Easton, C. S., Balfe, M. E. & Ferris, I. G. (1991) Pyrethroid resistance mechanisms in Australian *Helicoverpa armigera. Pesticide Science* 33, 473-490.
- Hamm, J. J. & B. R. Wiseman(1986) Plant resistance and nuclear polyhedrosis virus for suppression of the fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Florida Entomologist* 69, 541-549.
- Haq, S. K., Atif, S. M. & Khan, R. H. (2004) Protein proteinase inhibitor genes in combat against insects, pests, and pathogens: natural and engineered phytoprotection. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics* 431, 145-159.
- Hare, J. D. & Andreadis, T. G. (1983) Variation in the susceptibility of *Leptinotarsa decemlineata* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) when reared on different host plants to the fungal pathogen, *Beauveria bassiana* in the field and laboratory. *Environmental Entomology* 12, 1892-1897.
- Hodgson, D. J., Vanbergen, A. J., Hartley, S. E., Hails, R. S. & Cory, J. S. (2002) Differential selection of baculovirus genotypes mediated by different species of host food plant. *Ecology Letters* 5, 512-518.
- Jackai, L. E. N. & Daoust, R. A. (1986) Insect pests of cowpeas. Annual Review of Entomology 31, 95-119.
- Janmaat, A. F. & Myers, J. H. (2005) The cost of resistance to Bacillus thuringiensis varies with the host plant of *Trichoplusia ni. Proceedings of theRoyal Society* B 272, 1031-1038.
- Kennedy, G. G. (2003) Tomato, pests, parasitoids, and predators: tritrophic interactions involving the genus Lycopersicon. Annual Review of Entomology 48, 51-72.
- Kim, J. J., Jeong, G., Han, J. H. & Lee, S. (2013) Biological control of aphid using fungal culture and culture filtrates of *Beauveria bassiana*. *Mycobiology* 41, 221-224.
- Mahr, S. E. R., Cloyd, R. A., Mahr, D. L. & Sadof, C. S. (2001) Biological control of insects and other pests of greenhouse crops. 581 pp. North Central Regional Publication. Cooperative Extension of the University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Ode, P. J.(2006) Plant chemistry and natural enemy Ptness: effects on herbivore and natural enemy interactions. *Annual Review of Entomology* 51, 163-185.
- Ofuya, T. I. (1997) Control of the cowpea aphid, *Aphis craccivora* Koch (Homoptera: Aphididae), in cowpea, *Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp. *Integrated Pest Management Review* 2, 199-207.
- Palumbo, J. & Tickes, B. (2001) Cowpea Aphids in Alfalfa in Yuma County farm notes. University of Arizona. Arizona. Available from: http://ag.arizona.edu/crops/counties/ yuma/farmnotes/fn0101cowpea.html (accessed 25 November 2003).

- Pavela, R., Vrchotova, N. & Sera, B. (2009) Repellency and toxicity of three impatient species (Balsaminaceae) extracts on *Myzus persicae* Sulzer (Homoptera: Aphididae). *Journal of Biopesticide* 2, 48-51.
- Poprawski, T. J. & Jones, W. J. (2000) Host plant effects on activity of the mitosporic fungi *Beauveria bassiana* and *Paecilomyces fumosoroseus* against two populations of *Bemisia* whiteflies (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae). *Mycopathologia* 151, 11-20.
- Price, P. W., Bouton, C. E., Gross, P., McPheron, B. A., Thompson, J. N. & Weis, A. E. (1980) Interactions among three trophic levels: Influence of Plants on interactions between insect herbivores and natural enemies. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 11, 41-65.
- **Quan, G. H.** (1996) Yardlong bean varietal trial. Training report 1997. The 14<sup>th</sup> regional training course in vegetable production and research. 243-249 pp. Bangkok.
- Rosenthal, G. A. & Berenbaum, M. R. E. (1991) *Herbivores, their interactions with secondary plant metabolites. The chemical participants.* Vol. 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 251 pp. Academic, San Diego, CA.
- Sarutayophat, T., Nualsri, C., Santipracha, Q. & Saereeprasert, V. (2007) Characterization and genetic relatedness among 37 yardlong bean and cowpea accessions based on morphological characters and RAPD analysis. Songklanakarin Journal of Science and Technology 29, 591-600.
- SAS Institute (2002) SAS for Windows, Release 9.1. SAS Institute, Cary, NC.
- Singh, S. R. & Jackai, L. E. N. (1985) Insect pests of cowpeas in Africa: Their cycle, economic importance and potential for control. pp. 217-231 in Singh, S. R. & Rachie, K. O. (Eds) *Cowpea Research, Production and Utilization.* 448 pp. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester/ Britain.
- Souleymane, A., Akenova, M. E., Fatokun, C. A. & Alabi, O. Y. (2013) Screening for resistance to cowpea aphid (Aphis craccivora Koch) in wild and cultivated cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L. Walp.) accessions. International Journal of Environmental Sciences 2, 611-621.
- Talaei Hasanloui, R. (2005) The investigation of genetical diversity of the foungus *Beauvaria bassiana* (Bals.) Vuill. and their pathogencity on *Plutella xylostella* and *Leptinotarsa decemlineata*. Ph. D. Thesis. 170 pp. University of Tehran, Iran.
- Tanada, Y., & Kaya, H. K. (1993) Insect pathology. 666 pp. Academic press, San Diego, CA.

Received: 1 March 2015 Accepted: 29 March 2015