# A BELTWIDE RATING OF BENEFICIAL INSECTS

D. Eddie McGriff

Cooperative Extension Service, University of Georgia
Bainbridge, GA
John R. Ruberson
Department of Entomology, University of Georgia
Tifton, GA

### **Abstract**

There are three steps in using beneficial insects in integrated pest management (IPM): first, determining what species, or groups of species are important, next establishing sampling methods for these beneficials, and advising farmers how to use this information in making pest control decisions. Cotton IPM is only at step one now.

#### Introduction

The success of the boll weevil eradication program, the widespread use of Bt cotton, the development of insecticides that are less toxic to beneficial insects and integrated pest management are the major factors contributing to a greater reliance on beneficial insects and a diminished use on pesticides. Entomologists are also concerned that regulatory pressure may cause the loss of many organophosphate insecticides upon which farmers now depend. Integrated pest management, including use of beneficial insects, may help extend the life of these pesticides.

## Discussion

Twenty-one Extension and research entomologists across the U. S. cotton belt ranked the most important beneficial insects, dividing them into two categories--predators and parasites/pathogens. Predators attack and feed on multiple prey while parasites live in or on their hosts during immature development. Pathogens are organisms that cause disease, primarily fungi and viruses. The results of the survey are presented in Tables 1 and 2 below. Each entomologist assigned a ranking to the various natural enemies in their respective regions. A first place ranking got ten points, second place- 9 points, third place- 8 points, etc. Rankings were summed by region and totaled for the entire Cotton Belt (Tables 1 and 2).

The following entomologists participated:

Jeffery Slosser, Texas A&M University Allen Knutson, Texas A&M University Clyde Sorensen, North Carolina State University Peter Ellsworth, University of Arizona

S. E. Naranjo, USDA-Arizona Peter Goodell, University of California R. K. Sprenkel, University of Florida Blake Layton, Mississippi State University R. G. Luttrell, Mississippi State University Charles T. Allen, University of Arkansas Ralph Bagwell, Louisiana State University Jerry B. Graves, Louisiana State University Jeffrey Willers, USDA-Mississippi Phillip Roberts, University of Georgia Gary Herzog, University of Georgia John R. Ruberson, University of Georgia Barry L. Freeman, Auburn University Ron H. Smith, Auburn University Michael Williams, Mississippi State University Ames Herbert, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University Gloria McCutcheon, Clemson University

#### **Summary**

Table 1. Rankings of parasites/pathogens

17 25 -	37 41 57	124 113
25		
-	57	
_		111
	32	89
8	20	84
10	25	72
8	20	52
-	19	36
-	7	36
-	21	29
-	11	25
-	20	25
7	9	23
9	-	19
-	3	18
-	-	13
-	-	9
-	-	6
-	-	4
-	-	2
	10 8 - - - - 7	- 32 8 20 10 25 8 20 - 19 - 7 - 21 - 11 - 20 7 9

Table 2. Rankings of predators

Predators	SE	MS	SW	W	T
Minute Pirate Bugs	72	58	25	29	184
Big-eyed Bugs	71	62	23	28	184
Lady Beetles	53	47	25	17	142
Lacewings	40	43	22	20	125
Spiders	42	47	15	11	115
Nabids	22	38	13	14	87
Fire Ants	42	31	11	0	84
Ground Beetles	24	20	3	0	47
Syrphid Flies	10	14	11	5	40
Assassin Bugs	11	10	1	9	31
Collops Beetle	0	0	2	17	19
Spined Soldier Bugs	5	11	1	0	17
Hooded Beetles	10	0	3	3	16
Six-Spotted Thrips	0	2	4	2	8
Long-legged Fly(Dance Fly)	0	0	0	7	7
Earwigs	5	1	0	1	7
Drappetis spp.	0	0	0	7	7
Predatory Mites	0	1	4	0	5
Rove Beetles	0	0	0	3	3
Fleahoppers	0	0	0	1	1

SE- Southeast MS- Mid-South SW- Southwest W- West

T- Total