

D

Ε

Ρ

A

R

Т

Μ

Ε

Ν

Т

OF

Α

Ν

Π

Μ

Β

0

0

G

&

С

0

Ν

S

Ε

R

V

A

Т

0

Ν

S

С

Π

Π

Ν

С

Ε

EVALUATION OF THE GREAT® FRUIT FLY BAIT (GFFB)

AGAINST FRUIT FLIES IN TWO MANGO-PRODUCTION ZONES IN GHANA Maxwell BILLAH¹, Kossi ADOM², Michael OSAE³, James JIANG⁴ and Jason DU⁴ 1Department of Animal Biology & Conservation Science, University of Ghana, Legon, 2 Matrix Innovations Ltd., Box , Accra. Ghana Atomic Energy commission, Box LG. 80, Legon, ⁴Ecoman Biotech Co. Ltd., Unit 518, No.26, Information Road, Haidian District, Beijing, China. INTRODUCTION The horticultural industry is one of the most attractive agricultural sectors, and an important source of employment and income generation. However, several factors constrain production, with insect pests as one of the most important. Among the insect pests, perhaps none has gained notoriety than the group known as Fruit Flies. Species in this group are reported to cause 40-80% direct losses to fruits and vegetables (Lux et al., 2003; Billah et al., 2009). Quarantine restrictions also reduce exports to lucrative markets in Europe, Middle East and USA, where the insects are regarded as quarantine pests.. It is therefore essential that growers are provided with economically viable management techniques that are sustainable and environmentally-friendly against the pests. One such technique is the use of protein baits - which has been demonstrated as effective in many countries, and even accepted in organic farming (OMRI, 2001) The product is a mixture of food substance and insecticide that attract and kill fruit flies on consumption of the product . This trial was aimed at evaluating and validating the bio-efficacy of the product against fruit flies in two commercial mango production zones. METHODOLOGY Site Selection, Traps and Attractants Three farms (2 treatment & 1 control) were selected from each of the 2 sites, with 4-10 ha plot sizes and a minimum of 400-600 fruiting trees Spot sprays with the treatment products - Great [®] Fruit Fly Bait (GFFB, (Ecoman Biotech Co., Ltd., Beijing, China) and SUCCESS® Appat (GF-120, GF-120, Dow AgroSciences Ltd., UK))) were applied in the plots. Plots were geo-referenced using a Magellan Explorist 100 hand-held device (Table 1). Three attractants were used; Methyl eugenol (ME); Terpinyl Acetate (TA) and Trimedlure (TML), both for attracting different subgenera of *Ceratitis* species (Plate 2) Local Homemade Mineral Water Bottle (MWB) traps were used (Plate 1). Trap Deployment and Bait Application Nine traps (3 ME + 3 TA + 3 TML) were deployed per plot on trees at 2-4 m above ground (Plates 1 & 2). GFFB (1L: 3L Water) and SUCCESS® Appat (1L Bait : 5L Water), were delivered at 50ml/tree over 1 m² of canopy (Plate 3). Treatment repeated on weekly basis till end of harvest, and traps checked on weekly basis for catches. After every 4 weeks of exposure, traps were serviced by cleaning and replacing attractants and DDVP. Fruit sampling and Incubation After 8-10 weeks of application, 100 fruits per plot were collected and weighed for incubation over a layer of sand 1m After 3-4 weeks of incubation, fruits were dissected to retrieve hidden puparia before discarding. Puparia were held in petri dishes till fly emergence. Flies held in cages and fed on diet of yeast + sugar (ratio 1:3) for 4 days to attain full adult features. 1m Fruit collection was repeated toward end of harvest Data analysis Fly numbers were log-transformed [log (x +1)] and subjected to analysis of variance, using PROC GLM. Means were separated by SNK test at P = 0.05 (SAS Inc., 2003). To compare densities, catches were expressed as Number of flies (F) per trap (T) per day (D) i.e. F/T/D (IAEA, 2003). Fruit infestation levels were determined by number of p (weight or number of fruits) TABLE 1. Geo-referenced Points of Study Area **GPS Readings** Farm Locality Farm Treatment Lat. Alt. (m) Owner Long. A. Teikutey Andrews GFFB 05° 59' 09 N 82 000° 00' 50 E Rlate 3. Mango tree sh spot spray area Site 1 C. Olympio Epichris 1 GF-120 06° 00' 20 N 000° 00' 43 E 77 C. Olympio TABLE 2. Infestation Indices Sites = A, and Combined (B) and levels of Protection at the 2 Epichris 2 Control 06° 01' 45 N 000° 00' 27 E 68 K., Adams Koldam GFFB 06° 03' 24 N 000° 00' 55 W 91 Site 2 Sikeway 1 J.F. Awaitey GF-120 06° 02' 52 N 000° 00' 44 W 94 No. Wt No Farm Trt Sikeway 2 J.F. Awaitey Control (C-T) 06° 01' 38 N 000° 00' 52 W 81 (kg) Pupari (C-T)/C GFFB 90 66.0 2 0.022 0.030 0.929 96.8 Koldam RESULTS 80.9 Sikeway 1 GF-120 90 60.0 11 0.122 0.183 0.776 No. of Fruit flies Collected = 6,057 Control 90 58.4 56 0.622 0.959 Sikeway 2 (C1) Three (3) fruit fly species identified GFFB 90 60.0 3 0.033 0.050 0.728 93.6 Andrews Epichris 1 GF-120 90 60.0 9 0.100 0.150 0.628 80.7 1. Bactrocera invadens = 5,765 (95.2%) 90 63.0 49 0.544 0.778 = 191 (3.15%) 2. Ceratitis cosvra Epichris 2 (C2) 3. Ceratitis capitata = 101 (1.67%) Trt Fruits Wt Puparia Pup/fruit Pup/Wt Diff. Fig 1. Site 1 Fly Collection **Level of Fruit Protection** GFFB 180 126.0 5 0.028 0.040 0.825 95.4 GF-120 180 120.0 20 0.111 0.167 0.698 1 GEEB fields = 93.6-96.8% 180 121.4 105 0.583 0.865 at and a sta Control 2. GF-120 Fields 80.7-80.9% Fig 2. Site 1 Fly Collection **DISCUSSION & CONCLUDING REMARKS** RECOMMENDATIONS References Though high trap catches were recorded from treated plots, number • Farmers appreciate the simple but effective IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] (2003). Trapping guidelines for area-wide fruit fly programmes. IAEA, Vienna, of puparia from fruits were low. performance of the product • Implication: Traps and bait attracted flies away from fruits. programmes. But the **non-availability** food baits on the markets Statistical differences between catches from the 3 Lux, S.A., Ekesi, S. Dimbi, S. Mohamed, S. & Billah, M. K. (2003). Mango infesting fruit flies in Africa: Perspectives and limitations of biological encreashes to their makes farmers resort to the use anything they lay treatments were significant hands on Even though numbers from treated fields tended to fall Africa: Perspectives and the of biological approaches to their management, pp. 277-293. In P. The need to introduce food baits onto the with time, those from control fields followed same trend. management, pp. 277-293. In. Neuenschwander, P., Borgemeister, C. and Langewald, Ghanaian market is thus paramount It was because control fields were NOT abandoned farms farmers had their own types of treatments.

- Around 10th week, plots seemed to climb up in both plots coincides with peak fruiting period when all fruits are mature
- Most dominant species = Bactrocera invadens (>95 %). B. invadens now Ghana and Africa's biggest Fruit Fly challenge.
- Fruit Infestation levels 0.022-0.033 pup/kg
- Lowest infestation levels = GFFB fields
- Acknowledgements

- Food baits highly recommended for inclusion in all fruit fly IPM packages
- With the inclusion of food baits in IPM packages, growers will have the chance of producing high quality fruits and vegetables to boost the horticultural industry.
- [eds.], Biological control in J. manageme pest integrated systems in Arrica. Wallingford, United Kingdom. CABI
- OMRI [Organic Materials Review Institute] (2001). Generic Materials List with the National Organic Program Final Rule Listing. Organic Materials Review Institute, Eugene, OR.
- SAS Institute Inc. (2003) SAS/STAT[®] User's Guide, Version 9.1. Cary, NC: USA.