



# Stalk and Stem vegetables

## A guide to pesticide effects on beneficials

2020

---

### About this guide



This guide provides information on the effects of pesticides on key beneficial insects that are important in stalk and stem vegetable crops. The results presented in the guide below have been compiled from several sources which include scientific literature, international pesticide data bases, the results of testing that has been conducted for project VG16067 'Impact of pesticides on beneficial arthropods of importance in Australian vegetable production' and field observations. The intended use of this guide is to provide growers and agronomists with a better understanding of how best to use pesticides in an IPM program to maximize the impact of beneficial species.

The products included were selected because they are currently registered (in 2019) for use in stalk and stem vegetable crops and because of their potential to be incorporated into IPM programs. Some products that are not considered to be IPM compatible have also been included as a comparison of relative toxicity.

### About the testing

The information in this guide is based on the results of laboratory-based tests and not field tests. Laboratory tests are designed to be the worst-case scenario. In these tests the product is applied at the highest label rate to the most vulnerable life stage. This means that products with low toxicity are most likely to be very safe when applied to a crop and products that show medium to high toxicity have the potential to disrupt beneficial species. How disruptive a product is will depend on the frequency of use, application rate, the age of the crop, how well established the beneficials are at the time of application and if the crop is grown in the field or in a glasshouse.

## Acute and sublethal testing

We used two levels of testing and the first is acute which aims to measure the impact of direct exposure to the product. In these tests beneficial species were exposed to the product for 24 or 48 hours and then the level of mortality was assessed. If mortality was less than 30%, they were then tested for sublethal effects. For the development of this guide sublethal tests were designed to answer two questions 1. For predators only - do the juveniles that survive the acute test develop into adults? 2. For predators and parasites – are adults that have been exposed to the product able to reproduce? The results of sub-lethal testing are only shown in this guide if the results differ from the acute toxicity. A blue triangle  indicates that the results are a combination of both acute and sub-lethal. A white triangle  means acute results only.

\*The protocols for testing and the references for results that were not developed as part of this project are available in a separate document.

**Table 1: Codes for beneficial species used in the guide**

code



**N** **Damsel bug**  
(*Nabis kinbergii*)  
Caterpillar predator

code



**B** **Brown lacewing**  
(*Micromus tasmaniae*).  
Aphid predator

code



**L** **Ladybird**  
(*Hippodamia variegata*)  
Aphid predator



**A** **Aphidius**  
(*Aphidius colemani*)  
Aphid parasite

## About the beneficial species

The beneficials tested are species that are naturally occurring and commercially available and are considered important for IPM in stalk and stem vegetables. For the acute tests the juvenile stage of the predatory species was used and for the parasitoids the adult wasps were used.

## How to interpret this guide

The relative toxicity for each species is indicated on a scale from 0% to 100% mortality as shown in the example below.

This example shows that Spinetoram is safe to ladybirds (**L**) and Damsel bugs (**N**) but is harmful to Aphidius and (**A**) and Brown lacewings (**B**).

Active/Trade name	L-ladybird, B-Brown lacewing, N-Damsel bug, A-Aphidius,				Chem. Group
	0% Harmless	30% Slightly harmful	80% harmful	100%	
Spinetoram /Success Neo					5

When deciding to use this product things to consider are:

- How many other products have been used on the crop and what impact did they have on brown lacewings, Aphidius and Diadegma?
- Will there be an economic loss if this product is not applied?
- Is there another product that that could be used that is less disruptive?

## Pesticides and IPM











The results presented here are based on worse-case scenario laboratory testing. In the field it is likely that the effects will be less toxic for some of the products shown in this guide. However, the impact of pesticides on beneficial species is cumulative which means that the impact is the combined effects of all pesticides used. This is particularly relevant for growers wanting to maintain healthy populations of beneficial species on their farms and for growers investing in commercially available biological control.

# The guide for Stalk and Stem vegetables

The information presented in the guide below is intended to be used as a support tool for IPM decision making and not to be interpreted as a list of “good and bad” or “safe and not safe” products.



\*Information is currently not available for all the beneficial species listed in this guide which is why some of the products only show results for a few species.

## Pesticides in order by active ingredient



Active/Trade name	L-ladybird, B-Brown lacewing, N-Damsel bug, A-Aphidius,  Acute results only  Acute and sub-lethal results	Chem. Group
	<b>Mortality</b> 0% Harmless    30% Slightly harmful    80% harmful 100%	
<b>Abamectin</b> /Vertimec		6
<b>Afidopyrofen</b> /Versys		9D
<b>Bacillus thuringiensis</b> /Dipel and Xentari		11A
<b>Chlorpyrifos</b> /Lorsban		1B
<b>Chlorantraniliprole</b> /Coragen		28
<b>Emamectin Benzoate</b> /Proclaim		6A
<b>Fipronil</b> /Regent		2B
<b>Flubendiamide</b> /Belt		28













<b>Imidacloprid</b> /Confidor		4A
<b>Indoxacarb</b> /Avatar		22A
<b>NPV</b> /Vivus		31
<b>Permethrin</b> /Ambush		31
<b>Pirimicarb</b> /Pirimor		1A
<b>Pymetrozine</b> /Chess		9B
<b>Spinetoram</b> /Success Neo		5
<b>Spirotetramat</b> /Movento		23
<b>Sulfoxaflor</b> /Transform		4C

## Fungicides in order by active ingredient






Active/trade name	L-ladybird, B-Brown lacewing, N-Damsel bug, A-Aphidius	Chem. Group
	 Acute results only  Acute and sub-lethal results	
<b>Mortality</b> 0% Harmless     30% Slightly harmful     80% harmful     100%		
Boscalid /Filan		7 11
Mancozeb		M3
Metalaxyl /Ridomil Gold		4

## Pesticides in order by trade name

Trade name /Active	L-ladybird, B-Brown lacewing, N-Damsel bug, A-Aphidius,	Chem. Group
	 Acute results only  Acute and sub-lethal results	
<b>Mortality</b> 0% Harmless     30% Slightly harmful     80% harmful     100%		
Ambush /Permethrin		31
Avatar /Indoxacarb		22A
Belt /Flubendiamide		28
Chess /Pymetrozine		9B
Chess /Imidacloprid		4A

<b>Coragen</b> /Chlorantraniliprole		28
<b>Dipel and Xentari</b> /Bacillus thuringiensis		11A
<b>Lorsban</b> /Chlorpyrifos		1B
<b>Movento</b> /Spirotetramat		23
<b>Pirimor</b> /Pirimicarb		1A
<b>Proclaim</b> /Emamectin Benzoate		6A
<b>Regent</b> /Fipronil		2B
<b>Success Neo</b> /Spinetoram		5
<b>Transform</b> /Sulfoxaflor		4C
<b>Versys</b> /Afidoprofen		9D
<b>Vertimec</b> /Abamectin		6
<b>Vivus</b> /NPV		31

## Fungicides in order by Trade name

Trade name /Active	L-ladybird, B-Brown lacewing, N-Damsel bug, A-Aphidius	Chem. Group
	 Acute results only  Acute and sub-lethal results	
<b>Mortality</b>		
0%    Harmless    30%    Slightly harmful    80% harmful    100%		
<b>Filan</b> /Boscalid		7 11
<b>Mancozeb</b>		M3
<b>Ridomil Gold</b> /Metalaxyl		4

**Project acknowledgement:** This project has been funded by Hort Innovation, using the Vegetable research and development levy and contributions from the Australian Government. Hort Innovation is the grower-owned, not-for-profit research and development corporation for Australian horticulture.

Horticulture Innovation Australia Limited (Hort Innovation) makes no representations and expressly disclaims all warranties (to the extent permitted by law) about the accuracy, completeness, or currency of information in *VG16067 Impact of pesticides on beneficial arthropods of importance in Australian vegetable production*. Reliance on any information provided by Hort Innovation is entirely at your own risk. Hort Innovation is not responsible for, and will not be liable for, any loss, damage, claim, expense, cost (including legal costs) or other liability arising in any way, including from any Hort Innovation or other person's negligence or otherwise from your use or non-use of *VG16067 Impact of pesticides on beneficial arthropods of importance in Australian vegetable production*, or from reliance on information contained in the material or that Hort Innovation provides to you by any other means.

Copyright © Horticulture Innovation Australia Limited 2019

Copyright subsists in *Stalk and Stem - A guide to pesticide effects on beneficials 2019* Horticulture Innovation Australia Limited (Hort Innovation) owns the copyright, other than as permitted under the Copyright ACT 1968 (Cth). *Stalk and Stem - A guide to pesticide effects on beneficials 2019* (in part or as a whole) cannot be reproduced, published, communicated or adapted without the prior written consent of Hort Innovation. Any request or enquiry to use the *Stalk and Stem - A guide to pesticide effects on beneficials 2019* should be addressed to

Communications Manager  
Hort Innovation



Level 7, 141 Walker Street  
North Sydney NSW 2060  
Australia  
Email: [communications@horticulture.com.au](mailto:communications@horticulture.com.au)  
Phone: 02 8295 2300