

(E48)

PEPPER (JALAPEÑO): *Capsicum annuum* (L.) ‘Ixtapa’

INSECTICIDAL CONTROL OF PEPPER WEEVIL AND EFFECTS ON BROAD MITE, JALAPEÑO PEPPER, 2007

Philip A. Stansly

University of Florida/ IFAS
Southwest Florida Res. and Ed. Center
2686 State Road 29 North
Immokalee, FL 34142-9515
Phone: (239) 658-3427
Fax: (239) 658-3469
E-mail: pstansly@ufl.edu

Barry Kostyk

Robert Reifer

Pepper weevil: *Anthonomus eugeni* (Cano)

Broad mite: *Polyphagotarsonemus latus* (Banks)

Pepper weevil is the major pest of all pepper varieties in the southern parts of the US, damaging fruit primarily through larval feeding. Control is difficult due in part to the inaccessibility of all but the adult stage to insecticide sprays. For this field trial, greenhouse-raised pepper plants were transplanted on 5 Apr at 18 inch spacing in single rows on a set of 3 beds, 240 ft in length and covered with polyethylene film mulch. Approximately 25 % of the fertilizer was preplant soil incorporated (granular 15-0-15) with the remainder applied as liquid 8-0-8 delivered by drip irrigation. Each bed was divided into 4 plots 60 ft long and the 3 treatments assigned across the 3 beds 4 times in a RCBD. A high clearance sprayer was used operating at 200 psi and 2.3 mph with the spray delivered through two vertical booms using yellow Albuz® hollow cone nozzles that applied 10 gpa each. Both May and Jun applications were conducted with 4 nozzles that delivered 40 gpa. Applications were made 16, 21, 25, 30 May and 1, 5, 8, 13, 18 Jun. Pepper weevil damage was monitored 29 May and 4, 12, 19 Jun by counting fallen fruit and fallen flowers from 10 plants per plot collected by fixing a barrier of wood lathing onto the plastic. All fruit 2.5 inches or more in length was harvested 15 and 22 Jun from 20 plants located centrally in each plot. No fruit of harvestable size was available from any plot in replicate 3 during the entire experiment and therefore was not included in the harvest analysis. Fruit was weighed and then cut open to determine if weevil larvae and/or larval feeding damage were present. Broad mite damage was evaluated as light = less than 33% of whorls with visible damage and less than 10% with severe curling, and severe = more than 67% of whorls with visible damage or more than 33 % with severe curling. Data were subjected to ANOVA, and means separated by Fisher’s Protected LSD, P = 0.05.

Mean (\pm SEM) of fallen flowers per plant was 18.1 ± 6.0 and of fallen fruit per plant was 2.1 ± 2.1 across all plots with no significant treatment effect was observed. Significantly more fruit was harvested from plants treated with Assail than with XDE-175 or untreated. Fruit with larvae or feeding damage was less by a factor of 4 in the Assail treatment than in the XDE-175 treatment, although not statistically significant for the presence of larvae. Broad mite damage was least on untreated plants and greatest on plants treated with Assail, with XDE-175 treated plants intermediate. This result was attributed to effects on a predaceous mite *Amblyseius swirskii* that had been released in an adjacent block and had dispersed into the treated blocks.

Table 1.

Treatment	Formulation	Rate	Pepper weevil damage assessment on fruit				Broad mite damage	
			Total (No)	Weight (lbs)	Fruit with larvae (%)	Fruit with feeding damage	Light	Severe
Untreated check			0.67b	0.00a	NA	NA	8.3a	1.5c
Assail	30 SG	4 oz/acre	277.3a	6.12a	8.2a	17.1b	0.8c	9.3a
XDE-175	SC 120 g/l	8 fl oz/acre	33.0b	0.39a	32.9a	66.86a	4.0b	5.8b