

Document downloaded from:

[\[http://redivia.gva.es/handle/20.500.11939/5237\]](http://redivia.gva.es/handle/20.500.11939/5237)

This paper must be cited as:

[Garcerá, C., Moltó, E., Chueca, P. (2011). Effect of spray volume of two organophosphate pesticides on coverage and on mortality of California red scale *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell). *Crop Protection*, 30(6), 693-697.]

**ivia**  
Institut Valencià  
d'Investigacions Agràries

The final publication is available at

[\[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2011.02.019\]](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2011.02.019)

Copyright [Elsevier]

Crop Protection

Cruz Garcerá

Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Agrarias.

Centro de Agroingeniería.

Ctra. Moncada-Náquera km. 4.5-E-46113-Moncada, Valencia (Spain)

Tel: +34 963424000

Fax: +34 963424001

E-mail: garcera\_cru@gva.es

Journal of Economic Entomology

Horticultural Entomology

1

2

**1Effect of Spray Volume of Two Organophosphate Pesticides on Coverage and on Mortality**

**2of California Red Scale *Aonidiella aurantii* Maskell**

3Cruz Garcerá, Enrique Moltó, Patricia Chueca

4Centro de Agroingeniería, Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Agrarias (IVIA); Ctra.

5Moncada-Náquera km. 4,5; E-46113-Moncada, Valencia (Spain). Tel: +34 963424000 Fax: +34 6963424001

3

## 7Abstract

8A trial under laboratory conditions was carried out to study the possibility of decreasing the  
9delivered dose of organophosphate insecticides without affecting their efficacy against California  
10red scale (CRS), *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell), by reducing the volume of water used whilst  
11maintaining the concentration of pesticide. In order to establish an optimal application volume,  
12the coverage and the efficacy against different stages of development of CRS of two commercial  
13organophosphate pesticides (chlorpyrifos 750 g kg<sup>-1</sup> WG [Dursban<sup>®</sup> 75 WG] and chlorpyrifos-  
14methyl 224 g l<sup>-1</sup> EC [Reldan<sup>®</sup> E]) at four volumes of water (1, 2, 3 and 4 ml) were compared.  
15Results showed that in general Chlorpyrifos-methyl-based product (CMBP), provided greater  
16coverage and impact size, but did not achieve the highest efficacy. The minimum deposited  
17volume (1.01 µl/cm<sup>2</sup>) produced 11% coverage with Chlorpyrifos-based product (CBP) and 22%  
18with CMBP, reaching the highest efficacies (around 89-95%) against the youngest stages (N1  
19and N2 stages) with both products. To attain similar efficacy with males (prepupal and pupa  
20stages), twice the volume (2.03 µl/cm<sup>2</sup>) of the CBP was required, producing 28% coverage. The  
21CMBP required higher deposited volumes (3.41 µl/cm<sup>2</sup>) and higher coverage (51%). The  
22maximum efficacy in the control of adult females (third instar and gravid female stages) was  
2370% with both pesticides. This level was attained with 3.41 µl/cm<sup>2</sup> of CBP (36% coverage) and  
244.72 µl/cm<sup>2</sup> of CMBP (62% coverage). The research shows that greater coverage does not result  
25in greater efficacy, so it would be possible to reduce the spray volume in field conditions. Further  
26research will be carried out in order to check these results under real field conditions

27

28**Keywords:** efficacy; deposition; chlorpyrifos; chlorpyrifos-methyl; bioassay.

## 291. Introduction

30California red scale (CRS), *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell) (Hemiptera: Diaspididae), is one of the  
31most damaging scale insects in citrus crops worldwide and is considered the main citrus pest in  
32Spain. The most common economic harm caused by CRS to citrus is due to its presence on  
33fruits, downgrading them and making marketing difficult even when CRS populations are low.  
34Severe infestations can also reduce tree vigour and yield (Alfaro et al., 2003; Vanaclocha et al.,  
352009; Walker et al., 1991).

36Organophosphate insecticides have been used worldwide to control CRS in citrus producing  
37regions (Carman, 1977; Grout and Richards, 1992; Levitin and Cohen, 1998; Martínez Hervás et  
38al., 2005). Among them, chlorpyrifos has been particularly widely used due to its high efficacy  
39(Bailey and Morse, 1991). It is well known, however, that their application can have significant  
40adverse environmental effects (FAO, 2008). Moreover, during the last few years some problems  
41with residues of organophosphate insecticides after harvest (especially chlorpyrifos) started to  
42occur in the citrus industry, a problem associated with the repetitive and excessive use of these  
43active materials (Coscollá, 2003, 2007).

44A way to restrict contamination by pesticides goes through the reduction of the amount of active  
45ingredient (a.i.) delivered per unit area of cultivation. This could be achieved by 1) decreasing  
46the concentration of a.i. in the solution whilst maintaining the water volume, or 2) decreasing the  
47water volume applied whilst maintaining the recommended concentration.

48Reduction of the concentration does not seem advisable, since concentration is one of the  
49parameters that have to be declared and tested in the legal registration of a commercial  
50insecticide (minimal concentration to achieve a certain guaranteed efficacy).

51Nowadays, organophosphate field treatments against CRS use high volumes of water to

52maximize the probability of reaching the insects on the tree canopy. Nevertheless, it is necessary  
53to know how far these volumes can be reduced without affecting the efficacy of applications.

54Some studies have been conducted to analyze the effect of the sprayed volume in the efficacy of  
55pesticides but against other pests and/or using other products. McCoy et al. (1989) did not find  
56differences in control efficacy by changing sprayed volumes of different acaricides against  
57*Phyllocoptruta oleivora* Ashmead (Acari: Eriophyidae). In the same way, no differences were  
58found in the control of *Coccus pseudomagnoliarum* Kuwana (Hemiptera: Coccidae) with  
59petroleum derived spray oils by Chueca et al. (2009). Conversely, other authors found  
60differences in efficacy dependent on the sprayed volume at constant concentration: Beattie et al.  
61(2002) for applications of a mineral oil against soft and armoured scales, Grout and Stephen  
62(1993) for applications of a mineral oil against CRS, and Cunningham and Harden (1999) for  
63methidathion applications against this same pest.

64Spray volume is the volume of spray solution that is emitted from the nozzles of the sprayer per  
65unit ground area, but it should be remarked that the important factor as far as efficacy is  
66concerned is which part of this volume reaches the target and how it distributes on the surface of  
67the plant. It is widely known that physicochemical properties of formulations affect droplet size  
68spectrum (Bouse et al., 1990; Haq et al., 1983; Yates et al., 1983) and thus deposition pattern  
69(Salyani, 1988; Spillman, 1984; Zabkiewicz, 2007).

70Because of the above-mentioned facts, this study was carried out to determine the optimal  
71volume of solution to be applied for controlling different stages of CRS when using two  
72organophosphate pesticide products containing two different active ingredients registered for  
73citrus against this pest: chlorpyrifos and chlorpyrifos-methyl. Three parameters that describe  
74spray deposition (coverage, average size of impacts and number of impacts per unit area) were  
75studied in order to determine how different applied volumes change these distributions and affect

76the efficacy of the treatments. The final goal was to determine the relationships between the  
77deposition pattern and the efficacy on CRS control.

## 782. Materials and Methods

79Two experiments were conducted to study the effect of spray volume on (1) deposition, and (2)  
80efficacy against different stages of CRS under laboratory conditions. In both experiments, two  
81commercial organophosphate insecticides were used: Dursban<sup>®</sup> 75 WG (a.i.: chlorpyrifos 750 g  
82kg<sup>-1</sup> WG) (Dow AgroSciences Ibérica, Madrid, Spain) and Reldan<sup>®</sup> E (a.i.: chlorpyrifos-methyl  
83224g l<sup>-1</sup> EC) (Dow AgroSciences Ibérica, Madrid, Spain). Both products were used at maximum  
84label concentration, 1.25 g/l for Chlorpyrifos-based product (CBP) and 4 ml/l for Chlorpyrifos-  
85methyl-based product (CMBP). In the efficacy study, a control treatment with water was  
86included. The spray volumes used for both experiments were 1, 2, 3 and 4 ml. This last volume  
87was the greatest spray volume tested because, at higher volumes, the droplets coalesced  
88producing a surface of liquid that ran off from the target surface. These volumes were used since,  
89in preliminary tests, we obtained with them a wide range of coverage levels that could be  
90achieved in field treatments.

91 These volumes were applied with a Potter Spray Tower (Burkard Scientific, Uxbridge, United  
92 Kingdom), fitted with its finest nozzle (internal diameter: 0.762 mm) (Potter, 1952). The  
93 pressure was fixed at 0.1 MPa. It was calibrated before each experiment, since the volume of the  
94 solution that reached the base of the tower was very low compared with that sprayed up the  
95 tower. The amount of solution deposited per unit area ( $\mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ) on the base of the tower for each  
96 applied volume was estimated by a series of tests carried out as follows: Different volumes of  
97 water were sprayed to Petri dishes of known surface area. The Petri dishes were weighed before  
98 and after application using an analytical balance (XR 205 SM-DR, Precisa Instruments Ltd.,  
99 Dietikon, Switzerland). The time between spraying and weighting was very short (around two  
100 seconds); therefore, evaporation was so small that we decided to disregard it. Five replicates per  
101 volume tested were performed. The average increase of weight produced by the deposition of the  
102 droplets of the solution per unit area was calculated. From these data, the amount of a.i. per unit  
103 area for each organophosphate pesticide treatment was estimated (Table 1).

#### 104 2.1. Study of deposition.

105 To study the effect of the spray volume on deposition, four spray volumes with three solutions  
106 (water, CBP and CMBP) were compared.

107 White PVC collectors (4.5 x 4.5 cm) were used as artificial targets whose drop retention  
108 behaviour is similar to that of citrus leaves (Mercader et al., 1995). Collectors were sprayed with  
109 the corresponding solution; adding 20 mg/l of iron chelate (Sequestrene 138 Fe G-100, Syngenta  
110 Agro S.A., Madrid, Spain) as a dye to produce a high drop/background contrast, required for  
111 subsequent image analysis. Five replicates for each combination of solution and spray volume  
112 were performed.

113 Sprayed collectors were photographed and images analyzed with specific software (Matrox  
114 Inspector, version 2.2, MatroxTM, Dorval, Canada) following the methodology described by

115Chueca et al. (2010). The images were taken with 20 pixels/mm resolution. Objects in the image  
116constituted by one single pixel were considered as noise and thus removed. Therefore, impacts  
117less than 50  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter were not necessarily detected. In each image, the program detects all  
118the impacts (deposited droplets produced by the spray over the collector) bigger than  $2.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$   
119 $\text{mm}^2$ , and then calculates three parameters to describe deposition: coverage (%) (Percentage of  
120the total surface covered by the impacts), mean area of impacts ( $\text{mm}^2$ ) and number of impacts per  
121unit area (No. of impacts/ $\text{cm}^2$ ).

## 1222.2. *Study of biological efficacy.*

123To study the effect of the different spray volumes on the efficacy against CRS, the same four  
124spray volumes of each pesticide solution (CBP and CMBP) were applied on lemons infested with  
125CRS populations in four groups of stages of development. These groups of stages were labelled  
126as follows (each one included the growth stages shown in brackets): N1 (nipple stage and first  
127molt), N2 (second instar and second molt), N3 (third instar and gravid females) and PP (prepupal  
128and pupa males). A control treatment (only water) was also included. Each lemon fruit was used  
129as one replicate. five replicates of each combination of stage, solution and spray volume were  
130performed.

131Lemons were infested following the protocol developed by Pina (2006): Briefly, clean lemons  
132were partially covered with wax, leaving a clean surface (arena) of about  $16 \text{ cm}^2$ , by dipping  
133them in molten paraffin while the long axis of the fruit was held horizontal, so that the level of  
134paraffin slightly surpassed the stem and blossom ends. The paraffin film reduced desiccation and  
135avoided the spreading of CRS individuals. Lemons were big enough relative to the size of the  
136arena so that the arenas could be considered flat. The arenas were kept horizontal during and  
137after spraying.

138The infestation procedure was as follows: Each of the waxed lemons was put on the top of black



139paperboard tubes (10 cm high and 3 cm base diameter) with the unwaxed surface up. On the  
140bottom of each tube, a lemon infested with hundreds of reproducing CRS females, from a colony  
141maintained under laboratory conditions, was put with the unwaxed surface up. Fluorescent lights  
142were placed over this set up to attract crawlers from the infested lemons to the arenas for 24  
143hours. After crawlers reached the “whitecap” stage, lemons with more than 50 fixed scales were  
144removed and placed in a tray until around 90% of individuals had reached the corresponding  
145stage for each test. This time was around 5 days to reach the N1 stage, 9 days for the N2 and 15  
146days for the N3 and the PP stages. To guarantee that the corresponding development stage had  
147been reached, the infested lemons were checked before treatment. Trays and colonies were kept  
148in chambers at a temperature of  $26 \pm 3$  °C,  $50 \pm 5\%$  relative humidity (RH) and continuous light.  
149Before being sprayed, about 50 healthy scales per lemon of the corresponding stage were circled  
150with a permanent marker (Lumocolor F width, Staedtler Mars GmbH & Co. KG, Germany). Ten  
151days after treatment, the numbers of dead and live scales from those that have been circled were  
152recorded. N1, N2 and PP scales that had not matured to the next stage were considered dead. N3  
153scales were considered dead when their body under the shield had a dry, thin and flat appearance.  
154Mortality rates were calculated as the ratio of dead individuals to the total checked individuals  
155(alive and dead).

### 1562.3. *Data Analysis.*

157A two-factorial analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed for each deposition variable  
158studied (coverage, mean area of impact and number of impacts per square centimetre). The two  
159factors were the “deposited spray volume” and the “pesticide” (CBP, CMBP and water).

160In order to study the efficacy of the treatments, Dunnett’s test (Dunnett, 1985) was used to  
161compare N1, N2, N3 and PP mortality of control (only water) and organophosphate treatments  
162for each spray volume. When significant differences were found, efficacies of the two products

163 were calculated using the Schneider-Orelli formula (Püntener, 1981). These efficacies were the  
164 dependent variable in a two factor MANOVA performed for each pesticide. In these tests, the  
165 factors were “deposited spray volume” ( $\mu\text{l}$  solution/ $\text{cm}^2$ ) and “CRS stage” (N1, N2, N3 and PP).  
166 Both in the study of deposition and in the study of biological efficacy, the ANOVA assumption  
167 of normal distribution of residues was assessed by the Shapiro-Wilk’s test (Shapiro and Wilk,  
168 1965) and the assumption of homocedasticity by the Levene’s test (Levene, 1960). After  
169 MANOVA in both studies, Fisher's LSD test (Fisher, 1935) was used for mean comparisons. All  
170 tests were considered at the 95% confidence level and were carried out with Statgraphics® Plus  
171 version 5.1 (STSC Inc., 1987).

### 1723. Results

#### 1733.1. Study of deposition.

174 The interaction between the factors, deposited spray volume and product, was significant for  
175 coverage ( $F = 2.51$ ;  $df = 6, 75$ ;  $P = 0.0306$ ), mean area of the impacts ( $F = 1738.82$ ;  $df = 6, 72$ ;  $P$   
176  $< 0.0001$ ) and number of impacts per unit area ( $F = 4.13$ ;  $df = 6, 70$ ;  $P = 0.0016$ ). The increase of  
177 spray volume deposited caused an increase of coverage (%) of the three solutions tested (Fig.  
178 1A). The greatest coverage values were obtained with CMBP for all deposited volumes (from  
179 around 22% at  $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  to around 62% at  $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ). CBP produced the lowest coverage  
180 values for all spray volumes, except for  $2.03 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  where it produced coverage similar to that of  
181 water (from around 11% at  $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  to around 43% at  $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ). The differences of  
182 coverage between both pesticides were around 10-20%. The values for water were between those  
183 of the two pesticide treatments.

184 No significant differences of mean area of impacts ( $\text{mm}^2$ ) were found between water and CBP  
185 for all deposited volumes, except for the highest ( $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ), in which CBP produced larger

186 mean area of impacts than water (Fig. 1B). For the lowest spray volume of  $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ , no  
187 significant differences of mean area of impact were found among the three solutions. However,  
188 CMBP produced significantly greater values of mean area of impacts than water and CBP for  
189 volumes deposited starting from  $2.03 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ . These values ranged from  $3.68 \text{ mm}^2$  at  $3.41 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$   
190 to  $19.94 \text{ mm}^2$  at  $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ .

191 An increase in deposited spray volume caused a decrease in number of impacts per square  
192 centimetre for the three solutions tested (Fig. 1C). This was because the droplets joined on the  
193 target, thus increasing the size of the impacts. Water produced the greatest number of impacts  
194 per square centimetre for all spray volumes (around  $770 \text{ impacts}/\text{cm}^2$  at  $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  and around  
195  $270 \text{ impacts}/\text{cm}^2$  at  $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ). The curve produced by CBP decreased approximately in  
196 parallel to that of water treatment, but with a difference of 200-300 impacts per square  
197 centimetre at each volume, with lower values for CBP. CMBP produced the lowest number of  
198 impacts per square centimetres at all volumes ( $170 \text{ impacts}/\text{cm}^2$  at  $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  and  
199  $10 \text{ impacts}/\text{cm}^2$  at  $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ). There were no significant differences in the number of impacts  
200 per square centimetre between the spray volumes of  $1.01$  and  $2.03 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  for any of the tested  
201 solutions. For water and CBP solutions, significant differences were found between these  
202 volumes and  $3.41 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  and between this and the highest volume ( $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ). For CMBP,  
203 there were no significant differences between the two highest volumes, but there were between  
204 these volumes and the lowest ( $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ).

### 205 3.2. *Study of biological efficacy.*

206 N1, N2, N3 and PP mortalities produced by both pesticide solutions differed significantly from  
207 the water control (Dunnett test,  $P < 0.05$ ). The mortality percentages for water controls were  
208  $12.50\%$  (SE=3.49%) for N1,  $8.42\%$  (SE=1.24%) for N2,  $0.8\%$  (SE=0.8%) for N3 and  $7.94\%$   
209 (SE=3.59%) for PP.

210The effect of spray volume on the efficacy against CRS depended on the stage for both  
211organophosphate pesticides. The interaction of the two factors, spray volume and stage, was  
212significant for CBP ( $F = 5.83$ ;  $df = 9, 82$ ;  $P < 0.0001$ ) (Fig. 2A) and for CMBP ( $F = 9.83$ ;  $df = 9,$   
21378;  $P < 0.0001$ ) (Fig. 2B). However, trends apparently differed for both pesticides.  
214Differences of spray volume did not statistically affect efficacy against N1 and N2 stages for  
215both insecticides. For these stages, efficacies ranged between 88-100% whatever the spray  
216volume applied.

217The effect of volume was significant when CBP was applied against the PP stage. The efficacy  
218increased from 63% with the volume of  $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  to 85% with  $2.03 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ , but with the  
219subsequent volumes, the efficacy did not increase. When CMBP was applied against PP, there  
220were significant increases of efficacy, from 76 % with the volume of  $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  to 97% with  
2213.41  $\mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ . No significant increase of efficacy was found with volumes higher than  $3.41 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ .

222The effect of spray volume was also significant on the N3 stage for both pesticides. In the case of  
223CBP, there were no significant differences between  $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  and  $2.03 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ , with an average  
224efficacy around 45%. However, an increase in volume to  $3.41 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  did affect efficacy, which  
225increased significantly to 68%. Despite the rise of volume to  $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ , average efficacy did  
226not change significantly. When CMBP was applied, efficacy against N3 increased significantly  
227at every volume from 4% to 68%, except for the highest volume (significant differences between  
2283.41  $\mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  and  $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  were not found).

#### 2294. Discussion and Conclusions

230In general, increases in spray volume increased both coverage and mean impact size and reduced  
231the number of impacts. This was due to coalescence of droplets produced when using the Potter  
232Tower. This phenomenon is often observed in other surfaces, with other spraying devices and in  
233field treatments (Chueca et al., 2009; Ebert and Downer, 2006; Salyani and McCoy, 1989).

234 Clear differences in the relationships between spray volume and deposition pattern of the  
235 solutions were found. CMBP produced a greater coverage, larger impacts and a lesser number of  
236 impacts per square centimetre than CBP. These results are probably due to differences in the  
237 formulation that affect the surface tension of the solution and hence droplet formation and  
238 deposition. This is most likely to be the explanation for the differences in the deposition pattern  
239 between water and the other solutions. Other authors have also observed how different  
240 formulations affect deposition pattern (Akesson and Gibbs, 1990; Akesson et al., 1994; Bouse et  
241 al., 1990; Butler-Ellis et al., 1997).

242 All treatments achieved high efficacies (around 89-95%) against N1 and N2 stages, so it was not  
243 possible to find a relationship between deposition and efficacy. The minimum-deposited volume  
244 ( $1.01 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ) of CBP produced 11% coverage and an a.i. deposition of 0.945 mg of chlorpyrifos/  
245  $\text{cm}^2$ . CMBP produced greater coverage (22%) but similar deposition of a.i. (0.903 mg of  
246 chlorpyrifos-methyl/ $\text{cm}^2$ ). We assume that both products produced the same effect on N1 and N2  
247 stages since, even at these low dosages, enough a.i. has been deposited to kill the insects, no  
248 matter how the products spread on the target.

249 At the PP stage,  $2.03 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  of CBP produced 22% coverage and 80-90% efficacy. In the case of  
250 CMBP, higher deposited volumes ( $3.41 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$ ) and higher coverage (51%) were required to  
251 achieve similar efficacy.

252 The maximum efficacy on N3 stage with both pesticides was 70%. To reach such a level, it was  
253 necessary to deposit  $3.41 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  of CBP (36% coverage) and  $4.72 \mu\text{l}/\text{cm}^2$  of CMBP (62%  
254 coverage). As before, it was observed that more deposition of CMBP than CBP was required to  
255 achieve the same effect. This indicated that chlorpyrifos had a higher toxicity.

256 The results show that N1 and N2 stages are the most sensitive to both products, because maximal  
257 efficacies were obtained with the lowest volumes. This conclusion is explained by the fact that

258these stages are less protected because their shield is thinner compared to that of older stages as  
259has been widely reported in literature (Asplanato and García-Marí, 2001; Busvine, 1971;  
260Hernández-Penadés et al., 2004; Walker et al., 1990). Furthermore, this research shows that  
261greater coverage does not necessarily result in greater efficacy. Experiments carried out in this  
262work indicated that efficacy of the pesticides under study on adult stages of CRS reached a  
263maximum value that was not surpassed by higher deposition of product. They also showed that  
264this maximum differed for the two products.

265In Spanish citrus growing areas, CRS may have 2-4 generations per year depending on climatic  
266conditions. The first generation begins in May when temperatures are optimal for CRS  
267development. At this time, there is a peak of crawlers in the population, so in this first generation  
268the development stages of the insect are more or less homogenous. Therefore, it is recommended  
269to control the pest at the beginning of its first generation because, in the succeeding generations,  
270different stages coexist. Our experiments indicate that treatments carried out at this time should  
271be set up in such a way that 11% coverage is attained on fruit for CBP solutions, or 22%  
272coverage is attained for CMBP solutions. This probably implies the use of lower volumes of  
273water than those that are usually sprayed. And thus, the amount of pesticide delivery could be  
274reduced, decreasing both the environmental impact and the presence of residues in fruit. The next  
275step of our experimentation will be devoted to validating if the proposed deposition attains the  
276expected level of pest control in field conditions and to determine which operative conditions of  
277the machinery (sprayer, pressure, speed, volume, nozzles, etc.) will be capable of producing such  
278deposition in citrus orchards.

279This study contributes to the understanding of how the spray volume is deposited and how it  
280affects the efficacy of two organophosphate insecticides for controlling CRS. It shows the  
281relevance of studying the relationship between efficacy of the pesticides against a pest and the

282deposition patterns of such products.

### 283Acknowledgements

284This research was partially funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación de España (project  
285AGL2007-66093-C04) and Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER). C. Garcerá was  
286recipient of a grant from IVIA.

### 287References

288Akesson, N.B., Steinke, W.E., Yates, W.E., 1994. Spray atomization characteristics as a function  
289of pesticide formulations and atomizer design. *J. Environ. Sci. Health Part B Pestic. Food*  
290*Contam. Agric. Wastes* 29, 785-814.

291Akesson, N.B., Gibbs, R.E., 1990. Pesticide drop size as a function of spray atomizers and liquid  
292formulations, in: Bode, L.E., Hazen, J.L., Chasin, D.G. (Eds.), *Pesticide Formulations and*  
293*Application Systems*. 10<sup>th</sup> volume. ASTM STP 1078, American Society for Testing and  
294Materials. Philadelphia, pp. 170-183.

295Alfaro, F., Cuenca, F.J., Esquivia, M., 2003. Problemática actual del piojo rojo de California en la  
296Comunidad Valenciana. *Comunidad Valenciana Agraria* 13, 21-28.

297Asplanato, G., García-Marí, F., 2001. Ciclo estacional de la cochinilla roja californiana,  
298*Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell) (Homoptera: Diaspididae) en naranjos del sur de Uruguay.  
299*Agrociencia* V, 54-67.

300Bailey, J.B., Morse, J.G., 1991. *Citrus treatment guide*. Cooperative Extension Div. Agric. Nat.  
301Res. Publ. 2903. University of California, Oakland, CA.

302Beattie, G.A.C., Clift, A.D., Parkes, R.A., Jiang, L., 2002. Impacts of spray volume and  
303horticultural mineral oil concentration on control of pink wax scale and red scale in citrus  
304orchards, in: Beattie, G.A.C., Watson, D.M., Stevens, M.L., Rae, D.J., Spooner-Hart, R.N.

305(Eds.), *Spray Oils Beyond 2000*. University of Western Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 306pp. 582-591.

307Bedford, E.C.G., 1998a. Pesticides. Compatibility of pesticides and fungicides with IPM, in:

308Bedford, E.C.G., Van Den Berg, M.A., De Villiers, E.A. (Eds.), *Citrus pest in the Republic of*  
309*South Africa*. Institute for Tropical and Subtropical Crops, Nelspruit, Sudáfrica, pp. 15-21.

310Bedford, E.C.G., 1998b. Red scale, *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell), in: Bedford, E.C.G., Van Den

311Berg, M.A., De Villiers, E.A. (Eds.), *Citrus pest in the Republic of South Africa*. Institute for  
312Tropical and Subtropical Crops, Nelspruit, Sudáfrica, pp. 132-144.

313Bouse, L.F., Kirk, I.W., Bode, L.E., 1990. Effect of spray mixture on droplet size. *T. ASAE* 33,  
314783-788.

315Busvine, J.R., 1971. *A Critical Review of the Techniques for Testing Insecticides*. 2nd. Ed.

316Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux. England.

317 Butler-Ellis, M.C., Tuck, C.R., Miller, P.C.H., 1997. The effect of some adjuvants on sprays  
318produced by agricultural flat fan nozzles. *Crop Prot.* 16, 41-50.

319Carman, G.E., 1977. Chemical control of scale insects on California citrus. *Proc. Int. Soc.*

320*Citriculture* 2, 468-474.

321Chueca, P., Garcerá, C., Moltó, E., Jacas, J.A., Urbaneja, A., Pina, T., 2010. Spray deposition

322and efficacy of four petroleum-derived oils used against *Tetranychus urticae* (Acari:

323Tetranychidae). *J. Econ. Entomol.* 103, 386-393.

324Chueca, P., Grafton-Cardwell, E.E., Moltó, E., 2009. Influence of spray equipment and water

325volume on coverage of citrus and control of citricola scale, *Coccus pseudomagnoliarum*

326(Hemiptera: Coccidae) with mineral oil. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 102, 296-303.

327Coscollá, R., 2003. Los residuos de plaguicidas en frutos cítricos: problemas y soluciones.



328Comunitat Valenciana Agraria 25, 3-10.

329Coscollá, R., 2007. Situación de la lucha química contra plagas en cítricos. *Vida Rural* 247, 36-33040.

331Cunningham, G.P., Harden, J., 1999. Sprayers to reduce spray volumes in mature citrus trees.

332Crop Prot. 18, 275-281.

333Dunnett, C.W., 1985. Multiple comparison procedure for comparing several treatments with a

334control. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 50, 1096-1121.

335Ebert, T.A., Downer, R.A., 2006. A different look at experiments on pesticide distribution. *Crop*

336Prot. 25, 299-309.

337FAO, 2008. FAO specifications and evaluations for chlorpyrifos. Retrieved 17 December 2010

338from [http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/agphome/documents/Pests\\_Pesticides/Specs/](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/agphome/documents/Pests_Pesticides/Specs/)

339chlorpyriphos08.pdf

340Fisher, R.A., 1935. *The Design of Experiments*. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd.

341Grafton-Cardwell, E.E., Vehrs, S.L.C., 1995. Monitoring for organophosphate – and carbamate-

342resistant armored scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) in San Joaquin Valley citrus. *J. Econ.*

343Entomol. 88, 495-504.

344Grout, T.G., Richards, G.I., 1992. Organophosphate resistance in California red scale

345(Homoptera, Diaspididae) on citrus in the Eastern Cape and the effect of oils as an

346organophosphate synergist. *J. Entomol. Soc. South Af.* 55, 1-7.

347Grout, T.G., Stephen, P.R., 1993. Reduced spray volumes for the control of red scale, *Aonidiella*

348*aurantii* (Maskell), with oil or pyriproxyfen plus oil. *Citrus Journal* 3, 27-28.

349Haq, K., Akesson, N.B., Yates, W.E., 1983. Analysis of droplet spectra and spray recovery as a

350function of atomizer type and fluid physical properties. ASTM STP 828, 67-82.

351Hernández-Penadés, P., Rodríguez, J.M., Alonso, A., Costa, S., García-Marí, F., 2004. Influencia  
352del momento del tratamiento en la eficacia del control químico, en los diaspididos de cítricos  
353piojo gris (*Parlatoria pergandii*), serpeta gruesa (*Lepidosaphes beckii*) y piojo rojo de California  
354(*Aonidiella aurantii*). Levante Agrícola 2º Trimestre 2004, 122-130.

355Levene, H., 1960. Robust Tests for Equality of Variances, in: Olkin, I., Ghurye, S.G., Hoeffding,  
356W., Madow, W.G., Mann, H.B. (Eds.) Contributions to Probability and Statistics: Essays in  
357Honor of Harold Hotelling. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA, pp. 278-292.

358Levitin, E., Cohen, E., 1998. The involvement of acetylcholinesterase in resistance of the  
359California red scale *Aonidiella aurantii* to organophosphorus pesticides. Entomol. Exp. Appl. 88,  
360115-121.

361Martínez Hervás, M.A., Soto, A., García Marí, F., 2005. Prospección de la eficacia de clorpirifos  
362en poblaciones del cóccido *Aonidiella aurantii* (Homoptera: Diaspididae) en parcelas de cítricos  
363de la Comunidad Valenciana. Levante Agrícola 2º Trimestre 2005, 176-182.

364McCoy, C.W., Lye, B.H., Salyani, M., 1989. Spray volume and acaricide rate effects on the  
365control of the citrus rust mite. Proc. Fla. State Hort. Soc. 102, 36-40.

366Mercader, G., Pellicer, J., Fabado, F., Moltó E., Juste, F., 1995. Influencia de los colectores sobre  
367los parámetros característicos de la pulverización en cítricos. VI Congreso de la SECH.  
368Barcelona 1995, 322.

369Pina, T., 2006. Control biológico del piojo rojo de California, *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell)  
370(Hemiptera: Diaspididae) y estrategias reproductivas de su principal enemigo natural *Aphytis*  
371*chrysomphali* (Mercet) (Hymenoptera: Aphelinidae). PhD Thesis. Universidad de València.  
372Facultat de Ciències Biològiques, Departamento de Zoología. España.

- 373Potter, C., 1952. An improved laboratory apparatus for applying direct sprays and surface films,  
374with data on the electrostatic charge on atomized spray fluids. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* 39, 1-29.
- 375Püntener, W., 1981. *Manual for field trials in plant protection* second edition. Agricultural  
376Division, Ciba-Geigy Limited.
- 377Salyani, M., 1988. Droplet size effect on spray deposition efficiency of citrus leaves. *T. ASAE*  
37831, 1680-1684.
- 379Salyani, M., McCoy, C.W., 1989. Deposition of different spray volumes on citrus trees. *Proc.*  
380*Fla. State Hort. Soc.* 102, 32-36.
- 381Shapiro, S.S., Wilk, M.B., 1965. An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples).  
382*Biometrika* 52, 591-611.
- 383Smith, D., Beattie, G.A.C., Broadley, R., 1997. *Citrus pests and their natural enemies. Integrated*  
384*pest management in Australia.* Dept of Primary Industries. Queensland, Australia.
- 385Spillman, J.J., 1984. Spray impaction, retention and adhesion: An introduction to basic  
386characteristics. *Pestic. Sci.* 15, 97-106.
- 387Vanaclocha, P., Urbaneja, A., Verdú, M.J., 2009 Mortalidad natural del piojo rojo de California,  
388*Aonidiella aurantii*, en cítricos de la Comunidad Valenciana y sus parasitoides asociados. *Bol.*  
389*San. Veg. Plagas* 35, 59-71.
- 390Walker, G.P., Richards, C.B., Jones, W.G., Aitken, D.C.G., 1991. Toxicity of five insecticides  
391used to control California red scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) against susceptible red scale  
392strains. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 84, 17-24.
- 393Walker, G.P., Aitken, D.C.G., O'Connell, N.V., Smith, D., 1990. Using phenology to time  
394insecticide applications for control of California red scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) on citrus. *J.*

395Econ. Entomol. 83, 189-196.

396Yates, W.E., Cowden, R.E., Akesson, N.B., 1983. Nozzle orientation, air speed and spray

397formulation affects on drop size spectrums. T. ASAE 26, 1638-1643.

398Zabkiewicz, J.A., 2007. Spray formulation efficacy – holistic and futuristic perspectives. Crop

399Prot. 26, 312-319.

400**Table 1. Estimated amount of active ingredient deposited per unit area ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ ) for the**  
401**four volumes of solution and for each organophosphate pesticide sprayed with the Potter**  
402**tower onto Petri dishes.**

403

404**Fig. 1. Interaction between the factors deposited volume and product for coverage (A),**  
405**mean impact area (B) and number of impacts per unit area (C)**

406

407**Fig. 2. Interaction between the factors deposited volume and development stage for the**  
408**effectiveness of Chlorpyrifos-based product (A) and Chlorpyrifos-methyl-based product**  
409**(B)**

410