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Project aim and objectives
The project is continuing research on aphicide resistance management for the UK farming industries and providing up-to-date information for agronomic and regulatory procedures. The need for this work is heightened by the occurrence of control failures with neonicotinoids against peach-potato aphids (Myzus persicae) in southern mainland Europe and north Africa and the movement of resistant forms to secondary hosts. The appearance of these highly-resistant aphids in that region represents a substantial threat to aphid control in the UK as any movement into this country (on imported plant material or through winged migration) would have very serious repercussions for neonicotinoid treatments on a range of crops. The loss of effective neonicotinoids due to resistance and, as a result, reliance on other chemistries would accentuate the risk of the evolution of resistance to the alternative non-neonicotinoid compounds.

The project is monitoring the response of live samples of M. persicae (collected from field and protected crops with a good UK geographical spread) to neonicotinoids and pyrethroids and to a range of novel aphicides including the new aphicide Isoclast (sulfoxaflor). It is also screening for established forms of resistance using DNA-based techniques. This close vigilance is essential to safeguard the contribution of these compounds to aphid pest management in the UK, as resistant aphids will inevitably cause crop losses. Other important aphid pests: potato aphids (Macrosiphum euphorbiae), currant-lettuce aphids (Nasonovia ribisnigri), grain aphids (Sitobion avenae), bird cherry-oat aphids (Rhopalosiphum padi), and rose-grain aphids (Metopolophium dirhodum), representing the interests of the project consortium, are also being monitored, and baseline bioassay data established for relevant insecticides for these and other important aphid pests. The project also now includes resistance monitoring in other important UK insect pests including cabbage stem flea beetles (Psylliodes chrysocephala), pea and bean weevils (Sitona lineatus), pollen beetles (Meligethes aeneus), diamond back moths (Plutella xylostella) and onion thrips (Thrips tabaci).

The continued work is highly relevant to the policy objectives of Defra-CRD, and the co-ordination of research and decision making among agrochemical companies, farmer and grower organisations and advisors. Its importance is enhanced by current EU-imposed restrictions on neonicotinoid use (as seed treatments) which may extend to flowering crops and cereals and other insecticide classes, coupled with the resistance situation for existing insecticides in M. persicae.

The over-riding objective of the project is to retain the availability of effective pesticides by developing appropriate Aphid Management Strategies and providing robust scientific support to the regulatory decision-making process. Guidance is being regularly made available to advisors, growers and the scientific community through the Insecticide Resistance Action Group (IRAG-UK). Other routes of communication include articles in the trade press, presentations to growers and agronomists, and papers in referred journals and conference proceedings (see below for this year’s outputs).

Key messages emerging from the project
- Screening of peach-potato aphid (M. persicae) samples taken from the field and protected crops in 2017 showed that there continues to be no significant resistance (that may compromise control) to a range of newer compounds belonging to different chemical classes, including sulfoxaflor. Furthermore, there have been no significant shifts in response to diagnostic doses of these insecticides that are currently effective (un-resisted) in the UK.
- In contrast, strong pirimicarb resistance and pyrethroid resistance (conferred by MACE and super-kdr target site mechanisms respectively), remain prevalent in the M. persicae samples although there is evidence for some changes in the genetic make-up of the UK population.
- Our findings continue to suggest that at least some M. persicae collected from protected crops may have come from more genetically-diverse, sexual populations on imported plant material. Obtaining samples from...
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these environments remains very important as they are more likely to harbour aphids with new resistance mechanisms (e.g. to neonicotinoids) coming into the UK from abroad.

- The baseline work on other important aphid pests continues to add data to the large database (which currently contains 50 separate baselines). This will allow aphid species linked to future reports of insecticide control problems to be quickly screened for potential resistance (that has not been seen previously).
- Greater pyrethroid resistance than that conferred by kdr has not been found in grain aphids (S. avenae).
- Pyrethroid resistance continues to be seen in cabbage stem flea beetles (P. chrysoscelis), pollen beetles (M. aeneus), pea and bean weevils (S. lineatus) and diamond back moths (P. xylostella).
- Pyrethroid resistance was seen in bioassays on several other beetle pests of stored grain and oilseed rape.
- Spinosad resistance was found for the first time in onion thrips (Thrips tabaci). This explains reports of reduced efficacy of this compound against this pest on salad onions and leeks. Resistance to pyrethroids was also still found to be present in this pest in the UK. Growers, advisors and CRD have been made aware of these findings.

Summary of results from the reporting year

- In 2017, we received, successfully reared and screened 65 field and 3 protected crop peach-potato aphid (M. persicae) samples from a good geographical range of sites in England and Scotland (collected primarily by the sub-contractors and agronomy companies).
- Screening bioassays applying diagnostic doses to live aphids from these samples continued to show no resistance to neonicotinoids, pyrethroids, fipronil, spirotetramat or cyanturoliprole. Testing with sulfoxaflor, a compound added to the work in 2017, also showed no evidence of resistance.
- In contrast, continued strong resistance to pyrethroids was seen in most of the samples.
- This was backed up by DNA tests showing that M. persicae carrying MACE resistance (to pirimicarb) and the new form (north European: ne) of super-kdr (conferring resistance to pyrethroids), with both mechanisms in the heterozygous form, continue to be common and widespread in the UK.
- A few of the M. persicae field samples were found to contain aphids that were susceptible to lambda-cyhalothrin but resistant to esfenvalerate (both pyrethroid insecticides), with resistance specifically to esfenvalerate probably being caused by a new, as yet undisclosed, mechanism.
- In the M. persicae field samples, there continued to be an absence of M. persicae with extreme (R2) esterase resistance to organophosphates (OPs).
- The frequency of the ‘O’ super-clone continued to fall in Scotland and England to the point where only a few examples were seen in the micro-satellite testing. This has been replaced by a new super-clone; ‘W’, which has the same resistance profile of MACE and super-kdr, both in the heterozygous form. The UK M. persicae population appears, therefore, to be undergoing a change in its make-up. The ‘P’ super-clone, which also has the same resistance genotype as ‘W’, remained common though.
- A comparison of the M. persicae insecticide resistance profiles found in our UK field and protected crop samples continued to show that aphids with rarer combinations of resistance mechanisms/genotypes are found more often at the in the protected sites. This is probably due to some of the aphids in these environments originating from more diverse, foreign, sexually-producing, populations, on imported plant material.
- The good news is that Nic-R++ M. persicae, which are found in southern mainland Europe and north Africa, have so far not been seen in either the protected or field UK samples.
- We have continued to develop and validate the best bioassay method for various aphid species with the end product of insecticide-susceptible baselines for a range of aphicides. These data will make quick screening bioassays available to assess whether any new reports of control failures against these aphid pests are due to the evolution of resistance.

The results described in this summary report are interim and relate to one year. In all cases, the reports refer to projects that extend over a number of years.

While the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board seeks to ensure that the information contained within this document is accurate at the time of printing, no warranty is given in respect thereof and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board accepts no liability for loss, damage or injury howsoever caused (including that caused by negligence) or suffered directly or indirectly in relation to information and opinions contained in or omitted from this document. Reference herein to trade names and proprietary products without stating that they are protected does not imply that they may be regarded as unprotected and thus free for general use. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is any criticism implied of other alternative, but unnamed, products.
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- Two grain aphid (*S. avenae*) samples (collected from winter wheat in north and south Yorkshire) in response to reports of pyrethroid control failures contained aphids carrying pyrethroid resistance but this remained at the expected level for aphids carrying kdr.
- The proportion of the SA3 (kdr-SR) *S. avenae* super-clone in Scotland appears to have stabilised at around 30%.
- No *S. avenae* kdr-RRs (homozygote) genotypes have been found to date. This may relate to a fitness cost associated with this genotype or the inability of the SA3 super-clone to produce males and hence no opportunity to bring the kdr allele together through sexual reproduction.
- One bird cherry-oat aphid (*R. padi*) sample (collected from winter wheat in Hertfordshire) contained aphids with slightly higher pyrethroid resistance than the susceptible baseline standard.
- Twenty cabbage stem flea beetle (*P. chrysoscelpha*) samples (collected from oilseed rape in England) all contained adults carrying pyrethroid resistance (tested in bioassays). The hot spot of higher frequencies of resistant beetles in the south east of England was seen again, particularly in Suffolk.
- Three samples of pollen beetle (*M. aeneus*) collected in England all contained adults carrying pyrethroid resistance.
- The response of the samples to lambda-cyhalothrin and tau-fluvalinate (pyrethroids) was similar showing that the latter should not be used in preference to the former for controlling this pest.
- Bioassays applying a synergist prior to a pyrethroid gave good control demonstrating a metabolic-based mechanism is responsible for resistance.
- One pea and bean weevil (*S. lineatus*) sample (collected from Suffolk) contained pyrethroid-resistant adults.
- One diamond back moth (*P. xylostella*) sample (collected from Somerset) contained pyrethroid resistant moths. However, diamides and spinosad showed 100% control in the bioassays.
- This resistance profile was the same as seen for *P. xylostella* samples collected in 2016 from England and Scotland. This supports reports from growers and agronomists that this pest is now overwintering in the UK.
- Bioassays showed that pyrethroid resistance has evolved in three other beetle pests in the UK: bean seed beetle (*Bruchus rufimanus*), seed weevil (*Ceutorhynchus assimilis*) and striped flea beetle (*Phyllotreta striolat*)
- Reports of reduced control of onion thrips (*T. tabaci*) with spinosad were followed up by tests on a sample collected in Kent. Bioassays showed that some of the adults were resistant to this insecticide when applied at the recommended field rate. In addition, 100% pyrethroid resistance was found in this sample, as seen in English *T. tabaci* samples that we tested over a decade ago.

Key issues to be addressed in the next year

- The current project is due to end on 31/3/18. However, we are seeking funding for an extension to the current project which will continue to allow resistance research in all relevant UK insect pests.
- If we are successful, we will continue to measure the response of live samples of *M. persicae* to a range of aphicides using screening bioassays; an important approach as we cannot predict the mechanism of any new types of resistance. This close vigilance is essential to safeguard the contribution of effective compounds to aphid pest management.
- We will continue to test for several known, established forms of insecticide resistance in the *M. persicae* samples using DNA diagnostics (to monitor for any changes in their frequency in the population).
- We will continue to monitor other important aphid pests, where significant resistance is not yet present, in response to any reports of insecticide control problems. We will also continue to establish useful insecticide-susceptible baseline data for various aphid/insecticide combinations to allow quick screening, using diagnostic doses, for resistance in samples associated with control failures.
- We will also continue to monitor for resistance, mainly to pyrethroids, in other important UK insect pests (beetles, moths and thrips).

The results described in this summary report are interim and relate to one year. In all cases, the reports refer to projects that extend over a number of years.

While the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board seeks to ensure that the information contained within this document is accurate at the time of printing, no warranty is given in respect thereof and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board accepts no liability for loss, damage or injury howsoever caused (including that caused by negligence) or suffered directly or indirectly in relation to information and opinions contained in or omitted from this document. Reference herein to trade names and proprietary products without stating that they are protected does not imply that they may be regarded as unprotected and thus free for general use. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is any criticism implied of other alternative, but unnamed, products.
### Has your project featured in any of the following in the last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Press articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Conference presentations, papers or posters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Presentations</th>
<th>Scientific papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other

Book Chapters


The results described in this summary report are interim and relate to one year. In all cases, the reports refer to projects that extend over a number of years.

While the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board seeks to ensure that the information contained within this document is accurate at the time of printing, no warranty is given in respect thereof and, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board accepts no liability for loss, damage or injury howsoever caused (including that caused by negligence) or suffered directly or indirectly in relation to information and opinions contained in or omitted from this document. Reference herein to trade names and proprietary products without stating that they are protected does not imply that they may be regarded as unprotected and thus free for general use. No endorsement of named products is intended, nor is any criticism implied of other alternative, but unnamed, products.