

Original Research Article

Population dynamics of *P. brassicae* on different cauliflower genotypes

ABSTRACT

The research study on Population dynamics of *P. brassicae* on ten cauliflower genotypes , i.e. White corona, Snow mystique, Snow grece, Local, Clima, 5340, Sydney, Snow crown, White magic and AX-2034 was conducted at the Agricultural Research Institute Tarnab, Peshawar during 2012-2014. The results of field experiments revealed that maximum larval poulation of *Pieris brassicae* per plant was recorded on White magic (361.83larvae plant⁻¹) and lower on White corona (15.83 larvae plant⁻¹). And no larvae was recorded on Sydney and AX-2034. Population trend of *P. brassicae* larvae on cauliflower genotypes during 2012-13 greatly fluctuates between 22nd Nov to 14 Feb. During 2013-14 it gives 3 maximum peaks between 11 Oct to 21 Feb. Mean yield of cauliflower for the year 2012-14 was significantly higher in White Magic (46550 kg ha⁻¹) and lower in White Corona (9913 kg ha⁻¹).

Key words: cauliflower, commercial genotypes, *P. brassicae*, Population dynamics, peshawar

INTRODUCTION

Cauliflower, *Brassica oleracea*, is one of the important vegetable in the family Brassicaceae. Its white curd is used for eating purpose while its stalk and leaves used as fodder. It contains several phytochemicals that may be beneficial to human health. It includes sulforaphane, a compound released when cauliflower is chopped or chewed, which may protect against cancer. Glucosinolates, carotenoids, indole-3-carbinol, are chemicals that enhances DNA repair, and acts as an estrogen antagonist slowing the growth of cancer cells (Sharma *et al.*, 2004).Cauliflower is an economical crop, which can be produced under smallholder conditions (Weinberger and Srinivasan, 2009). Pakistan is included in top ten cauliflower producing countries in the world. (FAOSTAT, 2011). Cauliflower is cultivated more intensively in Peshawar valley and attacked by different insect pests at different growing stages, which reduces its yield. The major insect pests include aphids, cabbage butterfly, cutworm and diamondback moth. Among which cabbage butterfly (*Pieris brassicae* L.) causes severe damage to cruciferous vegetables (Hasan and Ansari, 2011). In Khyber

31 Pakhthoonkhwa, *Pieris brassicae* is present throughout the year its single larva can consume
32 74–80 cm² leaf area and cause economic losses to cruciferous crops. (Younas *et al.*, 2004).

33 In order to get maximum yield and avoid excessive use of insecticides different
34 resistant cultivars are sown. Variety selection and crop management practices are the main
35 factors that contribute to growing profitable cauliflower (Zerkoune, 2000).

36 The aim of our study was to evaluate commercially available cauliflower genotypes
37 against *P. brassicae* infestation. This would be helpful in evolving resistant varieties of
38 cauliflower against *P. brassicae*.

39 MATERIALS AND METHODS

40 The research studies on Population dynamics of *P. brassicae* on different cauliflower
41 genotypes was conducted at the Agricultural Research Institute Tarnab, Peshawar during
42 2012-2014. The research trial consisted of field experiment.

43 Screening of cauliflower genotype

44 Ten commercially available genotypes of cauliflower, i.e. White corona, Snow mystique,
45 Snow grece, Local, Clima, 5340, Sydney, Snow crown, White magic and AX-2034 were
46 transplanted in the last week of September, 2012 on ridges in separate plots each measuring 4
47 m x 2m. Plant to plant and row to row distance was kept at 45 cm and 75cm, respectively.
48 The experiment was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with three
49 replications. There were 30 experimental units and in each experimental unit there were 30
50 plants. Standard agronomic practices were applied to all the treatments throughout the crop
51 growing season but no preventive measures were applied. The treatments were regularly
52 inspected for appearance of pest and data was recorded weekly from appearance of larvae till
53 harvest of crop. In each treatment five healthy plants of uniform size were randomly selected
54 for data recording. Total number of larvae on upper and lower leaf surfaces was calculated as
55 larvae plant⁻¹. The weight of cauliflower fruits (curd) for each genotype was recorded
56 separately after each picking and total yield was calculated by adding the yield from all
57 picking for each treatment. The formula used for yield (kg ha⁻¹) calculation was:

$$58 \text{ Yield (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \frac{\text{row length} \times \text{row to row distance} \times \text{No. of rows}}{10,000 \text{ m}^2}$$

60

61

62 RESULTS

63 The larval population plant⁻¹ recorded on different cauliflower genotypes during 2012-
 64 13 and 2013-14 is given in Table 1. In 2012-13, significantly highest larval population plant⁻¹
 65 was recorded on White magic (288 larvae plant⁻¹) while lowest on Snow mystique (58 larvae
 66 plant⁻¹). No larva was recorded on White corona, Clima, 5340, Sydney and AX-2034. In
 67 2013-14, significantly more larvae plant⁻¹ were recorded on White magic (436 larvae plant⁻¹)
 68 and lowest on White corona (32 larvae plant⁻¹). The average of two years results revealed that
 69 significantly higher no of 361.83 *P. brassicae* larvae plant⁻¹ were recorded on White magic
 70 and lower on White corona (15.83 larvae plant⁻¹). The interaction between year and genotype
 71 was significant at $p \leq 0.01$.

72 **Table 1. Mean *Pieris brassicae* larval population plant⁻¹ on 10 cauliflower genotypes**
 73 **during 2012-14.**

Genotype	Mean larval population plant ⁻¹		
	2012-13	2013-14	Mean (2012-14)
White Corona	0.0 f	32 e	15.833 g
Snow Mystique	58 e	342 b	200.17 c
Snow Grece	165 c	171 d	168.00 d
Local	252 b	176 d	214.00 b
Clima	0.0 f	223 c	111.50 e
5340	0.0 f	37 e	18.500 g
Sydney	0.0 f	0.0 f	0.0000 h
Snow Crown	115 d	0.0 f	57.500 f
White Magic	288 a	436 a	361.83 a
AX-2034	0.0 f	0.0 f	0.0000 h
LSD (0.05)	4.1352	5.4835	3.3149

Years	
2012-13	87.80 b
2013-14	141.67 a
Significance level	**
Interaction	Significance level
Year x Genotype	**

Means in columns with similar letters are non significantly different at $\alpha = 0.05$ (LSD test)

** Significant at $P \leq 0.01$

74 It is clear from the Fig.1 that during 2012-13 *P. brassicae* larvae first appeared on
75 22nd Nov on White Corona and Snow Grece. There were two peaks of larval population on
76 each of the two genotypes. On White Corona larval population peaked on 22nd Nov and 24th
77 Jan. On Snow Greece first peak of larval was observed on 22nd Nov and second on 17th Jan.
78 On Snow Mystique larvae appeared on 27th Dec and disappeared on 31st Jan. On White
79 Magic larvae appeared on 3rd Jan and peaked on 24th Jan. On Snow crown larvae appeared on
80 10th Jan and disappeared on 14th Feb 2014.




Fig. 1. Response of *Pieris brassicae* larval population on various cauliflower genotypes during 2012-13.

Response of *P. brassicae* larva to different cauliflower genotypes during 2013-14 showed that larvae appeared on 11th Oct and disappeared on 21st Feb (Fig. 2). On Clima larvae appeared on 11th Oct and peaked on 15th Nov. On Local genotype larvae appeared on 18th Oct, increased to its maximum no. on 1st Nov. On Snow Mystique larvae appeared on 18th Oct, and peaked twice on 3rd Jan and 24th Jan. On genotype 5340 larvae appeared on 25th Oct, remained more or less similar and disappeared on 27th Dec. On Snow Greece larvae appeared on 20th Dec, increased afterwards with two peaks on 27th Dec and 17th Jan. On White Magic larvae appeared on 27th Dec, and peaked twice on 3rd Jan and 24th Jan.




Fig. 2. Response of *Pieris brassicae* larval population on various cauliflower genotypes during 2013-14.

Population trend of *P. brassicae* larvae on cauliflower genotypes during 2012-13

P. brassicae larval population greatly fluctuated in 2012-13 (Fig. 3). First larvae were observed on 22nd Nov, 2012. Its population increased and then decreased in the coming weeks, till its disappearance on 27th Dec. Larvae appeared again after 27th Dec, increased to its peak during 17th Jan to 24th Jan, and declined afterwards till end of data recording (14th Feb, 2013).




Fig. 3. Larval population trend of *Pieris brassicae* on cauliflower crop during 2012-13.

Population trend of *P. brassicae* larvae on cauliflower during 2013-14

In 2013-14 *P. brassicae* larvae appeared on 11th Oct (Fig. 4). Its population increased exponentially in the next few weeks to its first peak on 15th Nov, after which it declined abruptly to its minimum on 20th Dec. Larval population started increasing again from 20th Dec, till its second and 3rd peaks on 3rd Jan and 31st Jan, 2014, respectively. Its population declined afterwards till end of data recording (21st Feb, 2014).




Fig. 4. Larval population trend of *Pieris brassicae* on cauliflower crop during 2013-14.

Screening cauliflower genotypes on the basis of yield (kg ha⁻¹)

Yield of cauliflower recorded during 2012-13 showed that mean yield (kg ha⁻¹) was significantly higher of 37617 kg ha⁻¹ for White Magic and lower of 8950 kg ha⁻¹ for White Corona (Table 2). In the year 2013-14 too yield of cauliflower was a significantly higher of 55483.33 kg ha⁻¹ for White Magic and lower of 10875 kg ha⁻¹ for White Corona. Mean yield of cauliflower for the year 2012-14 was significantly higher of 46550 kg ha⁻¹ for White Magic and lower of 9913 kg ha⁻¹ for White Corona. The interaction of Year x Genotype was significant at $p \leq 0.01$ and significant at $p \leq 0.05$.

130

131 **Table 2. Mean yield (kg ha⁻¹) of 10 cauliflower genotypes during 2012-14.**

Genotype	Cauliflower yield (kg ha ⁻¹)		
	2012-13	2013-14	Mean Yield (2012-14)
White Corona	8950 g	10875 f	9913 e
Snow Mystique	30750 b	29300 b	30025 b
Snow Grece	13150 f	31350 b	22250 c
Local	9350 g	13550 ef	11450 e
Clima	15200 ef	16580 de	15890 d
5340	16133 de	16525 de	16329 d
Sydney	18800 cd	21850 c	20325 c
Snow Crown	19150 c	21800 c	20475 c
White Magic	37617 a	55483.33 a	46550 a
AX-2034	13650 ef	18500 d	16075 d
LSD _(0.05)	2964.6	3279.7	2134.3
Years			
2012-13	23581a		
2013-14	18275b		
Significance level	*		
Interaction	Significance level		
Year x Genotype	**		

Means in columns with similar letters are non-significantly different at $\alpha = 0.05$ (LSD test).

** Significant at $p \leq 0.01$

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05$

132

133

134
 135 **Table 3. Correlation between cauliflower yield with overall larval number per genotype**
 136

Larval population										
	White Corona	Snow Mystique	Snow Grece	local	Clima	5340	Sydney	Snow Crown	White Magic	AX-2034
yield	0.6787 ns	-0.3516 ns	0.8129 *	-0.9285 **	0.5132 ns	0.2772 ns	---	-0.5746 ns	0.9864 **	---

137
 138 ** Significant at $P \leq 0.01$
 139 * Significant at $P \leq 0.05$
 140 ns Non significant

Table 3 shows correlation between yield with overall larval number per genotype. Results of table reveal that genotype White Corona , Snow Mystique , Clima , 5340 , Snow Crown has non significant correlation with larval population of *P.brassicae*. Snow Grece and White Magic have positive and significant correlation with infestation by *P.brassicae* at $P \leq 0.05$ and $P \leq 0.01$ respectively. But local genotype has negative and highly significant correlation. While no linear correlation of the production of Sydney and AX-2034 was found.

DISCUSSION

Screening on the basis of *P. brassicae* larval population plant⁻¹

P. brassicae larval population plant⁻¹ recorded on ten cauliflower genotypes varied significantly during 2012-13 and 2013-14, where it was significantly higher (361.83 larvae plant⁻¹) on White magic and lower (15.83 larvae plant⁻¹) on White corona. No larvae were recorded on Sydney and AX-2034. The interaction between year and genotype was significant at $p \leq 0.01$.

The present results are comparable to that of some earlier researchers. Younas *et al.* (2004) reported that cauliflower cultivar Snowball has maximum 247.34 larvae plant⁻¹ and minimum 0.67 larvae plant⁻¹ on Meigetsal. The variation in larval population may be due to physical plant characters, especially the plant height and leaf length and chemical plant factors especially protein content. It was observed during study that White magic has maximum plant height and maximum leaf length while White corona, Sydney and AX-2034 have minimum plant height and minimum leaf length. Also, protein content was more in White magic then White corona, Sydney and AX-2034. Variation in larval population may be due to different ecological conditions, physical and biochemical factors of plant and biotic and abiotic factors (Ahmed, 1994; Sajjad *et al.*, 2011). Wittstock *et al.* (2004) reported that *P. brassicae* oviposition is a cue that correlate with the survival of larva. The oviposition site helps the young larvae in seeking out appropriate hosts because for the slow moving larvae it is difficult to reach its host plant and the young larvae usually show high mortality if forced to leave their original host. Blatt *et al.* (2008) found that *P. brassicae* laid eggs in batches on host plant in spring. After hatching larvae feed on host plant gregariously. At older stage they disperse on whole plant and in last instar they start searching for pupation site.

According to Gutbrodt (2012) *P. brassicae* preferred feeding on young leaves that were characterized by higher glucosinolate and nitrogen concentrations in comparison.

Reduced levels of defense compounds as well as carbon and nitrogen in old leaves have previously been described for several Brassicales, including *B. oleracea* (Gols *et al.* 2007; Travers-Martin and Müller 2008). Higher levels of defense compounds in younger, more valuable leaves (Harper 1989), are expected according to the optimal defense hypothesis, which states that plant defenses are adjusted to the risk of damage, the cost of a module and its value to a plant (McCall and Fordyce, 2010; Rhoades, 1979). However, specialist herbivores, such as *P. brassicae*, often rely on these compounds as host recognition cues and may be attracted to high levels

Gutbrodt (2012) stated that specialist herbivores, such as *P. brassicae*, often rely on higher glucosinolate and nitrogen concentrations of compounds as host recognition cues and may be attracted to high levels of specific defense compounds in young leaves, resulting in an inverse effect to the optimal defense hypothesis (Lankau, 2007; Renwick and Lopez, 1999). Furthermore, *P. brassicae* as a specialist herbivore is known to tolerate high concentrations of glucosinolates due to successful detoxification mechanisms (Agerbirk *et al.*, 2006) and may even gain a nutritional benefit when feeding on diets of higher glucosinolate concentrations (Smallegange *et al.*, 2007). Lal (1991) screened nineteen genotypes and one cross in 1982, 50 genotypes and four crosses in 1983, and 41 genotypes and 23 crosses in 1984 under field conditions against *P. brassicae* in Kulu Valley, India. . The varieties were categorized into different grades of resistance depending upon the larval population per plant. None of the genotypes was immune to the pest. 'Red Pickling' and 'Red Rock Mammoth' were highly resistant in 1983 and 1984 but moderately resistant in 1982. 'Red Drum Head' was highly resistant in 1984 but moderately resistant in 1982 and 1983. 'EC 90730' and 'ARU Glory' were moderately resistant in 1984.

Screening cauliflower genotypes on the basis of yield (kg ha⁻¹)

Cauliflower yield during 2012-13 and 2013-14 was significantly higher for White Magic and lower for White Corona. Combined mean yield of cauliflower for the year 2012-14 was significantly higher of 46550 kg ha⁻¹ for White Magic and lower of 9913 kg ha⁻¹ for

White Corona. The interaction of Year x Genotype was significant at $p \leq 0.01$ as well as significant at $p \leq 0.05$.

The ten cauliflower genotypes yielded differently in our results. Although this variation may be due to genetic yield traits, plant height and leaf length as in White magic, but it might be due to variable infestation of *P. brassicae* on it. Our results showed that White magic proved to be a tolerant genotype as it had maximum larval population plant⁻¹ and maximum yield. These findings are comparable to those of Matin *et al.* (1992), who reported that the leaf damage of two cauliflower varieties, Snowball and Snowdrift due to *P. brassicae* larvae were highly significant but the final yield (head weights) were not significant. While Local genotype was found susceptible genotype as it had 2nd maximum larval population plant⁻¹ but minimum yield. Genotypes Sydney and AX-2034 with no larva plant⁻¹ and White corona with lowest larval population plant⁻¹ yielded lowest yield. The reason for low yield might be due to genetic yield traits, lowest plant height and leaf length. As plant height and leaf length is positively correlated with cauliflower yield.

Population trend of *P. brassicae*

In our study *P. brassicae* larvae appeared on 22nd Nov and 11th Oct and after attaining different population peaks it declined and disappeared on 14th Feb and 21st Feb during 2012-13 and 2013-14, respectively. Younas *et al.* (2004) reported that infestation of *P. brassicae* in Tarnab, Peshawar started at the last week of Oct. It increased gradually and attained its peak during 1st week of Nov. and then decreased gradually till the end of Dec. Maximum larval population 86.67 larvae plant⁻¹ was observed in 1st week of Nov and minimum 0.67 larvae plant⁻¹ was observed in 1st week of Dec. The fluctuation in larval population during our study might be due to high mobility of larvae in older stage and overlapping generations of *P. brassicae*. Mushtaque and Mohyuddin (1984) reported that full grown larvae usually leave the host plant and crawl 10 m or more on ground and 5m above the ground on the wall or tree

in search for pupation site. Ovsyannikova and Grichanov (2009) reported that high temperatures (above 26°C) along with low air humidity (upto 60%) are adverse conditions for *P. brassicae* development while its distribution is restricted at low temperatures (-20°C and lower).

Correlation between larvae plant⁻¹ and yield

Our results reveal that genotype White Corona , Snow Mystique , Clima , 5340 , Snow Crown has non significant correlation with larval population of *P.brassicae*. Which is in compliance with Martin *et al.* (1992) where, the predictive equations for the head weights (mg), as affected by the number of insects, were $y=674.5-1.92x$; $r=-0.71$ and $y=939.54-5.66x$; $r=0.97$ for Snowball and Snowdrift, respectively. The leaf damage due to varieties was highly significant but the final yield (head weights) was not.

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that all heighted genotypes have more larval population then short height genotypes. White magic was proved itself as a tolerant genotype having more *Pieris brassicae* larval population per plant but give maximum yield too.

REFERENCES

- Agerbirk, N., C. Muller, C.E. Olsen and F.S. Chew. 2006. A common pathway for metabolism of 4-hydroxybenzylglucosinolate in *Pieris* and *Anthocaris* (Lepidoptera: Pieridae). *Biochem. Syst. Ecol.* 34: 189–198.
- Ahmed, I. 1994. Cultivar resistance and chemical control of tomato fruitworm, *Heliothis armigera* Hb. on tomato. Ph.D Thesis, Department of Entomology, Faculty of Crop Protection. Sindh Agriculture University, Tando Jam, Pakistan. 191 p.
- Blatt, S.E., R.C. Smallegange, L. Hess, J.A. Harvey, M. Dicke and J.J.A. van Loon. 2008. Tolerance of *Brassica nigra* to *Pieris brassicae* herbivory. *Botany*, 86: 641-648.
- FAOSTAT.2011. www.faostat.fao.org
- Gols, R., C.E. Raaijmakers, N.M. van Dam, M. Dicke, T. Bukovinszky and J.A. Harvey. 2007. Temporal changes affect plant chemistry and tritrophic interactions. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* 8: 421–433.

- 253 Gutbrodt, B, S. Dorn, S.B. Unsicker and K. Mody. 2012. Species-specific responses of
254 herbivores to within-plant and environmentally mediated between-plant variability in plant
255 chemistry. Chemoecology, 22: 101–111
- 256 Hasan, F. and M.S. Ansari. 2011. Effects of different brassicaceous host plants on the fitness
257 of *Pieris brassicae* (L.). Elsevier Crop Protec. 30(7): 854-862.
- 258 Lal, O.P. 1991. Studies on field resistance of different genotypes and crosses of cabbage
259 against cabbage caterpillar, *Pieris brassicae* (L.) (Lepidoptera: Pieridae). Zeitschrift
260 fuer Pflanzenkrankheiten und Pflanzenschutz. 98(3): 293-300.
- 261 Lankau, R.A. 2007. Specialist and generalist herbivores exert opposing selection on a
262 chemical defense. New Phytol. 175: 176–184.
- 263 Matin, M.A., S.A Saghir and M.A. Rafi.1992. Quantitative relationship between *Pieris*
264 *brassicae* population and damage in cauliflower. Philip. Entomol. 8(5): 1182-1188.
- 265 McCall, A.C. and J.A. Fordyce. 2010. Can optimal defence theory be used to predict the
266 distribution of plant chemical defences? Jour. Ecol. 98: 985–992.
- 267 Mushtaque, M. and A.I. Mohyuddin. 1984. *Pieris brassicae* (Pieridae: Lepidoptera), A pest
268 of crucifers and its control by parasites. Pak. J. Agric. Res. 5(3): 165-169.
- 269 Ovsyannikova, E.I. and I.YA. Grichanov. 2009. In: Interactive Agricultural Ecological Atlas
270 of Russia and Neighboring Countries. Economic Plants and their Diseases, Pests and
271 Weeds. <http://www.agroatlas.ru>
- 272
- 273 Renwick, J.A.A. and K. Lopez. 1999. Experience-based food consumption by larvae of *Pieris*
274 *rapae*: addiction to glucosinolates? Entomol. Exp. Appl. 91: 51–58.
- 275 Sajjad, M., M. Ashfaq, A. Suhail and S. Akthar. 2011. Screening of tomato genotypes for
276 resistance to tomato fruit borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) in Pakistan. Pak. J. Agric.
277 Res. 48 (1): 59-62
- 278 Sharma, S.R., P.K. Singh, Chable and V. Tripathi. 2004. A review of hybrid cauliflower
279 development. J. of New Seeds. 6: 151-156.

- 280 Smallegange, R.C., J.J.A. van Loon, S.E. Blatt, J.A. Harvey, N. Agerbirk and M. Dicke.
281 2007. Flower vs. leaf feeding by *Pieris brassicae*: glucosinolate-rich flower tissues
282 are preferred and sustain higher growth rate. Jour. Chem. Ecol. 33: 1831–1844.
- 283 Travers-Martin, N. and C. Mu‘ller. 2008. Matching plant defence syndromes with
284 performance and preference of a specialist herbivore. Funct. Ecol. 22: 1033–1043.
- 285 Weinberger, K. and R. Srinivasan. 2009 .Farmers management of cabbage and cauliflower
286 pests in India and their approaches to crop protection. J. Asia Pac. Entomol. 12: 253–
287 259.
- 288 Wittstock, U., N. Agerbirk, E.J. Stauber, C.E. Olsen and M. Hippler. 2004. Successful
289 herbivore attack due to metabolic diversion of a plant chemical defense. Proc. Natl.
290 Acad. Sci. USA. 101: 4859-4864
- 291 Younas, M., M. Naeem, A. Raqib, and S. Masud. 2004. Population dynamics of cabbage
292 butterfly (*Pieris brassicae*) and cabbage aphids (*Brevicoryne brassicae*) on five
293 genotypes of cauliflower at Peshawar Pakistan. Asian J. Pl. Sci. 3(3): 391-393.
- 294 Zerkoune, M.A. 2000. Field evaluation of cauliflower varieties grown in southwest low
295 desert soils.The University of Arizona College of Agriculture, Vegetable Report index
296 at <http://ag.arizona.edu/pubs/crops/az1177/>. Retrieved on September 2, 2011.