

BURLEIGH DODDS SERIES IN AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE

Improving integrated pest management in horticulture

Edited by Professor Rosemary Collier, Warwick University, UK



Contents

Series list	xi
Introduction	xviii

Part 1 Using biological agents in integrated pest management

1	Advances in biopesticides for insect control in horticulture	3
	<i>Travis R. Glare, Bio-Protection Research Centre, Lincoln University, New Zealand; and Aimee C. McKinnon, La Trobe University, Australia</i>	
	1 Introduction	3
	2 What are biopesticides?	4
	3 Biopesticide use in horticulture	5
	4 Key challenges in the successful use of biopesticides in integrated pest management programmes	7
	5 Integrated pest management	14
	6 New approaches	17
	7 Conclusion and future trends	23
	8 Where to look for further information	24
	9 References	25
2	Advances in biopesticides for plant disease control in horticulture	37
	<i>Philippe C. Nicot, Thomas Pressecq and Marc Bardin, INRAE, Pathologie Végétale, France</i>	
	1 Introduction	37
	2 Availability of biopesticides against diseases of horticultural crops	39
	3 Advances in increasing the number of biopesticides for disease control	43
	4 Enhancing the field efficacy of biopesticides on horticultural crops	51
	5 Fostering the adoption of biocontrol	60
	6 Conclusion	64
	7 Future trends in research	64
	8 Where to look for further information	65
	9 References	67

3	Advances in biostimulants as an integrated pest management tool in horticulture	77
	<i>Surendra K. Dara, University of California Cooperative Extension, USA</i>	
	1 Introduction	77
	2 Integrated pest management	78
	3 Enhancement of crop growth, health and yield	81
	4 Enhancement of soil health	86
	5 Inducing natural resistance	87
	6 Suppression of diseases	87
	7 Suppression of arthropod pests	91
	8 Tolerance to abiotic stresses	94
	9 Multitrophic interactions and influencing factors	95
	10 Strategies of using biostimulants	96
	11 Challenges and future needs	97
	12 Conclusion	98
	13 Where to look for further information	98
	14 References	99
4	Improving application systems for bioprotectants in integrated pest management (IPM) programmes in horticulture	111
	<i>Clare Butler Ellis, Silsoe Spray Applications Unit Ltd, UK</i>	
	1 Introduction	111
	2 Application technology in integrated pest management	113
	3 Achieving the correct dose of active substance	113
	4 The right place: targeting the spray	118
	5 The right time: ensuring good logistics	121
	6 The right form: droplet size and coverage	123
	7 Adjuvants	124
	8 Efficacy	125
	9 Conclusion	126
	10 References	126
Part 2 Using decision support systems in integrated pest management		
5	Advances in insect pest and disease monitoring and forecasting in horticulture	131
	<i>Irene Vänninen, Natural Resources Institute Finland (LUKE), Finland</i>	
	1 Introduction	131
	2 Addressing key issues and challenges of pest monitoring and forecasting	145
	3 Case study: whitefly sampling, monitoring and forecasting	167

4 Conclusion	173
5 Future trends in research	173
6 Where to look for further information	175
7 References	176
6 Advances in proximal sensors to detect crop health status in horticultural crops	197
<i>Catello Pane, CREA - Research Centre for Vegetable and Ornamental Crops, Italy</i>	
1 Introduction	197
2 Optoelectronic devices for detecting disease in vegetable plants	199
3 Sensors for the detection of micro-environmental parameters related to disease outbreaks	206
4 Case study: digital and mechatronic applications on baby leaf vegetable quality chain	208
5 Conclusion	208
6 Where to look for further information	210
7 References	211
7 Advances in decision support systems (DSSs) for integrated pest management in horticultural crops	217
<i>Mark W. Ramsden, ADAS, UK; and Aoife O'Driscoll, NIAB, UK</i>	
1 Introduction	217
2 The availability of integrated pest management decision support systems in horticulture	220
3 What to look for in decision support systems for pest management	222
4 Integrated pest management decision support system platforms	232
5 Conclusion	234
6 Future trends in research	236
7 Where to look for further information	237
8 Acknowledgements	238
9 References	238

Part 3 Improving integrated pest management techniques and implementation

8 The use of agronomic practices in integrated pest management programmes in horticulture	247
<i>Aude Alaphilippe, Claude Bussi, Marion Casagrande, Tarek Dardouri and Sylvaine Simon, INRAE UERI Gotheron, France; Pierre-Eric Lauri, INRAE UMR ABSys, France; Amélie Lefèvre, INRAE Agroecological Vegetable Systems Experimental Facility, France; and Mireille Navarrete, INRAE UR Ecodeveloppement, France</i>	

1	Introduction	247
2	Integrated pest management practices related to the crop and its annual management	250
3	Integrated pest management practices related to the enhancement of plant diversity in the cropping system at field scale	259
4	Designing cropping systems that combine agronomic integrated pest management practices at field, farm and agri-food system scales	265
5	Where to look for further information	271
6	References	272
9	Advancing conservation biological control as a component of integrated pest management of horticultural crops <i>Robbie D. Girling, Tom D. Breeze and Michael P. Garratt, University of Reading, UK</i>	281
1	Introduction	281
2	Effects of scale on the efficacy of conservation biological control	286
3	Evaluating the effectiveness of conservation biological control management in multiple dimensions	289
4	Benefits of conservation biological control beyond integrated pest management	293
5	Case studies of conservation biological control in practice	294
6	Conclusion and future trends in research	299
7	Where to look for further information	300
10	Assessing the economics of integrated pest management for horticultural crops <i>Philip R. Crain and David W. Onstad, Corteva Agriscience, USA</i>	313
1	Introduction	313
2	Concepts of economic thinking	315
3	Economic impact of horticultural crops and case studies on the complexity of integrated pest management	318
4	Conclusion	322
5	Future trends in research	322
6	Where to look for further information	324
7	References	325
11	Encouraging integrated pest management uptake in horticultural crop production <i>Norma R. Samuel, Associate District Extension Director and Urban Horticulture Extension Agent, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, USA; and Oscar E. Liburd, University of Florida-Gainesville, USA</i>	329

1 Introduction	329
2 Rogers' <i>Diffusion of Innovation Theory</i> in relation to integrated pest management	331
3 Using a logic model to develop an integrated pest management program plan	334
4 Extension approaches to delivering integrated pest management technologies	337
5 Building an integrated pest management toolkit	347
6 Useful resources to aid in the diffusion of integrated pest management technologies	348
7 Barriers to adoption of integrated pest management in horticulture crop production and how to overcome them	349
8 Conclusion	352
9 Where to look for further information	352
10 References	353

Part 4 Case studies

12 Practical application of integrated pest management in greenhouses and protected cultivation	359
<i>Bruno Gobin, Els Pauwels and Joachim Audenaert, PCS-Ornamental Plant Research, Belgium</i>	
1 Introduction	359
2 Case study 1: Knowledge translation, demonstration and communication	362
3 Case study 2: Use of good crop hygiene to prevent disease	365
4 Case study 3: Predatory mites as a major success story	367
5 Case study 4: The detection and control of broad mites	368
6 Case study 5: The addition of feed in the field	371
7 Case study 6: Mealybugs as difficult pests compromising integrated pest management strategies	374
8 Conclusion	376
9 Future trends in research	376
10 Where to look for further information	379
11 References	380
13 Practical applications of integrated pest management in horticultural cultivation: the cases of protected tomato and outdoor <i>Brassica</i> production	387
<i>Richard H. Binks, FreshTec Agricultural Consultancy Limited, UK</i>	
1 Introduction	387
2 Integrated pest management in protected tomato production	388

3	Integrated pest management strategies in protected tomato crops: resistant varieties, physical and cultural control	389
4	Integrated pest management strategies in protected tomato crops: chemical and biological control	391
5	Integrated pest management strategies to control particular insect pests of tomato crops: plant-feeding mites and whiteflies	394
6	Integrated pest management methods to control particular insect pests of tomato crops: aphids and leaf miners	396
7	Integrated pest management for tomato crops: conclusions	400
8	Integrated pest management in outdoor <i>Brassica</i> production	401
9	Integrated pest management methods to control insect pests of <i>Brassica</i> crops: aphids and cabbage root fly	402
10	Integrated pest management methods to control insect pests of <i>Brassica</i> crops: lepidopteran pests	406
11	Integrated pest management for <i>Brassica</i> crops: conclusions	408
12	Future trends in research	409
13	Where to look for further information	411
14	References	412
14	Practical application of integrated pest management to control cabbage root fly in vegetables	421
	<i>Louis Lippens, PCG vzw - Vegetable Research Centre Kruishoutem, Belgium; Sander Fleerackers, PSKW vzw - Research Station for Vegetable Production Sint-Katelijne-Waver, Belgium; Femke Temmerman, Inagro vzw, Belgium; and Annelies De Roissant, HOGENT University of Applied Sciences & Arts, Belgium</i>	
1	Introduction	421
2	Developing a decision-support system to predict pest outbreaks	424
3	The use of row covers in crop protection	426
4	Entomopathogenic nematodes as biocontrol agents	428
5	Key issues in chemical control	431
6	Case study 1: row covers as a preventive measure against <i>Delia radicum</i>	432
7	Case study 2: the use of entomopathogenic nematodes against <i>Delia radicum</i>	437
8	Case study 3: chemical control of <i>Delia radicum</i>	444
9	Conclusion and future trends	449
10	Where to look for further information	451
11	Acknowledgements	452
12	References	452
	Index	457

Chapter 1

Advances in biopesticides for insect control in horticulture

Travis R. Glare, Bio-Protection Research Centre, Lincoln University, New Zealand; and Aimee C. McKinnon, La Trobe University, Australia

- 1 Introduction
- 2 What are biopesticides?
- 3 Biopesticide use in horticulture
- 4 Key challenges in the successful use of biopesticides in integrated pest management programmes
- 5 Integrated pest management
- 6 New approaches
- 7 Conclusion and future trends
- 8 Where to look for further information
- 9 References

1 Introduction

Horticulture, from the production through to the sale of fruit, vegetables and flowers, is an industry that is crucial for food production and human wellbeing. The science of horticulture is critical to the prosperity and health of people and the environment. With an increasing population, it is estimated that food production will need to increase by 70% by the middle of the century to meet demand (Davies, 2015). Opportunities exist to develop new high-value and high-nutrition horticultural produce on the decreasing area of land available for food production. However, horticulture is a more intensive farming approach than that used for broad-acre crops such as wheat and corn, which means that poor sustainability practices will have more severe consequences for future generations, although the area impacted is less than for some other crops. This includes approaches toward invertebrate pest control, as insects and other invertebrates cause significant damage and production losses across the horticulture sector around the world.

The application of synthetic pesticides has been the main approach to controlling pest insects in horticulture. However, applications of certain

pesticides on fruit crops, such as stone fruits, have pre-harvest intervals ranging between 7 and 28 days that preclude the use of treatments prior to fruit ripening, to minimise residues, during a period when the risk of pest outbreak is high (Hossain et al., 2006; Boston et al., 2020). Frequent use of broad-spectrum insecticides can also promote secondary pest outbreaks of insect pests such as mites, which are otherwise regulated by natural invertebrate predators (Epstein et al., 2000). Furthermore, the pest insect species of some horticultural crops occupy cryptic ecological niches. For example, *Carpophilus truncatus* beetles, pests in Australian almond orchards, live inside mummified nuts and in new nuts, so that insecticide sprays are often unable to reach them and are therefore ineffective (Boston et al., 2020). In the USA, pecan weevils are major pests that cause significant crop damage; the larvae and pupae occur inside the pecan nuts and in soil, so that control of the weevils using contact insecticides is restricted only to the adults (Mulder et al., 2012).

The development of insecticide resistance from the continual use of pesticides is also a key challenge. Development of new synthetic pesticides is now costly and difficult, partly due to the strict environmental and safety regulations involved when converting an active compound into a product (Qadri et al., 2020). For instance, a recent report estimated that in the USA, the development of a novel synthetic pesticide would cost in excess of \$300 million and can take approximately 12 years (McDougall, 2016).

The withdrawal of pesticides, combined with health and environmental concerns and the rise in the resistance to current pesticides, is driving the need for new methods of control, including the growing use of biopesticides.

2 What are biopesticides?

Biopesticides have been loosely defined as biologically based pesticides (Glare, 2015). This can be quite a broad definition, including the incorporation of live organisms and their derivatives (e.g. metabolites), through to the use of semiochemicals in formulations. The use of plant extracts, for example, can fit into a broad definition of biopesticides, but authors often use the term to refer to a subgroup of biopesticides such as microbial-based biopesticides.

Kienwick (2007) limited the definition of biopesticides to only those based on microbes, while Copping and Menn (2000) included semiochemicals. The USA EPA defined biopesticides as 'certain types of pesticides derived from such natural materials as animals, plants, bacteria, and certain minerals' (<http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/biopesticides>). However, biopesticides are divided into three groups - microbial-based, plant-incorporated protectants (e.g. Bt corn) and biochemical - which encompass formulations of naturally occurring substances including plant extracts and pheromones.

Several novel approaches to using microbes for the control of pest insects have expanded the basic definition of biopesticides. Endophytes, microbes which can live inside plants without causing disease, can often confer resistance to pests and pathogens (McKinnon et al., 2017) and can be classed as a new biopesticide (Glare et al., 2012). Other novel biopesticide approaches include the use of RNAi, which is the use of the antiviral immune system of insects for post-transcriptional gene silencing (Vogel et al., 2019).

It is more common for researchers to define the term 'biopesticide' based on their own area of expertise and focus. In this chapter, we will focus on microbial-based biopesticides for use against pest insects. Paradoxically, 'microbial' in the area of entomopathogens generally includes nematode entomopathogens, which are not microorganisms *per se*, although, as the most commonly studied entomopathogenic nematodes that use symbiotic bacteria as an agent for lethality, this is understandable.

The term 'biopesticide' has also been questioned from a viewpoint of public understanding. The term 'pesticide' has become associated with chemical insecticides and the connotation of broad-spectrum killing. As such, it can be viewed negatively, even for biopesticides. The term 'biorationals' has been used (e.g. Rosell et al., 2008) to encompass biopesticides and other biologically based approaches.

The history of biopesticides is as long as the history of agriculture. The use of plant extracts is probably the earliest example of biopesticides, dating from about some 4000 years ago, with regard to extracts of the neem tree (El-Wakeil, 2013). The use of microbes to control insects is relatively recent; the first demonstration of a disease caused by a microbial infection in insects was for silkworms infected by *Beauveria bassiana*, published in 1835 by Agostino Bassi. It was not until the nineteenth century, after the discovery that microbes cause disease, that the idea of using microbes to control insects was proposed by Pasteur, with the first practical attempts in Russia in the 1890s (Zimmermann et al., 1995). The product Sporéine, based on the bacterium *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt), is thought to be the first microbial-based insecticidal biopesticide that was commercialised.

Since that time, biopesticide use has increased incrementally, especially for those based on Bt. However, in the last decade, with the reduction in available synthetic pesticides and more concern around sustainable plant production, the use of biopesticides and the availability of products have increased dramatically. There are several areas where biopesticide development has advanced significantly, which will be reviewed below.

3 Biopesticide use in horticulture

The global market for biopesticides has an estimated value of \$3 billion USD and is expected to increase by 15% in the next few years, outpacing market

growth of novel synthetic pesticides by 10-fold (Damalas and Koutroubas, 2018). Although biopesticide sales have been increasing year on year, they still make up only a small percentage of the insecticide market worldwide. When looking at the current, most exploited, microbes used as biopesticides in horticulture, there is an indication of where some of the key challenges lie.

Microbial-based biopesticides for insect control have been based mainly on bacterial, nematode, viral and fungal entomopathogens. Although there have been products based on protozoa and microsporidia, the lack of rapid-kill and *in vitro* production methods has greatly limited their development. For viruses and nematodes, *in vitro* production limitations have restricted biopesticide development to only a few examples, such as nucleopolyhedroviruses (Nguyen et al., 2016) and the nematodes in *Heterorhabditis* and *Steinernema* which are associated with the entomopathogenic bacteria in the genera *Xenorhabdus* and *Photorhabdus* (Shapiro-Ilan et al., 2012).

Fungi in the genera *Beauveria* and *Metarhizium* are the most exploited entomopathogenic fungi that are currently formulated into biopesticides (Quesada-Moraga et al., 2020). Strains of these genera are the most common to infect insects naturally, with host ranges in the hundreds of species across a range of insect orders. These species are largely asexual, with just conidia produced in bulk on cadavers. They can also be grown easily on simple media, including grains (Grzywacz et al., 2014), which makes mass production possible. In general, strains of *Metarhizium* and *Beauveria* are safe for non-target organisms, such as predators and parasites, when applied in the field. This does not mean these other beneficial agents may not be infected in the laboratory in some cases, but these other organisms are far more resistant to infection, meaning they have a little impact in the field. The compatibility of these beneficial fungi with other environmentally sensitive control approaches has been exploited in integrated pest management (IPM) programmes (Glare et al., 2020b).

Insect-killing bacteria are known from diverse taxonomic groups, although only a few groups have been exploited as commercially available biopesticides (Jurat-Fuentes and Jackson, 2012), and even fewer used in horticulture. Spore-forming bacteria in the genera *Bacillus*, *Paenibacillus*, *Lysinibacillus* and *Brevibacillus* are the most commonly used for insect-control products, the majority of which target caterpillars or Diptera. Among the Proteobacteria, species of *Serratia*, *Pseudomonas*, *Chromobacterium* and *Burkholderia* have been used. Bt strains and subspecies have been the mainstay of biopesticides used in horticulture for over 70 years, with the first commercialised Bt sold in 1938, and still accounting for around 60–70% of all microbial-based biopesticide sales (Olson, 2015). Some bacteria act through infection, but in many cases, including Bt, most target mortality is due to toxins. The use of toxins, as opposed to microbes with an infectious mode of action, results in very different commercial

products. For example, in the case of Bt, in which there is no requirement for live cells in the final product. This greatly simplifies formulation and storage.

Entomopathogenic nematodes can be found in several major groups, but the most exploited for biopesticides are in the Heterorhabditidae and Steinernematidae families. These nematodes have symbiotic bacteria involved in the infection cycle. The two groups are not particularly closely related but do share common characteristics, since they are obligate parasites, horizontally transmitted, have an infective juvenile stage and are always associated with bacteria that are involved in infection (Koppenhöfer et al., 2020).

This group of nematodes has been the subject of commercial development, with 13 species now developed. Commercialisation has been aided by the often broad host range of the main nematode families and the development of *in vitro* mass-production methods (Shapiro-Ilan et al., 2012). Although the range of hosts can be broad in the laboratory, with over 200 species for *S. carpocapsae* across 10 insect orders (Koppenhöfer et al., 2020), for many species, the host range has not been investigated in the field. Infective juveniles are able to disperse actively and passively, which can greatly aid effectiveness.

Entomopathogenic viruses are known from 15 families, but most viruses used in biopesticides have been from the family Baculoviridae, containing the nucleopolyhedroviruses (NPV) and granuloviruses (GV), which target Lepidoptera (Srinivasan et al., 2019). These viruses have several attractive characteristics, principally that the infective virions are encased in a proteinaceous coat, ensuring more robust particles in the environment and suitability for formulation into biopesticides. The known viruses in these groups are host-specific, sometimes only known to infect a single lepidopteran species, meaning they are safe for non-target organisms. However, growing these viruses outside living cells is not currently possible, which greatly increases the cost of production and limits their use as biopesticides in many areas.

Some successful biopesticides have been developed based on baculoviruses. In Africa, commercial formulations of the *Maruca vitrata* Mavi NPV have been used in Benin, Niger and Nigeria (Srinivasan et al., 2019). NPV formulations have also been used against *Spodoptera*, *Plutella xylostella*, *Mamestra brassicae* and *Helicoverpa armigera*, including in citrus orchards in South Africa (Moore and Kirkman, 2010). In the Canary Islands, a *Chrysodeixis chalcites* NPV is under development as a commercial biopesticide for the pest of banana crops, *Chrysodeixis chalcites* (Bernal et al., 2018).

4 Key challenges in the successful use of biopesticides in integrated pest management programmes

There is a common list of challenges that have been reported to limit the uptake of microbial-based biopesticides. Some are based on the limitations of using

Index

- AcMNPV. *see* *Autographa californica* nucleopolyhedrovirus (AcMNPV)
- Adaptive frequency classification sampling, 160
- Agricultural Knowledge System (AKS), 330
- Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board (AHDB), 230
- AKS. *see* Agricultural Knowledge System (AKS)
- Amber project, 117, 125
- Amblyseius* sp., 367
- A. swirskii*, 371, 373
- AMF. *see* Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF)
- Ampelomyces quisqualis*, 43
- Androctonus australis* (AaT), 18, 19
- ANN. *see* Artificial neural networks (ANN)
- Aphidoletes aphidimyza*, 398
- Application systems, bioprotectants
- achieving correct dose, active substance calibration, 114
 - dose uniformity, 114–115
 - water volume, 115–118
- adjuvants, 124–125
- application technology, 113
- droplet size and coverage, 123–124
- efficacy, 125
- good logistics, 121–123
- overview of, 111–113
- spray targeting, 118–121
- Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF), 81–82, 91
- Artificial neural networks (ANN), 165, 166
- Ascophyllum nodosum*, 85
- Autographa californica* nucleopolyhedrovirus (AcMNPV), 20
- Average global digital penetration, 345
- Bacillus* sp., 87–88
- B. amyloliquefaciens*, 58
- B. thuringiensis*, 119
- B. thuringiensis israelensis*, 20
- Bactrocera tryoni*, 320
- BCA. *see* Biological control agent (BCA)
- Beauveria* sp., 6, 22
- B. bassiana*, 18–19, 82
- Big Data, 163, 173, 174
- Biological control agent (BCA), 9
- Biopesticides, insect control
- biopesticides, 4–5
 - future trends, 23–24
 - integrated pest management, 14–15
 - case study, 15–17
 - in integrated pest management programmes
 - agent selection, 9
 - bioassay, 10
 - ecological suitability, 10–12
 - integration and safety, 13–14
 - production, formulation and application, 12–13
 - new approaches
 - microbes, genetic modification of, 18–21
 - microbiome, 17–18
 - production and formulation advances, 21–23
 - RNAi for insect control, 21
 - overview of, 3–4
 - use in horticulture, 5–7
- Bioprotectants, plant disease control
- biocontrol adoption
 - by horticulturists in France, 60–62
 - obstacles for wider adoption, 62–63
 - technical complexity of deployment, 63–64
 - against diseases of horticultural crops, 39–43
 - field efficacy, 51

- factor of efficacy, 53–56
- improving delivery, 56–58
- knowledge on modes of action, 52–53
- use with integrated pest management
 - toolbox, 59–60
- future trends, 64–65
- increasing bioprotectants
 - bioprotectants registration, 51
 - existing products activity, extending spectrum of, 43–48
 - new active substances, 48–50
- overview of, 37–39
- Biorationals, 5
- BioREco system experiment (2005–2015), 265–266
- Biostimulants, integrated pest management tool
 - abiotic stresses, 94–95
 - arthropod pest suppression
 - algal and botanical extracts, 92–93
 - AMF and microorganisms, 91
 - chitosan, 94
 - humic substances, 92
 - plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria, 91–92
 - silicates and phosphites, 93–94
 - biostimulants strategies, 96–97
 - crop growth, health and yield
 - algal extracts, 84–85
 - arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF), 81–82
 - botanical extracts, 85
 - chitosan, 86
 - entomopathogenic fungi, 82
 - humic substances, 83–84
 - plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR), 82–83
 - protein hydrolysates, 83
 - silicates and phosphites, 85–86
 - disease suppression
 - algal and botanical extracts, 89–90
 - arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, 87–88
 - chitosan, 90–91
 - humic substances, 89
 - plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria, 88
 - protein hydrolysates, 88
 - silicates and phosphites, 90
 - future needs, 97–98
 - integrated pest management, 78–81
 - multitrophic interactions and influencing factors, 95–96
 - natural resistance, 87
 - overview of, 77–78
 - soil health enhancement, 86–87
- BOTMAN, 64
- Botrytis cinerea*, 55
- Brassica crops
 - control insect pests
 - aphids, 402–405
 - cabbage root fly, 405–406
 - lepidopteran pests, 406–408
 - synopsis, 408–409
- Brevibacillus laterosporus*, 15–17, xix
- Brown rot, 254–255
 - time-course of, 255, 257
- Cabbage root fly (CRF), 229–232, 405–406
 - alternative strategies, 424
 - attack Brassica vegetable crops, 422
 - challenging task, 422–423
 - control of, 422
 - damage incidence, 435
 - larvae, roots, 444
 - larval development, 421
 - pest damage, 422
 - seed, granule and drench treatments, 423
 - treatment effect, 442–443
- Calcium (Ca), 252–253
- Capirel®, 438
- Carpophilus truncatus*, 4
- Cascaded tripartite classification sampling plan, 160
- Cauliflowers root classification, 448
- CBC. see Conservation biological control (CBC)
- Centrifugal training, 251
- Chlorophyll fluorescence imaging, 206
- Climate warming, 167
- Coefficient of variation (CV), 114
- Commercial greenhouse operations, 371
- Companion plants (CPs), 260–263
- Conservation biological control (CBC), xxii, 404
 - additive intercropping, 296
 - benefits of, 293–294
 - case study, 294
 - lettuce production, California, 295–297
 - sweet cherry production, United Kingdom, 297–299
 - description, 281–282
 - economic benefits, 290

- effectiveness evaluation, multiple dimensions
 assessing economic benefits, 290
 barriers, 292-293
 costs management, 291
 data gathering, 293
 determine of, crop price and temporal scale, 292
 economic incentive, 290
 evaluation of, final crop yield and consumer impacts, 292
 farmer cost-benefit analysis, 292
 guideline, 290-291
 pest damage evaluation, 291
 record counts of, pests and predators, 291
 spatial scales determination, 291
 efficacy of, scale effects, 286-289
 future trends, 299-300
 horticulture employment, 282-284
 limited and knowledge gaps
 commercial horticulture, 286
 horticultural IPM, 284
 metric measures, 285
 percentage of, 285
 research papers, 284-285
 mean of, natural enemy abundance, 299
 tools, 298
- Conventional horticultural production systems, 295
- CPs. see Companion plants (CPs)
- CRF. see Cabbage root fly (CRF)
- Crop and annual management, 250
 harvest, damaged fruit and plant residue management, 258
 plant nutrition and fertilisation, 252-253
 soil and ground cover management, 255-258
 synopsis, 258-259
 tree architecture, 250-252
 water supply, 254-255
- Crop pests, 156
- Crop protection, row covers, 426
 material choice, 426-427
 mesh size of, insect nets, 427
 timing of, covering, 427-428
- Crop wall area, 116
- CV. see Coefficient of variation (CV)
- Cydia pomonella*, 152
- Dacnusa sibirica*, 399
- DBM. see Diamond back moth (DBM)
- Decision support systems (DSSs), xxi, 63, 64
 case studies, 225-226
 cabbage root fly (*D. radicum*), 229-232
 downy mildew (*P. destructor*) in onions, 227-229
 gaps and limitations, 232
 powdery mildew (*P. aphanis*) on strawberry, 226-227
- CRF monitoring, 425-426
 future trends, 236-237
 overview of, 217-220, 425
 pest insect phenology, 424
 for pest management, 222-223
 DSS as tools for knowledge exchange, 224
 DSS as tools for self-assessment, 224-225
 inputs, outputs and validation, 223-224
- strategic and operational decision support systems, 221-222
 tactical decision support systems, 220-221
- VIPS-open-source technology platform, 233
 data input, 233, 234
 data output, 233-234
 enabled by mobile, 234
 warning system, 424
- Delia radicum*, 147, 167, 229-232, 405-406
 chemical control, 444
 assessment methods, 445
 materials methods, 444-445
 results and discussion, 447-449
 statistical analysis, 445-447
 synopsis, 449
 trial setup, 445
- entomopathogenic nematodes, 437
 assessments, 438-440
 cauliflower planting, 437-438
 results and discussion, 440-441
 statistical analysis, 440
 synopsis, 441-444
 treatments, 438
 trial design, 437
 trial site, 437
- row covers, 432-433
 chinese cabbage 2019, 434
 chinese cabbage 2020, 434
 field trials, 433
 statistical analysis, 433

- success factors, 434–437
 - synopsis, 434
 - turnip 2018, 434
 - turnip 2019, 434
- Delia suzukii*, 149, 152, 166
- Designing cropping systems, 265
 - co-design process, 271
 - combining agronomic IPM practices, field scale
 - BioREco system experiment (2005–2015), 265–266
 - Ecopeach system experiment (2013–2018), 266–267
 - complexity dealing, agri-food system scale, 267–268
 - alternative farming systems, 269–270
 - stakeholders, 268–269
 - synopsis, 270–271
 - redesign and crop diversification, farm scale, 267
- Diamond back moth (DBM), 15–17, 406
- Digital technologies, 197
- Diglyphus isaea*, 399–400
- Diversified vegetable cropping systems, 269
- DOWNCAST model, 228
- Drosophila suzukii*, 365
- DSSs. see Decision support systems (DSSs)
- (E)- β -caryophyllene, 11
- Ecoation robotic platform, 157
- Ecolibrium Biologicals, 17
- Economically important crops, *Brassicaceae*, 402
- Economic damage thresholds, 133–135, 137
- Economic data on the Brassica crop production, Flanders, 423
- Economic injury levels (EILs), 133–135, 137, 170, 317–318
- Economics assessment
 - agricultural problems, 314
 - box thinking, 314
 - concepts of, economic thinking
 - components of, 315–316
 - economic injury levels (EIL), 317–318
 - economic thresholds (ET), 317–318
 - scope, 316
 - stakeholders, 316–317
 - time horizon, 317
 - economic impact
 - case studies, 319–322
 - overview of, horticultural economics, 318–319
 - future trends, 322–324
 - investment of, control strategies, 314
 - optimized economic value, 313
 - synopsis, 322
- Economic thresholds (ET), 317–318
- Ecopeach system experiment (2013–2018), 266–267
- EILs. see Economic injury levels (EILs)
- Entomopathogenic nematodes (EPN), 7, 428, 437
 - application technologies
 - challenges, 430
 - pesticides compatibility, 430
 - sedimentation, 430
 - shear forces, 430–431
 - temperature, 430
 - biology and ecology of, 428
 - factors affecting, biocontrol, 428
 - application rate, 429
 - EPN species, 429
 - soil water content, 429
 - temperature, 429
 - timing and method of, application, 429
 - treatments overview, 439
- Entomopathogenic viruses, 7
- ET. see Economic thresholds (ET)
- European Union Minor Uses Co-ordination Facility, 43
- Farmer field schools (FFS) guidance, 340
- Field crop sprayers, 112
- Field margins, 283–284
- Fruit and vegetable production, 318–319
- Fungicover, 57
- GAI. see Green area index (GAI)
- Genome sequencing, 16
- GF-120, 15
- Global tomato production, 389
- Global vegetable production, 387–388
- Glomus* sp.
 - G. aggregatum*, 81
 - G. mosseae*, 82, 94
 - G. versiforme*, 82, 94
- Green area index (GAI), 155
- Greenhouses and protected cultivation
 - biocontrol agents, 359–360
 - case study 1: knowledge translation, demonstration and communication

- chemical and biological control, 363
- IPM strategy, 363
- ornamental horticulture and tree nurseries, 364
- regulatory changes, 362
- translating knowledge, 364
- case study 2: crop hygiene, prevent disease
 - growers, re-using, 365-366
 - non-IPM related regulation, 365
 - Phytophthora ramorum*, 365-366
 - UV filters or slow sandbed filters, 366
- case study 3: predatory mites, success story
 - crop-growing techniques, 367-368
 - predation continuum categories, 367
- case study 4: detection and control, broad mites
 - Amblyseius swirskii*, 371
 - biocontrol, 370
 - control efficacy, 370
 - damage symptoms, 369
 - EU PDO (Protected Designation of Origin) product, 368
 - greenhouse spraying equipment, 368
 - presence of, 370
- case study 5: addition feed, field application technology, 373
 - artificial or natural feed, 372-373
 - boost calculation, 373
 - ornamental plant production, 371-372
 - population of, predatory mites, 373
- case study 6: mealybugs, difficult pests
 - biocontrol agents, 374-376
 - regular crop monitoring and identification, 375
- challenge, 360
- future trends, 376-379
- growing crops, 360
- pest, 361-362
- regulatory requirements, 361
- synopsis, 376
- training, 361
- Greenpatrol-robot, 157
- Horticultural crop production, integration
 - IPM
 - adoption barriers, 349
 - competing sources of, information or misinformation, 351
 - extenuating circumstances, 351-352
 - lack of, indigenous practices
 - integration, 350-351
 - lack of, knowledge, 350
 - lack of, supporting government policies, 351
 - lack of, trust, 349-350
 - limited financial resources, 350
 - products unavailability, 350
 - technology access, 351
 - Diffusion of Innovation Theory* (see *Rogers' Diffusion of Innovation Theory*)
 - E-extension and virtual communication, 344-346
 - extension approaches, 337
 - diagnostic services, 340-344
 - farmer field schools, 340
 - field days, 339
 - field visits, 339
 - workshops, 337-339
 - further information, 352-353
 - logic model development, 334-335
 - assumptions, 336
 - evaluation, 336
 - external factors, 336
 - inputs, 334
 - outcomes/impacts, 335-336
 - outputs, 334-335
 - planning and efficiency, extension programs, 335
 - situation statement, 334
 - synopsis, 352
 - toolkit, 347-348
 - useful resources aid, 348-349
- Horticultural Development Council, 116
- Hyperspectral sensors, 200
- Hyperspectral technology, 201, 202
- IBMA. see International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association (IBMA)
- In-field approaches, 283
- Insectary beds, 297
- Insectary plants, 296
- Insecticide trial in 2018, 447
- Insecticide trial in 2019, 448
- Insecticide trial in 2020, 450
- Insect pest and disease monitoring and forecasting
 - automated identification, insects from traps and plants
 - based on optoacoustics, 148-149
 - fixed camera-based systems, 145-146

- identifying pests with challenging taxonomic features, 146-148
- mobile camera-based systems, 146
- bottlenecks and challenges, pest monitoring and forecasting, 134-145
- detection with more selective traps, 149-153
- forecasting, 163-167
- future trends, 173-175
- nano-inspired biosensors for plants, 157-158
- natural enemy adjusted thresholds (NEETs), 158-159
- pest species to collect information on bottlenecks and challenges, 133-134
- remote sensing, 153-157
- research, 131-133
- value of information, sampling plans and economic/action, 159-163
- whitefly sampling
 - monitoring, 171-172
 - physiological EILs possibilities, 170
 - plant injury by, 167-168
 - population dynamics, 172-173
 - sampling, monitoring and identifying, 168-169
 - simultaneous mass trapping and monitoring, 170-171
- Integrated Control of Noxious Animals and Plants (IOBC), 59
- Integrated pest management (IPM), xix, xxiii; *see also individual entries*
 - Agricultural Knowledge System (AKS), 330
 - agronomic practices, 248, 249, 264
 - evolutionary timeline, 250
 - representation of, 249, 259
 - coherent and resilient systems, 248
 - concept of, 330
 - diffusion and adoption
 - approaches, 330-331
 - farm scale, 247
 - field scale, 247
 - fruit and vegetable production, 248
 - innovation, 330
 - strategies, 329
 - study, 331
 - University of Florida, 339
- International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association (IBMA), 37
- IOBC. *see* Integrated Control of Noxious Animals and Plants (IOBC)
- IOBC General Technical Guideline, 247, 259
- IPM. *see* Integrated pest management (IPM)
- Irrigation regime, 255
- Landscape-scale effects, 284
- Lateral flow diagnostic (LFD) test, 229
- LED spectra, 377-378
- LFD. *see* Lateral flow diagnostic (LFD) test
- Light spectra, 377
- Liquid fermentation, 22
- Macrolophus pygmaeus*, 169
- Macrosiphum euphorbiae*, 91
- Male annihilation technique (MAT), 15
- Maximum incremental social tolerable irreversible costs (MISTICs), 159
- M&E. *see* Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)
- Mechanistic models, 141, 164
- Metarhizium* sp., 6
 - M. anisopliae*, 11, 15, 19
 - M. pingshaense*, 18
- Meyerozyma caribbica*, 57
- Microbial-based biopesticides, 6
- Microbial bioprotectants, 37
- Microencapsulation, 58
- MILIONCAST, 228
- MISTICs. *see* Maximum incremental social tolerable irreversible costs (MISTICs)
- Monitoring and evaluation (M&E), 336
- NAES. *see* Norwegian Agricultural Extension Service (NAES)
- N concentration, 252
- NDVI. *see* Normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI)
- N fertilisation, 252-253
- Normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI), 155, 165
- Norwegian Agricultural Extension Service (NAES), 231
- Nucleopolyhedroviruses (NPV), 7, 12
- Organic production, 295
- Paraphaeosphaeria minitans*, 55
- Pats drones, 155
- Peach orchards, 256
- Pear orchards proposes guidelines, 262
- Peronospora destructor*, 227-229
- Pest observations, 144

- PGPR. see Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR)
- Phytophthora ramorum*, 365–366
- Phytoseiulus persimilis*, 395
- Pitburn incidence, 252–254
- Plant disease diagnostic form, 343
- Plant diversity, cropping system, 259
- diversification with cash crops, 263–264
 - intercropping with companion plants, 259–263
 - synopsis, 264–265
- Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR), 82–83, 91–92
- Plant protection products (PPPs), 217
- Plant samples for disease diagnosis, 341–342
- Plutella xylostella*, 161, 166, 167
- Podosphaera aphanis*, 226–227
- Potassium phosphite, 93
- Potassium silicate, 93
- PPPs. see Plant protection products (PPPs)
- Practical applications
- Brassica* crops, control insect pests, 402–406
 - Brassica* production, 400–401
 - Cabbage root fly (CRF) control
 - case study 1: row covers, *Delia radicum*, 432–437
 - case study 2: entomopathogenic nematodes, *Delia radicum*, 437–444
 - case study 3: chemical control, *Delia radicum*, 444–449
 - chemical control issues, 431–432
 - decision-support system, 424–425
 - entomopathogenic nematodes, biocontrol agents, 428–431
 - future trends, 449–451
 - monitoring of, 425–426
 - row covers use, crop protection, 426–428
 - future trends, 409–411
 - particular insect pests, tomato crops, 394–400
 - protected tomato crops
 - chemical and biological control, 391–394
 - resistant varieties, physical and cultural control, 389–391
 - protected tomato production, 388–389
 - vegetable crops, 387–388
- Products tested and trial details, 2018 and 2020, 446
- Proximal sensors, detect crop health status
- digital and mechatronic applications, baby leaf vegetable quality chain, 208, 209
 - micro-environmental parameters, 206–207
 - optoelectronic devices, detecting disease in vegetable plants, 199–206
 - overview of, 197–199
- Pseudomonas chlororaphis*, 59
- Push-pull strategy, 260
- Queensland fruit fly, 320
- RDI. see Regulated deficit irrigation (RDI)
- Red-green-blue (RGB) channels, 204
- Reflectance, 199
- Regulated deficit irrigation (RDI), 254
- Remote sensing technologies, 197
- RGB. see Red-green-blue (RGB) channels
- Rogers' *Diffusion of Innovation Theory*
- adopter categorization, 333
 - communication channels, 333
 - description, 331–332
 - innovation, 332
 - compatibility, 332
 - complexity, 332
 - observability, 333
 - relative advantage, 332
 - trialability, 333
 - social system, 334
 - time, 333
 - early adopters, 333
 - early majority, 334
 - innovators, 333
 - laggards, 334
 - late majority, 334
- SafeBerry, 227
- SAR. see Systemic acquired resistance (SAR)
- Satellite-based remote sensors, 164
- Sclerotinia sclerotiorum*, 55
- SDM. see Species distribution modelling (SDM)
- Sequential classification sampling plans, 160
- Sequential tripartite classification sampling, 160
- Short-wavelength infrared (SWIR), 202
- Sodium silicate, 90
- Spatial considerations, 287–288

- Species distribution modelling (SDM), 144, 165
- Spider mites, 374-375
- Spirulina platensis*, 85
- Spotted wing Drosophila (SWD), 319-320
- Spray application technique, 111
- Successful workshop presentations tips, 338
- Surfactants, 124
- SWAT model, 230
- SWD. *see* Spotted wing Drosophila (SWD)
- SWIR. *see* Short-wavelength infrared (SWIR)
- Systemic acquired resistance (SAR), 87
- Temporal considerations, 288-289
- Tetranychus urticae*, 359
- TFI. *see* Treatment frequency index (TFI)
- Thermal analysis, 205
- Thermal sensors, 204
- Tillage-based methods, 256
- Tomato crops protection
 - chemical and biological control
 - augmentation biological control, 392
 - biological solutions, 391-392
 - biopesticides, 392
 - glasshouse-grown, 392
 - insecticide, 391-392
 - management strategies, 394
 - natural enemies, 392-393
 - commercially applied IPM programme, 393
 - resistant varieties, physical and cultural control
 - cultural control strategies, 390
 - manipulation of, adult insect behaviour, 390-391
 - monitoring and trapping, 391
 - non-chemical control methods, 389-390
 - Southern Europe, 390
 - selection control, insect pests
 - aphids, 396-398
 - leaf miners, 398-400
 - plant-feeding mites, 394-395
 - whiteflies, 395-396
 - synopsis, 400-401
- Training systems, 251-252
- Treatment frequency index (TFI), 225
- Trichoderma harzianum*, 82
- Tripartite classification sampling, 160
- Tuta absoluta*, 162, 164
- TYLCV. *see* Yellow leaf curl virus (TYLCV)
- UC Davis Powdery Mildew Risk Assessment Model, 226
- UK project (PC 136), 116
- Variable intensity sampling (VIS), 162, 163
- Virtual communication tool, 346
- Virtual extension trainings tips, 346
- VIS. *see* Variable intensity sampling (VIS)
- Volatile organic compounds (VOCs), 260-261
- Wildflower habitats, 297-298
- Working Group for Integrated Plant Protection in Fruit Orchards, 59
- Yellow leaf curl virus (TYLCV), 390, 396
- Yellow sticky traps (YST), 168, 170, 171