

**(12) PATENT**  
**(19) AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE**

**(11)** Application No. **AU 199535984 B2**  
**(10)** Patent No. **708200**

(54) Title  
**A method of controlling moth and other insect pests**

(51)<sup>6</sup> International Patent Classification(s)  
**A01N 063/04**

(21) Application No: **199535984**

(22) Application Date: **1995 .09 .26**

(87) WIPO No: **WO96/09765**

(30) Priority Data

(31) Number	(32) Date	(33) Country
<b>PM8407</b>	<b>1994 .09 .26</b>	<b>AU</b>

(43) Publication Date : **1996 .04 .19**

(43) Publication Journal Date : **1996 .06 .06**

(44) Accepted Journal Date : **1999 .07 .29**

(71) Applicant(s)  
**The State of New South Wales**

(72) Inventor(s)  
**Robert Kofi Mensah**

(74) Agent/Attorney  
**GRIFFITH HACK, GPO Box 4164, SYDNEY NSW 2001**

(56) Related Art  
**CA 1185172**  
**DE 4005628**

OPI DATE 19/04/96 APPLN. ID 35984/95  
AOJP DATE 06/06/96 PCT NUMBER PCT/AU95/00633



AU9535984

(CT)

<b>(51) International Patent Classification <sup>6</sup> :</b> <b>A01N 63/04</b>	<b>A1</b>	<b>(11) International Publication Number:</b> <b>WO 96/09765</b> <b>(43) International Publication Date:</b> 4 April 1996 (04.04.96)
<b>(21) International Application Number:</b> PCT/AU95/00633 <b>(22) International Filing Date:</b> 26 September 1995 (26.09.95) <b>(30) Priority Data:</b> PM 8407 26 September 1994 (26.09.94) AU <b>(71) Applicant (for all designated States except US):</b> THE STATE OF NEW SOUTH WALES [AU/AU]; NSW Dept. of Agriculture, 161 Kite Street, Orange, NSW 2800 (AU). <b>(72) Inventor; and</b> <b>(75) Inventor/Applicant (for US only):</b> MENSAH, Robert, Kofi [GH/AU]; 161 Kite Street, Orange, NSW 2800 (AU). <b>(74) Agent:</b> GRIFFITH HACK & CO.; G.P.O. Box 4164, Sydney, NSW 2001 (AU).		<b>(81) Designated States:</b> AM, AT, AU, BB, BG, BR, BY, CA, CH, CN, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, GB, GE, HU, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LK, LR, LT, LU, LV, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, NO, NZ, PL, PT, RO, RU, SD, SE, SG, SI, SK, TJ, TM, TT, UA, UG, US, UZ, VN, European patent (AT, BE, CH, DE, DK, ES, FR, GB, GR, IE, IT, LU, MC, NL, PT, SE), OAPI patent (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG), ARIPO patent (KE, MW, SD, SZ, UG). <b>Published</b> <i>With international search report.</i>
<b>(54) Title:</b> A METHOD OF CONTROLLING MOTH AND OTHER INSECT PESTS <b>(57) Abstract</b> A method of controlling moth and other insect pests in a habitat and attracting, augmenting or conserving natural enemies of the moth or other insect pests, which comprises treating the habitat with yeast.		

## A METHOD OF CONTROLLING MOTH AND OTHER INSECT PESTS

## TECHNICAL FIELD

This invention relates to the use of yeast for the control of moth of other insect pests and for attracting  
5 and conserving predatory insects of the pests. In particular, the present invention relates to the use of yeast for the control of cotton bollworm and native budworm.

## BACKGROUND ART

10 Cotton bollworm (*Helicoverpa armigera* Hubner) and native bud worm (*Helicoverpa punctigera* Wallengren) are the major pests of cotton. Both insects are polyphagous and they feed preferentially on young growing tips or reproductive structures. The adults feed on nectar and  
15 the damage they cause is the result of the larvae feeding on leaves and buds or bolls. Infestations of these moths results in the loss of the terminal bud or fruiting structures either as floral buds (squares) or as fruit (bolls) causing considerable yield loss. Host plants  
20 other than cotton include maize, sorghum, wheat, sunflower, lucerne, various legumes especially soybean, pigeon pea and chickpea, tomatoes, okra, other vegetables, fruits, top fruits and citrus.

H. *armigera* is cosmopolitan and is the principal  
25 species in the Old World from Africa to the Pacific Islands but H. *punctigera* is an endemic species. Infestation of cotton by *Helicoverpa* spp. may occur at anytime after seedling emergence, but their abundance is highly variable being influenced by environmental  
30 factors, natural enemy abundance, quality and quantity of host plants and also their migratory movements. The two species usually follow a regular pattern of abundance in all areas they attack with H. *punctigera* the dominant species prior to flowering and well into summer  
35 (January). H. *armigera* becomes dominant from January onwards in most areas and is rarely seen in early season cotton.

The current control programme for cotton bollworm

and native budworm in cotton relies heavily on synthetic insecticides. Cotton crops receive on average 12 insecticide and insecticide mixture sprays each season, although extremes of 18-20 sprays still occur. In 1991  
5 Australian cotton growers spent approximately A\$74 million on insecticides, A\$15 million on application costs and A\$9 million for professional consultants giving total insect control costs approaching A\$100 million per year. The over-reliance on insecticides and its  
10 associated problems of insecticide resistance especially in *H. armigera*, disruption of natural enemies of the pests and environmental consequences due to residues in soil and water, off-target drift near human habitation have cast doubt on the long term viability of the cotton  
15 industry and the classical insecticide approach. It is therefore essential that an alternative non-chemical control measure be developed against the pest to achieve sustainability of cotton production.

Presently with our monoculture practices in  
20 agriculture and the use of pesticides we are inadvertently discriminating against beneficial insects. Many areas where crops are grown especially cotton growing areas are remote from wild vegetation. They are often treeless, bushless, rockless and often lay fallow  
25 most part of the year. With no natural refuges, no food sources for adult natural enemies of phytophagous insects, beneficial insects are made ineffective. There is therefore lack of diversity and instability in the agroecosystem.

#### 30 DISCLOSURE OF THE INVENTION

In one aspect, the present invention provides a method of controlling moth or other insect pests in a habitat which comprises disrupting and suppressing female oviposition by treating the habitat with yeast.

35 In a second aspect, the present invention provides a method of controlling moth or other insect pests and attracting, augmenting and conserving natural enemies of the moth or other insect pests, in a habitat which

comprises treating the habitat with yeast.

In a third aspect, the present invention provides a method of controlling moth or other insect pests in a habitat and attracting, augmenting and conserving natural enemies of the moth or other insect pests, which comprises treating the habitat with yeast and one or more other food substances suitable for sustaining the natural enemies.

The present invention controls moth or other pests through suppression and disruption of female oviposition.

Preferably, the moth or other insect pests are cotton bollworm and native budworm.

Habitat includes cotton, maize, sorghum, wheat, sunflower, lucerne, various legumes especially soybean, pigeon pea and chickpea, tomatoes, okra, other vegetables, fruits, top fruits, citrus and like plants.

Yeast includes brewers' yeast, bakers' yeast, yeast hydrolysate, and enzymatically hydrolysed yeast products, and other yeast extracts. Suitable commercial yeast products include Feed Wheast (a product of Knudsen Creamery Company, Los Angeles, California, USA), Pred-Feed (a product of Custom Chemicides, Fresno, California) yeast protein (Bee Wheast), Yesta 20B (a product of CPC (United Kingdom) Limited, Bovril Food Ingredients Division, Staffordshire, UK).

Preferably, the food substance suitable for attracting, augmenting or sustaining natural enemies includes one or more kinds of saccharides, crude proteins, fat, fibre or ash. Other substances include natural honeydews produced by some insects, pollen from flowers, molasses, sucrose, honey, date syrup (a product of Date Factory, Tripoli, Libya) tryptophan and the like.

Preferably, the food substance is raw sugar. The yeast and raw sugar can be applied simultaneously or sequentially.

The insects that are suitable for treatment by the present invention apart from cotton bollworm and native budworm, include thrips (plague thrips, cotton bud

thrips, predatory thrips, onion thrips).

Beneficial insects of *Helicoverpa* spp. that can be attracted and or conserved by the present invention include *Harmonia arcuata* Fabricuis, *Diomus notescens* Blackburn, *Coccinella repanda* Thunberg, *Dicranolauis bellulus* Guerin (predatory beetles); *Geocoris lubra* Kirkaldy, *Cermatulus nasalis* Westwood, *Nabis capsiformis* Germar, *Campylomma livida* Reuter (predatory bugs); *Chrysopa* spp. *Micromus tasmaniae* Walker (predatory lacewings); *Pterocormus promissorius* Erichson, *Heteropelma scaposum* Morley *Netelia producta* (Brulle) (parasitoids), *Archaeearanea veruculata* Urquhart, *Oxyopes* spp. *Lycosa* spp. Salticidae spp., *Diaea* spp., *Araneus* spp. (spiders).

The present invention is also suitable for integrating with chemical treatments and/or biological treatments against the relevant pest. Suitable chemical treatments include the use of insecticides such as organochlorines (eg endosulfan, dicofol), organophosphates (eg acephate Chlorpyrifos, demeton-s-methyl, dimethoate, disulfoton, formothion, monocrotophos, omethoate, parathionmethyl, phorate, profenofos, sulprofos, thiometon), carbamates (aldicarb, carbaryl, methomyl, thiodicarb), pyrethroids (alphamethrin, beta-cyfluthrin, deltamethrin, esfenvalerate, fenvalerate fluvalinate, lambda-cyhalothrin), chitin inhibitors (eg chlorfluazuron), synergists (eg piperonyl butoxide (PBO), petroleum spray oil and the like.

Suitable biological pesticides include *Bacillus thuringiensis* and Neem tree (*Azadiracta indica*) extracts which are known to suppress larval feeding of both cotton bollworm and native budworm.

The present invention is also suitable for combining with other treatments in order to prevent build up of resistance by the pests. The other treatment can be applied simultaneously or sequentially. For example, for a sequential treatment with a particular treatment regime

for the present invention, if the regime requires treatment every fortnight, then another treatment can be used every alternate fortnight to prevent the pests from building up resistance to the present treatment.

5 Typically, the present treatment is alternated with another treatment which includes a substance such as petroleum spray oil or a combination of petroleum spray oil and saccharides.

Suitable petroleum spray oils are white oils or  
10 dormant or summer spray oils as known in the horticultural industry. These are typically C<sub>19</sub>-C<sub>28</sub> hydrocarbons. Preferably, the petroleum spray oils are C<sub>19</sub>-C<sub>21</sub> but other hydrocarbons having acceptable phytotoxicity may be used. There are a number of such  
15 products on the market which are suitable for use in the present invention. These are Sunspray Ultra-fine (USA EPA Reg. No. 862-23, Sunspray 6E Plus), and Sunspray 6 (USA EPA No. 862-11) and 7 (USA EPA No. 862-8), manufactured by the Sun Refining and Marketing Company,  
20 Philadelphia, PA, USA; Caltex Lo-Vis, marketed by Caltex Oil (Australia) Pty Limited, Sydney and Ampol D-C-Tron and Ampol D-C-Tron NR, marketed by Ampol Limited, Sydney.

The petroleum spray oil and/or polysaccharide may be used in conjunction with suitable agronomically  
25 acceptable diluents and/or carriers and with other additives common in the art such as emulsifiers, wetting agents, surfactants stabilizers, spreaders or the like. A suitable additive for use in the present invention is Agral which is a nonylphenylethyleneoxide and is a non-  
30 ionic organic surfactant sold by ICI.

#### BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

Figure 1 shows ovipositional response of cotton boll and native bud worms to various food sprays in commercial cotton at Norwood, near Moree (a) and Auscott, Narrabri  
35 (b) during 1992/93 season. (T1 = brewers yeast; T2 = sugar; T3 = brewers yeast + sugar; T4 = polysaccharide + petroleum oil).

Figure 2 shows effect of food spray (treatment 1) on

the abundance of predatory beetles of *Helicoverpa* spp. on commercial cotton at Norwood, near Moree (Results from December 11, 1992 to January 21, 1993 using a sweep net (a), and from January 28, to March 4, 1993 using a D-vac (b)).

Figure 3 shows effect of provision of food supplements (treatment 1) on numbers of predatory bugs of *Helicoverpa* spp. on commercial cotton at Norwood, near Moree (Results of sweep net catches (a) from December 11, 1992 to January 21, 1993, and (b) D - vac catches from January 28, to March 4, 1993).

Figure 4 shows effect of food spray (treatment 1) on the abundance of predatory lacewings and spiders attaching *Helicoverpa* spp. on commercial cotton at Norwood, near Moore (Results from December 11, 1992 to January 21, 1993 using a sweep net (a), and from January 28, to March 4, 1993 using a D-Vac (b)).

Figure 5 shows provision of food supplements (treatment 1) on the abundance of some parasitoids of *Helicoverpa* spp. on commercial cotton at Norwood, near Moree (Results of sweep net catches).

#### MODES OF CARRYING OUT THE INVENTION

A typical formulation of yeast extract of the present invention comprises 1.5 kg of yeast in 20 litres of water for application per hectare.

A typical formulation of protein hydrolysate of brewers' yeast and sugar comprises of 1.5 kg of brewers' yeast + 1 kg of sugar in 20 litres of water per hectare. Typically, for good crop coverage, a formulation of 1.8 kg of brewers yeast + 1 kg of sugar in 30 litres of water per hectare is suitable.

Typically, the treatment involves six sprays at fortnightly intervals.

The yeast product used for all of the following experiments is Yesta 20B, a product of CPC (United Kingdom) Limited, Bovril Food Limited Ingredient Division, Staffordshire, UK.

#### Experiment 1

Mesh house study on ovipositional response of cotton bollworm and native budworm.

An experiment to assess the ovipositional response of *Helicoverpa armigera* (cotton bollworm) and *Helicoverpa punctigera* (native budworm) was conducted under "free" and "no" choice conditions on cotton plants in a mesh house in November 1992 and January 1993 at the Narrabri Agricultural Research Station (NARS) (30° 13'S, 149° 47'E), which is situated 25 km west of Narrabri in New South Wales. The various food supplements/sprays evaluated were (1) 0.06kg of yeast in 1 L of water, (2) 0.07 kg raw sugar in 1 L of water, (3) a mixture of 0.06 kg yeast and 0.07 kg sugar in 1 L of water, (4) a mixture of 0.08 g polysaccharide and 7 ml (0.5%) petroleum oil in 1 L of water and (5) 1 L of water (control).

The experimental plants were potted cotton plants of 0.5 m high and of Sicala VI normal leaf variety. The experiment was designed as a randomised complete block with 10 replicates of each of the above 4 treatments and a control. Each replicate comprised four plants, and each row contained one replicate of each treatment. The trial was conducted separately for cotton bollworm and native budworm in the same mesh house.

Under "free" choice conditions, for each trial, the stems and leaves of each plant were sprayed in relation to each treatment for 10 seconds on both sides using a knapsack sprayer delivering 420 ml per minute. The control plants were sprayed with water. After treatment application 110 pairs (in the case of cotton bollworm) and 100 pairs (native budworm) were introduced into the mesh house to oviposit on the treated plants. The number of eggs laid on the plants were counted daily until the adults died thus giving the total number of eggs laid per plant per treatment.

Under "no" choice conditions plants from same treatment were enclosed in cages within the mesh house so that insects had no other choice to select from other plants receiving different treatments. Eight pairs

(cotton bollworm) and 5 pairs (native budworm) were released in each cage. The same number of males were released into the cages to ensure mating. Record was taken of the total number of eggs per plant per treatment. All the data in each experiment was subjected to analysis of variance and means were compared by Duncan's multiple range test (Zar 1984).

#### Experiment 2.

##### Field studies on *Helicoverpa* spp. control

Experiments were conducted on commercial cotton farms at Norwood (near Moree) and Auscott (near Narrabri) in the 1992/93 cotton season. The experimental plants at each study site were of the same age and of the normal leaf variety, Sicala VI. The treatments evaluated were (1) 7.20 kg protein hydrolysate of yeast, (2) 8.40 kg of sugar, (3) a mixture of 7.20 kg of yeast and 8.40 kg sugar, (4) 9.60 g polysaccharides and 840 ml petroleum oil, (5) control (untreated) and (6) control (growers insecticide treated plot).

Experimental plots were arranged in a randomized complete block design with 4 replicates per treatment and an untreated control. Each replicate was 6 metre wide and 100 metre long. A 10 metre wide buffer separated each replicate to minimize spray drift between treatments and controls.

Pre-treatment counts of insects were made 24 h before treatment application and post-treatment every 7 days until end of study. Foliar application of each treatment were applied on October 27, 1992 at Norwood and November 4, 1992 at Auscott and thereafter at fortnight intervals until the end of February, 1993 when spraying was stopped at all study areas. In all 6 sprays of each treatment were applied in each study site. Sprays were applied using a knapsack sprayer delivering 420 ml per minute. On each occasion, 120 L of spray was applied in relation to each treatment, i.e. 30 L of spray per replicate. The untreated control plants were sprayed with water and the growers plot (treated control)

received 12 applications of synthetic insecticides and their mixtures by means ground rig (early season i.e. October to December) and by aircraft (mid to late season i.e. January - April). The kind of pesticide, date, rate and method of applications are shown in Table 5. The growers plot was located 400 metres away from the other 4 treatments and the untreated control.

Counts of *Helicoverpa* spp. (eggs and larvae) were made on 1 metre sections in each replicate i.e. 4 metres for each treatment and control plots throughout the season. At each study site, the cumulative total number of eggs and larvae per metre from each treatment and control were computed. So also was the mean number of eggs and larvae per sample date per metre.

Final fruit yield (mature + open bolls) were assessed on 1 metre sections in each replicate i.e. 4 metres for each treatment and control plots at the end of the season. All data were analysed by analysis of variance and means separated by Duncan's multiple range test (Zar 1984).

To assess the effect of artificial food (represented by treatment 1) on natural enemies of cotton bollworm and native budworm, 20 sweeps using a sweep net (from December 11, 1992 to January 21, 1993) and a 20 metre vacuum sampling using a D-vac (from January 28, 1993 to March 4, 1993) were made on cotton plants at 20 metres, 50, 100, 200, 400 metres (i.e growers plot) away from treatment 1 (which is 0 metres). This was replicated 4 times at each distance. Data was expressed as numbers per sampling date per sweep or metre at each distance away from the food sprayed plot. Analysis of variance was used to analysed the data and means were compared by Duncan's multiple range test.

The results of the ovipositional response experiments under "free" and "no" choice conditions in the mesh house are shown in Tables 1 and 2. Significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ ) in numbers of eggs per plant laid by cotton bollworm and native budworm were found among

treatments under both "free" and "no" choice conditions in the mesh house (Table 1 and 2). Maximum numbers of eggs per plant were laid on control plants (i.e. plants sprayed with only water) and minimum numbers on plants

5 sprayed with protein hydrolysate of yeast (treatment 1) and a mixture of yeast and raw sugar (treatment 3). A mixture of polysaccharides and petroleum oil suppressed oviposition in cotton budworm but not in cotton bollworm (Table 1 and 2).

10 Under field conditions, oviposition of *Helicoverpa* spp. varied significantly ( $P < 0.01$ ) among treatments at both study sites (Table 3 and Fig. 1). Cotton plants which received yeast, and a mixture of yeast and sugar

15 sprays had the least numbers of eggs laid on them compared with plants which were sprayed with either synthetic insecticide or were left unsprayed (Table 3 and Fig 1). The higher numbers of eggs on the growers plot at both study sites indicate that the insecticides used by the growers had no ovicidal effect. Significant

20 differences ( $P < 0.05$ ) in the numbers of larvae per sample date per metre were also detected among treatments only at Norwood with the growers farm recording the least numbers of larvae and that of the unsprayed plot the highest (Table 3). However there were no significant

25 differences between the numbers of larvae per metre among the rest of the treatments. The insecticides applied by the grower at Norwood was responsible for the lower numbers of larvae on this plot. In contrast, the difference in numbers of larvae per sample date per metre

30 among treatments at Auscott was not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ) even though the grower applied insecticides on this plot (Table 3). This was due possibly to the fact that the grower at Norwood applied more insecticides than the one at Auscott.

35 The final fruit yield at Norwood was highest on the growers plot and also on plots which received yeast spray (treatment 1) but least on the other treatments (Table 4). In contrast the fruit yield at Auscott was highest

on the yeast plot and lowest on the growers plot (Table 4). The average cost per hectare of yeast was \$6.80 whereas that of the insecticides was \$17 per ha in stage 1 (October - December) and \$40/ha from January to March when Bt was used by the grower within the insecticide resistance management programme.

Natural enemy numbers were highest on plots receiving yeast spray (treatment 1) and continued to decline to reach its lowest level on the insecticide treated growers plot located 400 meters away (Figs. 2, 3, 4 and 5). There was a general decline in natural enemy numbers away from the food sprayed plot (Figs. 2-5). The natural enemies of cotton bollworm and native budworm found in high numbers in the food spray plot included the predatory beetles *H. arcuata* (three - banded ladybird), *D. notescens* (two - spotted ladybird), *C. repanda* (transverse ladybird), *D. bellulus* (red and blue beetle) (Fig. 2); predatory bugs *G. Lubra* (big - eyed bug), *C. livida* (apple dimpling bug), *C. nasalis* (glossy shield bug) and *N. capsiformis* (damsel bug) (Fig.3); predatory lacewings *Chrysopa spp.* (green lacewing), *M. tasmaniae* (brown lacewing) and spiders (Fig. 4); and parasitoids cotton bollworm and native budworm *P. promissorius* (banded caterpillar parasite) *H. scaposum* (two-toned caterpillar parasite) (Fig. 5). Insecticides applied in the growers plot could account for lower numbers of natural enemies recorded. The higher number on the food sprayed plot indicate an attraction and conservation of the beneficial insects.

The result of the study clearly demonstrate that protein hydrolysate of yeast deters oviposition of *Helicoverpa spp.* females and also attracts and conserves beneficial insects of the pest in commercial cotton farms without affecting the yield of the crop. The low numbers of eggs and larvae on plots receiving yeast spray was due to a combination of oviposition suppression, predation and parasitism. The food spray resulted in fewer eggs being laid on the plot and these eggs were preyed upon by

the natural enemies in this plot.

The pesticides applied to the growers plot at Norwood kept larval moth numbers low but it resulted in an outbreak of mites and aphids. None of the other  
5 treatments resulted in an outbreak of mites and aphids. There was no difference in the yields between pesticide treated plots and the yeast plots at the end of the season. Economically the food spray was cheaper and had no effect on the environment compared with insecticide  
10 spray.

TABLE 1. Ovipositional preferences of *Helicoverpa armigera* (n = 110 pairs) and *H. punctigera* (n = 100 pairs) on cotton plants sprayed with various food supplements in the mesh house at the Agricultural Research Station, Narrabri, November, 1992. (Results of free choice tests).

Treatments	<i>H. armigera</i> No. of eggs/plant (n = 40 plants/treatment)	<i>H. punctigera</i> No. of eggs/plant (n = 40 plants/treatment)
0.06 kg of Brewers yeast in 1 L of water	11.78 a	2.10 a
0.07 kg of raw sugar in 1 L of water	17.10 b	19.40 b
0.06 kg of Brewers yeast + 0.07 kg of sugar in 1 L of water	10.78 a	3.73 a
0.08g polysaccharide + 7ml (0.5%) petroleum oil in 1 L of water	25.20 c	3.13 a
1 L of water (Control)	28.50 c	23.17 b

Means within a column followed by same letter not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ) (Duncan's Multiple Range test).

TABLE 2. No choice test for oviposition of *Helicoverpa armigera* (n = 8 pairs) and *H. punctigera* (n = 5 pairs) on cotton plants in the mesh house at the Agricultural Research Station, Narrabri, January 1993.

Treatment	<i>H. armigera</i> No. of eggs/plant (n = 40 plants/treatment)	<i>H. punctigera</i> No. of eggs/plant (n = 40 plants/treatment)
0.06 kg of Brewers yeast in 1 L of water	1.11 a	0.37 a
0.07 kg of raw sugar in 1 L of water	3.82 ab	1.91 bc
0.06 kg of Brewers yeast + 0.07 kg sugar in 1 L of water	3.61 ab	0.83 ab
0.08 g polysaccharide + 7 ml (0.5%) petroleum oil in 1 L of water	5.33 b	1.99 c
1 L of water	7.61 b	4.45 d

Means within column followed by same letter not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ) (Duncan's Multiple Range Test).

TABLE 3. Mean numbers of *Helicoverpa armigera* and *H. punctigera* eggs and larvae/metre/sample date on commercial cotton plants sprayed with various food supplements at Norwood (Moree) and Auscott (Narrabri) October 1992 - March 1993.

Treatments	Eggs/metre/sample date		Larvae/metre/sample date	
	Norwood	Auscott	Norwood	Auscott
7.20 kg of brewers yeast in 120L of water	1.85 a	0.36 a	1.31 a	0.14 a
8.40 kg sugar in 120 L water	2.79 ab	0.89 ab	1.31 a	0.09 a
7.20 kg brewers yeast + 8.40 kg sugar in 120 L water	2.21 a	0.43 a	1.29 a	0.11 a
9.60 g polysaccharide + 840ml petroleum oil in 120 L of water	3.83 b	0.59 ab	1.71 a	0.14 a
Control (Unsprayed)	6.44 c	1.09 b	2.66 b	0.21 a
Growers plot (Treated control)	6.21 c	2.39 c	*0.60 c	0.27 a

Means within column followed by same letter not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ) (Duncan's Multiple Range Test).

TABLE 4. Comparison of the final fruit yield per metre (mature + open bolls) on the various food sprayed plots and growers plot receiving conventional control programme at Norwood, March, 18, 1993 and Auscott, March, 22, 1993. (Mean of 4 replicates per treatment).

Treatments	Norwood No. of mature bolls/m	Auscott No. of mature bolls/m
7.20 kg brewers yeast in 120 L of water	93.00 a	118.50 a
8.40 kg sugar in 120 L of water	71.25 b	90.25 b
7.20 kg brewers yeast + 8.40 kg sugar in 120 L of water	71.25 b	93.00 b
9.60 g polysaccharides + 840 ml petroleum oil	84.75 b	98.50 b
Control (Unsprayed)	75.25 b	91.00 b
Growers plot (Treated control)	99.00 a	76.25 c

Means within column followed by same letter not significantly different ( $P > 0.05$ ) (Duncan's Multiple Range Test).

**TABLE 5.** Coventional control programme based on current pest thresholds used by Grower during the 1992/93 cotton season.

Pesticides	Date of application	Rate	Method of application
Lorsban	11-12-92	0.6L/ha	Water injection
Temik	" "	3.0kg/ha	Applicator on planter
Endo ULV	12-11-92	3.0L/ha	By air
Dipel ES	" "	3.0L/ha	Ground rig
Endo ULV	26-11-92	3.0L/ha	By air
Dipel ES	27-11-92	3.0L/ha	Ground rig
Endo ULV	5 -12-92	3.0L/ha	By air
Rogor	5 - 12-92	0.5L/ha	By air
Thuricide	11 - 12-92	2.5L/ha	By ground rig
Larvin	11 -12-92	0.5L/ha	By ground rig
Endo EC	18 - 12-92	2.1L/ha	By air
Larvin 375	" "	0.5L/ha	By air
Larvin 375	30 - 12-92	0.5L/ha	By air
Maverik	10 - 1-93	3.5L/ha	By air
Endo ULV	27 - 1-93	3.0L/ha	By air
Bt	27 -1 -93	2.0L/ha	By air
Bulldock	9 - 2-93	2.5L	By air
Lannate	9 - 2 93	1.0L	By air
Thuricide	18-2-93	2.5L	By air
Larvin 375	18-2-93	0.5L	By air
Talstar	18-2-93	0.8L	By air
Rogor	11-3-93	0.5L	By air

CLAIMS

1. A method of controlling moth or other insect pests in a habitat which comprises disrupting and suppressing female oviposition by treating the habitat with yeast.
- 5 2. A method of controlling moth or other insect pests in a habitat and attracting, augmenting or conserving natural enemies of the moth or other insect pests, which comprises treating the habitat with yeast.
- 10 3. A method of controlling moth or other insect pests in a habitat and attracting, augmenting or conserving natural enemies of the moth or other insect pests, which comprises treating the habitat with yeast and one or more other food substances suitable for sustaining the natural enemies.
- 15 4. A method according to claim 2 or 3 characterised in that moth or other insect pests are controlled through suppression and disruption of female oviposition.
5. A method according to any one of the preceding claims characterised in that the habitat is cotton.
- 20 6. A method according to claim 5 characterised in that the moth or other insect pest is Cotton bollworm (*Helicoverpa armigera* Hubner).
7. A method according to claim 5 characterised in that the moth or other insect pest is native bud worm
- 25 (*Helicoverpa punctigera* Wallengren).
8. A method according to any one of claims 1 to 4 characterised in that the habitat is a fruit or vegetable field.

9. A method of controlling moth or other insect pests in a habitat which comprises disrupting and suppressing female oviposition by treating the habitat with yeast substantially as herein described with reference to Experiment 1 or  
5 Experiment 2.

10. A method of controlling moth or other insect pests in a habitat and attracting, augmenting or conserving natural enemies of the moth or other insect pests, which comprises treating the habitat with yeast substantially as herein  
10 described with reference to Experiment 2.

11. A method of controlling moth or other insect pests in a habitat and attracting, augmenting or conserving natural enemies of the moth or other insect pests, which comprises treating the habitat with yeast and one or more other food  
15 substances suitable for sustaining the natural enemies substantially as herein described with reference to Experiment 2.

Dated this 10th day of July 1997

20

THE STATE OF NEW SOUTH WALES

By their Patent Attorney

GRIFFITH HACK

30  
20  
10






Figure 1a












Figure 1b



Distance (m) away from food sprayed plot (0).



Distance (m) away from food sprayed plot (0).

Figure 2a



Figure 2b

3/5


*Geocoris lubra* (Predatory bug)





*Campylomma livida*(ADB)



*Cermatulus nasalis*(Predatory bug)



*Nabis capsiformis*(Damsel bug)





Distance (m) away from food sprayed plot (0).

Distance (m) away from food sprayed plot (0).


Figure 3a

Figure 3b



Chrysopa spp.(Green lacewings)



Micromus tasmaniae(Brown lacewing)



Spiders



Distance (m) away from food sprayed plot (0).

Distance (m) away from food sprayed plot (0).

Figure 4a

Figure 4b

### Pterocormus promissorius(Parasite)




Figure 5a

### Heteropelma scaposum (Parasite)




Figure 5b