

 <p>ISSN (O): 2320-5407 ISSN (P): 3107-4928</p>	<p>Journal Homepage: www.journalijar.com</p> <p>INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)</p> <p>Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/22384 DOI URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/22384</p>	
--	--	---

RESEARCH ARTICLE

IMPACT OF CERTAIN INSECT GROWTH REGULATORSON SPODOPTERA LITTORALIS (LEPIDOPTERA: NOCTUIDAE)

Dina Housam Abd El-Monem Ahmed

1. Department of Entomology, Faculty of Science, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 8 October 2025

Final Accepted: 10 November 2025

Published: December 2025

Key words:-

S. littoralis, lufenuron, hexaflumuron, LC₅₀, biochemical effects

Abstract

This study aims to evaluate the toxic and biochemical effect of certain insect growth regulators (IGRs) namely, lufenuron and hexaflumuron on *S. littoralis*. Our results indicated that lufenuron was more toxic than hexaflumuron on 4th instar based on LC₅₀ values. In addition, chitinase activity was increased of treated insects during moulting period than control while the chitin content of treated larvae was lower than control during this period. Glycogen level of treated larvae increased than control ones. Moreover, total protein, total lipids and total carbohydrates were significant decreased for lufenuron at 12 hrs post treatments compared with hexaflumuron. In addition to amylase and trehalase were significant decreased in case of hexaflumuron compared with lufenuron. On contrast, both insecticides caused non significant inhibition in lipase and invertase compared with control. Results indicated that lufenuron and hexaflumuron have shown high potentiality against *S. littoralis*.

"© 2025 by the Author(s). Published by IJAR under CC BY 4.0. Unrestricted use allowed with credit to the author."

Introduction:-

The cotton leafworm *S. littoralis* (Boisd.) is considered as a destructive phytophagous pest causing great losses in yield (Hamouda and Dahi, 2008; Hatem et al., 2009; Lanzoni et al., 2012). Major of conventional chemical insecticides used against *S. littoralis* led to resistance development. Hence, it is important to search for alternative and eco-friendly methods of pest control. IGRs interfere with insect development and growth. Chitin synthesis inhibitors (CSIs) are among IGRs which prevent insect ecdysis via interference with biosynthesis of chitin and complete life cycle (Hammock & Quistad, 1981; Mondal & Parween, 2000). Many insect pests as well as different lepidopterous insects were controlled by using IGRs (Abd-El Wahed et al., 2011; Assar et al., 2016). Therefore, the present study was conducted to evaluate the toxic and biochemical effects of certain chitin synthesis inhibitors namely lufenuron and hexaflumuron on 4th instar of *S. littoralis*.

Materials and Methods:-

Insects:-

From the cotton leafworm division, Plant Protection Research Institute, Dokki, Egypt, *S. littoralis* larvae were obtained. Larvae were reared on castor bean leaves at 27±2° C and 65±5 R.H. as described by (El-Dafrawi et al., 1964).

Experiments:-**Toxicity bioassay:-**

Lufenuron (Match® 5% EC) and hexaflumuron (Consult® 10% EC) were supplied by Syngenta. Leaf dipping method was used for experiment. Castor leaves were dipped in six concentrations (0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6 ppm) and (0, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100, 120 ppm; prepared in water) of lufenuron and hexaflumuron, respectively for 30 seconds. Also, for control ones untreated leaves were put in tap water and allowed to feed 4th larval instar on them. Each treatment contains 3 replicates and each replicate has 10 larvae of the same age. After 48 h, the mortality was recorded and mortality % was corrected according to Abbott's formula (Abbott, 1925) and LC₅₀ values calculation was determined by Probit analysis and related parameters, according to Finney (1971) using software computer program (SAS, 2002).

Chitinase assay:

The method of Ishaaya & Casida (1974) was adopted for chitinase activity estimation.

Chitin determination:-

The chitin was extracted from *S. littoralis* by the method of Kaya et al. (2017).

Glycogen determination:-

The method of Yuval et al. (1998) was adopted for determination of glycogen level.

Total carbohydrates level estimation:-

The method of Yuval et al. (1998) was adopted for the carbohydrate level estimation.

Total protein level estimation:-

The method of Bradford (1976) was adopted for total protein measure.

Total lipid level estimation:-

The method of Yuval et al. (1998) was adopted for lipid content measure.

Protease assay:

The method of Birk et al. (1962) was adopted for proteolytic activity measure.

Lipase assay:

The method of Tahoun & Abdel-Ghffar (1986) was adopted for lipase activity measure.

Enzymes hydrolyzing carbohydrate assay:

The method of Ishaaya & Swirski (1976) was adopted for estimation of amylase, invertase and trehalase measure.

Statistical analyses:-

Means \pm SEs of the experimental values in tables were obtained and data were subjected to student's t-test, to evaluate the significance of the results at levels of 1, 5.

Results and Discussion:-

Table (1) showed that LC₅₀ values of lufenuron and hexaflumuron against *S. littoralis* 4th larval instar were 0.304 and 59.223 ppm respectively with a slope value of 3.884 \pm 0.294 and 4.1055 \pm 0.3042 for 4th instar larvae, respectively. The LC₅₀ of lufenuron to *S. littoralis* 4th instar was found to be 0.0188 ppm (El-Banna, 2020). While the values of LC₅₀ were 1.3, 1.66, 1.7 and 0.81 ppm for hexaflumuron, teflubenzuron, diflubenzuron and lufenuron, respectively against *Pectinophora gossypiella* 3rd instar (Taha & Radwan, 2023).

Table 1: Lethal action (as expressed by LC₅₀ values) of lufenuron and hexaflumuron on *S. littoralis* 4th larval instar.

Treatments	LC ₅₀ ppm*	95% fiducial limits		Slope	χ^2
		Lower	Upper		
Lufenuron	0.304	0.229	0.380	3.884 \pm 0.294	20.211
Hexaflumuron	59.223	46.452	71.873	4.106 \pm 0.304	17.079

* LC₅₀ values are significant (P< 0.05), whenever fiducial limits do not overlap.

The results in table (2) showed that during intermoult period and post-treatment with 2,12 and 24 hr, the chitinase activity in larvae treated with lufenuron increased insignificantly than control ones by 0.457, 3.318 and 3.815 %, respectively, while in case of hexaflumuron, the activity insignificantly decreased by 2.739, 1.89 and 1.635%, respectively. Furthermore, during moulting, the activity of chitinase in larvae treated with lufenuron significantly increased than control ones by 17.764% while that of hexaflumuron increased significantly by 19.35%. El-Banna (2020) stated that chitinase values was increased in both chlorfluazuron and lufenuron being 266.3 and 230.3 ($\mu\text{g NAGA/min/g.b.wt}$), respectively against *S. littoralis* 4th larval instar compared with control. Our results agreed with those of Abdel Aziz (2019) and Abd El-Mageed&Shalaby (2011), they found when treated *S. littoralis* with mixtures of insecticides and IGRs, chitinase activity was increased. Abdel-Mageed et al. (2018) found that treatment of *S. littoralis* with chlorfluazuron, triflumuron and flufenoxuron, increase in chitinase activity by 51.28%, 72.06% and 32.70% for, respectively compared with control.

Chitinase enzyme is vital for ecdysis in insects. The insect cuticle might constitute a useful target site for different insecticides. As a result of treatments with different insecticides, it might affect synthesis of protein within insects leading to obtained change in this enzyme activity (Dean et al., 1999; Merzendorfer&Zimoch, 2003; Kostyukovsky&Trostanetsky, 2006). Data presented in table (3) showed that chitin content in both treatments was significantly decreased than control during moulting period being 1.064, 1.191 and 1.580 mg, respectively. Chitin synthesis inhibition impedes chitin biosynthesis in treated insects. Malfunction in chitin biosynthesis prevents molting and or leading to defective insect cuticle (Hammock &Quistad, 1981).

Table 2: Chitinase activity in the total body homogenate of *S. littoralis* treated with lufenuron- and hexaflumuron-LC₅₀s.

Hours after treatment	Control	Lufenuron		Hexaflumuron	
		Activity ^(a)	% ^(b)	Activity ^(a)	% ^(b)
2	219±7.31	220±03.11 ns	+ 0.457	213±01.02 ns	- 2.739
12	211±1.95	218±01.93 ns	+ 3.318	207±05.15 ns	- 1.890
24	367±1.10	381±06.20 ns	+ 3.815	361±12.50 ns	- 1.635
48	5421±32.13	6384±70.60 ***	+ 17.764	6470±08.41***	+19.350

(a) Activity expressed as as $\mu\text{g NAGA released} \times 10^3 / \text{min/insect}$.

(b) Percentage decrease or increase than untreated .

Ns Non-significant .

*** Significant at the level of 0.1%

Table 3: Chitin content of *S. littoralis* treated with lufenuron- and hexaflumuron-LC₅₀s.

Hours after treatment	Chitin content (mg)		
	Control	Lufenuron	Hexaflumuron
2	1.50±0.05	1.172±0.06	1.072±0.01
12	2.165±0.10	1.251±0.04	1.411±0.04
24	3.10±0.06	1.647±0.06	1.748±0.03
48	1.580±0.13	1.064±0.03***	1.191±0.02 ***

Data are presented as means \pm SE_s

*** Significant at the level of 0.1%

Concerning the increase in glycogen level of treated larvae compared with control as indicated in table (4) it can be referred to that chitin synthesis in treated larvae was lower than control ones, hence requirement of glycogen for chitin synthesis was lesser. These results were agreed with that of Radwan et al. (1986).

Table 4: Glycogen level during moulting of *S. littoralis* treated with lufenuron- and hexaflumuron- LC₅₀s.

Treatments	Fresh body weight (mg)	Glycogen level	
		as $\mu\text{g glucose/insect}$	% of body weight
Control	41±1.46	104.81±2.90	0.26
Lufenuron	37.5±2.00	127.4±2.45	0.33***
Hexaflumuron	40.83±0.80	142.28±4.00	0.34***

Data are presented as means \pm SE_s

*** Significant at the level of 0.1%

The results indicated that total protein in larvae treated with lufenuron at 12 and 24 hr post treatment were significantly decreased than control being 1251 and 1171.53 μ g/ larva, respectively compared with that of control (1348.2 and 1623.1 μ g/ larva, respectively) (Table 5). While in case of hexaflumuron was non-significantly increased than control at 12 hr post-treatment (1358.02 μ g/ larva), but at 24 hr post-treatment it significantly decreased (947 μ g/ larva). Similar results were obtained by El-Banna (2020) who found that *S. littoralis* protein content was decreased after IGRs treatment compared with control ones. The hemolymph protein works as a reserve source of protein synthesis responsible for development and growth of the adult during pupal stage (Florkin&Jeanulaux, 1964). Also, total lipids in both treatments with lufenuron and hexaflumuron either at 12 or 24 hr post treatment were significantly increased than that of control. While Assar et al. (2016) showed that *S. littoralis* treated with teflubenzuron and hexaflumuron, respectively led to total lipid reduction. Concerning total carbohydrates, the results indicated that both lufenuron and hexaflumuron either at 12 or 24 hr post treatment were significantly increased than control. While novaluron increased the total carbohydrates in *S. littoralis* 5th larval instar (Aly & Ali, 2024). The efficacy of the IGRs relies on the species of treated insect and the applied concentration (Khedr et al., 2005).

Table 5: Effects on the main metabolites of *S. littoralis* treated with lufenuron- and hexaflumuron-LC₅₀s.

Treatments	Total carbohydrates (μ g glucose/larva)		Total lipids (mg/larva)		Total protein (μ g/larva)	
	12 hrs ●	24 hrs ●	12 hrs ●	24 hrs ●	12 hrs ●	24 hrs ●
Control	194.1 \pm 2.9	243.0 \pm 1.8	6.9 \pm 0.10	8.42 \pm 0.55	1348.2 \pm 7.5	1623.1 \pm 9
Lufenuron	250 \pm 1.9***	269.88 \pm 1.55** *	7.95 \pm 0.195** *	9.37 \pm 0.1*	1251 \pm 2.8** *	1171.53 \pm 6.8** *
Hexaflumuron	262.70 \pm 0.9** *	301.84 \pm 6.6***	8.24 \pm 0.11***	9.17 \pm 0.25 *	1358.02 \pm 5.4 n.s.	947.0 \pm 5.7***

Data are presented as means \pm SE_s

● hours post treatment

n.s. Non-significant

* Significant at the level of 5%

*** Significant at the level of 0.1%

Table (6) shows that protease activity significantly increased in both lufenuron and hexaflumuron compared with that of control. While lipase activity was insignificantly affected by treatment. In case of carbohydrates hydrolyzing enzymes, the amylase activity was significantly decreased in both lufenuron and hexaflumuron, Trehalase activity was insignificantly decreased in lufenuron but significantly decreased in case of hexaflumuron. While invertase activity was insignificantly affected by treatments. Ishaaya& Ascher (1977) indicated that carbohydrates might be affected due to the reduced level of amylase, invertase and trehalase of *Tribolium castaneum* 4th instar larvae treated with diflubenzuron. Also, El Saïdy&Degheele (1990) agreed with our results in that amylase activity was reduced in *S. littoralis* after diflubenzuron treatment. Thus, our results showed that chitin synthesis inhibitors do not reduce digestive enzymes activity, except some carbohydrates hydrolyzing enzymes.

Table 6: LC₅₀ effects of lufenuron and hexaflumuron on *S. littoralis* digestive enzymes.

Treatments	Digestive enzymes				
	Amylase (μ g glucose/min/gut)	Trehalase (μ g glucose/min/gut)	Invertase (μ g glucose/min/gut)	Lipase (μ M oleic acid liberated/min/gut)	Protease (O.D. units \times 10 ³ / min./gut)
Control	1.601 \pm 0.07	21.17 \pm 0.74	51.182 \pm 0.85	1.21 \pm 0.12	2.70 \pm 0.18
Lufenuron	1.234 \pm 0.11**	20.752 \pm 1.3n.s.	50.01 \pm 0.65 n.s.	1.24 \pm 0.11 n.s.	4.33 \pm 0.15***
Hexaflumuron	1.031 \pm 0.07***	11.251 \pm 0.62***	51.07 \pm 0.45 n.s.	1.20 \pm 0.14 n.s.	3.52 \pm 0.10**

Data are presented as means \pm SE_s

n.s. : Non-significant

** : Significant at the level of 1%

*** : Significant at the level of 0.1%

Conclusion:-

The tested IGRs effectiveness was shown from the latent effect on some biochemical aspects. Therefore, these CSIs will disrupt many physiological functions and ultimately lead to death. In addition, these results would facilitate better integration of these insect growth regulators into integrated management programs of *S. littoralis*.

Competing interests:

No competing of interests was obtained.

References:-

1. Abbott, W.S. (1925). A method of computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. *J. Econ. Entomol.*, 18, 265-267.
2. Abdel Aziz, M.F. (2019). Effects of some insecticide mixtures on toxicity and some biochemical parameters of cotton leafworm, *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.). *Egyptian Academic Journal of Biological Sciences, F. Toxicology & Pest Control*, 11(3), 139-148.
3. Abdel-Mageed, A., El-bokl, M., Khidr, A. & Said, R. (2018). Disruptive Effects of Selected Chitin Synthesis Inhibitors on Cotton Leaf Worm *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.). *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 12 (1), 4-9.
4. Abd El-Mageed, A.E. & Shalaby, S.E. (2011). Toxicity and biochemical impacts of some new insecticide mixtures on cotton leafworm *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.). *Plant Protection Science*, 47 (4), 166-75.
5. Abd-El Wahed, M.S., Ahmed, F.M., Abdel-Aal, A.E. & Abdel Aziz, M.M. (2011). The effect of certain biocontrol agent on some biological, biochemical and histological aspects of the cotton leafworm *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Egyptian Journal of Agricultural Research*, 89 (2), 431-44.
6. Aly, M.F.K. & Ali, A.M. (2024). Toxicity and biochemical effects of some insecticides on the cotton leafworm, *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) under laboratory conditions. *Egyptian Journal of Crop Protection*, 19 (1), 27-46.
7. Assar, A.A., El-Mahasen, M.A., Dahi, H.F. & Amin, H.S. (2016). Biochemical effects of some insect growth regulators and bioinsecticides against cotton leafworm, *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Journal of Bioscience and Applied Research*, 2(8), 587-594.
8. Birk, Y., Harpaz, I., Ishaaya, I. & Bondi, A. (1962). Studies on the proteolytic activity of the beetles *Tenebrio* and *Tribolium*. *J. Insect Physiol.*, 8, 417-429.
9. Bradford, M.M. (1976). A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. *Anal Biochem.*, 72, 248-254.
10. Dean, S.R., Meola, R.W., Meola, S.M., SittertzBhatkar, H. & Schenker, R. (1999). Mode of action of lufenuron in adult *Ctenocephalides felis* (Siphonaptera: Pulicidae). *J. Med. Entomol.* 36, 486-492.
11. El-Banna, H.M.S. (2020). Effective use of two chitin synthesis inhibitors against cotton leaf worm *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) based on toxicity, biological and biochemical studies. *International Journal of Entomology Research*, 5 (5), 43-48.
12. El-Dafrawi, M.E., Topozada, A., Mansour, M. & Zaid, M. (1964). Toxicological studies on the Egyptian cotton leafworm, *Prodenialitura*. I. Susceptibility of different larval instars of *Prodenia* to insecticides. *J. Econ. Entomol.*, 57 (4), 591-593.
13. El-Saidy, M.F. & Degheele, D. (1990). Effect of diflubenzuron on growth, development and digestive enzymes in *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.). *Mededelingen van de Faculteit Landbouwwetenschappen, Rijksuniversiteit Gent.*, 55 (2b), 583-592.
14. Florkin, M. & Jeanuiaux, C.H. (1964). Haemolymph composition. In "Physiology of Insecta": (Edited by Rockstein, M.). Academic Press, New York & London, (3), 109-152. 34.
15. Finney, D.J. (1971). Probit analysis, 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.
16. Hammock, C.D. & Quistad, G.B. (1981). Metabolism and mode of action of juvenile hormone, juvenoids and other insect growth regulators. In: "Progress in pesticide Biochemistry" (Hutson, D.H. and Roberts, T.R. eds.). John Wiley & Sons Ltd., (1): 1-85.

17. Hamouda, L.S. &Dahi, H.F. (2008). neurotoxic effect of spinetoram on *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.) larvae. Egypt. Acad. J. Biol. Sci., 1(2), 27-36.
18. Hatem, A.E., Abdel-Samad, S.S.M., Saleh, H.A., Soliman, M.H.A. &Hussien, A.I. (2009). Toxicological and physiological activity of plant extracts against *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisduval) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) larvae. Boletin de Sanidad Vegetal Plagas, 35, 517-531.
19. Ishaaya, I. & Ascher, K.R.S. (1977). Effect of diflubenzuron on growth and carbohydrate hydrolases of *Triboliumcastaneum*, *Phytoparasitica*, 5, 149-158.
20. Ishaaya, I. &Casida, J.E. (1974). Dietary TH 6040 alters composition and enzyme activity of house fly larval cuticle. *Pestic. Biochem. Physiol.*, 4, 484-490.
21. Ishaaya, I. &Swirski, E. (1976). Trehalase, invertase and amylase activities in the Black scale *Saissetiaolea* and their relation to host adaptability, *J. Insect Physiol.*, 16, 1025-1029.
22. Kaya, M., Mujtaba, M., Ehrlich, H., Salaberria, A.M., Baran, T., Amemiya, C.T., Galli, R., Akyuz, L., Sargin, I. &Labidi, J. 2017. On chemistry of γ -chitin, *Carbohydr. Polym.*, 176, 177–186.
23. Khedr, M.M.A., Desuky, W.M.H., El Shakaa, S.M.A.& Khalil, S.I.Y. (2005). Toxicological and biochemical studies on the effect of some insect growth regulators on *Spodopteralittoralis* (Boisd.) larvae. *Egypt. J. Agric. Res.*, 83(2), 539 – 561.
24. Kostyukovsky, M.&Trostanetsky, A. (2006). The effect of a new chitin synthesis inhibitor, novaluron, on various developmental stages of *Triboliumcastaneum* (Herbst). *J. Stored Prod. Res.*, 42, 136-148.
25. Lanzoni, A., Bazzocchi, G.G., Reggiori, F., Rama, F., Sannino, L., Maini, S. &Burgio, G. (2012). *Spodopteralittoralis* male capture suppression in processing spinach using two kinds of synthetic sex-pheromone dispensers. *Bulletin of Insectology*, 65, 311-318.
26. Merzendorfer, H. &Zimoch, L. (2003). Chitin metabolism in insects: structure, function and regulation of chitin synthases and chitinases. *J. Exp. Biol.*, 206(Pt 24), 4393-4412.
27. Mondal, K.A. &Parween, S. (2000). Insect growth regulators and their potential in the management of stored-product insect pests. *Integrated Pest Manag. Rev.*, 5, 255-295.
28. Radwan, H.S.A., Assal, O.M., Abo-Elghar, G.E., Riskallah, M.R. & Ahmed, M.T. (1986). Some aspects of the action of diflubenzuron and trifluron on food consumption, growth rate and food utilization by *Spodopteralittoralis* larvae. *J. Insect Physiol.*, 32 (2), 103-107.
29. SAS (2002). SAS/STAT User's guide, version 9.1, Ed. SAS Institute Inc. Cary.
30. Taha, H.S.E. & Radwan, E.M.M. (2023). Insect growth regulator insecticides toxicity evaluation in relation to catalase, pyrooxidase, lactate-dehydrogenase and total antioxidant activities in field population of *Pectinophoragossypiella* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae). *Egypt. J. Plant Prot. Res. Inst.*, 6 (1), 84 – 95.
31. Tahoun, M.K. & Abdel-Ghaffar, M. (1986). A modified colourimetric method for assay of lipase activity. *Alex. Sci. Exch.*, 7 (2): 235-244.
32. Yuval, B., Kaspi, R., Shloush, S. & Warburg, M.S. (1998). Nutritional reserves regulate male participation in Mediterranean fruit fly leks. *Ecological Entomology*, 23, 211–215.