Pesticide dosing must be guided by ecological principles

Théotime Colin, Coline Monchanin, Mathieu Lihoreau, Andrew B Barron

► To cite this version:

Théotime Colin, Coline Monchanin, Mathieu Lihoreau, Andrew B Barron. Pesticide dosing must be guided by ecological principles. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2020, 4 (12), pp.1575-1577. 10.1038/s41559-020-01302-1 . hal-03082154

HAL Id: hal-03082154

<https://hal.science/hal-03082154>

Submitted on 11 Jan 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Pesticide dosing must be guided by ecological principles

Théotime Colin^{1,2}, Coline Monchanin^{2,3}, Mathieu Lihoreau³ & Andrew B. Barron²

1. Sydney Institute of Agriculture, School of Life and Environmental Sciences,
University of Sydney, Sydney 2000

2. Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109

3. Research Center on Animal Cognition (CRCA), Center for Integrative Biology
(CBI); CNRS, University Paul Sabatier – Toulouse III, France

Corresponding author: Andrew.Barron@mq.edu.au

Insecticide use could be reduced if dose recommendations move from a toxicological perspective (how much is needed to kill an insect pest) to an ecological perspective (how much is needed to protect a crop).

Insect populations are in sharp decline, with potentially catastrophic consequences for ecosystem function¹. This is a complex problem, but the widespread use of pesticides is certainly part of it^{2,3}. Debates continue about whether some insecticides should be banned, but where bans have happened different insecticides have been substituted. These may be no less harmful to insects⁴. Agriculture needs to move away from such a heavy reliance on pesticides and adopt an integrated pest management approach (IPM)⁵ and a better regulatory process⁶, but this change will take time with the IPM approaches proposed to date. Here we argue that we could immediately reduce the amounts of insecticide applied to the environment without necessarily risking loss of crop yields if we rethink pesticide dosing recommendations based on ecological principles. This action alone will not solve the pesticide problem, but will reduce pesticide pollution to win time while we transition to a more sustainable agricultural model.

Since 1990 the amount (measured in weight) of insecticide applied to farmland in the UK has actually decreased, but this is because modern insecticides are far more toxic than older options⁷. For example, neonicotinoids are 10,000 times more toxic to insects than even DDT⁸! In the UK, the land area treated with insecticides has increased sharply since 2000, and the frequency and diversity of insecticide treatments has also increased⁹. Therefore, in recent decades the toxicity of the environment in the UK to insects has increased.

The justifications given by any pesticide supplier for their dose recommendations is seldom clear. The research performed to justify the dose is proprietary and not in the public sphere⁶, which is itself a problem. Usually dose guidelines, when given, refer to

41 a measure of the LC50 (the dose lethal to 50%) of the active ingredient(s) of the
42 pesticide against the target, and pesticides are recommended to be used at doses
43 causing a fast death in the targeted pests (Table 1). We argue this kind of effect is not
44 needed to control damage to crops from insect pests.

45

Currently insecticides are applied at concentrations in the upper range of the mortality dose-response curve (Figure 1, dashed lines) to deliver a rapid and total elimination of the pest. Mortality dose-response relationships are sigmoid¹⁰. As a consequence, a dose that yields even 90% mortality of the target organism can be far less than a dose yielding a promise of 100% mortality. For example, in the case of the cotton whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci*, Figure 1B), a target of 90% mortality would reduce pesticide amount used by 75% from the current dose recommendation.

Sublethal effects of insecticides can be sufficient to eliminate economic damage to crops

Target insect pests may not need to be killed outright to prevent economic crop damage. Pesticides also have sublethal effects at low doses (Figure 1), which can affect the feeding, vision, mobility, orientation, learning and fertility of insects²³. These sublethal effects are known to severely reduce populations of beneficial insects^{24,25}, but they have been largely overlooked for control of targeted pest insects.

There are examples of sublethal effects of commercial insecticides being sufficient to control target pest insects. Trees can be injected with highly concentrated doses of neonicotinoids to protect them against insect herbivores. Even when the insecticide doses injected into the trunks are highly concentrated, only sublethal concentrations end up in the leaves and twigs^{20,26} (see purple dashed line on Figure 1B for levels found in trees). These sublethal doses have nonetheless been shown to provide effective control against the Asian longhorn beetle²⁶ at doses 17 times less than the 100% lethal dose²⁰. Two common insecticides, at sublethal doses, were found to cause the silverleaf whitefly to stop feeding and lay 75% fewer eggs²⁷, and tefluthrin

inhibits feeding in the corn rootworm at a concentration causing only 20% direct mortality²⁸.

It is not necessary to kill all target insects to eliminate a pest population. The IPM paradigm has argued for decades that it is not necessary to treat a crop when the density of the pest is too low to cause any significant economic damage²⁹. Using additional principles from ecology³⁰, we further argue that for low density pest populations sublethal insecticide concentrations are likely sufficient to precipitate their extinction. Stochastic dynamics and Allee effects (the effect of population density on mean individual fitness) can be sufficient to drive small populations of pests to extinction³⁰. The original description of the Allee effect came from a pest management study. Allee³⁰ reported that tsetse fly baits did not need to catch 100% of the flies to drive a local population to extinction. Allee effects in low density populations can be due to reduced foraging efficiency, mate finding, reduced predator dilution, or from inbreeding³¹. Sublethal effects of pesticides can exacerbate these effects if they damage the capacity of insects to find food, mates or to avoid predators³¹.

Insects are likely exposed to mixtures of pesticides³. Insecticide residues that accumulate in the environment, and other pesticides such as fungicides can have additive or synergistic effects, including on beneficial insects³. Interactions between pesticides influence how much need be applied to control a pest. Fungicidal treatments are well-known for their negative effects on invertebrates^{3,32}. For example, two of the most common fungicides affect the development of Colorado potato beetle larvae, and can increase the susceptibility of the pest to imidacloprid³³. If interactions between pesticides are better understood, it may be possible to reduce the amounts

of pesticide used even further by applying principles from community ecology to pesticide application³⁴.

What pesticide dose is needed to prevent economic damage to a crop?

Few pesticides dosage guidelines are given in terms of economic outcomes for the crop, or assurance of yield. Most studies of insecticide dosing solely focus on lethality to the target insect rather than the economic benefits of the treatments (and lethality is widely used as a marketing argument, see Table 1). In fact, demonstrating economic benefits from insecticide treatments is not straightforward². In the UK, no clear gains in crop yields have been seen linked to increased neonicotinoid use² perhaps because neonicotinoids are often applied prophylactically where no pest are present or because their effects on beneficial insects may negatively affect yields². If we are not seeing benefits from high doses of insecticides, we have an even greater imperative to rethink insecticide doses.

Applying insecticides at the minimum dose needed to reduce the target pests' fitness to zero will also help manage insecticide resistance. This echoes lessons learned from managing antibiotic resistance: manage resistance by tightly controlling and minimising antibiotic use³⁵. By contrast, widespread prophylactic use of long-lived pesticides at high doses is alarmingly common² which may explain why insecticide resistance keeps increasing globally^{2,36}.

Controlling pest resistance on the long-term will only be achieved by an IPM approach³⁶. This should involve multiple IPM strategies, such as crop rotation, the use of short lived pesticides and alternating pesticide treatments with different modes of

actions³⁶. Reducing the dose of pesticide will additionally slow the development of resistance in populations by reducing the extent and intensity of the selection pressure for insecticide resistance.

Rethinking necessary insecticide doses

Arguing to end-users that total eradication of pests is not needed to assure their economic returns will require changing expectations. It will take some serious re-education to reassure growers that a low pesticide dose that may leave some pests visible in a crop has worked to protect the crop. There is also work to be done to assure growers that a lower dose will be sufficient to protect their livelihoods. But a benefit to farmers will be that a lower insecticide dose will be cheaper to apply and cause less damage to beneficial insects such as pollinators.

We do not pretend that this will solve the problem of declining insect populations. Reducing insecticide dosing will not eliminate insecticide residues, but it will reduce the severity and the scale of the problem. This could be done now with no cost to crop yields. It may be a short-term, temporary and partial patch across a far larger and more complex problem, but perhaps this patch can help us win time to change pesticide regulatory processes, shift to an IPM culture, and globally redesign the model of food production into a more sustainable form.

Acknowledgements

We thank Mark J. F. Brown and two anonymous reviewers for their useful comments on the manuscript. The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. van Klink, R. *et al.* Meta-analysis reveals declines in terrestrial but increases in freshwater insect abundances. *Science*. **368**, 417–420 (2020).
2. Goulson, D. An overview of the environmental risks posed by neonicotinoid insecticides. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **50**, 977–987 (2013).
3. Goulson, D., Nicholls, E., Botías, C. & Rotheray, E. L. Bee declines driven by combined stress from parasites, pesticides, and lack of flowers. *Science*. **347**, 1435–1445 (2015).
4. Siviter, H., Brown, M. J. F. & Leadbeater, E. Sulfoxaflor exposure reduces bumblebee reproductive success. *Nature* **561**, 109–112 (2018).
5. Hendrichs, J., Kenmore, P., Robinson, A. S. & Vreysen, M. J. B. Area-Wide Integrated Pest Management (AW-IPM): Principles, Practice and Prospects. in *Area-Wide Control of Insect Pests* 789 (2007).
6. Boyd, I. L. An inside view on pesticide policy. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **2**, 920–921 (2018).
7. Goulson, D., Thompson, J. & Croombs, A. Rapid rise in toxic load for bees revealed by analysis of pesticide use in Great Britain. *PeerJ* **6**, e5255 (2018).
8. Sánchez-Bayo, F. The trouble with neonicotinoids. *Science*. **346**, 806–807

- 158 (2014).
- 159 9. Fera Science Limited. Fera Science Limited. (2020). Available at:
160 <https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/pusstats/index.cfm>. (Accessed: 12th May
161 2020)
- 162 10. Krieger, R. *Hayes' Handbook of Pesticide Toxicology*. **1**, (2001).
- 163 11. Alkassab, A. T. & Kirchner, W. H. Impacts of chronic sublethal exposure to
164 clothianidin on winter honeybees. *Ecotoxicology* **25**, 1000–1010 (2016).
- 165 12. Basley, K., Davenport, B., Vogiatzis, K. & Goulson, D. Effects of chronic
166 exposure to thiamethoxam on larvae of the hoverfly *Eristalis tenax* (Diptera,
167 Syrphidae). *PeerJ* **2018**, 1–15 (2018).
- 168 13. Wu-Smart, J. & Spivak, M. Effects of neonicotinoid imidacloprid exposure on
169 bumble bee (Hymenoptera: Apidae) queen survival and nest initiation. *Environ.*
170 *Entomol.* **47**, 55–62 (2018).
- 171 14. Chahbar, N., Chahbar, M. & Doumandji, S. Evaluation of acute toxicity of
172 thiamethoxam in Algerian honeybee *Apis mellifera intermissa* and *Apis*
173 *mellifera sahariensis*. *Int. J. Zool. Res.* **4**, 29–40 (2014).
- 174 15. Horowitz, A. R., Mendelson, Z., Weintraub, P. G. & Ishaaya, I. Comparative
175 toxicity of foliar and systemic applications of acetamiprid and imidacloprid
176 against the cotton whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) . *Bull.*
177 *Entomol. Res.* **88**, 437–442 (1998).
- 178 16. Hunter White, W. *et al.* Knockdown and mortality comparisons among
179 spinosad-, imidacloprid-, and methomyl-containing baits against susceptible

- 180 *Musca domestica* (Diptera: Muscidae) under laboratory conditions. *J. Econ.*
181 *Entomol.* **100**, 155–163 (2007).
- 182 17. Ramakrishnan, R., Suiter, D. R., Nakatsu, C. H. & Bennett, G. W. Feeding
183 inhibition and mortality in *Reticulitermes flavipes* (Isoptera: Rhinotermitidae)
184 after exposure to Imidacloprid-treated soils. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **93**, 422–428
185 (2000).
- 186 18. Suchail, S., Guez, D. & Belzunces, L. P. Characteristics of imidacloprid toxicity
187 in two *Apis mellifera* subspecies. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **19**, 1901 (2000).
- 188 19. Tomé, H. V. V., Martins, G. F., Lima, M. A. P., Campos, L. A. O. & Guedes, R.
189 N. C. Imidacloprid-induced impairment of mushroom bodies and behavior of
190 the native stingless bee *Melipona quadrifasciata anthidioides*. *PLoS One* **7**,
191 e38406 (2012).
- 192 20. Wang, B., Gao, R., Mastro, V. C. & Reardon, R. C. Toxicity of four systemic
193 neonicotinoids to adults of *Anoplophora glabripennis* (Coleoptera:
194 Cerambycidae). *J. Econ. Entomol.* **98**, 2292–2300 (2005).
- 195 21. Wasserberg, G. *et al.* Imidacloprid as a potential agent for the systemic control
196 of sand flies. *J. Vector Ecol.* **36**, S148–S156 (2011).
- 197 22. Klein, S., Cabirol, A., Devaud, J. M., Barron, A. B. & Lihoreau, M. Why bees
198 are so vulnerable to environmental stressors. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **32**, 268–278
199 (2017).
- 200 23. Desneux, N., Decourtye, A. & Delpuech, J. The sublethal effects of pesticides
201 on beneficial arthropods. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **52**, 81–106 (2007).

- 202 24. Rundlöf, M. *et al.* Seed coating with a neonicotinoid insecticide negatively
203 affects wild bees. *Nature* **521**, 77–80 (2015).
- 204 25. Woodcock, B. A. *et al.* Country-specific effects of neonicotinoid pesticides on
205 honey bees and wild bees. *Science*. **356**, 1393–1395 (2017).
- 206 26. Poland, T. M. *et al.* Field Evaluations of Systemic Insecticides for control of
207 *Anoplophora glabripennis* (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae) in China. *J. Econ.*
208 *Entomol.* **99**, 383–392 (2009).
- 209 27. He, Y. *et al.* Assessment of potential sublethal effects of various insecticides
210 on key biological traits of the tobacco whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci*. *Int. J. Biol. Sci.*
211 **9**, 246–255 (2013).
- 212 28. Michaelides, P. K. & Wright, D. J. Sub-lethal effects of tefluthrin on *Diabrotica*
213 *undecimpunctata howardi*, Barber: adult emergence weights, fecundity and
214 fertility. *Crop Prot.* **16**, 431–438 (1997).
- 215 29. Pedigo, L. Economic injury levels in theory and practice. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.*
216 **31**, 341–368 (1986).
- 217 30. Allee, W. C. *The Social Life of Animals*. W.W. Norton & Company INC, New
218 York (1938). doi:10.2307/4509549
- 219 31. Berec, L., Angulo, E. & Courchamp, F. Multiple Allee effects and population
220 management. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **22**, 185–191 (2007).
- 221 32. Zubrod, J. P. *et al.* Fungicides: an overlooked pesticide class? *Environ. Sci.*
222 *Technol.* **53**, 3347–3365 (2019).

- 223 33. Clements, J. *et al.* Agricultural fungicides inadvertently influence the fitness of
224 Colorado potato beetles, *Leptinotarsa decemlineata*, and their susceptibility to
225 insecticides. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 13282 (2018).
- 226 34. Rohr, J. R., Kerby, J. L. & Sih, A. Community ecology as a framework for
227 predicting contaminant effects. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **21**, 606–613 (2006).
- 228 35. Nathan, C. Resisting antimicrobial resistance. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **18**, 259–
229 260 (2020).
- 230 36. Whalon, M., Mota-Sanchez, D. & Hollingworth, R. *Global pesticide resistance*
231 *in arthropods*. *CAB International* (CABI, 2008).
232 doi:10.1079/9781845933531.0000

235 **Figure legend**

236

237 **Figure 1:** Examples of dose-response mortality curves for non-target (A) and target
238 (B) insects^{11–21}. Concentration is shown on a log scale. Colours represent different
239 insect-insecticide combinations. Sublethal effects with impact on fitness (dotted lines)
240 are often detected at doses well below the concentrations killing 50% or 100% of the
241 population. Recommended doses for target insects (dashed lines, see supplementary
242 methods) often exceed concentrations known to cause 100% mortality. Non-target
243 insects are often more sensitive than targeted pests to insecticides²², so
244 concentrations are shown in parts per billion for non-target (A) and parts per million
245 for target insects (B).

246

247

248

249

250 Table 1: Research performed to justify the dose is mostly proprietary, but usage
 251 guidelines for popular insecticides promise rapid eradication of pests (see
 252 supplementary methods for references).

Manufacturer	Pesticide	Group	Marketed effect on pest
BASF	Dinotefuran	neonicotinoid	"control pyrethroid-resistant pests quickly"
Bayer	Spirotetramat	keto-enol	"suppression of woolly apple aphids", figure shows 80-100 "% control"
Bayer	Thiacloprid	neonicotinoid	"suppression of woolly apple aphids", figure shows 100% mortality
Corteva	Spinetoram and methoxyfenozide	spinosyn, diacylhydrazine	"faster knockdown and consistent control"
Corteva	Spinetoram and sulfoxaflor	spinosyn, sulfoximine	"for control or suppression of listed pests"
Corteva	Chlorpyrifos and Lambda-cyhalothrin	organophosphate, pyrethroid	"fast knockdown and excellent residual control of a broad spectrum of insects"
Syngenta	Emamectin	avermectin	Figures show 90 "% control" of a moth, and 100% bee mortality three hours after application
Syngenta	Pymetrozine	pyridine	"excellent control of aphid and suppression of whitefly populations"
Syngenta	Thiamethoxam	neonicotinoid	"death occurs by starvation within 24 hours"
Syngenta	Chlorantraniliprole and Abamectin	ryanoid, avermectin	"feeding stops within minutes, larvae start to wriggle then become paralysed, death follows after 48 hours"

253

254