Evaluation of the effectiveness of insecticide trunk injections for control of *Latoia lepida* (Cramer) in the sweet olive tree *Osmanthus fragrans*

Jun Huang [1], **Juan Zhang** [1], **Yan Li** [2], **Jun Li** [Corresp., 3], **Xiao-hua S Shi** [1]

[1] Flower Research and Development Centre, Zhejiang Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province, China

[2] The Key Laboratory of Chemistry for Natural Products of the Guizhou Province, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guizhou, Guiyang Province, China

[3] Guangdong Key Laboratory of IPM in Agriculture and Public Laboratory of Wild Animal Conservation and Utilization, Guangdong Institute of Applied Biological Resources, Guangzhou, Guangdong Province, China

Corresponding Author: Jun Li
Email address: junlee100@163.com

The screening of suitable insecticides is a key factor in successfully applying trunk injection technology to ornamental plants. In this study, six chemical pesticides were selected and injected into the trunks of *Osmanthus fragrans* to control the nettle caterpillar, *Latoia lepida* (Lepidoptera: Limacodidae), using a no-pressure injection system. The absorption rate of the insecticides, the leaf loss due to insect damage, and the mortality and frass amount of *L. lepida* larvae were evaluated after 77 and 429 days. The results showed that 4% imidacloprid + carbosulfan and 21% abamectin + imidacloprid + omethoate had the fastest conductivity and were completely absorbed into the trunks within 14 days; however, the efficiencies of these insecticides in controlling *L. lepida* were extremely low. Additionally, the treatment 10% emamectin benzoate + clothianidin and 2.5% emamectin benzoate was almost completely absorbed within 30 days and exhibited a longer duration of insecticide efficiency (>80% mortality) in the upper and lower leaves of the canopy. Treatment with these insecticides also resulted in significantly lower leaf loss and frass amounts. We conclude that emamectin benzoate and emamectin benzoate + clothianidin have a rapid uptake into *O. fragrans*, and are effective as insecticides over long durations. Hence, they may be a suitable control option for *L. lepida* in *O. fragrans* plants.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of insecticide trunk injections for control of *Latoia lepida* (Cramer) in the sweet olive tree *Osmanthus fragrans*

Jun Huang[1], Juan Zhang[1], Yan Li[3], Jun Li[2*], Xiao-Hua Shi[1]

[1] Flower Research and Development Centre, Zhejiang Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Hangzhou 311202, Zhejiang Province, P.R. China.

[2] Guangdong Key Laboratory of IPM in Agriculture and Public Laboratory of Wild Animal Conservation and Utilization, Guangdong Institute of Applied Biological Resources, Guangzhou 510260, Guangdong Province, P.R. China.

[3] The Key Laboratory of Chemistry for Natural Products of the Guizhou Province and the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guiyang 550002, Guizhou Province, P.R. China.

Juan Zhang contributed equally with Jun Huang and is a co-first author of this paper.

Corresponding author: junlee100@163.com (Li Jun)

ABSTRACT

The screening of suitable insecticides is a key factor in successfully applying trunk injection technology to ornamental plants. In this study, six chemical pesticides were selected and injected into the trunks of *Osmanthus fragrans* to control the nettle caterpillar, *Latoia lepida* (Lepidoptera: Limacodidae), using a no-pressure injection system. The absorption rate of the insecticides, the leaf loss due to insect damage, and the mortality and frass amount of *L. lepida* larvae were evaluated after 77 and 429 days. The results showed that 4% imidacloprid + carbosulfan and 21% abamectin + imidacloprid + omethoate had the fastest conductivity and were completely absorbed into the trunks within 14 days; however, the efficiencies of these insecticides in controlling *L. lepida* were extremely low. Additionally, the treatment 10% emamectin benzoate + clothianidin and 2.5% emamectin benzoate was almost completely absorbed within 30 days and exhibited a longer duration of insecticide efficiency (>80% mortality) in the upper and lower

leaves of the canopy. Treatment with these insecticides also resulted in significantly lower leaf loss and frass amounts. We conclude that emamectin benzoate and emamectin benzoate + clothianidin have a rapid uptake into *O. fragrans*, and are effective as insecticides over long durations. Hence, they may be a suitable control option for *L. lepida* in *O. fragrans* plants.

78

79

80 ## INTRODUCTION

81 The sweet olive, *Osmanthus fragrans* (Thunb.) Lour., is a popular garden evergreen shrub or
82 small tree that belongs to the family of Oleaceae. It has both ornamental and practical uses in
83 landscaping and as incense (*Liu & Xiang, 2003*; *Lee et al., 2007*) and is widely planted in the
84 Huaihe River basin and southern areas of China (*Wang et al.,* 2006). The nettle caterpillar or
85 blue-striped nettle grub, *Latoia lepida* (Cramer; Lepidoptera: Limacodidae), is distributed
86 throughout Southeast Asia (*Azharul Islam et al.,* 2009), especially in China, Japan, India, Sri
87 Lanka, Indonesia and Vietnam (*Hirashima, 1898*). *L. lepida* larvae mainly feed on *O. fragrans*
88 leaves, resulting in restricted growth and dieback of leaves and twigs (*Wakamura et al., 2007*).
89 Thus, this pest reduces the ornamental and practical values of the plants (*Ju et al., 2007*). In
90 addition, exposure to the stinging spines on the dorsal surface of *L. lepida* can cause skin
91 problems in humans, such as redness, swelling and pain, as well as other clinical manifestations
92 such as fever, joint pain, and even death in allergic populations (*Qin et al., 1998*). Therefore,
93 combating *L. lepida* infestations is both economically valuable and significant for protecting
94 human health.

95 Currently, spraying chemicals on tree crowns is the main control method for *L. lepida* in
96 China. However, chemical spraying can release pesticides into the air and water, and affect non-
97 target animals, causing adverse consequences such as the deaths of large numbers of natural
98 enemies, livestock poisoning, and environmental pollution (*Wakamura et al., 2007*). Chemical
99 spraying is most commonly used in the green areas of cities or in the suburbs. In contrast, trunk
100 injection technology is a more environmentally friendly method of applying pesticides, because
101 it is highly efficient for liquid drugs, can be used with a broad spectrum of insecticides, and is
102 relatively pollution free, safe, simple to apply, and is less affected by weather (*Navarro, 1992*;
103 *Montecchio, 2013*). Trunk injection technology involves the injection of pesticides directly into
104 tree trunks, which then transport the liquids through their conductive tissues to the site of action
105 (*Mendel, 1998*; *Harrell, 2006*; *Mota-Sanchez et al., 2009*; *Doccola et al., 2011*); thus, trunk
106 injection can play an important role in disease or insect pest control (*Mota-Sanchez et al., 2009*;
107 *Takai et al., 2001*; *James et al., 2006*; *Darrieutort & Lecomte, 2007*). For example, using trunk
108 injections of emamectin benzoate, ash trees with heavy infestations of *Agrilus planipennis*
109 exhibited less canopy decline over a four-year period compared to non-treated control trees
110 (*Flower et al., 2015*) and also resulted in a nearly 99% mortality of *A. planipennis* feeding on the
111 treated tissues (*Smitley et al., 2010*; *McCullough et al., 2011*; *Herms et al., 2014*).

Certainly, having a variety of insecticide options is a key factor in the successful application of trunk injection technology. *Byrne et al.* (2012) found that the uptake of 10% dinotefuran was more rapid than the uptake of 5% imidacloprid in California avocado groves. Both chemicals showed good control of the avocado thrips *Scirtothrips perseae*, and no residues were detected within the fruits. In contrast, although 10% acephate showed a rapid uptake and provided good control of thrips in bioassays, acephate residues and its insecticidal metabolite methamidophos were detected in fruits for up to 4 weeks after the injection. However, the uptake of 5% avermectin was slow, and it was ineffective against avocado thrips (*Byrne et al., 2012*). Another study found that trunk injections of imidacloprid, thiamethoxam and clothianidin in fully grown king mandarin trees to control the citrus greening disease vector *Diaphorina citri* resulted in approximately 50% mortality of the psyllids within 45 days. In general, imidacloprid had a better control effect than other insecticides tested (*Ichinose et al., 2010*). Therefore, evaluations of pest control using trunk injections of different chemicals provide a quick and effective assessment of the optimal trunk injection agent. However, little has been reported on the success of insecticide treatments using trunk injection techniques to control *L. lepida* on *O. fragrans* trees.

In this study, we selected six chemical pesticides to be injected, without pressure, into the trunks of *O. fragrans* to control *L. lepida*. First, the absorption rates of the insecticides were estimated on different observation days within a month after the trunk-injection application. In addition, the mortality of *L. lepida* larvae and tree leaf loss were evaluated in bioassays to determine the duration of efficacy at 77 days (approximately the period between two successive generations of *L. lepida* in a year in China) (*Ju et al., 2007*) and 429 days after treatment. Finally, we also investigated the amount of frass deposited by *L. lepida* larvae at these two time points. Our goal was to assess which type of insecticide performed best with regard to the uptake rate, efficacy against the target pest, and effective duration.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plants and insects

This study was conducted in a garden located in the Zhejiang Academy of Agricultural Sciences (30°18′75″ N; 120°28′60″ E), Hangzhou, China. The sweet olive trees used in this study, *O. fragrans* var. thunbergii, were 10–15 years old and planted in a total of three rows spaced approximately 3 m apart. The trees had well-structured crowns and a uniform growth trend. We randomly selected 21 individual trees and measured their heights, canopy widths, and diameter at chest height, resulting in means (± sem) of 4.53 ± 0.20 m, 2.39 ± 0.10 m, and 0.12 ± 0.01 m,

145 respectively. These trees were managed with common watering and fertilization techniques;
146 however, they were not subjected to chemical pesticides. Fifth instar larvae of *L. lepida* with
147 similar weights were collected from sweet olive trees planted in the Hangzhou Blue Ocean
148 Ecology Park (30°08′71″ N; 120°31′49″ E) and used for the bioassay. None of the study species
149 are protected in China; therefore, no specific permits were required for collections or field
150 activities.

151

152 **Insecticides**

153 The insecticides used in this study included 95% imidacloprid and 70% emamectin benzoate
154 (Guangdong Dafeng Plant Protection Technology Co., Ltd.), 95% abamectin (Hebei Weiyuan
155 Group Co., Ltd.), 95% clothianidin emulsifiable concentrate (Nanjing Lebang Chemical Products
156 Co., Ltd.), 98% omethoate (Lianyungang Dongjin Chemical Co., Ltd.), and 92% carbosulfan
157 (Jiangsu Xingnong Co., Ltd.). These insecticides were diluted and formulated (or mixed)
158 following the six trunk injection chemicals described in Table 1.

159

160 **Insecticide application by trunk injection**

161 On 28 April 2014, 21 brown plastic bottles (Guangdong Institute of Applied Biological
162 Resources supplied, designed by Dr. Li Jun) 6 cm high (from the bottom to the bottle neck) and 4
163 cm in diameter were prepared in the laboratory (Fig. 1). Each bottle was supplied with 30 mL of
164 insecticide for trunk injection (n = 3 for each treatment). Three bottles were filled with distilled
165 water (no insecticides) as controls. A hole approximately 30 mm in depth and 4 mm in diameter
166 was drilled downward in the main trunk of each tree at a 45° angle approximately 30 cm above
167 the ground using a rechargeable drill (Model TSR/1080-LI, Bosch Power Tools Co., Ltd.,
168 Shanghai, China). The bottle tip was cut open using a razor and inserted into the hole to
169 completely inject the insecticides into the trunk. The screw threads on the tip of the bottle
170 provide a good seal between the bottle and the edges of the drilled hole to prevent chemical
171 leakage. Finally, an approximately 1 mm diameter air hole was made by puncturing the bottom
172 of the bottle with an insect needle (approximately 0.75 mm in diameter and 40 mm in length) to
173 promote the uptake of the insecticides. The quantity of residual agent in the bottles was visually
174 observed and recorded at 9, 14, 23, and 30 days after application to test whether the absorption
175 rates of the trunk-injected insecticides varied. During the assays, the temperature was 23.4 ±
176 0.71°C and the atmospheric humidity was 67.8 ± 2.10%; there were 5 rainy days (showers).

177

178 **Laboratory bioassay**

179 Treated tree branches were sampled at 77 and 429 days after insecticide application and were
180 brought to a laboratory to test the efficacy of insecticides on the targeted *L. lepida* larvae. Two
181 branches from the bottom and top of the canopy were randomly collected from each tree in any
182 compass direction. Each branch was 25–30 cm in length and had approximately 16 leaves.
183 Debris and insects were removed from the branches and leaves before the test. A similar leaf-
184 residue method (*Busvine, 1980*) and a custom setup were used for the larval bioassay (Fig. 2).
185 The specific operational steps were as follows: 1) Each branch was placed vertically in a glass
186 bottle (6 cm in diameter, 9 cm in height) filled with distilled water and sealed at the bottle neck
187 with polystyrene foam; 2) the glass bottles were placed in the center of a plastic funnel (upper
188 diameter, 40 cm; lower diameter, 5 cm; and height, 20 cm); and 3) the funnel was placed on the
189 mouth of another glass bottle with the funnel neck (ca. 4 cm in length) inserted into the glass
190 bottle and secured. This setup served to collect the larval frass in the bottom bottle. The inner
191 wall of the funnel was coated with Teflon cream (Fluon®) to avoid the escape of fallen larvae.

192 *L. lepida* larvae (after being starved for 24 h) were allowed to stabilize for 12 h of observation
193 before the test began. Two larvae were placed on each branch using a brush and allowed to feed
194 on leaves for 5 consecutive days, during which time their frass was collected. The mortality of
195 the larvae feeding on treated leaves was recorded after 5 days. The efficacy of the insecticide
196 was evaluated based on the recorded mortality. Supplementary evaluation information was also
197 recorded, such as the number of leaves eaten or damaged by larvae, and larval frass was weighed
198 using an electronic scale (model EX223, Ohaus Inc., USA).

199

200 **Statistical Analyses**

201 Shapiro-Wilks tests were applied to determine whether the data had a normal distribution and
202 homogeneity of variance. When the data were normally distributed and exhibited similar
203 variances, they were further analyzed using a repeated-measures ANOVA to compare the
204 absorption rates between insecticides (between-subject) and between the examination days
205 (within-subject). The mortality of larvae feeding on the upper and lower isolated branches
206 following trunk injection with different insecticides at 77 days or 429 days was analyzed and
207 compared using a two-way ANOVA and Duncan multiple range tests. The same methods were
208 used to compare the differences in the percentages of damaged leaves and frass amounts between

insecticides and leaf position (i.e., upper or lower branches). When necessary, data were normalized by either square root or logarithmic transformations. All the statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS 14.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

RESULTS

Absorption rates of the insecticides

The quantities of the six insecticides were reduced according to the number of days that had elapsed after the applications (Fig. 3). In particular, insecticide quantities decreased dramatically between the 14th and 30th days. The tests showed that the absorption rates of the insecticides differed significantly between insecticides ($F_{5,36} = 8.899$, $P < 0.001$) and observation times ($F_{3,36} = 14.568$, $P < 0.001$), but the interaction between these two factors was not significant ($F_{15,36} = 0.825$, $P = 0.686$). Within 30 days of the injection, 4 of the insecticides were completely absorbed into the trunks: A+I+O, EB, I+Ca and EB+A. Among these, I+Ca exhibited the fastest injection speed (it was completely absorbed within 14 days) followed by A+I+O and EB+A (23 days). However, only 77.5% of EB+CL and 56.7% of I were absorbed within 30 days. In addition, the absorption rate of EB+CL showed no significant differences in all the measured time points ($P > 0.05$). At the 9-day point, the quantities of A+I+O and I+Ca absorbed were the largest (over 80% of the total).

Larval mortality

Larval mortality after 77 days of treatment differed significantly between insecticides ($F_{6,28} = 23.721$, $P < 0.001$), but neither the leaf position nor the interaction between these two factors was significant ($F_{1,28} = 8.34$, $P = 0.007$; $F_{6,28} = 1.929$, $P = 0.111$; Fig. 4). Larval mortality from the EB+CL treatment was 100%, whereas mortality values from the A+I+O (0~33.3%), I+Ca (0), I (16.7~50%) and EB+A (33.3~66.7%) treatments were not significantly different from that of the control ($P > 0.05$); in fact, A+I+O and I+Ca caused no mortality. Larval mortality 429 days after treatment differed significantly between insecticides ($F_{6,28} = 14.878$, $P < 0.001$), but neither leaf position nor the interaction between these two factors was significant ($F_{1,28} = 0.031$, $P = 0.861$; $F_{6,28} = 0.454$, $P = 0.836$). Again, the mortality from the EB+CL treatment was 100%, while the data for A+I+O (16.7~33.3%) and I+Ca were not significantly different from the controls ($P > 0.05$), especially for I+Ca (mortality = 0). These results indicate that although I+Ca had a good absorption rate after application, it had no insecticide efficacy on the larvae.

241

242 **Leaf loss**

243 After 77 days of treatment, the percentages of damaged leaves were significantly different
244 between insecticides, leaf position and the interaction between these two factors ($F_{6,28}$ = 19.439,
245 $P < 0.001$; $F_{1,28}$ = 43.969, $P < 0.001$; $F_{6,28}$ = 8.921, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 5). The percentage of upper
246 leaves damaged, in total, was approximately 20% or less for EB and EB+CL and significantly
247 less than that for the other treatments ($P < 0.05$). However, in comparison with the upper leaves,
248 the data for lower damaged leaves for all the agents were significantly different from that of the
249 controls ($P < 0.05$). The percentage of lower damaged leaves, in total, was less than 12% for
250 EB+CL, A+I+O and EB (Fig. 3). Notably, the greatest contrast in damaged leaves from the
251 upper (78.7%) and lower branches (8.2%) occurred with the A+I+O treatment. After 429 days,
252 the percentage of damaged leaves was significantly different between insecticides ($F_{6,28}$ = 12.498,
253 $P < 0.001$), but neither the leaf position nor the interaction between these two factors was
254 significant ($F_{1,28}$ = 3.603, P = 0.068; $F_{6,28}$ = 0.76, P = 0.607). The percentages of upper leaves
255 damaged, in total, for EB+CL, EB, A+I+O and I were not significantly different from that of the
256 control ($P > 0.05$); however, they were below the percentages from the other insecticides. The
257 percentages of lower damaged leaves for EB+CL, EB and A+I+O were less than those from I
258 and from the controls ($P < 0.05$).

259

260 **Larval frass**

261 After 77 days of treatment, the frass amount differed significantly between insecticides ($F_{6,28}$ =
262 44.768, $P < 0.001$), but neither the leaf position nor the interaction between these two factors was
263 significant ($F_{1,28}$ = 1.837, P = 0.186; $F_{6,28}$ = 0.424, P = 0.857; Fig. 6). For all the treatments
264 (except I+Ca), the frass amounts were smaller than controls ($P < 0.05$). For EB+CL and EB, the
265 data were more obvious. After 429 days of treatment, the frass amount was significantly different
266 between insecticides and leaf position ($F_{6,28}$ = 65.478, $P < 0.001$; $F_{1,28}$ = 15.061, $P < 0.001$), but
267 the interaction between these two factors was not significant ($F_{6,28}$ = 4.935, P = 0.0015). The
268 frass amounts for EB and EB+CL were smaller than those found in the other treatments ($P <$
269 0.05). The frass amount from larvae on the upper leaves with I+Ca was significantly different
270 from that of the controls ($P < 0.05$); however, for larvae on lower leaves, the frass amount was
271 not significantly different from the controls ($P > 0.05$).

272

DISCUSSION

The selection of appropriate trunk injection agents is key for the successful implementation of trunk injection technology (*Dedek et al., 1986*; *Takai et al., 2004*). For a no-pressure injection system (where the only pressure in the system is that of gravity), it is important for the liquid chemicals in external injection plastic bottles to move into the plants quickly; in other words, this is the first indication of how well the liquid chemicals have been absorbed after application. No-pressure injection systems such as the method used here may seem to be less advantageous because their lack of pressure can make the uptake slow; however, they are inexpensive and simple to use. Here, we found that four insecticides (i.e., A+I+O, EB, I+Ca and EB+A) were completely absorbed into the trunks within 30 days; additionally, more than 80% of A+I+O and I+Ca were absorbed into the trunks after only 9 days. However, for 4% imidacloprid, only 56.7% of the agent was absorbed within 30 days, and its insecticide efficacy on the mortality of *L. lepida* larvae was poor. In contrast, the conductivity and insecticide efficacy of imidacloprid on avocado groves (*Byrne et al., 2012*) and ash trees (*Mota-Sanchez et al., 2009*) were acceptable, although the authors did not mention whether the chemicals were completely absorbed into the plants after application. The reason for this result may be that chemical conductivity was affected by the injection time, procedure, tree size, growth, or even the type, concentration and formulation of the chemicals (*Harrell, 2006*; *McCullough et al., 2005*; *Cowles et al., 2006*; *Tanis et al., 2012*).

It is worthy to note that larval mortality could be produced by using our trunk injection and bioassay method, because the insecticide residues had been detected in leaf samples collected from treated trees, e.g. 16.5~45.6 μg g^{-1} emamectin benzoate occurred in upper leaf tissues after half a year (data now shown), although the sample number was not enough for statistics; while on the other hand, in the control group all larvae were able to maintain normal physiology state and carry out molt. We used the method of trunk injection to complete the conductance or movement of chemical compounds through the tree. The choice of application method was according to local climate conditions. In general, heavy rain occurs during April to early July in southeast of China. Other methods, such as leaf spraying and trunk painting, are more vulnerable to heavy rain, which washes off the insecticide applied to leaves or trunks (*Ichinose et al., 2010*), and the mortality of target pests was significantly fluctuating due to the different degree of rainfall following the application of leaf spraying (*Ichinose et al., 2010*). Meanwhile, the larval bioassay in our study was similar to a leaf-residue method (*Busvine, 1980*), which was contained on the host plant.

We found that EB alone or mixed with other agents (i.e., EB+A and EB+CL) exhibited a

307 better absorption rate and insecticide efficiency. Although only 77.5% of the total amount of
308 EB+CL was absorbed into the injected trees, its insecticide efficiency, based on larval mortality,
309 achieved a level as high as that of EB (>80%). We suggest that the mixture of EB and CL may
310 have a synergistic effect. Interestingly, other chemicals such as A+I+O and I+Ca showed a better
311 absorption rate but a lower insecticide efficiency. Specifically, larval mortality was zero in the
312 I+Ca treatment group, and the surviving larvae could enter the molt stage. However, previous
313 studies have reported that imidacloprid insecticides effectively control many groups of insects,
314 such as sap-feeders and beetles, following trunk injection (*Jeschke & Nauen, 2008; Mota-*
315 *Sanchez et al., 2009*). The reason for the failures that we observed may be that 1) the chemical
316 residue in the leaves was too low to be effective as an insecticide, or our trunk injection of
317 A+I+O and I+Ca may not have provided sufficient volume for a duration of 77 days, and/or 2)
318 although previous studies showed that chemical metabolites were toxic to target insects as well
319 as the parent compound (*Nauen et al., 1998*; *Mota-Sanchez et al., 2009*), it is possible that the
320 effective components of the chemical may be negatively impacted by plant metabolic processes.

321 Previous studies have shown that the concentrations of trunk-injected chemicals among plant
322 tissue types were different among plants as a whole, but that leaves showed much greater
323 concentrations (*Mota-Sanchez et al., 2009*; *Takai et al., 2004*; *Xu et al., 2004*). For example, the
324 imidacloprid concentrations in leaves increased steadily throughout the first growing season and
325 were highest in leaf tissues, also were detected in leaves in the year following the injection
326 (*Mota-Sanchez et al., 2009*). Therefore, for leaf-feeding insect pests, leaf loss was negatively
327 correlated with the chemical concentration in leaves. EB (emamectin benzoate) acts as an
328 antagonist for gamma-aminobutyric acid-gated chloride channels, causing a disruption of nerve
329 impulses and rapid paralysis in a range of Lepidopteran species (*Kass et al., 1980*; *Ishaaya et al.,*
330 *2002*). In addition, it has excellent control effects on nematodes (*Kazuya et al., 1999*; *Cheng et*
331 *al., 2015*) and emerald ash borers (*Flower et al., 2015*) through either trunk or soil injections.
332 Similarly, in our study, we found that the conductivities of both EB+CL and EB were acceptable,
333 and they also had a longer duration of insecticide efficiency (429 days). However, another mixed
334 agent, EB+A, showed insecticide efficacy only on the lower leaves and failed to persist over time.
335 This result may have occurred because the different agent mixtures had different active
336 ingredients in different concentrations. In the A+I+O treatment group, leaf loss from the lower
337 canopy was less than that from the upper canopy, which indicates that higher concentrations of
338 the agent were retained primarily in the lower leaves, or that degradation of the insecticide was
339 higher in the upper canopy.

340 The amount of frass excreted by the insect pests can be used as the main indicator for
341 estimating whether an insecticide is efficient (*Paguia et al., 1980*; *Yang et al., 2006*). In the

present study, we found that the larval frass was affected to various degrees by all the treatments except for I+Ca; however, the frass amounts from the EB and EB+CL treatment groups were below those of the other treatments, which suggest that such chemical agents may have a stronger insecticidal effect on larvae. A previous study demonstrated that a decrease in food uptake was significantly correlated with decreased frass in insect pests (*Yang et al., 2006*). This result corroborates our previous investigation (unpublished data), in which we found that the amount of frass was significantly positively correlated with the extent of leaf damage. Interestingly, insects can reduce the toxicity of chemical agents through an excretion mechanism (*Bues et al., 2005*; *Liu et al., 2006*). Therefore, the detection and analysis of frass could be an important method for further estimating the metabolic residues of injected chemical agents. However, the efficacy of insecticides based on the mortality of the targeted *L. lepida* is the most important prerequisite for choosing suitable trunk-injection insecticides.

CONCLUSION

Overall, we conclude that emamectin benzoate (EB) and emamectin benzoate + clothianidin (EB+CL) trunk-injected insecticides were rapidly absorbed into *O. fragrans*, demonstrated significant insecticide efficacy against *L. lepida*, and remained effective over a longer duration than the other insecticides. However, the safety of these injection insecticides on the flowers of *O. fragrans* must be further studied in future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Professor Wayne B. Hunter and other anonymous referees are thanked for useful comments to improve this manuscript. The authors are grateful for the assistance of Dr. Zhang Shao-yong (School of Forestry and Bio-technology, Zhejiang Agricultural and Forestry University) for his constructive comments regarding the insecticide trunk injections.

REFERENCES

Azharul Islam MD, Yamakawa R, Duc Do N, Numakura N, Suzuki T, Ando T. 2009. Instrumental analysis of terminal conjugated diened for reexamination of the sex pheromone secreted by a nettle moth, *Parasa lepida lepida*. *Bioscience Biotechnology & Biochemistry* 73(5): 1152–1162.

Bues R, Bouvier JC, Boudinhon L. 2005. Insecticide resistance and mechanisms of resistance to selected strains of *Heliciverpa armigera* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in the south of France. *Crop Protection* 24: 814–820.

Busvine JR. 1980. Recommended methods for measurement of pest resistance to pesticides. FAO Plant Production Protect. Paper No. 21, FAO, Rome, 132 pp.

Byrne FJ, Urena AA, Robinson LJ, Krieger RI, Doccola J, Morse JG. 2012. Evaluation of neonicotinoid, organophosphate and avermectin trunk injections for the management of avocado thrips in California avocado groves. *Pest Management Science* 68(5): 811–817.

Cheng XK, Liu XM, Wang HY, Ji XX, Wang KY, Wei M, Qiao K. 2015. Effect of emamectin benzoate on root-knot nematodes and tomato yield. *PLoS One*. 10(10): e0141235.

Cowles RS, Montgomery ME, Cheah CA. 2006. Activity and residues of imidacloprid applied to soil and tree trunks to control hemlock woolly adelgid (Hemiptera: Adelgidae) in forests. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 99(4): 1258–1267.

Darrieutort G, Lecomte P. 2007. Evaluation of a trunk injection technique to control grapevine wood diseases. *Phytopathologia Mediterranea* 46: 50–57.

Dedek W, Grahl R, Mothes B, Schwarz H. 1986. Degradation and excretion of ^{32}P-mehtamidophos after oral administration in lactating cattle. *Archiv Für Experimentelle Veterinrmedizin* 40(4): 621–626.

Doccola JJ, Smitley DR, Davis TW, Aiken JJ, Wild PM. 2011. Tree wound responses following systemic insecticide trunk injection treatments in green ash (*Fraxinus* pennsylvanica Marsh.) as determined by destructive autopsy. *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* 37(1): 6–12.

Flower CE, Dalton JE, Knight KS, Brikha M, Gonzalez-Meler M A. 2015. To treat or not to treat: diminishing effectiveness of emamectin benzoate tree injections in ash trees heavily infested by emerald ash borer. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening* 14(4): 790–795.

Harrell M. 2006. Imidacloprid concentrations in green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*) following treatments with two trunk-injection methods. *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* 32: 126–129.

Herms DA, McCullough DG, Smitley DR, Clifford CS, Cranshaw W. 2014. Insecticide options for protecting ash trees from emerald ash borer, seconded. *North Central IPM*

Center Bulletin 16 pp.

Hirashima Y. 1989. A check list of Japanese insects. Entomological Laboratory, Faculty of Agriculture, Kyushu University, Fukuoka. 1767 pp.

Ichinose K, Miyazi K, Matsuhira K, Yasuda K, Sadoyama Y, Tuan DH, Bang DV. 2010. Unreliable pesticide control of the vector psyllid *Diaphorina citri* (Hemiptera: Psyllidae) for the reduction of microorganism disease transmission. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health Part B* 45: 466–472.

Ishaaya I, Kontsedalov S, Horowitz AR. 2002. Emamectin, a novel insecticide for controlling field crop pests. *Pest Management Science* 58: 1091–1095.

James R, Tisserat N, Todd T. **2006**. Prevention of pine wilt of scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) with systemic abamectin injections. *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* 32(5):195–201.

Jeschke P, Nauen R. 2008. Review: Neonicotinoids-from zero to hero in insecticide chemistry. *Pest Management Science* 64: 1084–1098.

Ju RT, Wang F, Li YZ, Wu SY, Du YZ. 2007. Niche and interspecies competition of four Limacodidae species on green belt plants in Shanghai. *Chinese Journal of Ecology* 26(4): 523–527.

Kass IS, Wang C, Walrond J, Stretton A. 1980. Avermectin B1a, a paralysing anthelmintic that affects interneurons and inhibitory motoneurons in Ascaris. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 77: 6211–6215.

Kazuya T, Soejima T, Suzuki T, Kawazu K. 1999. Studies on development of a novel trunk-injection agent against the pine wilt disease. *Pest Management Science* 56: 10.

Lee HH, Lin CT, Yang LL. 2007. Neuroprotection and free radical scavenging effects of *Osmanthus fragrans*. *Journal of Biomedical Science* 14(6): 819–827.

Liu, LC & Xiang, QH. 2003. Reseach progress on *Osmanthus genus*. *Journal of Nanjing Forestry University* 27(2): 84–88.

Liu NN, Zhu F, Xu Q, Pridgeon JW, Gao XW. **2006.** Behavioral change, physiological modification, and metabolic detoxification: mechanisms of insecticide resistance. *Acta Entomologica Sinica* 49(4): 671–679.

Mendel RM. 1998. Trunk applications of imidacloprid to orange trees and related effects of the

active ingredient formulation and the water supply to the trees. *University of Bonn*189 pp.

McCullough DG, Cappaert D, Poland TM, Lewis P, Molongoski J. 2005. Long-term (three-year) results of truck injections for emerald ash borer control in landscape ash trees. In: Proceedings of Emerald Ash Borer Research and Technology Development Meeting. USDA Forest Service Publication, Pittsburgh, PA, 31–33.

McCullough DG, Poland TM, Anulewicz AC, Lewis P, Cappaert D. 2011. Evaluation of *Agrilus planipennis* (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) control provided by emamectin benzoate and two neonicotinoid insecticides, one and two seasons after treatment. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 104: 1599–1612.

Montecchio L. 2013. A venturi effect can help cure our trees. *Journal of Visualized Experiments* (80). e51199-e51199.

Mota-Sanchez D, Cregg BM, McCullough DG, Poland TM, Hollingworth RM. 2009. Distribution of trunk-injected 14C-imidacloprid in ash trees and effects on emerald ash borer (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) adults. *Crop Protection* 28: 655–661.

Nauen R, Koob B, Elbert A. 1998. Antifeedant effects of sublethal dosages of imidacloprid on *Bemisia tabaci*. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* 88: 287–293.

Navarro C. 1992. A low-pressure, trunk-injection method for introducing chemical formulations into olive trees. *Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science* 117(2): 357–360.

Paguia P. Pathak MD, Heinrichs EA. 1980. Honeydew excretion measurement techniques for determining differential feeding activity of biotypes of *Nilaparvata lugens* on rice varieties. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 73: 35–40.

Qin ZH, Li CP, Han YM. 1998. Investigation on morphology of pathogenic eucleidae larva and toxigenic spine. *Chinese Journal of Parasitic Disease control* 11(3): 217–219.

Smitley DR, Doccola JJ, Cox DL. 2010. Multiple-year protection of ash treesfrom emerald ash borer with a single trunk injection of emamectin benzoate, and single-year protection with an imidacloprid basal drench. *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* 36 (5): 206–211.

Takai K, Soejima T, Suzuki T, Kawazu K. 2001. Development of a water-soluble preparation of emamectin benzoate and its preventative effect against the wilting of pot-grown pine trees inoculated with the pine wood nematode, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*. *Pest Management Science* 57(5): 463–466.

Takai K, Suzuki T, Kawazu K. 2004. Distribution and persistence of emamectin benzoate at efficacious concentrations in pine tissues after injection of a liquid formulation. *Pest Management Science* 60 (1): 42–48.

Tanis SR, Cregg BM, Mota-Sanchez D, McCullough DG, Poland TM. 2012. Spatial and temporal distribution of trunk-injected (14) C-imidacloprid in Fraxinus trees. *Pest Management Science* 68(4): 529–536.

Wakamura S, Tanaka H, Masumoto Y, Sawada H, Toyohara N. 2007. Sex pheromone of the blue-striped nettle grub moth *Parasa lepida* (Cramer) (Lepidoptera: Limacodidae): identification and field attraction. *Applied Entomology and Zoology* 42 (3): 347–352.

Wang HS, Pan YM, Tang XJ, Huang ZQ. 2006. Isolation and characterization of melanin from '*Osmanthus fragrans*' seeds. *LWT- Food Science and Technology* 39(5): 496–502.

Yang ZD, Zhu L, Zhao BG, Fang J, Xia LQ. **2006**. Inhibitory effects of alkaloids from *Sophora alopecuroidson* feeding, development and reproduction of *Clostera anastomosis*. *Scientia Silvae Sinicae* 41(4):106–111.

Table 1(on next page)

Active ingredients and their formulation for the trunk injection.

Active ingredients and their formulation for the trunk injection.

1 Table 1. Active ingredients and their formulation for the trunk injection.

Trunk injection chemicals (abbreviation or code)	Formulation or composition	Active ingredient percentage (%)
EB+CL	Emamectin benzoate + clothianidin	10
A+I+O	Abamectin + imidacloprid + omethoate	21
EB	Emamectin benzoate	2.5
I	Imidacloprid	4
I+Ca	Imidacloprid + carbosulfan	4
EB+A	Emamectin benzoate+abamectin	2.5

2

3

Figure 1(on next page)

Structure diagram of the plastic bottle.

Structure diagram of the plastic bottle (injection device). Two main parts of the bottle, i.e. bottle body (containing chemicals) and bottle tip (inserting the drilled hole).


Practicality picture of bottle tip
Screw thread
Bottle tip
Upper and lower seperated
Bottle body
Air hole

Figure 2(on next page)

A diagram of the setup for larval bioassay.

A diagram of the setup for larval bioassay.


Isolated branch
Glass bottle
(Placing and fixing branch)
Plastic funnel
Glass bottle
(Collecting larvae frass)

Figure 3(on next page)

Absorption rate of insecticides

<!--[if !supportAnnotations]--> <!--[endif]--> Mean (±SE) percentage (%) of the six types of insecticides (EB+Cl, A+I+O, EB, I, I+Ca, and EB+A) absorbed into the trunk of *Osmamthus fragrans* at 9, 14, 23, and 30 days after application of trunk injection. $N = 18$ trees. Insecticides (between-subjects) and observation time (within-subjects) effects were significant ($P < 0.001$); Insecticides ´ observation time interaction effect was not significant. Bars labeled with different lowercase letters are significantly different at $P = 0.05$ from each other in the same insecticide group based on Dunn's range test.


EB+Cl
A+I+O
EB
I
I+Ca
EB+A
Percentage (%)
Days after treatment
9
14
23
30
Percentage of remaining liquid
Percentage of introducing liquid

Figure 4(on next page)

Larval mortality

<!--[if !supportAnnotations]--> <!--[endif]--> Mean (±SE) mortality of *Latoia lepida* larvae on upper and lower leaves collected from *Osmamthus fragrans* trees treated with the insecticides of EB+CL, A+I+O , EB, I, I+Ca, and EB+A, by trunk injection after 77 and 429 days, respectively. $N = 42$ isolated branches in each observation time. Any observation time, insecticides effect was significant ($P < 0.001$); leaf position and insecticides × leaf position interaction effects were not significant. Bars labeled with different lowercase or uppercase letters are significantly different at $P = 0.05$ from each other in the same leaf layer group (upper or lower leaves) based on Dunn's range test.


77 days after treatment
429 days after treatment
Mortality (%) of Saddleback
100
80
60
40
20
0
a A
b
BC
a AB
b
AB
b C
ab
AB
b C
a A
ab
AB
a A
ab
B
b B
ab B
b B
EB+Cl
A+I+O
EB
I
I+Ca
EB+A
CK
Insecticide
Upper leaves
Lower leaves
Dead individual
(Body turns black)

Figure 5(on next page)

Percentage of damaged leaves

Mean (±SE) percentage of damaged leaves collected from upper and lower canopies after the application of six types of trunk injection at 77 and 429 days. $N = 42$ isolated branches in each observation time. 77 days after treatment, insecticides, leaf position, and insecticides ´ leaf position interaction effects were significant ($P < 0.001$); 429 days after treatment, insecticides effect was significant ($P < 0.001$), and leaf position and insecticides × leaf position interaction effects were not significant. Bars labeled with different lowercase or uppercase letters are significantly different at $P = 0.05$ from each other in the same leaf layer group (upper or lower leaves) based on Dunn's range test.


77 days after treatment
429 days after treatment
Percentage (%) of damaged leaves
Damaged leaves
EB+Cl
A+I+O
EB
I
I+Ca
EB+A
CK
Insecticide
Upper leaves
Lower leaves

Figure 6(on next page)

Frass amounts of *L. Lepida* larvae

Mean (±SE) frass amounts of *L. Lepida* larvae fed on upper and lower isolated leaves for 5 consecutive days after the application of six types of trunk injection at 77 and 429 days. $N = 42$ isolated branches in each observation time. 77 days after treatment, insecticides effect was significant ($P < 0.001$), and leaf position and insecticides × leaf position interaction effects were not significant. 429 days after treatment, insecticides and leaf position effects were significant ($P < 0.001$), and insecticides × leaf position interaction effect was not significant. Bars labeled with different lowercase or uppercase letters are significantly different at $P = 0.05$ from each other in the same leaf layer group (upper or lower leaves) based on Dunn's range test.


77 days after treatment
429 days after treatment
Frass amount of Saddleback (g)
1.5
1.2
0.9
0.6
0.3
0
d
D
b
BC
d
D
c
C
ab
AB
c
C
a
A
d
CD
c
C
d
D
b
C
b
A
bc
B
a
A
EB+Cl
A+I+O
EB
I
I+Ca
EB+A
CK
Insecticide
Upper leaves
Lower leaves