

Natural products for biocontrol: Fate in the environment and impact on biodiversity

Laure Mamy, Cédric Bertrand, Bruno Chauvel, M.-F. Corio-Costet, Fabrice Martin-Laurent, Sophie Le Perchec, Marcel Amichot

▶ **To cite this version:**

Laure Mamy, Cédric Bertrand, Bruno Chauvel, M.-F. Corio-Costet, Fabrice Martin-Laurent, et al.. Natural products for biocontrol: Fate in the environment and impact on biodiversity. 5. Congress Natural products & Biocontrol 2022, Sep 2022, Perpignan, France. pp.78. hal-03788918

HAL Id: hal-03788918
https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03788918

Submitted on 27 Sep 2022

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.



Natural products for biocontrol: Fate in the environment and impact on biodiversity

Laure Mamy[1], Cédric Bertrand[2], Bruno Chauvel[3], Marie-France Corio-Costet[4], Fabrice Martin-Laurent[3], Sophie Le Perchec[5], Marcel Amichot[6]

[1] INRAE-UMR ECOSYS, Equipe Science du Sol 78850 Thiverval-Grignon, France (laure.mamy@inrae.fr)
[2] Université de Perpignan Via Domitia CRIOBE UAR 3278 CNRS-EPHE-UPVD 66860 Perpignan, France
[3] Agroécologie, INRAE, Institut Agro, Univ. Bourgogne, Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté 21000 Dijon, France
[4] INRAE-UMR SAVE, 33883 Villenave d'ornon, France
[5] INRAE UAR DISPO 35042 Rennes, France
[6] INRAE Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, UMR ISA, Team "Communities' Ecology in Agrosystems", Sophia Antipolis, 06903, France

Introduction

Introduction

Context

- Preservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services is critical for sustainable development and human well-being
- Unprecedented erosion of biodiversity observed for many years
- Chemical pollution, including plant protection products (PPPs), is one of the main cause of biodiversity decline (IPBES, 2019)

➢ French collective scientific assessment (scientific literature survey): Impacts of PPPs on biodiversity and ecosystem services



Collective scientific assessment
Plant protection products
Biodiversity
Ecosystem services


INRAE

Ifremer

https://www.inrae.fr/en/news/impacts-plant-protection-products-biodiversity-and-ecosystem-services-findings-inrae-ifremer-collective-scientific-expert-report

Introduction

Collective scientific assessment on the impacts of PPPs on biodiversity and ecosystem services



- Contamination
- Land use and transfers
- Effects on:
  - Primary producers
  - Microorganisms
  - Terrestrial invertebrates
  - Aquatic inverterbrates
  - Terrestrial vertebrates
  - Aquatic vertebrates
- Propagation
- Ecosystem services
- Biocontrol
- Modelling
- Regulation

- **Biocontrol:** Set of crop protection methods defined as agents and products using natural mechanisms in the context of integrated pest management

Introduction

Objective and approach

Objective

➢ **To determine the sustainability of biocontrol solutions**

Approach

➢ To review:

- The contamination of the environment by biocontrol solutions
- The fate of biocontrol solutions in the environment
- The effects of biocontrol solutions on the biodiversity
- The effects of biocontrol solutions compared to those of conventional PPPs


© Xavier Remongin / agriculture.gouv.fr

Biocontrol solutions

Biocontrol solutions

Macroorganisms (examples)

Predators













Parasitoids













Nematodes





Biocontrol solutions

Microorganisms (examples)

Bacteria

- *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens*
- *Bacillus firmus*
- *Bacillus pumilus*
- *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt)
- *Bacillus subtilis*
- *Pseudomonas*




Fungi

- *Beauveria bassiana*
- *Clonostachys rosea*
- *Metarhizium anisopliae*
- *Pythium oligandrum*
- *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*
- *Trichoderma atroviride*



Virus

- *Cydia pomonella granulosis virus*
- *Pepino mosaic virus*
- *Polyhedrosis nucleus virus*



Biocontrol solutions

Natural substances (examples)

Plants

- 6-benzyladenine
- Caprylic acid
- Eugenol
- Fatty acids
- Garlic extract
- Geraniol
- Gibberelins
- Heptamaloxyloglucan
- Maltodextrin
- Orange oil
- Pelargonic acid
- Pyrethrins
- Rape oil
- Terpenoids mixture
- Thymol



Minerals

- Disodium phosphonate
- Ferric phosphate
- Iron sulfate
- Kaolin
- Paraffin oil
- Potassium hydrogenocarbonate
- Potassium phosphonate
- Quartz sand
- Sulfur




Animals

- Blood meal
- COS-OGA
- Fish oil
- Sheep fat



Microbial

- Abamectin
- Acetic acid
- Cerevisane
- Diatomaceous earth
- Spinosad




Biocontrol solutions


Semiochemicals (examples)

- Straight chain lepidopteran pheromones


Tetradecyl acetate




(E)-5-decen-1-yl acetate



(Z)-7-dodecen-1-yl acetate



(E)-8-dodecen-1-yl acetate



From EFSA (2021)







Biocontrol solutions

Example of the France case study


➢ Biocontrol market booming : 12% of PPPs market in 2020, 30% expected in 2030 (IBMA, 2021)



Use of biocontrol solutions
(% market share 2020) (IBMA, 2021)
NB : Sulfur is the most used solution



Number of active substances, micro and macroorganisms species per fungicide, insecticide or herbicide use (DGAL, 2021)



Sales of biocontrol solutions
(% market share 2020) (IBMA, 2021)

Bibliographic corpus

Bibliographic corpus


Definition of queries and keywords

Query 1	Query 2	Query 3
General	*Microorganisms, Natural substances, Semiochemicals*	*Macroorganisms*
Unspecific keywords / Biocontrol	French list of biocontrol plant protection products of the Rural Code and Maritime Fishing	French decree Décrets, arrêtés, circulaires TEXTES GÉNÉRAUX MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE, DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE ET DE LA FORÊT anses Macroorganisms notices *Innovations Agronomiques 79 (2020), 425-439* **Macroorganismes de biocontrôle en France, état des lieux** *Biocontrol macroorganisms in France, state of the art* Robin D.C.[1], Marchand P.A.[1]
Biological control Biocontrol Semiochemical Natural extract Plant extract Natural substance Biopesticide, etc.	*Bacillus thuringiensis* *Beauveria bassiana* *Trichoderma asperellum* Straight chain lepidopteran pheromone Abamectin Acetic acid Eugenol Heptamaloxyloglucan, etc.	*Adalia bipunctata* *Bombus terrestris* *Chrysoperla carnea* *Harmonia axyridis* *Leptomastidea abnormis* *Orius laevigatus* *Osmia bicornis* *Trichogramma achaeae,* etc.

ANSES: French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety


Bibliographic corpus

Selection of papers in the Web of Science™ (WoS) from 2000 to 2020



Bibliographic corpus

Distribution of papers according to the usage of biocontrol products



- Huge number of papers / insecticides, fungicides
- Very low number of papers / herbicides, molluscicides
- Consistency between the number of papers and the sale volumes (France case study), except for molluscicides

Contamination of the environment by biocontrol solutions

Contamination of the environment

- Biocontrol compounds are very rarely searched in the environment
- Some of them are naturally present: fatty acids, potassium hydrogen carbonate, aluminum silicate, sulfur...
  - ➢ Fraction coming from products / native fraction?
- Some compounds have a chemical nature that is not compatible with analytical monitoring: blood meal, fish oil, sheep fat...

➢ **Very few results for exogenous biocontrol substances that can be measured in the environment**




Contamination of the environment

Pyrethrins < LOQ
(French AASQA, 2011 & 2016)

Abamectin? Analytical problems (ANSES, 2020)

Pheromones detected some hours after dispensers removal in USA
(Koch et al., 2009)



Bt + Cry toxins up to 28 months
(Vettori et al., 2003)

No data

No data

Bt + Cry4Aa and Cry4Ba toxins after several months
(Tetreau et al., 2012)


Bt: *Bacillus thuringiensis*
LOQ: Limit of quantification


Fate of biocontrol solutions in the environment

Fate in the environment


Natural substances





Boxplots of the distribution of DT50 and Koc of natural substances
(From Mamy and Barriuso, 2022)



- Many natural substances have a low persistence in the environment

ⓘ The degradation may produce transformation products (abamectin, spinosad)

- Some substances are immobile contrary to others having high mobility


➡ Risk of groundwater contamination

➢ **Lack of persistence and mobility data for several substances**

DT50: Degradation half-life in soil
Koc: Adsorption coefficient in soil

Fate in the environment

Microorganisms, macroorganisms and semiochemicals



Microorganisms

- Fungal-based insecticides are persistent in the environment (Meyling and Eilenberg, 2007)
- Persistence of Bt insecticide several months and years (Tetreau et al., 2012; Bruhl et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021)
- Fungal-based and bacteria-based fungicides are not persistent (Kohl et al., 2019)



Macroorganisms

- Persistence in the short term well known (efficacy)
- Persistence in the long term?



Semiochemicals

- No data


➢ **Lack of data to characterize the fate of microoorganims, macroorganisms and semiochemicals in the environment**

Ecotoxicological effects of biocontrol solutions and impact on biodiversity

Microorganisms

Summary of observed effects

- Most of results for Bt bacteria, some results for *Beauveria Bassiana* and *Metarhizium anisopliae* fungi, no result for virus



Negative effect
No effect

Bt: *Bacillus thuringiensis*

Microorganisms

Example of *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt)

Interactions with biocontrol agents

Parasitoids (*Habrobracon hebetor*)
(Oluwafemi et al., 2019)
↘ Emergence rate

Parasitoids (*Trichogramma chilonis*)
(Amichot et al., 2016)
↗ Life duration

Entomopathogenic nematodes
(Lanzoni et al., 2014; Oestergaard et al., 2006)

Entomopathogenic fungi
(Mantzoukas et al., 2013)

Natural substances (Abamectin)
(Zhu et al., 2006)

Predators
(*O. strigicollis*, *S. cantonensis*)



Ecotoxicological effects

↘ **Arthropod food resources for birds**
(Awkerman et al., 2011; Poulin and Lefebvre, 2018)

Soil microorganisms (Ferreira et al., 2003)
↘ **Development of drosophila** (Babin et al., 2020)

Batracian larvae (Weeks and Paris, 2020)
Soil arthropods (Beck et al., 2004)
Spiders (Bajwa and Aliniazee, 2001)

Survival, longevity, pollen consumption and physiology of bees (Dai et al., 2012)

No transfer along the maize-slug-carabid food chain
Reproduction of carabids (Harwood et al., 2006)

➢ **High complexity of interactions between Bt and biocontrol agents and between Bt and other (micro)organisms**


Microorganisms

Main conclusions

- Limited impact of microorganisms on soil micro-biodiversity, except for Bt
- Some effects of fungi on various organisms

➢ **Need of more data:**

- **Impacts of microorganisms on biodiversity**
- **Impacts of virus**
- **Invasion of microorganisms**
- **“Cocktail” effects on local biodiversity**
- **Effects on ecological functions and ecosystem services**




©Lucile Wargniez

Macroorganisms

Summary of observed effects

- Affect the biodiversity through their mode of feeding, their ability to move and their ability to reproduce



Negative effect
No effect
Positive effect

Macroorganisms

Example of *Harmonia axyridis* predator escape

- Introduction to impose top-down population regulation of pests, in particular aphids



Intraguild predation
(Gardiner and Landis, 2007)

Canibalism
(Rondoni et al., 2012;
Tayeh et al., 2014)

Invasion
(Lombaert et al., 2014)

Decrease in biodiversity of native species
(Li et al., 2021)

Early reproduction and during a longer time
(Tayeh et al., 2015)

➢ **Illustration of what should not be done in biocontrol**

Negative effect
No effect
Positive effect

Macroorganisms

Main conclusions

- High complexity of modes of action
- Interactions among them or with local organisms
- Direct interactions: predation, parasitism, hybridation
- Indirect interactions: competition for resources
- Change in host or preys

➢ **“Cocktail” effects on local biodiversity?**


➢ **Effects on ecological functions and ecosystem services?**



Natural substances

Summary of observed effects



- Most of results for abamectin, spinosad and pyrethrins


ⓘ **Similar modes of action as conventional PPPs**

- **Observed ecotoxicity of natural substances, especially abamectin and spinosad**

Natural substances

Main conclusions

- In general, natural substances have a low ecotoxicity
- But, some of them have high ecotoxicity (abamectin, spinosad...)
- Lack of data for numerous substances



Boxplots of the distribution of PNEC of natural substances
(From Mamy and Barriuso, 2022)

➢ **Need of more data:**

- **Impacts of natural substances on biodiversity**
- **Chronic effects at low doses**
- **"Cocktail" effects on local biodiversity**
- **Effects on ecological functions and ecosystem services**



PNEC: Predicted No Effect Concentration

Semiochemicals

- **No data!**

- Comparison of the effects of biocontrol solutions with those of conventional PPPs

Effects of biocontrol solutions / conventional PPPs

- Biocontrol solutions seem to have lower ecotoxicity than conventional PPPs, but there are some exceptions

➢ **Need of more data**

Conclusion

Conclusion (1/2)

➢ **Very few results in the literature**

Microorganisms

- High persistence of some insecticides (Bt), low persistence of fungicides
- Some observed effects
- Change in soil biodiversity?
- Invasion of non native species?

Natural substances

- Low persistence in the environment
- Low ecotoxicity / conventional PPPs
- ⓘ Abamectin, spinosad, pyrethrins
- Contamination?

Macroorganisms

- Direct effects: predation, hybridation
- Indirect effects: competition / resources
- Decrease in local biodiversity (*H. axyridis*)
- Persistence in the long term?

Semiochemicals

- ?



Bt : *Bacillus Thuringiensis*

Conclusion (2/2)

- Contamination?
- Chronic effects?
- “Cocktail” effects?
- Effects on ecological functions and ecosystem services?
- Nanoparticules?
- Risk assessment and regulation?
- Management of potential invasion?
- Biocontrol / conventional PPPs?



➢ **Biocontrol is a promising alternative to conventional PPPs, but it depends on the type of solution (and lack of herbicide solutions)**

➢ **Numerous research still remains to be done**

Ackowledgements

- Scientific Committee of the 5th Congress on Natural products & Biocontrol
- Nicolas Ris (INRAE) for his expertise on macroorganisms
- Thierry Caquet, INRAE Scientific Director of Environment, and the general directorate of Ifremer
- Guy Richard, head of the INRAE Directorate for Expertise, Foresight and Advanced Studies (DEPE)
- Illustrations: Lucile Wargniez
- Graphic designer: Sacha Desbourdes (INRAE)
- Oversight Committee
- Stakeholder Advisory Committee
- ANSES
- Backers: French Ministries of Ecological Transition, Agriculture and Food, and Higher education, Research and Innovation
- Funding: French Office for Biodiversity (OFB)

MINISTÈRE DE LA TRANSITION ÉCOLOGIQUE
Liberté Égalité Fraternité

MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DE L'ALIMENTATION
Liberté Égalité Fraternité

MINISTÈRE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR, DE LA RECHERCHE ET DE L'INNOVATION
Liberté Égalité Fraternité

RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE
Liberté Égalité Fraternité

OFB OFFICE FRANÇAIS DE LA BIODIVERSITÉ

Ifremer

INRAE

References (1/2)

- Al-Assiuty, A.; Khalil, M.A.; Ismail, A.W.A.; van Straalen, N.M.; Ageba, M.F., 2014. Effects of fungicides and biofungicides on population density and community structure of soil oribatid mites. Sci Total Environ 466: 412-420.
- Amichot, M.; Curty, C.; Benguettat-Magliano, O.; Gallet, A.; Wajnberg, E., 2016. Side effects of Bacillus thuringiensis var. kurstaki on the hymenopterous parasitic wasp Trichogramma chilonis. Environ Sci Pollut Res 23 (4): 3097-3103.
- ANSES, 2020. Campagne nationale exploratoire des pesticides dans l'air ambiant. Premières interprétations sanitaires. Préambule. Rapport d'appui scientifique et technique révisé. Paris: ANSES, 146 p. https://www.anses.fr/fr/system/files/AIR2020SA0030Ra.pdf
- Awkerman, J.A.; Marshall, M.R.; Williams, A.B.; Gale, G.A.; Cooper, R.J.; Raimondo, S., 2011. Assessment of indirect pesticide effects on worm-eating warbler populations in a managed forest ecosystem. Environ Tox Chem 30 (8): 1843-1851.
- Babin, A.; Nawrot-Esposito, M.P.; Gallet, A.; Gatti, J.L.; Poirie, M., 2020. Differential side-effects of Bacillus thuringiensis bioinsecticide on non-target Drosophila flies. Scient Rep 10 (1): 16.
- Bajwa, W.I.; Aliniazee, M.T., 2001. Spider fauna in apple ecosystem of western Oregon and its field susceptibility to chemical and microbial insecticides. J Eco Entomol 94 (1): 68-75
- Beck, L.; Rombke, J.; Ruf, A.; Prinzing, A.; Woas, S., 2004. Effects of diflubenzuron and Bacillus thuringiensis var. kurstaki toxin on soil invertebrates of a mixed deciduous forest in the Upper Rhine Valley, Germany. Eur J Soil Biol 40 (1): 55-62.
- Biondi, A.; Desneux, N.; Siscaro, G.; Zappala, L., 2012. Using organic-certified rather than synthetic pesticides may not be safer for biological control agents: Selectivity and side effects of 14 pesticides on the predator Orius laevigatus. Chemosphere, 87 (7): 803-812.
- Botina, L.L.; Bernardes, R.C.; Barbosa, W.F.; Lima, M.A.P.; Guedes, R.N.C.; Martins, G.F., 2020. Toxicological assessments of agrochemical effects on stingless bees (Apidae, Meliponini). Methodsx 7: 18.
- Bruhl, C.A.; Despres, L.; Fror, O.; Patil, C.D.; Poulin, B.; Tetreau, G.; Allgeier, S., 2020. Environmental and socioeconomic effects of mosquito control in Europe using the biocide Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. israelensis (Bti). Sci Tot Environ 724: 16.
- Bundy, J.G.; Paton, G.I.; Campbell, C.D., 2004. Combined microbial community level and single species biosensor responses to monitor recovery of oil polluted soil. Soil Biol Biochem 36 (7): 1149-1159.
- Carcamo, H.A.; Parkinson, D.; Volney, J.W.A., 1998. Effects of sulphur contamination on macroinvertebrates in Canadian pine forests. App Soil Ecol 9 (1-3): 459-464.
- Chen, H.J.; Zhao, S.; Zhang, K.K.; Zhao, J.M.; Jiang, J.; Chen, F.D.; Fang, W.M., 2018. Evaluation of soil-Applied chemical fungicide and biofungicide for control of the Fusarium Wilt of Chrysanthemum and their effects on rhizosphere soil microbiota. Agriculture-Basel, 8 (12): 15
- Czerwonka, G.; Konieczna, I.; Zarnowiec, P.; Zielinski, A.; Malinowska-Gniewosz, A.; Galuszka, A.; Migaszewski, Z.; Kaca, W., 2017. Characterization of Microbial Communities in Acidified, Sulfur Containing Soils. Polish J Microbiol 66 (4): 509-517.
- Dai, P.L.; Zhou, W.; Zhang, J.; Jiang, W.Y.; Wang, Q.; Cui, H.J.; Sun, J.H.; Wu, Y.Y.; Zhou, T., 2012. The effects of Bt Cry1Ah toxin on worker honeybees (Apis mellifera ligustica and Apis cerana cerana). Apidologie 43 (4): 384-391.
- D'Avila, V.A.; Barbosa, W.F.; Guedes, R.N.C.; Cutler, G.C., 2018. Effects of Spinosad, Imidacloprid, and Lambda-cyhalothrin on Survival, Parasitism, and Reproduction of the Aphid Parasitoid Aphidius colemani. Journal of Econom Entomo 111 (3): 1096-1103.
- DGAL, 2021. Liste des produits phytopharmaceutiques de biocontrôle, au titre des aticles L.253-5 et L.253-7 du code rural et de la pêche maritime. In: Direction générale de l'alimentation, S.-d.d.l.s.e.d.l.p.d.v., Bureau des Intrants et du Biocontrôle, ed. DGAL/SDSPV/2021-277. 14 p.
- Duchet, C.; Coutellec, M.A.; Franquet, E.; Lagneau, C.; Lagadic, L., 2010. Population-level effects of spinosad and Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis in Daphnia pulex and Daphnia magna: comparison of laboratory and field microcosm exposure conditions. Ecotoxicology 19 (7): 1224-1237.
- EFSA, 2008. Conclusion regarding the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance sulfur. EFSA Scientific Report, 221: 70 p.
- EFSA, 2009. Conclusion regarding the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance paraffin oils (CAS 64742-46-7, 72623-86-0, 97862-82-3). EFSA J 7 (4): 59 p
- EFSA, 2013. Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance pyrethrins. EFSA J 11 (1): 3032
- EFSA, 2018. Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance spinosad. EFSA J 16 (5): 33
- EFSA, 2020. Peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance abamectin. EFSA J 18 (8): 28.
- EFSA, 2021. Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance Straight Chain Lepidopteran Pheromones (SCLPs). EFSA 19(6):6656, 30 pp.
- Engelen, B.; Meinken, K.; von Wintzintgerode, F.; Heuer, H.; Malkomes, H.P.; Backhaus, H., 1998. Monitoring impact of a pesticide treatment on bacterial soil communities by metabolic and genetic fingerprinting in addition to conventional testing procedures. App Environ Microbiol 64 (8): 2814-2821.
- Erlacher, E.; Loibner, A.P.; Kendler, R.; Scherr, K.E., 2013. Distillation fraction-specific ecotoxicological evaluation of a paraffin-rich crude oil. Environ Pollut 174: 236-243
- Ferreira, L.; Molina, J.C.; Brasil, C.; Andrade, G., 2003. Evaluation of Bacillus thuringiensis bioinsecticidal protein effects on soil microorganisms. Plant Soil 256 (1): 161-168.
- Fournier, B.; Dos Santos, S.P.; Gustavsen, J.A.; Imfeld, G.; Lamy, F.; Mitchell, E.A.D.; Mota, M.; Noll, D.; Planchamp, C.; Heger, T.J., 2020. Impact of a synthetic fungicide (fosetyl-Al and propamocarb-hydrochloride) and a biopesticide (Clonostachys rosea) on soil bacterial, fungal, and protist communities. Sci Tot Environ 738: 10.
- French AASQA, 2011 & 2016. https://www.atmo-france.org/article/phytatmo
- Gardiner, M.M.; Landis, D.A., 2007. Impact of intraguild predation by adult Harmonia axyridis (Coleoptera : Coccinellidae) on Aphis glycines (Hemiptera : Aphididae) biological control in cage studies. Biol Cont, 40 (3): 386-395.
- Gradish, A.E.; Scott-Dupree, C.D.; Shipp, L.; Harris, C.R.; Ferguson, G., 2011. Effect of reduced risk pesticides on greenhouse vegetable arthropod biological control agents. Pest Manage Sci 67 (1): 82-86.
- Harwood, J.D.; Samson, R.A.; Obrycki, J.J., 2006. No evidence for the uptake of Cry1Ab Bt-endotoxins by the generalist predator Scarites subterraneus (Coleoptera : Carabidae) in laboratory and field experiments. Biocontrol Sci Tech 16 (4): 377-388.

References (2/2)

- IBMA, 2021. Les culturales 15-16-17 juin 2021 Terralab, Betheny (51) : Dossier de presse. Paris: International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association, 9 p. https://www.ibmafrance.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/210615_Dossier_Presse_IBMA_France.pdf
- IPBES, 2019. Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Brondizio ES, Settele J, Díaz S, Ngo HT (Eds). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany. 1148 p.
- James, D.G., 2003. Pesticide susceptibility of two coccinellids (Stethorus punctum picipes and Harmonia axyridis) important in biological control of mites and aphids in Washington hops. Biocontrol Sci Technol 13 (2): 253-259.
- Karagounis, C.; Kourdoumbalos, A.K.; Margaritopoulos, J.T.; Nanos, G.D.; Tsitsipis, J.A., 2006. Organic farming-compatible insecticides against the aphid Myzus persicae (Sulzer) in peach orchards. J App Entomol 130 (3): 150-154.
- Koch, U.T.; Luder, W.; Andrick, U.; Staten, R.T.; Carde, R.T., 2009. Measurement by electroantennogram of airborne pheromone in cotton treated for mating disruption of Pectinophora gossypiella following removal of pheromone dispensers. Entomol Exp Applic 130 (1): 1-9.
- Kohl, J.; Kolnaar, R.; Ravensberg, W.J., 2019. Mode of Action of Microbial Biological Control Agents Against Plant Diseases: Relevance Beyond Efficacy. Front Plant Sci 10: 19.
- Kolar, L.; Erzen, N.K.; Hogerwerf, L.; van Gestel, C.A.M., 2008. Toxicity of abamectin and doramectin to soil invertebrates. Environ Pollut 151 (1): 182-189.
- Lanzoni, A.; Ade, G.; Martelli, R.; Radeghieri, P.; Pezzi, F., 2014. Technological aspects of Steinernema carpocapsae spray application alone or mixed with Bacillus thuringiensis aizawai in spinach crop. Bull Insectology 67 (1): 115-123.
- Larkin, R.P., 2016. Impacts of biocontrol products on Rhizoctonia disease of potato and soil microbial communities, and their persistence in soil. Crop Protec 90: 96-105.
- Li, H.R.; Li, B.P.; Lovei, G.L.; Kring, T.J.; Obrycki, J.J., 2021. Interactions Among Native and Non-Native Predatory Coccinellidae Influence Biological Control and Biodiversity. Ann Entomol Soc Am 114 (2): 119-136.
- Liu, T.X.; Irungu, R.W.; Dean, D.A.; Harris, M.K., 2013. Impacts of spinosad and lambda-cyhalothrin on spider communities in cabbage fields in south Texas. Ecotoxicology, 22 (3): 528-537
- Liu, J.; Liang, Y.S.; Hu, T.; Zeng, H.; Gao, R.; Wang, L.; Xiao, Y.H., 2021. Environmental fate of Bt proteins in soil: Transport, adsorption/desorption and degradation. Ecotox Environ Safe 226: 14.
- Lombaert, E.; Estoup, A.; Facon, B.; Joubard, B.; Gregoire, J.C.; Jannin, A.; Blin, A.; Guillemaud, T., 2014. Rapid increase in dispersal during range expansion in the invasive ladybird Harmonia axyridis. J Evol Biol 27 (3): 508-517.
- Malagnoux, L.; Capowiez, Y.; Rault, M., 2015. Impact of insecticide exposure on the predation activity of the European earwig Forficula auricularia. Environ Sci Pollut Res 22 (18): 14116-14126.
- Mamy, L.; Barriuso, E., 2022. Les substances naturelles : une alternative aux pesticides de synthèse. L'Actualité Chimique, 470: 9-14.
- Mantzoukas, S.; Milonas, P.; Kontodimas, D.; Angelopoulos, K., 2013. Interaction between the entomopathogenic bacterium Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. kurstaki and two entomopathogenic fungi in bio-control of Sesamia nonagrioides (Lefebvre) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Ann Microbiol 63 (3): 1083-1091.
- Marliac, G.; Mazzia, C.; Pasquet, A.; Cornic, J.F.; Hedde, M.; Capowiez, Y., 2016. Management diversity within organic production influences epigeal spider communities in apple orchards. Agri Ecosys Environ 216: 73-81.
- Martelli, F.; Hernandes, N.H.; Zuo, Z.; Wang, J.; Wong, C.-O.; Karagas, N.E.; Roessner, U.; Rupasinghe, T.; Robin, C.; Venkatachalam, K.; Perry, T.; Batterham, P.; Bellen, H.J., 2022. Low doses of the organic insecticide spinosad trigger lysosomal defects, elevated ROS, lipid dysregulation, and neurodegeneration in flies. eLife, 11: e73812.
- Meyling, N.V.; Eilenberg, J., 2007. Ecology of the entomopathogenic fungi Beauveria bassiana and Metarhizium anisopliae in temperate agroecosystems: Potential for conservation biological control. Biol Cont 43 (2): 145-155.
- Nikolova, I.; Georgieva, N.; Tahsin, N., 2015. Toxicity of neem and pyrethrum products applied alone and in combination with different organic products to some predators and their population density. Rom Agri Res 32: 291-301.
- Oestergaard, J.; Belau, C.; Strauch, O.; Ester, A.; van Rozen, K.; Ehlers, R.U., 2006. Biological control of Tipula paludosa (Diptera : Nematocera) using entomopathogenic nematodes (Steinernema spp.) and Bacillus thuringiensis subsp israelensis. Biological Cont 39 (3): 525-531.
- Ohtonen, R.; Ohtonen, A.; Luotonen, H.; Markkola, A.M., 1992. Enchytraeid and nematode numbers in urban, polluted Scots pine (Pinus sylvestris) stands in relation to other soil biological parameters. Biol Fertil Soils 13 (1): 50-54.
- Oliveira, C.R.; Garcia, T.D.; Franco-Belussi, L.; Salla, R.F.; Souza, B.F.S.; de Melo, N.F.S.; Irazusta, S.P.; Jones-Costa, M.; Silva-Zacarin, E.C.M.; Fraceto, L.F., 2019. Pyrethrum extract encapsulated in nanoparticles: Toxicity studies based on genotoxic and hematological effects in bullfrog tadpoles. Environ Pollut 253: 1009-1020.
- Oluwafemi, A.R.; Rao, Q.; Wang, X.Q.; Zhang, H.Y., 2009. Effect of Bacillus thuringiensis on Habrobracon hebetor during combined biological control of Plodia interpunctella. Insect Sci 16 (5): 409-416.
- Pereira, J.L.; Picanco, M.C.; da Silva, A.A.; de Barros, E.C.; da Silva, R.S.; Galdino, T.V.D.; Marinho, C.G.S., 2010. Ants as Environmental Impact Bioindicators From Insecticide Applic Corn Sociobiol 55 (1): 153-164.
- Poulin, B.; Lefebvre, G., 2018. Perturbation and delayed recovery of the reed invertebrate assemblage in Camargue marshes sprayed with Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis. Insect Sci 25 (4): 542-548.
- Quesada, C.R.; Sadof, C.S., 2020. Residual toxicity of insecticides to Chrysoperla rufilabris and Rhyzobius lophanthae predators as biocontrol agents of pine needle scale. Crop Protec 130: 7.
- Rondoni, G.; Onofri, A.; Ricci, C., 2012. Laboratory studies on intraguild predation and cannibalism among coccinellid larvae (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae). European Journal of Entomology, 109 (3): 353-362.
- Sutherland, A.M.; Gubler, W.D.; Parrella, M.P., 2010. Effects of fungicides on a mycophagous coccinellid may represent integration failure in disease management. Biol Cont 54 (3): 292-299
- Tacoli, F.; Cargnus, E.; Zandigiacomo, P.; Pavan, F., 2020. Side Effects of Sulfur Dust on the European Grapevine Moth Lobesia botrana and the Predatory Mite Kampimodromus aberrans in Vineyards. Insects 11 (11): 13.
- Tayeh, A.; Hufbauer, R.A.; Estoup, A.; Ravigne, V.; Frachon, L.; Facon, B., 2015. Biological invasion and biological control select for different life histories. Nature Comm 6: 5.
- Telesinski, A.; Michalcewicz, W.; Platkowski, M.; Strek, M.; Onyszkol, M.; Wisniewska, J., 2015. The side-effect of organic insecticide spinosad on biochemical and microbiological properties of clay soil. J Ecol Eng 16 (4): 191-197.
- Tetreau, G.; Alessi, M.; Veyrenc, S.; Perigon, S.; David, J.P.; Reynaud, S.; Despres, L., 2012. Fate of Bacillus thuringiensis subsp israelensis in the Field: Evidence for Spore Recycling and Differential Persistence of Toxins in Leaf Litter. App Environ Microbiol 78 (23): 8362-8367.
- Vettori, C.; Paffetti, D.; Saxena, D.; Stotzky, G.; Giannini, R., 2003. Persistence of toxins and cells of Bacillus thuringiensis subsp kurstaki introduced in sprays to Sardinia soils. Soil Biol Biochem 35 (12): 1635-1642.
- Weeks, D.M.; Parris, M.J., 2020. A Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki Biopesticide Does Not Reduce Hatching Success or Tadpole Survival at Environmentally Relevant Concentrations in Southern Leopard Frogs (Lithobates sphenocephalus). Environ Tox Chem 39 (1): 155-161.
- Zhu, Y.; Liu, B.; Sengonca, C., 2006. Efficiency of GCSC-BtA, as a new type of biocide, on different agricultural arthropod pests and its side-effect on some predators. Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für allgemeine und angewandte Entomologie. Band 15 Juli 2006. Dresden, 21-24 märz 2005: 01/01, 309-313.