1 **Deployment of mating disruption dispensers before and after first seasonal male flights for**

2 **the control of *Aonidiella aurantii* in citrus**

3

4 S. Vacas*, C. Alfaro, J. Primo & V. Navarro-Llopis

5 Centro de Ecología Química Agrícola - Instituto Agroforestal del Mediterráneo, Universitat Politécnica de Valencia.

6 Camino de Vera s/n, edificio 6C, 5ª planta. 46022, Valencia (Spain).

7 **Correspondence:** Sandra Vacas, Centro de Ecología Química Agrícola - Instituto Agroforestal del Mediterráneo,

8 Universidad Politécnica de Valencia. Camino de Vera s/n, edificio 6C, 5ª planta. 46022, Valencia (Spain). E-mail:

9 sanvagon@ceqa.upv.es; tel: +34 963879058; fax: +34 963879059

10

11 **Abstract** The rejection of citrus fruit caused by infestations of the California red scale (CRS), *Aonidiella aurantii*

12 (Maskell) (Hemiptera: Diaspididae), raises concerns about its management. This fact has led to the introduction of

13 new integrated control methods in citrus orchards, including the implementation of techniques based on pheromones.

14 Previous works described efficient mating disruption pheromone dispensers to control *A. aurantii* in the

15 Mediterranean region. The main aims of the present study were to adjust the timing of dispenser applications and

16 study the importance of controlling the early first generation of *A. aurantii* by testing two different application dates:

17 before and after the first CRS male flight. The efficacy of the different mating disruption strategies was tested during

18 2010 in an experimental orchard and these results were confirmed during 2011 in a commercial citrus farm. Results

19 showed that every mating disruption strategy achieved significantly lower male captures in monitoring pheromone

20 traps compared with untreated plots, as well as mean fruit infestation reductions of about 80%. The control of the

21 first CRS generation is not essential for achieving a good efficacy as demonstrated in two locations with different

22 pest pressure. The late application of MD dispensers before the second CRS male flight has proven to be effective,

23 suggesting a new advantageous way to apply mating disruption.

24

27

28 **Key Message**

29 Mating disruption (MD) of *Aonidiella aurantii* proved successful in citrus orchards. The importance of controlling

30 the first generation of *A. aurantii* has been investigated by checking the efficacy of MD applied before and after the

31 first generation. We concluded that the control of the first generation is not essential and the application of MD

32 before the second male flight has proven to effectively reduce fruit infestation. This late deployment allows a

33 reduction in the required quantity of pheromone, thus increasing the economic viability of MD in citrus crops.

34

35 **Author Contribution Statement**

36 VN and JP conceived and designed research. SV, CA and VN conducted experiments. SV analyzed data. SV and VN

37 wrote the manuscript. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

38

Introduction

Infestations of California red scale (CRS), *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell) (Hemiptera: Diaspididae), pose a serious problem for citrus growers, as CRS may lead to a reduction in tree vigor and the downgrading or commercial rejection of fruits. The economic importance of this armored scale is due to its presence on the surface of the fruits, as a cosmetic damage, and the cost of the strategies needed to control it, even more intense in fresh citrus market.

Since CRS control has been affected by the development of resistances to insecticides (Yust et al. 1943; Collins et al. 1994; Grafton-Cardwell and Vehrs 1995; Levitin and Cohen 1998), the development and introduction of new integrated and biological control programs was essential for citrus crops. The use of mineral and vegetable oils (University of California 1991; Grafton-Cardwell and Reagan 1995; Rongai et al. 2008) and insect growth regulators (Yarom et al. 1988; Grout and Richards 1991a; Grafton-Cardwell et al. 2006; Eliahu et al. 2007; Rill et al. 2007) appeared as good alternatives to conventional pesticides. These products have provided good control results but they can be harmful to beneficial arthropods (Grafton-Cardwell and Gu 2003; Grafton-Cardwell et al. 2006; Desneux et al. 2007; Vanaclocha et al. 2013). The main enemies of CRS are species of the *Aphytis* parasitoids (Hymenoptera: Aphelinidae) (DeBach 1959; DeBach and Argyriou 1967). Specifically, *Aphytis melinus* (DeBach) is the most successful agent but the control of CRS by augmentative releases of this parasitoid is still under study in Spain (Sorribas et al. 2008; Pekas et al. 2010; Sorribas et al. 2012; Tena et al. 2013). Although in some regions the augmentative biocontrol of CRS through *A. melinus* has achieved good results (Avidov et al. 1970; McLaren and Buchanan 1973; Furness et al. 1983; Moreno and Luck 1992; Bedford 1996), the current cosmetic thresholds in citrus fresh fruit market makes the *A. melinus* success quite improbable in the short term.

Integrated pest management programs include the implementation of control methods based on pheromones. Tashiro and Chambers (1967) demonstrated the production of a sex pheromone in CRS, whose chemical structures were reported by Roelofs et al. (1977), as 3-methyl-6-isopropenyl-9-decen-1-yl acetate and (Z)-3-methyl-6-isopropenyl-3,9-decadien-1-yl acetate. Since then, synthetic sex pheromone traps have been widely employed as a detection and monitoring tool for CRS populations (Kennett and Hoffmann 1985; Moreno and Kennett 1985; Grout et al. 1989; Grout and Richards 1991b). The efficacy of mating disruption (MD) technique against CRS was not clearly demonstrated in the first experiments using rubber pheromone dispensers (Barzakay et al. 1986; Hefetz et al. 1988). However, by studying different pheromone doses, Vacas et al. (2009) described a new mesoporous dispenser capable

66 of interfering with normal *A. aurantii* chemical communication. The efficacy of these mesoporous dispensers was

67 further verified, when CRS male catches and fruit infestation were significantly reduced by applying doses of about

68 40 g pheromone/ ha for six months (Vacas et al. 2010). Moreover, the pheromone environment in MD-treated

69 orchards resulted harmless for the performance of *A. melinus* in field and laboratory trials (Vacas et al. 2011;

70 Vanaclocha et al. 2012). By means of all these studies, it was found that CRS mating disruption achieved control at

71 least equal to conventional oil sprays, providing growers with an advantageous control tool. It is commonly known

72 that oil sprays need careful planning and application for a satisfactory control level. On the other hand, the

73 deployment of MD dispensers does not need replacement or qualified hand-labor, and only a minimum flight

74 monitoring is needed to determine the moment of application; all these are important advantages to take into account.

75 However, research had shown the need for additional trials to adjust the timing of dispenser application to cover all

76 the CRS generational cycles. In Spain CRS shows between three and four complete generations with four male

77 flights; the first taking place from mid-April to mid-May, the second from mid-June to mid-July, the third from end-

78 August to September and a late fourth flight during October-beginning of November. Following this dynamic, if all

79 the generations must be affected, mating disruption should be maintained for eight months what would mean a large

80 amount of pheromone, making this control method unaffordable. However, several authors have stated that the first

81 flight of *A. aurantii* males is not correlated with fruit infestation and abundance of the following flights (Moreno and

82 Kennett 1985; Hernández-Penadés et al. 2002; Campos-Rivela et al. 2012). Thus, the importance of controlling the

83 early first generation of *A. aurantii* has been investigated and the efficacy of MD applied before and after the

84 development of the CRS first generation has been examined both in small plots and in a commercial large size

85 orchard.

86

87 **Materials and Methods**

88 Mesoporous dispenser and device

89 The pheromone dispensers applied in the mating disruption (MD) treatments are based on the technology of

90 inorganic molecular sieves (Corma et al. 1999, 2000). Pheromone is impregnated in a natural clay mineral matrix

91 called sepiolite. Its structure, with a high specific surface area, confers to the dispenser good properties for the

92 adsorption and release of organic molecules. Besides the pheromone, formulations include different additives to give

93   consistency and protect the dispenser against humidity. The impregnated material is then compressed in a cylindrical

94   mold by means of a hydraulic press. The manufacturing process has been licensed to Ecologia y Protección Agrícola

95   S.L. (Valencia, Spain) who manufactured the dispensers for these trials. Currently, these MD dispensers are

96   commercialized since 2013 by Syngenta Agro (Madrid, Spain) under the name Dardo®.

97   Dispensers contained 70 mg (a.i.) of the CRS sex pheromone as the diastereomeric mixture (3S,6R and 3S,6S) of the

98   3-methyl-6-isopropenyl-9-decen-1-yl acetate with 75% chemical purity; the remaining 25% belongs to the by-

99   product 3-methyl-6-isopropylidene-9-decen-1-yl acetate, without pheromonal activity. Dispensers were attached to

100 tree branches inside polypropylene baskets 50 mm wide and 90 mm long with a hanger at the top (Ecología y

101 Protección Agrícola SL, Valencia, Spain). Pheromone is released through the 6×5 mm grid walls of the basket.

102

103 Experimental design - Trial 2010

104 The field trial was conducted in a 3 ha mandarin (*Citrus reticulata × sinensis*; var. Ortanique) experimental orchard

105 located in Denia (Alicante, Spain; UTM: X243500 Y4303900) under Mediterranean climate conditions (mean

106 temperature = 19.9ºC, mean relative humidity = 71.2%). Trees were 20 years-old and spaced 6 m by 4 m. The trial

107 was designed with 11 plots: nine plots of 0.3 ha alternately arranged to test three different procedures for the

108 application of mating disruption and two plots of 0.1 ha as reference untreated plots. Pheromone treated plots were at

109 least 50 m apart, whereas untreated plots were separated 60 m from any MD plot. Pheromone dispensers were

110 applied on 29 March 2010 in three plots before the appearance of the first CRS flight (MD-I treatment). Another

111 three plots had dispenser application on 28 May 2010, before the CRS second flight (MD-II treatment). Timings of

112 dispensers' deployment were determined according to general population dynamics in the study area and degree-day

113 accumulation ($DD = [(T_{max} + T_{min})/2] - T_{critical}$; being $T_{critical} = 11.7ºC$) (Kennet and Hoffmann 1985). Finally, the

114 combination of MD-II application with an oil treatment against nymphs of the first generation was tested in another

115 three plots (MD-II + Oil), where dispensers were also placed on 28 May 2010 and oil treatments were applied on 28

116 May in only these three plots. Pheromone dispensers in every plot were placed at a density of one per tree (420

117 dispensers ha^{-1}) and were not replaced during the experiment.

118

119 Experimental design - Trial 2011

120   A new field trial was conducted in a commercial citrus farm, with larger plots, to confirm the result obtained in the

121   previous trial 2010. MD timings were tested in a 10 ha orange (*Citrus sinensis* Osbeck, var. Navelina) orchard

122   located in Nerva (Huelva, Spain; UTM: X717288 Y4177107) under semi-continental climate conditions (mean

123   temperature = 21.6ºC, mean relative humidity = 56.6%). Trees were 25 years-old and spaced 7 m by 3.5 m. In this

124   case, plots with the same MD timing were contiguous as mating disruption is more efficient when applied in large

125   areas. Thus, pheromone dispensers were applied on 7 April 2011 in a whole 1 ha as MD-I treatment, while for MD-II

126   treatment, 1.5 ha had dispenser application on 6 June 2011. Timings were determined according to population

127   dynamics and degree-day accumulation. MD pheromone dispensers in both strategies were placed at a density of 410

128   dispensers ha^{-1} and were not replaced during the experiment. A third 0.3 ha plot was left without treatments as

129   untreated plot, which was 100 m apart from the pheromone treated areas.

130

131   Oil sprays

132   Given that fruit infestation was over 20% in the previous season, oil treatments in the corresponding plots were timed

133   for the presence of crawlers, which were monitored according to the sampling method suggested by the Valencian

134   regional IPM programme (DOCV 2008). A total of 25 infested branches (2–3 years old) were randomly sampled

135   each week from the date of the first flight and taken to the laboratory. Leaves and twigs were removed from the

136   branches and cut into 10 cm long pieces. Using a binocular scope, a total of 100 live scales were identified as first,

137   second and third instars, adult females, and adult females with crawlers. The oil treatment was applied when first and

138   second instars represented 70% of live scales and more than 90% of adult females had crawlers. Paraffinic oil (15 g l$^-$

139   ^{1}) (Argenfrut RV; GulfOil Argentina SA, Argentina) applications were made with an airblast sprayer calibrated to

140   deliver 3500 l ha^{-1} at 150 psi with the tractor driven at 1.55 km h^{-1}.

141

142   Evaluation of treatment efficacy

143   The efficacy of the different strategies was evaluated according to the CRS male flight inhibition and the fruit

144   infestation assessment. Both parameters were studied in the center of each plot to avoid possible edge effects due to

145   pheromone drift between contiguous treated areas, as buffer areas are considered to be 15 m from the plot borders

146   (Vacas et al. 2009). One commercial white sticky pheromone trap (Pherocon® V Trap; Trécé Inc., Adair, OK) was

147   placed in the center of each plot in Trial 2010 to compare male catches between the different control strategies. In the

148   case of Trial 2011, captures where also evaluated in triplicate, as in the center of three subplots within each above

149   described area. All the monitoring traps were revised every 7 or 15 days, from April to November, and the recorded

150   captures in each trap were divided by the corresponding number of days (7 or 15) to obtain the number of males

151   captured per trap and day (MTD). Pherocon® monitoring lures (Trécé Inc., Adair, OK), loaded with 250 μg sex

152   pheromone, were replaced every 42 days.

153   To measure the inhibition of male catches that occurred in pheromone-treated plots, the mating disruption index

154   (MDI) for each strategy was calculated as an indicator of the treatment efficacy using the following formula: $MDI =$

155    $(1-(x/y)) \times 100$, where x is the number of males captured in MD plots and y is the number of males captured in

156   untreated plots.

157   Fruit were evaluated for scale infestation of Ortanique mandarins on 21 September 2010 and 29 September 2011 in

158   Navelina oranges. Forty fruit per tree (10 fruit per direction: north, east, south and west) were evaluated on trees

159   located on the center of each plot (250-300 fruits/ha) in Trial 2010 and in the center of three subplots within each

160   area in Trial 2011 (250-300 fruits/ha). A fruit was considered to be scale-infested when it had more than three scales

161   on its surface, as suggested by the treatment threshold published in the Valencian regional IPM guidelines (DOCV

162   2008). The percentage of fruit with more than 10 scales was also recorded to perform a sensitivity analysis.

163

164   Field data analysis

165   Generalized linear model (GLM) techniques assuming negative-binomial error variance were employed to compare

166   the number of CRS males captured in the different treated plots. Models were constructed with MTD data as the

167   dependent variable and treatment, time (week of the study period) and their interaction as the explanatory variables.

168   Given that the MD-II application of dispensers was not carried out until 28 May in Trial 2010 and 6 June in Trial

169   2011, we constructed different models for data from the first male flight and data from the rest of flights (second and

170   third). In this way, we evaluate the initial disruption level in MD-I plots during the first flight when MD-II was not

171   yet installed (from April to beginning of June), and also the significance of the male captures inhibition during the

172   second and third flights (from mid-June to October) for both trials.

173   The significance of the explanatory variables was assessed by backward elimination from the model. When

174   significant effects were found, the *glht* function in the multcomp package (Hothorn et al. 2008) was used to perform

175   Tukey HSD tests for post-hoc pairwise comparisons.

176   Likewise, we used GLM techniques assuming negative-binomial error variance to assess scale-infestation differences

177   between the different treatments. For both trials, models were constructed with the percentages of scale-infested fruit

178   in the trees inspected at the end of the trial as the dependent variable and treatment as the explanatory variable.

179   All statistical analyses were conducted with R (R Development Core Team 2012).

180

181   Pheromone release profile

182   The pheromone release profile of the mesoporous dispensers was studied during the trials. Additional dispensers

183   were aged under field conditions in a nearby area, 500 m away from trial orchard, in order to extract their residual

184   pheromone content at different aging times (from 0 to 250 days of field exposure). Three dispensers were taken per

185   aging time, to be extracted at 40ºC for 2 h, with magnetic agitation, in 15 ml of dichloromethane/methanol (2/3, v/v)

186   as solvent. After 1 h of extraction, 0.5 ml of the internal standard 1-dodecanol (20 mg ml^{-1}) were added to the

187   extracts. The extracts were centrifuged (3000 rpm for 8 min) and then filtered with syringe filters before

188   chromatographic analysis. Pheromone was then quantified by gas chromatography with flame ionization detector

189   (GC/FID; Clarus® 500 gas chromatograph; PerkinElmer Inc., Wellesley, MA). All injections were made onto a ZB-

190   5ms (30 × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm) column (Phenomenex Inc., Torrance, CA), held at 160ºC for 5 min, and then

191   programmed at 2ºC min^{-1} up to 180ºC, where it was held for 1 min, and then programmed at 45ºC min^{-1} up to 250ºC.

192   The carrier gas was helium at 1.2 ml min^{-1}. The pheromone amount was estimated by means of a calibration curve

193   which was previously built by preparing standard solutions with the following concentrations: 10.0, 5.0, 2.0, 1.0 and

194   0.4 mg ml^{-1} of pheromone and 1 mg ml^{-1} of the internal standard. Calibration curve was described by the equation y

195    $= a + bx$, where y is the FID peak area ratio of the pheromone and the internal standard (area$_{ph}$/area$_{IS}$) and x is the

196   known amount of pheromone.

197   Simple regression was used to determine the evolution of the residual pheromone load (mg) according to ageing time

198   for the dispenser employed. The quantified residual pheromone contents were employed in a polynomial regression

199   as the dependent variable, to study the significance of the linear and quadratic effect of time (days and days^2) on

200   pheromone emission and check whether the pheromone emission was constant during the time under study. In this

201   case, the residual pheromone load decrease at a constant level and the mean emission rate is given by the slope of the

202   fitted linear model. Statgraphics Centurion XVI v16.1 software (StatPoint Technologies Inc., Warrenton, VA) was

203   used for these analyses.

204

205 **Results**

206 Trial 2010

207 Population dynamics of *A. aurantii* in the area of Denia can be observed by the data obtained with traps located in

208 the untreated plots (Fig. 1). The first flight took place during May with a maximum of 6.93 CRS males per trap and

209 day (MTD). The second flight began at the end of June with the maximum number of males captured in mid-July.

210 Male captures of *A. aurantii* increased from the first week of August. They reached a maximum on 31 August and

211 began to decrease slowly up to the beginning of November, when only 0.4 MTD were registered in the untreated

212 plots.

213 Male catches in plots treated with pheromone remained low throughout the entire season, and only slight peaks were

214 registered according with the three described male flights (Fig. 1). The effect of time factor on male catches during

215 the first flight was statistically significant ($F_{1,16}= 5.30$, $P = 0.035$) according to the natural population dynamics. Yet

216 more crucial, the treatment applied significantly affected male captures ($F_{3,16}= 6.67$, $P = 0.004$) as follows. When

217 first flight was taking place (April to beginning of June), MD was already installed on MD-I plots and captures were

218 94.2% inhibited relative to the untreated plots (P < 0.001). Meanwhile, MD was not yet established in MD-II

219 strategies but mean initial population levels were lower compared to the untreated plots although not significantly

220 different (MD-II: P = 0.226; MD-II + Oil: P = 0.310) (Tukey test; adjusted P values with single step method).

221 Considering, catches from the most abundant flights (mid-June to October), time factor resulted statistically

222 significant ($F_{7,75}= 27.89$, $P < 0.001$), as well as the effect of treatment ($F_{3,75}= 84.75$, $P < 0.001$). Compared to the

223 untreated, male catches were significantly lower in the MD-I, MD-II and MD-II + Oil plots (P < 0.001). Thus,

224 communication disruption occurred during this period with the three tested mating disruption strategies, resulting in

225 average male flight inhibitions of 81.5% with the MD-I timing, 87.7% in plots with MD-II and 88.9% with the

226 combined strategy MD-II + Oil (without significant differences among them, P > 0.2).

227 Regarding fruit damage assessment, 31% of fruit were scale-infested with more than three scales on the surface when

228 no treatment was applied in the orchard (untreated plot in Fig. 2). Results of every MD treatment differed

229 significantly from the absence of treatments for both infestation levels recorded (more than three scales: $F_{3,76}= 20.98$,

230 $P < 0.001$; more than 10 scales: $F_{3,76}= 22.97$, $P < 0.001$). All of the mating disruption deployments achieved a

231 reduction in scale-infested fruit compared to the untreated plot: 81% damage reduction for MD-I (P = 0.006); 95%

232 for MD-II; and 96% by the combination MD-II + Oil (P < 0.001). Although CRS fruit infestation was significantly

233 reduced by MD-I application, it differed significantly from the MD-II timing (P = 0.003) and MD-II + Oil strategy (P

234 < 0.001) (Fig. 2). Fruit infestation observed in MD-I plots did not exceed 6%, whereas less than 1.5% of fruit was

235 found to be scale-infested in the MD-II plots.

236

237 Trial 2011

238 The male population level was significantly higher in Nerva regarding to level of captures obtained in Denia ($F_{1,7}$=

239 9.19, $P = 0.02$). In the area of Nerva, the first male flight peaked during April and the first weeks of May (Fig. 3)

240 with a maximum of 16.57 MTD in the untreated plot. The first catches belonging to the second flight were obtained

241 on 22 June, while the third flight peaked on 31 August.

242 Male catches in plots treated with pheromone remained low throughout the entire season with statistical differences

243 regarding to the untreated plot (Fig. 3). Time had a significant effect on catches during the entire period of study

244 (first flight: $F_{9,18}$= 21.78, $P < 0.001$; rest of flights: $F_{18,36}$= 9.05, $P < 0.001$), according to natural population

245 dynamics. The effect of treatment factor was significant (first flight: $F_{2,18}$= 64.66, $P < 0.001$; rest of flights: $F_{2,36}$=

246 248.55, $P < 0.001$). Considering catches from the first flight, MD-I achieved a significant mean male flight reduction

247 (P < 0.001) of 97.3% relative to the control. Given that MD-II was not yet installed when the first flight took place,

248 mean male captures during April and May in MD-II plots were significantly higher compared to MD-I (P < 0.001).

249 When multiple comparison was performed with data from the most abundant flights (July-October), CRS male

250 captures were 96.2% and 99.1% reduced, relative to control, with MD-I and MD-II respectively (with significant

251 differences between MD strategies, P < 0.001).

252 Damage assessment revealed that pheromone treatments had a significant effect on CRS fruit infestation (more than

253 three scales: $F_{2,67}$= 27.16, $P < 0.001$; more than 10 scales: $F_{2,67}$= 16.33, $P < 0.001$). Damage was significantly lower

254 in both pheromone treated plots, regarding to the untreated which had 55% fruit with more than three scales (P <

255 0.001). The percentage of fruit with more than three scales was 71.8% reduced with MD-I treatment, while this

256 reduction achieved 82.7% with the MD-II application, although they were not significantly different (P = 0.145)

257 (Fig. 4).

258

259 Pheromone release profile

260   Pheromone release profile of mesoporous dispensers is depicted in Fig. 5. The complete model was fitted to an

261   exponential model (solid line in Fig. 5, equation 1) resulting in $R^2 = 0.95$.

262    $$y = 71.322 \times e^{-0.008x} \qquad \text{(equation 1)}$$

263   However, statistical analysis showed that the curvature of this model was due to data from the last three months of

264   the dispenser life-span. Polynomial regression of data from 0 to 154 days of aging (end March to August), evaluated

265   the significance of the quadratic ($days^2$) and linear (days) effects of time and confirmed the absence of curvature

266   (quadratic effect not significant: $P = 0.31$; linear effect: $P < 0.001$). Thus, the release profile was fitted to the line

267   given by equation 2 (discontinuous line in Fig. 5), resulting $R^2 = 0.99$. This means that emission of mesoporous

268   dispensers is assumed to be constant from 0 to 154 days (until August), and the mean release rate given by the slope

269   of the linear model is 334 µg day^{-1}. From this date on, emission level decreased below 100 µg day^{-1} during the last

270   months of field exposure.

271    $$y = 70.241 - 0.334x \qquad \text{(equation 2)}$$

272

273   **Discussion**

274   The efficacy of the mating disruption technique against CRS infestations was previously demonstrated by Vacas and

275   coworkers (Vacas et al. 2009; Vacas et al. 2010; Vacas et al. 2011); nevertheless, timing of dispensers' deployment

276   needed to be adjusted for an optimal practical application. In the present work, the efficacy of the late application of

277   MD dispensers, before the second CRS male flight (MD-II), has been demonstrated in two trials carried out in 2010

278   and 2011, in two different locations of Spain, with different climates, male population levels and citrus varieties.

279   CRS is able to develop from three to five generations per year, mainly influenced by temperature (Kennett and

280   Hoffmann 1985; Grout et al. 1989). Under the climatic conditions of Spanish citrus areas, CRS shows three complete

281   generations and a possible fourth generation in some areas and during warmer autumns. Generally, the first male

282   flight takes place between mid-April and mid-May, and is usually not too abundant. In the present work, the

283   importance of controlling the first generation of *A. aurantii* was investigated in 2010 by the application of mating

284   disruption at two different times of deployment: before (MD-I) and after (MD-II) the occurrence of the first male

285   flight. According to CRS male flight monitoring in trial 2010, the first flight was significantly inhibited in MD-I

286   plots. Once MD was also installed in MD-II and MD-II + Oil plots, catches were maintained at low levels throughout

287   the study and both MD timings achieved more than 80% reduction of CRS male catches. This disorientation effect

288   was confirmed in trial 2011 in larger commercial plots with higher male population levels, where both MD strategies

289   achieved mean flight inhibition of about 97%.

290   In the trial carried out in 2010, the scale-infestation assessment revealed that the MD-II results were significantly

291   better than the MD-I strategy, despite reducing damage by around 80%. This could be explained by the release

292   profile and life-span of the pheromone dispensers. According to the results, flight inhibition in MD-I plots was not

293   significantly different from MD-II plots during the third flight but MD-II achieved significantly greater reduction of

294   fruit infestation. Extraction and quantification of the pheromone remaining in the aged dispensers showed that

295   release rate was constant for five months and equal to 334 µg day^{-1}, and thereafter it decreased. This reduction in

296   release rate is not due to climate factors but to dispenser formulation itself. The release profile of this kind of

297   dispensers is highly temperature independent (Domínguez-Ruiz et al. 2008) and release rate is lower as closer the

298   pheromone load to the residual content that remains retained in the dispenser. If the mesoporous dispensers are

299   applied in March (MD-I), this five month period with proper pheromone emission would protect the crop only until

300   the end of August, without covering the entire third flight of CRS males. Mean pheromone emission during

301   September in MD-I plots was 130 µg day^{-1}, clearly under the optimum release level of 250 µg day^{-1} suggested by

302   Vacas et al. (2009). We think that this lower emission rate could still have a disorientation effect of males towards

303   traps, but could be insufficient to disrupt the short-range attraction and mating of males. It has been described for

304   moth pests that the amount of pheromone needed to disrupt male orientation to traps is lower than the amount needed

305   to disrupt mating (Ioratti et al. 2011). In this way, when dispensers are applied on May (MD-II), pheromone emission

306   is maintained at suitable levels to protect the crop against the entire third flight.

307   The present work confirms that the late deployment of dispensers is at least as efficient as the deployment before the

308   first flight. Therefore, it has been observed with different infestation levels that the control of the CRS first

309   generation is not crucial and damage can be controlled by establishing MD before the second flight with mesoporous

310   dispensers releasing 334 µg day^{-1} constantly for at least five months. This could be related with the fact highlighted

311   by several authors who stated that the first flight is not correlated with the abundance of the following flights

312   (Moreno and Kennett 1985; Hernández-Penadés et al. 2002; Campos-Rivela et al. 2012). Thus, the first flight is not a

313   good predictor of infestation later in the season, probably because survival and activity of the first generation is

314   highly affected by more unstable weather conditions. However, mating disruption of the first emerging moths is

315   crucial for the development of the subsequent generations throughout the season in Lepidoptera species. Several

316 authors demonstrated that early pheromone applications prevent mid-season increases in Lepidoptera populations

317 (Staten et al. 1987; Kehat et al. 1995; Lykouressis et al. 2005); these populations being responsible for high yield

318 losses. By contrast, we have observed that the control of the first CRS generation is not so essential for achieving a

319 good efficacy. Moreover, this first generation does not usually colonize the fruit and the second annual crawler

320 generation, which takes place in the summer, is generally considered to be mainly responsible for the infestation of

321 fruit (Rodrigo et al. 2004).

322 It has been demonstrated that the late application of dispensers allows a reduction in the required quantity of

323 pheromone, thus increasing the economic viability of CRS mating disruption. Currently, available dispensers are not

324 able to release pheromone at a suitable level during all the CRS male flights. The development of pheromone

325 dispensers with higher load and longer lifespan would not be cost-effective, as the current cost of pheromone

326 synthesis is a limiting factor for MD implementation. At the moment, pheromone represents about 90% of the value

327 of the dispenser (Ecología y Protección Agrícola, pers. comm.) and this technique is already in the upper limit of the

328 costs affordable by the growers (300 € ha^{-1} for the MD treatment vs. 200-250 € ha^{-1} for two oil sprays). Therefore,

329 with the dispensers available in the market, the recommended strategy will be the application of mating disruption

330 before the second CRS male flight.

331

338

339 **References**

340 Avidov Z, Balshin M, Gerson U (1970) Studies on *Aphytis coheni* , a parasite of the California red scale, *Aonidiella*

341 *aurantii* in Israel. BioControl. 15:191-207

342   Barzakay I, Hefetz A, Sternlicht M, Peleg BA, Gokkes M, Singer G, Geffen D, Kronenberg S (1986) Further field

343   trials on management of the California red scale, *Aonidiella aurantii*, by mating disruption with its sex-

344   pheromone. Phytoparasitica 14:160-161

345   Bedford ECG (1996) Problems which we face in bringing red scale, *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell), under biological

346   control in citrus in South Africa. Proc Int Soc Citriculture 1:485-492

347   Campos-Rivela JM, Martínez-Ferrer MT, Fibla-Queralt JM (2012) Population dynamics and seasonal trend of

348   California red scale (*Aonidiella aurantii* Maskell) in citrus in Northern Spain. Span J Agric Res 10:198-208

349   Collins PJ, Lambkin TM, Bodnaruk P (1994) Suspected resistance to methidation in *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell)

350   (Homoptera: Diaspididae) from Queensland. J Aust Entomol Soc 33:325-326

351   Corma A, Muñoz-Pallares J, Primo-Yufera E (1999) Production of semiochemical emitters having a controlled

352   emission speed which are based on inorganic molecular sieves. World Patent WO9944420

353   Corma A, Muñoz-Pallares J, Primo-Yufera E (2000) Emitter of semiochemical substances supported on a sepiolite,

354   preparation process and applications. World Patent WO0002448

355   DeBach P (1959) New species and strains of *Aphytis* (Hymenoptera: Eulophidae) parasitic on the California red

356   scale, *Aonidiella aurantii* (Mask.), in the Orient. Ann Entomol Soc Am 52:354-362

357   DeBach P, Argyriou L (1967) The colonization and success in Greece of some imported *Aphytis* spp. (Hymenoptera:

358   Aphelinidae) parasitic on citrus scale insects (Homoptera: Diaspididae). BioControl 12:325-342

359   Desneux N, Decourtye A, Delpuech JM (2007) The sublethal effects of pesticides on beneficial arthropods. Ann Rev

360   Entomol 52:81-106

361   (DOCV) Diari Oficial de la Comunitat Valenciana (2008) DOCV no. 5901, 26. Resolution 27 October 2008 of

362   Consellería de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación; November 2008.

363   http://www.docv.gva.es/datos/2008/11/26/pdf/2008_13692.pdf

364   Domínguez-Ruiz J, Sanchis J, Navarro-Llopis V, Primo J (2008) A new long-life trimedlure dispenser for

365   Mediterranean fruit fly. J Econ Entomol 101:1325-1330

366   Eliahu M, Blumberg D, Horowitz AR, Ishaaya I (2007) Effect of pyriproxyfen on developing stages and

367   embryogenesis of California red scale (CRS), *Aonidiella aurantii*. Pest Manag Sci 63:743-746

368   Furness G, Buchanan G, George R, Richardson N (1983) A history of the biological and integrated control of red

369   scale, *Aonidiella aurantii* on citrus in the lower Murray Valley of Australia. BioControl 28:99-212

370   Grafton-Cardwell EE, Lee JE, Stewart JR, Olsen KD (2006) Role of two insect growth regulators in integrated pest

371   management of citrus scales. J Econ Entomol 99:733-744

372   Grafton-Cardwell EE, Gu P (2003) Conserving vedalia beetle, *Rodolia cardinalis* (Mulsant) (Coleoptera :

373   Coccinellidae), in citrus: a continuing challenge as new insecticides gain registration. J Econ Entomol 96:1388-

374   1398

375   Grafton-Cardwell EE, Reagan CA (1995) Selective use of insecticides for control of armored scale (Homoptera:

376   Diaspididae) in San-Joaquin Valley California citrus. J Econ Entomol 88:1717-1725

377   Grafton-Cardwell EE, Vehrs SLC (1995) Monitoring for organophosphate-resistant and carbamate-resistant armored

378   scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) in San-Joaquin Valley citrus. J Econ Entomol 88:495-504

379   Grout TG, Richards GI (1991a) Effect of buprofezin applications at different phenological times on California red

380   scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae). J Econ Entomol 84:1802-1805

381   Grout TG, Richards GI (1991b) Value of pheromone traps for predicting infestations of red scale, *Aonidiella aurantii*

382   (Maskell) (Homoptera: Diaspididae), limited by natural enemy activity and insecticides used to control citrus

383   thrips, *Scirtothrips aurantii* Faure (Thysanoptera: Thripidae). J Appl Entomol 111:20-27

384   Grout TG, Du Toit WJ, Hofmeyr JH, Richards GI (1989) California red scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) phenology

385   on citrus in South Africa. J Econ Entomol 82:793-798

386   Hefetz A, Kronengerg S, Peleg BA, Bar-zakay I (1988) Mating disruption of the California red scale *Aonidiella*

387   *aurantii* (Homoptera: Diaspididae). Proc 6th Int Citrus Congress, Tel Aviv (Israel), pp 1121-1127

388   Hernández-Penadés P, Rodríguez-Reina JM, García-Marí F (2002) Umbrales de tratamiento para cóccidos

389   diaspídidos en cítricos. Bol San Veg Plagas 28:469-478

390   Hothorn T, Bretz F, Westfall P (2008) Simultaneous Inference in General Parametric Models. Biometrical J 50:346-

391   363

392   Ioratti C, Anfora G, Tasin M, De Cristofaro A, Witzgall P, Lucchi A (2011) Chemical ecology and management of

393   *Lobesia botrana* (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae). J Econ Entomol 104:1125-1137

394   Kehat M, Anshelevich L, Harel M, Dunkelblum E (1995) Control of the codling moth (*Cydia pomonella*) in apple

395   and pear orchards in Israel by mating disruption. Phytoparasitica 23:285-296

396   Kennett CE, Hoffmann RW (1985) Seasonal development of the California red scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) in

397   San Joaquin Valley citrus based on degree-day accumulation. J Econ Entomol 78:73-79

398 Levitin E, Cohen E (1998) The involvement of acetylcholinesterase in resistance of the California red scale shape

399   *Aonidiella aurantii* to organophosphorus pesticides. Entomol Exp Appl 88:115-121

400 Lykouressis D, Perdikis D, Samartzis D, Fantinou A, Toutouzas S (2005) Management of the pink bollworm

401   *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) by mating disruption in cotton fields. Crop Prot

402   24:177-183

403 McLaren IW, Buchanan GA (1973) Parasitism by *Aphytis chrysomphali* Mercet and *A. melinus* Debach of

404   Californian red scale, *Aonidiella aurantii* (Maskell), in relation to seasonal availability of suitable stages of the

405   scale. Austr J Zool 21:111-117

406 Moreno DS, Luck RF (1992) Augmentative releases of *Aphytis melinus* (Hymenoptera: Aphelinidae) to suppress

407   California red scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) in southern California lemon orchards. J Econ Entomol 85:1112-

408   1119

409 Moreno DS, Kennett CE (1985) Predictive year-end California red scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) orange fruit

410   infestations based on catches of males in the San-Joaquin Valley. J Econ Entomol 78:1-9

411 Pekas A, Aguilar A, Tena A, García-Marí F (2010) Influence of host size on parasitism by *Aphytis chrysomphali* and

412   *A. melinus* (Hymenoptera: Aphelinidae) in Mediterranean populations of California red scale *Aonidiella aurantii*

413   (Hemiptera: Diaspididae). Biol Control 55:132-140

414 Rill S, Grafton-Cardwell EE, Morse JG (2007) Effects of pyriproxyfen on California red scale (Hemiptera:

415   Diaspididae) development and reproduction. J Econ Entomol 100:1435-1443

416 Rodrigo E, Troncho P, García-Marí F (1996) Parasitoids (Hymenoptera: Aphelinidae) of three scale insects

417   (Homoptera: Diaspididae) in a citrus grove in Valencia, Spain. Entomophaga 41:77-94

418 Roelofs WL, Gieselmann MJ, Cardé AM, Tashiro H, Moreno DS, Henrick CA, Anderson RJ (1977) Sex-pheromone

419   of California red scale, *Aonidiella aurantii*. Nature 26:698-699

420 Rongai D, Cerato C, Lazzeri L, Palmieri S, Patalano G (2008) Vegetable oil formulation as biopesticide to control

421   California red scale (*Aonidiella aurantii* Maskell). J Pest Sci 81: 179-185.

422 Sorribas JJ, Rodríguez R, Rodrigo E, García-Marí F (2008) Niveles de parasitismo y especies de parasitoides del

423   piojo rojo de california *Aonidiella aurantii* (Hemiptera: Diaspididae) en cítricos de la Comunidad Valenciana.

424   Bol San Veg Plagas 34:201-210

425   Sorribas J, van Baaren J, Garcia-Marí F (2012) Effects of climate on the introduction, distribution and biotic

426   potential of parasitoids: Applications to biological control of California red scale. Biol Control 62:103-112

427   Staten RT, Flint HM, Weddle RC, Quintero E, Zarate RE, Finell CM, Hernandes M, Yamamoto A (1987) Pink

428   bollworm (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae): Large-scale field trials with a high-rate gossyplure formulation. J Econ

429   Entomol 80:1267-1271

430   Tashiro H, Chambers DL (1967) Reproduction in the California Red Scale, *Aonidiella aurantii* (Homoptera:

431   Diaspididae). I. Discovery and extraction of a female sex pheromone. Ann Entomol Soc Am 60:1166-1170

432   Tena A, Llácer E, Urbaneja A (2013) Biological control of a non-honeydew producer mediated by a distinct

433   hierarchy of honeydew quality. Biol Control 67:117-122

434   University of California (1991) Integrated pest management for citrus. University of California, Berkeley, California

435   Vacas S, Alfaro C, Navarro-Llopis V, Primo J (2009) The first account of the mating disruption technique for the

436   control of California red scale *Aonidiella aurantii* Maskell (Homoptera: Diaspididae) using new biodegradable

437   dispensers. Bull Entomol Res 99:415-423

438   Vacas S, Alfaro C, Navarro-Llopis V, Primo J (2010) Mating disruption of California red scale, *Aonidiella aurantii*

439   Maskell (Homoptera: Diaspididae), using biodegradable mesoporous pheromone dispensers. Pest Manag Sci

440   66:745-751

441   Vacas S, Vanaclocha P, Alfaro C, Primo J, Verdú MJ, Urbaneja A, Navarro-Llopis V (2011) Mating disruption for

442   the control of *Aonidiella aurantii* Maskell (Hemiptera: Diaspididae) may contribute to increased effectiveness of

443   natural enemies. Pest Manag Sci 68:142-148

444   Vanaclocha P, Vacas S, Alfaro C, Primo J, Verdú MJ, Navarro-Llopis V, Urbaneja A (2012) Life history parameters

445   and scale-cover surface area of *Aonidiella aurantii* are altered in a mating disruption environment: Implications

446   for biological control. Pest Manag Sci 68:1092-1097

447   Vanaclocha P, Vidal-Quist C, Oheix S, Montón H, Planes L, Catalán J, Tena A, Verdú MJ, Urbaneja A (2013) Acute

448   toxicity in laboratory tests of fresh and aged residues of pesticides used in citrus on the parasitoid *Aphytis*

449   *melinus*. J Pest Sci 86: 329-336

450   Yarom I, Blumberg D, Ishaaya I (1988) Effects of buprofezin on California red scale (Homoptera: Diaspididae) and

451   Mediterranean black scale (Homoptera: Coccidae). J Econ Entomol 81:1581-1585

452   Yust HR, Nelson HD, Busbey RL (1943) Comparative susceptibility of two strains of California red scale to HCN,

453   with special reference to the inheritance of resistance. J Econ Entomol 36:744-749

454

455

456   **Fig. 1** Population dynamics of *Aonidiella aurantii* in trial 2010 (Alicante, Spain), shown as males per trap per day

457   (MTD) captured on the different plots: dispenser application before the first CRS male flight (MD-I), application

458   before the second flight (MD-II), the combination of MD-II application with an oil treatment, and the untreated plots.

459   Black arrow indicates dispenser application in MD-I strategy (29 March 2010).The grey arrow points out pheromone

460   application in MD-II strategy (28 May 2010) and oil application in the May+Oil plots.

461

462

463

464   **Fig. 2** Mean percentage of scale-infested fruits observed in the different plots of trial 2010: untreated, MD-I, MD-II

465   and the combination of MD-II with oil spray. Bars labeled with the same letter do not differ significantly (Tukey

466   HSD tests, $P > 0.05$).

467

468

469

470   **Fig. 3** Population dynamics of *Aonidiella aurantii* in trial 2011 (Huelva, Spain), shown as males per trap per day

471   (MTD) captured on the different plots: dispenser application before the first CRS male flight (MD-I), application

472   before the second flight (MD-II) and the untreated plot. Black arrow indicates dispenser application in MD-I strategy

473   (7 April 2011) and the grey arrow points out pheromone application in MD-II strategy (6 June 2011).

474

475

476

477   **Fig. 4** Mean percentage of scale-infested fruits observed in the different plots of trial 2011: MD-I, MD-II and the

478   untreated plot. Bars labeled with the same letter do not differ significantly (Tukey HSD tests, $P > 0.05$).

479

480

481

482   **Fig. 5** Evolution of the remaining load of pheromone (mg) on the mesoporous dispensers versus time (days in

483   orchard). The complete release profile was fitted to an exponential model (equation 1, $R^2 = 0.95$), although

484   pheromone release rate was constant until 154 days of field exposure and fitted a linear model (equation 2, $R^2 =$

485   0.99). The x-axis represents the dates corresponding to ageing time.

486