



**Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* (Heteroptera):
Anthocoridae) for apple and pear.**

Sigsgaard, L

Published in:
Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata

Publication date:
2004

Document version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Sigsgaard, L. (2004). Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* (Heteroptera):
Anthocoridae) for apple and pear. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, 111, 215-223.

1 **Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* (Heteroptera:**
2 ***Anthocoridae*) for apple and pear.**

3

4 Lene Sigsgaard, Department of Ecology, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University,
5 Thorvaldsensvej 40, DK-1871 Frederiksberg C, tel: +45 3528 2674, FAX: +45
6 35282670, e-mail: les@kvl.dk.

7

8 *Key words: Anthocoris nemorum, Anthocoris nemoralis, choice, preference, apple, pear,*
9 *Malus domestica, Pyrus communis, Operophtera brumata,*

10

11 **Abstract**

12

13 Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *Anthocoris nemoralis* for apple and
14 pear was tested in the laboratory. *Anthocoris nemorum* laid significantly more eggs on
15 apple (75%) than on pear, while *A. nemoralis* preferred pear (71%). Over 90% of *A.*
16 *nemorum* eggs were laid at the leaf margins whereas eggs of *A. nemoralis* were most
17 commonly found in the leaf centre, 5 mm or more inside the leaf. Both laid more eggs on
18 the ventral than on the dorsal side of pear leaves (*A. nemorum* 63%, *A. nemoralis* 94%),
19 and in the last two experiments *A. nemorum* laid significantly more eggs on the dorsal
20 side of apple leaves. The females' choice of oviposition site is important for the later
21 distribution of immatures in host plants. The oviposition preferences found correspond to
22 the natural distribution of these predators in apple and pear orchards. The preference of *A.*
23 *nemorum* for the leaf margins, and of *A. nemoralis* for the leaf centre as oviposition site,

1 supports earlier observations. Anthocorids did not display a preference for the dorsal or
2 ventral side of a leaf *per se*. Oviposition may be affected by the pubescence of the leaves.
3 While the dorsal side of a pear leaf is quite smooth, the ventral side of an apple leaf
4 present the most pubescent oviposition surface. Most eggs were found between these two
5 extremes. Preference for cut leaves to whole leaves could help *A. nemorum* to locate prey
6 in a field situation as also suggested by its preference to oviposit on leaves with eggs of
7 *Operophtera brumata*.

8

9 **Introduction**

10

11 Two of the most abundant predators in apple and pear orchards are *Anthocoris nemorum*
12 (L.) and *Anthocoris nemoralis* (Fabricius) (Skanland, 1981; Solomon, 1982). Both have a
13 wide range of hosts and habitats and oviposition occurs on various plants (Anderson,
14 1962a; Collyer, 1967; Scutareanu et al., 1994). *Anthocoris nemoralis* is mostly found on
15 perennials, *A. nemorum* is found on both perennials and annuals (Anderson, 1962a). They
16 are probably strictly predatory bugs, though they can take up plant sap. However, to *A.*
17 *nemorum* the value seems only equal to that of water (Lauenstein, 1980a). Both are
18 polyphagous predators preying on aphids, mites, psyllids and lepidopteran eggs and
19 young larvae, and are considered to play an important role in controlling insect pests
20 (Collyer, 1953; Collyer 1967; Hill, 1957; Solomon, 1982), *Anthocoris nemoralis*
21 particularly in controlling pear psyllids (Fauvel et al., 1984; Solomon et al., 1989;
22 Trapman & Blommers, 1992; Rieux et al., 1994; Scutareanu et al., 1999; Beninato & la
23 Morella, 2000; Solomon et al., 2000).

1 A predator's choice of oviposition site may be affected by various factors
2 including the presence of prey, prey dietary quality, prey preferences, cues of prey on the
3 host plant as well as the plant itself. Several studies have documented variable dietary
4 quality of preys. Where psyllids were tested they ranked over aphids and other prey. All
5 studies involving *A. nemorum* demonstrated marked differences among aphid species
6 tested (Lauenstein, 1977). The quality of *Myzus persicae* and whiteflies were equal to *A.*
7 *nemorum* (Ekbohm, 1981). Both *A. nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* were found to develop
8 fastest and attain the highest adult weight when fed *Psylla mali* as compared to *Aphis*
9 *fabae* and *Acyrtosiphon pisum* (Anderson, 1962b). *Anthocoris nemoralis* nymphs were
10 found to develop faster on eggs of pear psylla than on eggs of *Ephestia kuhniella* and
11 *Ceratitis capitata* (Fauvel et al., 1984). Though clear differences can be found in dietary
12 quality, earlier studies have not shown preference for any particular prey. Thus Ruth &
13 Dwumfour (1989) found that *A. nemorum* readily accepted different aphid species.
14 However, in a recent study comparing preference for aphids of importance in greenhouse
15 production (Meyling et al., 2002) both *A. nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* preferred *M.*
16 *persicae* to *Macrosiphum euphorbiae*, *Aulacorthum solani* and *Aphis gossypii*. This result
17 could have been affected by the fact that *M. persicae* nymphs were observed to be the
18 least likely to move when attacked (Meyling et al., 2002). Earlier it was believed that
19 anthocorids searched by tactile cues only (Lauenstein, 1980b). However, psylla infested
20 pear trees have been shown to be attractive to anthocorids. Interestingly, laboratory
21 reared *A. nemoralis* did not show such a preference before having experienced volatiles
22 from damaged plants in the presence of food (Scutareanu et al., 1996; Drukker et al.,
23 2000). Preferences for plants for oviposition have not been specifically tested, except for

1 a comparison of pear and barley leaves to *A. nemorum* (Herard & Chen, 1985). However
2 several studies have documented the distribution of anthocorids among various habitats
3 and annual changes in distribution among habitats (Anderson, 1962a; Collyer, 1967;
4 Fauvel, 1999).

5 The present study tested whether the two anthocorids would have any oviposition
6 preference for apple or pear, as choice of oviposition choice can greatly influence the
7 resulting densities of their offspring on a given host.

8

9 **Materials and methods**

10

11 *Plant material*

12 To assess the choice of *A. nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* between apple and pear leaves for
13 oviposition, branches of pear (cv. Ovid) and apple (cv. Prima) were field collected
14 immediately before the experiment at Rørrendegaard, an experimental orchard belonging
15 to KVL. Branches were pruned to leave three fully developed healthy and undamaged
16 leaves of 5-6 cm in length and 2-3 cm in width. Before being introduced to cages the
17 pruned branches were gently shaken and thereafter carefully examined under
18 stereomicroscope. Any remaining arthropods were removed with a fine paintbrush.

19 To assess oviposition choice in smaller cages between two single apples leaves
20 either cut or undamaged, or with or without prey, branches were collected as described
21 above, and individual healthy and undamaged leaves selected measuring 3-4 cm in length
22 and 2-3 cm in width.

23

1 *Insects* *Anthocoris nemorum* females were field collected in and around orchards
2 and up till the onset of the experiment they were kept in thermo cabinets providing
3 L16:D8 with day temperature of 18 ± 1 °C and night temperature of 12 ± 1 °C in individual
4 cages ('medicine cups'). Cages measured 3.5 cm in diameter at the base, 4 cm in
5 diameter at the top and 4 cm in height, and had lids with ventilation holes. Water was
6 provided on a 1×1 cm piece of gauze. A few *Anthocoris nemoralis* were field collected
7 and tested in replicates one and two, the remaining were obtained from a laboratory
8 rearing facility and then kept in the same way as *Anthocoris nemorum*. Excess of
9 *Sitotroga cerealella* (Ol.) eggs were provided every second or third day until the onset of
10 the experiment and at least for three days, to assure that all experimental animals were
11 well fed. Eggs of *Operophtera brumata* L. were obtained from females collected on oak
12 (*Quercus robur*) kindly provided by Dr. Vanbergen, CEC Banchory. Ten eggs were
13 applied to each treated leaf with a wet paintbrush. Leaves were allowed to dry before use.

14
15 *Cages* Cages for comparing the oviposition on apple and pear were transparent
16 plastic jars, 7 cm in diameter and 9 cm high. They were used upside-down. One branch of
17 apple and one of pear were mounted in two individual, opposite holes equidistant from
18 the centre and cage sides. Water was provided on a square piece of gauze on the cage
19 floor between the branches. The ends of the branches reached down in a beaker with
20 water. Each cage had a ventilation hole of 2 cm in diameter at the top. The ventilation
21 hole was covered with filter paper.

22 The small cages used for individual rearing of anthocorids, as described above,
23 were used to compare oviposition on single leaves either a whole or a wounded leaf, or a

1 leaf with prey or one without prey. To provide water and support for the leaves the base
2 of the cages were covered with 3% agar, into which the petiole could conveniently be
3 stuck. For the comparison of oviposition on a whole or wounded leaf one leaf was
4 inserted whole, and one leaf had approximately one quarter removed from the apical end
5 with a scalpel immediately prior to the onset of the experiment. Leaves were so chosen
6 that sizes of the two leaves were equivalent after the wounding of one leaf.

7
8 *Method* Three experiments tested the oviposition of *A. nemorum* given the choice
9 of apple and pear. A fourth experiment with the same set-up included both *A. nemorum*
10 and *A. nemoralis*. A few field collected *A. nemoralis* females were tested along the *A.*
11 *nemorum* in the first and second experiments thus allowing a first comparison of
12 responses with those of mass-reared *A. nemoralis*. All experiments were done between
13 mid May and mid June (13 May, 21 May, 29 May and 23 June 2001) thus including a
14 mixture of over wintering females and the first spring generation.

15 In small cages the effect of a healthy or a freshly wounded leaf on oviposition was
16 compared. This experiment was replicated twice including both *A. nemorum* and *A.*
17 *nemoralis* first both with leaves of apple or leaves of pear (26 June 2001, on apple *A.*
18 *nemorum* n = 9, *A. nemoralis* n = 9 and on pear n = 8 and 10, respectively) second only
19 with apple leaves (13 July 2001, *A. nemorum* n = 28, *A. nemoralis* n = 18). Finally an
20 experiment assessed oviposition preference of *A. nemorum* for apple leaves with no prey
21 and apple leaves with *Operopthera brumata* eggs (8 August, n = 20).

22 At the onset of an experiment one anthocorid female was carefully introduced into
23 each cage, in the larger cages through the ventilation hole. Each experiment lasted 48 h,

1 with L:D of 16:8 and temperature of $25 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$. Humidity within the cages was (mean \pm
2 s.d.) $89 \pm 3\%$ rh, ranging from 84-93% rh, enough to maintain the freshness of the plant
3 material.

4 After removal of the anthocorids from the cages, plant material was examined for
5 eggs under the stereomicroscope. For each egg, the eggs position was noted as leaf
6 margin (< 5 mm from edge), leaf centre (> 5 mm from edge), leaf tip (< 5 mm from the
7 tip), or petiole. For eggs laid on the leaf it was also noted whether they were laid on the
8 dorsal or ventral side of the leaf. Finally eggs closer to each other than 5 mm were also
9 recorded as a batch.

10

11 *Data analysis* All statistical analysis was carried out in SAS/STAT ver. 6.12
12 (SAS Institute 1990). Preferences within a species were analysed with a paired t-test
13 (PROC MEANS on the difference between a pair of observations). Across species
14 analyses were made using PROC MIXED with anthocorid individuals as a random effect
15 for experiment four and for the experiment comparing preference for cut and uncut
16 leaves. Replicates in which anthocorids did not lay any eggs during the 48 hours each
17 experiment lasted were excluded from analyses.

18

19 **Results**

20

21 *Oviposition on apple or pear* The number of eggs laid by a female within or
22 across experiments was not significantly different between *A. nemorum* (mean \pm s.e. =
23 10.3 ± 0.8 , n = 64) and *A. nemoralis* (8.1 ± 1.3 , n = 26), nor between field collected and

1 mass-reared *A. nemoralis* (8.5 ± 3.0 , $n = 8$ and 7.9 ± 1.4 , $n = 18$, respectively). Both
2 species laid fewer eggs in experiment one (*A. nemorum* 7.5 ± 1.4 , $n = 16$ and *A.*
3 *nemoralis* 2.3 ± 1.9 , $n = 5$). A total of six *A. nemorum* and five *A. nemoralis* laid no eggs
4 and were excluded from the later analysis. Of these, three of each species were from
5 experiment one, partly explaining the lower average number of eggs in this experiment.
6 The remaining number of replicates in the experiments comparing oviposition on apple
7 and pear were for *A. nemorum*: exp 1: $n=13$, exp 2: $n = 14$, exp 3: $n= 13$, exp 4: $n= 18$,
8 and for *A. nemoralis*: exp 1: $n = 2$, exp 2: $n= 4$, exp 4: $n = 16$.

9 Both species often laid more eggs together (less than 5 mm apart) resulting in an
10 average batch size of 1.5 ± 0.1 for *A. nemorum* and 1.6 ± 0.1 for *A. nemoralis* (p : n.s.,
11 both range: 1-4 eggs).

12 A clear difference in choice of plant for oviposition could be seen. *Anthocoris*
13 *nemorum* laid 75% of its eggs on apple (exp 1, $T = 3.1$, $P < 0.007$, exp 2, $T = 2.6$, $P <$
14 0.02 , exp 3, $T = 4.3$ $P < 0.0004$, exp 4: $T = 5.9$, $P < 0.0001$) and *A. nemoralis* 72% of its
15 eggs on pear (exp 1, $T = -0.7$, $P = 0.54$, exp 2, $T = -5.1$, $P < 0.02$, exp 4, $T = -2.6$, $P <$
16 0.02) (Figure 1). In experiment four, where both anthocorid species were represented in
17 almost equal numbers there was a significant effect of plant ($F = 4.4$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.04$)
18 and the crossed effect of anthocorid species by plant on the number of eggs laid on either
19 plant was highly significant ($F = 37.2$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.0001$) ($n = 68$).

20 Eggs of *A. nemorum* were predominantly found inserted in the leaf margins
21 including the leaf tip on both apple and pear. Since there was no significant difference
22 among experiments for pear, or for *A. nemoralis* on apple, these data were pooled for the
23 T-test. Across experiments 93% of *A. nemorum* eggs were laid in leaf margins on apple.

1 Though there was a significant preference for leaf margin in all four experiments data for
2 *A. nemorum* on apple could not be pooled (exp 1, $T = 7.6$, $P < 0.0001$, exp 2, $T = 2.9$, $P <$
3 0.02 , exp 3, $T = 7.5$, $P < 0.0001$, exp 4, $T = 6.2$, $P < 0.0001$). Similarly *A. nemorum* laid
4 95% of its eggs in the leaf margin of pear ($T = 6.0$, $P < 0.0001$). Eggs of *A. nemoralis*
5 were most commonly found in the leaf centre (5 mm or more from leaf margins) with
6 81% on apple ($T = -2.8$, $P < 0.01$) and 67% on pear, though only near significant on pear
7 ($T = -0.9$, $P = 0.07$) (Figure 2). There was a highly significant effect of anthocorid species
8 on the difference between numbers laid in margin and leaf centre in experiment four ($F =$
9 22.5 , $df = 1$, $P < 0.0001$), a significant effect of plant ($F = 9.9$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.003$) and the
10 crossed effect of anthocorid species by plant was highly significant ($F = 19.1$, $df = 1$, $P <$
11 0.0001) ($n = 68$), indicating that the level of preference for leaf margin and leaf centre
12 depends on the interaction of the two factors.

13 *Anthocoris nemorum* laid 63% of its eggs on the ventral side of pear leaves ($T = -$
14 2.0 , $P < 0.05$) and *A. nemoralis* 83% ($T = -3.7$, $P < 0.001$). Since there was no significant
15 difference among experiments for pear or for *A. nemoralis* on apple, data were pooled for
16 the T-test. On apple *Anthocoris nemoralis* laid few eggs. Of these 52% were laid on the
17 dorsal leaf side, showing no significant preference for leaf side in *A. nemoralis* on apple.
18 Data for choice of leaf side by *A. nemorum* on apple could not be pooled. It laid
19 significantly more eggs on the upper leaf side in experiments three and four ($T = 3.1$, $P <$
20 0.008 and $T = 2.5$, $P < 0.02$), but in experiments one and two no significant preference
21 was found (Figure 3). Experiment four revealed a highly significant effect of plant ($F =$
22 25.5 , $df = 1$, $P < 0.0001$), and a significant effect of species ($F = 14.8$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.0003$)
23 ($n = 68$), but no significant crossed effect on the difference between numbers of eggs laid

1 on the dorsal and ventral leaf sides, indicating that the choice of leaf side for oviposition
2 on apple and pear does not interact with anthocorid species.

3

4 *Oviposition preference assessed in small cages* As data for the two experiments with
5 cut versus uncut leaves were not significantly different they were pooled for statistical
6 analysis. *Anthocoris nemorum* laid 63% of its eggs on cut apple leaves ($T = 2.0$, $P < 0.05$,
7 $n = 24$), while the opposite was true for *A. nemoralis* which laid only 37% of its eggs on
8 the cut apple leaves ($T = -2.1$, $P < 0.04$, $n = 20$). Few females laid eggs on pear leaves.
9 While *A. nemoralis* also preferred uncut pear leaves ($T = -2.87$, $P < 0.04$, $n = 5$),
10 preference for cut leaves was not significant for the few replicates with *A. nemorum* on
11 pear ($T = 2.31$, $P = 0.15$, $n = 3$) (Figure 4). There was a significant crossed effect of
12 anthocorid species by plant on the difference in eggs laid on cut and uncut leaves ($F =$
13 12.27 , $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$, $n = 52$) and no significant main effects of anthocorid species or
14 plant.

15 There was a near-significant preference of *A. nemorum* for oviposition on apple
16 leaves with *O. brumata* eggs over clean leaves (mean with eggs \pm s.e. = 5.1 ± 1.3 , mean
17 without eggs = 3.1 ± 0.5 , $T = -2.2$, $P = 0.057$, $n = 10$).

18

19 **Discussion**

20

21 The present study demonstrated a clear preference for oviposition host plant for both
22 anthocorid species and a highly significant difference between their host plant choices.
23 Since the ability of moving to alternative plants is very limited for the wingless young,

1 oviposition preference will greatly affect the resulting density of immatures on a given
2 plant and thus the potential role of these predators in apple and pear orchards. Oviposition
3 preference may be a major explanation why *A. nemorum* is more abundant in apple and
4 *A. nemoralis* in pear (Skanland ,1981; Herard & Chen, 1985).

5 One other study assessed oviposition preference of *A. nemorum*: Herard & Chen
6 (1985) found that young barley leaves were preferred over young pear leaves, except
7 when prey (*C. pyri*) was offered on pear but not on barley. Batch size in this study was
8 less for *A. nemorum* than the two to eight eggs mentioned by Sands (1957), who also
9 noted that eggs of *A. nemoralis* were seldom laid in batches.

10 The observed preference of leaf margins of *A. nemorum* in contrast to *A.*
11 *nemoralis* (Figure 2) corresponds to earlier records of their general oviposition pattern on
12 different host plants (Hodgson & Aveling, 1988) and are in agreement with results from
13 Elliott & Way (1968) who found that 95% of *A. nemorum* eggs were laid on the leaf
14 margin (2mm from edge) (48.6%) or stipules (47.4%) of bean (*Vicia faba*). Search for
15 prey by *A. nemorum* is also concentrated on leaf margins as found on *Brassica oleracea*
16 *var. gongylodes* (90.4%), tobacco (67.3%) and bean *Phaceolus vulgaris* (65.1%)
17 (Lauenstein, 1980b). On the contrary, *A. nemoralis* spend more time searching on the leaf
18 centre. Thus Brunner & Burts (1975) observed that it searched the leaf midrib half its
19 time and spent 71% of its time on the ventral side of pear leaves. Thus, the search pattern
20 of *A. nemoralis* also seems to reflect its oviposition pattern. Overlap of oviposition and
21 search for prey at the single leaf scale may present a potential risk of egg cannibalism at
22 high predator densities. On a whole tree, however, oviposition sites and search for prey
23 may be spatially separated.

1 No overall preference for dorsal or ventral leaf side *per se* was found but both
2 species laid most eggs on the dorsal side of apple leaves and the ventral side of pear
3 leaves, and in the two last experiments *A. nemorum* showed a significant preference for
4 the dorsal side of apple leaves. While the ventral side of apple leaves is very hairy, and
5 the dorsal side of pear leaves almost hairless, the dorsal side of apple leaves and the
6 ventral side of pear leaves are intermediate in this respect. Thus it is possible that choice
7 of oviposition site is affected by leaf surface structure. Possibly the difference between
8 leaves sides on apple were more pronounced to anthocorids in the last two experiments,
9 when leaves would tend to be slightly older. Warabieda et al. (1997) suggest that
10 pubescence may protect spider mites (*Tetranychus urticae*) from predation. Possibly
11 anthocorid females can protect their eggs by choosing oviposition sites with some
12 pubescence, but on the other hand may prefer to search more smooth areas. Thus,
13 according to Lauenstein (1980b), *A. nemorum* searched upper surfaces of leaves more
14 thoroughly than under surfaces, most so on the smooth brassica, intermediate on tobacco,
15 least so on bean.

16 The preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* to oviposit on cut apple leaves over whole
17 leaves may be influenced by volatiles from the newly cut leaves. Such a preference could
18 help *A. nemorum* to locate prey in the field. The fact that *A. nemoralis* preferred whole
19 leaves to leaves with this particular damage may be that as this species mostly oviposits
20 away from leaf margins it was in less direct contact with any leaf exudates from the cut
21 leaf, and perhaps experienced a change in leaf quality as oviposition medium. Prey search
22 of another anthocorids, *Orius tristicolor*, has earlier been found to increase when leaves
23 were artificially damaged with a pin. Thus, bean leaves that prior to experiments had

1 been exposed to plant feeding (thrips or spider mites) or artificial damage elicited
2 increased searching, and resulting higher predation success (VanLaerhoven et al., 2000).
3 Maybe the preference of *A. nemoralis*, which mostly preys upon psyllids and other
4 insects which pierce, rather than chew, plant material, would have been different towards
5 pierced rather than cut leaves.

6 Field collected leaves where preys are mechanically removed, as used in this
7 study, may still hold volatiles related to preys or their feeding. The most common prey
8 observed on collected leaves was *Psylla mali* on apple and a few aphids and psyllids on
9 both apple and pear. From Dutch studies the attraction of *A. nemoralis* to volatiles from
10 pear psylla-infested trees is well documented (Scutareanu et al., 1997; Drukker et al.,
11 2000). This study suggests that *A. nemorum* prefer to oviposits near prey. Likewise,
12 (Steer, 1929) observed that *A. nemorum* preferred to oviposit near spider mite colonies.

13 *Anthocoris nemoralis* is currently under evaluation for inoculative and/or
14 inundative releases against pear psylla in various European countries, so far with variable
15 results, often with initial success followed by dispersal away from the release area
16 (Fauvel et al., 1984; Rieux et al., 1994; Beninato et al., 2000). Oviposition preference,
17 presence of prey and/or plant related volatiles, may all affect the attraction to a plant,
18 oviposition and later the retention of adult *A. nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* in orchards and
19 thus the success of biological control.

20

21 **Acknowledgements**

22 Thanks to M. Solomon, O. P. Tikkanen, N. Meyling and P. Esbjerg for valuable
23 discussions. I am grateful to A. Vanbergen for supplying *O. brumata* eggs. Thanks to Bo

1 Martin Bibby for statistical advice. Special thanks to P. Esbjerg for commenting on a
2 draft of this paper.

3

4 **References**

5

6 Anderson, N. H., 1962a. Bionomics of six species of *Anthocoris* (Heteroptera:
7 Anthocoridae) in England. Transactions of the Entomological Society of London 114:
8 67-95.

9 Anderson, N. H., 1962b. Growth and fecundity of *Anthocoris* spp. reared on various prey
10 (Hetroptera: Anthocoridae). Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 5: 40-52.

11 Beninato, S., & S. la Morella, 2000. Control of *Cacopsylla pyri* with massive releases of
12 *Anthocoris nemoralis* in pear orchards. Giornate Fitopatologiche, Perugia, 16-20 aprile,
13 2000, 1: 367-372.

14 Brunner, J. F.& E. C. Burts, 1975. Searching behavior and growth rates of *Anthocoris*
15 *nemoralis* (Hemiptera: Anthocoridae), a predator of the pear psylla, *Psylla pyricola*.
16 Annals of the Entomological Society of America 68: 311-315.

17 Collyer, E., 1953. Biology of some predatory insects and mites associated with the fruit
18 tree red spider mite *Metatransychus ulmi* (Koch) in South-Eastern England. II Some
19 important predators of the mite. Journal of Horticultural Science 28: 85-97.

20 Collyer, E., 1967. On the Ecology of *Anthocoris nemorum* (L.) (Hemiptera-Heteroptera).
21 Proceedings of the Entomological Society of London 42: 107-118.

- 1 Drukker, B., J. Bruin, & M. W. Sabelis, 2000. Anthocorid predators learn to associate
2 herbivore-induced plant volatiles with presence or absence of prey. *Physiological*
3 *Entomology* 25: 260-265.
- 4 Ekbohm, B. S., 1981. Efficiency of the predator *Anthocoris nemorum* (Het.: Anthocoridae)
5 against the greenhouse whitefly, *Trialeurodes vaporariorum* (Hom.: Aleyrodidae).
6 *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Entomologie* 92: 26-34.
- 7 Elliott, W. M. & M. J. Way, 1968. The action of some systemic insecticides on the eggs
8 of *Anthocoris nemorum* (L.) and *A. confusus* Reut. *Annals of Applied Biology* 62: 215-
9 226.
- 10 Fauvel, G., 1999. Diversity of Heteroptera in agroecosystems: role of sustainability and
11 bioindication. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* 74: 275-303.
- 12 Fauvel, G., M. Thiry, & D. Cotton, 1984. Progress towards the artificial rearing of
13 *Anthocoris nemoralis* F. *Bulletin SROP* 7: 176-183.
- 14 Herard, F. & K. Chen, 1985. Ecology of *Anthocoris nemorum* (L.) (Heteroptera:
15 Anthocoridae) and evaluation of its potential effectiveness for biological control of pear
16 psylla. *Agronomie* 5: 855-863.
- 17 Hill, A.R., 1957. The biology of *Anthocoris nemorum* (L.) in Scotland (Hemiptera:
18 Anthocoridae). *Transactions of the Entomological Society of London* 109: 379-394.

- 1 Hodgson, C. & C. Aveling, 1988. Anthocoridae. In: A. K. Minks & P. Harrewijn (eds),
2 Aphids, Their Biology, Natural Enemies and Control, vol 2B, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp.
3 279-292.
- 4 Lauenstein, G., 1977. Investigations on the fertility and oviposition of the predacious bug
5 *Anthocoris nemorum* L. (Hem.: Heteroptera). Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Entomologie
6 83: 355-363.
- 7 Lauenstein, G., 1980a. On the uptake of plant substances by the predacious bug
8 *Anthocoris nemorum* (Hem.: Heteroptera). Entomophaga 24: 431-441.
- 9 Lauenstein, G., 1980b. The searching behaviour of *Anthocoris nemorum* L. (Het.
10 Anthocoridae). Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Entomologie 89: 428-442.
- 11 Meyling, N. V., A. Enkegaard & H. Brødsgaard, 2002. The flower bugs, *Anthocoris*
12 *nemorum* and *Anthocoris nemoralis*, voracity and prey preference for aphids in
13 glasshouses. IOBC/ wprs Bulletin 25: 185-188.
- 14 Rieux, R., G. Fauvel, A. d'Faivre, G. Fournage & A. Lyoussoufi, 1994. Study of
15 biological control against *Cacopsylla pyri* (L.) in pear orchards by experimental release
16 of *Anthocoris nemoralis* F. in the egg stage. II. - results and discussion. Bulletin OILB
17 SROP 17: 120-124.
- 18 Ruth, J. & E. F. Dwumfour, 1989. Laboratory studies on the suitability of some aphid
19 species for food of the predaceous flower bug *Anthocoris gallarum ulmi* (DeG.)
20 (Heteroptera, Anthocoridae). Journal of Applied Entomology 108: 321-327.

- 1 Sands, W.A., 1957. The immature stages of some British Anthocoridae (Hemiptera).
2 Transactions of the Entomological Society of London 109: 295-310.
- 3 SAS Institute 1990. SAS/STAT User's Guide Version 6. SAS/STAT Inc., Cary N. C.
- 4 Scutareanu, P., B. Drukker, J. Bruin, M. A. Posthumus & M. W. Sabelis, 1996. Leaf
5 volatiles and polyphenols in pear trees infested by *Psylla pyricola*. Evidence of
6 simultaneously induced responses. *Chemoecology* 7: 34-38.
- 7 Scutareanu, P., B. Drukker, J. Bruin, M. A. Posthumus & M. W. Sabelis, 1997. Volatiles
8 from *Psylla*-infested pear trees and their possible involvement in attraction of anthocorid
9 predators. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* 23: 2241-2260.
- 10 Scutareanu, P., B. Drukker & M. W. Sabelis, 1994. Local population dynamics of pear
11 psyllids and their anthocorid predators. *Bulletin OILB SROP* 17: 18-22.
- 12 Scutareanu, P., R. Lingeman, B. Drukker, & M. W. Sabelis, 1999. Cross-correlation
13 analysis of fluctuations in local populations of pear psyllids and anthocorid bugs.
14 *Ecological Entomology* 24: 354-362.
- 15 Skanland, H. T., 1981. Studies on the arthropod fauna of a Norwegian apple orchard.
16 *Fauna Norvegica B* 28: 25-34.
- 17 Solomon, M. G. 1982. Phytophagous mites and their predators in apple orchards. *Annals*
18 *of Applied Biology* 101: 201-203.

- 1 Solomon, M. G., J. E. Cranham, M. A. Easterbrook & J. D. Fitzgerald, 1989. Control of
2 the pear psyllid, *Cacopsylla pyricola*, in South East England by predators and pesticides.
3 Crop Protection 8: 197-205.
- 4 Solomon, M. G., J. V. Cross, J. D. Fitzgerald, C. A. M. Campbell, R. L. Jolly, R. W.
5 Olszak, E. Niemczyk & H. Vogt, 2000. Biocontrol of pests of apples and pears in
6 northern and central Europe - 3. Predators. Biocontrol Science and Technology 10: 91-
7 128.
- 8 Steer, W. 1929. Notes on *Anthocoris nemorum* L. (Hemiptera-Anthocoridae). The
9 Entomologists Monthly Magazine 65: 103-104.
- 10 Trapman, M. & L. Blommers, 1992. An attempt to pear sucker management in the
11 Netherlands. Journal of Applied Entomology 114: 38-51.
- 12 VanLaerhoven, S., D. R. Gillespie, & R. R. McGregor, 2000. Leaf damage and prey type
13 determine search effort in *Orius tristicolor*. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 97:
14 167-174.
- 15 Warabieda, W., R. W. Olszak, & B. Dyki, 1997. Morphological and anatomical
16 characters of apple leaves associated with cultivar susceptibility to spider mite
17 infestation. Acta Agrobotanica 50: 53-64.

1 Figure 1. Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* (exp 1: n =13, exp 2: n = 14,
2 exp 3: n= 13, exp 4: n= 18) and *A. nemoralis* (exp 1: n = 2, exp 2: n= 4, exp 4: n = 16) for
3 apple or pear (mean number of eggs + s.e.).

4

5 Figure 2. Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* (n = 58) and *A. nemoralis* (n =
6 22) for leaf margin or leaf of apple and pear leaves (mean number of eggs + s.e.). Data
7 for *A. nemorum* on apple could not be pooled and are presented for the individual
8 experiments (exp 1: n =13, exp 2: n = 14, exp 3: n= 13, exp 4: n= 18). Remaining results
9 were pooled and are presented across experiments.

10

11 Figure 3. Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* (n = 58) and *A. nemoralis* (n =
12 22) for dorsal or ventral leaf side of apple and pear leaves (mean number of eggs + s.e.).
13 Data for *A. nemorum* on apple could not be pooled and are presented for the individual
14 experiments (exp 1: n =13, exp 2: n = 14, exp 3: n= 13, exp 4: n= 18). Remaining results
15 were pooled and are presented across experiments.

16

17 Figure 4. Oviposition preference of *Anthocoris nemorum* and *A. nemoralis* for cut or
18 uncut leaves of apple (*A. nemorum*, n = 24, *A. nemoralis*, n = 20) or pear (*A. nemorum*, n
19 = 3, *A. nemoralis*, n = 5) (mean number of eggs + s.e.).

20

21

22

23







