Wheat stem sawfly parasitism in varying field sizes and tillage systems in dryland wheat in Montana
by Justin Blake Runyon

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Science in Entomology
Montana State University
© Copyright by Justin Blake Runyon (2001)

Abstract:
The wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus Norton, is a major pest of wheat in the northern Great Plains. Sawfly-infested plants have lower yields and usually lodge, reducing the amount of grain that can be harvested. In 1995 and 1996, annual losses because of sawfly infestations were estimated to exceed $25 million in Montana alone. Two parasitoids, Bracon cephi (Gahan) and B. Iissogaster Muesebeck, attack the wheat stem sawfly in wheat, but provide satisfactory control only in isolated cases. The effects of selected conventional dryland wheat production practices on sawfly parasitism were examined. Sawfly parasitism levels in tilled vs untilled, and block vs strip fields were compared. The effect of sawfly parasitism on kernel weight was investigated.

In general, little difference was found in sawfly parasitism between tilled and untilled fields. However, parasitism was significantly lower in intensively tilled fields. No difference was found in sawfly parasitism between strip fields and block fields. Sawfly parasitism was uniform across block fields, even though sawfly infestation levels were often lower in the middle of blocks. Intensive tillage prevents successful biological control of the wheat stem sawfly by reducing the total number of sawfly parasitoids. Replacing intensive tillage with minimum tillage or chemical fallow will better conserve sawfly parasitoids and result in a cumulative increase in sawfly parasitism over time. Planting block fields instead of strips should have little effect on sawfly parasitism and should decrease sawfly infestations. Kernels of stems containing parasitized sawflies were generally heavier than those containing unparasitized sawflies, indicating that parasitism may provide some protection against yield loss caused by sawfly feeding.

WHEAT STEM SAWFLY PARASITISM IN VARYING FIELD SIZES AND TILLAGE SYSTEMS IN DRYLAND WHEAT IN MONTANA

by

Justin Blake Runyon

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree

of

Master of Science

in

Entomology

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

April 2001

© COPYRIGHT

by

Justin Blake Runyon

2001

All Rights Reserved

N378
R8762

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Justin Blake Runyon

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

Wendell L. Morrill — (Chairperson, Graduate Committee) — April 19, 2001 — Date

David K. Weaver — (Co-Chairperson, Graduate Committee) — April 19, 2001 — Date

Approval for the Department of Entomology

Gregory D. Johnson — (Head, Entomology) — 4.19.01 — Date

Approval for the College of Graduate Studies

Bruce R. McLeod — (Graduate Dean) — 4-19-01 — Date

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under the rules of the Library.

If I have indicated my intention to copyright this thesis by including a copyright notice page, copying is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in parts may be granted only by the copyright holder.

Signature Justin B. Rupp

Date April 19, 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am especially grateful to my advisors, Wendell Morrill and David Weaver, for their mental and physical encouragement. Without them this project would not have been possible. I also thank my committee members, Greg Johnson and Perry Miller, for their helpful comments on this manuscript. I thank BG FitzGerald for the many hours spent dissecting wheat stems, Steve Cherry for help with statistical analysis, Pat Hensleigh for use of the thresher, and Rich Hurley for reviewing this manuscript and his many contributions to my education. This project was funded by the USDA, CSREES, Western Regional IPM; Montana Agriculture Experiment Station; and the Montana Wheat and Barley Committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vii

LIST OF FIGURES ix

ABSTRACT xi

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Objectives 3
History of the Wheat Stem Sawfly 4
Taxonomy and Distribution of the Wheat Stem Sawfly 5
Biology of the Wheat Stem Sawfly 6
Wheat Stem Sawfly Damage 7
Wheat Stem Sawfly Control 9
    Resistant Cultivars 9
    Insecticides 10
    Cultural Control 10
History of Sawfly Parasitoids 12
Taxonomy and Distribution of *Bracon cephi* (Gahan) and *B. lissogaster* Muesebeck 13
Biology of *Bracon cephi* and *B. lissogaster* 14
    Bracon cephi 14
    Bracon lissogaster 17
Wheat Production Practices 18
    Summer Fallow 18
    Tillage 19
    Chemical Fallow (No-Till) 19
Field Size 20
    Strip Farming 20
    Block Farming 20

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS 21

Research Sites 21

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

Page

Stem Sampling 27
Tillage System Comparison 27
Block / Strip Field Comparison 28
Stem Processing 31
Sawfly Infestation and Cutting Levels 31
Sawfly Parasitism Levels 31
Kernel Analysis 32
Statistical Analysis 32
Tillage System Comparison 33
Block / Strip Field Comparison 33
Kernel Analysis 34

3. RESULTS 36

Tillage System Comparison 36
Block / Strip Field Comparison 39
Kernel Analysis 55

4. DISCUSSION 56

Tillage System Comparison 56
Block / Strip Comparison 57
Kernel Analysis 59

SUMMARY 61

REFERENCES CITED 63

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Research site locations and production practices compared 21
2. No-till / tilled fields: Year sampled and production practices 25
3. Block / strip fields: Year sampled and production practices 26
4. ANOVA results for sawfly infestation, cut stems, and sawfly parasitism for all sites and years 36
5. Mean percent sawfly-infested stems, cut stems, and parasitism in the tilled and untilled field at each site (± SEM) 37
6. Summary of the tillage system paired comparison by site 38
7. Kolmogorov-Smirnov results comparing sawfly parasitism of the edge and middle of block fields 39
8. Summary of Dunnett's t-test results comparing sawfly infestation and sawfly cut stems in the block edge ("Strip B1", Fig. 4) with the inner block ("Strip B2", Fig. 4) at each location 40
9. Kruskal-Wallis test results comparing parasitism in the block edge ("Strip B1", Fig. 4) with all strips at each location 53
10. Summary of Dunnett's t-test results comparing sawfly infestation and sawfly cut stems in each strip with the block edge ("Strip B1", Figure 4) at each location 54

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table Page

11. Summary of Dunnett's t-test results comparing sawfly infestation and sawfly cut stems in each strip with the inner block ("Strip B2", Figure 4) at each location....54

12. Results of the sign test comparing kernel weights....55

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

1. Approximate locations of research sites....24
2. Sampling: Tillage system comparison....29
3. Sampling: Block / strip field comparison....30
4. Statistical analysis: Block / strip field comparison....35
5. Site 5-1998: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field....41
6. Site 5-1999: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field....42
7. Site 6: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field....43
8. Site 7: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field....44
9. Site 8: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field....45
10. Site 10: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field....46
11. Site 14: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field....47

LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)

Figure Page

12. Site 15-1999: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field 48

13. Site 15-2000: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field 49

14. Site 16: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field 50

15. Site 17: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field 51

16. Site 20: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field 52

ABSTRACT

The wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton, is a major pest of wheat in the northern Great Plains. Sawfly-infested plants have lower yields and usually lodge, reducing the amount of grain that can be harvested. In 1995 and 1996, annual losses because of sawfly infestations were estimated to exceed $25 million in Montana alone. Two parasitoids, *Bracon cephi* (Gahan) and *B. lissogaster* Muesebeck, attack the wheat stem sawfly in wheat, but provide satisfactory control only in isolated cases. The effects of selected conventional dryland wheat production practices on sawfly parasitism were examined. Sawfly parasitism levels in tilled vs untilled, and block vs strip fields were compared. The effect of sawfly parasitism on kernel weight was investigated.

In general, little difference was found in sawfly parasitism between tilled and untilled fields. However, parasitism was significantly lower in intensively tilled fields. No difference was found in sawfly parasitism between strip fields and block fields. Sawfly parasitism was uniform across block fields, even though sawfly infestation levels were often lower in the middle of blocks. Intensive tillage prevents successful biological control of the wheat stem sawfly by reducing the total number of sawfly parasitoids. Replacing intensive tillage with minimum tillage or chemical fallow will better conserve sawfly parasitoids and result in a cumulative increase in sawfly parasitism over time. Planting block fields instead of strips should have little effect on sawfly parasitism and should decrease sawfly infestations. Kernels of stems containing parasitized sawflies were generally heavier than those containing unparasitized sawflies, indicating that parasitism may provide some protection against yield loss caused by sawfly feeding.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In Montana, the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), has been the most economically important chronic insect pest of wheat since cultivation began more than a century ago (Weiss and Morrill 1992). Within the northern Great Plains of North America this insect has caused devastating losses in spring wheat, and more recently, winter wheat (Weiss and Morrill 1992, Morrill and Kushnak 1996). Estimated annual losses in 1995 and 1996 exceeded $25 million in Montana alone (Anonymous 1997). Sawfly-infested plants have reduced yields and usually lodge, making harvest difficult (Ainslie 1920, Platt and Farstad 1946, Holmes 1977). Sawflies are difficult to control because eggs, larvae, and pupae are enclosed within host plants. Current management practices do not provide adequate levels of control. Solid-stemmed wheat cultivars provide some measure of control; however, stem solidness varies with environmental factors (Platt 1941). Resistant cultivars have lower yield potentials and reduced disease resistance (Weiss and Morrill 1992). Tillage implements to bury sawflies or to expose overwintering sawfly larvae to unfavorable winter conditions do not kill enough sawflies to affect populations the following year (Weiss *et al.* 1987, Goosey 1999). Sawflies are difficult to control

with insecticides because residues are not active long enough to protect crops throughout the adult emergence period (Holmes and Hurtig 1952).

The original hosts of the wheat stem sawfly are grasses (Ainslie 1929, Wallace and McNeal 1966, Morrill *et al.* 1992) where sawfly larvae are attacked by nine species of parasitoids (Criddle 1923, Nelson 1953, Holmes *et al.* 1963, Morrill 1997). Only two of these, *Bracon cephi* (Gahan) and *B. lissogaster* Muesebeck (Hymenoptera: Braconidae), have been found in significant numbers in wheat (Morrill 1998). Levels of parasitism vary greatly among fields but provide satisfactory control only in isolated cases (Morrill 1997, 1998). Seasonal phenology of wheat plays a major role in parasitoid success. Wild grasses remain green longer than wheat and sawfly parasitism is maximized; in wheat, sawflies complete development sooner and avoid parasitism by second generation parasitoids (Morrill *et al.* 1994, Morrill 1997).

The effects of wheat production practices on levels of parasitism are unknown. The goal of this research was to ascertain the effects of tillage practice and field size on sawfly parasitoids and to identify practices that would conserve naturally occurring beneficial insects in the wheat agroecosystem.

Objectives

The objectives of this project were to identify wheat production practices that can be used to enhance populations of two parasitoids of the wheat stem sawfly, reduce severity of sawfly infestations, and minimize crop loss. Practices compared were tilled and untilled fallow fields, and block and strip fields. The hypothesis that sawfly infestation, cut stems, and parasitism of untilled and tilled fields were equal was tested. The hypotheses that sawfly infestation, cut stems, and parasitism were the same at the edge and middle of block fields, and that sawfly infestation, cut stems, and parasitism of the block edge, block middle, and the strips at each location were equal were tested.

Sawfly-infested stems produce lighter kernels than similar sized uninfested stems. However, nothing is known about the yield of sawfly-infested plants that have been parasitized. The hypothesis that kernel weights of uninfested, sawfly-infested, and sawfly-parasitized stems were equal was tested.

History of the Wheat Stem Sawfly

In 1890, when wheat stem sawfly adults were first reared from grasses in California, Riley and Marlatt (1891) predicted, "The economic importance of this species arises from the fact that it may be expected at any time to abandon its natural food source in favor of the small grains, on which it can doubtless successfully develop." Five years later, wheat stems containing *C. cinctus* larvae were found at Souris, Manitoba (Fletcher 1896), fulfilling this prediction. After the early infestation at Souris, there were continuous increases in the amount of damage and the area involved (Farstad 1940). Heavy infestations occurred in wheat at Minot, North Dakota, in 1907 (Wallace and McNeal 1966, Holmes 1978). By 1926, sawfly damage was widespread and extensive; annual losses in wheat were estimated at 25 million bushels in Montana and Canada (Wallace and McNeal 1966). In 1951, grain loss caused by the wheat stem sawfly in Montana and North Dakota was valued at over 10 million dollars (Davis 1952). Cropping systems developed in an attempt to solve problems of drought, wind erosion, and plant diseases, made the control of the wheat stem sawfly much more difficult (Farstad 1940). Alternate-year summer fallow, strip cropping, and a major increase in wheat production encouraged sawfly populations and increased crop damage (Weiss and Morrill 1992, Morrill 1997).

Sawflies are continuing to adapt to wheat. Originally, infestations were primarily in spring wheat because winter wheat usually matured early enough to avoid losses (Davis 1955). However, by the 1980's, both winter and spring wheat were heavily infested in Montana. The recent increase in susceptibility of winter wheat to attack by *C. cinctus* is a result of earlier emergence of adults (Morrill and Kushnak 1996).

Taxonomy and Distribution of the Wheat Stem Sawfly

Edward Norton first described the wheat stem sawfly as *Cephus cinctus* in 1872 from one male collected in Colorado (Norton 1872). In 1890, Albert Koebele reared *C. cinctus* adults from grass stems near Alameda, California (Koebele 1890), which Riley and Marlatt (1891) described as *C. occidentalis*. Six years later, Ashmead described a female from Wisconsin as *C. graenicheri* (Ashmead 1897). The first name given, *Cephus cinctus* Norton, is valid and all others are considered junior synonyms.

The wheat stem sawfly is known from the Pacific Coast states and British Columbia, south to Arizona and east to Ontario and Georgia (Ainslie 1929, Ivie 1996, Wallace and McNeal 1966); however, it is of economic importance only in the northern Great Plains (Weiss and Morrill 1992). In recent years, it has been suggested that *C. cinctus* was introduced from northeast Asia; unfortunately, the

taxonomy of the genus *Cephus* is poorly understood and a world revision is needed to understand species limits (Ivie 1996).

Biology of the Wheat Stem Sawfly

Adult emergence begins in late May or early June and lasts three to four weeks (Weiss and Morrill 1992, Morrill and Kushnak 1996). The wheat stem sawfly is reported to be a weak flier; females usually deposit eggs in stems near the emergence site (Criddle 1911, 1915, Ainslie 1920, Salt 1947, Mills 1945, Holmes 1975, 1982). Adults are active when it is sunny, the temperature is above 17° C, and wind speeds are minimal (Seamans 1945). Females prefer to oviposit in the uppermost internode of the largest diameter stems from which the head has not yet emerged (Holmes and Peterson 1960). Morrill *et al.* (2000) and Morrill and Weaver (2000) demonstrated that the sex ratio is male-biased in small diameter stems and female-biased in larger stems. Adult size, fecundity, and longevity increase with stem size.

Eggs hatch in approximately seven days, and larvae feed on parenchyma and vascular tissue within the stems (Ainslie 1920, Holmes 1954). Because of cannibalism, only one sawfly per stem completes development (Ainslie 1920, Holmes 1954, Weiss and Morrill 1992). There are four or five instars, depending on the host (Ainslie 1920, Farstad 1940). Upon completion of development, the

larva migrates to the lower region of the stem and cuts a V-shaped notch around the perimeter of the stem, usually at or a little above ground level. The larva retreats to the region of the stem below the notch and plugs the stem with frass; this provides an easy exit for the adult the following spring. The stem usually breaks at the notch, leaving a "stub" that serves as an overwintering chamber (Ainslie 1920, Wallace and McNeal 1966, Weiss and Morrill 1992). The "stub" is hollow and lined with a silk hibernaculum, allowing the larva to overwinter below the soil surface and thus protecting it against severe winter weather (Ainslie 1920, Salt 1946a, 1946b, Holmes and Farstad 1956, Weiss and Morrill 1992).

C. cinctus overwinters as a larva that can withstand freezing and some drying (Salt 1946a, 1947, 1961, Morrill *et al.* 1993). A diapause of 10° C for 90 days is necessary before pupation can take place (Salt 1947). The following spring, changing climatic conditions trigger pupation (Salt 1947, Church 1955), the pupal stadium lasts 7-14 days (Criddle 1922); adults emerge by chewing through the frass plug (Ainslie 1920).

Wheat Stem Sawfly Damage

Sawfly infestation reduces yield in two ways. The most obvious loss is the result of lodging prior to harvest (Morrill *et al.* 1992). High winds and precipitation increase lodging of cut stems (Ainslie 1920, Weiss and Morrill 1992). Supplementary harvest techniques, such as swathing and lowering

header height, are required to recover lodged stems. The potential for equipment damage and harvest time increase, and lower stubble height affects field moisture levels because of less snow retention (Caprio *et al.* 1982, Goosey 1999). Weiss and Morrill (1992) estimated that there would be a total yield loss of 15.5% in a field where 50% of the stems were cut, assuming that 85% of the cut stems could be retrieved during harvest.

The second source of loss is a direct reduction in yield of infested plants. Feeding by wheat stem sawfly larvae affects yield by physically interrupting the flow of nutrients and water to the developing kernels (Morrill *et al.* 1992). Reports concerning the reduction of head weight caused by larval feeding range from "no significant effect" (Munro 1945) to >20% reduction (Seamans *et al.* 1944, McNeal *et al.* 1955, Holmes 1977). Sawflies prefer to oviposit in large stems, which inherently produce the heaviest heads. Accurate estimations of loss can be determined only by comparing infested and uninfested stems of similar size (Morrill *et al.* 1992). This may explain why early research failed to detect a yield loss. Holmes (1977) found that there was a yield reduction of 11-22% attributable to decreases in the number and weight of kernels in *C. cinctus* infested plants. Seamans *et al.* (1944) estimated that sawfly infestation reduced the amount of grain produced by two kernels per head, a 10% crop loss in an average season. Morrill *et al.* (1992) showed a head weight reduction of 3-10%, depending on cultivar, due to larval feeding.

Wheat Stem Sawfly Control

Resistant Cultivars. Solid-stemmed wheat cultivars have been available since 1945 (Stoa 1947, Roberts 1954, Morrill *et al.* 1994). Kemp (1934) was the first to relate stem solidness to wheat stem sawfly resistance. Stem solidness is a result of pith production inside the stem. Pith dries early during plant maturation; this may result in desiccation of sawfly eggs and larvae (Holmes and Peterson 1961, 1962). In stems completely filled with pith, larval movement appears to be physically impeded. Larvae that hatch from eggs completely surrounded by pith don't survive (Farstad 1940). The degree of stem solidness is strongly tied to environmental factors; elongating stems fail to fill with pith during cloudy conditions (Platt 1941, Holmes 1984).

Sawflies are able to infest and cut solid-stemmed cultivars. Sawfly infestation in solid-stemmed cultivars ranged between 16 and 47% in 1991 (Morrill *et al.* 1992). However, there is greater mortality of overwintering larvae in solid stems (Morrill *et al.* 1994). Mortality factors included desiccation (Holmes and Farstad 1956) and freezing of larvae that were unable to migrate below the soil surface (Holmes and Peterson 1962, Morrill *et al.* 1993).

Although sawfly-resistant cultivars reduce sawfly losses, their lower yield potential, reduced disease resistance, and lower grain quality have resulted in limited grower acceptance (Weiss and Morrill 1992). New resistant winter wheat lines, 'Vanguard' and 'Rampart', were produced by back crossing with

solid-stemmed spring wheats (Bowman *et al* 1998). As a result, the new winter wheat cultivars are more susceptible to winter kill (Morrill *et al.* 1994).

Insecticides. The biology of the wheat stem sawfly makes control with conventional insecticides difficult and uneconomical. Sawfly larvae spend all of their development inside the host plant and are protected from insecticides. Because adult emergence and oviposition lasts up to six weeks, multiple insecticide applications are necessary (Holmes and Hurtig 1952). Systemic insecticides and seed treatments were also shown to be ineffective (Wallace 1962, Holmes and Peterson 1963, Skoog and Wallace 1964, Blodgett *et al.* 1996). No insecticides are currently labeled for wheat stem sawfly control.

Cultural Control. Cultural practices that could be used to manage the wheat stem sawfly were first evaluated in the early 1900's. Suggestions included mowing grassy borders that could act as sawfly reservoirs, trap strips, leaving grasses that could act as reservoirs for sawfly parasitoids, early harvesting, and deep plowing (Criddle 1915, 1917, 1922). Tillage, trap crops, swathing, and planting date modifications are practices currently suggested to control sawflies.

Tillage is commonly used to kill weeds in fallow fields, and has been extensively evaluated as a control method for sawflies (Farstad *et al.* 1945,

Callenbach and Hansmeier 1944, 1945, Mills 1945, Holmes and Farstad 1956, Morrill *et al.* 1993, Goosey 1999). Tillage that exposes sawfly-infested stubs on the soil surface showed potential as a control tactic (Holmes and Farstad 1956). Freezing and desiccation were important mortality factors for larvae in exposed stubs (Salt 1946a, 1961). Although there is high mortality in exposed stubs (Holmes and Farstad 1956, Morrill *et al.* 1993), current tillage methods do not expose enough stubble to affect sawfly populations the following year (Goosey 1999).

Trap crops are used to concentrate sawflies into a small percentage of the total crop. The trap crop can consist of planting a susceptible or resistant cultivar around the border of the crop being protected (Morrill *et al.* 2001). The susceptible trap crops are destroyed after sawfly oviposition (Callenbach and Hansmeier 1945) and resistant trap crops can be harvested (Anonymous 1997, Morrill *et al.* 2001). Trap crops are not widely used because producers are reluctant to destroy grain (Goosey 1999) and drought conditions sometimes preclude the vigorous plant growth needed to retain dispersing sawflies (Farstad and Jacobson 1945).

Modifications in planting dates can reduce sawfly damage by disrupting synchronization of sawfly emergence and plant development (Weiss *et al.* 1987). Morrill and Kushnak (1999) showed that late-planted spring wheat had lower levels of sawfly infestation than winter wheat and sometimes avoided attack completely. They suggested that fields with a history of the heaviest sawfly

infestations be planted last. A disadvantage of late planting in semiarid regions is the loss of critical early season moisture (Morrill and Kushnak 1999).

History of Sawfly Parasitoids

Sawfly populations in feral grasses were impacted by at least nine species of hymenopterous parasitoids (Criddle 1923, Morrill 1997) where parasitism levels sometimes approached 100%. However, parasitism levels were usually less than 2% in wheat (Criddle 1923, Neilson 1949). Until recently, parasitoids have made little progress in following the sawfly into wheat; only two, *Bracon cephi* and *B. lissogaster,* have been reared from sawflies in wheat (Holmes 1953, Davis *et al.* 1955, Somsen and Luginbill 1956, Morrill *et al.* 1994). Slow adaptation of parasitoids to wheat may be due to lack of synchrony between parasitoids and host, because feral grasses remain green longer than wheat. *C. cinctus* larvae usually escape parasitoid attack once they move to the lower underground regions of mature plants in preparation for overwintering (Morrill *et al.* 1994). Both *B. cephi* and *B. lissogaster* have two generations. Therefore, unless there is an unusually long growing season caused by cool wet weather, thus prolonging plant senescence and sawfly activity, the second generation of parasitoids cannot survive in wheat because they are unable to locate their hosts in their underground "stubs" (Holmes *et al.* 1963, Morrill *et al.* 1994). *B. cephi*

has effectively suppressed sawfly populations in wheat in Canada (Nelson and Farstad 1953, Holmes *et al.* 1963) and Montana (Morrill *et al.* 1994).

Attempts at introducing other biological control agents have been unsuccessful. A release of 6,000 adult *Collyria calcitrator* (Gravenhorst) (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae), a parasitoid of the European wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus pygmaeus* L., was made in Saskatchewan in 1930, but they did not become established. Further releases of *C. calcitrator* over a nine-year period were unsuccessful (Clausen 1978). Releases of 17,000 *C. calcitrator* and 3,000 *Bracon terebella* Wasmael (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) were made in North Dakota and Montana during 1952-1954, but neither became established (Smith 1961). Smith (1961) hypothesized that the releases failed because of the parasitoids' specific adaptations for the European species.

Taxonomy and Distribution of *Bracon cephi* (Gahan) and *B. lissogaster* Muesebeck

In 1918, A. B. Gahan described *Bracon cephi* (as *Microbracon cephi*) from two males and five females from North Dakota and Manitoba. Specimens were reared from *Cephus cinctus* infested stems of wild grasses. *Microbracon cephi* was later transferred to the genus *Bracon* (Muesebeck and Walkley 1951).

In 1953, C. F. W. Muesebeck described *Bracon lissogaster* from 17 females and 28 males reared from *C. cinctus* infested wheat in Teton County, Montana.

Bracon cephi is recorded from Alberta, Saskatchewan (Nelson and Farstad 1953), Manitoba, North Dakota (Gahan 1918), British Columbia, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, South Dakota, Wyoming, and southwest United States (Krombein *et al.* 1979).

Bracon lissogaster is found in the north-central Montana counties of Cascade, Chouteau, Glacier, Hill, Liberty, and Pondera (Somsen and Luginbill 1956), and Teton and Toole (Muesebeck 1953). It was released and is established in south-central Montana (Morrill 1998) and was recently released in northeastern Montana, but its status there is uncertain (Morrill *et al.*, unpublished).

Runyon *et al.* (2001) give morphological characters that can be used to separate adults of *B. cephi* and *B. lissogaster*.

Biology of *Bracon cephi* and *B. lissogaster*

Bracon cephi. *Bracon cephi* has two generations per year (Criddle 1923, Nelson and Farstad 1953, Morrill 1997). The occurrence of a complete second generation apparently depends on how late in the season the first generation females continue to oviposit. Eggs deposited by first generation parasitoids in June or July pupate and emerge as second generation adults, whereas those laid in August overwinter as larvae (Holmes *et al.* 1963). First generation adults emerge in late June and may still be found when second generation adults

appear in mid August. Second generation adults are present at harvest and have been found in late September (Nelson and Farstad 1953). There is a preoviposition period of one to three weeks for the first generation (Nelson and Farstad 1953, Holmes *et al.* 1963). Whether this delay is required for maturation of eggs (Nelson and Farstad 1953) or for sawfly larvae to develop sufficiently to permit parasitoid development (Holmes *et al.* 1963) is unclear. Females of the second generation begin oviposition almost immediately upon emergence (Holmes *et al.* 1963).

A number of parasitoids respond to odors released by the feeding activity of their hosts (Lewis and Tumlinson 1988, Whitman 1988, Dicke and Sabelis 1989, Turlings *et al.* 1990, Vinson 1991, 1999). Turlings *et al.* (1990, 1991a, 1991b) found that a chemical alicitor in the saliva of the fall armyworm caterpillar causes the host plant (corn) to release chemicals, which attract fall armyworm parasitoids. These chemicals are released not only from the site of attack, but systemically by the entire plant (Turlings and Tumlinson 1992). It is logical that *B. cephi* females locate sawfly-infested stems using chemical cues. "It can fly for considerable periods and, on a very calm day, may be observed flying above the crop, but with no specific directional tendency" (Nelson and Farstad 1953). Indeed, without air currents to direct these chemical cues *B. cephi* has nothing to orient toward.

Once an infested plant is found, the sawfly larva within the stem must be located. Nelson and Farstad (1953) observed "females walking up and down the stem, stopping periodically and straddling the stem with the antennae and remaining in this position for several seconds". Substrate vibration is often used by parasitoids, especially those attacking concealed hosts (Wharton 1984, Lawrence 1981, Glas and Vet 1983, Meyhofer *et al.* 1994). Richerson and Borden (1972) demonstrated that oviposition by a braconid bark beetle parasitoid could be induced by scratching the undersurface of the bark with a pin. *C. cinctus* larvae in wheat stems also produce detectable sounds (Mankin *et al.* 2000). It is likely that *B. cephi* uses the vibrations and sounds produced by sawfly larval feeding and movement to locate its host within the stem.

Once the host has been located, the female inserts her ovipositor into the stem, paralyses the sawfly larva, and deposits an egg. Typically, only one egg is placed per host (Holmes *et al.* 1963); however, the oviposition of two eggs has been observed (Nelson and Farstad 1953). Paralysis probably occurs prior to oviposition and is achieved by the injection of a toxin (Clausen 1940, Piek 1986, Shaw and Huddleston 1991). Parasitoids that do not allow the host to continue functioning (paralysis is permanent or the host is killed) after being parasitized are called idiobionts (Vinson 1975, Wharton 1993). *B. cephi* is an idiobiont parasitoid (Morrill 1998, Runyon *et al.* 2001), and must complete development using the host resources present at oviposition. A related and well-studied parasitoid, *Bracon hebetor* (Say), injects two proteins into its host, which act

presynaptically at neuromuscular junctions. The venom paralyzes the host, which may live for several weeks after the attack without moving or molting (Godfray 1994).

B. cephi places the egg on or near the host. The larva hatches in one to two days, locates the host, attaches itself with its mandibles, and immediately begins to feed. Development is completed in approximately 10 days; usually little is left of the host except the integument. The mature larva spins a cylindrical cocoon that is attached lengthwise to the inside of the stem at each end by a disc-like plate. First generation cocoons are often loosely woven; those of the second generation are tightly woven (Nelson and Farstad 1953). Most *B. cephi* larvae overwinter above ground in uncut stems. Unlike sawfly larvae, which are below the soil surface, *B. cephi* larvae are more exposed to unfavorable winter conditions, making cold-hardiness necessary. They avoid freezing and are able to survive if they do freeze because of large concentrations of glycerol in the haemolymph (Salt 1959). Larvae pupate in the spring and adults emerge by chewing a neat, circular hole in the stem wall.

Bracon lissogaster. The biologies of *B. lissogaster* and *B. cephi* are similar. In general, the preceding discussion also applies to *B. lissogaster.* Somsen and Luginbill (1956) described the biology of *B. lissogaster* in some detail; with the following differences: *B. lissogaster* has two complete generations. Each female lays one to four eggs per host. Four larvae have been

observed to successfully develop on a single host (Runyon, personal observation). Larvae hatch in 66 hours at 23° C and 78% relative humidity. They feed on the outer surface of the host, sucking juices from minute lacerations made with the mandibles. Larval development is completed in six to eight days. When three or four larvae feed on the same host, the development period is shorter and adults are smaller, probably because of food limitations. The sex ratio appears to be 2:1 (male:female) (Somsen and Luginbill 1956).

Wheat Production Practices

Summer Fallow. Summer fallow is a practice to replenish soil water reserves during one growing season for use by the crop grown the following season (Troeh *et al.* 1999). In the semiarid regions of the northern Great Plains, water availability is a major factor limiting plant growth (Willis *et al.* 1983). Summer fallow helps conserve water and reduce the risk of poor yields. Yields of spring wheat and winter wheat are 40-50% higher after fallow than with continuous cropping in dryland areas (Krall *et al.* 1965, Willis *et al.* 1983). Tillage and chemical fallow are common practices used to manage weeds on fallow land in Montana. Weeds must be controlled on fallow land to obtain maximum water storage and to reduce future weed problems (Willis *et al.* 1983).

Tillage. Tillage, disturbance and perturbation that results in the inversion of soil, is used to prepare seedbeds and control weeds. Tillage kills seedlings and mature weeds (Troeh *et al.* 1999). However, intensive tillage that leaves the soil surface free of crop residue increases water loss and soil erosion (Young *et al.* 1983).

Chemical Fallow (No-Till). During the fallow period weeds are controlled with herbicides; the soil is left undisturbed and the crop is seeded directly into the residue of the previous crop (Blevins and Frye 1993). Chemical fallow maximizes soil surface residue, thus decreasing soil erosion and increasing moisture by trapping snow (Larney *et al.* 1994). Crop residue also conserves water by decreasing evaporation and run-off (Wiese *et al.* 1967). The absence of tillage in chemical fallow reduces machinery repair and maintenance costs, and cuts fuel bills in half (Unger *et al.* 1977). Wicks and Smika (1973) demonstrated that chemical fallow plots stored more water and had higher yields than conventionally tilled plots. Crop emergence is typically superior in chemical fallow due to improved soil structure and more favorable moisture (Perry Miller, personal communication). Also, winter wheat seeded into standing stubble has a better chance of winter survival because snow caught by stubble protects the young plants against low temperatures and freezing (Larney *et al.* 1994). The developments of a wide variety of new and improved herbicides (Weise 1983),

and of new seeding equipment that can penetrate heavy crop residue and compact soils (Larney *et al.* 1994) have reduced the need for tillage.

Field Size

Strip Farming. Strip farming is a method of wind erosion control that consists of narrow adjacent strips, oriented perpendicularly to the prevailing wind, which are alternately cropped and fallowed (Troeh *et al.* 1999). Strip farming began in the early 1920's after the drought years of 1917-1919 resulted in serious erosion problems (Howard 1959, Larney *et al.* 1994). Typical strip widths range from 50 to 100 meters.

Disadvantages of the use of strips are the susceptibility of the multiple, long, exposed borders to disease and insect attacks, and to the desiccating effect of hot, dry winds in arid regions (Troeh *et al.* 1999), and to overlap inefficiencies during machinery operation. The efficiency of chemical fallow in reducing soil erosion has diminished the need for strip farming.

Block Farming. Block farming is the planting of large rectangular fields (Figure 3). Block farming is better suited to the efficient use of large farming equipment (Larney *et al.* 1994) and presents fewer borders to diseases, insects, and desiccation from hot, dry winds (Troeh *et al.* 1999).

CHAPTER 2

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Sites

Research sites were located in the north-central and south-central wheat producing regions of Montana (Figure 1, Table 1). Study sites were selected to examine either the impact of tillage (Table 2) or the effect of field size (Table 3) on sawfly parasitism levels. Sites were sampled with a sweep net to ensure the presence of sawflies. Each site was assigned a number, since fields were sampled in different years and differed in production practices.

Table 1. Research site locations and production practices compared.

Site	Comparison	County	Latitude	Longitude
1	nt / t [1]	Chouteau	N 47° 50'	W 111° 17'
2	nt / t	Chouteau	N 48° 00'	W 111° 13'
3	nt / t	Chouteau	N 48° 00'	W 111° 16'
4	nt / t	Chouteau	N 47° 58'	W 111° 22'
5	b / s [2]	Stillwater	N 45° 41'	W 109° 11'

Table 1. Research site locations and production practices compared (cont.).

Site	Comparison	County	Latitude	Longitude
6	nt / t b / s	Stillwater	N 45° 45'	W 109° 07'
7	b / s	Stillwater	N 45° 59'	W 109° 15'
8	b / s	Golden Valley	N 46° 10'	W 109° 16'
9	nt / t	Cascade	N 47° 41'	W 111° 37'
10	nt / t b / s	Teton	N 47° 57'	W 111° 47'
11	nt / t	Toole	N 48° 16'	W 111° 49'
12	nt / t	Chouteau	N 47° 50'	W 111° 19'
13	nt / t	Chouteau	N 48° 00'	W 111° 08'
14	b / s	Cascade	N 47° 42'	W 111° 34'
15	b / s	Teton	N 47° 51'	W 111° 40'
16	b / s	Pondera	N 48° 02'	W 111° 39'
17	b / s	Chouteau	N 48° 05'	W 111° 29'

Table 1. Research site locations and production practices compared (cont.).

Site	Comparison	County	Latitude	Longitude
18	nt / t b / s	Cascade	N 47° 39'	W 111° 35'
19	nt / t	Teton	N 47° 49'	W 111° 59'
20	b / s	Teton	N 47° 50'	W 111° 34'

[1] nt / t = no-till / tilled
[2] b / s = block / strip

Figure 1. Approximate locations of research sites.



Table 2. No-till / tilled fields: Year sampled and production practices.

Site	Year	nt / t [1]	Tillage Type	sw / ww [2]	h / s [3]	b / s [4]
1	1998	t	N / A	ww	s	s
1	1998	nt		ww	s	b
2	1998	t	N / A	ww	h	s
2	1998	nt		ww	h	b
3	1998	t	N / A	ww	h	b
3	1998	nt		ww	h	b
4	1998	t	min [5]	ww	h	s
4	1998	nt		ww	s	b
9	1998	t	min	ww	s	s
9	1998	nt		ww	s	s
10	1998	t	min	ww	s	s
10	1998	nt		ww	s	b
11	1998	t	int [6]	sw	s	b
11	1998	nt		sw	s	b
6	1999	t	int	ww	s	s
6	1999	nt		ww	s	s
12	1999	t	int	ww	s	s
12	1999	nt		ww	s	s
4	1999	t	mod [7]	ww	s	s
4	1999	nt		ww	s	s
13	1999	t	int	ww	s	s
13	1999	nt		ww	s	s
9	1999	t	min	ww	s	s
9	1999	nt		ww	s	s
18	2000	t	mod	ww	s	s
18	2000	nt		ww	s	s
19	2000	t	int	ww	h	b
19	2000	nt		ww	h	b

[1] nt / t = no-till / tilled
[2] sw / ww = spring wheat / winter wheat
[3] h / s = hollow / solid-stemmed
[4] b / s = block / strip field
[5] min = minimum
[6] int = intense
[7] mod = moderate

Table 3. Block / strip fields: Year sampled and production practices.

Site	Year	nt / t [1]	sw / ww [2]	h / s [3]
5	1998	t	ww	h
6	1998	nt	ww	s
7	1998	t	ww	h
8	1998	t	ww	h
10	1998	t	ww	s
5	1999	t	ww	h
14	1999	nt	ww	s
15	1999	nt	ww	s
16	1999	nt	ww	s
17	2000	nt	ww	s
15	2000	nt	ww	s
20	2000	nt	sw	s

[1] nt / t = no-till / tilled
[2] sw / ww = spring wheat / winter wheat
[3] h / s = hollow / solid-stemmed

Stem Sampling

Plant samples were collected at each location to determine sawfly infestation, sawfly cutting, and sawfly parasitism levels. Mature plant stems were collected immediately before harvest. Stems were collected by uprooting entire plants to ensure that the sawfly 'stubs' were obtained. The plants were then secured with twine, labeled, and transported to the lab for processing. The wheat type (spring or winter, solid or hollow) was determined, but the exact cultivar was sometimes unknown. Locations in which the wheat cultivar was not known were selected to match hollow or solid-stemmed, and winter or spring wheat. Only fields with the same wheat cultivar or stem character were selected for comparison at each location.

Tillage System Comparison

Neighboring fields that were as similar as possible, except for differences in tillage system, were chosen at each location. The tillage type was categorized by the amount of crop residue on the soil surface. Tilled fields with >90% of the stubble remaining on the soil surface were designated as "minimum tillage", fields with approximately half of the stubble remaining were "moderate tillage", and fields with no visible stubble were labeled "intensive tillage". Four samples

were taken at each location. The first sampling location was randomly assigned, and sample spacing along the long axis of the field was constant thereafter. Samples were taken in two fields, one that bordered an untilled and one that bordered a tilled summer fallow field (Figure 2, ☆ 's). Samples were taken from the same side of each field (i.e., from the east edge) at each location because adults fly upwind to existing crops, possibly causing sawfly infestation and parasitism levels to vary between opposing field edges. In 1998, samples consisted of four replicates of approximately 100 randomly selected stems located within 1-5 m of the field border. In 1999 and 2000, samples consisted of four replicates of all stems in a 30 cm length of a row located within 1-5 m of the field border.

Block / Strip Field Comparison

Strip fields adjacent to a block field were chosen at each location, which matched stubble management practice and cultivar type. In 1998, a single strip field was paired with a block field. In 1999 and 2000, four strip fields were matched with a single neighboring block field. Mature plant stems were collected as described above. For every strip at each location, eight samples were taken. Four samples at the field edge and four corresponding samples were taken in the center of each strip. The first sampling location was randomly assigned, and sample spacing along the long axis of the field was constant thereafter. In 1998,

samples consisted of four replicates of approximately 100 randomly selected stems. In 1999 and 2000, samples consisted of four replicates each comprising all plants in a 30 cm length of a row. All samples from the field border were collected within 1-5 m of the field edge. Samples were taken at regular intervals across the block fields. The edge and three transects into each block, each transect corresponding to half the width of the associated strip(s) (Figure 3, ☆ 's), were sampled as above.

Figure 2. Sampling: Tillage System comparison. ☆ = sampling location.



Figure 3. Sampling: Block / strip field comparison. ☆ = sampling location.



Stem Processing

Sawfly Infestation and Stem Cutting Levels

Each stem was dissected lengthwise with an X-ACTO® knife, to determine sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism levels. Sawfly infestation was determined by noting the presence of characteristic frass resulting from the feeding of the sawfly larva within the stem. The cleanly cut, frass-plugged lower portions of stems were easily recognized as sawfly cut stems. Questionable cut stems were dissected to confirm the presence of sawfly larvae and their translucent hibernacula. Only the lower part of cut stems ('stubs') were used to estimate sawfly cutting. The numbers of sawfly-infested and sawfly-cut stems were recorded for each replication.

Sawfly Parasitism Levels

Sawfly parasitism levels were determined by the presence of parasitoid cocoons and adult parasitoid emergence holes. Plants were held in the lab for one month to allow completion of parasitoid development and cocoon construction before each stem was dissected. The cocoons were collected and stored at 0° C for three months to break diapause and allow emergence of adults. The number of parasitoid cocoons and emergence holes was recorded for each replication.

Kernel Analysis

In 1999 and 2000, all heads from uninfested, sawfly-infested, and stems with parasitized sawfly larvae were saved and placed in brown paper bags labeled with the location, field, and within field location. The heads were threshed and three replicates of the weights of 100-kernels were randomly taken from each uninfested, infested, and parasitized sample. Kernels were weighed to the nearest .01 grams using an Ainsworth CP-300 digital balance, and counted using a Pfeuffer Contador® seed counter (Hoffman Manufacturing Inc., Albany, Oregon). Kernels were dried in a VRW Scientific convection oven (Sheldon Manufacturing Inc., Cornelius, Oregon) at 70° C, and kernel weights were calibrated to 13% moisture.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using the SAS Statistical Package (SAS Institute 1990). Percent data were normalized using the arcsine transformation and count data were normalized using the square root transformation.

Tillage System Comparison

The General Linear Model (GLM) procedure of SAS was used to examine the possibility of year and tillage system effects and interactions. The TTEST procedure was used in a paired comparison by site, evaluating mean percent sawfly infestation, cut stems, and parasitism between untilled and tilled fields.

Block / Strip Field Comparison

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test, using the NPAR1WAY procedure of the SAS System, was performed to compare sawfly parasitism of the edge ("Strip B1", Figure 4) with the inside ("Strip B2", Figure 4) of the block at each site. The Kruskal-Wallis test (NPAR1WAY procedure) was used to compare sawfly parasitism in the block edge and inner block with every strip at each location. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Kruskal-Wallis tests are nonparametric procedures chosen because of the nonnormality of the parasitism data.

Dunnett's two-tailed t-test, using the GLM procedure, was applied in a multiple comparison at each location, testing if mean percent sawfly infestation and mean percent sawfly cut stems in any strip was significantly different from sawfly infestation and sawfly cut stems in the block edge ("Strip B1", Figure 4). A second Dunnett's multiple comparison procedure was performed comparing each strip and the block edge with the block middle ("Strip B2", Figure 4).

Kernel Analysis

The sign test, using the UNIVARIATE procedure of SAS, was performed to compare kernel weights of uninfested stems, sawfly-infested stems, and stems with parasitized sawfly larvae by location, field, and within field location. The sign test counts the number of positive and negative signs among the differences (omitting all differences of zero). The hypothesis that the number of positive and negative signs is sampled from a population in which the two signs are present in equal proportions (as expected if there were no true difference between the two populations) was tested.

Figure 4. Statistical analysis: Block / strip Field comparison. The four sampling locations sampled in the block are analogous to two of the associated strips.



CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Tillage System Comparison

Table 4. ANOVA results for sawfly infestation, cut stems, and sawfly parasitism for all sites and years.

		Mean % Sawfly Infestation		Mean % Sawfly Cut Stems		Mean % Sawfly Parasitism	
Source	DF	Mean Square	Pr > F	Mean Square	Pr > F	Mean Square	Pr > F
Year	2	2.549	<0.0001	0.344	<0.0001	0.163	0.36
Tillage System	1	0.169	0.16	0.0002	0.98	0.261	0.21
Year * TS	2	0.098	0.32	0.0089	0.67	0.064	0.67

The year effect accounted for 91% of the ANOVA model variance for sawfly infestation (Table 4). Mean percent sawfly infestation was highest in 1998 (48%), followed by 2000 (36%), and 1999 (22%). Not surprisingly, year also had an effect on sawfly cut stems, explaining 97% of the ANOVA model variance. Mean percent sawfly cut stems was highest in 1998 (9%), then 2000 (8%), and 1999 (7%), paralleling the trend for sawfly infestation. Tillage system and its interaction with year were not significant (P>0.05).

Table 5. Mean percent sawfly-infested stems, cut stems, and parasitism in the tilled and untilled field at each site (± SEM).

Site - Year	Bordering Field	Mean % Sawfly Infested Stems	Mean % Sawfly Cut Stems	Mean % Sawfly Parasitism
1	t [1]	87 ± 4	9 ± 2	55 ± 12
	nt [2]	92 ± 3	15 ± 3	41 ± 8
2	t	98 ± 1 **	18 ± 2	74 ± 4 **
	nt	88 ± 4	14 ± 4	49 ± 8
3	t	91 ± 1 **	19 ± 3 **	67 ± 6 **
	nt	97 ± 1	28 ± 4	52 ± 4
4-1998	t	77 ± 3	14 ± 2	48 ± 9
	nt	84 ± 8	14 ± 3	58 ± 6
4-1999	t	30 ± 4 **	10 ± 1	24 ± 4 **
	nt	42 ± 3	13 ± 3	9 ± 2
6	t	11 ± 2	3 ± 2 **	5 ± 3 **
	nt	11 ± 4	0 ± 0	81 ± 17
9-1998	t	44 ± 4	6 ± 2	27 ± 9
	nt	43 ± 8	12 ± 7	20 ± 7
9-1999	t	34 ± 6	10 ± 2	18 ± 7
	nt	25 ± 8	9 ± 1	15 ± 3
10	t	39 ± 5	5 ± 1	45 ± 11
	nt	53 ± 7	8 ± 3	69 ± 16
11	t	38 ± 4 **	15 ± 2 **	7 ± 7 **
	nt	9 ± 2	0 ± 0	39 ± 15
12	t	38 ± 12	11 ± 3 **	20 ± 11
	nt	35 ± 9	4 ± 3	32 ± 17
13	t	52 ± 14	9 ± 2 **	56 ± 9 **
	nt	42 ± 4	3 ± 1	74 ± 8

Table 5. Mean percent sawfly infested stems, cut stems, and parasitism in the tilled and untilled field at each site (± SEM) (cont.).

Site - Year	Bordering Field	Mean % Sawfly Infested Stems	Mean % Sawfly Cut Stems	Mean % Sawfly Parasitism
18	t	81 ± 3 **	20 ± 3	28 ± 3
	nt	97 ± 1	27 ± 5	26 ± 4
19	t	72 ± 8	19 ± 4	31 ± 4 **
	nt	84 ± 7	18 ± 4	59 ± 3

** indicates significant difference at $\alpha = 0.05$
[1] t = tilled
[2] nt = no-till

Table 6. Summary of the tillage system paired comparison by site.

	Tilled Higher	Untilled Higher	No Difference
Sawfly Infestation	2	3	9
Sawfly Cut Stems	2	2	10
Sawfly Parasitism	3	4	7

The paired comparison of untilled and tilled fields by year and site did not show a trend, other than that there was little difference in sawfly infestation, cutting, and parasitism levels. Overall, sawfly parasitism did not differ between untilled and tilled fields ($P>0.05$). However, sawfly parasitism was higher ($P = 0.05$) in the

untilled field at four of the five intensely tilled locations (sites 6, 11, 13, and 19), suggesting that intense tillage might be detrimental to sawfly parasitoids. There were no differences in parasitism between minimal tilled and untilled fields (sites 4, 9-1998, 9-1999, and 10) ($P>0.05$).

Block / Strip Field Comparison

Table 7. Kolmogorov-Smirnov results comparing sawfly parasitism of the edge and middle of block fields. The percent parasitism (± SEM) is included.

Site - Year	Block Edge: Sawfly Parasitism	Block Middle: Sawfly Parasitism	p - value
5-1998	85 ± 6	72 ± 16	> 1.00
5-1999	9 ± 5	8 ± 4	> 1.00
6	49 ± 8	62 ± 10	0.09
7	25 ± 11	29 ± 8	0.68
8	98 ± 5	74 ± 19	0.28
10	50 ± 17	43 ± 7	0.68
14	7 ± 4	5 ± 3	> 1.00
15-1999	34 ± 11	27 ± 4	0.68
15-2000	29 ± 4	26 ± 5	0.68
16	79 ± 10	77 ± 16	> 1.00
17	50 ± 13	48 ± 19	> 1.00
20	39 ± 13	48 ± 16	> 1.00

No difference in percent sawfly parasitism between the edge and middle of block fields was detected (Table 7).

Table 8. Summary of Dunnett's t-test results comparing sawfly infestation and sawfly cut stems in the block edge ("Strip B1", Fig. 4) with the inner block ("Strip B2", Fig. 4) at each location.

	Block Edge Higher	Inner Block Higher	No Difference (α=0.05)
Sawfly Infestation	8	0	4
Sawfly Cut Stems	6	0	6

Sawfly infestation was higher (P = 0.05) in the block edge than in the inner block at 67% of the sites (Table 8, Figures 19, 21-24, and 27-29), and sawfly cutting was higher (P = 0.05) in the block edge at half the sites (Table 8, Figures 19, 21, 22, 24, 27, and 29). Fewer differences in sawfly cut stems occurred at locations where there was essentially no cutting because of high sawfly parasitism (Figures 9 and 14).

Figure 5. Site 5 - 1998: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 6. Site 5 - 1999: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 7. Site 6: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 8. Site 7: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 9. Site 8: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 10. Site 10: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 11. Site 14: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 12. Site 15 - 1999: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 13. Site 15 - 2000: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 14. Site 16: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 15. Site 17: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Figure 16. Site 20: Effect of distance from field edge on sawfly infestation, stem cutting, and parasitism in the block field



Table 9. Kruskal-Wallis test results comparing parasitism in the block edge ("Strip B1", Fig. 4) with all strips at each location.

Site - Year	DF	Test Statistic (T)	Pr > T
5-1998	1	0.4737	0.49
5-1999	4	4.1635	0.38
6	1	6.3905	0.02
7	1	1.6143	0.20
8	1	0.0000	1.00
10	1	1.2196	0.27
14	4	2.9486	0.57
15-1999	4	0.9645	0.92
15-2000	4	15.0538	0.005
16	4	2.7308	0.61
17	4	6.5880	0.16
20	4	8.6527	0.08

Sawfly parasitism did not differ between the strips and the block edge, except at two of the twelve locations (P=0.05) (Table 9).

Results of the Kruskal-Wallis test comparing sawfly parasitism in the inner block ("Strip B2", Figure 4) with all strips at each location were similar to those for the block edge. This was expected since sawfly parasitism in the block edge and inner block were the same.

Table 10. Summary of Dunnett's t-test results comparing sawfly infestation and sawfly cut stems in each strip with the block edge ("Strip B1", Figure 4) at each location.

	Strip Higher	Block Edge Higher	No Difference (α=0.05)
Sawfly Infestation	4	2	27
Sawfly Cut Stems	6	2	25

Table 11. Summary of Dunnett's t-test results comparing sawfly infestation and sawfly cut stems in each strip with the inner block ("Strip B2", Figure 4) at each location.

	Strip Higher	Inner Block Higher	No Difference (α=0.05)
Sawfly Infestation	16	0	17
Sawfly Cut Stems	14	0	19

In general, there was no difference in percent sawfly infestation and percent sawfly cut stems between the strips and the block edge (Table 10). Conversely, sawfly infestation and sawfly cutting was lower (P = 0.05) in the inner block in half of the comparisons (Table 11).

Kernel Analysis

Table 12. Results of the sign test comparing kernel weights.

Difference	N	+ Signs	- Signs	Test Statistic (M)	Pr >= |M|
uninfested - infested	273	88	185	- 48.5	< .0001
infested - parasitized	90	24	66	-21	< .0001
uninfested - parasitized	89	10	80	-34.5	< .0001

Kernel weight of sawfly-infested stems were heavier (P=0.05) than kernel weight of uninfested stems (Table 12). Sawfly-parasitized stems had heavier (P=0.05) kernels than uninfested and sawfly-infested stems.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Tillage System Comparison

Overall, there was little difference in mean percent sawfly parasitism between untilled and tilled fields. However, sawfly parasitism was lower in the intensively tilled field at four of the five locations (sites 6, 11, 13, and 19). Heavy tillage in which all stubble is buried was detrimental to sawfly parasitoids. Sawfly parasitoids typically overwinter above ground in stems, and might be unable to dig to the soil surface if buried. In the samples at sites 6, 13, and 19, there were 240 total parasitoids in the untilled fields and only 104 total parasitoids in the intensively tilled fields, even though there was no difference in sawfly infestation (731 and 712 total sawfly-infested stems in untilled and intensively tilled fallow fields, respectively). Sawfly parasitism did not differ between minimal tilled and untilled fields. Fields with minimum tillage are similar to untilled fields in that few parasitoids are buried. If biological control of the wheat stem sawfly is to be encouraged, intensive tillage should be discouraged.

Tillage was sometimes used as a sawfly control tactic. Intensive tillage that incorporates sawfly-infested stubble into the soil was recommended (Criddle 1922, Farstad *et al.* 1945). However, Goosey (1999) reported no difference in

sawfly mortality between untilled and tilled fields that resulted in soil-incorporated stubble. In this study, mean percent sawfly infestation was not different in intensively tilled and untilled fields at four of the five locations (sites 6, 12,13, and 19). These data support Goosey's findings.

Producers who wish to reduce or eliminate minimum tillage operations in favor of chemical fallow should see no increase in sawfly numbers (Goosey 1999) and no reduction in sawfly parasitism. Intensive tillage is not an effective sawfly control practice. Successful biological control of the wheat stem sawfly is prevented by the use of intensive tillage. Replacing intensive tillage with minimum tillage or chemical fallow should result in a cumulative increase in sawfly parasitism over multiple years.

Block / Strip Field Comparison

Sawfly parasitism did not change with distance into the block field, even though sawfly infestation decreased with distance into the field at two-thirds of the locations. Percent sawfly infestation had no effect on parasitism, showing that the parasitoids were efficient at locating sawflies at low densities. Sawfly parasitoids probably use chemical cues produced by sawfly-infested plants to locate hosts as has been found in other insects (Whitman 1988, Turlings *et al.* 1990, Vinson 1991, 1999). Substrate vibrations and sounds produced by sawfly feeding are almost certainly used by sawfly parasitoids to locate their hosts within

the stem (Wharton 1984, Lawrence 1981, Meyhofer *et al.* 1994, Mankin *et al.* 2000). The efficiency of sawfly parasitoid host location is probably improved in the inner block due to reduced chemical confusion and reduced vibrational background noise, possibly explaining why parasitism doesn't increase with sawfly density. A concentration of sawfly-infested plants at the field edge may result in a concentration of chemical cues, and complicates parasitoid location of infested stems. Higher wind speeds at field edges might increase vibrational background noise, making location of the host within the stem difficult. Also, Nelson and Farstad (1963) found that high sawfly densities could be detrimental to sawfly parasitoids because of cannibalism. If more than one egg is deposited in a stem, one sawfly larva will destroy the other(s) including any associated parasitoid larvae.

Generally, there was no difference in sawfly parasitism, sawfly infestation, and sawfly cut stems in the strips and the associated block's edge. This is no surprise since the source of sawflies and parasitoids is the previous year's stubble and both the block edge and the strips border fallow fields. In general, there was no difference in mean percent parasitism in the inner block and the associated strips. However, at half of the locations, sawfly infestation and cut stems were lower in the inner block than in the associated strips. Also, at two-thirds of the locations, sawfly infestation and stem cutting were lower in the inner block than the block edge. The inner block does not border a fallow field.

Sawflies infesting stems in the inner block would have to pass by many suitable hosts in the block edge.

The most important advantage of block farming is the presentation of fewer borders to attack by sawflies, especially in areas of heavy sawfly infestation. Replacing strip farming with blocks will have little effect on the percent of sawflies parasitized, and might decrease sawfly infestations.

This study measured the short-term impact of field size and tillage practice on sawfly parasitism. A multiple year study under controlled conditions could further explain the variability in the results obtained. Planting history, long-term tillage practices, topography, soil type, and environment are factors that might affect sawfly parasitism.

Kernel Analysis

Generally, kernels of sawfly-infested stems were heavier than kernels of uninfested stems, supporting the idea that sawflies selectively oviposit in large stems, which inherently produce heavier kernels (Morrill *et al.* 1992). Accurate estimations of the effect of sawfly feeding on kernel weight can be determined only by comparing stems of similar size (Morrill *et al.* 1992). Kernels of stems containing parasitized sawflies, for the most part, were heavier than kernels of stems containing unparasitized sawflies. First generation parasitoids are present

early in the season and paralyze sawfly larvae before they complete feeding within the stems (Ainslie 1920, Holmes *et al.* 1963). This reduction in feeding affords some protection against head weight loss. Second generation parasitoids typically appear after sawfly feeding is complete (Holmes *et al.* 1963) and probably provides little or no protection against reduced kernel weight. An alternative explanation for heavier kernels in stems containing parasitized sawflies is that sawfly parasitoids selectively oviposit in the largest infested stems, which produce heavier kernels.

SUMMARY

The wheat stem sawfly has been a serious pest of wheat in the northern Great Plains for almost a century. No single control method effectively reduces sawfly populations, demonstrating the importance of the development of an effective integrated pest management (IPM) program. Summer fallow is necessary in the semiarid regions of the northern Great Plains to replenish soil moisture for dependable crop production. Therefore, knowledge of the effect of summer fallow practices on wheat stem sawfly parasitoids is essential in the implementation of a successful biological control component of an IPM program to control the wheat stem sawfly.

Tillage is often used to manage fallow land. Intensive tillage is detrimental to sawfly parasitoids. However, there was no difference in sawfly parasitism between minimally tilled and untilled fields. Chemical fallow offers advantages in water conservation, soil erosion, and production costs over tillage. Producers replacing minimum tillage with chemical fallow should see no effect on sawfly parasitism. The elimination of intensive tillage in favor of chemical fallow should result in higher sawfly parasitism over time.

Sawfly parasitism was uniform across block fields, even when a marked decrease in sawfly infestation occurred with increased distance from the field edge. Replacing strip fields with blocks will have little effect on percent sawfly

parasitism, and the reduction in borders exposed to sawfly attack should reduce sawfly infestations.

REFERENCES CITED

Ainslie CN. 1920. The western grass-stem sawfly. *U S Department of Agriculture Bulletin* **841**

Ainslie CN. 1929. The western grass-stem sawfly a pest of small grains. *U S Department of Agriculture Technical Bulletin* **157**

Anonymous. 1997. Montana crop health report 1997. Special edition: Wheat stem sawfly. *Montana Extension Service* **10**(10): 1-7

Ashmead WH. 1897. Classification of the horntails and sawflies, of the suborder Phytophaga. *The Canadian Entomologist* **30**: 177-83

Blevins RL, Frye WW. 1993. Conservation tillage: An ecological approach to soil conservation, in *Advances in Agronomy* **51**: 33-78. Academic Press

Blodgett SL, Goosey HB, Waters D, Tharp CI, Johnson GD. 1996. Wheat stem sawfly control on winter wheat. *Arthropod Management Tests* **22**: 331-2

Bowman HF, Cash SD, Bruckner P, Bergman JW, Eckhoff JL, Wichman DM, Kushnak GD, Carlson GR, Stougaard RN. 1998. Winter wheat cultivars. *Montana Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin* **1098**

Callenbach JA, Hansmeier MP. 1944. Wheat stem sawfly control in severely infested areas. *Montana Extension Service, Circular* **56**

1945. Wheat stem sawfly control. *Montana Extension Service, Circular* **164**

Caprio JM, Grunwald GK, Snyder RD. 1982. Snow barrier potential for harvesting moisture in transects across chinook areas in Montana. *Montana Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report* **175**

Church NS. 1955. Hormones and the termination and reinduction of diapause in *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **33**: 339-69

Clausen CP. 1940. *Entomophagous Insects.* McGraw-Hill, New York

1978. Introduced parasites and predators of arthropod pests and weeds. *U S Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Handbook* **480**

Criddle N. 1911. Injurious insects of 1910 at Treesbank, Manitoba. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **4**: 236-41

1915. The Hessian fly and the western wheat-stem sawfly in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. *Canadian Department of Agriculture Bulletin* **11**

1917. Further observations upon the habits of the western wheat stem sawfly in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. *Agricultural Gazette of Canada* **4**(3): 176-7

1922. The western wheat-stem sawfly and its control. *Canadian Department of Agriculture Pamphlet* **6**

1923. The life habits of *Cephus cinctus* Nort. in Manitoba. *The Canadian Entomologist* **55**: 1-4

Davis EG. 1952. Status of the wheat stem sawfly in the northern Great Plains in 1951. *U S Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.* Special Report **1**

1955. Status of the wheat stem sawfly in the United States in 1954. *North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station Bimonthly Bulletin* **17**(5): 171-75

Davis EG, Benton C, Somsen HW. 1955. Natural enemies of the wheat stem sawfly in North Dakota and Montana. *North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station Bimonthly Bulletin* **28**: 63-65

Dicke M, Sabelis MW. 1989. Does it pay plants to advertise for bodyguards? Towards a cost-benefit analysis of induced syndrome production, in *Causes and consequences of variation in growth rate of higher plants.* SPB, The Hague pp. 341-58.

Farstad CW. 1940. The development of western wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Nort.) in various host plants as an index of resistance. Ph.D. Thesis. Iowa State College.

Farstad CW, Jacobson KM. 1945. Manual for sawfly control workers in Alberta. *Canadian Department of Agriculture Science Service, Division of Entomology, Contribution* **16**

Farstad CW, King KM, Glen R, Jacobson LA. 1945. Control of the wheat stem sawfly in the Prairie Provinces. *Canadian War-Time Production Series, Agricultural Supplies Board Special Pamphlet* **59**

Fletcher J. 1896. The western wheat stem sawfly (Cephus pygmaeus (L)). *Canadian Entomological Report 1896* pp. 147-49

Gahan AB. 1918. Description of a new hymenopterous parasite (Braconidae). *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington* **20**(1): 18-19

Glas PCG, Vet LEM. 1983. Host-habitat location and host location by *Diachasma alloeum* Muesebeck (Hymenoptera: Braconidae), a parasitoid of *Rhagoletis pomonella* Walsh (Diptera: Tephritidae). *Netherlands Journal of Zoology* **33**: 41-45

Godfray HCJ. 1994. *Parasitoids.* Princeton University Press, New Jersey

Goosey HB. 1999. In field distributions of the wheat stem sawfly, (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), and evaluation of selected tactics for an integrated pest management program. Master's Thesis. Montana State University

Holmes ND. 1953. Notes on *Scambus detritus* (Holmg.) (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae), a new parasite of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. *The Canadian Entomologist* **85**: 339

1954. Food relations of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *The Canadian Entomologist* **86**: 159-67

1975. Effects of moisture, gravity, and light on the behavior of larvae of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *The Canadian Entomologist* **107**: 391-401

1977. The effect of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), on the yield and quality of wheat. *The Canadian Entomologist* **109**: 1591-98

1978. The wheat stem sawfly. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Entomological Society of Alberta* 2-13

1982. Population dynamics of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), in wheat. *The Canadian Entomologist* **114**: 775-88

1984. The effect of light on the resistance of hard red spring wheats to the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Science* **36**: 196-202

Holmes ND, Hurtig H. 1952. Screening tests for ten contact insecticides on the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. *Canadian Department of Agriculture Science Service, Division of Entomology, Research Note Series* **E-8**

Holmes ND, Farstad CW. 1956. Effects of field exposure on immature stages of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Science* **36**: 196-202

Holmes ND, Peterson LK. 1960. The influence of the host on oviposition of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Canadian Journal of Plant Science* **40**: 29-46

1961. Resistance of spring wheats to the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) I. Resistance to the egg. *The Canadian Entomologist* **93**: 348-65

1962. Resistance of spring wheats to the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) II. Resistance to the larva. *The Canadian Entomologist* **94**: 579-81

1963. Heptachlor as a systemic insecticide against the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. *The Canadian Entomologist* **95**: 792-96

Holmes ND, Nelson WA, Peterson LK, Farstad CW. 1963. Causes of variations in effectiveness of *Bracon cephi* (Gahan) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) as a parasite of the wheat stem sawfly. *The Canadian Entomologist* **95**:113-26

Howard JK. 1959. *Montana, high, wide and handsome.* Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut

Ivie, MA. 1996. Discovery of the wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Norton) (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) in Asia, with the proposal of a new synonymy. *The Canadian Entomologist* **128**: 347-48

Kemp HJ. 1934. Studies of solid stem wheat cultivars in relation to wheat stem sawfly control. *Scientific Agriculture* **15**: 30-38

Koebele A. 1890. California notes. *U S Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, Insect Life* **3**: 71

Krall JL, Army TJ, Post AH, Seamans AE. 1965. Summary of dryland rotations and tillage experiments at Havre, Huntley, and Moccasin, Montana. *Montana Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin* **599**

Krombein KV, Hurd PD, Jr, Smith DR, Burks DB. 1979. *Catalog of Hymenoptera in America North of Mexico.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Press

Larney FJ, Lindwall CW, Izaurralde RC, Moulin AP. 1994. Tillage systems for soil and water conservation on the Canadian Prairie, in *Conservation tillage in temperate agroecosystems.* CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida pp. 305-28

Lawrence PO. 1981. Host vibration: A cue to host location by the parasitoid *Biosteres longicaudatus. Oecologia* **48**: 249-51

Lewis WJ, Tumlinson JH. 1988. Host detection by chemically mediated associative learning in a parasitic wasp. *Nature* **331**: 257-59

Mankin RW, Brandhorst-Hubbard J, Flanders KL, Zhang M, Crocker RL, Lapointe SL, McCoy CW, Fisher JR, Weaver DK. 2000. Eavesdropping on insects hidden in soil and interior structures of plants. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **93**(4): 1173-1182

McNeal FH, Berg MA, Luginbill P, Jr. 1955. Wheat stem sawfly damage in four spring wheat cultivars as influenced by date of seeding. *Agronomy Journal* **47**: 522-525

Meyhofer R, Casas J, Dorn S. 1994. Host location by a parasitoid using leafminer vibrations: Characterizing the vibrational signals produced by the leafmining host. *Physiological Entomology* **19**: 349-59

Mills HB. 1945. Wheat stem sawfly in Montana. *Wartime Service, Montana Agricultural Experiment Station War Circular* **6**

Morrill WL. 1997. The wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), and associated parasitoids in the northern Great Plains of North America. *Trends in Entomology* **1**: 171-74

1998. Parasitism of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) in Montana. *Biological Control* **12**: 159-63

Morrill WL, Kushnak GD. 1996. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) adaptation to winter wheat. *Environmental Entomology* **25**(5): 1128-32

1999. Planting date influence on the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) in spring wheat. *Journal of Agricultural and Urban Entomology* **16**(2): 123-8

Morrill WL, Weaver DK. 2000. Host plant quality and male wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) fitness. *Journal of Entomological Science* **35**(4): 478-482

Morrill WL, Gabor JW, Kushnak GD. 1992. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae): Damage and detection. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **85**(6): 2413-17

Morrill WL, Gabor JW, Wichman, D. 1993. Mortality of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) at low temperatures. *Environmental Entomology* **22**(6): 1358-61

Morrill WL, Weaver DK, Johnson GD. 2001. Trap strip and field border modification for management of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Journal of Entomological Science* **36**(1): 34-45

Morrill WL, Kushnak GD, Bruckner PL, Gabor JW. 1994. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) damage, rates of parasitism, and overwinter survival in resistant wheat lines. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **87**: 1373-76

Morrill WL, Gabor JW, Weaver DK, Kushnak GD, Irish NJ. 2000. Effect of host plant quality on the sex ratio and fitness of female wheat stem sawflies (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Environmental Entomology* **29**(2): 195-99

Muesebeck CFW. 1953. Three new reared Braconidae. *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington* **55**(3): 149-51

Muesebeck CFW, Walkley LM. 1951. Braconidae, in *Hymenoptera of America north of Mexico.* Muesebeck CFW, Krombein KV, Townes HK, *et al. eds. USDA Agricultural Monograph* **2**

Munro JA. 1945. Wheat stem sawfly and harvest loss. *North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station Bimonthly Bulletin* **7**: 12-16

Neilson CL. 1949. Biology and seasonal history of *Pleurotropis utahensis* Crawford, a parasite of the wheat stem sawfly. *The Canadian Entomologist* **81**: 174-80

Nelson WA. 1953. Observations on hyperparasitism of the wheat stem sawfly *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *The Canadian Entomologist* **85**: 249-51

Nelson WA, Farstad CW. 1953. Biology of *Bracon cephi* (Gahan) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae), an important parasite of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), in western Canada. *The* Canadian Entomologist **85**: 103-7

Norton E. 1872. Notes on North American Tenthredinidae with descriptions of new species. *American Entomological Society Transactions* **4**: 77-86

Piek T. 1986. *Venoms of the Hymenoptera*. Academic Press, London

Platt AW. 1941. The influence of some environmental factors on the expression of the solid-stem character in certain wheat cultivars. *Scientific Agriculture* **22**: 139-51

Platt AW, Farstad CW. 1946. The reaction of wheat cultivars to wheat stem sawfly attack. *Scientific Agriculture* **26**(6): 231-47

Richerson JV, Borden JH. 1972. Host finding by heat perception in *Coeloides brunneri* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). *The Canadian Entomologist.* **104**: 1877-81

Riley CV, Marlatt CL. 1891. Wheat and grass-sawflies. *U S Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, Insect Life* **4**: 168-79

Roberts DWA. 1954. Sawfly resistance in wheat. I. Types of resistance. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Science* **34**: 582-97

Runyon JB, Hurley RL, Morrill WL, Weaver DK. 2001. Distinguishing adults of *Bracon cephi* and *Bracon lissogaster* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae), parasitoids of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *The Canadian Entomologist* **133**: 215-17

Salt RW. 1946a. Moisture relationships of the wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Nort.) I. Some effects of dessication. *Scientific Agriculture* **26**: 622-30

1946b. Moisture relationships of the wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Nort.) II. Some effects of moisture contact. *Scientific Agriculture* **26**: 631-39

1947. Some effects of temperature on the production and elimination of diapause in the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. *Canadian Journal of Research* **25**: 66-86

1959. Role of glycerol in the cold-hardening of *Bracon cephi* (Gahan). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **37**: 59-69

1961. A comparison of injury and survival of larvae of *Cephus cinctus* Nort. after intracellular and extracellular freezing. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **39**: 349-50

SAS Institute. 1990. SAS/STAT user's guide. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC

Seamans HL. 1945. A preliminary report on the climatology of the wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Nort.) on the Canadian Prairies. *Scientific Agriculture* **25**: 432-5

Seamans HL, Manson GF, Farstad CW. 1944. The effect of wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus*) on the heads and grain of infested stems. *75th Annual Report of the Entomological Society of Ontario* 10-15

Shaw MR, Huddleston T. 1991. Classification and biology of braconid wasps (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). *Handbook for the Identification of British Insects* **7**(11): 1-126

Skoog FE, Wallace LE. 1964. Application of systemic insecticides as seed treatment to protect wheat plants against grasshoppers and wheat stem sawfly. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **57**(2): 199-205

Smith RW. 1961. Notes on parasites of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus pygmaeus* (L.) (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) from continental Europe. *The Canadian Entomologist* **94**: 714-17

Somsen HW, Luginbill P, Jr. 1956. *Bracon lissogaster* Mues., a parasite of the wheat stem sawfly. *U S Department of Agriculture Technical Bulletin* **1153**

Stoa TE. 1947. Rescue wheat. *North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station Bimonthly Bulletin* **2**: 43-45

Troeh RF, Hobbs JA, Donahue RL. 1999. *Soil and water conservation: Productivity and environmental protection.* Prentice Hall, New Jersey

Turlings TCJ, Tumlinson JH. 1992. Systematic release of chemical signals by herbivore-injured corn. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* **89**: 8399-402

Turlings TCJ, Tumlinson JH, Lewis WJ. 1990. Exploitation of herbivore-induced plant odors by host-seeking parasitic wasps. *Science* **250**: 1251-53

Turlings TCJ, Tumlinson JH, Eller FJ, Lewis WJ. 1991a. Larval-damaged plants: Source of volatile synonomes that guide the parasitoid *Cotesia marginiventris* to the microhabitats of its host. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* **58**: 75-8

Turlings TCJ, Tumlinson JH, Heath RH, Proveaux AT, Doolittle RE. 1991b. Isolation and identification of allelochemicals that attract the larval parasitoid, *Cotesia marginiventris* (Cresson), to the microhabitat of one of its hosts. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **17**: 2235-51

Unger PW, Wiese AF, Allen DR. 1977. Conservation tillage in the southern plains. *Journal of Soil Water Conservation* **32**: 43-8

Vinson SB. 1975. Biochemical coevolution between parasitoids and their hosts, in *Evolutionary Strategies of Parasitic Insects and Mites.* PW Price ed. Plenium, New York pp 14-48

1991. Chemical signals used by insect parasitoids. *Redia* **124**: 15-42

1999. Parasitoid manipulation as a plant defense strategy. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* **92**(6): 812-28

Wallace LE. 1962. Field-plot tests of chemicals for wheat stem sawfly control. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **55**(6): 909-12

Wallace LE, McNeal FH. 1966. Stem sawflies of economic importance. *U S Department of Agriculture Technical Bulletin* **1350**

Weiss MJ, Morrill WL. 1992. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) revisited. *American Entomologist* **38**: 241-45

Weiss MJ, Morrill WL, Reitz LL. 1987. The influence of planting date and spring tillage on wheat stem sawfly. *Montana Agricultural Research* **4**: 2-5

Wharton RA. 1984. Biology of the Alysiini (Hymenoptera: Braconidae), parasitoids of cyclorrhephous Diptera. *Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Technical Monograph* **11**: 1-39

1993. Bionomics of the braconidae. *Annual Review of Entomology* **38**: 121-43

Whitman DW. 1988. Allelochemical interactions among plants, herbivores, and their predators, in *Novel aspects of insect plant interactions*. Wiley, New York pp. 11-64.

Wicks G, Smika DE. 1973. Chemical fallow in a winter wheat fallow rotation. *Weed Science* **21**: 97-102

Wiese AF. 1983. Weed control, in *Dryland Agriculture*. Dregne HE, Willis WO *eds.* ASA, CSSA, SSSA, Madison, Wisconsin pp. 463-88

Wiese AF, Burnett E, Box JE. 1967. Chemical fallow in dryland cropping sequences. *Agronomy Journal* **59**: 175-7

Willis WO, Bauer A, Black AL. 1983. Water conservation: Northern Great Plains, in *Dryland Agriculture*. Dregne HE, Willis WO *eds.* ASA, CSSA, SSSA, Madison, Wisconsin pp. 73-88

Young RA, Lindstrom MJ, Holt RF. 1983. Soil conservation: Central and northern Great Plains, in *Dryland Agriculture*. Dregne HE, Willis WO *eds.* ASA, CSSA, SSSA, Madison, Wisconsin pp. 219-29

52 197MT TH 3149
5/01 30568-83 NULB

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY - BOZEMAN
3 1762 10350669 5