1 **Adaptation of artificial diets for *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera:** 2 **Noctuidae) at laboratory rearing**

3
4 **Caio C. Truzzi¹, Hurian G. Holzhausen¹, José A. Chameçanga¹, Valéria L. Laurentis², Natalia**
5 **F. Vieira¹, Alessandra M. Vacari^{3,*} & Sergio A. De Bortoli¹**

6
7 ¹Department of Plant Protection, São Paulo State University, 14884-900, Jaboticabal, SP, Brazil

8 ²University Center of Rio Preto, 15025-400, São José do Rio Preto, SP, Brazil

9 ³University of Franca, 14404-600, Franca, SP, Brazil

10
11 ***Corresponding author**

12 E-mail address: amvacari@gmail.com (AMV)

13
14 **Author Contributions:**

15 conceptualization: AMV SADE

16 methodology: AMV SADE

17 formal analysis: AMV

18 investigation: CCT HGH JAC VLL NFV

19 writing (original draft preparation): CCT AMV SADE

20 writing (review and editing): AMV SADE

21 supervision: AMV SADE

22

24 ABSTRACT

25 *Helicoverpa armigera* is an important pest of crops worldwide, and several studies have
 26 focused on the development of artificial diets for this species. However, studies evaluating the
 27 insect's performance at nutritionally different diets are scarce. Larval development is dependent on
 28 the ratio of protein and carbohydrates. The aim of this study was to evaluate the biology and to
 29 compare the consumption and use of food of *H. armigera* larvae on diets with different protein
 30 levels. The nutritional index, the relative consumption rate, the relative metabolic rate, the relative
 31 growth rate, and the apparent digestibility were higher in the diet with added protein. On the other
 32 hand, the conversion efficiency of digested food was lower, resulting in a higher metabolic cost. In
 33 terms of biological aspects, larval survival was higher for the diet with average protein content and
 34 lower for the diet with a high protein level. The pupal period was longer for the diet with a higher
 35 protein content, while pupal survival was lower. Among the evaluated diets, the diet with an
 36 average protein content resulted in a higher net reproductive rate, a shorter time for the population
 37 to double in number, and the highest rates of population growth. The results suggest that lower or
 38 higher protein contents in the diets of *H. armigera* negatively affect the biological aspects of this
 39 species.

40 **Keywords:** insect biology, mass rearing, nutrition.

41

43 Introduction

44 *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) is an important pest of agricultural crops
45 worldwide and stands out with polyphagia, facultative diapause, a high dispersal capacity,
46 adaptation to different environments, and a high reproductive potential [1, 2]. This pest species can
47 feed on vegetative organs and reproductive structures, causing significant losses and control costs of
48 about US\$ 5 billion worldwide [3, 4].

49 Although several studies have investigated artificial diets for *H. armigera*, few studies have
50 been carried out evaluating its performance on nutritionally different diets. Larval development is
51 dependent on the ratio of proteins and carbohydrates [5]. Protein digestion during the larval period
52 is a complex process and performed by the proteases present in the insect's gut [6].

53 In other lepidopteran species, such as *Plodia interpunctella* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera:
54 Pyralidae), a diet low in proteins and carbohydrates can influence several biological aspects [7].

55 The development of artificial diets suitable for insects has allowed a great advance in
56 integrated pest management programs. The consumption and use of food are basic conditions for
57 insect growth, development, and reproduction, and the quantity and the proportion of nutrients in
58 the food substrate of the larval stage influence the acceptance of the food, besides affecting the
59 performance of adults, and may have more or less severe effects on the biology of insects,
60 facilitating or impeding their development [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13].

61 In this context, the aim of this study was to evaluate the biology and to compare the
62 consumption and use of food in *H. armigera* larvae on diets with different protein levels.

63

64 Material and Methods

65 The rearing of *H. armigera* and the experiments were conducted at the Laboratory of Biology and
66 Insect Rearing (LBIR), Department of Plant Protection, São Paulo State University (UNESP),

67 Jaboticabal, SP. The insects were kept under controlled laboratory conditions at a temperature of 25
68 $\pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$, a relative humidity of $70 \pm 10\%$, and a photoperiod of 12 hours light/12 hours dark.

69

70 **Rearing of *H. armigera***

71 The larvae were placed in Petri dishes (6 cm diameter $\times$ 2 cm height) containing an artificial diet
72 described by Greene et al. (1976), with modifications, and monitored until the larvae reached the
73 pupal stage. At the pupal stage, they were separated by sex and transferred to copula and
74 oviposition cages of PVC (20 cm diameter $\times$ 20 cm height), lined with paper towels and supported
75 on a plastic cover (23.5 cm diameter $\times$ 3 cm height) lined with paper towels, with the top closed
76 with voile fabric fastened with elastic. Twenty couples were conditioned per cage and fed with a
77 10% honey-water mixture on a piece of soaked cotton packed inside a plastic top (3 cm diameter $\times$
78 1.5 cm height). The eggs were removed and placed in plastic containers (25 $\times$ 15 $\times$ 12 cm) until
79 hatching.

80

81 **Artificial diets**

82 The artificial diets used in this study are described in Greene et al. [14], with modifications. Three
83 formulations were used; one for rearing (D_1) and two with variations in the amount of protein, with
84 double (D_2) and with half (D_3). The compositions of the diets are shown in Table 1.

85

86

87

88 **Nutritional indices**

89 When the larvae reached the fourth instar, determined when they were about 12 mm in
90 length [15] and had dark tubercles in the dorsal region of the first abdominal segment [16], 10
91 insects were removed from the Petri dishes, weighed, killed by freezing, and oven-dried. Another

10 insects were weighed and kept in the Petri dishes; where when they reached the fifth instar, 20 mm of length [15], confirmed by the presence of ecdysis, the same procedure as described above was performed. In addition, dietary leftovers and excrements from the insects during the fourth instar and 10 whole artificial diet cubes were weighed and oven-dried. After a drying period of 3 days, the diets and larvae were weighed. Thus, the weight of the dry larvae, the food consumed, and the weight gain of the larvae were obtained for the determination of the indices of food consumption and use.

The methodology proposed by Waldbauer [17] and modified by Scriber and Slansky Jr. [8] was adopted for determination the quantitative nutritional indices of fourth instar of the larvae stage. For the calculation of these indices, the following parameters were used (in dry matter weight):

T = duration of feeding period (days);

A_f = weight of food supplied to the insect (g);

A_r = weight of leftover food provided to the insect (g) after T;

F = weight of excretory produced (g) during T;

B = (I – F) – M = weight gain by larvae (g) during T;

$\bar{B}$ = mean weight of larvae (g) during T;

I = weight of food consumed (g) during T;

I – F = food assimilated (g) during T;

M = (I – F) – B = food metabolized during T (g).

The indices of consumption and use for each treatment were determined using the following equations:

$$\text{Relative consumption rate (g/g/day) - RCR} = \frac{I}{\bar{B} \times T};$$

$$\text{Relative growth rate (g/g/day) - RGR} = \frac{B}{\bar{B} \times T};$$

$$\text{Relative metabolic rate (g/g/day) - RMR} = \frac{M}{\bar{B} \times T};$$

Approximate digestibility (%) - $AD = \frac{I - F}{I} \times 100$;

Efficiency of conversion of ingested food (%) - $ECI = \frac{B}{I} \times 100$;

Efficiency of conversion of digested food (%) - $ECD = \frac{B}{I - F} \times 100$;

Metabolic cost (%) - $CM = 100 - ECD$.

Biological aspects

For each diet, 60 newly hatched larvae (< 24 hours) were individualized in Petri dishes (6 cm diameter × 2 cm height), where they were monitored until reaching the pupal stage. Artificial diet cubes (2 cm × 2 cm) were supplied and replaced after approximately 80% had been consumed. We evaluated the following biological parameters: larval period, larval survival, pupal weight at 24 hours, sex ratio, pupal period, and pupal survival.

After the emergence of adults, four cylindrical PCV cages (10 cm diameter × 20 cm height) were constructed for each diet, with the top closed with voile fabric fastened with elastic, supported on a plastic cover (15 cm diameter × 2 cm height) and lined with paper towels, where two couples of *H. armigera* that had emerged the same day were released. Adults were fed with a 10% honey-water mixture on a piece of soaked cotton packed inside a plastic top (3 cm diameter × 1.5 cm height). Based on daily observation, female fecundity (eggs/female) and longevity of male and female adults were determined.

With the biological parameters obtained, the parameters for the construction of fertility life tables were estimated, according to Birch [18], Price [19], and Southwood [20]: x = age of parental females, age is considered starting in the egg phase; l_x = life expectancy to age x , expressed as a fraction per female; m_x = specific fertility or number of offspring produced per female at age x ; $l_x.m_x$ = total number of females at age x . The growth parameters resulting from life tables were R_0 = net rate of population growth, T = mean generation time, r_m = intrinsic rate of increase, λ = finite

rate of increase. In addition to these parameters, we also determined D_t , which is the time required for the population to double in number, according to Krebs [21].

The growth parameters (R_0 , T , r_m , λ e D_t) were calculated using the following equations:

$$R_0 = \sum(lx.mx);$$

$$T = \sum(x.lx.mx)/\sum(lx.mx);$$

$$r_m = \ln R_0/T;$$

$$\lambda = e^{r_m};$$

$$D_t = \ln(2)/r_m.$$

Statistical analysis

Data from nutritional indices and biological characteristics of adult *H. armigera* specimens on different diets were subjected to Kolmogorov and Bartlett tests to determine normality and homogeneity of variance. Data from the RCR, RGR, RMR, ECD, weight of the fresh and dry larvae, and pupal period were transformed by the root of $x + 0.5$ to meet the requirements of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) and then analyzed using PROC ANOVA. Means were compared by Tukey's test ($P < 0.05$). Data for larval period, larval survival, weight of pupae, pupal period, pupal survival, fecundity of females, and longevity of males and females were compared using the Student Newman Keuls test. All analyses were conducted using the software package SAS [22].

Population parameters of fertility life tables were estimated according to the Jackknife methods for estimating the confidence intervals of the parameters and for allowing comparisons between treatments, as described by Maia et al. [23]. Estimates were conducted using SAS software [22].

Results

166 **Nutritional indices**

167 The highest fresh weight of *H. armigera* in the fifth instar was obtained in D₃, whereas in D₂ the
168 caterpillars had the lowest weight, with a variation greater than 60 mg. Regarding dry weight, all
169 treatments were similar (Fig. 1).

170 Relative consumption rate (RCR), relative metabolic rate (RMR), and apparent digestibility
171 (AD), which represents the percentage of the feed that was effectively assimilated, were higher in
172 D₂. For D₁ and D₃, these indices were smaller and similar to each other, differing in AD, which was
173 lower for D₃ (Table 3).

174 Regarding the relative growth rate (RGR), the lowest values were for D₁ and D₃, while for
175 the efficiency of conversion of ingested food (ECI) the values were similar for the three diets,
176 varying from 29.1 to 30.8%. On the other hand, the efficiency of the conversion of digested food
177 (ECD) was lower in D₂, which led to a higher metabolic cost (CM) for this diet; while ECD was
178 higher for D₁ and D₃ and CM was lower (Table 3).

179

180 **Biological characteristics**

181 For the larval period, the insects fed with different diets did not present significant differences, with
182 larval periods varying from 18.2 to 21.0 days. Survival in this period was higher for D₁ and lower
183 for D₂, with a variation of 38.1%, while D₃ presented intermediate survival (Table 4).

184 The weight of pupae at 24 hours of age and the sex ratio did not differ significantly between
185 the diets evaluated, with the weight varied between 310.6 and 337.6 mg and the sex ratio between
186 0.3 and 0.4. The different diets influenced the pupal period of *H. armigera*, where the duration was
187 higher for D₂ and similar between D₁ and D₃ (Table 4).

188 Survival to the end of the pupal phase was lower for D₂, while D₁ and D₃ showed similar
189 survival rates (Table 4).

In adulthood, there was no significant difference in terms of longevity between males and females. However, females presented a higher longevity when compared to males in more than 3 days (Table 5).

The different diets had no impact on female fecundity, which varied between 206.5 and 268.7 eggs/female (Table 5).

The Fertility Life Table, based on the results obtained for the biological parameters of *H. armigera*, showed differences between the evaluated diets. The net reproduction rate (R_0), although higher for D_1 , was similar for all treatments, ranging from 22.7 to 61.3 females/females per generation. Regarding the average generation time (T), the lowest value was found for D_1 , while D_3 presented the highest value. The intrinsic increase rate (r_m) was higher for D_1 and lower for D_3 , from 0.052 females/female/day. The finite increase rate (λ) was also higher for D_1 , presenting similar values between D_2 and D_3 . The time for the population to double in size (Dt) was significantly lower for D_1 ; while for D_3 , it took 3 more days for the population to double in the number of individuals when the larvae were fed on these diets (Table 6).

Among the diets evaluated, D_1 had the highest net reproduction rate, the shortest time for the population to double in number, and the highest rates of population growth (Table 6).

Discussion

By comparing the consumption, feed use, and biology of *H. armigera* larvae in diets with different protein contents, significant differences were identified.

The highest fresh weight of fourth instar larvae was related to the protein content, since the lower the protein content of the diet, the greater the weight of the larvae. These results differ from those found by Sarate et al. [5], who fed larvae with several host plants and observed that diets rich in proteins and/or carbohydrates resulted in higher larvae weight and a shorter larvae period. However, the dry larvae mass was similar between the different diets.

The relative consumption rate (RGR), representing the amount of food ingested per unit weight of the insect per day, and the relative metabolic rate (RMR), representing the amount of food spent in metabolism per unit weight, were higher for the diet with a higher protein content, demonstrating that larvae need a greater amount of food to meet their nutritional needs due to the high amount of protein required for their development.

Apparent digestibility (AD), which represents the percentage of ingested food that is effectively assimilated by the insect, was also higher for the diet with a higher protein content and lower for the diet with a lower protein content, suggesting that the amount of food assimilated by the insect was associated with the protein level; therefore, in diets rich in protein, a higher food intake is necessary to satisfy the nutritional needs of the insect.

In terms of the relative growth rate (RGR), which indicates the biomass gain by the insect in relation to its weight, the lowest values were found for the diets with the lowest amounts of protein; however, regarding the efficiency of the conversion of ingested food (ECI), which represents the percentage of food ingested that is transformed into biomass, there was no difference between the three diets. The efficiency of the conversion of digested food (ECD) showed that for diets with high protein contents, a low conversion of the diet to biomass occurred. Due to this low efficiency, this diet presented a high metabolic cost (CM).

The protein present in the diet did not influence the length of the larval period (18.2 to 21.0 days). Survival during this period was low in the high-protein diet, demonstrating that high levels of this nutrient in the diet may impair *H. armigera* population growth. Hamed and Nadeem [25], who evaluated different artificial diets to rear *H. armigera* in the laboratory, found a larval period varying between 15.6 and 42.8 days, and the results of this study are within this range. Truzzi et al. [24], using an artificial diet similar to D₁, found a larval period of 14.6 days, a higher value than observed in this study.

The variation in protein content did not influence pupal weight and sex ratio. However, the pupal period was influenced in that the high protein diet prolonged this phase of the insect's life

241 cycle. For the diet based on cotton seed and water chestnut, similar values have been found
242 previously [25]. However, for artificial diets, this period was shorter [24].

243 The survival of insects in the pupal phase was lower for the diet with a high protein content,
244 in which was also the case for the larval period, indicating again the negative influence of high
245 protein levels on the biology of this pest species.

246 The diet in the larval period did not interfere with the longevity of adults. However, females
247 presented greater longevity than males, which has also been observed in other studies using
248 different diets [15, 26, 24].

249 Female fecundity was not influenced by the diet during the larval period. However, the
250 values found were low when compared to other studies, which reported values between 440 and
251 more than 2,500 eggs/female on different diets during the larval phase [24, 27, 28].

252 In relation to the fertility life table, for the net reproduction rate (R_0), Truzzi et al. [24] found
253 a higher value for the artificial diet, with 255 females per female in each generation. For soybean
254 cultivars, the rate ranged from 16.0 to 270.0 females per female [29], while for tomato cultivars, it
255 was between 7.8 and 186.9 females per females [30]. The average generation time (T) was
256 influenced by the protein content, and at lower protein levels, the insects took longer to complete
257 the cycle. The intrinsic rate of increase (r_m) was also affected by the low protein level, with a
258 smaller number of females per female being produced per day. When *H. armigera* larvae were
259 reared on soybean cultivars, the values were similar, ranging between 0.084 and 0.114 females per
260 female each day [29], but for artificial diets and for different host plants, larger values have been
261 observed in previous studies [24, 27]. For the finite rate of increase (λ), low and high protein levels
262 resulted in a lower number of females per female each day. *Helicoverpa armigera* presented the
263 shortest time for the population to double in size (D_t) at D_1 with 4.9 days, but this period was higher
264 than that found by Truzzi et al. [24], which was 3.6 days.

265 The influence of different protein levels on *H. armigera* development, population growth,
266 consumption indices, and feed use was studied, and the information obtained in this study can be

used to adapt diets or to develop new diets for mass rearing of this insect species. In addition, future studies should evaluate the influence of different protein levels on successive generations of *H. armigera*.

Conclusion

The most suitable artificial diet for the mass rearing of *H. armigera* in the laboratory was D₁, with lower or higher levels of protein affecting the biological aspects of this pest species.

Acknowledgements

We are very thankful to Dr. Sergio Antonio De Bortoli for the opportunity to carry out this work in the Laboratory of Biology and Insect Rearing (LBIR) within the Insect Biology of Postgraduate Program in Agriculture (Agricultural Entomology) of the FCAV/Unesp.

References

1. Fitt GP. The ecology of *Heliothis* in relation to agroecosystems. Annu Rev Entomol. 1989;34: 17-52.
2. CABI. Crop protection compendium – *Helicoverpa armigera*. 2015. Available: <http://www.cabi.org/cpc/datasheet/26757>. Accessed 12 Sep. 2017.
3. Lammers JW, Macleod A. Report of a pest risk analysis: *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner, 1808). Plant Protection Service and Central Science Laboratory, Netherlands. 2007. 18 pp.
4. Fathipour Y, Sedaratian A. Integrated management of *Helicoverpa armigera* in soybean cropping systems. In: El-Shemy H, editor. Soybean – pest resistance. Cairo: InTech; 2013. pp. 231-280.
5. Sarate PJ, Tamhane VA, Kotkar HM, Ratnakaran N, Susan N, Gupta VS, Giri AP. Developmental and digestive flexibilities in the midgut of a polyphagous pest, the cotton bollworm, *Helicoverpa armigera*. J Insect Sci. 2012;12: 1-16.

- 292 6. Kotkar HM, Sarate PJ, Tamhane VA, Gupta VS, Giri AP. Responses of midgut amylases of
293 *Helicoverpa armigera* to feeding on various host plants. J Insect Physiol. 2009;55: 663-670.
- 294 7. Bouayad N, Rharrabe K, Ghailani N, Sayah F. Effects of different food commodities on larval
295 development and alpha-amylase activity of *Plodia interpunctella* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera:
296 Pyralidae). J Stored Prod Res. 2008;44(4): 373-378.
- 297 8. Scriber JM, Slansky Jr. F. The nutritional ecology of immature insects. Annu Rev Entomol.
298 1981;26: 183-211.
- 299 9. Behmer ST. Insect herbivore nutrient regulation. Annu Rev Entomol. 2009;54: 165-187.
- 300 10. Panizzi AR, Parra JRP. Bioecologia e nutrição de insetos – base para o manejo integrado de
301 pragas. Brasília: Embrapa; 2009. 1169 pp.
- 302 11. Schowalter TD. Insect ecology: an ecosystem approach. San Diego: Elsevier; 2011. 650 pp.
- 303 12. Parra JRP. The evolution of artificial diets and their interactions in science and technology. In:
304 Panizzi AR, Parra JRP, editors. Insect Bioecology and Nutrition for Integrated Pest
305 Management. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2012. pp. 51-92.
- 306 13. Cohen AC. Insect diets: science and technology. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2015. 473 pp.
- 307 14. Greene GL, Leppla NC, Dickerson WA. Velvetbean caterpillar: a rearing procedure and
308 artificial medium. J Econ Entomol. 1976;69(4): 487-488.
- 309 15. Ali A, Choudhury RA, Ahmad Z, Rahman F, Khan FR, Ahmad SK. Some biological
310 characteristics of *Helicoverpa armigera* on chickpea. Tunis J Plant Prot. 2009;4(1): 99-106.
- 311 16. Matthews M. Heliothinae moths of Australia: a guide to pest bollworms and related noctuid
312 groups. Melbourne: CSIRO; 1999. 320 pp.
- 313 17. Waldbauer GP. The consumption and utilization of food by insects. Adv in Insect Physiol.
314 1968;5: 229-288.
- 315 18. Birch LC. The intrinsic rate of natural increase of on insect population. J Anim Ecol.
316 1948;17(1): 15-26.
- 317 19. Price PW. Insect Ecology. New York: John Willey; 1984. 607 pp.

- 318 20. Southwood TRE. Ecological methods. London: Chapman and Hall; 1978. 524 pp.
- 319 21. Krebs CJ. Ecology: the experimental analysis of distribution and abundance. New York: Harper
320 Collins College Publishers; 1994. 801 pp.
- 321 22. SAS Institute. SAS: user`s guide: statistics. Version 9.0. Cary, USA; 2002.
- 322 23. Maia AHN, Luiz AJB, Campanhola C. Statistical inference on associated fertility life
323 parameters using Jackknife technique: computational aspects. J Econ Entomol. 2000;93(2): 511-
324 518.
- 325 24. Truzzi CC, Vieira NF, Laurentis VL, Vacari AM, De Bortoli SA. Development and feeding
326 behavior of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on different sunflower
327 genotypes under laboratory conditions. Arthropod-Plant Interac. 2017;11: 797-805.
- 328 25. Hamed M, Nadeem S. Rearing of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) on artificial diets in laboratory.
329 Pak J Zool. 2008;40(6): 447-450.
- 330 26. Jha RK, Tuan SJ, Chi H, Tang LC. Life table and consumption capacity of corn earworm,
331 *Helicoverpa armigera*, fed asparagus, *Asparagus officinalis*. J Insect Sci. 2014;14(34): 1-17.
- 332 27. Razmjou J, Naseri B, Hemati SA. Comparative performance of the cotton bollworm,
333 *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on various host plants. J Pest Sci.
334 2013;87: 29-37.
- 335 28. Naseri B, Golparvar Z, Razmjou J, Golizadeh A. Age-stage, two-sex life table of *Helicoverpa*
336 *armigera* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on different bean cultivars. J Agr Sci Technol. 2014;16: 19-
337 32.
- 338 29. Soleimannejad S, Fathipour Y, Moharramipour S, Zalucki MP. Evaluation of potential
339 resistance in seeds of different soybean cultivars to *Helicoverpa armigera* (Lepidoptera:
340 Noctuidae) using demographic parameters and nutritional indices. J Econ Entomol.
341 2010;103(4): 1420-1430.

- 342 30. Safuraie-Parizi S, Fathipour Y, Talebi AA. Evaluation of tomato cultivars to *Helicoverpa*
343 *armigera* using two-sex life table parameters in laboratory. J Asia Pac Entomol. 2014;17: 837-
344 844.
345
346

348

Table 1. Composition of the artificial diets for *Helicoverpa armigera*.

Constituent	D ₁	D ₂	D ₃
White bean	75.0 g	150.0 g	37.5 g
Wheat germ	60.0 g	120.0 g	30.0 g
Soy bran	30.0 g	60.0 g	15.0 g
Milk powder	30.0 g	60.0 g	15.0 g
Brewer's yeast	37.5 g	75.0 g	18.75 g
Ascorbic acid	3.6 g	3.6 g	3.6 g
Sorbic acid	1.8 g	1.8 g	1.8 g
Methylparahydroxybenzoate (Nipagin®)	3.0 g	3.0 g	3.0 g
Vitamin solution	9.0 mL	9.0 mL	9.0 mL
Tetracycline	0.12 g	0.12 g	0.12 g
Formaldehyde (40%)	3.6 mL	3.6 mL	3.6 mL
Agar	23.0 g	23.0 g	23.0 g
Distilled water	1,400 mL	1,400 mL	1,400 mL

D₁ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], used at rearing.

D₂ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with double protein.

D₃ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with half protein.

349

351

Table 2. Composition of the vitamin solution used for artificial diets.

Component	Amount
Niacinamide	4.0 mg
Calcium pantothenate	4.0 mg
Thiamine HCl	1.0 mg
Riboflavin	2.0 mg
Pyridoxine HCl	1.0 mg
Folic acid	1.0 mg
Biotin	0.08 mg
Vitamin B12	0.008 mg
Distilled water	400 mL

352

353

355

Table 3. Nutritional indices of *Helicoverpa armigera* on artificial diets.

Index	Diet		
	D ₁	D ₂	D ₃
RCR (g/g/day)	2.3 ± 0.40 b ¹	5.5 ± 6.48 a	1.9 ± 0.08 b
RGR (g/g/day)	0.7 ± 0.00 b	1.6 ± 0.41 a	0.5 ± 0.01 b
RMR (g/g/day)	0.7 ± 0.18 b	2.5 ± 0.46 a	0.3 ± 0.02 b
AD (%)	58.4 ± 2.42 b	73.2 ± 2.17 a	45.8 ± 10.22 c
ECI (%)	30.8 ± 1.90 a	30.3 ± 1.21 a	29.1 ± 2.21 a
ECD (%)	54.4 ± 4.55 a	41.9 ± 2.50 b	63.8 ± 1.93 a
CM (%)	45.6 ± 4.55 b	58.1 ± 2.50 a	36.2 ± 1.93 b

¹Means ± SE followed by the same letter on the line do not differ by the Tukey test (P > 0.05).

D₁ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], used at rearing.

D₂ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with double protein.

D₃ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with half protein.

356

357

359

Table 4. Biological characteristics of the larval and pupal stages of *Helicoverpa armigera* on artificial diets.

Characteristic	Diet		
	D ₁	D ₂	D ₃
Larval period (days)	18.2 ± 0.53 a ¹	20.9 ± 1.54 a	21.0 ± 4.97 a
Larval survival (%)	60.0 ± 7.29 a	21.9 ± 4.63 b	40.0 ± 7.29 ab
Pupae weight (mg)	335.2 ± 10.23 a	337.6 ± 12.29 a	310.6 ± 9.08 a
Sex ratio	0.4 ± 0.05 a	0.4 ± 0.25 a	0.3 ± 0.09 a
Pupal period (days)	14.9 ± 0.36 b	18.5 ± 1.06 a	14.6 ± 0.21 b
Pupal survival (%)	42.5 ± 5.00 a	10.0 ± 4.68 b	32.5 ± 6.37 a

¹Means ± SE followed by the same letter on the line do not differ by the Student Newman Keuls (P > 0.05).

D₁ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], used at rearing.

D₂ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with double protein.

D₃ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with half protein.

360

361

363

Table 5. Biological characteristics of *Helicoverpa armigera* adults on artificial diets.

Characteristic	Diet		
	D ₁	D ₂	D ₃
Male longevity (days)	6.7 ± 1.96 a ¹	5.5 ± 1.55 a	5.0 ± 1.12 a
Female longevity (days)	10.1 ± 1.84 a	9.2 ± 1.31 a	9.1 ± 1.33 a
Fecundity (eggs/female)	229.7 ± 77.60 a	268.7 ± 65.10 a	206.5 ± 28.02 a

¹Means ± SE followed by the same letter on the line do not differ by the Student Newman Keuls (P > 0.05).

D₁ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], used at rearing.

D₂ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with double protein.

D₃ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with half protein.

364

365

367

Table 6. Parameters of the fertility life table of *Helicoverpa armigera* on artificial diets.

Characteristics	Diets		
	D ₁	D ₂	D ₃
R ₀	61.3 a ¹ (-20.37-143.00)	23.7 a (-108.66-156.05)	22.7 a (-4.65-50.11)
r _m	0.139 a (0.1044-0.1756)	0.091 ab (-0.0791-0.2605)	0.087 b (0.0557-0.1180)
λ	1.146 a (1.1045-1.1866)	1.096 b (0.9123-1.2816)	1.089 b (1.0554-1.1233)
T	30.1 c (25.01-35.31)	36.0 b (34.29-37.81)	36.8 a (35.89-37.70)
Dt	4.9 b (3.62-6.21)	7.4 ab (-9.45-24.28)	7.9 a (4.87-10.86)

¹Means (confidence interval) followed by the same letter on the line do not differ by the Student's t test (P > 0.05).
R₀ = net reproduction rate, r_m = intrinsic increase rate, λ = finite increase rate, T = average generation time, Dt = time for the population to double in size.
D₁ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], used at rearing.
D₂ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with double protein.
D₃ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with half protein.

368

369

371

372 **Fig 1.** Dry and fresh weight of *Helicoverpa armigera* larvae on artificial diets. D₁ – Artificial diet
 373 modified from Greene et al. [14], used at rearing. D₂ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al.
 374 [14], with double protein. D₃ – Artificial diet modified from Greene et al. [14], with half protein.

375

376