



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Transgenerational toxicity of imidacloprid on demography and behaviour of key larval parasitoid, *Habrobracon hebetor* (Say)

Prabhu Prasanna Pradhan^{1,3}, Basana-Gowda Gadratagi^{2,3*}, Umashankar Nayak¹, Aishwarya Ray³, Totan Adak³,
Guru-Pirasanna-Pandi Govindharaj⁴, Naveenkumar Basavanagouda Patil⁵ & Shyamaranjan Das Mohapatra³

¹Department of Entomology, College of Agriculture, Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, Bhubaneswar 751 003, Odisha, India

²National Research Centre on Pomegranate, Solapur 413 255, Maharashtra, India

³Crop Protection Division, ICAR-Central Rice Research Institute, Cuttack 753 006, Odisha, India

⁴ICAR- National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, Regional Station, Hyderabad 500 030, Telangana, India

⁵ICAR - Mahatma Gandhi Integrated Farming Research Institute, Motihari 845 429, Bihar, India

*Correspondence email - basanagowda.g@icar.gov.in

Received: 02 December 2024; Accepted: 22 March 2025; Available online: Version 1.0: 13 June 2025; Version 2.0: 29 July 2025

Cite this article: Prabhu PP, Basana-Gowda G, Umashankar N, Aishwarya R, Totan A, Guru-Pirasanna-Pandi G, Naveenkumar BP, Shyamaranjan DM. Transgenerational toxicity of imidacloprid on demography and behaviour of key larval parasitoid, *Habrobracon hebetor* (Say). Plant Science Today. 2025; 12(3): 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.14719/pst.6470>

Abstract

A successful Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program depends on using both bio agents and chemical pesticides, making it essential to consider pesticide effects on non-target organisms used in biological control. This study examines the effects of LC₅, LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ concentrations of imidacloprid on the demographic and behavioural traits of *Habrobracon hebetor* (Say) across successive generations (F₁ to F₅). In the bioassay experiments, imidacloprid exhibited profound toxicity, with an LC₅₀ of 40.75 mg L⁻¹, while LC₅ was 0.27 mg L⁻¹ and LC₃₀ was 8.27 mg L⁻¹. Notably, egg and larval development periods were significantly prolonged in F₅ individuals exposed to LC₅ and LC₃₀ compared to those in F₁. Key population parameters, including the net reproductive rate (R_0), gross reproductive rate (GRR) and mean generation time (T), were markedly lower in the F₅ generation, particularly at LC₃₀. Exposure to LC₅₀ in the F₅ generation resulted in extended egg, larval and pupal development durations, alongside reduced male longevity, fecundity and oviposition periods. All population parameters, except the intrinsic rate of increase (r) and finite rate of increase (λ), were significantly impacted. Additionally, walking behaviour differed significantly among individuals treated with LC₅, LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ concentrations; while LC₅ exposure notably increased walking speed, it still exerted a detrimental effect on demographic parameters overall. To minimize these adverse outcomes, optimizing the timing of pesticide application is essential to avoid antagonistic interactions with natural enemies in IPM programs.

Keywords: biological control; life table; mass rearing; natural enemy; sublethal

Introduction

The use of pesticides remains a cost-effective and convenient strategy for pest control, demonstrating high efficacy (1). However, injudicious pesticide usage has resulted in problems such as pest resistance, environmental pollution and crop residues risking human health (1). Insecticides may permeate the insect body directly through direct application, ingestion of treated food, or through contact of insects with residual substances (2). The impact of pesticides on both target and non-target insect populations is significantly influenced by the application rate (3). Beyond causing lethality, pesticides also trigger sublethal effects in treated organisms (4). These sublethal effects encompass a range of demographic and behavioural characteristics, including alterations in fecundity, developmental rate, sex ratio as well as variations in diapause behaviour and morphological changes, all of which significantly influence the growth of arthropod populations.

Habrobracon hebetor (Say) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) is a gregarious, idiobiont larval ectoparasitoid of Lepidopteran insects (5). It is distinguished by its short generation time, high reproductive rate and versatility in adapting to different host species. *Corcyra cephalonica* Stainton (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) serves as a prominent host, particularly in the mass rearing of *H. hebetor*.

The success of an IPM program hinges on the effective integration of both chemical and biological control methods. A critical prerequisite for initiating a biological control program is a thorough evaluation of the lethal and sublethal effects of insecticides on non-target organisms (6). Exploration of these insecticidal effects can be conducted through various methodological approaches encompassing field studies, semi-field experiments, as well as laboratory investigations (7). Assessing the impact of insecticide toxicity on non-target organisms under controlled conditions is essential for obtaining reliable findings. Laboratory toxicological studies, particularly methodologies like life table response experiments,

are crucial in understanding sublethal effects (8). This is crucial as sublethal effects have the potency to adversely affect the physiology and behaviour of beneficial organisms, thereby necessitating focused studies on population dynamics.

Imidacloprid, a widely employed pesticide globally, is utilized on crops either through direct plant application, seed treatment, or soil treatment (9). It plays a pivotal role in pest management by effectively targeting plant and leafhoppers, whiteflies, aphids, termites and thrips. However, its prolonged persistence and toxicity pose risks to non-target organisms (10). Given the increasing emphasis on biological control in IPM strategies, understanding the sublethal effects of pesticides on natural enemies is crucial. Numerous studies have investigated the sublethal impacts of various pesticides on *H. hebetor*, revealing significant effects on key biological and demographic parameters, including longevity, fecundity, fertility, parasitism rate, developmental duration, sex ratio, intrinsic and finite rates of increase, as well as net and gross reproductive rates (11-14). Despite this, most existing research has been confined to a single-generation assessment. To bridge this knowledge gap, the present study examines the residual toxicity of imidacloprid on the demographic and behavioural parameters of *H. hebetor* over five consecutive generations (F_1 to F_5) following initial exposure in the F_0 generation.

Materials and Methods

Study environment

The current experiment was conducted in the Biocontrol Laboratory of the Crop Protection Division at ICAR-Central Rice Research Institute (CRRRI), Cuttack, India (20.4537° N, 85.9338° E). The study was carried out under controlled environmental conditions, maintaining a temperature of 25 ± 1 °C, relative humidity of 70 ± 5 %, (measured using an HTC-1 digital thermo-hygrometer) and a photoperiod of 14 hr light and 10 hr dark.

Initial colonies of the host, *C. cephalonica*

Initial colonies of the factitious host, *C. cephalonica* were acquired from the mass-rearing facility located at ICAR-CRRRI, Cuttack, India. The host *C. cephalonica*, was mass-reared following previously established protocols as described in earlier studies (15, 16). The insect colony was maintained for over 10 generations prior to its use in subsequent experiments. For experimental purposes, fourth or fifth instar larvae emerging from eggs, all reared on the same day, were selected to ensure uniformity in developmental stage.

Rearing of the parasitoid, *H. hebetor*

The parasitoid *H. hebetor* was reared using the standardized methodology detailed in the study (17). Upon the emergence of the adult parasitoids, a pair was introduced into a 1000 mL plastic container and allowed to mate for 24 hr. Five larvae of *C. cephalonica* (4th and 5th instars) were positioned between two layers of fine muslin cloth and positioned over the opening of the container (using the sandwich method) (15, 18). Cotton swabs dipped in a honey solution (50 %) were provided to the parasitoids as food (12). After 48 hr of parasitization, the parasitized *C. cephalonica* larvae were

transferred to an insect growth chamber and maintained under controlled standard laboratory conditions for further development (25 ± 1 °C, 70 ± 5 % and 14:10 L:D) (16). The parasitoid was continuously reared for 10 generations before being used in further experiments to eliminate any prior effects.

Insecticide

In this experiment, a 98 % pure technical-grade formulation of imidacloprid (Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, MI, USA) was used. Serial dilution of the insecticide was prepared using analytical-grade acetone to achieve the requisite concentrations for conducting contact toxicity studies. Acetone was used as the control due to its negligible effect on insect behaviour and mortality. For further experiments, fresh insecticide dilutions were used to avoid chemical decomposition.

Toxicity assay

The toxicity of imidacloprid to *H. hebetor* was conducted through a concentration-mortality bioassay. A dry film deposition assay was conducted to assess the toxicity of imidacloprid on *H. hebetor* (<24 hr old), following the standardized protocol (19). Preliminary bioassay studies were conducted to establish a suitable range of concentrations for subsequent experiments. Five different concentrations i.e., 10, 50, 100, 150 and 200 mg L⁻¹ of imidacloprid were used to establish a concentration-mortality curve.

After the preparation of insecticide solutions, 1mL solution of insecticide was applied inside the glass tubes (Borosil[®]; height × diameter, 19.0 cm × 3.6 cm), by covering the inner surface to ensure homogeneous deposition. The tubes were gently rotated until all visible droplets had evaporated, then they were left at room temperature for approximately 1 hr to facilitate complete solvent evaporation. About 60 newly emerged adult wasps (<24 hr old) were introduced in the glass tubes, supplied with a streak of honey as a food source. Muslin cloth was used to cover the openings of the tubes, facilitating air movement.

Subsequently, the tubes were placed in an insect growth chamber (model: JSPC-420C; JS Research Inc., Gongju, Republic of Korea) configured at 25 °C, 70 % RH, 14L:10D. Three replications (corresponding to three tubes), were employed for each insecticide concentration. Following 24 hr of exposure, adult wasps were transferred to a separate tube devoid of pesticides, containing a honey streak. Mortality was recorded by counting the number of deceased parasitoids and the percentage of mortality was calculated. Wasps that did not move after being probed were declared dead.

Risk assessment

The ecological risk of imidacloprid to *H. hebetor* was assessed using the risk quotient (RQ) method. The RQ value was

Risk quotient	Category
<50	Harmless
50-2500	Slightly to moderately toxic
>2500	Dangerous

determined by dividing the field-recommended application rates of imidacloprid by the LC_{50} value for *H. hebetor* obtained from laboratory studies (20).

Life table experiments

Different concentrations of imidacloprid (LC_5 , LC_{30} , LC_{50}), along with a control (acetone), were applied to the parental generation (F_0) of *H. hebetor*. The subsequent exposure consequences were observed in the successive untreated generations (F_1 and F_5). The demographic parameters of *H. hebetor* were evaluated using the previously described methodology under standard laboratory conditions (temp. $25 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$, RH $70 \pm 5\%$ and 14 hr L:10 h D) (21).

The developmental duration of *H. hebetor* was examined at LC_5 , LC_{30} and LC_{50} concentrations, in addition to the control (acetone). One mL of each prepared insecticide concentration was applied to the inner surface of glass tubes. The parental generation consisted of about 100 adult wasps (<24 hr old) per treatment group, which were exposed to the treated tubes. After 24 hr of exposure, the living insects were transferred to a pesticide-free 1000 mL plastic container and provided with late-instar larvae of *C. cephalonica*. Following adult emergence, about 80 pairs of parasitoids were transferred individually in small plastic boxes (height \times diameter, 40 mm \times 35 mm) and each pair was provided with one late-instar larva of *C. cephalonica* for parasitization (22). After 24 hr, the parasitized larvae were placed individually in Petri dishes (BR Biochem; height \times diameter, 90 mm \times 15 mm), ensuring that only a single egg remained per larva, with excess eggs carefully removed. Daily observations were conducted to monitor each developmental stage through to adult emergence and the sex of each emerging adult was recorded.

Fecundity and longevity assessments of *H. hebetor* adults were conducted in controlled environmental conditions ($25 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$, $70 \pm 5\%$ and 14:10 L:D). From the above developmental studies, thirty pairs of parasitoids (<24 h old) were isolated in separate plastic boxes and supplied with a streak of honey. Daily, two fresh larvae of *C. cephalonica* were provided to each pair until the female wasp died naturally (21). The parasitized host larvae were extracted daily and subsequently incubated until offspring emerged. The longevity and fecundity of the adult, as well as the rate of emergence and sex ratio of the offspring, were documented for both untreated generations (F_1 and F_5) (23).

Behavioural experiment

The walking speed of the parasitoid *H. hebetor* was assessed at different concentrations of imidacloprid (LC_5 , LC_{30} , LC_{50}), along with a control (acetone), following a standardized method (24). One treated female was randomly selected from

each concentration group and individually transferred to a pesticide-free petri dish. A sheet of smooth white paper was placed to cover the base of the petri dish and a 1 cm reference line was drawn on the surface to standardize the speed measurements. A Nikon Z30 Digital camera was used to document the walking behaviour of individual wasps for 20 min. The original MP4 video footage was partitioned into four distinct 5-min segments, each regarded as a replication. The Kinovea software (v0.9.5; <https://www.kinovea.org/>), a video annotation tool equipped with object-tracking functionality, was employed to analyze these segments. Each segment was analyzed to detect a single, continuous movement lasting a minimum of 10 sec. Ultimately, all eligible movement segments were aggregated and averaged for each wasp, yielding a comprehensive understanding of their movement dynamics.

Statistical analysis

Mortality data were analysed using probit analysis using PoloPlus version 2.0 (LeOra Software Inc., Berkeley, CA, USA) to determine LC_5 , LC_{30} , LC_{50} and LC_{90} values, along with corresponding 95 % confidence intervals (25).

Life history data of *H. hebetor* reared on *C. cephalonica* larvae were analyzed using the age-stage, two-sex life table theory implemented in the TWOSEX-MSChart program (26). The bootstrap method, with 100000 resamples, was employed to calculate means, variances and standard errors of biological and population parameters (27). Statistical comparisons between imidacloprid-treated and control groups, as well as intergenerational differences within each treatment, were conducted using the paired bootstrap test. Walking speed data of *H. hebetor* were analyzed using one-way ANOVA to compare treatment and control groups within the F_1 and F_5 generations and paired t-tests were used to compare between generations within each treatment group. Tukey's multiple comparison test ($P = 0.05$) was applied using IBM® SPSS® Statistics Version 22.

Results

Toxicity of imidacloprid to *H. hebetor* adults

The imidacloprid concentrations for *H. hebetor* adults were determined through probit regression analysis. The derived regression equation for the dose-response relationship was $y = 0.7655x + 3.768$, with an R^2 value of 0.8348, demonstrating a strong correlation and a reliable fit to the observed data. The concentration-mortality assay resulted in LC_{50} value of 40.75 mg L^{-1} and an LC_{90} value of 2006.34 mg L^{-1} , with corresponding 95 % fiducial limits of 13.91-119.38 mg L^{-1} and 684.88-5877.52 mg L^{-1} , respectively (Table 1). Additionally, the LC_5

Table 1. Toxicity of imidacloprid to the ecto-parasitoid, *H. hebetor*

Insecticide	<i>n</i>	Slope \pm SE*	LC_5 mg L^{-1} (95% CL)	LC_{30} mg L^{-1} (95% CL)	LC_{50} mg L^{-1} (95% CL)	LC_{90} mg L^{-1} (95% CL)	χ^2 (df)†
Imidacloprid	60	0.766 ± 0.238	0.27 (0.09-0.80)	8.27 (2.82-24.24)	40.75 (13.91-119.38)	2006.34 (684.88-5877.52)	0.831 (3)

*SE, standard error

†Chi-square value (χ^2) and degrees of freedom (df) as calculated by PoloPlus® software (California, USA); LC, lethal concentration; CL, Confidence limit.

concentration was calculated as 0.27 mg L⁻¹, with a confidence interval of 0.09-0.80 mg L⁻¹, while the LC₃₀ value was determined to be 8.27 mg L⁻¹, with a confidence interval of 2.82-24.24 mg L⁻¹ (Table 1). The calculated risk quotient calculated was 0.61, which falls below the threshold of 50, indicating that imidacloprid poses a low level of toxicity to *H. hebetor* (section 2.6). Subsequently, LC₅, LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ concentration, along with the control (acetone), were selected to evaluate the effect of imidacloprid on the biological, population and behavioural parameters of *H. hebetor* across five successive generations (F₁ to F₅).

Biological parameters of *H. hebetor* exposed to imidacloprid

The effects of imidacloprid on the biological parameters of the larval parasitoid *H. hebetor* in the F₁ and F₅ generations are documented in Table 2. The findings indicated that exposure to LC₅ led to a noteworthy difference in adult longevity and total longevity in the F₁ generation compared to the control group. In the F₅ generation, most biological parameters showed no significant difference under LC₅ exposure, except for the developmental duration of the eggs and larval stages, which were notably different from the control. A generational comparison indicated a marked decline in fecundity ($p < 0.0001$), decreasing from 127.09 ± 9.95 in the F₁ generation to 61.42 ± 5.77 in F₅. Under LC₃₀ exposure, significant decrease was noticed in female longevity, fecundity and oviposition days were observed in the F₅ generation compared to F₁ generation, whereas no such differences were observed in male longevity, total longevity and TPOP. In *H. hebetor* individuals of the F₅

generation, there was a noteworthy elevation in the developmental days of the egg by 10 % ($p = 0.001$), male longevity by 13.4 % ($p = 0.033$) TPOP by 4.7 % ($p = 0.0004$) when compared to the control group. However, a significant reduction in the larval developmental period from 1.72 ± 0.06 to 1.67 ± 0.07 and fecundity from 73.12 ± 6.46 to 56.29 ± 8.05 was noticed in the LC₃₀ exposed F₅ individuals when compared to control. LC₅₀ exposure to *H. hebetor* exhibited notable differences in biological parameters such as the developmental period of the eggs ($p = 0.023$), larvae ($p = 0.017$), pupae ($p = 0.005$) and fecundity ($p = 0.024$), when compared to the control during the F₅ generation. Furthermore, a substantial reduction in fecundity by 36.5 %, was seen in the F₅ individuals subjected to LC₅₀, relative to the control group (Table 2).

Population parameters of *H. hebetor* exposed to imidacloprid

The impact of imidacloprid on the population parameters of the F₁ and F₅ of *H. hebetor* are provided in Table 3. Individuals exposed to the LC₅ concentration exhibited a significant reduction in the net reproductive rate (R_0) ($p = 0.024$), mean generation time (T) ($p = 0.026$) and gross reproductive rate (GRR) ($p = 0.001$) in the F₅ generation upon comparison with the F₁. However, no significant differences were observed in any population parameters between the LC₅-exposed individuals compared to the control. Exposure to LC₃₀ concentration had no noteworthy variations in the population parameters compared to the control in both F₁ and F₅ generations. On the contrary, when comparing among generations, all population parameters, including r ($p =$

Table 2. Biological parameters of F₁ and F₅ generations of *H. hebetor* exposed to different concentrations of imidacloprid

Biological parameters	Generations	Mean ± SE ^{*,†}					
		Control	LC ₅	Control	LC ₃₀	Control	LC ₅₀
Egg (days)	F ₁	1.63 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.59 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.63 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.68 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.63 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.49 ± 0.07 ^{ba}
	F ₅	2.00 ± 0.02 ^{ab}	2.19 ± 0.06 ^{aA}	2.00 ± 0.02 ^{ab}	2.20 ± 0.06 ^{aA}	2.00 ± 0.02 ^{ab}	2.10 ± 0.04 ^{aA}
Larva (days)	F ₁	1.38 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.41 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.38 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.32 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.38 ± 0.07 ^{ba}	1.51 ± 0.07 ^{ba}
	F ₅	1.72 ± 0.06 ^{ab}	1.63 ± 0.07 ^{aA}	1.72 ± 0.06 ^{ab}	1.67 ± 0.07 ^{aA}	1.72 ± 0.06 ^{ab}	1.90 ± 0.04 ^{aA}
Pupa (days)	F ₁	5.00 ± 0.05 ^{aA}	5.00 ± 0.03 ^{aA}	5.00 ± 0.05 ^{aA}	5.00 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	5.00 ± 0.05 ^{aA}	5.00 ± 0.04 ^{aA}
	F ₅	3.94 ± 0.08 ^{ba}	4.04 ± 0.08 ^{ba}	3.94 ± 0.08 ^{ba}	4.11 ± 0.06 ^{ba}	3.94 ± 0.08 ^{ba}	3.63 ± 0.07 ^{ba}
Female longevity (days)	F ₁	28.05 ± 2.45 ^{ab}	34.50 ± 1.57 ^{aA}	28.05 ± 2.45 ^{ab}	35.81 ± 1.78 ^{aA}	28.05 ± 2.45 ^{ab}	34.96 ± 1.60 ^{aA}
	F ₅	31.28 ± 1.13 ^{aA}	32.70 ± 1.20 ^{aA}	31.28 ± 1.13 ^{aA}	29.81 ± 1.48 ^{ba}	31.28 ± 1.13 ^{aA}	31.71 ± 1.50 ^{aA}
Male longevity (days)	F ₁	13.07 ± 0.84 ^{bb}	16.90 ± 1.21 ^{aA}	13.07 ± 0.84 ^{bb}	18.93 ± 1.31 ^{aA}	13.07 ± 0.84 ^{bb}	20.08 ± 1.06 ^{aA}
	F ₅	15.84 ± 0.52 ^{aA}	16.75 ± 0.53 ^{aA}	15.84 ± 0.52 ^{aA}	17.96 ± 0.85 ^{aA}	15.84 ± 0.52 ^{aA}	15.48 ± 0.53 ^{ba}
Total longevity (days)	F ₁	15.97 ± 1.51 ^{bb}	21.37 ± 1.63 ^{aA}	15.97 ± 1.51 ^{bb}	22.52 ± 1.65 ^{aA}	15.97 ± 1.51 ^{bb}	22.77 ± 1.64 ^{aA}
	F ₅	20.13 ± 1.44 ^{aA}	20.28 ± 1.56 ^{aA}	20.13 ± 1.44 ^{aA}	18.17 ± 1.49 ^{aA}	20.13 ± 1.44 ^{aA}	20.00 ± 1.50 ^{aA}
Fecundity	F ₁	138.65 ± 16.11 ^{aA}	127.09 ± 9.95 ^{aA}	138.65 ± 16.11 ^{aA}	161.43 ± 11.18 ^{aA}	138.65 ± 16.11 ^{aA}	116.13 ± 9.66 ^{aA}
	F ₅	73.12 ± 6.46 ^{ba}	61.42 ± 5.77 ^{ba}	73.12 ± 6.46 ^{ba}	56.29 ± 8.05 ^{ba}	73.12 ± 6.46 ^{ba}	53.54 ± 5.74 ^{ba}
TPOP (days)	F ₁	8.00 ± 0.05 ^{aA}	8.00 ± 0.08 ^{aA}	8.00 ± 0.05 ^{aA}	8.00 ± 0.01 ^{aA}	8.00 ± 0.05 ^{aA}	8.00 ± 0.03 ^{aA}
	F ₅	7.64 ± 0.10 ^{ba}	7.96 ± 0.04 ^{aA}	7.64 ± 0.10 ^{ba}	8.00 ± 0.85 ^{aA}	7.64 ± 0.10 ^{ba}	7.78 ± 0.11 ^{aA}
Oviposition days	F ₁	13.70 ± 1.65 ^{aA}	14.09 ± 0.82 ^{aA}	13.70 ± 1.65 ^{aA}	17.25 ± 0.80 ^{aA}	13.70 ± 1.65 ^{aA}	14.65 ± 1.12 ^{aA}
	F ₅	11.04 ± 0.83 ^{aA}	10.54 ± 0.77 ^{ba}	11.04 ± 0.83 ^{aA}	9.90 ± 1.05 ^{ba}	11.04 ± 0.83 ^{aA}	9.70 ± 0.71 ^{ba}

*Mean and Standard Errors (SE) were calculated using the bootstrap technique with 100,000 re-samples.

†Significant differences between generations and two treatments were estimated using the paired bootstrap test in the TWO-SEX MS Chart ($P < 0.05$).

Different lower-case letters indicate significant differences between F₁ and F₅ generations within each treatment group, while upper-case letters indicate significant differences between control and imidacloprid treatments in each generation. TPOP, total preoviposition period; LC, lethal concentration.

Table 3. Population parameters of *F*₁ and *F*₅ generations of *H. hebetor* exposed to different concentrations of imidacloprid

Population parameters	Generations	Mean ± SE			
		Control	LC ₅	LC ₃₀	LC ₅₀
<i>r</i> (d ⁻¹)	<i>F</i> ₁	0.30 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	0.30 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	0.30 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	0.30 ± 0.02 ^{aA}
	<i>F</i> ₅	0.28 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	0.27 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	0.24 ± 0.02 ^{bA}	0.26 ± 0.02 ^{aA}
λ (d ⁻¹)	<i>F</i> ₁	1.35 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	1.35 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	1.36 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	1.34 ± 0.02 ^{aA}
	<i>F</i> ₅	1.33 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	1.30 ± 0.02 ^{aA}	1.27 ± 0.02 ^{bA}	1.29 ± 0.02 ^{aA}
<i>R</i> ₀ (offspring/individual)	<i>F</i> ₁	46.22 ± 9.97 ^{aA}	46.60 ± 8.67 ^{aA}	56.50 ± 10.66 ^{aA}	44.52 ± 8.16 ^{aA}
	<i>F</i> ₅	30.47 ± 5.35 ^{aA}	24.57 ± 4.51 ^{bA}	19.70 ± 4.44 ^{bA}	21.42 ± 4.08 ^{bA}
<i>T</i> (days)	<i>F</i> ₁	12.88 ± 0.28 ^{aA}	12.70 ± 0.19 ^{aA}	13.25 ± 0.18 ^{aA}	12.81 ± 0.23 ^{aA}
	<i>F</i> ₅	12.08 ± 0.24 ^{bA}	12.05 ± 0.22 ^{bA}	12.42 ± 0.27 ^{bA}	11.99 ± 0.32 ^{bA}
<i>GRR</i> (offspring/individual)	<i>F</i> ₁	129.33 ± 15.63 ^{aA}	76.83 ± 10.96 ^{aB}	94.41 ± 13.41 ^{aA}	66.09 ± 10.24 ^{aB}
	<i>F</i> ₅	45.37 ± 6.32 ^{bA}	36.49 ± 5.90 ^{bA}	31.41 ± 6.53 ^{bA}	31.95 ± 5.60 ^{bA}

*Mean and Standard Errors (SE) were calculated using the bootstrap technique with 100,000 re-samples.

†Significant differences between generations and two treatments were estimated using the paired bootstrap test in the TWO-SEX MS Chart ($P < 0.05$).

Different lower-case letters indicate significant differences between *F*₁ and *F*₅ generations within each treatment group, while upper-case letters indicate significant differences between control and imidacloprid treatments in each generation. *r*, intrinsic rate of increase; λ , finite rate of increase; *R*₀, net reproductive rate; *T*, mean generation time; *GRR*, gross reproductive rate; LC, lethal concentration.

0.013), λ ($p = 0.012$), *R*₀ ($p = 0.002$), *GRR* ($p = 0.0003$) and *T* ($p = 0.011$) showed significant differences. Adults exposed to LC₅₀ concentration showed no significant variations from the control in both generations, except for the *GRR* ($P = 0.001$) of the *F*₁ generation.

Age-stage specific survival rate, fecundity and life expectancy of imidacloprid exposed *H. hebetor*

The age-stage-specific survivorship curve (s_{xj}) denotes the likelihood of neonatal survival from age *x* to stage *j*, as depicted in Fig. 1. Notably, owing to variations in developmental durations, there is discernible overlap among different stages (Fig. 1). The discernible trend reveals a gradual reduction in survival rates during the transition from immature to adult stages. The age-specific survival rate (l_x), age-specific fecundity of the total population (m_x) and age-specific maternity ($l_x m_x$) for *H. hebetor* exposed to imidacloprid in *F*₁ and *F*₅ generations are illustrated in Fig. 2. The l_x curves, representing survival rates without stage distinction, exhibit a noteworthy decrease at 40 and 45 days for both *F*₁ and *F*₅ generations exposed to LC₅ and LC₅₀ concentrations, respectively. For the LC₃₀ concentrations, the decline occurs at 40 and 41 days (*F*₁ and *F*₅, respectively), contrasting with control groups where the declining trend halts at 43 and 40 days for *F*₁ and *F*₅ generations, respectively (Fig. 2). The m_x and $l_x m_x$ curve manifest a statistically significant decline earlier in the LC₅ and LC₃₀ groups compared to the control, evident in both the *F*₁ and *F*₅ generations.

The age-stage-specific life expectancy (e_{xj}), which indicates the expected remaining lifespan of an individual at age *x* and stage *j*, as shown in Fig. 3. The curve suggests that individual exposure to LC₅ and LC₃₀ survive longer than those exposed to LC₅₀ group (Fig. 3). Notably, concerning the effect on *F*₁ and *F*₅ generations, the e_{xj} curve for *F*₅ adults tends to decline earlier than that of *F*₁ adults, indicating a transgenerational impact of the treatment. The age-stage-reproductive value (v_{xj}), characterizes the contribution of the

population from age *x* to stage *j* to future offspring, as demonstrated in Fig. 4. A higher reproductive value trend is observed in the LC₅ and LC₃₀ treatments compared to the LC₅₀, specifically in the *F*₅ generation (Fig. 4).

Walking behaviour of *H. hebetor* exposed to imidacloprid

The effect of imidacloprid on the walking speed of *H. hebetor* in the *F*₁ and *F*₅ generations is detailed in Fig. 5. The results demonstrate that, apart from the LC₅₀ concentration, all treatments led to noticeable differences in walking speed across both generations. In the *F*₁ generation, the walking speed of individuals exposed to LC₅₀ declined significantly compared to the control group. By the *F*₅ generation, significant reductions in walking speed were observed in individuals treated with LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ concentrations when compared to both the control and LC₅ treatments (Fig. 5). In the *F*₁ generation, reductions in walking speed of 10.5 %, 49.6 % and 33.3 % were observed for individuals exposed to LC₅, LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ treatments, respectively, relative to the control. These reductions were higher in the *F*₅ generation, with declines of 16.3 %, 16.9 % and 53.1 % for LC₅, LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ treatments, respectively. Interestingly, in the *F*₅ generation, walking speed in LC₅-treated individuals significantly increased, rising from 3.41 ± 0.10 to 4.00 ± 0.17 . In contrast, individuals exposed to LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ concentrations exhibited reduced locomotor activity, with walking speeds decreasing from 3.12 ± 0.12 to 2.48 ± 0.11 and from 2.54 ± 0.16 to 2.30 ± 0.11 , respectively (Fig. 5).

Discussion

In the realm of agricultural pest management, the widespread application of insecticides poses a significant risk to non-target organisms, including beneficial insects utilized in IPM programs. Understanding the impact of pesticides on biocontrol agents is crucial for the successful implementation of IPM strategies that integrate both biological and chemical control methods (28). Consequently, there is a necessity for




Fig. 1. Age-stage-specific survival rates (s_{ij}) of *H. hebetor* adults treated with acetone and LC₅, LC₃₀, and LC₅₀ concentrations of imidacloprid in F₁ and F₅ generations. These data were generated using TWO-SEX MS Chart.




Fig. 2. Age-specific survival rate (l_x), age-specific fecundity of total population (m_x), and age-specific maternity ($l_x \cdot m_x$) of *H. hebetor* adults treated with acetone and imidacloprid in F_1 and F_5 generations. These data were generated using TWO-SEX MS Chart.




Fig. 3. Age-stage-specific life expectancy (e_{xj}) of *H. hebetor* adults treated with acetone and imidacloprid in F_1 and F_5 generations. These data were generated using TWO-SEX MS Chart.




Fig. 4. Age-stage-reproductive value (v_{xj}) of *H. hebetor* adults treated with acetone and imidacloprid in F_1 and F_5 generations. These data were generated using TWO-SEX MS Chart.




Fig. 5. Walking behaviour of *H. hebetor* adults treated with acetone and imidacloprid in F₁ and F₅ generations. Different lower-case letters indicate significant differences between control and imidacloprid treatments in each generation ($P < 0.05$, one-way ANOVA), while upper-case letters indicate significant differences between F₁ and F₅ generations within each treatment group ($P < 0.05$, paired T-test).

toxicological investigations on the effects of chemical pesticides on natural enemies (28).

This study aims to elucidate the repercussions of imidacloprid exposure on the parasitoid *H. hebetor*. The findings reveal that imidacloprid exhibits high toxicity, with an LC₅₀ value of 40.75 mg L⁻¹, which is consistent with previous research reporting an LC₅₀ of 42.13 mg L⁻¹ (29). In contrast, a lower LC₅₀ value of 9.5 mg L⁻¹ was reported for *Bracon brevicornis* (Wesmael) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) (30). The field-recommended concentration (FRC) of imidacloprid (17.80 % SL) is 25 g a.i./ha (31) and according to the risk quotient method (20), imidacloprid demonstrates low toxicity to *H. hebetor*. This outcome aligns with earlier studies, where imidacloprid was shown to have minimal adverse effects on *H. hebetor* (11, 32).

Beyond its lethal effects, chemical insecticides can elicit sublethal impacts that influence various physiological and behavioral traits in exposed arthropods (33, 34). These sublethal effects can be either beneficial or detrimental to insect populations (35). In this study, LC₅ (0.27 mg L⁻¹) and LC₃₀ (8.27 mg L⁻¹) concentrations of imidacloprid significantly influenced developmental parameters-positively affecting the egg development period, while negatively impacting larval development. An accelerated developmental rate may be disadvantageous for parasitoids if it leads to desynchronization with the susceptible stages of their hosts (33). For instance, fenoxycarb has been reported to prolong the developmental duration of the predator *Chrysoperla rufilabris* Burmeister (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae) across all stages except the pupal stage, which corresponds with our observations (36). A previous study indicated that parasitoids exposed to buprofezin during later developmental stages exhibited reduced sensitivity compared to those treated during earlier stages-a pattern also evident in our findings with imidacloprid. Conversely, *Trichogramma pretiosum* (Riley) (Hymenoptera: Trichogrammatidae) pupae were found to be more sensitive to pesticide exposure in terms of

developmental period than eggs, larvae, or prepupae (37, 38).

Moreover, the longevity of bio-agents, particularly parasitoids, depends upon pesticide type, bioagent species and application techniques (39). A reduction in longevity is commonly observed in parasitoids exposed to insecticides during their development within the host (40). In the present study, exposure to LC₅ and LC₃₀ concentrations of imidacloprid led to a significant reduction in female longevity in the F₅ generation, while male longevity was notably reduced at the LC₅₀ concentration. Similar findings were reported in a previous study, which documented decreased longevity in *H. hebetor* adults following imidacloprid exposure (41). However, this contrasts with an earlier study where adult longevity remained unaffected by imidacloprid exposure (42). Likewise, divergent outcomes were observed in previous study, where *Trichogramma chilonis* Ishii (Hymenoptera: Trichogrammatidae) exhibited increased longevity when subjected to LC₅ concentrations of imidacloprid (43). Numerous additional investigations have documented the impact of insecticides on the longevity of *H. hebetor* (13, 29, 44). One study reported adverse effects on *H. hebetor* longevity at LC₂₅ concentrations of chlorpyrifos and fenpropathrin (44). However, a previous study reported an improved longevity of the parasitoid with the LC₂₅ concentration of profenofos (13).

Furthermore, our study observed a drastic reduction in fecundity in individuals treated with LC₅, LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ concentrations of imidacloprid. Corroborating these findings, prior research also documented a detrimental impact on the fecundity of *H. hebetor* due to the application of imidacloprid (45). Moreover, adverse effects of imidacloprid, indoxacarb and deltamethrin were also observed on the fecundity of *H. hebetor* (29). However, a reduction in female fecundity with sublethal concentrations of deltamethrin, while no significant observations were noted for sublethal concentrations of imidacloprid and indoxacarb (42). Conversely, an increased fecundity in another parasitoid, *T. chilonis* was observed when exposed to the LC₃₀ concentration of imidacloprid (43). These

different outcomes are due to the variability in the effects of insecticides on different organisms.

Our investigations revealed a declining trend in oviposition days for individuals subjected to LC₅, LC₃₀ and LC₅₀ concentrations. In contrast, an extended oviposition period was observed for *H. hebetor* upon exposure to chlorantraniliprole and cyantraniliprole (45). Additionally, there was no influence on the oviposition period of *Bracon nigricans* Szépligeti (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) following exposure to cyantraniliprole (46).

The LC₅ concentration of imidacloprid on *H. hebetor* resulted in a lower R_0 , GRR and T without notable differences in the r and λ . In contrast, the LC₃₀ concentration demonstrated significant differences in r and λ as well as in R_0 , GRR and T . Similarly, exposure to imidacloprid, indoxacarb and deltamethrin significantly lowered the intrinsic rate of increase, finite rate of increase and net reproductive rate of *H. hebetor* (29). It is noteworthy that, across all treatments, R_0 was lower than GRR , indicating a substantial impact on survivorship (l_x) attributable to insecticide exposure. The intrinsic rate of increase emerges as a crucial parameter for assessing population development, given its incorporation of age, l_x and the effects of m_x in its calculation (47).

Imidacloprid also had a significant impact on the locomotor activity of *H. hebetor*, resulting in a noteworthy reduction in all the concentrations when compared to the control group. Similar effects were observed in a previous study, where treated *Trissolcus basalis* (Wollaston) (Hymenoptera: Scelionidae) exhibited reduced linear speed after exposure to LD₂₅ concentrations of deltamethrin, with effects lasting up to 24 hr (48).

In another investigation, *Diachasmimorpha longicaudata* (Ashmead) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) males showed higher susceptibility (LT₅₀ = 24 hr) to spinosad than females (LT₅₀ = 120 hr), indicating sex-specific differences in locomotory responses to insecticide exposure (49). Additionally, *Copidosoma truncatellum* (Dalman) (Hymenoptera: Encyrtidae) displayed a significant increase in walking activity when treated with acephate, methomyl, flubendiamide and indoxacarb (50). Conversely, no significant differences in walking behavior were observed between control and treated groups exposed to chlorantraniliprole, deltamethrin, spinosad and chlorfenapyr.

Considerable research has been dedicated to developing nicotinyl insecticides with high affinity for insect nicotinic acetylcholine receptors (nAChRs), leading to the advent of a novel class of insecticides (51, 52). Neonicotinoids specifically target nAChRs in both the central and peripheral nervous systems, causing neural excitation, followed by paralysis and ultimately leading to insect death (53).

Conclusion

The findings of this study revealed that imidacloprid exerted varying effects on the ectoparasitoid *H. hebetor*, including increased adult longevity in both male and female, along with a reduced pre-adult developmental period, female fecundity and pre-oviposition period across different generations (F₁ and F₅). Notably, this insecticide treatment exhibited

deleterious impacts on both biological and population-level parameters. Consequently, a judicious evaluation of their inclusion in IPM programs is crucial. After conducting extensive laboratory studies, it is imperative to shift focus towards semi-field and field experiments to gain practical insights relevant to real-world conditions.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Director, ICAR-Central Rice Research Institute (CRRRI), Cuttack, India for constant support and for providing all the facilities. For this research work, funding was received from ICAR-Central Rice Research Institute, Cuttack, India [Institute project 3.5]. We thank Mr. Harmohan Pradhan, Mr. Deepak Kumar Tripathy, Mr. Narendra Biswal, Mr. Bidyadhar Bhoi, Ms. Swagatika Sahoo, Ms. Lopamudra Mandal and Ms. Nandini Sahu for helping in various phases of the study.

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed to the study's conception and design. BGG and PPP conceptualize and prepared the original draft. Visualization, investigation, validation were carried out by PPP and UN. Resource collection done by TA. Data curation and Analysis carried out by GPPG. BGG, NBP and AR did the writing- reviewing and editing work. Supervision and project administration done by SDM. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Ethical issues: None

References

1. Stanley J, Preetha G. Pesticide toxicity to microorganisms: Exposure, toxicity and risk assessment methodologies. Springer Netherlands; 2016. 351-410. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-7752-0_6
2. Stark JD, Banks JE. Population-level effects of pesticides and other toxicants on arthropods. Annu Rev Entomol. 2003;48(1):505-19. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.48.091801.112621>
3. Cutler GC. Insects, insecticides and hormesis: Evidence and considerations for study. Dose-response. 2012;11(2):154-77. <https://doi.org/10.2203/dose-response.12-008.Cutler>
4. Yao FL, Zheng Y, Zhao JW, Desneux N, He YX, Weng QY. Lethal and sublethal effects of thiamethoxam on the whitefly predator *Serangium japonicum* (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae) through different exposure routes. Chemosphere. 2015;128:49-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.01.010>
5. Borzoui E, Naseri B, Mohammadzadeh-Bidarani M. Adaptation of *Habrobracon hebetor* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) to rearing on *Ephesia kuehniella* (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) and *Helicoverpa armigera* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). J Insect Sci. 2016;16(1):12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jisesa/iew001>
6. Tirello P, Pozzebon A, Duso C. The effect of insecticides on the non-target predatory mite *Kampimodromus aberrans*: laboratory studies. Chemosphere. 2013;93(6):1139-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/>

[j.chemosphere.2013.06.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.06.046)

7. Schneider MI, Sanchez N, Pineda S, Chi H, Ronco A. Impact of glyphosate on the development, fertility and demography of *Chrysoperla externa* (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae): Ecological approach. *Chemosphere*. 2009;76(10):1451-55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2009.05.029>
8. Hasan F, Ansari MS. Lethal and sublethal effects of insecticides on the biological attributes of *Zygogramma bicolorata* Pallister (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae): A biocontrol agent of *Parthenium hysterophorus* L. *Neotrop. Entomol*. 2017;46:473-86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13744-017-0485-3>
9. Li YF, An JJ, Dang ZH, Pan WL, Gao ZL. Systemic control efficacy of neonicotinoids seeds dressing on English grain aphid (Hemiptera: Aphididae). *J Asia Pac Entomol*. 2018;21(1):430-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aspen.2018.01.003>
10. Dicks L. Bees, lies and evidence-based policy. *Nature*. 2013;494(7437):283. <https://doi.org/10.1038/494283a>
11. Mahdavi V. Residual toxicity of some pesticides on the larval ectoparasitoid, *Habrobracon hebetor* Say (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). *J Pl Prot Res*. 2013;53(1):27-31. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jppr-2013-0003>
12. Abedi Z, Saber M, Gharekhani G, Mehrvar A, Kamita SG. Lethal and sublethal effects of azadirachtin and cypermethrin on *Habrobracon hebetor* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). *J Econ Entomol*. 2014;107(2):638-45. <https://doi.org/10.1603/EC13227>
13. Dastjerdi HR, Hejazi MJ, Ganbalani GN, Saber M. Sublethal effects of some conventional and biorational insecticides on ectoparasitoid, *Habrobracon hebetor* Say (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). *J Entomol*. 2009;6(2):82-89. <https://doi.org/10.3923/je.2009.82.89>
14. Asadi A, Karimi J, Abbasipour H. The effect of sublethal concentrations of malathion on some biological parameters of the ectoparasitoid wasp, *Habrobracon hebetor* (Say, 1836). *Acta Agric Slov*. 2018;111(3):639-46. <https://doi.org/10.14720/aas.2018.111.3.12>
15. Gowda GB, Pandi GGP, Ullah F, Patil NB, Sahu M, Adak T, et al. Performance of *Trichogramma japonicum* under field conditions as a function of the factitious host species used for mass rearing. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(8):e0256246. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256246>
16. Gowda GB, Sahu M, Ullah F, Patil NB, Adak T, Pokhare S, et al. Insecticide-induced hormesis in a factitious host, *Coryca cephalonica*, stimulates the development of its gregarious ectoparasitoid, *Habrobracon hebetor*. *Biological Control*. 2021;160:104680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2021.104680>
17. Hagstrum DW, Smittle BJ. Host-finding ability of *Bracon hebetor* and its influence upon adult parasite survival and fecundity. *Environ Entomol*. 1977;6(3):437-39. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ee/6.3.437>
18. Ghimire MN, Phillips TW. Oviposition and reproductive performance of *Habrobracon hebetor* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) on six different pyralid host species. *Ann Entomol Soc Am*. 2014;107(4):809-17. <https://doi.org/10.1603/AN14046>
19. Ray A, Gadratagi BG, Budhlakoti N, Rana DK, Adak T, Govindharaj GP, et al. Functional response of an egg parasitoid, *Trichogramma chilonis* Ishii to sublethal imidacloprid exposure. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2023;79(10):3656-65. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.7540>
20. Preetha G, Stanley J, Suresh S, Kuttalam S, Samiyappan R. Toxicity of selected insecticides to *Trichogramma chilonis*: Assessing their safety in the rice ecosystem. *Phytoparasitica*. 2009;37:209-15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12600-009-0031-x>
21. Amir-Maafi M, Chi H. Demography of *Habrobracon hebetor* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) on two pyralid hosts (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). *Ann Entomol Soc Am*. 2006; 99(1):84-90. [https://doi.org/10.1603/0013-8746\(2006\)099\[0084:DOHHHB\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1603/0013-8746(2006)099[0084:DOHHHB]2.0.CO;2)
22. Pezzini C, Jahnke SM, Kohler A. Morphological characterization of immature stages of *Habrobracon hebetor* (Hymenoptera, Braconidae) ectoparasitoid of *Ephestia kuehniella* (Lepidoptera, Pyralidae). *J Hymenopt Res*. 2017;60:157-71. <https://doi.org/10.3897/jhr.60.20104>
23. Nath A, Gadratagi BG, Maurya RP, Ullah F, Patil NB, Adak T, et al. Sublethal phosphine fumigation induces transgenerational hormesis in a factitious host, *Coryca cephalonica*. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2023;79(10):3548-58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.7542>
24. Cedden D, Guney G, Scholten S, Rostás M. Lethal and sublethal effects of orally delivered double-stranded RNA on the cabbage stem flea beetle, *Psylliodes chrysocephala*. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2024;80(5):2282-93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.7494>
25. Ullah F, Gul H, Desneux N, Tariq K, Ali A, Gao X, et al. Clothianidin-induced sublethal effects and expression changes of vitellogenin and ecdysone receptors genes in the melon aphid, *Aphis gossypii*. *Entomol Gen*. 2019;39(2):137-49. <https://doi.org/10.1127/entomologia/2019/0865>
26. Chi H. Life-table analysis incorporating both sexes and variable development rates among individuals. *Environ Entomol*. 1988;17(1):26-34. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ee/17.1.26>
27. Chi H, You M, Atlihan R, Smith CL, Kavousi A, Ozgokçe MS, et al. Age-stage, two-sex life table: an introduction to theory, data analysis and application. *Entomol Gen*. 2020;40(2):103-24. <https://doi.org/10.1127/entomologia/2020/0936>
28. Stark JD, Banks JE, Acheampong S. Estimating susceptibility of biological control agents to pesticides: Influence of life history strategies and population structure. *Biological Control*. 2004;29(3):392-98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2003.07.003>
29. Sarmadi S, Nouri-Gonbalani G, Rafiee-Dastjerdi H, Hassanpour M, Farshbaf-Pourabad R. The effects of imidacloprid, indoxacarb and deltamethrin on some biological and demographic parameters of *Habrobracon hebetor* Say (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) in adult stage treatment. *Munis Entomol Zool*. 2010;5:646-51.
30. Shankarganesh K, Paul B, Naveen NC. Eco-toxicological effect of insecticides on the larval parasitoid, *Bracon brevicornis* Wesmael (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). *Afr Entomol*. 2017;25(2):367-74. <https://doi.org/10.4001/003.025.0367>
31. DPPQS. Major uses of pesticides; 2024. <https://ppqs.gov.in/divisions/cib-rc/major-uses-of-pesticides>
32. Sarmadi S. Laboratory investigation on lethal and sub-lethal effects of imidacloprid, indoxacarb and deltamethrin on parasitoid wasp *Habrobracon hebetor* Say (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). Ardabil: University of Mohaghegh Ardabili; 2008
33. Desneux N, Decourtye A, Delpuech JM. The sublethal effects of pesticides on beneficial arthropods. *Annu Rev Entomol*. 2007;52(1):81-106. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.52.110405.091440>
34. Ullah F, Gul H, Desneux N, Gao X, Song D. Imidacloprid-induced hormesis effects on demographic traits of the melon aphid, *Aphis gossypii*. *Entomol Gen*. 2019;39(3-4):325-37. <https://doi.org/10.1127/entomologia/2019/0892>
35. Gowda GB, Ray A, Adak T, Sahu M, Sahu N, Pandi GP, et al. Non-target effect of pesticides in rice environment. *ORYZA*. 2021;58(1 SPL):194-207. <https://doi.org/10.35709/ory.2021.58.spl.8>
36. Liu TX, Chen TY. Effects of the insect growth regulator fenoxycarb on immature *Chrysoperla rufilabris* (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae). *Fla Entomol*. 2001;628-33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3496394>
37. Jones WA, Ciomperlik MA, Wolfenbarger DA. Lethal and sublethal effects of insecticides on two parasitoids attacking *Bemisia argentifolii* (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae). *Biological Control*. 1998;11(1):70-76. <https://doi.org/10.1006/bcon.1997.0581>
38. Consoli FL, Parra JR, Hassan SA. Side-effects of insecticides used in tomato fields on the egg parasitoid *Trichogramma pretiosum* Riley (Hym., Trichogrammatidae), a natural enemy of *Tuta absoluta* (Meyrick) (Lep., Gelechiidae). *J Appl Entomol*. 1998;122(1

- 5):43-47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0418.1998.tb01459.x>
39. Bayram A, Salerno G, Onofri A, Conti E. Sub-lethal effects of two pyrethroids on biological parameters and behavioral responses to host cues in the egg parasitoid *Telenomus busseolae*. *Biological Control*. 2010;53(2):153-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2009.09.012>
 40. Desneux N, Denoyelle R, Kaiser L. A multi-step bioassay to assess the effect of the deltamethrin on the parasitic wasp *Aphidius ervi*. *Chemosphere*. 2006;65(10):1697-706. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2006.04.082>
 41. Kalajahi MJ, Ganbalani GN, Kazemi MH, Shojai M, Imani S. Investigation of sex ratio and adult longevity of *Habrobracon hebetor* Say in relation to some conventional and biorational insecticides. *Arch Phytopathol Pflanzenschutz*. 2014;47(7):852-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03235408.2013.823714>
 42. Rafiee-Dastjerdi H, Hassanpour M, Nouri-Ganbalani G, Golizadeh A, Sarmadi S. Sublethal effects of indoxacarb, imidacloprid and deltamethrin on life table parameters of *Habrobracon hebetor* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) in pupal stage treatment. *J Crop Prot*. 2012;1(3):221-28. <http://jcp.modares.ac.ir/article-3-4389-en.html>
 43. Ray A, Gadratagi BG, Rana DK, Ullah F, Adak T, Govindharaj GP, et al. Multigenerational insecticide hormesis enhances fitness traits in a key egg parasitoid, *Trichogramma chilonis* Ishii. *Agronomy*. 2022;12(6):1392. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy12061392>
 44. Faal-Mohammad-Ali H, Allahyari H, Saber M. Sublethal effect of chlorpyrifos and fenprothrin on functional response of *Habrobracon hebetor* (Hym.: Braconidae). *Arch Phytopathol Pflanzenschutz*. 2015;48(4):288-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03235408.2014.886411>
 45. Muslim M, Ansari MS, Hasan F. Non-target toxicity of synthetic insecticides on the biological performance and population growth of *Bracon hebetor* Say. *Ecotoxicology*. 2018;27:1019-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-018-1947-z>
 46. Abbes K, Biondi A, Kurtulus A, Ricupero M, Russo A, Siscaro G, et al. Combined non-target effects of insecticide and high temperature on the parasitoid *Bracon nigricans*. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(9):e0138411. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138411>
 47. Carey JR. *Applied demography for biologists: With special emphasis on insects*. Oxford University Press; 1993. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195066876.001.0001>
 48. Salerno G, Colazza S, Conti E. Sub-lethal effects of deltamethrin on walking behaviour and response to host kairomone of the egg parasitoid *Trissolcus basalus*. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2002;58(7):663-68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.492>
 49. Andrezza F, Haddi K, Nomberg SD, Guedes RN, Nava DE, Oliveira EE. Sex-dependent locomotion and physiological responses shape the insecticidal susceptibility of parasitoid wasps. *Environ Pollut*. 2020;264:114605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114605>
 50. Ramos RS, de Araujo VC, Pereira RR, Martins JC, Queiroz OS, Silva RS, et al. Investigation of the lethal and behavioral effects of commercial insecticides on the parasitoid wasp *Copidosoma truncatellum*. *Chemosphere*. 2018;191:770-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2017.10.113>
 51. Abbink J. The biochemistry of imidacloprid. *Pflanzenschutz-Nachr Bayer*. 1991;44:183-94.
 52. Tomizawa M, Yamamoto I. Binding of nicotinoids and the related compounds to the insect nicotinic acetylcholine receptor. *J Pestic Sci*. 1992;17(4):231-36. https://doi.org/10.1584/jpestics.17.4_231
 53. Tabozada EO, Sayed SM, El-Arnaouty SA. Side effects of sublethal concentration of two neonicotinoids; thiamethoxam and thiacloprid on the larval parasitoid, *Bracon brevicornis* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae). *Am J Exp Agric*. 2014;5(1):29-35. <https://doi.org/10.9734/AJEA/2015/12469>

Additional information

Peer review: Publisher thanks Sectional Editor and the other anonymous reviewers for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

Reprints & permissions information is available at https://horizonpublishing.com/journals/index.php/PST/open_access_policy

Publisher's Note: Horizon e-Publishing Group remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Indexing: Plant Science Today, published by Horizon e-Publishing Group, is covered by Scopus, Web of Science, BIOSIS Previews, Clarivate Analytics, NAAS, UGC Care, etc. See https://horizonpublishing.com/journals/index.php/PST/indexing_abstracting

Copyright: © The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Publisher information: Plant Science Today is published by HORIZON e-Publishing Group with support from Empirion Publishers Private Limited, Thiruvananthapuram, India.