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ABSTRACT

Survey undertaken to assess the distribution of fruit fly fauna in Himachal Pradesh revealed new distribution records of two species viz., Bactrocera watersi (Hardy) and Bactrocera zahadi (Mahmood) observed on cucurbitaceous crops. Bactrocera zahadi a member of the B. tau complex is a serious pest in the mid and low hills of Himachal Pradesh covering the districts of Una, Hamirpur, Solan, Sirmaur, Chamba and Shimla. It was observed both on fruit and exfruit, while B. watersi was observed only from Solan region in traps.
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Fruit flies belong to the family Tephritidae (Diptera) and these occur as pests on horticultural crops. Bactrocera tau, B. cucurbitae, B. dorsalis, B.zonata and B. correcta are the major pests of fruits and vegetables (Kapoor, 2002). Bactrocera Macquart is a diversified genus of tribe Dacini with several cryptic species which are pests. Cucurbits are infested by a number of fruit fly species, of which B. tau is observed as a major pest throughout the country and its incidence has been serious in Himachal Pradesh (Gupta and Verma, 1991); and B. tau and B. zahadi (Mahmood) are similar in their morphological features, and also in their host range and distribution, and hence are often confused with each other. This study explored the Bactrocera spp., from the mid and high hills of Himachal Pradesh, which resulted in bringing out the new distribution records of B. zahadi and B. watersi (Hardy) have been recorded.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Flies were trapped using insecticide-based attractant (cuelure) fruit fly traps installed at Una, Hamirpur, Solan, Sirmaur, Chamba and Shimla. The trap consisted of a polyurethane bottle (250 ml), to which a metal canopy was attached with an aluminum wire; a wooden block of 7.5x 2.5x 2.5 cm size was impregnated with ethanol: methyl eugenol: malathion solution in the ratio 6:4:1 for 48 hr and placed inside the bottle. Another aluminum wire was used to install the bottle trap. In addition, cucurbits with fruit punctures were brought to the laboratory and reared up to adult emergence. The egg laying females were captured from the cucurbits and later the cucumber slices were provided in glass jar, for egg laying in the laboratory, and these were reared to adult. Specimens were side mounted on 00 size entomological pins using glue, and were identified based on keys provided by Drew and Raghu (2002), David and Ramani (2011; 2019), and Drew and Romig (2013). Images of the wings were obtained using ISH1000 camera mounted on Olympus SZX10 binocular microscope in the Department of Entomology, Dr. Yashwant Singh Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Nauni, Solan, Himachal Pradesh. Virgilo et al. (2015) uplifted this to genus level based on their molecular phylogenetic studies but this study follows Hancock and Drew (2018) and considers the Zeugodacus as subgenus of Bactrocera.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The two new records of the Bactrocera observed now are given below:

Bactrocera (Zeugodacus) watersi (Hardy, 1954) (Fig. 1)

It is a large sized (9.1 mm) species, reddish-brown, and can be identified by a broad costal band and broad round apical spot on the wing apex. Scutum bears two lateral and one medial post sutural vittaee, median vitta tapering toward both ends, black apical spot is present on scutellum. Narrow black T pattern is present on abdominal tergites, otherwise abdominal tergites red-brown. Only one specimen was captured from Solan district in cuelure trap. Earlier it was recorded from Karnataka and Tamil Nadu (Agarwal and Sueyoshi, 2005; David and Ramani, 2011)
**Bactrocera (Zeugodacus) zahadi** (Mahmood, 1999)

(Fig. 2)

It is a medium sized (6.1± 0.062 mm) reddish brown species with irregular to round facial black spot. Scutum is reddish-brown, few specimen with dark patches at laterally. Both lateral and median poststural vittae present. Supernumerary lobe is strong, depressed and keel shaped. *B. zahadi* is similar to *B. tau*, but can be differentiated by the presence of prominent black markings on apex of all femora and wing with depressed keel shapes strongly developed anal lobe while *B. tau* have round to keel shaped medium developed anal lobe (Fig. 1). Glans densely covered with vasica in case of *B. zahadi*. It has been trapped in large number from Himachal Pradesh with the maximum trap catch being from Solan district (32± 3.14) and minimum being from Chamba (8.4± 1.93) district, as compared to Una (22.4± 2.97), Hamirpur (13.8± 3.23), Shimla (8.4± 1.93) and Sirmaur (24.2± 1.98); *B. zahadi* can be easily mistaken as *B. tau* but can easily be differentiated by depressed keel shaped anal lobe in *B. zahadi* whereas the anal lobe is round keel like and weak in *B. tau* (Fig. 1). There is confusion between *B. tau* and *B. zahadi* but with the help of some peculiar characters such as wing and genitalia morphology (David Ramani, 2019) both the species can be differentiated. Infuscation of costal band below the vein R2+3 is considered as different from the *B. tau* but it is generally variable in both the species and the infuscation can be seen in both, it may depend on environment. Earlier it was recorded from Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Tripura (Agarwal and Sueyoshi, 2005; David and Ramani, 2011; David and Ramani, 2019).
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