



# Habitat management and the use of plant-based resources for conservation biological control

## Gestión del hábitat y papel de los recursos vegetales en el control biológico por conservación

Lorena Pumariño Romero

**ADVERTIMENT.** La consulta d'aquesta tesi queda condicionada a l'acceptació de les següents condicions d'ús: La difusió d'aquesta tesi per mitjà del servei TDX ([www.tdx.cat](http://www.tdx.cat)) ha estat autoritzada pels titulars dels drets de propietat intel·lectual únicament per a usos privats emmarcats en activitats d'investigació i docència. No s'autoritza la seva reproducció amb finalitats de lucre ni la seva difusió i posada a disposició des d'un lloc aliè al servei TDX. No s'autoritza la presentació del seu contingut en una finestra o marc aliè a TDX (framing). Aquesta reserva de drets afecta tant al resum de presentació de la tesi com als seus continguts. En la utilització o cita de parts de la tesi és obligat indicar el nom de la persona autora.

**ADVERTENCIA.** La consulta de esta tesis queda condicionada a la aceptación de las siguientes condiciones de uso: La difusión de esta tesis por medio del servicio TDR ([www.tdx.cat](http://www.tdx.cat)) ha sido autorizada por los titulares de los derechos de propiedad intelectual únicamente para usos privados enmarcados en actividades de investigación y docencia. No se autoriza su reproducción con finalidades de lucro ni su difusión y puesta a disposición desde un sitio ajeno al servicio TDR. No se autoriza la presentación de su contenido en una ventana o marco ajeno a TDR (framing). Esta reserva de derechos afecta tanto al resumen de presentación de la tesis como a sus contenidos. En la utilización o cita de partes de la tesis es obligado indicar el nombre de la persona autora.

**WARNING.** On having consulted this thesis you're accepting the following use conditions: Spreading this thesis by the TDX ([www.tdx.cat](http://www.tdx.cat)) service has been authorized by the titular of the intellectual property rights only for private uses placed in investigation and teaching activities. Reproduction with lucrative aims is not authorized neither its spreading and availability from a site foreign to the TDX service. Introducing its content in a window or frame foreign to the TDX service is not authorized (framing). This rights affect to the presentation summary of the thesis as well as to its contents. In the using or citation of parts of the thesis it's obliged to indicate the name of the author.



DEPARTAMENTO DE BIOLOGÍA ANIMAL  
FACULTAD DE BIOLOGÍA  
UNIVERSIDAD DE BARCELONA

DEA- Programa de Doctorado “Avances en ciencias agrarias y del medio natural”: Departamento  
Agricultura y Economía Agraria, Universidad de Zaragoza, Bienio 2006-2008  
Programa de Doctorado “Biodiversidad”: Departamento de Biología Animal, Universidad de  
Barcelona

**Habitat management and the use of plant-based resources for  
conservation biological control**

**Gestión del hábitat y papel de los recursos vegetales en el control biológico  
por conservación**

Memoria presentada por **Lorena Pumariño Romero** para  
optar al título de Doctor por la Universidad de Barcelona  
**2012**

Tesis realizada en el Departamento de Entomología, Institut de Recerca i Tecnologia  
Agroalimentàries (IRTA, Cabrils)

Director  
**Dr. Oscar Alomar Kurz**  
Investigador de Entomología  
IRTA- Centro de Cabrils

Tutora  
**Dra. Marta Goula Goula**  
Investigadora titular Dto. Biología Animal  
Facultad de Biología  
Universidad de Barcelona

# Development of specific ITS markers for plant DNA identification within herbivorous insects

L. Pumariño, O. Alomar and N. Agustí\*

IRTA, Entomology, Carretera de Cabrils, Km 2, E-08348 Cabrils,  
Barcelona, Spain

## Abstract

DNA-based techniques have proved to be very useful methods to study trophic relationships between pests and their natural enemies. However, most predators are best defined as omnivores, and the identification of plant-specific DNA should also allow the identification of the plant species the predators have been feeding on. In this study, a PCR approach based on the development of specific primers was developed as a self-marking technique to detect plant DNA within the gut of one heteropteran omnivorous predator (*Macrolophus pygmaeus*) and two lepidopteran pest species (*Helicoverpa armigera* and *Tuta absoluta*). Specific tomato primers were designed from the ITS 1–2 region, which allowed the amplification of a tomato DNA fragment of 332 bp within the three insect species tested in all cases (100% of detection at  $t=0$ ) and did not detect DNA of other plants nor of the starved insects. Plant DNA half-lives at 25°C ranged from 5.8 h, to 27.7 h and 28.7 h within *M. pygmaeus*, *H. armigera* and *T. absoluta*, respectively. Tomato DNA detection within field-collected *M. pygmaeus* suggests dietary mixing in this omnivorous predator and showed a higher detection of tomato DNA in females and nymphs than males. This study provides a useful tool to detect and to identify plant food sources of arthropods and to evaluate crop colonization from surrounding vegetation in conservation biological control programs.

**Keywords:** gut-content analysis, specific primers, molecular markers, dispersion, ITS, ingested plant DNA

(Accepted 23 July 2010)

## Introduction

In nature, predators and parasitoids move over a broad range of spatial scales, and it is of vital importance to understand the dispersal characteristics of these beneficial insects for biological control of agricultural pests. Different marking and tracking techniques have been developed in order to evaluate the movement or identify the sources of several species of arthropods (Lavandero *et al.*, 2004; Jones *et al.*, 2006; Wanner *et al.*, 2006; Goubault & Hardy, 2007;

Scarratt *et al.*, 2008; Stephens *et al.*, 2008). However, those useful methods have a major inconvenience for field studies; either the insects or the plants need to be marked beforehand.

Many predators are omnivores, consuming plant provided foods at least during part of their life cycles (Albajes & Alomar, 2004; Wäckers *et al.*, 2005). Enhancing the availability of such food sources within or close to crops provides resources, which enhance populations of natural enemies, and adds to their colonization of the target crop, increasing the effectiveness of biological control (Landis *et al.*, 2000; Gurr *et al.*, 2004). Pollen grains, present either on the exoskeleton or within the gut, have been used to confirm feeding on certain plant species (Silberbauer *et al.*, 2004). However, procedures for morphological pollen identification are too time consuming, and not all predators feed on pollen.

---

\*Authors for correspondence  
Fax: (34) 93 7533954  
E-mail: nuria.agusti@irta.cat

In recent years, several studies have developed DNA-based techniques to analyse predator gut contents in arthropods, mainly in those where the feeding does not leave remains that can be morphologically identified. The first attempts developed specific SCAR (sequence characterized amplified region) markers (Agustí *et al.*, 1999, 2000); but, more recently, other regions like the internal transcribed spacer region 1 (ITS-1) (Hoogendoorn & Heimpel, 2001) or the cytochrome c oxidase subunits I and II (COI and COII) mitochondrial genes have been used to develop prey-specific primers (Agustí *et al.*, 2003a,b; Greenstone *et al.*, 2007; Weber & Lundgren, 2009). Based on this, an alternative way to track movement of omnivorous predators from their refuges would be the identification of ingested plant DNA within whole insects, as similarly done in predation gut contents analysis studies. Even if the COI region has been mainly used for primer design in gut analysis of predation, it is not clear which region would be most appropriate for the detection of ingested plant DNA. ITS 1–2 together with *trnH-psbA* region have been proposed to have a faster gene evolution rate than COI in plants (Chase *et al.*, 2005).

*Macrolophus pygmaeus* (Rambur) (Heteroptera: Miridae) is a polyphagous predator that feeds on several arthropod species. Until recently, *M. pygmaeus* on tomato has been misidentified as *M. melanotoma* (Costa) (= *M. caliginosus* Wagner) and is still named as *M. caliginosus* by commercial beneficial producers (Martinez-Cascales *et al.*, 2006; Gemenio *et al.*, personal communication). This species spontaneously colonizes field and greenhouse crops from refuges present in the agricultural landscape of the Mediterranean basin (Alomar *et al.*, 2002; Castañé *et al.*, 2004; Gabarra *et al.*, 2004). Like most mirids, it is an omnivore that also feeds on plant tissues; therefore, it was selected as a candidate for our study. Because *M. pygmaeus* is a small sucking insect and it is not known whether it feeds either on phloem or on leaf cells, we suspected that prohibitively small quantities of plant DNA would be present in its gut leading on a low detection of plant DNA. For this reason, we also tested two insects with chewing habits that would ingest a large amount of plant cells: *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) and *Tuta absoluta* (Meyrick) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) larvae, both important tomato pests.

Here, we show that molecular markers can be used to specifically identify plant DNA in herbivorous/omnivorous insects. We have developed a tomato-specific marker which allows the detection of tomato DNA in the gut of three different insect species with different feeding types (sucking or chewing insects) and showed the detection percentages of tomato DNA within their gut with digestion time. Finally, we have also shown that this marker allows the identification of plant DNA within field insects collected in tomato greenhouses with just a PCR reaction, avoiding the process of sequencing.

## Materials and methods

### *Insects and plants*

*Macrolophus pygmaeus* were reared at IRTA facilities as explained by Agustí & Gabarra (2009a,b). This colony is renewed every year with introductions of new field collected insects near Barcelona (NE Spain). They were maintained on tobacco plants (*Nicotiana tabacum* L.) and *Ephestia kuehniella* Zeller (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) eggs. *Helicoverpa armigera* and

*T. absoluta* larvae were collected in tomato fields near Barcelona and maintained on artificial diet and on tomato plants, respectively. All insects were maintained under controlled conditions of  $25 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ ,  $70 \pm 10\%$  RH and L16:D8 photoperiod. *Ephestia kuehniella* eggs were provided by Biotop (Valbonne, France).

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.), cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* L.) and tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum* L.) plants were cultivated in greenhouses at IRTA. Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.), aubergine (*Solanum melongena* L.), pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.), zucchini (*Cucurbita pepo* L.) and cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) plants were obtained from fields in the vicinity of our facilities. *Carlina corymbosa* L., *Ononis natrix* L., *Verbascum thapsus* L. and *Solanum nigrum* L. plants were obtained from the margins of the previously cited crops in the same area.

### *DNA extraction*

Whole individual insects were homogenized in clean microcentrifuge tubes to avoid possible contamination by its own faeces, and DNA extractions were done using the DNeasy Tissue Kit (QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany; protocol for insects). Plant DNA was extracted from a 1 cm diameter leaf disc using the DNeasy Plant Mini Kit (QIAGEN) following the manufacturer's protocol. Total DNA was eluted with 100 µl in the AE buffer provided in the kit. All DNA extracts were stored at  $-20^\circ\text{C}$ .

### *PCR amplification*

Specific tomato primers were designed from the ITS 1–2 region by comparison with sequences of other solanaceous plants with CLUSTALW (Larkin *et al.*, 2007). Sequences obtained from GenBank were: *S. lycopersicum* (AF244747), *S. tuberosum* (AY875827), *S. nigrum* (AJ300211) and *N. tabacum* (AJ300215). Guidelines proposed for the design of efficient and specific primers by Innis & Gelfand (1990) and Saiki (1990) were followed. Primers were synthesized by Roche Diagnostics, Basel, Switzerland. DNA amplifications were performed in a 10 µl reaction volume containing 1 µl of DNA extract, 5 µl of master mix of Multiplex Kit (QIAGEN) and 1 µl of primer mix (10 µM). Samples were amplified in a 2720 thermal cycler (Applied Biosystems, CA, USA) for 40 cycles at  $94^\circ\text{C}$  for 30 s;  $62^\circ\text{C}$  for 2 min and  $72^\circ\text{C}$  for 90 s. A first cycle of denaturation at  $95^\circ\text{C}$  for 15 min and a final extension at  $72^\circ\text{C}$  for 10 min were carried out. Tomato DNA and water were always included as positive and negative controls, respectively. PCR products were separated by electrophoresis in 1.5% agarose gels stained with ethidium bromide and visualized under UV light.

### *Species specificity*

The specificity of the tomato primers was tested by attempting to PCR-amplify DNA from leaf discs of 11 other cultivated and non-cultivated plant species belonging to six families (table 1) ( $n=2$ ). These species were all selected as being present in the studied area and could potentially be fed on by the targeted insects. Starved *M. pygmaeus*, *H. armigera* and *T. absoluta* ( $n=10$ ) were also tested.

### *Feeding trials and detection periods*

Clean tomato leaves were cut in small discs (2.5 cm diameter) which included a fragment of the central leaf vein,

Table 1. Plant species used in the specificity test ( $n=2$ ).

| Family           | Species  |
|------------------|--|
| Solanaceae       | <i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> L., cv Bodar         |
|                  | <i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L., cv. Red Pontiac     |
|                  | <i>Solanum melongena</i> L., cv Cristal          |
|                  | <i>Capsicum annuum</i> L., cv. Aristocrata       |
|                  | <i>Nicotiana tabacum</i> L., cv. Brazillan Blend |
|                  | <i>Solanum nigrum</i> L.*                        |
| Cucurbitaceae    | <i>Cucumis sativus</i> L., cv. Porto             |
|                  | <i>Cucurbita pepo</i> L., cv. Mastil             |
| Cruciferae       | <i>Brassica oleracea</i> L., cv. Savoy           |
| Compositae       | <i>Carlina corymbosa</i> L.*                     |
| Papilionaceae    | <i>Ononis natrix</i> L.*                         |
| Scrophulariaceae | <i>Verbascum thapsus</i> L.*                     |

Species marked with \* are non-crop plants.

where mirids usually feed. Each tomato leaf disc was put on a 0.5-cm thick layer of an agar solution (5%) in small plastic boxes (2.6 cm diameter). A starved 48 h (at 25°C) *M. pygmaeus* female was introduced in each plastic box for three hours at room temperature and was observed every 10 min. Only those individuals that had been seen with the stylet inserted into the leaf at least three times were considered to have fed and were frozen until tested by PCR. Lepidopteran feeding trials were prepared in the same way, but with a tomato leaf disc of 1 cm diameter and without the agar layer. In each of the plastic boxes, a third or fourth instar larva starved for 48 h was individually confined for three hours at room temperature. Lepidopteran larvae were only considered for the analysis if they had consumed at least 10 mm<sup>2</sup> of the tomato leaf.

Once the insects had been observed feeding, they were either immediately frozen at -20°C ( $t=0$ ) or maintained at 25°C for 2, 4 or 8 h (*M. pygmaeus*); 6, 8 or 24 h (*H. armigera*) and 8 or 24 h (*T. absoluta*). After that, they were frozen at -20°C. Twenty *M. pygmaeus* females were assayed at  $t=0$  and 8 h and 16 at  $t=4$  h. Ten lepidopteran larvae were assayed for all times. Positive (tomato DNA) and negative (free DNA) control samples were included in all PCRs. Each sample was tested up to three times and considered positive if tomato DNA was detected in one of these three replicates. Negative exponential equations were fitted to describe the decay in the percentage of positive responses with time and  $R^2$  was calculated (JMP 8.0.1; SAS Institute Inc.). From these equations, the half-lives (50% positive detection) were estimated (Greenstone *et al.*, 2007).

#### Analysis of field collected *Macrolophus pygmaeus*

We analyzed *M. pygmaeus* collected from several tomato greenhouses in the studied area. Those predators were part of another study that has analyzed predation on two whitefly species and their parasitoids (Moreno-Ripoll *et al.*, 2009; personal communication). Once collected, those predators (25 males, 31 females and 83 nymphs) were frozen at -20°C prior to DNA extraction. Each individual was analyzed by PCR using the tomato specific primers developed in this work.

## Results

### Development of ITS markers

Sequences of ITS-1, 5.8S and ITS-2 regions of *S. lycopersicum*, *S. tuberosum*, *S. nigrum* and *N. tabacum* were aligned and

compared in order to design one pair of tomato-specific primers. These primers were named Le2F and Le1R and their sequence was 5'-CCGAGGCGCGCAAGCTCTTC-3' and 5'-TAAAGCCTTGCGGCGTGCGAG-3', respectively. They amplified a fragment of 332bp for *S. lycopersicum* including part of ITS-1 and ITS-2, and the whole 5.8S region.

### Species specificity and detection periods

These primers were tomato specific. No other plant species, neither cultivated nor weeds, amplified a band of the same length in the cross-reactivity test (fig. 1). Even if a band of a very high molecular weight was amplified in *N. tabacum*, this does not interfere with detection of the specific tomato band. Besides, a fragment of that size is unlikely to be detected after digestion. None of the starved insects tested (*M. pygmaeus*, *H. armigera* and *T. absoluta*) gave false positive results (fig. 2).

Tomato DNA was detected within all individuals of the three insect species tested after they had fed on tomato leaf discs with 100% detection in both chewing and sucking insects immediately after feeding ( $t=0$ ) (fig. 3). In all three species, tomato DNA detection decreased with time since  $t=0$  within *T. absoluta* and after 2 h and 6 h within *M. pygmaeus* and *H. armigera*, respectively (fig. 3). Detection curves were fitted to a negative exponential equation starting with the last detection time where 100% detection was obtained. Equations were:  $y = 133.1 \exp^{-0.17x}$ ,  $R^2 = 0.98$ ;  $y = 114.7 \exp^{-0.03x}$ ,  $R^2 = 0.95$  and  $y = 88.7 \exp^{-0.026x}$ ,  $R^2 = 0.81$  for *M. pygmaeus*, *H. armigera* and *T. absoluta*, respectively. From these equations, half-lives of tomato DNA detection within their gut were estimated as 5.8 h for *M. pygmaeus*, 27.7 h for *H. armigera* and 28.7 h for *T. absoluta*.

### Analysis of field collected *M. pygmaeus*

Tomato DNA was found in 30.2% of field-collected *M. pygmaeus* ( $n=139$ ), being much higher in nymphs (36.1%) and females (32.3%) than in males (8%).

## Discussion

In this study, we show the detection of plant DNA within the gut of three insect species by the use of a specific molecular marker. Tomato-specific primers were highly specific, showing no cross-reactivity either with other closely-related plant species or with the insect species tested.

The COI region has been applied extensively in animal barcoding; but, it is known that, for most of the plant species, it is not suitable due to its much slower rate of COI gene evolution in higher plants than in animals (Kress *et al.*, 2005). There is a lack of consensus on the most appropriate barcoding locus and criteria to be used in plants (Hollingsworth *et al.*, 2009; Valentini *et al.*, 2009a). Kress *et al.* (2005) proposed ITS and *trnH-psbA* as the best candidate regions for the design of plant-specific molecular markers, and ITS has been shown to work on many plant groups and has been recommended (Chase *et al.*, 2005; Sass *et al.*, 2007; Chen *et al.*, 2010). According to these considerations, we have designed a pair of primers from the ITS region that amplifies a fragment, 332bp long, that proved very effective for the detection of tomato DNA within the gut of the insects tested. As previously suggested (Agustí *et al.*, 1999), those primers were designed to amplify relatively short fragments to make possible the detection of semi-digested DNA fragments.






Fig. 1. PCR products obtained using the tomato-specific ITS primers (332bp). Lanes 3–26 show different plant species: 3–4, *Verbascum Thapsus*; 5–6, *Ononis natrix*; 7–8, *Carlina corymbosa*; 9–10, *Brassica oleracea*; 11–12, *Cucurbita pepo*; 13–14, *Cucumis sativus*; 15–16, *Capsicum annuum*; 17–18, *Solanum nigrum*; 19–20, *Solanum melongena*; 21–22, *Solanum tuberosum*; 23–24, *Nicotiana tabacum*; 25–26, *Solanum lycopersicum*. Lane 2, negative control. Lane 1 and 27, 100bp molecular-size marker.




Fig. 2. PCR products obtained using the tomato-specific ITS primers (332bp). Lane 3, starved *M. pygmaeus*; lane 4, starved *T. absoluta*; lane 5, starved *H. armigera*; lane 6, *M. pygmaeus* fed on tomato; lane 7, *T. absoluta* fed on tomato; lane 8, *H. armigera* fed on tomato; lane 9, tomato. Lane 2, negative control. Lane 1 and 10, 100bp molecular-size marker.




Fig. 3. Detectability of tomato DNA in the gut of *M. pygmaeus*, *T. absoluta* and *H. armigera* at different times after ingestion. Equations and  $R^2$  values are shown in the text (●, *H. armigera*; ○, *T. absoluta*; ♦, *M. pygmaeus*).

In this study, tomato DNA was detected in both a small sucking insect (around 4mm long) (*M. pygmaeus*) and two bigger chewing insects (*T. absoluta* and *H. armigera*). Even with this sucking insect, where the amount of ingested DNA was expected to be much lower than the bigger amount of leaf material (and then plant DNA) ingested by the chewers, the detection was possible in 100% of cases at  $t=0$ . As we expected, a faster loss of detection was found within the sucking insect. Some other authors obtained longer detection periods within other sucking insects species compared with chewing ones (Greenstone *et al.*, 2007; Hosseini *et al.*, 2008); but, as they also mention, detection depends not only on the size of the species analyzed but on the species itself. Degradation of the plant DNA through digestion probably also depends on other biotic and abiotic factors, as happens with insect DNA (Lövei *et al.*, 1990; Agustí *et al.*, 1999; Weber & Lundgren, 2009).

Tomato DNA was identified in many field individuals of unknown age and feeding history, which shows that even with a relatively quick digestion of tomato DNA within *M. pygmaeus*, this technique is useful to identify plant DNA in the gut contents of field-collected insects. As with other predators (Agustí *et al.*, 2003b; Harwood *et al.*, 2007; Juen & Traugott, 2007), it is possible to analyze feeding events in the field and opens the possibility for more detailed studies to confirm the use of a range of food plants.

Such techniques can also be used to understand trophic interactions of omnivorous predators. In predatory Heteroptera, the functions of omnivory and the functional relationships between plant and prey feeding are still poorly understood; and it is not clear to what extent they depend on relative availability, amount or nutritional value of the food types (Gillespie & McGregor, 2000; Sinia *et al.*, 2004; Albajes *et al.*, 2006). In some cases, the digestive capabilities of these omnivorous predators may vary through their lives (Lundgren & Weber, 2010). Comparing our data with those obtained by Moreno-Ripoll *et al.* (2009; personal communication) using specific primers of two whiteflies and their parasitoids, 13.7% of all individuals were positive for both tomato and insect prey, whereas only-plant or only-prey remains were found in 16.6% and 25.9% of their guts. Simultaneous detection of both food sources was much higher on nymphs than on females and males (19.3%, 6.5% and 4%, respectively). The fact that tomato DNA was detected in many field-collected *M. pygmaeus* clearly shows that plant material was consumed within a few hours of capture. Detection of both plant and prey within the same individual suggests dietary mixing, mainly in nymphs, according to a model where plant feeding is essential for predation (Sinia *et al.*, 2004).

Recently, some studies (Miller *et al.*, 2006; Matheson *et al.*, 2007; Jurado-Rivera *et al.*, 2009; Valentini *et al.*, 2009b) have

identified plant meal composition in insects by molecular methods. In these studies, plant DNA fragments from insect guts were sequenced and compared for homologies in the BLAST database (<http://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>) in an attempt to identify the ingested plant species. Such procedures, a very powerful tool when identifying unknown ingested plants, are not very practical in field studies where the aim is to confirm the ingestion of a limited number of host plants and where a very high number of insects should be analysed (e.g. to confirm plant sources of predators in crop colonization studies). That would not only require sequencing each DNA fragment found in their gut, but even cloning each fragment when several DNA fragments are present within the insect at the same time. In this case, it is much cheaper and more suitable to develop specific plant primers, in order to identify plant DNA with just a PCR as it has been done in most of the studies about molecular detection of predation and parasitism (King *et al.*, 2008; Garipey *et al.*, 2007; Agustí *et al.*, 2005). If several plant DNAs are expected, a multiplex PCR can be used by developing one specific pair of primers for each of the plant species, avoiding the cloning and sequencing needed in the previously cited studies.

This study shows the detection of tomato DNA within the gut of insects by using a specific molecular marker. This marker allows knowing the percentage of insects which have been found to consume tomato plant in an insect population. This is a promising technique in conservation biological control because it can speed up the identification of food plants of colonizing species in the agricultural landscape surrounding target crops.

### Acknowledgements

We thank Rafael Moreno-Ripoll and Rosa Gabarra for sharing DNA extractions of field-collected *M. pygmaeus* with us in order to analyze tomato DNA gut contents. We also thank Thais Aznar for her technical assistance and two anonymous reviewers for their comments. This work was funded by projects AGL2006-08726 and AGL2008-00546. NA was supported by the Ramon y Cajal Program and LP by a FPI doctorate studentship both from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (MICINN).

### References

- Agustí, N. & Gabarra, R. (2009a) Puesta a punto de una cría masiva del depredador polífago *Dicyphus tamaninii* Wagner (Heteroptera: Miridae). *Boletín Sanidad Vegetal: Plagas* **35**, 205–218.
- Agustí, N. & Gabarra, R. (2009b) Effect of adult age and insect density of *Dicyphus tamaninii* Wagner (Heteroptera: Miridae) on progeny. *Journal of Pest Science* **82**(3), 241–246.
- Agustí, N., De Vicente, M.C. & Gabarra, R. (1999) Development of sequence amplified characterized region (SCAR) markers of *Helicoverpa armigera*: a new polymerase chain reaction-based technique for predator gut analysis. *Molecular Ecology* **8**, 1467–1474.
- Agustí, N., de Vicente, C. & Gabarra, R. (2000) Developing SCAR markers to study predation on *Trialetrodes vaporariorum*. *Insect Molecular Biology* **9**, 263–268.
- Agustí, N., Shayler, S.P., Harwood, J.D., Vaughan, I.P., Sunderland, K.D. & Symondson, W.O.C. (2003a) Collembola as alternative prey sustaining spiders in arable ecosystems: prey detection within predators using molecular markers. *Molecular Ecology* **12**, 3467–3475.
- Agustí, N., Unruh, T.R. & Welter, S.C. (2003b) Detecting *Cacopsylla pyricola* (Hemiptera: Psyllidae) in predator guts using COI mitochondrial markers. *Bulletin of Entomological Research* **93**, 179–185.
- Agustí, N., Bourguet, D., Spataro, T., Delos, M., Eychenne, N., Folcher, L. & Arditi, R. (2005) Detection, identification and geographical distribution of European corn borer larval parasitoids using molecular markers. *Molecular Ecology* **14**, 3267–3274.
- Albajes, R. & Alomar, O. (2004) Facultative predators. pp. 818–822 in Capinera, J.L. (Ed) *Encyclopedia of Entomology*, vol. 2. Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Albajes, R., Castañé, C., Gabarra, R. & Alomar, O. (2006) Risks of plant damage caused by natural enemies introduced for arthropod biological control. pp. 132–144 in Bigler, F., Babendreier, D. & Kuhlmann, U. (Eds) *Environmental Impact of Invertebrates for Biological Control of Arthropods: Methods and Risk Assessment*. Wallingford, UK, CAB International.
- Alomar, O., Goula, M. & Albajes, R. (2002) Colonisation of tomato fields by predatory mirid bugs (Hemiptera: Heteroptera) in northern Spain. *Agriculture Ecosystems and Environment* **89**, 105–115.
- Castañé, C., Alomar, O., Goula, M. & Gabarra, R. (2004) Colonization of tomato greenhouses by the predatory mired bugs *Macrolophus caliginosus* and *Dicyphus tamaninii*. *Biological Control* **30**, 591–597.
- Chase, M.W., Salamin, N., Wilkinson, M., Dunwell, J.M., Kesanakurth, R.P., Haidar, N. & Savolainen, V. (2005) Land plants and DNA barcodes: short-term and long-term goals. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Series B* **360**, 1889–1895.
- Chen, S., Yao, H., Han, J., Liu, C., Song, J., Shi, L., Zhu, Y., Ma, X., Gao, T., Pang, X., Luo, K., Li, Y., Li, X., Jia, X., Lin, Y. & Leon, C. (2010) Validation of the ITS2 Region as a Novel DNA Barcode for Identifying Medicinal Plant Species. *PLoS ONE* **5**(1): e8613.
- Gabarra, R., Alomar, O., Castañé, C., Goula, M. & Albajes, R. (2004) Movement of greenhouse whitefly and its predators between in and outside of Mediterranean greenhouses. *Agriculture Ecosystems and Environment* **102**, 341–348.
- Garipey, T.D., Kuhlmann, U., Gillott, C. & Erlandson, M. (2007) Parasitoids, predators and PCR: the use of diagnostic molecular markers in biological control of Arthropods. *Journal of Applied Entomology* **131**(4), 225–240.
- Gillespie, D.R. & McGregor, R.R. (2000) The functions of plant feeding in the omnivorous predator *Dicyphus hesperus*: water places limits on predation. *Ecological Entomology* **25**(4), 380–386.
- Goubault, M. & Hardy, I.C.W. (2007) Deuterium marking of chemical emissions: detectability and fitness consequences of a novel technique for insect behavioural studies. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* **125**, 285–296.
- Greenstone, M.H., Rowley, D.R., Weber, D.C. & Hawthorne, D. J. (2007) Feeding mode and prey detectability half-lives in molecular gut-content analysis: An example with two predators of the Colorado potato beetle. *Bulletin of Entomological Research* **97**, 201–209.
- Gurr, G.M., Wratten, S.D. & Altieri, M.A. (2004) (Eds) *Ecological Engineering for Pest Management: Advances in Habitat Manipulation for Arthropods*. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.

- Harwood, J.D., Desneux, N., Yoo, H.J.S., Rowley, D.L., Greenstone, M.H., Obrycki, J.J. & O'Neil, R.J. (2007) Tracking the role of alternative prey in soybean aphid predation by *Orius insidiosus*: a molecular approach. *Molecular Ecology* **16**, 4390–4400.
- Hollingsworth, M., Clark, A., Forrest, L., Richardson, J., Pennington, T., Long, D., Cowan, R., Chase, M., Gaudeul, M. & Hollingsworth, P. (2009) Selecting barcoding loci for plants: evaluation of seven candidate loci with species level sampling in three divergent groups of land plants. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **9**, 439–457.
- Hoogendoorn, M. & Heimpel, G.E. (2001) PCR-based gut content analysis of insect predators: using ribosomal ITS-1 fragments from prey to estimate predation frequency. *Molecular Ecology* **10**, 2059–2067.
- Hosseini, R., Schmidt, O. & Keller, M.A. (2008) Factors affecting detectability of prey DNA in the gut contents of invertebrate predators: a polymerase chain reaction-based method. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* **126**(3), 194–202.
- Innis, M.A. & Gelfand, D.H. (1990) Optimization of PCR's. pp. 3–12 in Innis, M.A., Gelfand, D.H., Sninsky, J.J. & White, T.J. (Eds) *PCR protocols*. San Diego, CA, Academic Press.
- Jones, V.P., Hagler, J.R., Brunner, J.F., Baker, C.C. & Wilburn, T. D. (2006) An inexpensive immunomarking technique for studying movement patterns of naturally occurring insect populations. *Environmental Entomology* **35**(4), 827–836.
- Juen, A. & Traugott, M. (2007) Revealing species-specific trophic links in soil food webs: molecular identification of scarab predators. *Molecular Ecology* **16**(7), 1545–1557.
- Jurado-Rivera, J.A., Vogler, A.P., Reid, C.A.M., Petitpierre, E. & Gómez-Zurita, J. (2009) DNA barcoding insect-host plant associations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Series B* **276**, 639–648.
- King, R.A., Read, D.S., Traugott, M. & Symondson, W.O.C. (2008) Molecular analysis of predation: a review of best practice for DNA-based approaches. *Molecular Ecology* **17**, 947–963.
- Kress, W.J., Wurdack, K.J., Zimmer, E.A., Weigt, L.A. & Janzen, D.H. (2005) Use of DNA barcodes to identify flowering plants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **102**, 8369–8374.
- Landis, D.A., Wratten, S.D. & Gurr, G.M. (2000) Habitat management to conserve natural enemies of arthropod pests in agriculture. *Annual Review of Entomology* **45**, 175–201.
- Larkin, M.A., Blackshields, G., Brown, N.P., Chenna, R., McGettigan, P.A., McWilliam, H., Valentin, F., Wallace, I. M., Wilm, A., Lopez, R., Thompson, J.D., Gibson, T.J. & Higgins, D.G. (2007) Clustal W and Clustal X version 2.0. *Bioinformatics* **23**, 2947–2948.
- Lavendero, B.I., Wratten, S.D., Hagler, J. & Tylianakis, J. (2004) Marking and tracking techniques for insect predators and parasitoids in ecological engineering. pp. 117–131 in Gurr, G.M., Wratten, S.D. & Altieri, M.A. (Eds) *Ecological Engineering for Pest Management: Advances in Habitat Manipulation for Arthropods*. Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press.
- Lövei, G.L., Sopp, P.I. & Sunderland, K.D. (1990) Digestion rate in relation to alternative feeding in three species of polyphagous predators. *Ecological Entomology* **15**, 293–300.
- Lundgren, J.G. & Weber, D.C. (2010) Changes in digestive rate of a predatory beetle over its larval stage: Implications for dietary breadth. *Journal of Insect Physiology* **56**, 431–437.
- Martinez-Cascales, J.I., Cenis, J.L., Cassis, G. & Sanchez, J.A. (2006) Species identity of *Macrolophus melanotoma* (Costa 1853) and *Macrolophus pygmaeus* (Rambur 1839) (Insecta: Heteroptera: Miridae) based on morphological and molecular data and bionomic implications. *Insect Systematics and Evolution* **37**, 385–404.
- Matheson, C.D., Muller, G.C., Junnila, A., Vernon, K., Hausmann, A., Miller, M.A., Greenblatt, C. & Schlein, Y. (2007) A PCR method for detection of plant meals from the guts of insects. *Organisms, Diversity and Evolution* **7**, 294–303.
- Miller, M.A., Muller, G.C., Kravchenko, V.D., Junnila, A., Vernon, K.K., Matheson, C.D. & Hausmann, A. (2006) DNA-based identification of Lepidoptera larvae and plant meals from their gut contents. *Russian Entomological Journal* **15**, 427–432.
- Moreno-Ripoll, R., Gabarra, R. & Agustí, N. (2009) Tracking predation of *Macrolophus pygmaeus* and *Nesidiocoris tenuis* (Heteroptera: Miridae) in tomato protected crops by molecular methods. *IOBC/WPRS Bulletin* **49**, 307–312.
- Saiki, R.K. (1990) Amplification of genomic DNA. pp. 13–20 in Innis, M.A., Gelfand, D.H., Sninsky, J.J. & White, T.J. (Eds) *PCR Protocols*. San Diego, CA, Academic Press.
- Sass, C., Little, D.P., Stevenson, D.W. & Specht, C.D. (2007) DNA Barcoding in the Cycadales: Testing the Potential of Proposed Barcoding Markers for Species Identification of Cycads. *PLoS ONE* **2**(11), e1154.
- Scarratt, S.L., Wratten, S.D. & Shishebor, P. (2008) Measuring parasitoid movement from floral resources in a vineyard. *Biological Control* **46**, 107–113.
- Silberbauer, L., Yee, M., Del Socorro, A., Wratten, S., Gregg, P. & Bowie, M. (2004) Pollen grains as markers to track the movements of generalist predatory insects in agroecosystems. *International Journal of Pest Management* **50**, 165–171.
- Sinia, A., Roitberg, B., McGregor, R.R. & Gillespie, D.R. (2004) Prey feeding increases water stress in the omnivorous predator *Dicyphus hesperus*. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* **110**(3), 243–248.
- Stephens, A.E.A., Barrington, A.M., Bush, V.A., Fletcher, N.M., Mitchell, V.J. & Suckling, D.M. (2008) Evaluation of dyes for marking painted apple moths (*Teia anartoides* Walker, Lep. Lymantriidae) used in a sterile insect release program. *Australian Journal of Entomology* **47**, 131–136.
- Valentini, A., Pompanon, F. & Taberlet, P. (2009a) DNA barcoding for ecologists. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **24** (2), 110–117.
- Valentini, A., Miquel, C., Nawaz, M.A., Bellemain, E., Coissac, E., Pompanon, F., Gielly, L., Cruaud, C., Nascetti, G., Wincker, P., Swenson, J.E. & Taberlet, P. (2009b) New perspectives in diet analysis based on DNA barcoding and parallel pyrosequencing: the trnL approach. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **9**(1), 51–60.
- Wäckers, F.L., van Rijn, P.C.J. & Bruin, J. (2005) *Plant-Provided Food for Carnivorous Insects: A Protective Mutualism and its Applications*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Wanner, H., Gu, H., Günther, D., Hein, S. & Dorn, S. (2006) Tracing spatial distribution of parasitism in fields with flowering plant strips using stable isotope marking. *Biological Control* **39**, 240–247.
- Weber, D.C. & Lundgren, J.G. (2009) Detection of predation using qPCR: Effect of prey quantity, elapsed time, chaser diet, and sample preservation on detectable quantity of prey DNA. *Journal of Insect Science* **9**, 41.