Short Communication

# Sensitivity of the silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. (Lepidoptera: Bombycidae) larvae to UVirradiation

### SI Faruki, PK Kundu

Department of Zoology, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi, Bangladesh

Accepted May 31, 2005

#### Abstract

The effects of UV-radiation on some commercially relevant traits of three instars viz. 1st, 2nd and 3rd of the two multivoltine strains, Nistari-M and Urboshi-1 of the silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. have been investigated. UV-rays reduced the weight of larvae, pupae and adults of both the strains and sexes of *B. mori* independently of the instar that has been treated. The cocoon weight, shell weight and shell ratios were also reduced due to UV-irradiation. Increased larval mortality was recorded at all the doses of UV-rays.

Key words: UV-radiation; Bombyx mori L. growth; cocoon characters; larval mortality

#### Introduction

In sericulture, the growth of various developmental stages of the mulberry silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. is of paramount importance because the quality of successful cocoon crop depends mostly on a healthy larval growth.

Radiation studies have been extensively carried out in different insects (Calderon *et al.*, 1985; Mehta *et al.*, 1990, 1991; Islam *et al.*, 1992; Faruki and Khan, 1993; Sharma and Dwivedi, 1997; Hasan *et al.*, 1998). In silkworms, few attempts have been made to find out the radiation sensitivity on different developmental stages through the use of chemical agents and ionizing radiations (Mallik *et al.*, 1968; Park and Hyun, 1968; Subramany and Reddy, 1982; Tazima, 1983, 1984; Ali and Ali, 1998). It has been observed that radiosensitivity varies according to species, strain, individual and even at different developmental stages of the individual (Tazima, 1978). Dose dependent sensitivity of silkworm growth to different forms of ionizing radiations have also been reported by Molnar *et al.* (1964),

Saiful Islam Faruki

Murakami and Kondo (1964), Shankarnarayanan (1982) and Singh *et al.* (1990). Moreover, gamma radiation has been used to identify the resistant and less resistant strains of silkworm (Hirobe, 1974).

The Ultraviolet (UV) portion of the spectrum is widely used as germicide (Bruce, 1975), in embryological-physiological studies (Bodenstein, 1953) and for the surface disinfection of insect eggs from pathogens (Guerra, *et al.* 1968). In Bangladesh, some works have been conducted on the effect of gamma-rays on the eri-silkworm, *Samia cynthia ricini* (Rahman *et al.*, 1982; Khan and Khan, 1991) and *B. mori* (Rahman *et al.*, 1983a, b). Unfortunately, no investigation was done on the effect of ultraviolet radiation on the mulberry silkworm, *B. mori*. Keeping in view the importance and feasibility of the use of UV-rays the present investigation on commercially relevant aspects of *B. mori*.

#### **Materials and Methods**

The multivoltine strains of the silkworm, *B. mori* used in the present investigation were Nistari-M and Urboshi-1. Newly-hatched larvae were brushed to wooden rearing trays ( $40 \times 29 \times 7.5 \text{ cm}$ ) and were reared on finely-chopped fresh, tender mulberry (*Morus*)

Corresponding Author:

Department of Zoology, Rajshahi University, Rajshahi, 6205,

Bangladesh

E-mail: faruki64@yahoo.com

alba L.) leaves to get the 2nd and 3rd instar larvae . First instar larvae were exposed to UV-rays just after hatching from eggs, and the 2nd and 3rd instar larvae were irradiated just after completion of their moulting, i.e. no feeding was provided before irradiation. The larvae of all instars were irradiated with 254 nm wavelength of UV-rays at different durations (doses), e.g. 2, 4 and 8 min. A 15W germicidal lamp, GE15T8 measuring 20 x 4 cm was the source of UV radiation, emitting at a wavelength of 254 nm. For irradiation the test insects were kept in 15 cm diameter Petri dishes placed on the surface apart 12 cm from the lamp. Irradiated larvae were then reared on mulberry leaves in rearing trays up to pupation. A single batch of nonirradiated worms was simultaneously reared as controls on fresh mulberry leaves up to spinning. From the fourth instar onwards entire mulberry leaves were supplied to both irradiated and control groups. Food was provided four times a day. Three replications, each with 50 larvae, were made for each UV treatment and for controls. The rearing trays were kept in fine-netted cabinets.

The weight of larvae was determined at maturity, i. e. one day before spinning. Thirty larvae were taken randomly from each treatment and were individually weighed on an electric balance. Mature larvae were transferred to bamboo-made mountages for spinning cocoons. After spinning and pupation the cocoons were harvested and stored according to their sexes. The sex was determined by cutting cocoons with a sharp blade and observing the external genitalia.

Cocoons were then retained for adult emergence. Pupal and adult weight were individually recorded. The adult weight was determined after emergence but before coupling. The cocoon characters, i. e. whole cocoon and shell weight, and shell-ratio (%) were also noted. For each character and each treatment 30 males and 30 females were randomly selected. Data of all the characters were subjected to analyses of variance. Here, the variance ratio F was calculated from the ratio between treatment mean square and residual mean square and the value was compared with the tabulated value for significance. The differences between means were determined by the "Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) test". The mortality of B. mori larvae was observed up to pupation and data were corrected by Abbott's (1925) formula.

All the experiments were conducted at a mean room temperature of  $24 \pm 2$  °C.

## **Results and Discussion**

The results on the effect of UV-rays on the weight of mature larvae, pupae and adults are shown in Tables 1, 2 and 3. It was found that the weight of larvae decreased with increased radiation doses at all the instars of both the strains of *B. mori* (P < 0.001 for Nistari and P < 0.05 for Urboshi) (Table 1). It was also observed that the effect of UV-rays was more pronounced at an early stage than an advanced stage.

			Instars		_
Strains	Doses (min.)	1st	2nd	3rd	F-ratio
		Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	
Nictori M	0 (Control)	1926.93 ± 15.03 <sup>a</sup>	1926.93 ± 15.03 <sup>a</sup>	1926.93 ± 15.03 <sup>a</sup>	
INISIAI1-IVI	2	1530.86 ± 19.68 <sup>b</sup>	1599.33 ± 21.74 <sup>b</sup>	1670.00 ± 17.75 <sup>b</sup>	<sup>(a)</sup> 23.91 <sup>***</sup>
	4	1472.10 ± 15.63 <sup>b</sup>	1703.16 ± 20.26 <sup>b</sup>	1656.26 ± 24.75 <sup>b</sup>	<sup>(b)</sup> 5.55 <sup>*</sup>
	8	1447.53 ± 20.97 <sup>b</sup>	1584.43 ± 20.68 <sup>b</sup>	1653.86 ± 20.57 <sup>b</sup>	
Lirboshi-1	0 (Control)	1929.36 ± 20.92 <sup>a</sup>	1929.36 ± 20.92 <sup>a</sup>	1929.36 ± 20.92 <sup>a</sup>	
	2	1735.73 ± 27.16 <sup>b</sup>	1824.53 ± 50.29 <sup>b</sup>	1917.30 ± 18.20 <sup>a</sup>	<sup>(a)</sup> 6.92 <sup>*</sup>
	4	1735.20 ± 45.49 <sup>b</sup>	$1726.30 \pm 38.23^{bc}$	1916.70 ± 26.32 <sup>a</sup>	<sup>(b)</sup> 6.25 <sup>*</sup>
	8	1710.80 ± 37.26 <sup>b</sup>	1693.96 ± 31.01 <sup>c</sup>	1822.76 ± 18.67 <sup>a</sup>	

Table 1 Effect of UV-radiation on the weight (mg) of mature *B. mori* larvae (N = 30)

(a) = between doses, (b) = between instars; \* P < 0.05, \*\*\* P < 0.001

F = variance ratio. Means followed by the same letter in each instar of each strain are not significantly different at P = 0.05 (SNK test).

Strains	Doses		F-ratio		
	(min.)	1st	2nd	3rd	
		Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	
	0 (Control)	808.26 ± 10.59 <sup>a</sup>	808.26 ± 10.59 <sup>a</sup>	808.26 ± 10.59 <sup>a</sup>	
		(914.60 ± 7.57 <sup>k</sup> )	(914.60 ± 7.57 <sup>k</sup> )	(914.60 ± 7.57 <sup>k</sup> )	()
		L	L		<sup>(a)</sup> 36.46
	2	763.06 ± 9.28 <sup>°</sup>	745.66 ± 10.28 <sup>b</sup>	767.30 ± 8.56 <sup>°</sup>	(2.92 <sup>NS</sup> )
Nistari-M		$(891.80 \pm 6.40^{\kappa})$	$(895.86 \pm 5.44^{\kappa})$	$(892.10 \pm 6.33^{k})$	(b) NS
				he	<sup>(0)</sup> 4.19 <sup>NS</sup>
	4	$690.73 \pm 7.92^{\circ}$	$680.40 \pm 6.48^{\circ}$	$732.50 \pm 7.44^{bc}$	(2.78 <sup>113</sup> )
		(799.26 ± 2.81')	(893.63 ± 4.46 <sup>°</sup> )	(853.26 ± 7.39 <sup>°</sup> )	
				00400 00 <sup></sup>	
	8	$645.50 \pm 11.33^{\circ}$	$607.23 \pm 4.07^{-1}$	$694.86 \pm 6.87^{\circ}$	
		$(744.66 \pm 8.17)$	$(901.10 \pm 5.03^{\circ})$	$(851.63 \pm 8.65^{\circ})$	
	0 (Control)	040.40 . 40.048	040 40 · 40 04 <sup>8</sup>	040 42 · 40 04 <sup>a</sup>	
	0 (Control)	$810.13 \pm 10.04$	$810.13 \pm 10.04$	$810.13 \pm 10.04$	
		$(875.20 \pm 9.60)$	$(675.20 \pm 9.00)$	$(075.20 \pm 9.00)$	<sup>(a)</sup> c oz <sup>*</sup>
	2	$7/9.10 \pm 11.20^{b}$	$704.00 \pm 9.77^{a}$	$800.86 \pm 8.12^{a}$	(5.07)
	Z	$(957.20 \pm 12.10^{k})$	$(970.26 \pm 10.79^{k})$	$(858.60 \pm 11.46^{k})$	(3.07)
		(057.20 ±12.12)	(870.20 ± 10.78)	$(000.00 \pm 11.40)$	<sup>(b)</sup> 1 11 <sup>NS</sup>
Lirboshi-1	4	743 63 + 10 35 <sup>ab</sup>	694 20 + 5 61 <sup>b</sup>	794 33 + 8 39 <sup>a</sup>	$(2.24^{NS})$
	т	$(849.06 \pm 17.60^{k})$	$(865.96 \pm 8.05^{k})$	$(863.50 \pm 13.42^{k})$	(2.27)
		(0.00 ± 17.00)	(000.00 ± 0.00 )	$(000.00 \pm 10.72)$	
	8	731 73 + 8 17 <sup>ab</sup>	$692\ 70\ +\ 4\ 36^{b}$	$722.90 \pm 4.92^{b}$	
	U U	$(783.80 + 14.52^{l})$	$(843.66 + 8.25^{k})$	$(847.86 + 9.47^{k})$	
		(	(0.000 = 0.20)	(0	

#### Table 2. Effect of UV-radiation on the weight (mg) of *B. mori* pupae (N = 30)

(a) = between doses, (b) = between instars; \* P < 0.05, \*\*\* P < 0.001

NS = Not significant. Data in parentheses indicate corresponding values in females.

F = variance ratio. Means followed by the same letter in each instar of each strain are not significantly different at P = 0.05 (SNK test).

There was a significant weight difference between the instars of both the strains (P < 0.05). In all the instars of Nistari, UV-rays deleteriously reduced the weight of male pupae (P < 0.001) in comparison to controls but produced no effect on the weight of female pupae (Table 2). The weight of male and female pupae of Urboshi was significantly reduced (P < 0.05). Similarly, the adult weight of both the strains and sexes were significantly reduced due to UV-irradiation (P < 0.01 for male and female of Nistari, and P < 0.001 and P < 0.01 respectively for male and female of Urboshi)(Table 3). There was no significant difference regarding weight between the instars of both the sexes of pupae and adults of the two strains. Lassota (1966), Shigematsu and Takeshita (1968) working with gamma-ray and Coulon (1969) working with X-ray on B. mori reported that higher doses either on the eggs or the larvae decreased the body weight that corroborates with the present findings. Similarly, Khan and Khan (1991) stated that the growth of the eri-silkworm, S. cynthia ricini was adversely affected when the eggs were irradiated with gamma rays. In the present investigation, significantly increased larval mortality was also recorded at all the instars and strains of *B. mori* due to UV-irradiation (Table 4).

The cocoon weight of the two strains of *B. mori* was adversely affected when larvae of different instars were irradiated with UV-rays. The lighter cocoons were recorded at all the doses of UV-rays in both the strains and instars in comparison to controls (Table 5). In Nistari male cocoon weight was significantly (P < 0.001) reduced whereas both male and female cocoons of Urboshi were severely affected (P < 0.05 and P < 0.01 respectively for male and female). The UV-rays produced no adverse effects on the shell weight of B. mori but except the male shells in 3rd instar of the strain Nistari-M, the weight was reduced at all the doses of UV-rays in comparison to controls, which was not statistically significant (Table 6). Similarly, the shell ratios (%) was not affected except in the males of Nistari where the shell ratios were significantly reduced (P <0.001) due to UV-radiation (Table 6). Singh et al. (1990) also observed reduced cocoon and shell weight in B. mori due to gamma irradiation. Similar result was observed by Khan and Khan (1991) using gamma irradiation against the eggs of S. cynthia ricini.

Table 3. Effect of UV-radiation on the weight (mg) of <i>B. mori</i> adults (N = 30
---

Strains	Doses (min.)		F-ratio		
	· · · -	1st	2nd	3rd	
		Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	
	0 (Control)	342.73 ± 4.20 <sup>ª</sup>	342.73 ± 4.20 <sup>ª</sup>	342.73 ± 4.20 <sup>a</sup>	
		(541.80 ± 5.77 <sup>κ</sup> )	(541.80 ± 5.77 <sup>κ</sup> )	(541.80 ± 5.77 <sup>κ</sup> )	(a) **
			ah	L	<sup>(a)</sup> 14.24
	2	$326.80 \pm 3.88^{a}$	$317.36 \pm 4.82^{ab}$	$314.33 \pm 3.20^{\circ}$	(9.99)
Nistari-M		(522.30 ± 4.75 <sup>°</sup> )	(557.66 ± 4.38 <sup>°</sup> )	(566.73 ± 3.01 <sup>°</sup> )	(b) NS
		h	h	h	(0) 0.97
	4	$290.83 \pm 4.30^{\circ}$	$303.70 \pm 2.54^{\circ}$	$308.93 \pm 2.66^{5}$	(6.22)
		(495.53 ± 4.21')	(514.96 ± 3.13')	(551.66 ± 4.67 <sup>°</sup> )	
	8	$263.93 \pm 3.56^{\circ}$	$265.30 \pm 4.91^{\circ}$	$303.63 \pm 2.52^{\circ}$	
		(480.60 ± 4.13')	(490.86 ± 4.77')	(512.93 ± 3.77')	
	a (a			- ( - <b>-</b>	
	0 (Control)	$343.50 \pm 3.83^{\circ}$	$343.50 \pm 3.83^{\circ}$	$343.50 \pm 3.83^{\circ}$	
		(700.06 ± 6.63 <sup>°</sup> )	$(700.06 \pm 6.63^{\circ})$	$(700.06 \pm 6.63^{\circ})$	(2)
				ana an a an <sup>ab</sup>	(**) 26.18
	2	$329.93 \pm 4.72^{\circ}$	$331.36 \pm 3.78^{\circ}$	$338.00 \pm 3.08^{-1}$	(18.56)
Urboshi-1		$(639.80 \pm 3.93)$	$(634.16 \pm 4.67)$	$(640.16 \pm 9.13)$	(b) a coNS
					(0.69 (0.69 <sup>NS</sup> )
	4	$321.93 \pm 3.09^{\circ}$	$320.83 \pm 3.03$	$330.96 \pm 2.98$	(2.59)
		$(546.76 \pm 6.00)$	$(614.70 \pm 4.50)$	$(602.40 \pm 3.17)$	
	o	210 52 , 2 20 <sup>0</sup>	214 10 + 2 00 <sup>0</sup>	210 02 1 4 00 <sup>0</sup>	
	0	$310.03 \pm 3.32$	$314.10 \pm 2.99$	$510.03 \pm 4.00$	
		$(409.10 \pm 4.93)$	$(500.10 \pm 5.95)$	$(374.03 \pm 3.78)$	

(a) = between doses, (b) = between instars; \* P < 0.05, \*\* P < 0.01, \*\*\* P < 0.001 NS = Not significant. Data in parentheses indicate corresponding values in females.

F = variance ratio. Means followed by the same letter in each instar of each strain are not significantly different at P = 0.05 (SNK test).

Table 4. Effect	of UV-radiation	on the mortality	of	B. mori larvae
-----------------	-----------------	------------------	----	----------------

Strains	Doses (min.)	Correct	F-ratio		
		1st	2nd	3rd	
	2	2.04	2.04	0.67	
Nistari-M	4	5.44	4.08	4.75	<sup>(a)</sup> 78.50 <sup>***</sup>
	8	6.12	6.80	6.12	<sup>(b)</sup> 0.85 <sup>NS</sup>
	2	2.71	8.16	2.71	
Urboshi-1	4	3.39	3.39	4.75	<sup>(a)</sup> 11.84 <sup>**</sup>
	8	6.80	12.24	8.16	<sup>(b)</sup> 2.30 <sup>NS</sup>

Control mortality of both the strains and all the instars = 2.00%, (a) = between doses, (b) =between instars, \*\* P < 0.01, \*\*\* P < 0.001; NS = Not significant. F = variance ratio.

Strains	Doses	1st	2nd	3rd	F-ratio
	(min.)	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	
-	0 (Control)	886.62 ± 10.73 <sup>a</sup>	886.62 ± 10.73 <sup>ª</sup>	886.62 ± 10.73 <sup>ª</sup>	
		(1004.93 ± 7.52 <sup>k</sup> )	(1004.93 ± 7.52 <sup>k</sup> )	(1004.93 ± 7.52 <sup>k</sup> )	
					<sup>(a)</sup> 60.19 <sup>***</sup>
	2	842.06 ± 9.59 <sup>b</sup>	823.26 ± 10.34 <sup>b</sup>	851.96 ± 8.48 <sup>b</sup>	(3.25 <sup>NS</sup> )
Nistari-M		$(982.86 \pm 6.54^{k})$	$(982.36 \pm 5.72^{k})$	$(980.26 \pm 6.52^{k})$	<i>(</i> , ) +
				2	<sup>(D)</sup> 5.52
	4	$766.49 \pm 8.13^{\circ}$	$751.70 \pm 7.46^{\circ}$	815.53 ± 7.62	(2.65 <sup>NS</sup> )
		(879.86 ± 2.96''')	(983.20 ± 4.40 <sup>°</sup> )	(941.20 ± 7.28 <sup>°</sup> )	
	-			b, a constant	
	8	$718.56 \pm 11.62^{\circ}$	$679.63 \pm 4.12^{\circ}$	$744.02 \pm 6.74^{\circ}$	
		$(820.30 \pm 8.38^{\circ\circ})$	$(978.00 \pm 4.96^{\circ})$	$(937.80 \pm 8.67^{\circ})$	
	0 (Control)	055 40 + 11 20 <sup>8</sup>	055 10 + 11 20 <sup>8</sup>	055 40 + 11 20 <sup>8</sup>	
		$955.40 \pm 11.32$ (1020 40 $\pm$ 10 41 <sup>k</sup> )	$955.40 \pm 11.32$ (1030 40 $\pm$ 10 41 <sup>k</sup> )	$955.40 \pm 11.32$ (1030.40 $\pm$ 10.41 <sup>k</sup> )	
		$(1039.40 \pm 10.41)$	$(1039.40 \pm 10.41)$	$(1039.40 \pm 10.41)$	<sup>(a)</sup> 9 25 <sup>*</sup>
	2	871 36 + 11 /1 <sup>a</sup>	$930.63 \pm 7.91^{a}$	931 86 $\pm$ 12 80 <sup>a</sup>	(14 12**)
Urboshi-1	2	$(1001.36 \pm 12.62^{l})$	$(1018.06 \pm 12.81^{k})$	$(1019.60 \pm 9.01^{k})$	(14.12)
		(1001.00 ± 12.02)	(1010.00 ± 12.01)	(1010.00 ± 0.01)	<sup>(b)</sup> 0 20 <sup>NS</sup>
	4	881.56 ± 12.06 <sup>a</sup>	$820.00 \pm 5.55^{b}$	$807.26 \pm 12.96^{b}$	(1.49 <sup>NS</sup> )
		$(1015.83 \pm 17.02^{kl})$	$(1007.42 \pm 8.25^{kl})$	$(1011.46 \pm 13.50^{k})$	
		/	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	8	$867.03 \pm 8.67^{a}$	812.50 ± 4.28 <sup>b</sup>	$836.40 \pm 5.38^{b}$	
		(938.36 ± 14.45 <sup>m</sup> )	(983.66 ± 6.04 <sup>1</sup> )	(984.36 ± 8.35 <sup>1</sup> )	

# Table 5. Effect of UV-radiation on the cocoon weight (mg) of *B. mori* (N = 30)

(a) = between doses, (b) = between instars, \* P < 0.05, \*\* P < 0.01, \*\*\* P < 0.001, NS = Not significant. Data in parentheses indicate corresponding values in females. F = variance ratio. Means followed by the same letter in each instar of each strain are not significantly different at P = 0.05 (SNK test).

Strains	Doses		Shell weight / Instars			Sh	nell ratios (%) / Instar	S	_
	(min.)	1st	2nd	3rd	F-ratio	1st	2nd	3rd	F-ratio
		Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE		Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	
	0	78.36 ± 1.37	78.36 ± 1.37	78.36 ± 1.37		8.84 ± 0.18	8.84 ± 0.18	8.84 ± 0.18	
	(Control)	(90.33 ± 1.01)	(90.33 ± 1.01)	(90.33 ± 1.01)	()	(8.99 ± 0.12)	(8.99 ± 0.12)	(8.99 ± 0.12)	
					<sup>(a)</sup> 2.64 <sup>NS</sup>				<sup>(a)</sup> 26.80
Nistari-	2	79.00 ± 1.22	77.60 ± 0.61	84.66 ± 1.44	(4.22 <sup>NS</sup> )	9.38 ± 0.16	$9.43 \pm 0.14$	9.94 ± 0.19	(0.73 <sup>NS</sup> )
М		(91.06 ± 1.13)	(86.56 ± 1.08)	(88.16 ± 1.41)	<i>a</i> .) *	(9.26 ± 0.12)	(8.81 ± 0.10)	(8.99 ± 0.19)	(I) NO
					<sup>(D)</sup> 6.98				<sup>(D)</sup> 2.57 <sup>NS</sup>
	4	75.76 ± 0.81	71.30 ± 0.65	83.10 ± 1.11	(0.90 <sup>NS</sup> )	9.88 ± 0.12	9.49 ± 0.11	10.19 ± 0.14	(2.03 <sup>NS</sup> )
		$(80.60 \pm 0.78)$	(89.56 ± 0.42)	(87.83 ± 1.07)		$(9.16 \pm 0.08)$	(9.11 ± 0.06)	(9.33 ± 0.13)	
	8	73.06 ± 1.42	72.40 ± 0.53	79.16 ± 1.18		10.18 ± 0.22	10.65 ± 0.09	10.64 ± 0.16	
		(75.63 ± 1.46)	$(76.90 \pm 0.61)$	(86.26 ± 1.29)		(9.22 ± 0.18)	$(7.86 \pm 0.08)$	(9.20 ± 0.15)	
	0	144.90 ± 2.67	144.90 ± 2.67	144.90 ± 2.67		15.16 ± 0.23	15.17 ± 0.23	15.17 ± 0.23	
	(Control)	(164.13 ± 3.12)	(164.13 ± 3.12)	(164.13 ± 3.12)		(15.79 ± 0.30)	(15.79 ± 0.30)	(15.79 ± 0.30)	
					<sup>(a)</sup> 4.47 <sup>NS</sup>				<sup>(a)</sup> 3.19 <sup>NS</sup>
	2	123.26 ± 2.61	135.73 ± 0.69	131.00 ± 3.81	(2.47 <sup>NS</sup> )	14.15 ± 0.33	14.58 ± 0.13	14.06 ± 0.32	(0.61 <sup>NS</sup> )
Urboshi-		(144.16 ± 2.50)	(147.80 ± 1.52)	(161.00 ± 2.60)		(14.40 ± 0.26)	(14.52 ± 0.22)	(15.79 ± 0.22)	
1					<sup>(b)</sup> 0.90 <sup>NS</sup>				<sup>(b)</sup> 1.70 <sup>NS</sup>
	4	137.93 ± 3.37	125.66 ± 1.46	122.93 ± 3.10	(0.95 <sup>NS</sup> )	15.65 ± 0.33	15.32 ± 0.20	15.23 ± 0.27	(1.41 <sup>NS</sup> )
		(166.76 ± 2.58)	(141.46 ± 1.03)	(147.96 ± 2.77)		(16.42 ± 0.37)	$(14.04 \pm 0.15)$	(14.63 ± 0.28)	
	8	135.30 ± 2.79	119.86 ± 0.62	113.50 ± 2.41		15.60 ± 0.30	14.75 ± 0.11	13.57 ± 0.26	
		(154.60 ± 3.02)	(140.00 ± 1.94)	(136.50 ± 2.97)		(16.48 ± 0.37)	(14.23 ± 0.19)	(13.87 ± 0.27)	

## Table 6. Effect of UV-radiation on the shells of *B. mori* (N = 30)

(a) = between doses, (b) = between instars, \* P < 0.05, \*\*\* P < 0.001, NS = Not significant. Data in parentheses indicate corresponding values in females. F = variance ratio.

Hirobe (1974) stated that in silkworms, growth and other quantitative characters are changed by gammairradiation depending upon dose rate, total dosage, developmental stage, temperature, moisture and other environmental conditions. It has been demonstrated that the developmental stages of insects renew their cells and tissues, and a particular stage of these animals determine their radio-sensitivity to ionizing radiation (Allotey, 1985). In the present investigation dose dependent sensitivity was observed in the strains of Nistari-M and Urboshi-1 and in different instars of B. mori. Moreover, UV-radiation reduced the relevance of some commercial traits e.g. larval, pupal, adult, cocoon and shell weight, and increased larval mortality in B. mori, which are very much undesirable from the economic point of view. Future experiments with an array of doses on various developmental stages of B. mori and ecological factors are greatly to be desired.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors remain grateful to the Chairman, Department of Zoology, Rajshahi University, for providing necessary laboratory facilities.

#### References

- Abbott WS. A method for computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. J. Econ. Entomol. 18: 265-267, 1925.
- Ali Al, Ali A. Seasonal effect in Nistari (M) silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. under gamma irradiation of eggs. Bull. Sericult. Res. 9: 43-45, 1998.
- Allotey J. Study of radiosensitivity of the immature stages of *Corcyra cephalonica* (Stainton)(Lepidoptera: Galleriidae). Insect Sci. Applic. 6: 621-625, 1985.
- Bodenstein D. Embryonic development. In: Roder KD (ed), Insect Physiology, John Wiley, New York, pp. 780-822, 1953.
- Bruce WA. Effect of UV-radiation on egg hatch of *Plodia* interpunctella (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). J. Stored Prod. Res. 11: 243-244, 1975.
- Calderon M, Bruce WA, Leesch LG. Effect of UV-radiation on eggs of *Tribolium castaneum*. Phytoparasitica 13: 179-244, 1985.
- Coulon M. Studies on X-ray damage in the early larvae of Bombyx mori L. Compt. Rend. Ser. D. 268: 959-962, 1969.
- Faruki SI, Khan AR. Potency of UV-radiation on Carda cautella (Walker) (Lepidoptera: Phycitidae) larvae treated with Bacillus thuringiensis var. kurstaki. Univ. J. Zool., Rajshahi Univ. 12: 73-79, 1993.
- Guerra AA, Ouye MT, Bullock HR. Effect of ultraviolet irradiation on egg hatch, subsequent larval development, and adult longevity of the tobacco budworm and the bollworm. J. Econ. Entomol. 61: 541-542, 1968.
- Hasan M, Jahan MS, Khan AR. Effect of UV-radiation on the Uzi-fly, *Exorista sorbillans* Widemann, an endoparasitoid of the silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. Insect Sci. Appl. 18: 87-91, 1998.
- Hirobe T. Utilization of gamma-ray effects in the field of silkworm breeding. Indian J. Genet. 34A. Proc. 2nd General Congress SABRAO, New Delhi, 1973, 224-228, 1974.
- Islam S, Mannan MA, Begum M, Afreen KS, Saha AK. A preliminary report on the effects of ultra-violet radiation on fecundity and fertility of *Culex pipiens fatigans* Wiedemann

(Diptera: Culicidae). J. Asiatic Soc. Bangladesh (Sci.) 18: 57-63, 1992.

- Khan AR, Khan SH. Growth and development of the erisilkworm, Samia cynthia ricini (Boisd.) (Lepidoptera: Saturnidae) irradiated on the eggs with gamma rays. Bull. Sericult. Res. 2: 91-94, 1991.
- Lassota Z. Intestinal damage and water imbalance in gamma irradiation larvae of *Bombyx mori* L. Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci. Biol. 14: 293-296, 1966.
- Mallik MU, Hossain MM, Mollah SA. Preliminary study of the stimulating effect of low dose gamma-radiation on the larvae of silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. Nucl. Sci. Appl. 4: 7-10, 1968.
- Mehta VA, Sethi GR, Garg AK. Development of *Tribolium castaneum* (Herbst) larvae after gamma irradiation of eggs. J. Nucl. Agric. Biol. 19: 54-57, 1990.
- Mehta VA, Sethi GR, Garg AK. Gamma irradiation of pupae and adults of *Tribolium castaneum* (Herbst). J. Nucl. Agric. Biol. 19: 184-188, 1991.
- Molnar A, Gubicza A, Babos L. A study of silkworms from the eggs of *Bombyx mori* L. irradiated with gamma rays. Ann. Biol. Tihany 31: 50-54, 1964.
- Murakami A, Kondo. Relative biological effectiveness of 14 Mc V-neutrons to gamma rays for inducting mutations in silkworm. Gonia Japan. J. Genet. 39: 102-114, 1964.
- Park KW, Hyun JS. Preliminary study on the biological effects of gamma rays on the silkworms, *Bombyx mori* L. J. Nucl. Sci. 8: 19-25, 1968.
- Rahman S, Khan AR, Hoque A. Effect of gamma radiation on the oviposition of the silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. strain – Nistari (non-spotted). J. Asiatic Soc. Bangladesh (Sci.) 9: 129-130, 1983a.
- Rahman S, Khan AR, Hoque A. Effect of gamma radiation on the filament length of the cocoons of the silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. Bangladesh J. Zool. 11: 42-44, 1983b.
- Rahman S, Khan AR, Jalil A. Effect of radiation on the erisilkworm, *Philosamia ricini* Boisd. (Lepidoptera: Saturnidae). J. Asiatic Soc. Bangladesh (Sci.) 8: 59-62, 1982.
- Shankarnarayanan K. Genetic effects of ionizing radiation in multicellular eukaryotes and the assessment of genetic variation hazards in man. Elsevier Biomedical Press, Amsterdam, pp. 83-85, 1982.
- Sharma MK, Dwivedi SC. Investigation on the effects of ultraviolet and infra-red light on the life cycle of *Callosobruchus chinensis* Linn. J. Advan. Zool. 18: 27-31, 1997.
- Shigematsu H. Takeshita H. Formation of silk protein by he silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. after gamma-ray irradiation in the embryonic stage. J. Insect Physiol. 14: 1013-1024, 1968.
- Singh R, Nagaraju J, Vijayaraghavan K, Premalatha V. Radiation sensitivity of the silkworm *Bombyx mori*. Indian J. Seric. 29: 1-7, 1990.
- Subramany G, Reddy SG. Isolation of a mutant line with shorter larval duration by induction of mutation in the silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L. Indian J. Exp. Biol. 20: 139-141, 1982.
- Tazima Y. Radiation mutagenesis of the silkworm. In: Tazima Y (ed), The Silkworm – an Important Laboratory Tool, Kodensha Ltd., Tokyo, Japan, pp 213-245, 1978.
- Tazima Y. Environmental mutagenesis: A view from the study of the silkworm. In: Proc. XV Int. Cong. Genet., New Delhi, pp. 43-52, 1983.
- Tazima Y. Effect of dose rate and fractionated delivery of ionizing radiation on mutation induction in silkworm spermatogenesis. In: Tazima *et al.* (eds), Problems of threshold in Chemical Mutagenesis, The Environmental Mutagen Society of Japan, pp. 169-173, 1984