

Original Research Article

Comparative efficacy of certain chemicals and Biopesticides against pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea

ABSTRACT

The present field investigation was carried out in the Prayagraj district of Uttar Pradesh. The experiment was conducted in *rabi* 2021 -22 at Central Research Farm, SHUATS, Naini, Prayagraj. The field replicated in RBD with seven treatments and one control plot. To check the comparative efficacy of certain chemicals and biopesticides against pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea. The result of the efficacy of treatments showed that both chemicals and Biopesticides are effective against pod borer even if they have slight percent larval reductions. The different chemicals and Biopesticide treatments reveal that the most effective population infestation of pod borer, was recorded in, Chlorantraniliprole (0.46) followed by Spinosad (0.80), Emamectin benzoate (01.13), NSKE (01.46), *Beauveria bassiana* (01.66), *Metarhizium anisopilae* (02.00), *Bacillus thuringiensis* (02.26) and the highest population of Pod borer was found in Control T₀ (5.2). In another parameter higher yield and benefit cost ratio was recorded in chlorantraniliprole (18.89 q/ha and 1:2.21) followed by Spinosad (17.30 q/ha and 1:2.18), Emamectin Benzoate (15.80 q/ha and 1:2.14), NSKE (14.90 q/ha and 1:1.88), *Beauveria bassiana* (13.50 q/ha and 1:2.01), *Metarhizium anisopilae* (11.63 q/ha and 1:1.50), *Bacillus thuringiensis* (9.80 q/ha and 1:1.62) as compared to control (7.42 q/ha and 1:2.01).

Keywords: Bio-Pesticides, Cost benefit ratio, Efficacy, *Helicoverpa armigera*, Insecticides

Comment [u1]: What is this? The minimum per cent of infestation????

Comment [u2]: With ratio???

Comment [u3]: Check this

INTRODUCTION

Gram commonly known as chickpea or Bengal gram is the most important pulse crop of India. In India it is also known as 'King of pulses' India is the largest producer with 75% of world acreage and production of gram. India produces 5.3 MT of chickpea from 6.67 million ha with an average production of 844 kg per ha. Chickpea is used for human consumption as well as for

Comment [u4]: Reference?????

feeding to animals. Its seeds eaten as green vegetable, fried, roasted, as snack food and ground to obtain flour and dhal (**Pachundkar et al., 2013**). *H. armigera* is the major damaging pest in areas where chickpea is grown. The attack of this pest begins right from vegetative stage and continue up to maturity. Young larvae of *H. armigera* feeds on leaflets, buds, flowers and pods of chickpea (**Mandal and Roy, 2012**). Gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera*, is considered as a notorious pest of chickpea. It also attacks pigeon pea, moong bean, lentil, soybean, okra, maize, berseem, sunflower, sorghum, tobacco and tomato. Besides gram pod borer, it is also known as cotton bollworm, gram caterpillar, tomato fruit worm and tobacco bud worm (**Ullah et al. 2015**). In recent years, various types of insecticides belonging to different chemical group were used as spray to manage the pest complex Use of chemical pesticides has resulted in immediate high returns to farmers. However, their heavy and extensive use has created various health and environmental problems. To avoid these problems, use of environmentally safer bio-pesticides is gaining momentum these days (**Kaur et al. 2007**).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted during *rabi* season 2021 at Cental Research Farm, SHUATS, Naini, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India, in a Randomized Block Design with seven treatments along with controlled plot replicated three times using variety Ankur - Chirag in a plot size of (2m×2m) at a spacing of (30×10cm) with a recommended package of practices excluding plant protection. The soil of the experimental site was well drained and medium high. The climate of the experimental site is sub-tropical characterized by normal rainfall.

Comment [u5]: space

The population of chickpea pod borer was recorded before 1-day before spraying and on 3rd day, 7th day and 14th day after insecticidal application. The populations of chickpea pod borer was recorded on 5 randomly selected and tagged plants from each plot. At each picking the total number of pods infested of five selected plants from each treatment replication wise was recorded.

The healthy marketable yield obtained from different treatments was collected separately and weighed. The cost of insecticides used in this experiment was recorded during season of 2021-2022. The cost of botanicals used was obtained from nearby market. The total cost of plant

protection consisted of cost of treatments, sprayer rent and labour charges for the spray. There were two sprays throughout the research period and the overall plant protection expenses were calculated. Total income was realized by multiplying the total yield per hectare by the prevailing market price, while the net benefit is obtained by subtracting the total cost of plant protection from total income. Benefit over the control for each sprayed treatment was obtained by subtracting the income of the control treatment from that of each sprayed treatment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

All the treatments were significantly superior to the untreated control in reducing the population of *Helicoverpa armigera* on chick pea crop in both of insecticidal application. The larval population recorded one day prior to the 1st spray was in a range of 4.06 to 4.8 / 5 plants (Table 1). After 3 days of spray, T₁Chlorantraniliprole was recorded minimum larval count of pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) (2.26) followed by T₃ Spinosad (2.6), T₂ Emamectin Benzoate (3.06), T₄ NSKE (3.26), T₇ *Beauveria bassiana* (3.53), T₅ *Metarhizium anisopilae* (3.66), *Bacillus thuringiensis* (4) and the highest population of Pod borer was found in Control T₀ (6.13).

A significant reduction in mean larval population was observed on 7th and 14th days after 1st spray. In all treated plots mean larval population was minimum in T₁ Chlorantraniliprole (1.86 and 1.73 respectively) followed by Spinosad 45 SC (2.06 and 1.93). The overall mean of larval population after first insecticidal spray was lowest in T₁ Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC (1.95).

Over all mean analysis of 3rd, 7th and 14 days after 1st insecticidal application indicated that all the insecticidal treatments were significantly effective in reducing the larval population of *Helicoverpa armigera* as compared to untreated plots. Chlorantraniliprole (1.73%) was found significantly superior these findings are supported by **Chitrlekha et al., (2018)**. Followed by Spinosad (1.93) similar findings also reported in chickpea by **Nitharwal et al., (2017)**. Emamectin benzoate (57.74%) is the next best treatment for reducing the population of gram pod borer. Similar reports were made by **Turkhade et.al (2015)**. The treatment was showed by T₄ NSKE 0.15% (2.37) and the similar reported by **Kumar et al. (2018)**. The next best was which is in line with findings of Devi and Tayde (2017) *Beauveria bassiana* (3.2). T₅ *Metarhizium*

Comment [u6]: write third

Comment [u7]: check

anisiopilae (3.26) was next best treatment. T₆ *Bacillus thuringiensis* (3.8) which are supported by **Harika et al. (2019)**.

3rd day after second spray, all the treatment were superior with control plots and differed significantly with each other. Among all the treatments T₁ Chlorantraniliprole was recorded minimum larval count of pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) (1.0) followed by T₃ Spinosad (1.26), T₂ Emamectin Benzoate (1.60), T₄ NSKE (1.8), T₇ *Beauveria bassiana* (2.06), T₅ *Metarhizium anisiopilae* (2.60), T₆ *Bacillus thuringiensis* (2.73) and the highest population of Pod borer was found in Control T₀ (6.13). A significant reduction in mean larval population was observed on 7th and 14th days after 2nd spray. In all treated plots mean larval population was minimum in T₁ Chlorantraniliprole (0.8 and 0.46 respectively) followed by Spinosad 45 SC (1.13 and 0.8). The overall mean of larval population after 2nd insecticidal spray was lowest in T₁, Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC (0.75).

14th days after insecticidal application indicated that all the insecticidal treatments were significantly effective in reducing the larval population of *Helicoverpa armigera* as compared to untreated plots. Chlorantraniliprole (0.46) was found significantly superior these findings are supported by **Kumar and Sarada (2015)**. Followed by Spinosad (0.80) similar findings also reported in chickpea by. followed by NSKE (1.46) in controlling gram pod borer similar results are recorded by **Vikrant et al., (2018)**. The next best was *Beauveria bassiana* (1.66) which is in line with findings of. T₅ *Metarhizium anisiopilae* (2) was next best treatment. T₆ *Bacillus thuringiensis* (2.26) which are supported **Chandravanshi et al. (2019)**.

The highest yield and cost benefit ratio was recorded in Chlorantraniliprole (18.89 q/ha) and (1:2.21) as respectively, followed by spinosad (17.30 q/ha) and (1:2.18) this result supported by **Khare et al. (2021)**, followed by Emamectin Benzoate (15.80 q/ha) and (1:2.14), followed by *Beauveria bassiana* (1:2.01) this result is supported by **Carneiro et al. (2014)**. Followed by NSKE (14.90 q/ha) and (1:1.88) similar findings were supported by **Bhushan et al., (2011)**. The next superior was T₆ *Bacillus thuringiensis* (1:1.62) and *Metarhizium anisiopilae* (11.63 q/ha) and (1:1.50).

Comment [u8]: where does the second spray start?

Table 1: Efficacy of insecticides, NSKE and bio-pesticides on Larval Population of Gram pod borer at different days interval

S.No	Treatments	Larval Population of Gram pod borer at different days interval										Yield (q/ha)	B:C Ratio
		First Spray					Second Spray						
		1 DBS	3 DAS	7 DAS	14DAS	Mean	3 DAS	7 DAS	14DAS	Mean			
T ₀	Control	4.33	06.13	06.53	6.8	6.48	6.93	7.13	7.33	7.13	7.42	1:1.22	
T ₁	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC	4.06	03.26	01.86	1.73	1.95	01.00	0.8	0.46	0.75	18.89	1:2.21	
T ₂	Emamectin Benzoate 5% SG	4.26	3.06	02.26	2.00	2.44	1.6	1.26	1.13	1.33	15.80	1:2.14	
T ₃	Spinosad 45 SC	4.6	2.6	02.06	1.93	2.19	1.26	1.13	0.8	1.06	17.30	1:2.18	
T ₄	NSKE 5%	4.4	3.26	2.73	2.13	2.70	1.8	1.66	1.46	1.64	14.90	1:1.88	
T ₅	<i>Metarhizium anisopilae</i>	4.8	3.66	3.4	3.26	3.44	2.6	2.33	02.00	2.31	11.63	1:1.50	
T ₆	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>	4.46	4	3.66	3.8	3.82	2.73	2.53	2.26	2.50	9.80	1:1.62	
T ₇	<i>Beauveria bassiana 1.5% L.F</i>	4.46	3.53	3	3.2	3.24	2.06	1.86	1.66	1.86	13.50	1:2.01	
	C.D.(5%)	-	0.41	0.80	1.11	0.51	0.41	0.22	0.32	0.28	
	SE.d ±	-	0.19	0.37	0.51	0.24	0.19	0.10	0.15	0.13	

Comment [u9]: Where is the assay column in mg/mL

Comment [u10]: You must give a legend to your table
DBS means ?????

REFERENCES

Comment [u11]: Poor and too old we are in 2022

- Bhushan, S., Singh, R.P. and Shanker, R. (2011)** Bioefficacy of neem and Bt against pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* in chickpea. *Journal of Biopesticides*. **4** (1): 87 – 89.
- Carneiro, E., Silva, L.B., Maggioni, K., Santos, V.B.D., Rodrigues, T.F., Reis, S.S and Pavan, B.T. (2014).** Evaluation of Insecticides Targeting Control of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *American Journal of Plant Sciences*, **5**: 2823-2828.
- Chandravanshi, K.D., Tomar, R.K.S., Awasthi, A.K. and Kerketta, A. (2019)** Field Efficacy of Different Insecticides and Biopesticides against Okra Shoot and Fruit Borer *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry* **8**(1): 2623-2625.
- Chitralakha, Yadav, G.S. and Verma, T. (2018).** Efficacy of insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* on chickpea. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*; **6**(3): 1058-1061.
- Devi H.D. and Tayde, A.R. (2017)** Comparative Efficacy of Bio-Agents and Botanicals on the Management of Diamondback Moth (*Plutella xylostella* Linn.) on Cabbage under Allahabad Agroclimatic Conditions. *Intenational Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences* **6**(7): 711-716.
- Harika, G., Dhurua, S, Suresh, M and Sreesandhya, N. (2019)** Evaluation of Certain Insecticides against Diamondback Moth (DBM) *Plutella xylostella* on Cauliflower. *International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management*, **10**(1):070-076.
- Kaur, L., Sandhu, J.S. and Gupta, S.K. (2007).** Inter and Intra-accession variation for resistance to botrytis gray mold of chickpea in wild Cicer species. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. **77**:786-788.
- Khare, K.V. and Sneha. (2021)** Spinosad for Control of Brinjal Shoot and Fruit Borer Efficacy and Economics. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* **9**(1): 1843- 1845.
- Kumar, L., Bisht, R.S., Singh, H., Kumar, A., Pandey, N. and Kumar, M. (2018).** Bioefficacy and economics of some newer insecticides and bio-pesticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) crop. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, SP1: 1739-1744.

Kumar, S.G.V. and Sarada, O. (2015) Field efficacy and economics of some new insecticide molecules against lepidopteran caterpillars in chickpea. *Current Biotica* **9**(2):153-158.

Mandal, S.K., and Roy, S.P. (2012) Impact of environmental factors on certain pulse crops of north-eastern Bihar (India) with reference to resource management. *The Ecoscan*. 1:35-40.

Nitharwal, R.S., Kumar, A., Jat, S.L. and Chula, M.P. (2017) Efficacy of newer molecules against gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. **6**(4): 1224-1227.

Pachundkar, N., Kamble, P., Patil, P. and Gagare, P. (2013) Management of Gram Pod Borer *Helicoverpa armigera* in Chickpea With Neem Seed Kernel Extract as a Natural Pest Management Practice in Bhojdari Village. *International Journal of Current Research*. **5**(10):234-235.

Ullah, F., Ali, M., Ahmad, S. and Badshah, H. (2015) Impact of light traps on population density of gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) and its larval parasitoid (*Camponotus chlorideae* Uchida) in Rod Kohi area of Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*. **3**(2):203-207.

Vikrant, Singh, D.R., Kumar, S., Kishor, K. and Kewal, R. (2018) Bio-efficacy of Insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* in Chickpea. *Legume Research*. **6**(4): 1224-1227.