

Original Research Article

Evaluation of some biopesticides against pod borer in garden pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) under natural conditions of Prayagraj (U.P.)

ABSTRACT

The experiment was conducted at the research plot of the Department of Agricultural Entomology at the Central Research Farm, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj during the *Rabi* season of 2021-22. The treatments selected for this experiment were evaluated against Pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* L., Neem oil 2% @ 2ml/lit, Spinosad 45% SC @ 0.2ml/lit, NSKE 5% @ 5ml/lit, *Bacillus thuringiensis* 4% WSP @ ml/lit, NSKE+HaNPV+Bt @ 1ml/lit, Emamectin Benzoate 5% SG @ 2ml/lit, *Beauveria bassiana* @ 2ml/lit and Untreated control in RBD with three replications. Results revealed that among the different treatments Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (10.57%) was found to be the most effective treatment in the reduction of *H. armigera* followed by Spinosad 45% SC (15.21%), NSKE+HaNPV+Bt (9.03%), *Beauveria bassiana* 1.5% SG (13.98%), NSKE 5% (16.41%), *Bacillus thuringiensis* 4% WSP (12.00%) and Neem oil 2% (17.32%) was found to be least effective against this pest. Among all the treatments, the cost-benefit ratio has been analyzed, in which the highest was Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (1:4.25) and marketable yield (19.20 q/ha) followed by Spinosad 45% SC (1:3.43 and 16.40 q/ha), and NSKE+HaNPV+Bt (1:3.00 and 14.60 q/ha), *Beauveria bassiana* 1.5% SG (1:2.80 and 13.25 q/ha), NSKE 5% (1:2.69 and 12.45 q/ha), *Bacillus thuringiensis* 4% WSP (1:2.55 and 11.80 q/ha) and the lowest was Neem oil 2% (1:2.48 and 11.20 q/ha) have been recorded.

Keywords: benefit cost ratio, evaluation, garden pea, *Helicoverpa armigera*, pod.

INTRODUCTION

Garden pea (*Pisum sativum* L. var. Hortense) Garden originated in the region comprising Central Asia, Mediterranean countries and Ethiopia. It is native to Syria, Iraq, Iran, Turkey, Israel, Jordan, Ethiopia, Lebanon and has been cultivated in Europe for several thousand years (Mohan *et al.*, 2013).

In terms of productivity, India stands as the second largest producer of green peas next to China and ranks ten among the vegetable crops. The annual global production of green pea and dry pea seeds are approximately 14.5 million tons and 22 million tons, respectively (Kumari and Chandra2021).

In India, it is grown in an area of 0.42 million ha with the production of 4.01 million metric tonnes and productivity is 9.5 t/ha. Garden pea is a cool season crop mainly grown during winter season in plains and during summer season in hills (Mohan *et al.*, 2013)^[30]. The major Pea producing states are Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Orissa, Karnataka and Haryana, etc. (Senapati *et al.*, 2019).

Uttar Pradesh is the leading state in the area (1.8 lakh ha) and production (18.8 lakh tonnes) followed by Madhya Pradesh (22.8 thousand ha; 5.34 lakh tonnes). Jammu and Kashmir is the leading state in productivity (20.8 t/ha) followed by Jharkhand (Mohan *et al.*, 2013). The nutritional value of dry pea seed is similar to other grain legumes and contains 18-30 % protein, 35-50% starch and 4-7 % fiber (Ibrahim *et al.*, 2020).

The crop is known to suffer from a number of insect pests like pod borers (*Etiella zinckenella* Tr. and *Helicoverpa armigera* Hub.), pea stem fly (*Melanagromyza phaseoli* Tyron), pea leaf miner (*Chromatomyia horticola* Goureau), aphid (*Acyrtosiphon pisum*) and thrips (*Caliothrips indicus* Bagnall). These are serious insect pest and often cause substantial loss to the crop. Insect pest in western Uttar Pradesh, in addition to other insect pests, the pod borers *Etiella zinckenella* (Treitschke) and *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) are most serious insect pest of vegetable pea appearing during the flowering and pod stage which seriously

damages the crop and is considered to be a major limiting factor for the production of vegetable pea (Vaibhav *et al.*, 2018)¹.

Helicoverpa armigera completes its life cycle (from egg to adult) in 4-5 weeks at an average temperature of 28⁰ C. Adult insects having stout bodies with broad thorax are named as Moth. A female moth can lay up to 3000 eggs. Eggs are generally laid on leaves, pods and flowers. 1st to 3rd instar larvae generally feed on leaves, twigs and flowers. In later stages larger larvae (4th to 6th instar caterpillars) shift to developing pods by making holes/borers and consume entire developing seeds. Pod borers can cause yield losses up to 90 percent depending upon the insect density and susceptibility of cultivars (Mahmood *et al.*, 2021).

Various abiotic and biotic factors cause losses in the crops. Among the biotic constraints, the losses caused by insect-pests are a major limiting factor in realization of optimum yield of various crops. Every year world widely more than 20% of damage was occurring by insect pests, however individual fields may sustain losses up to 50–100% from one or more pests.

Objectives:

1. To evaluate the effect of some microbial and botanical biopesticides against the damage of pod borer in garden pea
2. To calculate the cost and benefit ratio.

Materials and Methods:

The experiment was conducted during Rabi 2021 at Central Research Farm, the Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Naini, Prayagraj, U.P, to evaluate the efficacy of Some Biopesticides viz., Neem oil 2%(T₁), Spinosad 45% SC (T₂), NSKE 5% (T₃), *Bacillus thuringiensis* (T₄), NSKE+HaNPV+Bt (T₅), Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (T₆), *Beauveria bassiana* (T₇) and untreated Control (T₀) in RBD with three replications at a spacing of 45cm x 30cm. **Anonymous** The experimental field was monitored for incidence of garden pea pod borer at the weekly interval to observe ETL levels of insects. Spraying was done by using a Hand compression sprayer. Pod damage analysis was recorded by randomly picking 5 plants per plot from each treatment a day prior to insecticide application and seven, fourteen days after each treatment. At each picking the average numbers of larvae (pod borer) of each species were counted in five randomly selected plants from each treatment and replication wise. The number of pods per plant and number of damaged pods; number of healthy and infested seeds

were recorded and expressed as per cent pod damage, seed damage, percent reduction in pod damage over control and % increasing The pod yield was recorded on the net plot area basis which was later converted to q/ha.

(Khorasiyaet *al.*, 2018)

$$\text{Percentage Pod damage} = \frac{\text{No. of affected pods}}{\text{Total no. of pods}} \times 100$$

Cost-benefit ratio of treatments:

Gross returns was calculated by multiplying the total yield with the market price of the produce. The cost of cultivation and cost of treatments will be deducted from the gross returns, to find out the returns and cost benefit of ratio by following formula,

$$B.C.R = \frac{\text{GrossReturns}}{\text{TotalCostofProtection}}$$

TotalCostofProtection

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the experiments, Seven treatments and Control of different treatments, consisting application of were tested to compare the efficacy against *Helicoverpa armigera* and their influences on the yield of a garden pea. The results obtained are discussed in the light of available relevant literature in this chapter as before.

Overall mean analysis of 7th and 14th days after 1st insecticidal application indicated that all the insecticidal treatments were significantly effective in highly reduced pod damage percentage of *H. armigera* as compared to untreated plots(**Table 1**)Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (14.16%) was found significantly superior among all the treatments. Spinosad 45% SC (17.06%) is the next best treatment for reducing the population of pod borers. It is followed by *NSKE+HaNPV+Bt* (13.27%), *Beauveria bassiana* 1.5% SG (16.72%) and NSKE 5% (17.79%), *Bacillus thuringiensis* 4% WSP (14.98%) followed by Neem oil 2% (18.18%) which is less effective against podborer.

The data on percent pod damage of *Helicoverpa armigera* on the second spray revealed that all the treatments were significantly superior to control. Among all treatments, Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (9.03%) was found significantly superior among all the treatments which are in line with the similar findings of **Akhtar et al. (2022)** with (10.4% and 11.9%) and **Upadhyay et al. (2020)** with (7.33%) and **Dadas et al. (2019)** with (8.33%). Spinosad 45% SC (10.57%) is the next best treatment for reducing the population of pod borer which is in line with the similar findings of **Dadas et al. (2019)** with (7.33%), **Agale et al. (2019)** with pooled mean percent (6.82%), **Mihretie et al. (2020)** with (11.39%), **Akthar et al. (2022)**with (7.8%). It is followed by *NSKE+HaNPV+Bt* (12.00%) which is in line with the similar finding of **Byrappa et al. (2012)** with (15.96%), *Beauveria bassiana* 1.5% SG (13.98%) which is in line with the similar finding of **Singh et al. (2016)** and **Khorasiya et al. (2018)** with (9.8%), and NSKE 5% (16.41%), *Bacillus thuringiensis* 4% WSP (12.00%) which is in line with the similar finding of **Khorasiya et al. (2018)** and **Meena et al. (2018)** with (13.17% and 10.50%) followed by Neem oil 2% (17.32%) which is in line with the similar finding of **Abhilasha and Shekarappa (2017)** and **Mishra et al. (2014)** with (25.68%) which is less effective against podborer.

Table 1 Comparative effect and economics of some biopesticides against the damage of pod borer in garden pea *rabi* season 2021-2

S.No.	Treatments	Pod damage percentage									Yield(q /ha)	C:B Ratio
		Firstspray				Secondspray						
		1DBS	7DAS	14DAS	Mean	1DBS	7DAS	14DAS	Mean	Overall Mean		
T ₁	Neem oil 2%	24.04	13.31	17.18	18.18	17.18	15.02	19.76	17.32	17.18	11.20	1:2.48
T ₂	Spinosad 45% SC	24.17	7.14	11.54	14.16	11.54	8.27	12.27	10.57	11.54	16.40	1:3.43
T ₃	NSKE 5%	24.19	11.41	15.76	17.06	15.75	13.03	17.04	15.21	15.75	12.45	1:2.69
T ₄	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>	24.21	12.40	16.33	17.79	16.33	14.22	18.25	16.41	16.33	11.80	1:2.55
T ₅	NSKE+HaNPV+Bt	24.07	8.54	12.32	14.98	12.32	9.57	14.09	12.00	12.32	14.60	1:3.00
T ₆	Emamectin benzoate 5% SG	24.33	6.21	9.21	13.27	9.21	7.38	10.45	9.03	9.21	19.20	1:4.25
T ₇	<i>Beauveria bassiana</i> 1.5% SG	24.88	10.63	15.75	16.72	15.76	11.01	16.25	13.98	15.76	13.25	1:2.80
T ₀	Control	24.26	27.95	29.25	27.07	29.25	27.95	28.99	28.64	29.25	8.2	1:1.90
	F-Test	NS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
	S. Ed. (±)	_____	1.65	1.55	2.37	1.55	1.54	1.52	0.49	1.55		
	C.D. (P = 0.05)	_____	3.5	3.3	5.09	3.3	3.31	3.27	1.05	3.3		


The yields among the treatments were found to be significant. The highest yield was recorded in Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (19.20 q/ha) which is in line with the similar findings of **Kumar and Kumar (2022)** with (1966 kg/ha), **Santhosh and Kumar (2022)** with (19.72q/ha) and **Chaukikar et al. (2017)** with (1810kg/ha) followed by Spinosad 45% SC (16.40q/ha) which is in line with the similar findings of **Mihretie et al. (2020)** with (16.68q/ha), **Mishra et al. (2014)** with (17.53q/ha) and **Upadhyay et al. (2020)** with (15.55q/ha), **NSKE+HaNPV+Bt** (14.60q/ha) which is in line with the similar finding of **Byrappa et al. (2012)**^[7] with (10.01q/ha), **Beauveria bassiana 1.5% SG** (13.25 q/ha) which is in line with the similar finding of **Khorasiya et al. (2018)** with (12.33q/ha), **NSKE 5%** (12.45 q/ha) which is in line with the similar finding of **Meena et al. (2018)** with (12.22q/ha) and **Hossain et al. (2010)** with (11.46q/ha), **Bacillus thuringiensis 4% WSP** (11.80 q/ha) with similar findings of **Khorasiya et al. (2018)**^[21] with (11.17q/ha), **Meena et al. (2018)** with (11.23q/ha) and **Singh et al. (2016)** with (11.4q/ha) and **Neem oil 2%** (11.20 q/ha) with similar findings of **Santhosh and Kumar (2022)**^[33] with (13.61q/ha) as compared to control plot(8.2q/ha).

When cost benefit ratio was worked out, interesting result was achieved(**Figure 1.**) and (**Table2.**) Among the treatments studied, the best and most economical treatment was Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (1:4.25) with the similar finding of **Kumar and Kumar (2022)** with (1:4.5) followed by Spinosad 45% SC (1:3.43) with the similar findings of **Kumar and Kumar (2022)**^[25] with (1:1.40) and **Abhilasha and Shekarappa (2017)** with (1:3.91), **NSKE+HaNPV+Bt** (1:3.00) with the similar finding of **Byrappa et al. (2012)** with (1:2.27), **Beauveria bassiana 1.5 % SG** (1:2.80) with the similar finding of **Singh et al. (2016)**, **NSKE 5%** (1:2.69) with the similar findings of **Abhilasha and Shekarappa (2017)** with (1:2.89) and **Hossain et al. (2010)**, **Bacillus thuringiensis 4% WSP** (1:2.55) with similar findings of **Khorasiya et al. (2018)** with (1:2.83) and **Meena et al. (2018)** with (1:2.29) and **Neem oil 2%** (1:2.48) with the similar findings of **Abhilasha and Shekarappa (2017)** with (2.73) and **Santhosh and Kumar (2022)** with (1:2.41) as compared to Control (1:1.90)(**Table2.**)

Table 2. Economics of Cultivation

S.No.	Treatments	Yield of q/ha	Cost of yield / ₹/q	Total cost of yield(₹)	Common cost (₹)	Treatment cost(₹)	Net re- turn(₹)	To cost
1	Neem oil 2%	11.20	5620	62944	24205	1160	37579	2
2	Spinosad 45% SC	16.40	5620	92168	24205	2640	65323	2
3	NSKE 5%	12.45	5620	69969	24205	1800	43964	2
4	<i>Bacillus thu- ringiensis</i> 4% WSP	11.80	5620	66316	24205	1700	40411	2
5	NSKE- <i>HaNPV- Bt</i> 5%-250LE- 1L	14.60	5620	82052	24205	3100	54747	2
6	Emamectin ben- zoate5%SG	19.20	5620	107904	24205	1130	82569	2
7	<i>Beauve- ria bas- siana</i> 1.5% SG	13.25	5620	74465	24205	2100	48160	2
8	Control	8.2	5620	46084	24205	0	22279	2

Fig1. Cost-benefit ratio of different treatments



The present study was conducted on the evaluation of insecticides during *rabi season* 2021-22 on garden pea pod borer, *H. armiger*. Percent pod damage revealed that, Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (10.57%) was found to be the most effective treatment in the reduction of *H. armigera* followed by Spinosad 45% SC (15.21%), *NSKE+HaNPV+Bt* (9.03%), *Beauveria bassiana* 1.5% SG (13.98%), *NSKE* 5% (16.41%), *Bacillus thuringiensis* 4% WSP (12.00%) and Neem oil 2% (17.32%). Among all the treatments, the cost-benefit ratio has been analyzed, in which the highest was Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (1:4.25) and marketable yield (19.20 q/ha) followed by Spinosad 45% SC (1:3.43 and 16.40 q/ha), and *NSKE+HaNPV+Bt* (1:3.00 and 14.60 q/ha), *Beauveria bassiana* 1.5% SG (1:2.80 and 13.25q/ha), *NSKE* 5% (1:2.69 and 12.45 q/ha), *Bacillus thuringiensis*

4% WSP (1:2.55 and 11.80 q/ha) and the lowest was Neem oil 2% (1:2.48 and 11.20 q/ha) have been recorded.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

The authors are highly grateful towards vice Chancellor and the Department of Entomology , SHUATS, Prayagraj for providing the facilities required to conduct this experiment besides technical guidance.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

REFERENCES

- Abhilasha, C.R. and Shekharappa. (2017).** Efficacy of bio and synthetic pesticides against Thrips *Scirtothrips dorsalis* (Hood) and Leaf miner *Liriomyza* spp. on Peas, *Pisum Sativum* (L.). *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*. **5**(3):690-696.
- Agale, S.V., Gupta, R. Rangarao, G. V. and Wani, S. P. (2019).** Efficacy of Some Bio-pesticides against *Helicoverpa Armigera* (Hubner) in Pigeonpea under Natural Condition. *Legume Research*,0250-5371
- Akhtar, M., Mahmood, M. T., Khalid, M. J., Amin, A., Zafar, M. N., Aziz, A., Rasool, I. and Qadeer, Z. (2022).** Efficacy of some new chemistry insecticides against the chickpea pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) [Hubner], *Plant Cell Biotechnology and Molecular Biology*,**23**(9&10):1-6.
- Byrappa, A. M., Kumar, N.G., Divya, M. 2012.** Impact of biopesticides application on pod borer complex in organically grown field bean ecosystem. *Journal of Biopesticides*, **5** (2):148.
- Chaukikar, K., Bhowmik A. K., Das, S. B., Marabi, R. S. and Singh, V. (2017).** Tomer-bio-efficacy of Emamectin benzoate against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) and its Natural Enemies on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) Crop, *International Journal of Bio- resource and Stress Management*,**8**(5):716-720.
- Hossain, M. S., Islam, M. S., Salam, M. A., Hossain, M. A. and Salma, M. U. (2010).** Management of chickpea pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) using neem seed extract and lambda-cyhalothrin in high barind tract, *Journal of bio-sciences*. **1**(18): 44-48.
- Ibrahim H., Dangora, D.B., Abubakar B.Y. and Suleiman. A. B. (2020).** Insect and vertebrate pests associated with cultivated field pea (*Pisum sativum*) in northern guinea savanna of Nigeria. *Science World Journal*,**15**(1):1597-6343.
- Iqbal, J., Farooq S. U., Jamil, M., Khan, H. A. A. and Younis, M. (2014).** Relative efficacy of selective insecticides against gram pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera* H.) of chickpea, *Myopathy*, **12**(2): 119-122.

Jakhar, P., Kumar, Y. and Lal, R. (2017). Efficacy of the different insecticides against gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (hub) on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.), *Annals of biology* **33**(1):94-97.

Jerusha, E. and Thakur, S. (2018). Integrated approaches for the management of gram pod borer *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) in chickpea, *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, **6**(4):1748-1750.

Khorasiya, S. G., Raghvani, K. L. and Bharadiya, A. M. (2017). Field efficacy of biopesticides with different spreader/ sticker against *H. armigera* in chick pea. *Trends in Biosciences*, **10**(48):9566-9570.

Khorasiya, S. G., Raghvani, K. L., Bharadiya, A. M., Jethva, D. M. and Bhut, J. (2018). Efficacy of bio-pesticides, insecticides alone and their combination against pod damage caused by *Helicoverpa armigera* in chickpea. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, **6**(1): 928-933.

Kumar, P., Kumar, S., Rana, R. and Sachin, S. K. (2014). Comparative efficacy of novel insecticides and bio-pesticides on larval population density of gram pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera* hubner) on chickpea, *Journal of Plant Development Sciences*, **6** (2):335-338.

Kumar, A., Tripathi, M. K., Chandra, U. and Veer, R. (2019). Efficacy of botanicals and bio-pesticide against *Helicoverpa armigera* in chickpea, *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, **7**(1):54-57.

Kumari, T. and Chandra, S. D. (2021). Potential health benefits of garden pea seeds and pods: A review *Legume Science Publisher*.<https://doi.org/10.1002/leg3.82>.

Kumar, S. T. and Kumar, A. (2022). Field efficacy of insecticides with neem products against chickpea pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner)]. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, **11**(6):1238-1241.

Mahmood, M. T., Akhtar, M., Ahmad, M., Saleem, M., Aziz, A., Rasool, I., Ali, Z. and Amin, M. (2021). An Update on Biology, Extent of Damage and Effective Management Strategies of Chickpea Pod Borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*), *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research*, **34**(1): 91-101.

- Meena, R. K., Naqvi, A. R., Meena, D. S. and Shivbhagvan. (2018).** Evaluation of bio-pesticides and indoxacarb against gram pod borer on chickpea, *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, **6** (2):2208-2212.
- Mihretie, A., Yimer, D., Wudu, E. and Kassaw, A. (2020).** Efficacy of insecticides against African bollworm (*Helicoverpa armigera* Hubner) on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) in the lowlands of Wollo, North-eastern Ethiopia, *food science & technology, Cogent Food & Agriculture*,(6):1833818.
- Mishra, V. K., Singh, N. N., Singh, S. K. and Kumari, R. (2014).** Efficacy of insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* on Chick pea, *Annals of Plant Protection Sciences*. **22**(2):422-460.
- Mohan, N., Aghora, T. S., Wani, M. A. and Divya, B. (2013).** Garden pea improvement in India. *Journal of Horticultural Sciences*, **8**(2):125-164.
- Patil, S. B. and Goyal, A., Satish, S., Chitgupekar., Kumar, S. and El-Bouhssini, M. (2017).** Sustainable management of chickpea pod borer. A review. *A Journal of Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, **37**: 20.
- Prasad, J. R., Dhoj, Y. G. C., Bahadur, R. T. and Kafle, L. (2008).** Efficacy of *Metarhizium anisopliae* and *Beauveria bassiana* against *Helicoverpa armigera* in Chickpea, under Field Conditions in Nepal. *Journal of Formosan Entomology*, **28**: 249-258.
- Santhosh, K. and Kumar, A. (2022).** Comparative efficacy of selected insecticides and neem products against chickpea pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner)]. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, **11**(6):1558-1562.
- Senapati, A. K., Varshney, A. K., & Sharma, K. V. (2019).** Dehydration of green peas: A review. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*, **7**(2):1088–1091
- Shahiduzzaman, M. D. (2017).** Efficacy of insecticides in controlling pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera* hubner) infesting chickpea. *Journal of the Bangladesh Agricultural Research*, **42**(2):373-378.
- Shivaleela, I. U., Nandihalli, B. S. and Prakash, H. T. (2014).** Performance of different spray sequences in the management of pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) in chick-

pea ecosystem. *International Journal of Plant Protection*, **7**(1): 192- 195.

Singh, A. K. and Kumar, A. (2012). Evaluation of new molecules in IPM modules against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Huebner) in Chick pea. *Annals of Plant Protection Sciences*,**2**(9-2).

Singh, H., Kumar, A., Kumar, N., Singh, H. R. and Yadav, R. N. (2016). Efficacy and economics of some bio – pesticide in management of *Helicoverpa armigera* (hub) on chick-pea, *Annals of Entomology*.32-34.

Tripathi, A. K. (2014). Integrated pest management in pulse crops in Bundelkhand region of Madhya Pradesh. *Journal of Food Legumes*, **27**(3):230-232.

Upadhyay, R. R., Singh, P. S. and Singh, S. K. (2020). Comparative efficacy and economics of certain insecticides against gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) in chick-pea, *Indian Journal of Plant Protection*, **48** (4):403-410.

Vaibhav, V., Singh, G., Deshwal, R., Maurya, N. K. and Vishvendra. (2018). Seasonal incidence of major pod borers *Etiella zinckenella* (Treitschke) and *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) of vegetable pea in relation with abiotic factors. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*. **6**(3):1642-1644.

Vanajakshi, H. S., Keval, R., Verma, S. and Bisht, K. (2021). Assessment of various IPM modules against major insect pests of pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, **10**(2):1100-1103.

Wadaskar, R. M., Bhalkare, S. K. and Patil, A. N. (2013). Field efficacy of newer insecticides against pod borer complex of pigeonpea. *Journal of food legumes*, **26**(1): 62-66.

Yadav, S. K., Patel, S. and Hasan, W. (2020). Insect Pests of Pulse Crops and their Management. *Integrated Pest Management*;217-230.