

## Original Research Article

### Evaluation of certain insecticides against paddy leaf folder infestation

#### ABSTRACT

A field experiment **which** was conducted during *rabi*, 2016-17 and 2017-18 in the wetland farm of S.V. Agricultural College, Tirupati to evaluate the efficacy of certain insecticides against rice leaf folder in paddy variety, BPT-5204 revealed that, all the tested ten insecticides had significantly affected the larvae of *C. medinalis* and reduced the leaf damage over untreated control. The chlorantraniliprole proved as the most effective insecticide with the percentage of leaf damage as 4.95 followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos with the damage percentage of 5.44 and 5.53. The least effective insecticides **were** cartap hydrochloride 4 G (7.39%) followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (7.33%) and acephate (7.19%) against paddy leaf folder damage.

**Key words:** Paddy, BPT-5204 ,Leaf folder, *C.medinalis*, leaf damage, insecticides

#### Introduction

Paddy, *Oryzasativa* (Linneaus) is the most important cereal food crop and one of the important human diets as carbohydrate source providing major source of the food energy for more than half of the human population of the world. "Paddy is Life" describes the importance of paddy in human diet. It is grown worldwide over an area of 153 million hectares with an annual production of more than 600 million tonnes [5]. In India, paddy is cultivated in an area of 43.19 million hectares with 110.15 million tonnes of production and 2550 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of productivity [1]. In Andhra Pradesh, area under cultivation of paddy is approximately 2.10 million hectares with 12.00 million tonnes of production and 5702 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of productivity. In Southern Agro-climatic zone of Andhra Pradesh (Chittoor, S.P.S.Nellore and Y.S.R.Kadapa districts), paddy crop is cultivated in an area of 0.16 million hectares with 1.32 million tonnes of production and 5722 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of productivity during *rabi*, 2021-2022[4].

Paddy cultivation is commonly encountered by different biotic factors including insect pests like Yellow Stem Borer (YSB), pink stem borer, green leaf hoppers, leaf folder, brown planthoppers, gall midge, grasshoppers, gundhi bugs *etc.*, which adversely affect its yield[2]. The yield losses caused by the insect pests in paddy was reported to the tune of 25 per cent [3]. Among the insect pests, YSB, *Scirpophaga incertulas* (Walker) was the major one accounting for 30-80 per cent yield loss followed by leaf folder, *Cnaphalocrocis medinalis* (Guenee) which causes 60 to 70 per cent leaf damage to paddy crop [5]. As a result, sufficient precautions should be taken to manage resistance by using pesticides with diverse modes of action in a reasonable and alternative manner. By considering the above circumstance, the current experimental investigation was

Comment [D1]: Remove **which**

Comment [D2]: Add ,respectively.

Comment [D3]: was

Comment [D4]: add one line space then write keywords

Comment [D5]: write headings in bold

undertaken to demonstrate the bio-efficacy of newer insecticides with diverse mechanisms of action against rice leaf folder

Comment [D6]: better to write new

### Materials and Methods:

A field experiment was conducted during *rabi*, 2016-17 and 2017-18 in the Wetland Farm of S.V. Agricultural College, Tirupati to evaluate the efficacy of certain insecticides against rice leaf folder in a randomized block design with three replications. Thirty days old seedlings of rice variety, Samba mashuri (BPT-5204) was transplanted with a spacing of 15×10 cm in a plot of 20 sq.m and all agronomical practices recommended for the region were followed to raise the crop. There were ten treatments which comprised of carbofuran 3G @10 kg/acre, cartap hydrochloride 4G @ 8 kg/acre, acephate 75 SP @ 1.5 g/L, cartap hydrochloride 50 SP @ 2 g/L, chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.3 mL/L, chlorpyrifos 20 EC @ 2.5 mL/L, dichlorvos 76 EC @ 1 mL/L, flubendiamide 20 WDG @ 0.25 g/L, monocrotophos 36 SL @ 1.6 mL/L, profenofos 50 EC @ 2 mL/L and one untreated control. Each treatment was applied twice during the crop growing season at 40 and 60 days after transplanting.

Comment [D7]: Instead of writing A, write The

Per cent leaf folder damage was recorded one day before and at 5 days after insecticidal treatment by counting the number of damaged leaves/hill, from 10 randomly selected hills in each plot. Observations were similarly recorded at 10 and 15 days after treatment. The leaf folder damage (%) was calculated as follows:

Comment [D8]: Damage percentage caused by leaf folder

$$\text{Leaf folder damage} = \frac{\text{Damaged leaves per 10 hills}}{\text{Total leaves per 10 hills}} \times 100$$

## Results and Discussion:

### Evaluation of Certain Insecticides Against Paddy Leaf Folder Damage During *rabi*, 2016-17

#### First insecticidal application

The initial percentage of paddy leaf damage ranged from 3.41 to 3.58 one day before the insecticidal application. At fiveDAA, it was evident from the Table 4. all the insecticides showed effectiveness against leaf folder damage over untreated control and were on par with each other in their efficacy showing chlorantraniliprole (3.56%) and cartap hydrochloride 4 G (3.88%) as highest and lowest efficacy against paddy leaf folder damage. The insecticides chlorantraniliprole followed by flubendiamide, chlorpyrifos, monocrotophos, acephate, carbofuran, dichlorvos, flubendiamide, cartap hydrochloride 50 SP and cartap hydrochloride 4 G shows the decreasing order of efficacy against paddy leaf folder damage with percentages of 3.67, 3.85, 3.91, 3.92, 4.02, 4.06, 4.13, 4.29, 4.37 and 4.48 at ten DAA. At 15 DAA, with percentage damage of 3.82, chlorantraniliprole showed as superior one in efficacy followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos with the leaf folder damage percentage of 4.17 and 4.27. The least effective insecticide was cartap hydrochloride 4G with the damage percentage of 5.29. The mean per cent leaf damage over untreated control was lowest in chlorantraniliprole (3.68%) followed by flubendiamide (3.88%) and monocrotophos

(3.94%) while highest was recorded incartaphydrochloride 4 G (4.55%) followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (4.48%) and acephate(4.42%) treated plots (Table 1).

**Table 1. Effect of insecticide treatments on the incidence of rice leaf folder, *C. medinalis* after first application during rabi, 2016-17**

Sl.No.	Treatment	Dosage	Pre treatment leaf damage (%)	Leaf damage (%)			
				5 DAA	10 DAA	15 DAA	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	Carbofuran 3 G	10.0 kg/acre	3.45 (10.70)	3.64 (11.00) <sup>abc</sup>	4.06 (11.63) <sup>bcd</sup>	4.78 (12.63) <sup>d</sup>	4.16 (11.77) <sup>de</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 4 G	8.0 kg/acre	3.55 (10.86)	3.88 (11.36) <sup>c</sup>	4.48 (12.22) <sup>f</sup>	5.29 (13.29) <sup>e</sup>	4.55 (12.32) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	Acephate 75 SP	1.5 g/L	3.44 (10.68)	3.82 (11.27) <sup>abc</sup>	4.29 (11.95) <sup>def</sup>	5.16 (13.13) <sup>e</sup>	4.42 (12.14) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	2.0 g/L	3.51 (10.80)	3.84 (11.30) <sup>bc</sup>	4.37 (12.07) <sup>ef</sup>	5.24 (13.23) <sup>e</sup>	4.48 (12.23) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	0.3 mL/L	3.51 (10.79)	3.56 (10.87) <sup>a</sup>	3.67 (11.04) <sup>a</sup>	3.82 (11.27) <sup>a</sup>	3.68 (11.06) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	2.5 mL/L	3.41 (10.65)	3.61 (10.96) <sup>ab</sup>	3.91 (11.40) <sup>abc</sup>	4.34 (12.02) <sup>bc</sup>	3.95 (11.47) <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Dichlorvos 76 EC	1.0 mL/L	3.45 (10.70)	3.64 (11.00) <sup>abc</sup>	4.13 (11.72) <sup>cde</sup>	4.96 (12.86) <sup>d</sup>	4.24 (11.88) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Flubendiamide 20 WDG	0.25 g/L	3.50 (10.77)	3.62 (10.97) <sup>ab</sup>	3.85 (11.32) <sup>ab</sup>	4.17 (11.78) <sup>b</sup>	3.88 (11.36) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Monocrotophos 36 SL	1.6 mL/L	3.58 (10.90)	3.63 (10.98) <sup>ab</sup>	3.92 (11.42) <sup>bc</sup>	4.27 (11.93) <sup>bc</sup>	3.94 (11.45) <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Profenofos 50 EC	2.0 mL/L	3.54 (10.84)	3.66 (11.03) <sup>abc</sup>	4.02 (11.56) <sup>bc</sup>	4.44 (12.17) <sup>c</sup>	4.04 (11.59) <sup>cd</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Untreated control	-	3.58 (10.90)	4.93 (12.82) <sup>d</sup>	6.96 (15.29) <sup>g</sup>	8.94 (17.39) <sup>f</sup>	6.94 (15.27) <sup>g</sup>
	<b>SE(m)</b>		-	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.07</b>
	<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>		-	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.21</b>

Figures in parentheses are angular transformed values; DAA: Days After Application  
The values followed by same letter did not differ significantly as per DMRT

### Second insecticidal application

The pre treatment percentage leaf damage ranged from 4.23 to 10.71 and a significant difference was observed among the treatments including untreated control. With the lowest percentage of paddy leaf folder damage recorded in 4.27, chlorantraniliprole proved as the most effective insecticide at five DAA followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos with the damage percentage of 4.63 and 4.67. The least effective insecticides were cartap hydrochloride 4 G (6.60%), cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (6.50%) and acephate (6.42%) which were on par with each other. The parallel on performance was recorded upto 15 DAA and also in the mean percentage leaf damage (Table 2).

**Table 2. Effect of insecticide treatments on the incidence of rice leaf folder, *C. medinalis* after second application during rabi, 2016-17**

Sl.No.	Treatment	Dosage	Pre treatment leaf damage (%)	Leaf damage (%)			
				5 DAA	10 DAA	15 DAA	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	Carbofuran 3 G	10.0 kg/acre	5.51 (13.58) <sup>d</sup>	5.71 (13.83) <sup>d</sup>	6.16 (14.37) <sup>d</sup>	6.86 (15.19) <sup>c</sup>	6.25 (14.47) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 4 G	8.0 kg/acre	6.27 (14.50) <sup>g</sup>	6.60 (14.89) <sup>f</sup>	7.17 (15.53) <sup>g</sup>	8.00 (16.43) <sup>h</sup>	7.26 (15.63) <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	Acephate 75 SP	1.5 g/L	6.02 (14.21) <sup>ef</sup>	6.42 (14.67) <sup>f</sup>	6.88 (15.21) <sup>f</sup>	7.76 (16.17) <sup>g</sup>	7.02 (15.36) <sup>g</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	2.0 g/L	6.16 (14.37) <sup>fg</sup>	6.50 (14.77) <sup>f</sup>	7.06 (15.41) <sup>fg</sup>	7.94 (16.37) <sup>h</sup>	7.17 (15.53) <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	0.3 mL/L	4.23 (11.87) <sup>a</sup>	4.27 (11.93) <sup>a</sup>	4.41 (12.13) <sup>a</sup>	4.58 (12.36) <sup>a</sup>	4.42 (12.14) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	2.5 mL/L	4.87 (12.75) <sup>c</sup>	5.05 (12.98) <sup>c</sup>	5.36 (13.39) <sup>c</sup>	5.79 (13.93) <sup>c</sup>	5.40 (13.44) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Dichlorvos 76 EC	1.0 mL/L	5.84 (13.98) <sup>e</sup>	6.03 (14.22) <sup>e</sup>	6.51 (14.79) <sup>e</sup>	7.36 (15.74) <sup>f</sup>	6.63 (14.93) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Flubendiamide 20 WDG	0.25 g/L	4.55 (12.32) <sup>b</sup>	4.63 (12.43) <sup>b</sup>	4.86 (12.74) <sup>b</sup>	5.21 (13.20) <sup>b</sup>	4.90 (12.79) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Monocrotophos 36 SL	1.6 mL/L	4.65 (12.45) <sup>b</sup>	4.67 (12.49) <sup>b</sup>	4.95 (12.86) <sup>b</sup>	5.30 (13.31) <sup>b</sup>	4.97 (12.89) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Profenofos 50 EC	2.0 mL/L	5.03 (12.96) <sup>c</sup>	5.15 (13.12) <sup>c</sup>	5.51 (13.58) <sup>c</sup>	5.94 (14.11) <sup>d</sup>	5.54 (13.61) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Untreated control	-	10.71 (19.10) <sup>h</sup>	11.87 (20.15) <sup>g</sup>	13.19 (21.30) <sup>h</sup>	14.57 (22.44) <sup>i</sup>	13.21 (21.31) <sup>i</sup>
	<b>SE(m)</b>		<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.05</b>
	<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>		<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.14</b>

Figures in parentheses are angular transformed values; DAA: Days After Application  
The values followed by same letter did not differ significantly as per DMRT

After the two insecticidal applications, the cumulative mean per cent leaf damage indicated that the chlorantraniliprole was most effective with lowest leaf damage per cent of 4.05 followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos as the next best treatments with the damage per cent of 4.39 and 4.46. The least effective treatment was cartap hydrochloride 4 G with leaf damage per cent of 5.90 followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (5.83 %) and acephate (5.72 %) (Table 3).

**Table 3. Cumulative effect of insecticide treatments on the incidence of rice leaf folder, *C. medinalis* during rabi, 2016-17**

Sl.No.	Treatment	Dosage	Pre treatment leaf damage (%)	Leaf damage (%)			
				5 DAA	10 DAA	15 DAA	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	Carbofuran 3 G	10.0 kg/acre	4.48 (12.22) <sup>d</sup>	4.68 (12.49) <sup>d</sup>	5.11 (13.07) <sup>d</sup>	5.82 (13.96) <sup>f</sup>	5.20 (13.19) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 4 G	8.0 kg/acre	4.91 (12.80) <sup>f</sup>	5.24 (13.24) <sup>f</sup>	5.82 (13.96) <sup>g</sup>	6.64 (14.94) <sup>i</sup>	5.90 (14.06) <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	Acephate 75 SP	1.5 g/L	4.73 (12.56) <sup>ef</sup>	5.12 (13.08) <sup>f</sup>	5.58 (13.67) <sup>f</sup>	6.46 (14.72) <sup>h</sup>	5.72 (13.84) <sup>g</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	2.0 g/L	4.84 (12.70) <sup>ef</sup>	5.17 (13.14) <sup>f</sup>	5.72 (13.83) <sup>fg</sup>	6.59 (14.88) <sup>i</sup>	5.83 (13.97) <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	0.3 mL/L	3.87 (11.34) <sup>a</sup>	3.92 (11.41) <sup>a</sup>	4.04 (11.60) <sup>a</sup>	4.20 (11.83) <sup>a</sup>	4.05 (11.61) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	2.5 mL/L	4.14 (11.74) <sup>bc</sup>	4.33 (12.01) <sup>c</sup>	4.63 (12.43) <sup>c</sup>	5.06 (13.00) <sup>d</sup>	4.68 (12.49) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Dichlorvos 76 EC	1.0 mL/L	4.64 (12.44) <sup>de</sup>	4.84 (12.71) <sup>e</sup>	5.32 (13.34) <sup>e</sup>	6.16 (14.37) <sup>g</sup>	5.44 (13.49) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Flubendiamide 20 WDG	0.25 g/L	4.02 (11.57) <sup>ab</sup>	4.13 (11.72) <sup>b</sup>	4.36 (12.05) <sup>b</sup>	4.69 (12.51) <sup>b</sup>	4.39 (12.10) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Monocrotophos 36 SL	1.6 mL/L	4.11 (11.70) <sup>bc</sup>	4.15 (11.76) <sup>b</sup>	4.44 (12.16) <sup>b</sup>	4.78 (12.63) <sup>c</sup>	4.46 (12.19) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Profenofos 50 EC	2.0 mL/L	4.28 (11.94) <sup>c</sup>	4.40 (12.11) <sup>c</sup>	4.76 (12.61) <sup>c</sup>	5.19 (13.17) <sup>e</sup>	4.79 (12.64) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Untreated control	-	7.14 (15.50) <sup>g</sup>	8.40 (16.84) <sup>g</sup>	10.07 (18.51) <sup>h</sup>	11.75 (20.05) <sup>j</sup>	10.08 (18.51) <sup>i</sup>
	<b>SE(m)</b>		<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.04</b>
	<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>		<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.13</b>

Figures in parentheses are angular transformed values; DAA: Days After Application  
The values followed by same letter did not differ significantly as per DMRT

## Evaluation of Certain Insecticides Against Paddy Leaf Folder Damage During *rabi*, 2017-18

### First insecticidal application

The initial percentage of paddy leaf folder damage ranged from 4.49 to 4.66 one day before the first insecticidal application. It is evident from the Table 4. that the insecticides, chlorantraniliprole, chlorpyrifos, profenofos, monocrotophos, dichlorvos, carbofuran and acephate were in the order and on par with each other in their efficacy against leaf folder. The least effective one was cartap hydrochloride 4 G followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP and flubendiamide and showed no significant difference among the three insecticides in their efficacy at five DAA. At ten DAA, chlorantraniliprole followed by flubendiamide with the damage percentage of 4.90 and 5.08 represents the superior ones and were on par with each other in their efficacy. Without the significant difference, the insecticides cartap hydrochloride 4 G,

cartaphydrochloride 50 SP and acephate with the damage percentage of 5.71, 5.60 and 5.51 showed the least ones in the increasing order of efficacy. At 15 days after insecticidal application, with less paddy leaf folder percentage damage chlorantraniliprole (5.14%) remained as superior one in efficacy followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos as the next best treatments with the leaf folder damage percentage of 5.48 and 5.58. The least effective insecticide was cartap hydrochloride 4G with the leaf folder damage percentage of 6.61 followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (6.55%) and acephate (6.46%) with non significant difference. The mean per cent paddy leaf folder damage over untreated control was observed as lowest in chlorantraniliprole (4.91%) followed by flubendiamide (5.10%) and monocrotophos (5.16%) while highest was recorded in cartap hydrochloride 4 G (5.78%) followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (5.70%) and acephate (5.64 %) treated plots (Table 4).

**Table 4. Effect of insecticide treatments on the incidence of rice leaf folder, *C. medinalis* after first application during rabi, 2017-18**

Sl.No.	Treatment	Dosage	Pre treatment leaf damage (%)	Leaf damage (%)			
				5 DAA	10 DAA	15 DAA	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	Carbofuran 3 G	10.0 kg/acre	4.53 (12.29)	4.77 (12.62) <sup>ab</sup>	5.29 (13.30) <sup>bcd</sup>	6.09 (14.29) <sup>d</sup>	5.39 (13.42) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 4 G	8.0 kg/acre	4.64 (12.44)	5.02 (12.94) <sup>c</sup>	5.71 (13.83) <sup>e</sup>	6.61 (14.90) <sup>f</sup>	5.78 (13.91) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	Acephate 75 SP	1.5 g/L	4.52 (12.27)	4.94 (12.84) <sup>bc</sup>	5.51 (13.57) <sup>de</sup>	6.46 (14.73) <sup>ef</sup>	5.64 (13.73) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	2.0 g/L	4.59 (12.37)	4.97 (12.88) <sup>bc</sup>	5.60 (13.68) <sup>e</sup>	6.55 (14.83) <sup>f</sup>	5.70 (13.82) <sup>ef</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	0.3 mL/L	4.58 (12.36)	4.68 (12.50) <sup>a</sup>	4.90 (12.78) <sup>a</sup>	5.14 (13.10) <sup>a</sup>	4.91 (12.80) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	2.5 mL/L	4.49 (12.23)	4.73 (12.56) <sup>ab</sup>	5.13 (13.09) <sup>b</sup>	5.64 (13.74) <sup>bc</sup>	5.17 (13.14) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Dichlorvos 76 EC	1.0 mL/L	4.53 (12.29)	4.77 (12.62) <sup>ab</sup>	5.36 (13.38) <sup>cd</sup>	6.27 (14.50) <sup>de</sup>	5.47 (13.52) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Flubendiamide 20 WDG	0.25 g/L	4.57 (12.34)	4.74 (12.58) <sup>ab</sup>	5.08 (13.02) <sup>ab</sup>	5.48 (13.54) <sup>b</sup>	5.10 (13.05) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Monocrotophos 36 SL	1.6 mL/L	4.66 (12.46)	4.75 (12.59) <sup>ab</sup>	5.15 (13.11) <sup>bc</sup>	5.58 (13.66) <sup>bc</sup>	5.16 (13.13) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Profenofos 50 EC	2.0 mL/L	4.62 (12.42)	4.79 (12.64) <sup>abc</sup>	5.25 (13.25) <sup>bc</sup>	5.76 (13.89) <sup>c</sup>	5.27 (13.27) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Untreated control	-	4.66 (12.46)	6.04 (14.23) <sup>d</sup>	8.35 (16.79) <sup>f</sup>	10.62 (19.02) <sup>g</sup>	8.34 (16.78) <sup>g</sup>
	<b>SE(m)</b>		-	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.04</b>
	<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>		-	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>0.12</b>

Figures in parentheses are angular transformed values; DAA: Days After Application

The values followed by same letter did not differ significantly as per DMRT

#### Second insecticidal application

A range of 5.67 to 12.71 percentage of paddy leaf folder damage was recorded as a pre treatment count which showed significant difference among all the treatments along

with untreated control. The chlorantraniliprole proved as the most effective insecticide at five DAA with the lowest percentage of paddy leaf folder damage as 5.77 followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos with the damage percentage of 6.12 and 6.16. The least effective insecticides were cartap hydrochloride 4 G (8.10%), cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (7.98%) and acephate (7.84%). The parallel trend was followed upto 15 DAA and also in the mean percentage leaf folder damage in the order of their efficacy (Table 5).

**Table 5. Effect of insecticide treatments on the incidence of rice leaf folder, *C. medinalis* after second application during rabi, 2017-18**

Sl.No.	Treatment	Dosage	Pre treatment leaf damage (%)	Leaf damage (%)			
				5 DAA	10 DAA	15 DAA	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	Carbofuran 3 G	10.0 kg/acre	6.95 (15.29) <sup>d</sup>	7.20 (15.57) <sup>d</sup>	7.74 (16.15) <sup>d</sup>	8.54 (16.99) <sup>e</sup>	7.83 (16.25) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 4 G	8.0 kg/acre	7.71 (16.12) <sup>f</sup>	8.10 (16.53) <sup>g</sup>	8.80 (17.26) <sup>g</sup>	9.68 (18.13) <sup>h</sup>	8.86 (17.32) <sup>i</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	Acephate 75 SP	1.5 g/L	7.40 (15.78) <sup>e</sup>	7.84 (16.26) <sup>f</sup>	8.40 (16.85) <sup>f</sup>	9.38 (17.83) <sup>g</sup>	8.54 (16.99) <sup>g</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	2.0 g/L	7.60 (16.00) <sup>f</sup>	7.98 (16.41) <sup>fg</sup>	8.64 (17.09) <sup>g</sup>	9.61 (18.06) <sup>h</sup>	8.74 (17.20) <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	0.3 mL/L	5.67 (13.78) <sup>a</sup>	5.77 (13.89) <sup>a</sup>	6.00 (14.18) <sup>a</sup>	6.27 (14.50) <sup>a</sup>	6.01 (14.19) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	2.5 mL/L	6.31 (14.55) <sup>c</sup>	6.53 (14.81) <sup>c</sup>	6.94 (15.27) <sup>c</sup>	7.47 (15.86) <sup>c</sup>	6.98 (15.32) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Dichlorvos 76 EC	1.0 mL/L	7.22 (15.59) <sup>e</sup>	7.47 (15.86) <sup>e</sup>	8.04 (16.47) <sup>e</sup>	8.98 (17.44) <sup>f</sup>	8.16 (16.60) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Flubendiamide 20 WDG	0.25 g/L	5.99 (14.17) <sup>b</sup>	6.12 (14.33) <sup>b</sup>	6.45 (14.71) <sup>b</sup>	6.89 (15.22) <sup>b</sup>	6.49 (14.75) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Monocrotophos 36 SL	1.6 mL/L	6.08 (14.28) <sup>b</sup>	6.16 (14.37) <sup>b</sup>	6.58 (14.86) <sup>b</sup>	6.97 (15.31) <sup>b</sup>	6.57 (14.85) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Profenofos 50 EC	2.0 mL/L	6.48 (14.75) <sup>c</sup>	6.65 (14.94) <sup>c</sup>	7.10 (15.46) <sup>c</sup>	7.63 (16.04) <sup>d</sup>	7.13 (15.48) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Untreated control	-	12.71 (20.89) <sup>g</sup>	13.89 (21.88) <sup>h</sup>	15.68 (23.33) <sup>h</sup>	17.43 (24.67) <sup>i</sup>	15.67 (23.32) <sup>j</sup>
	<b>SE(m)</b>		<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.03</b>
	<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>		<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.09</b>

Figures in parentheses are angular transformed values; DAA: Days After Application  
The values followed by same letter did not differ significantly as per DMRT

After the two insecticidal applications, the cumulative mean per cent leaf folder damage indicated that the chlorantraniliprole showed most effective with lowest leaf folder damage per cent of 5.46 followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos as the next best treatments with the paddy leaf folder damage per cent of 5.79 and 5.86. The least effective treatment was cartap hydrochloride 4 G with paddy leaf folder damage per cent of 7.32 followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (7.22%) and acephate (7.09%) (Table 6).

**Table 6. Cumulative effect of insecticide treatments on the incidence of rice leaf folder, *C. medinalis* during rabi, 2017-18**

Sl.No.	Treatment	Dosage	Pre treatment leaf damage (%)	Leaf damage (%)			
				5 DAA	10 DAA	15 DAA	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	Carbofuran 3 G	10.0 kg/acre	5.74 (13.86) <sup>d</sup>	5.99 (14.16) <sup>d</sup>	6.52 (14.79) <sup>d</sup>	7.32 (15.69) <sup>e</sup>	6.61 (14.89) <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 4 G	8.0 kg/acre	6.18 (14.39) <sup>g</sup>	6.56 (14.84) <sup>g</sup>	7.26 (15.63) <sup>g</sup>	8.14 (16.58) <sup>h</sup>	7.32 (15.70) <sup>i</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	Acephate 75 SP	1.5 g/L	5.96 (14.13) <sup>ef</sup>	6.39 (14.64) <sup>f</sup>	6.95 (15.29) <sup>f</sup>	7.92 (16.34) <sup>g</sup>	7.09 (15.44) <sup>g</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	2.0 g/L	6.09 (14.29) <sup>fg</sup>	6.47 (14.74) <sup>fg</sup>	7.12 (15.47) <sup>g</sup>	8.08 (16.51) <sup>h</sup>	7.22 (15.59) <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	0.3 mL/L	5.13 (13.09) <sup>a</sup>	5.22 (13.21) <sup>a</sup>	5.45 (13.50) <sup>a</sup>	5.70 (13.81) <sup>a</sup>	5.46 (13.51) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	2.5 mL/L	5.40 (13.43) <sup>bc</sup>	5.63 (13.73) <sup>c</sup>	6.03 (14.22) <sup>c</sup>	6.56 (14.83) <sup>c</sup>	6.07 (14.27) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Dichlorvos 76 EC	1.0 mL/L	5.88 (14.03) <sup>de</sup>	6.12 (14.32) <sup>e</sup>	6.70 (15.00) <sup>e</sup>	7.63 (16.03) <sup>f</sup>	6.81 (15.13) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Flubendiamide 20 WDG	0.25 g/L	5.28 (13.29) <sup>ab</sup>	5.43 (13.48) <sup>b</sup>	5.76 (13.89) <sup>b</sup>	6.18 (14.40) <sup>b</sup>	5.79 (13.93) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Monocrotophos 36 SL	1.6 mL/L	5.37 (13.40) <sup>b</sup>	5.46 (13.51) <sup>b</sup>	5.86 (14.01) <sup>b</sup>	6.28 (14.51) <sup>b</sup>	5.86 (14.01) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Profenofos 50 EC	2.0 mL/L	5.55 (13.63) <sup>c</sup>	5.72 (13.83) <sup>c</sup>	6.18 (14.39) <sup>c</sup>	6.70 (15.00) <sup>d</sup>	6.20 (14.41) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Untreated control	-	8.68 (17.14) <sup>h</sup>	9.97 (18.40) <sup>h</sup>	12.02 (20.28) <sup>h</sup>	14.03 (21.99) <sup>i</sup>	12.00 (20.27) <sup>j</sup>
	<b>SE(m)</b>		<b>0.07</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.03</b>
	<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>		<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.08</b>

Figures in parentheses are angular transformed values; DAA: Days After Application  
The values followed by same letter did not differ significantly as per DMRT

#### **Efficacy of Insecticides Against Paddy Leaf Folder Damage During rabi, 2016-17 and 2017-18 (Pooled data)**

The results presented in the Table 7 indicated that all the tested insecticides had significantly low infestation of paddy leaf folder. The initial percentage of paddy leaf folder damage ranged from 4.50 to 7.91 one day before the insecticidal application. At 15 DAA, the

chlorantraniliprole proved as the most effective insecticide with the percentage of paddy leaf folder damage as 4.95 followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos with the damage percentage of 5.44 and 5.53. The least effective insecticides were cartap hydrochloride 4 G (7.39%) followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (7.33%) and acephate (7.19%) against paddy leaf folder damage percentage (Table 7).

**Table 7. Effect of insecticide treatments on the incidence of rice leaf folder, *C. medinalis* after during rabi, 2016-17 and rabi, 2017-18 (Pooled data)**

Sl.No.	Treatment	Dosage	Pre treatment leaf damage (%)	Leaf damage (%)			
				5 DAA	10 DAA	15 DAA	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	Carbofuran 3 G	10.0 kg/acre	5.11 (13.06) <sup>d</sup>	5.33 (13.35) <sup>d</sup>	5.81 (13.95) <sup>e</sup>	6.57 (14.85) <sup>f</sup>	5.91 (14.06) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 4 G	8.0 kg/acre	5.54 (13.62) <sup>e</sup>	5.90 (14.06) <sup>e</sup>	6.54 (14.82) <sup>h</sup>	7.39 (15.78) <sup>i</sup>	6.61 (14.90) <sup>i</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	Acephate 75 SP	1.5 g/L	5.34 (13.37) <sup>ef</sup>	5.75 (13.88) <sup>f</sup>	6.27 (14.50) <sup>g</sup>	7.19 (15.55) <sup>h</sup>	6.40 (14.66) <sup>g</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	2.0 g/L	5.47 (13.52) <sup>fg</sup>	5.82 (13.96) <sup>fg</sup>	6.42 (14.67) <sup>h</sup>	7.33 (15.71) <sup>i</sup>	6.52 (14.80) <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	0.3 mL/L	4.50 (12.24) <sup>a</sup>	4.57 (12.34) <sup>a</sup>	4.75 (12.58) <sup>a</sup>	4.95 (12.86) <sup>a</sup>	4.76 (12.60) <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	2.5 mL/L	4.77 (12.62) <sup>bc</sup>	4.98 (12.90) <sup>c</sup>	5.33 (13.35) <sup>c</sup>	5.81 (13.95) <sup>d</sup>	5.38 (13.41) <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	Dichlorvos 76 EC	1.0 mL/L	5.26 (13.26) <sup>de</sup>	5.48 (13.54) <sup>e</sup>	6.01 (14.19) <sup>f</sup>	6.89 (15.22) <sup>g</sup>	6.13 (14.33) <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	Flubendiamide 20 WDG	0.25 g/L	4.65 (12.46) <sup>ab</sup>	4.78 (12.63) <sup>b</sup>	5.06 (13.00) <sup>b</sup>	5.44 (13.48) <sup>b</sup>	5.09 (13.04) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	Monocrotophos 36 SL	1.6 mL/L	4.74 (12.58) <sup>bc</sup>	4.80 (12.66) <sup>b</sup>	5.15 (13.12) <sup>b</sup>	5.53 (13.60) <sup>c</sup>	5.16 (13.13) <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	Profenofos 50 EC	2.0 mL/L	4.92 (12.81) <sup>c</sup>	5.06 (13.00) <sup>c</sup>	5.47 (13.53) <sup>d</sup>	5.94 (14.11) <sup>e</sup>	5.49 (13.55) <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>11</sub>	Untreated control	-	7.91 (16.34) <sup>h</sup>	9.18 (17.64) <sup>h</sup>	11.05 (19.41) <sup>i</sup>	12.89 (21.04) <sup>j</sup>	11.04 (19.41) <sup>j</sup>
	<b>SE(m)</b>		<b>0.08</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.03</b>
	<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>		<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.09</b>

Figures in parentheses are angular transformed values; DAA: Days After Application  
The values followed by same letter did not differ significantly as per DMRT

The results which were presented in the Tables 1 to 7 revealed that, all the treatments had significant control of paddy leaf folder damage over untreated control. Chlorantraniliprole @ 0.3 mL L<sup>-1</sup> was found most effective insecticide against paddy leaf folder infestation followed by flubendiamide, monocrotophos and chlorpyrifos while cartap hydrochloride 4 G @ 8 kg acre<sup>-1</sup> was found to be least effective. The results of the present investigation were in conformity with the findings of Sabitha *et al.*[6] who reported that the treatment Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (0.3 g/l) (per cent leaf folder damage: 3.29) worked best against leaf folder and this insecticide was on par to both of its mixtures with fungicides-azoxystrobin (per cent leaf folder damage: 3.02, per cent reduction over control: 92.91)

and difenoconazole (per cent leaf folder damage: 3.85, per cent reduction over control: 90.63). According to the reports of Srinivas *et al.* [7] it was discovered that chlorpyrifos and thiamethoxam were the most effective insecticides, causing 4.11% and 4.10% leaf damage, respectively. Surekha *et al.* [8] reported that among the different chemicals tested, 5 treatments *viz.*, tetraniliprole (8.71%), chlorantraniliprole (8.89%), cartap hydrochloride (9.23%), tetraniliprole + (tebuconazole + trifloxystrobin) (9.27%) and tetraniliprole + (azoxystrobin + Difenoconazole) (9.96%) recorded lowest incidence compared to control (20.90%) and were proved to be effective against leaf folder.

#### **Conclusion:**

The efficacy of certain insecticides against *C. medinalis* during *rabi*, 2016-17 and 2017-18 revealed that, all the tested insecticides had significantly affected the larvae of *C. medinalis* and reduced the leaf damage over untreated control. The chlorantraniliprole proved as the most effective insecticide with the percentage of leaf damage as 4.95 followed by flubendiamide and monocrotophos with the damage percentage of 5.44 and 5.53. The least effective insecticides were cartap hydrochloride 4 G (7.39%) followed by cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (7.33%) and acephate (7.19%) against paddy leaf folder damage.

#### **References:**

1. Annual Report, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmers Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Government of India, 2017-2018.
2. Bekele B G. Review on integrated pest management of important disease and insect pest of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). World Scientific News. 2018;100: 184-196.
3. Chaudari B N, Shamkuwar G R, Raut R F, Shende P V, Undirwade D B, Katti G R. Screening of new insecticides against major insect pests of rice. International Journal of Researches in Biosciences, Agriculture and Technology. 2017; 5(2): 506-509.
4. Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Andhra Pradesh, 2016 - 2017.
5. Jeer M, Choudary V K, Dixit A. Field efficacy of new pre-mix formulation of flonicamid 15% + fipronil 15% WG against major insect pests of rice. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2017; 5(3): 679-685.
6. Sabitha Ch, Dhurua S, Sreesandhya N, Suresh M. Bio-efficacy of insecticide and fungicide mixtures against leaf folder, stem borer, BPH and sheath blight of rice. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2022; 10(2): 139-143.
7. Srinivas K, Raghuraman M, Kumar A ST, Kumar E U. Management of paddy leaf folder, *Cnaphalocrocis medinalis* (Guenee) with novel molecules of pesticides. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022; 11(4): 1534-1537.
8. Surekha D, Venkataiah M, Varma N R G, Babu T K. Bio-efficacy of certain newer insecticides and fungicides alone and in combination against leaf folder and grain discoloration in rice. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022; 11(8): 16-20.