

# Efficacy of biopesticides and newer insecticides against major insect pests of cauliflower

## ABSTRACT

A field trail comprising of nine insecticides conducted at farmers field in endemic area of pest in Siwan district of Bihar revealed that Indoxacarb 45 SC @1.0 ml/L of water was found to be most effective over all other treatments in terms of significantly lowest flower head damage and resulted in higher yield (144.26 q/ha). However, Cost-benefit analysis revealed the highest cost-benefit ratio of 1:11.15 in treatment of Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP @ 1.0gm/L of water.

**Key Words:** Cauliflower, Insecticides, *Brevicornis brassicae*, *Crocidolomia binotalis*, *Plutella xylostella*, *Spodoptera litura*.

## INTRODUCTION

Cauliflower, *Brassica oleracea* L.var botrytis is the most popular winter vegetable grown in India. It consumed as vegetable in curries, soups, pickles and low fat content with rich source of dietary fibers, vitamins and minerals. The chief constraint in the production of cauliflower is the damage caused by the pest complex right from germination to till harvesting stage with enormous yield loss. The economics losses in the crop production every year caused by insect pest is a threat to global agriculture. Sometimes the yield loss by insect pests reaches as high as 60-70 per cent (Dhaliwal *et al.*,2007). In India, 37 insect pest species have been reported to feed on the crop (Lal, 1975). Among all, the crop is ravaged by aphid, *Brevicorne brassicae* Linn., leaf webber, *Crocidolomia binotalis* Zell., tobacco caterpillar, *Spodoptera litura* Fab, and diamond back moth, *plutella xylostella* Linn. and chemical insecticides are widely used by the growers to control these pests. Several insecticides have been recommended through ages to avert pest damage. But, almost all of them are obsolete due to development of insect resistance to insecticides and there is possibility of presence residue in the edible parts of cauliflower. The other issues like resurgence

and secondary pest's outbreak. Keeping the facts in view, the present investigation is undertaken with bio-rational and newer insecticides in order to formulate on effective and economic packages of control measures for the management of these pests on cauliflower crop and it's also compared with the local check insecticide (Farmer's practice).

## **Materials and Methods**

The field experiment was carried out at village of Chiroli in Siwan district of Bihar. The cauliflower crop (cv. Pusa Kataki) was transplanted in first week of November. The following treatments were evaluated : T<sub>1</sub> –Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 1.0 ml/L, T<sub>2</sub> – Emamectin benzoate 5 WSG @ 0.25 ml/L, T<sub>3</sub>– Thiodicarb 75 WP @ 1.0gm/L, T<sub>4</sub> – Novaluran 10 EC @ 1.00 ml/L, T<sub>5</sub>– Azadirachtin 0.15% @ 4.00 ml/L, T<sub>6</sub>– Avermectin 1.9 EC @ 0.50 ml/L, T<sub>7</sub>– Spinosad 45 SC @ 0.33 ml/L, T<sub>8</sub> Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP @ 1.00 gm/L, T<sub>9</sub>– Chlorpyrifos 20 EC @ 1.00 ml/L at weekly interval. (Farmer's Practice), T<sub>10</sub>– Untreated check.

Two sprays were given at 15 days interval (Except farmer's practice) in the evening hrs by knapsack sprayer. Observations were recorded on the population of major pests on 10 randomly selected plants with treatment wise at one day before spraying (DBS) and at 5 and 10 days after each spraying (DAS). The Yield of marketable flower heads was recorded treatment-wise and converted per hectare basis before subjected to statistical analysis.

## **Results and Discussion**

During the crop season, all the treatments were statistically significant over untreated control in reducing the pests incidence during early stages of the crop. Among the different sets of treatments, T<sub>1</sub>, comprising spray of Indoxacarb 45 SC @ 1 ml/L. proved to be the most effective with significantly lower per cent of leaf webber damage 8.15 and 6.94 after first spray and second spray, respectively. The other effective treatments in respect to leaf webber damage were T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>8</sub> the latter being at par with T<sub>7</sub>, having leaf webber damage varying from 8.38 to 8.87 and 7.31 to 7.52 percent after first and second spray, respectively (Table-1) The higher percentage of leaf webber damage (9.89-9.49) was recorded with T<sub>9</sub> (Farmer's practice) In comparison, the mean per

cent of leaf webber damage of 11.85 and 13.76 were recorded in untreated control. Overall the lowest mean per cent of leaf webber damage (7.55) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> which was significantly at par with T<sub>3</sub> (7.85) and T<sub>8</sub> (8.20). However, T<sub>5</sub> recorded mean highest percent of leaf webber damage (9.42) which is at par with farmers practice as T<sub>9</sub> (9.65) and were least effective against leaf webber. The percentage reduction of leaf webber damage over untreated control was varying from 24.67 to 41.06 (Table-1) Similar findings were also reported by Sharma and Misra, 2004 and Mandal *et al.*, (2020) on cabbage.

Statistically significant highest reduction in percentage head damage due to *S. lutra* was also recorded with T<sub>1</sub> (48.91) over untreated control (Table-2). The results being comparable with T<sub>3</sub> (47.02) and T<sub>8</sub> (45.05). Although, the other treatments, the per cent reduction in head damage to *S. lutra* was varied from 27.86 to 40.49 which is inconformity with the findings of Sharma and Misra (2003), and Monobrullah *et al.*, (2001). Rao *et al.*, (2006) reported Indoxacarb @ 0.0145% and Thiodicarb @ 0.075% to be most effective in reducing larval population of *S. lutra* on fenugreek, while Prasad *et al.*, (2007) and Stanley *et al.*, (2006) reported Emamectin benzoate to be the best treatment with the highest relative toxicity. Similar results were also recorded by Parthiban *et al.*, (2014) and Yadav *et al.*, (2015) on reducing the larval population of *S. lutra*.

The results (Table-3) observed that T<sub>3</sub> comprising spray of Indoxacarb 48 SC @ 1.0 ml/L of water was recorded 3.54 and 1.69 larvae/plant after first and second spray, respectively, proved to be most effective and which was followed by T<sub>3</sub> with mean number of 3.98 and 1.94 larvae/plant and it was at par with T<sub>8</sub> (4.18 and 2.38 larvae/plant) during first and second spray, respectively. The highest mean population of 5.72 and 4.23 larvae/plant was recorded in T<sub>9</sub> with the spraying of chlorpyiphos 20 EC @ 1.5 ml/L of water as farmer's practice, and which was significantly at par with T<sub>5</sub>, comprising spray of Azadirachtin 0.15 % @ 4 ml/L of water with larval count of 4.84 and 3.18 larvae/plant, respectively. In comparison, the mean population of 6.87 and 7.84 larvae/plant were recorded in untreated control (T<sub>10</sub>). Overall lowest mean population of 2.62 larvae/plant was also recorded in T<sub>1</sub> which was followed by T<sub>3</sub> (2.96 larvae/plant) and T<sub>8</sub> (3.28 larvae/plant).

However, T<sub>9</sub> (farmer's practice) recorded 4.97 larvae/plant and at par with T<sub>5</sub> (4.01 larvae/plant) and which were least effective in reducing the larval population (Table-3). Marked reduction of larvae/plant over untreated control varied from 32.47 to 64.40 was observed with different sets of the treatments. Similar, result of effectiveness of bio-pesticides and newer insecticides in reducing the insect pests of Cole crops by Singh *et al.*, (2018). The present results on the effectiveness of Spinosad and certain newer insecticides in management of *P. xylostella* are in conformity with those of Wale and Mohite (2019), Dhawan *et al.*, (2007), Kumar *et al.*, (2007), Stanikzi *et al.*, (2016) and Mandal *et al.*, (2020).

Similarly, the treatment T<sub>1</sub> recorded the lowest aphid population of 63.75 and 36.95/leaf after first and second spray, respectively and which was followed by T<sub>3</sub> (74.52 and 48.74 aphids/leaf) and T<sub>8</sub> (83.34 and 55.54 aphids/leaf). Among the treatments, T<sub>9</sub> (Farmer's practice) was recorded higher aphid population of 123.67 and 94.86 aphids/leaf after first and second spray, respectively over untreated control (Table- 4). The reduction of aphid population over untreated control was varied from 34.81 to 69.96 per cent. The present finding is in conformity with these of shalini *et al.*, (2020) and Mandal *et al.*, (2020).

The yield data (Table-5) was found statistically higher marketable cauliflower yield of 144.26 q/ha in T<sub>1</sub> followed by T<sub>3</sub> (140.63 q/ha) and T<sub>8</sub> (134.70 q/ha). The next best treatment was T<sub>7</sub> (128.15 q/ha) and which at par with other treatments, but significantly more than T<sub>9</sub> as farmer's practice (110.26 q/ha) and untreated control (95.84 q/ha). The cost-benefit analysis of different sets of treatments revealed that the maximum monetary benefit of Rs. 50840/ha found from T<sub>1</sub>. The most effective treatment in reducing the pest's incidence as well as yield realised as per hectare basis. Yet the highest cost: benefit ratio (1:11.15) obtained in T<sub>8</sub>. This was followed by T<sub>3</sub> (1:9.37), T<sub>1</sub> (1:7.96) and T<sub>2</sub> (1:7.22) and rather less efficiently by T<sub>4</sub> (1:6.48), T<sub>7</sub> (1:6.34), T<sub>6</sub> (1:5.57) and T<sub>5</sub> (1:4.10). In comparison the cost: benefit ratio of 1:3.10 were to west recorded in farmer's practice (T<sub>9</sub>) due to high cost of insecticidal treatment and received lower yield. Similar results were obtained by Muna *et al.*, (2011) and Mandal *et al.*, (2020).

The spray of Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 1.0 ml/L of water was found to be superior over all other package of the treatments in terms of statistically lower flower head damaged by these pests there by obtaining higher yield of 144.26 q/ha. However, the cost benefit analysis resulted the highest ratio of 1:11.15 with spray of cartap hydrochloride 50 SP @ 1.0 gm/L of water.

### **Conclusion:**

Present investigation, it could be concluded that Indoxacarb 45 C @ 1.0 ml/L was found most effective insecticides for all insect in cauliflower and resulted as well as provide higher yield and profit as compared to farmer's practices.

### **References**

- Dhaliwal, G.S., Dhawan, A. K. and Singh, R. (2007). Biodiversity and ecological agriculture: Issues and perspective. *Indian. J. Ecol.* 34 (2): 100-109.
- Dhawan, A. K., Kaur, A. and Kumar, R. (2007). Relative toxicity of new insecticides against *Spodoptera litura*. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.* 15 (1): 238-239.
- Kumar Prashant, C. Prasad, S. and Patel Lok Nath (2007). Efficacy and economics of insecticides and bio-pesticides against *Plutella xylostella* on Cabbage. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.* 15 (2): 342-344.
- Lal, O. P. (1975). A compendium of insect pests of vegetables in India. *Bulletin of Entomology.* 16:31-56
- Mandal, S.K., Barun and Mandal, R.K. (2020). Field evaluation of insecticide molecules against pest complex of cabbage. *Ann. pl. protec. Sci.* 98 (1):15-90.
- Meena, Ram, K. Lal, O. P. and Verma, J.R. (2011). Economics of treatment for management of *Plutella xylostella* on Cabbage. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.* 19 (2): 308-310.
- Monobrullah, Md., Poonam Bhatti, Umashankar, Gupta, R.K. Srivastava Kuldeep and Ahmad Hafeez (2007). Trap Catches and seasonal incidence of *Spodoptera litura* on cauliflower and tomato. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.* 15 (1): 73-76.

- Parthiban, P., Murali, R.K. Baskaran and Thangavel, K. (2014). Acute toxicity of emamectin benzoate 5 WC against *Spodoptera litura* of cabbage. *Ann.pl. protec. Sci.* 22:260-263.
- Prasad, R.D., Madhumati, T. Rao, P. A. and Rao, V.S. (2007). Toxicity of insecticides to resistant strain of *Spodoptera litura* (Fab) on cotton. *Ann. pl. Protect. Sci.* 15 :77-82.
- Rao A.B., Rajasekhar, P. Rao, G. R. and Rao, V.S. (2006.). Seasonal incidence and management of *Spodoptera litura* on fenugreek. *Ann. pl. protec. 34* :14: 86-89.
- Shalini, Maurya Veena and Sharma Kamal (2016). Seasonal incidence of *Brevicoryne oleracea* and *Plutella xylostella* in Rohtak District. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.* 24 (2): 319-323.
- Sharma, A.S.R. and Misra, H.P. (2003). Evaluation of some insecticides against *Spodoptera litura* infesting cabbage. In: Proceeding of the National Symposium of Frontier Areas of Entomological Research, Nov. 5-7, I.A.R.I., New Delhi, pp. 152-153.
- Sharma, A.S.R. and Misra, H.P. (2004). Studies on bio- efficacy of insecticides against the crucifer leaf webber, *Crociodolomia binotalis* Zell. infesting cabbage. *J. Pl. Protec. Environ.1* (1&2): 82-84.
- Singh, Bharat, Goswami, B.K. Singh, Neetu and Singh, Satyendra (2018). Population distribution of Insect pests of cole crops and its management by neem based bio-pesticides in Gurugram, Haryana. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.* 26 (2): 260-264.
- Stanikzi, Rahimgul, Thakur Sasya and Simon, Sobita (2016). Comparative efficacy of insecticides and botanical extract against *Plutella xylostella* in Cabbage. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.* 24 (2): 283-285.
- Stanley, J. S., Chandra Sekaran, Regupathy, A. and Sheeba Jasmine, R. (2006). Base line toxicity of emameictin benzoate and spinosad on *Spodoptera litura*. *Ann. pl. protec Sci.* 14: 346-349.
- Wale, S.D. and Mohite, P.B. (2019). Evaluation of Broflanillide 300 g/L SC against *Plutella xylostella* and *Spodoptera litura* on Cabbage, *Brassica oleracea* L var Capitata. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.* 27 (3): 316-319.

**Table - 1 : Efficacy of insecticides against leaf webber on cauliflower**

Treatment	Dose g/ml/L	Leaf webber damaged plant (%)								Over all mean	% reduction over control
		Frist Spray				Second Spray					
		1 DBS	5 DAS	10 DAS	Mean	1 DBS	5 DAS	10 DAS	Mean		
T <sub>1</sub> – Indoxacarb 14.5 SC	1.0 ml	9.42 (17.83)	8.26 (16.74)	8.04 (16.43)	8.15 (16.64)	7.62 (16.00)	7.31 (15.68)	6.56 (14.89)	6.94 (15.23)	7.55 (16.00)	41.06
T <sub>2</sub> – Emamectin benzoate 5WSG	0.25 ml	9.62 (18.05)	9.35 (17.85)	9.12 (17.56)	9.24 (17.66)	8.73 (17.16)	8.24 (16.64)	8.02 (16.43)	8.13 (16.54)	8.69 (17.16)	32.17
T <sub>3</sub> – Thiodicarb 75 WP	1.0 gm	9.83 (18.24)	8.51 (17.05)	8.24 (16.64)	8.38 (16.85)	8.04 (16.43)	7.52 (15.89)	7.10 (15.45)	7.31 (15.68)	7.85 (16.32)	38.72
T <sub>4</sub> - Novaluron 10 EC	1.0 ml	9.74 (18.15)	9.83 (18.24)	9.61 (18.05)	9.72 (18.15)	8.26 (17.36)	8.39 (16.85)	8.28 (16.74)	8.34 (16.74)	9.03 (17.46)	29.51
T <sub>5</sub> -Azadirachtin 0.15%	4 ml	10.25 (18.72)	10.02 (18.44)	9.59 (17.95)	9.81 (18.24)	8.72 (17.16)	9.41 (17.85)	8.65 (17.16)	9.03 (17.46)	9.42 (17.85)	26.46
T <sub>6</sub> – Avermectin 1.9 EC	0.5 ml	9.46 (18.05)	9.81 (18.24)	9.54 (17.85)	9.68 (18.05)	8.91 (17.36)	8.33 (16.74)	8.10 (16.54)	8.22 (16.64)	8.95 (17.36)	30.13
T <sub>7</sub> – Spinosad 45 SC	0.33 ml	9.51 (17.94)	9.12 (17.56)	9.00 (17.46)	9.06 (17.56)	8.37 (16.85)	8.00 (16.43)	7.86 (16.32)	7.93 (16.32)	8.50 (16.95)	33.65
T <sub>8</sub> – Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	1.0 gm	9.36 (17.85)	9.31 (17.76)	8.43 (16.85)	8.87 (17.36)	8.63 (17.05)	7.84 (16.22)	7.20 (15.56)	7.52 (15.89)	8.20 (16.64)	35.98
T <sub>9</sub> – Chlorpyriphos 20 EC (Former's Practice)	1.50 ml	10.72 (19.09)	10.42 (18.81)	9.36 (17.76)	9.89 (18.34)	9.86 (18.34)	9.47 (17.95)	9.32 (17.76)	9.49 (17.85)	9.65 (18.15)	24.67
T <sub>10</sub> - Untreated Check	-	9.68 (18.15)	10.87 (19.28)	12.82 (20.96)	11.85 (20.18)	12.53 (20.70)	14.17 (22.14)	13.34 (21.39)	13.76 (21.81)	12.81 (20.96)	-
SEm (±)	-	N.S.	0.121	0.540	0.446	0.362	0.421	0.437	0.638	0.375	-
CD (P= 0.05)	-	-	0.364	1.621	1.342	1.086	1.264	1.315	1.276	1.124	-

Average mean of there replications; Figure in parentheses are Arc sine transformed values.

DBS = Days before spraying : DAS = Days after spraying : NS = Non significant

**Table - 2 : Efficacy of insecticides against tobacco caterpillar on cauliflower**

Treatment	Dose g/ml/L	Tobacco caterpillar damaged (%)								Over all mean	% reduction over control
		First Spray				Second Spray					
		1 DBS	5 DAS	10 DAS	Mean	1 DBS	5 DAS	10 DAS	Mean		
T <sub>1</sub> – Indoxacarb 14.5 SC	1.0 ml	11.62 (19.91)	8.12 (16.54)	8.00 (16.43)	8.06 (16.54)	7.34 (15.68)	6.73 (15.00)	6.25 (14.54)	6.49 (14.77)	7.28 (15.68)	48.91
T <sub>2</sub> – Emamectin benzoate 5WSG	0.25 ml	12.41 (20.62)	9.91 (18.44)	9.39 (14.85)	9.65 (18.15)	8.52 (16.95)	8.21 (16.64)	7.93 (16.32)	8.07 (16.43)	8.86 (17.36)	37.82
T <sub>3</sub> – Thiodicarb 75 WP	1.0 gm	12.53 (20.70)	8.61 (17.05)	8.04 (17.46)	8.33 (16.74)	7.46 (15.89)	7.00 (15.34)	6.52 (14.77)	6.76 (15.12)	7.55 (16.00)	47.02
T <sub>4</sub> - Novaluron 10 EC	1.0 ml	12.34 (19.64)	10.45 (18.91)	10.11 (18.53)	10.28 (18.72)	9.05 (17.46)	8.92 (17.36)	8.46 (16.95)	8.69 (17.16)	9.49 (17.95)	33.40
T <sub>5</sub> -Azadirachtin 0.15%	4 ml	11.85 (20.18)	10.91 (19.28)	10.53 (18.91)	10.72 (19.09)	9.48 (17.95)	9.16 (17.66)	8.72 (17.16)	8.94 (17.36)	9.83 (18.24)	31.02
T <sub>6</sub> – Avermectin 1.9 EC	0.5 ml	12.40 (20.62)	10.00 (18.44)	9.62 (18.05)	9.81 (18.24)	8.67 (17.16)	8.34 (16.74)	8.00 (16.43)	8.17 (16.64)	8.99 (17.46)	36.91
T <sub>7</sub> – Spinosad 45 SC	0.33 ml	12.36 (20.53)	9.82 (18.24)	9.33 (17.76)	9.58 (18.05)	8.20 (16.64)	7.63 (16.00)	7.13 (15.45)	7.38 (15.89)	8.48 (16.95)	40.49
T <sub>8</sub> – Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	1.0 gm	11.62 (19.91)	9.16 (17.66)	8.54 (16.95)	8.85 (17.46)	7.80 (16.22)	7.36 (15.79)	6.24 (14.42)	6.80 (15.12)	7.83 (16.22)	45.05
T <sub>9</sub> – Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (Former's Practice)	1.50 ml	12.00 (20.27)	11.51 (19.82)	10.76 (19.19)	11.14 (19.46)	10.32 (18.72)	9.74 (18.15)	9.10 (17.56)	9.42 (17.85)	10.28 (18.72)	27.86
T <sub>10</sub> - Untreated Check	-	12.51 (20.70)	12.46 (20.62)	12.87 (21.05)	12.67 (22.88)	12.93 (21.05)	14.38 (22.30)	17.26 (24.58)	15.82 (23.42)	14.25 (22.22)	-
SEm (±)	-	N.S.	0.245	0.376	0.475	0.621	0.450	0.643	0.574	0.512	-
CD (P= 0.05)	-	-	0.734	1.125	1.428	1.865	1.352	1.927	1.723	1.536	-

Average mean of there replications; Figure in parentheses are Arc sine transformed values.

DBS = Days before spraying : DAS = Days after spraying : NS = Non significant

**Table - 3 : Efficacy of insecticides against diamond back moth on cauliflower**

Treatment	Dose g/ml/L	Mean number of diamond back moth larvae / plant								Over all mean	% reduction over control
		First Spray				Second Spray					
		1 DBS	5 DAS	10 DAS	Mean	1 DBS	5 DAS	10 DAS	Mean		
T <sub>1</sub> – Indoxacarb 14.5 SC	1.0 ml	6.70 (2.68)	3.91 (2.10)	3.17 (1.92)	3.54 (2.01)	3.02 (1.88)	2.31 (1.68)	1.06 (1.25)	1.69 (1.48)	2.62 (1.77)	64.40
T <sub>2</sub> – Emamectin benzoate 5WSG	0.25 ml	6.62 (2.67)	4.72 (2.28)	3.98 (2.12)	4.35 (2.20)	3.90 (2.10)	3.00 (1.87)	2.41 (1.71)	2.71 (1.79)	3.53 (2.00)	52.04
T <sub>3</sub> – Thiodicarb 75 WP	1.0 gm	6.14 (2.58)	4.56 (2.25)	3.42 (1.97)	3.98 (2.12)	3.13 (1.91)	2.16 (1.63)	1.72 (1.49)	1.94 (1.56)	2.96 (1.86)	59.78
T <sub>4</sub> - Novaluron 10 EC	1.0 ml	6.25 (2.60)	5.12 (2.37)	4.31 (2.19)	4.72 (2.28)	4.00 (2.12)	3.24 (1.93)	2.83 (1.82)	3.04 (1.88)	3.88 (2.09)	47.28
T <sub>5</sub> -Azadirachtin 0.15%	4 ml	6.16 (2.58)	5.05 (2.36)	4.63 (2.26)	4.84 (2.31)	4.21 (2.17)	3.35 (2.01)	3.00 (1.87)	3.18 (1.92)	4.01 (2.12)	45.52
T <sub>6</sub> – Avermectin 1.9 EC	0.5 ml	6.73 (2.69)	5.21 (2.39)	3.90 (2.10)	4.56 (2.25)	3.46 (1.99)	3.11 (1.90)	2.45 (1.72)	2.78 (1.81)	3.67 (2.04)	50.14
T <sub>7</sub> – Spinosad 45 SC	0.33 ml	5.91 (2.53)	4.62 (2.26)	3.80 (2.07)	4.21 (2.17)	3.31 (1.95)	2.85 (1.83)	2.16 (1.63)	2.51 (1.73)	3.36 (1.96)	54.35
T <sub>8</sub> – Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	1.0 gm	6.54 (2.65)	4.43 (2.22)	3.92 (2.10)	4.18 (2.16)	2.84 (1.83)	2.52 (1.74)	2.23 (1.65)	2.38 (1.70)	3.28 (1.94)	55.43
T <sub>9</sub> – Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (Former's Practice)	1.50 ml	6.61 (2.67)	6.12 (2.57)	5.31 (2.41)	5.72 (2.49)	5.00 (2.35)	4.35 (2.20)	4.10 (2.14)	4.23 (2.17)	4.97 (2.34)	32.47
T <sub>10</sub> - Untreated Check	-	6.53 (2.65)	6.94 (2.73)	6.79 (2.70)	6.87 (2.71)	7.56 (2.84)	7.74 (2.87)	7.93 (2.90)	7.84 (2.89)	7.36 (2.80)	-
SEm (±)	-	N.S.	0.043	0.058	0.064	0.072	0.092	0.156	0.127	0.046	-
CD (P= 0.05)	-	-	0.131	0.174	0.192	0.216	0.275	0.468	0.381	0.142	-

Average mean of there replications; Figure in parentheses are Arc sine transformed values.

DBS = Days before spraying : DAS = Days after spraying : NS = Non significant

**Table - 4 : Efficacy of insecticides against aphids on cauliflower**

Treatment	Dose g/ml/L	Mean number of aphid population / leaf								Over all mean	% reduction over control
		First Spray				Second Spray					
		1 DBS	5 DAS	10 DAS	Mean	1 DBS	5 DAS	10 DAS	Mean		
T <sub>1</sub> – Indoxacarb 14.5 SC	1.0 ml	135.82 (11.68)	75.16 (8.70)	52.34 (7.27)	63.75 (8.02)	53.21 (7.33)	42.38 (6.55)	31.52 (5.75)	36.95 (6.12)	50.35 (7.13)	69.96
T <sub>2</sub> – Emamectin benzoate 5WSG	0.25 ml	133.24 (11.56)	108.42 (10.44)	80.17 (8.98)	94.30 (9.74)	82.00 (9.08)	74.32 (8.65)	65.30 (8.11)	69.81 (8.39)	82.06 (9.09)	48.95
T <sub>3</sub> – Thiodicarb 75 WP	1.0 gm	116.12 (10.80)	84.61 (9.23)	64.43 (8.06)	74.52 (8.66)	63.72 (18.01)	53.41 (7.34)	44.08 (6.68)	48.74 (7.02)	61.63 (7.88)	36.77
T <sub>4</sub> - Novaluron 10 EC	1.0 ml	144.26 (12.03)	120.25 (10.99)	99.65 (10.00)	109.95 (10.51)	97.20 (9.88)	86.82 (9.34)	79.21 (8.93)	83.02 (9.14)	96.49 (9.85)	42.45
T <sub>5</sub> -Azadirachtin 0.15%	4 ml	150.41 (12.28)	126.84 (11.28)	103.47 (10.20)	115.16 (10.75)	102.32 (10.14)	92.50 (9.64)	83.00 (9.14)	87.75 (9.39)	101.46 (10.10)	39.47
T <sub>6</sub> – Avermectin 1.9 EC	0.5 ml	123.52 (11.14)	112.36 (10.62)	94.32 (9.74)	103.34 (10.19)	93.10 (9.67)	79.86 (8.96)	70.42 (8.42)	75.14 (8.70)	89.24 (9.47)	46.76
T <sub>7</sub> – Spinosad 45 SC	0.33 ml	118.34 (10.90)	102.17 (10.13)	78.90 (8.91)	90.57 (9.54)	75.23 (8.70)	68.00 (8.28)	63.41 (7.99)	66.71 (8.20)	78.63 (8.90)	28.19
T <sub>8</sub> – Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	1.0 gm	140.65 (11.88)	98.42 (9.95)	72.26 (8.53)	83.34 (9.26)	71.10 (8.46)	63.12 (7.97)	47.96 (6.96)	55.54 (7.49)	79.44 (8.42)	57.98
T <sub>9</sub> – Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (Former's Practice)	1.50 ml	145.34 (12.08)	134.86 (11.63)	112.48 (10.63)	123.67 (11.14)	110.44 (10.53)	98.27 (9.94)	91.45 (9.59)	94.86 (9.77)	109.27 (10.48)	34.81
T <sub>10</sub> - Untreated Check	-	126.87 (11.29)	145.24 (12.07)	158.52 (12.61)	151.88 (12.34)	162.93 (12.78)	174.45 (13.23)	192.24 (13.88)	183.35 (13.56)	167.62 (12.97)	-
SEm (±)	-	N.S.	0.138	0.543	0.412	0.451	0.574	0.715	0.805	0.641	-
CD (P= 0.05)	-	-	0.415	1.628	1.236	1.352	1.721	2.143	2.416	1.924	-

Average mean of there replications; Figure in parentheses are Arc sine transformed values.

DBS = Days before spraying : DAS = Days after spraying : NS = Non significant

**Table – 5 : Economics of insecticides against the pests on cauliflower.**

Treatments	Dost g/ml/l	Yield (q/ha)	Increased Yield over control	Value of additional yield over control (Rs./ha)	Cost of treatment (Rs/ha)	Incremental benefit (Rs/ha)	CB ratio
T <sub>1</sub> – Indoxacarb 14.5 SC	1.0 ml	144.26	48.42	50841.00	5672.00	45169.00	1:7.96
T <sub>2</sub> – Emamectin benzoate 5WSG	0.25 ml	123.75	27.91	29306.00	3565.00	25741.00	1:7.22
T <sub>3</sub> – Thiodicarb 75 WP	1.0 gm	140.63	44.84	47082.00	4536.00	42456.00	1:9.37
T <sub>4</sub> - Novaluron 10 EC	1.0 ml	120.42	24.58	25809.00	3452.00	22357.00	1:6.48
T <sub>5</sub> -Azadirachtin 0.15%	4 ml	118.56	22.72	23856.00	4680.00	19176.00	1:4.10
T <sub>6</sub> – Avermectin 1.9 EC	0.5 ml	121.34	25.50	26775.00	4078.00	22697.00	1:5.57
T <sub>7</sub> – Spinosad 45 SC	0.33 ml	128.15	32.31	33926.00	4625.00	29301.00	1:6.34
T <sub>8</sub> – Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP	1.0 gm	134.70	38.86	40803.00	3358.00	37445.00	1:11.15
T <sub>9</sub> – Chlorpyriphos 20 EC (Former's Practice)	1.50 ml	110.26	14.42	15141.00	3690.00	11451.00	1:3.10
T <sub>10</sub> - Untreated Check	-	95.84	-	-	-	-	-
SEm (±)	-	3.154	-	-	-	-	-
CD (P= 0.05)	-	9.462	-	-	-	-	-

Average mean of there replications; Market price of cauliflower @ Rs. 1050/quintal.