

Original Research Article

EVALUATION Impact OF INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT of Integrated Management Practices of Fruit fly In Bitter gourd IN BITTER GOURD

Abstract

Gourds are being cultivated in 310 ha in Tiruvallur district. Among gourds bitter gourd alone is cultivated in 125 hectares out of 310 ha occupied by gourds in Tiruvallur district in TamilNadu, India. Bitter gourds are attacked by several insect pests and among them the fruit fly Fruit is fly - the is the most destructive insect pests attacking bitter gourd. The present study was conducted to demonstrate the Integrated Pest Management practices in bitter gourd against major insect pests in Tiruvallur District. The demonstration was conducted at 10 farmers' fields in ten farmers field of located in four blocks viz., R.K.Pet, Thiruthani, Ekadu of Tiruvallur district during 2020-2021. Technological gap Technological — between gap — recommended between — practice recommended and practices — actual and — farmers actual farmers — practice — was practice was observed assessed. The front line front-line demonstration was consisted of included IPM practices (field sanitation, Installation of fruit fly fruit fly traps and spraying of neem oil 3%) and Non-IPM practices. Results indicated average fruit yield of 92.50 q/ha, an increase of 10.77% increase in yield over farmers practice of fruit yield and obtained as well as a net income of Rs.106450/- with 10.77% increase in yield over farmers practice. Reduction in cost of cultivation due to less investment for plant protection aspects has been recorded.

Keywords: *Integrated pest management, bitter gourd, marketable yield, net profit.*

Introduction

Bitter gourd (*Momordica charantia* L.) is a popular vegetable crop among cucurbits grown in India. In terms of nutritive value, bitter gourd ranks first among cucurbits, being rich in iron, phosphorus and ascorbic acid (Awasthi & Jaiswal, 1986). Insect pests are a major constraint for increasing the production and productivity of this crop. The crop loss due to melon fly varied from 30-100% depending upon the season. (Panday *et al.*, 2009). The extent of losses varies between 30 to 100%, depending on the cucurbit species and the season. Melon fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae: Dacinae) are economically important pests of the cucurbits and are geographically distributed throughout the tropics and subtropics of the world, especially

Comment [GN1]: What is the name of the fourth block, please?

Formatted: Highlight

in most countries of South East Asia. ~~The Crop losses due to~~ melon fly, *Bactrocera cucurbitae* (Coquillett) (Diptera: Tephritidae) ~~prefers tender fruits to lay eggs 2 to 4 mm deep in the fruit pulp. The maggots feed inside the developing fruit leading to rotting and premature fall. The crop loss due to melon fly varied from 30 - 100% depending upon the cucurbit species and season—(Panday et al., 2009). The extent of losses varies between 30 to 100%, depending on the cucurbit species and the season. Its abundance increases when the temperatures fall below 32° C, and the relative humidity ranges between 60 to 70%.~~ Keeping in view the importance of the pest and crop, melon fruit fly ~~management could be done using~~ is the right candidate for integrated pest management strategies.

Gourds are ~~being~~ cultivated in 310 ha in Tiruvallur district ~~and with~~ bitter gourd alone ~~in occupying~~ 125 hectares. Farmers cultivate hybrid bitter gourds in Kadambathur, Thiruvallangadu, Thiruthani and Ekadu blocks. Hence it was proposed to popularize Integrated Pest management module through frontline demonstrations for effective management of pests in Bitter gourd in Tiruvallur district.

Materials and methods

For the popularization of Integrated Pest management for Fruit fly in Bitter gourd module in Tiruvallur District, it was proposed to conduct field level demonstrations in ten ~~places-locations~~ during the year 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Ten farmers were selected from four blocks viz., ~~R.K.Pet, Thiruthani, Ekadu~~ of Tiruvallur district. On campus and off campus trainings were given to farmers as well as extension personnel on various improved crop production technologies and integrated pest management practices. The farmers were also facilitated with technical pamphlets on cultivation aspects and pest management in Bitter gourds. Demonstrations were made on ~~seed treatment, Methyl eugenol traps for fruit flies and yellow sticky traps for sucking pest monitoring.~~ Technology intervention ~~viz, Expose exposure~~ of the pupae by ploughing, supply ~~of Pseudomonas of Pseudomonas fluorescens @ 10 g / kg seed for seed treatment, Yellow yellow sticky traps @ 12 nos/numbers/ ha for sucking pest management, Methyl eugenol Fruit fly traps @ 12 / no/ ha for fruit fly management, need-based Spray spraying of 3% of Neem oil @ 3.0 % as need based, Collection collection~~ and destruction of the damaged fruits. Observations ~~on number of branches/vines~~ was recorded ~~in situ~~ from five ~~tagged and randomly sampled chosen and tagged~~ plants per plot. Matured fruits were harvested at 3 days interval for assessment of number of fruits per plant, average fruit weight, and marketable yield. Fruit yield per hectare was obtained through conversion of the net plot yield. The data on percent

Comment [GN2]: Please provide a reference.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [GN3]: Name of the fourth block please. In the introduction section, the blocks are mentioned as Kadambathur, Thiruvallangadu, Thiruthani and Ekadu blocks. Are these same?

Comment [GN4]:

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [GN5]: What were the sucking pests? What was the incidence?

Comment [GN6]: What were the sucking pests? How did you assess the impact of these yellow sticky traps? When were they placed? Were these traps changed? If so, how many times.

Comment [GN7]: Was the spray taken up? If so, when? How many sprays?

Comment [GN8]: How frequently was it done?

Formatted: Font: Italic

fruit damage was calculated on the basis of total number of healthy fruit and infested ones. ~~Economic parameters~~ Economic ~~such parameters~~ such ~~costs~~ of cost ~~cultivation of cultivation~~, net return ~~net~~ and return ~~benefit and~~ cost benefit ratio ~~cost ratio (BCR) were~~ BCR) were calculated by considering all inputs and outputs.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Results and discussion

~~Plants in the plots that had Demonstration fields practicing Integrated Pest Management technologies were periodically visited, observed and critical parameters viz., fruit fly and sucking pest incidence, Yield(kg/ha) and BCR were recorded.~~ Integrated Pest Management practices with recommended dose of fertilizers significantly increased the vine length, number of branches/vine and average fruit weight as compared to those in the plots with farmers' practice (Table 1). Plant growth in farmers' fields was reduced due to imbalanced use fertilizers and indiscriminate use of pesticides ~~and~~. An average of 23.3 fruit per plant was recorded in IPM plots against 17.4 fruits per plant in farmers' field ~~with 17.4 fruits per plant~~. Maximum of 23.48% and 19.25% of fruit incidence ~~was were recorded~~ ~~in recorded in~~ farmers' fields during 2019-2020 and ~~19.25% during~~ 2020-2021 ~~due to~~ respectively ~~indiscriminate use of pesticides~~. Reductions in fruit fly incidence ~~of by~~ 48.04% and 45.45% was observed in IPM demonstration plots ~~reduction compared to those in~~ farmers' practice during 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 respectively ~~was observed in IPM demonstration plots~~. Average yield of 10.03 tonnes per hectare ~~hectare in IPM plots~~ was recorded with which was 25.58% and 10.77% increase in yield over farmers' plot during the year 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 respectively (Table 2). Quality produce was harvested with 25.64 % and 23.34% increase in net returns and benefit cost ratio of 3.04 to 3.80 in IPM demonstration plots during 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 respectively. Similarly, Ranganath et al. 2015 and Kumar et al. 2019 ~~Earlier workers (Ranganath et al., 2015 and; Kumar et al., 2019)~~ have reported that minimum fruit fly incidence was observed in integrated pest management module. Mr. Mahendran, Reddiyur village, Thiruthani block practicing bitter gourd cultivation has achieved a maximum 98.50 q/ha of fruit yield and obtained a Net income of

Comment [GN9]: Vine length was not mentioned in M&M

Comment [GN10]: No data is provided. What was the growth parameter? Only the number of branches? Vine length data is not presented.

Comment [GN11]: How does indiscriminate use of pesticides reduce the vine length?

Comment [GN12]: ..fruit fly incidence?

Comment [GN13]: Which year? What about the yield in the other year?

Rs.111450/- with 18 % increase in yield over farmers practice. Reduction in cost of cultivation due to less investment for plant protection aspects has been recorded. The Yield parameters, pest incidence and economics assessed in varieties from ten trials is detailed below

Table: 1 : Effect of IPM practice on growth and yield parameters of Bitter gourd

Year/Season	Treatments	No. of branches/vine	No. of fruits per plant	Fruit weight(g)/plant
2019-2020	Farmers Practice	7.56	19.20	37.05
	IPM Demonstration Plot	10.60	25.81	63.03
2020-2021	Farmers Practice	7.24	15.55	41.43
	IPM Demonstration plot	9.84	20.78	65.36

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Table: 2 : Effect of IPM practice on Yield and Economic Parameters in Bittergourd

Year	Treatments	Average Yield (t/ha)	Percent fruit damage	Net returns (Rs./ha)	B:C Ratio
2019-2020	Farmers Practice	8.60	23.48	77600	2.33
	IPM Demonstration plot	10.80	12.20	97500	3.80
2020-2021	Farmers Practice	8.35	19.25	86300	2.48
	IPM Demonstration plot	9.25	10.50	106450	3.04

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Conclusion:

Severe incidence of fruit fly and sucking pests ~~incidence~~ was observed in farmers practice even after multiple spray of insecticides (18-22 %). Integrated pest management practices ~~hashave~~ been observed as the best alternate for quality produce production with good Benefit cost ratio. Farmers are willing to install Methyl Eugenol traps for fruit fly management and yellow sticky traps for sucking pest monitoring and management.

References

1. ~~Awasthi CP~~Awasthi CP, Jaiswal RC. Biochemical composition and nutritional quality of fruits of bitter gourd grown in Uttar Pradesh. *Progressive Horticulture*. 1986; 18:265-269.

2. Dillon MK, Ramsingh, Naresh JS and Sharma HC. The melon fruit fly, *Bactroceracurbitae*: A review of its biology and management. *Journal of Insect Science*, Volume 5, Issue 1, 200, 40.
3. Panday AK, Nath P, Rai AB, Kumar A. Screening of some bitter gourd varieties/germplasms on the basis of some biological and biometrical parameters of melon fruit fly (*Bactroceracurbitae*Coquillet) *Vegetable Science*. 2009; 36(3):399-400.
4. Kumar S, Nath S, Kannaujia SK, Sonkar SP, Singh AK, Rajput RK et al. Study of the integrated pest management practices against bitter gourd fruit fly in district Jaunpur (U.P.) India. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry* 2019;8(4):798-800
5. Rangnath HR, Krishna Kumar NK, Krishnamoorthy PN, Saroja S, Shivaram K. An integrated approach to manage melon fruit fly *Bactroceracurbitae* (C.) in bitter gourd. *Pest management in Horticultural Ecosystems* 2015;21(1):27-30.

Comment [GN14]: Not found in the text.

Comment [GN15]: Check the spelling. In the text , it is mentioned as "Ranganath..

UNDER PEER REVIEW