

# Original Research Article

## Screening of maize genotypes for their resistance to fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J.E. Smith) under artificial infestation

### ABSTRACT

**Aim:** The present study was undertaken to identify resistant maize genotypes against fall armyworm, which were screened in a net house under artificial infestation.

**Study design:** Randomized [Complete](#) Block Design

**Place and Duration of Study:** Winter Nursery Centre, ICAR-Indian Institute of Maize Research, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad during *rabi* 2023–24.

**Methodology:** The experimental material consisted of 19 diverse maize genotypes (Table 1). Each genotype was sown in a 2 m row and replicated thrice under Randomized [Complete](#) Block Design (RBD) in an insect screening net house facility. The tested genotypes were cultivated according to the recommended agronomic practices, with a 60 cm ~~cm~~ and 20 cm spacing between rows and plants, [respectively](#). Each genotype was released with 20 fall armyworm neonate larvae using a camel hair brush at V5 phenological stage. The observations on leaf damage rating were taken on the 7<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 21<sup>st</sup> days after larval release based on Leaf Damage Rating on a 1 to 9 scale ([Soujanya et al.,2022](#)).

**Results:** Among the tested genotypes, the leaf damage score ranged from 3.53 to 7.50 at 14 days after larval infestation. The genotypes namely CML 71 (3.53) and DMRE 63 (3.76) were found to be resistant while the genotypes namely HUZM 189 (4.13), CML 144 (4.36), CML 67 (4.50) CML 73 (4.56), CML-563 -B (4.60), CML 426 (4.66), CML-547 (W) (4.66), MIL 7-38-3 (4.66), CML 327 (5.03), VSL 16 (5.06), QIL 7-273 (5.26), MIL 7-102-2 (5.33), CML 33 (5.40), [and](#) MIL 7-16-163 (5.63), were found moderately resistant. At the same time, the remaining genotypes V 372 (6.06), CM 202 (7.33), and BML 6 (7.50), were found susceptible.

**Conclusion:** The identified resistant genotypes (DMRE 63 and CML 71) can be used in resistant breeding.

Formatted: Highlight

**Keywords:** Artificial infestation, fall armyworm, leaf damage rating, maize, resistance

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Globally, maize is known as the "queen of cereals" because of its highest genetic yield potential among cereals (Parihar *et al.*, 2011). In India maize is grown in an area of 9.3 mha with a production of 35.67 million tonnes. It is used as food, feed, fodder, industrial purposes, and recently for ethanol production. Several biotic and abiotic stresses hinder the production of maize. Among biotic stresses, insect pests are the major ones affecting maize production. A total of 139 insects cause damage to maize. Out of them, fall armyworm [*Spodoptera frugiperda* (J.E. Smith)] predominantly causing significant yield losses up to 60% if not well managed (Farias *et al.*, 2014). Fall armyworm (FAW) is native to tropical and subtropical regions of the Americas and has been known as a sporadic pest since 1797, which was first recorded in Georgia in 1797. Outside America, FAW first invaded Africa in 2016 (Georgenet *et al.*, 2016), and by January 2018, the pest was reported in over 40 African countries (Prasanna *et al.*, 2018). In India, it was first reported in May 2018 from the Shivamogga district of Karnataka (Sharanabasappa *et al.*, 2018) and later it spread to major maize-growing states including Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, and Odisha. Between 2018 and 2021, the pest rapidly spread across Asia-Pacific region and has been reported from Yemen, Bangladesh, Myanmar, China, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia, Australia, South Korea, Cambodia, Papua New Guinea, New Caledonia, Jordan and Syria (Prasanna *et al.* 2021).

FAW consists of two genetically and behaviorally distinct strains that coexist across North and South America (Pashley, 1986). The "corn" strain (C) is known to preferentially damage maize, sorghum, and cotton, while the "rice" strain (R) primarily infests rice, alfalfa, pasture, and forage grasses (Nagoshi *et al.*, 2007). FAW is a polyphagous insect pest and it prefers maize compared to other cereals and millets. The larvae cause extensive damage to the leaf, stem, and cob of the maize plant (Padhee *et al.*, 2019). Indiscriminate use of insecticides to control fall armyworm may result in the development of resistance, resurgence, toxicity to natural enemies, and environmental pollution. Therefore, among several pest management strategies, host plant resistance-based approaches are the most promising as these are sustainable and environmental friendly. Host plant resistance (HPR) involves the development and utilization of crop varieties that possess natural or induced mechanisms to deter or tolerate insect pests. The development of resistant genotypes reduces insecticide applications which results in a decrease in the cost of production for insect management. It also helps to maintain a sufficient natural enemy population under field conditions (Mohankumar and Ramasubramanian, 2014). As germplasm screening for insect pest resistance is crucial in developing resistant varieties/hybrids, the present study aimed to identify resistant maize genotypes against fall armyworm under artificial infestation.

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 2.1 Experimental site

The present study was conducted at Winter Nursery Centre, ICAR-Indian Institute of Maize Research, Rajendranagar during the *rabi* 2023-24. The experimental area comes under Telangana's Southern Zone (Zone-3). It is located between 17.184°N latitude and 78.240°E longitude, at an elevation of 494 meters above Mean Sea Level (MSL).

### 2.2 Rearing of FAW culture

Initially, fall armyworm neonate larvae were collected from infested plants at the Winter Nursery Centre (WNC) in Hyderabad, Telangana, India. Larvae were then reared in plastic jars containing a 2 to 3 mm layer of chickpea flour-casein-based artificial diet at the jar's bottom for five days in groups of 50-100 neonates at 28±1°C, 65±10% RH, under a 16-hour light/8-hour dark photoperiod (Singh and Rembold, 1992). To prevent cannibalism, larvae were subsequently transferred individually to 12-well plates (HiMedia), each cell measuring 2.5 cm in diameter and 2.3 cm in depth, where they remained until pupation. Pupae were sterilized using a 2% sodium hypochlorite solution and grouped in plastic jars with soil, numbering 25-50 per group. Upon adult emergence, 10 pairs of fall armyworm moths were introduced into a 30 cm long and 23 cm diameter oviposition cage. Adult moths were given a 10% honey solution on a cotton swab while blotting paper strips served as the oviposition substrate within the cage. These strips were replaced daily, and the eggs collected were sterilized using a 10% formalin solution. Subsequently, hatched eggs were transferred with a hairbrush to plastic jars

containing an artificial diet. These lab-raised neonate larvae were utilized for artificial infestation to standardize the screening technique.

### 2.3 Sowing and Artificial Infestation

This experiment includes 19 maize genotypes (Table 1) and each genotype was sown in a 2 m row and replicated thrice under **Randomized Block Design** (RBD) in an insect screening net house facility. Except for crop protection practices, all the tested maize genotypes were cultivated with recommended agronomic practices, with a 60 cm x 20 cm spacing between rows and plants, respectively. Each plant genotype was released with 20 fall armyworm neonate larvae using a camel hair brush at V5 phenological stage. The observations on leaf damage rating were recorded at the 7<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 21<sup>st</sup> DAI based on an LDR scale of 1 to 9 (Soujanya *et al.*, 2022) (Table 2).

### 2.4 Statistical analysis

The LDR data pertaining to the screening of maize germplasm was subjected to RBD analysis using OPSTAT software. The mean values were separated by using DMRT.

**Table 1: Details of maize genotypes selected for screening against fall armyworm**

| Sr. No | IMR code                   | Name of the genotype | Pedigree                                | Colour of the seed |
|--------|----------------------------|----------------------|---|--------------------|
| 1      | IMR-1                      | CML 71               | ANTGP2-5-#-1-2-1-1-5-5-7-B              | Yellow             |
| 2      | IMR-2                      | CML 73               | ANTGP2-5-#-1-2-3-B-1-1-1-B              | Yellow             |
| 3      | IMR-3                      | CML 144              | P62-C5-FS182-2-1-2-B-B-3-1-B            | White              |
| 4      | IMR-4                      | CML 563-B            | WLCY2-7-1-2-1-5-B*5                     | Yellow             |
| 5      | IMR 5                      | CML 67               | (ANTGP2-5-#-1/ANT38586-1)-6-B-4-2-2-5-B | Yellow             |
| 6      | IMR 6                      | BML 6                | SRRL 65-B96-1-1-2-# - 2-2-1-Å-1-1-Åb-Åb | Yellow             |
| 7      | IMR-156                    | CML 327              | P45-C6-F83-3-1-B                        | White              |
| 8      | IMR-363                    | CML 33               | P28TSR-B-B-21-3-1-3-1-B                 | Yellow             |
| 9      | IMR-367                    | CML 426              | P31-C4-B*6-38-#-#-2-B                   | Yellow             |
| 10     | IMR-392                    | MIL7-16-163          | Brazil 117 X ESM 113-1-1-3-4            | Yellow             |
| 11     | IMR-405                    | CML547(W)            | DRB-F2-60-1-1-1-B                       | White              |
| 12     | IMR-416                    | V372                 | V372                                    | Yellow             |
| 13     | IMR-461                    | MIL7-38-3            | DKC 8144-3-1-1-2                        | Yellow             |
| 14     | IMR-469                    | MIL7-106-2           | LM-13 X DML 170-1-3                     | Yellow             |
| 15     | IMR-541                    | VSL16                | VSL16                                   | White              |
| 16     | IMR-576                    | HUZM189              | HUZM189                                 | Yellow             |
| 17     | IMR-630                    | QIL7-273             | BML 6 X DQL 1017) X UMI 1220)-1         | White              |
| 18     | DMRE 63 (Resistant check)  | DMRE 63              | CM 500 SEL                              | Yellow             |
| 19     | CM 202 (Susceptible check) | CM 202               | ZSR923-B*4-5-1-B                        | Yellow             |

Formatted: Highlight

**TABLE 2: Leaf Damage Rating (LDR) scale to categorize maize germplasm for resistance to FAW (Soujanya *et al.*, 2022)**

| Ratings | Description/Symptoms  | Response             |
|---------|---|----------------------|
| 1       | Healthy plant/Nodamage/VisibleSymptoms  | Resistant            |
| 2       | Few short/pin sizes holes/scraping on a few leaves_(1-2)  | Resistant            |
| 3       | Short/pin size holes/scraping on several leaves_(3-4)   | Resistant            |
| 4       | Short/pin size holes/scraping on several leaves (5-6) and a few long-elongated lesions (1–3 Nos) up to 2.0 cm length present on whorl and or adjacent fully opened leaves   | Resistant            |
| 5       | Several holes with elongated lesions (4-5Nos)_upto_4.0_cm in length and uniform/irregularly shaped holes present on whorl and or adjacent fully opened leaves               | Moderately Resistant |
| 6       | Several leaves with elongated lesions -(6-7Nos) up to 6.0_cm i n length and uniform/irregularly shaped holes present on whorl and adjacent fully opened leaves              | Moderately Resistant |
| 7       | Several long lesions (>7 Nos) up to 10 cm in length and uniform/irregularly shaped holes common on one-half of the leaves present on whorl and adjacent fully opened leaves | Susceptible          |
| 8       | Several long lesions >10 cm in length and uniform/irregularly shaped holes common on one-half to two-thirds of leaves present on whorl and adjacent fully opened leaves     | Susceptible          |
| 9       | Complete defoliation of whorl of the plant  | Susceptible          |

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mean leaf damage score of the maize genotypes is based on the 1-9 leaf damage rating scale detailed by Lakshmi-Soujanya *et al.* (2022). The LDR Scale of tested genotypes ranged from 2.13 to 4.76 at seven days after larval release (Table 4). The mean leaf damage score per plant was lowest in CML 73 (2.13) followed by DMRE 63 (2.33), CML 71 (2.36), CML 67 (2.73), HUZM 189 (2.73), CML 144 (3.26), MIL 7-38-3 (3.76). The LDR score between 4.1 to 6.0 was observed in genotypes viz., MIL 7-102-2 (4.10), CML 327 (4.20), CML 563 -B (4.20), VSL 16 (4.30), QIL 7-273 (4.33), CML 547 (W) (4.43), BML 6 (4.46), CML 33 (4.56), V 372 (4.56), CM 202 (4.76), MIL 7-16-163 (4.90), and CML 426 (4.93).

At 14 days after larval infestation, the leaf damage rating score ranged from 3.53 to 7.50 and differed significantly among the tested genotypes. The genotypes namely CML 71 (3.53) and DMRE 63 (3.76) recorded LDR <4.0 and were found to be resistant while the genotypes namely HUZM 189 (4.13), CML 144 (4.36), CML 67 (4.50) CML 73 (4.56), CML 563 -B (4.60), CML 426 (4.66), CML 547 (W) (4.66), MIL 7-38-3 (4.66), CML 327 (5.03), VSL 16 (5.06), QIL 7-273 (5.26), MIL 7-102-2 (5.33), CML 33 (5.40), MIL 7-16-163 (5.63), recorded LDR Between 4.1 TO 6.0 and were found moderately resistant. At the same time, the remaining genotypes V 372 (6.06), CM 202 (7.33), and BML 6 (7.50) exhibited LDR between 6.1 to 9.0 and were found susceptible.

At 21 days after larval infestation, the leaf damage score ranged from 3.23 to 7.40 among the tested genotypes (Table 4). The mean leaf damage score per plant was lowest in DMRE 63 (3.23), followed by CML 71 (3.46), CML 327 (3.60), and CML 33 (3.90). The LDR score between 4.1 to 6.0 was observed in genotypes viz., CML 563 -B (4.06), CML 547 (W) (4.10), CML 426 (4.13), MIL 7-16-163

(4.16), CML 67 (4.20), VSL 16 (4.33), CML 144 (4.46), CML 73 (4.50), V 372 (4.50), QIL 7-273 (4.73), MIL 7-38-3 (5.06), CM 202 (5.06), MIL 7-102-2 (5.63), and HUZM 189 (5.63). The remaining genotype, BML 6 (7.40) exhibited an LDR of > 6.

The pooled mean data of leaf damage score per plant varied from 3.11 in DMRE 63 and 5.72 in CM - 202, respectively, and differed markedly from each other (Table 4). The mean leaf damage score per plant was lowest DMRE 63 (3.11) followed by CML 71 (3.13), CML 73 (3.73), CML 67 (3.76). The LDR score between 4.1 to 6.0 was observed in genotypes viz., CML 144 (4.06), CML 327 (4.10), CML 563-B (4.30), HUZM 189 (4.16), CML 547(W) (4.40), MIL 7-38-3 (4.49), VSL 16 (4.56), CML 426 (4.57), CML 33 (4.62), QIL 7-273 (4.77), MIL 7-16-163 (4.90), MIL 7-102-2 (5.02), V 372 (5.04), CM 202 (5.72). The remaining genotype, BML 6 (6.46) exhibited an LDR of > 6.0.

**Table 3: Response of various maize genotypes to fall armyworm infestation.**

| Sl.no          | Genotype    | 7 DAI                      | 14 DAI                       | 21 DAI                       | Mean                         | Response |
|----------------|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|
| 1              | CML 71      | 2.36 <sup>gh</sup> ±0.067  | 3.53 <sup>i</sup> ±0.120     | 3.46 <sup>ef</sup> ±0.088    | 3.13 <sup>f</sup> ± 0.367    | R        |
| 2              | CML 73      | 2.13 <sup>h</sup> ±0.088   | 4.56 <sup>defgh</sup> ±0.088 | 4.50 <sup>bcd</sup> ±0.058   | 3.73 <sup>ef</sup> ± 0.817   | MR       |
| 3              | CML 144     | 3.26 <sup>ef</sup> ±0.033  | 4.36 <sup>fghi</sup> ±0.033  | 4.46 <sup>bcd</sup> ± 0.088  | 4.06 <sup>cdef</sup> ± 0.384 | MR       |
| 4              | CML 563-B   | 4.20 <sup>cd</sup> ±0.120  | 4.60 <sup>defgh</sup> ±0.306 | 4.06 <sup>cdef</sup> ± 0.549 | 4.30 <sup>cde</sup> ± 0.153  | MR       |
| 5              | CML 67      | 2.73 <sup>fg</sup> ±0.351  | 4.50 <sup>efgh</sup> ±0.058  | 4.20 <sup>cdef</sup> ± 0.100 | 3.76 <sup>def</sup> ±0.289   | MR       |
| 6              | BML 6       | 4.46 <sup>abc</sup> ±0.208 | 7.50 <sup>a</sup> ±0.058     | 7.40 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.115    | 6.46 <sup>a</sup> ± 0.984    | S        |
| 7              | CML 327     | 4.20 <sup>cd</sup> ±0.346  | 5.03 <sup>cdef</sup> ±0.176  | 3.60 <sup>def</sup> ± 0.306  | 4.10 <sup>cdef</sup> ±0.406  | MR       |
| 8              | CML 33      | 4.56 <sup>abc</sup> ±0.441 | 5.40 <sup>bcd</sup> ±0.153   | 3.96 <sup>cdef</sup> ± 0.441 | 4.62 <sup>bcd</sup> ±0.433   | MR       |
| 9              | CML 426     | 4.93 <sup>a</sup> ±0.416   | 4.66 <sup>defg</sup> ±0.584  | 4.13 <sup>cdef</sup> ± 0.546 | 4.57 <sup>cde</sup> ±0.265   | MR       |
| 10             | MIL7-16-163 | 4.90 <sup>a</sup> ±0.067   | 5.63 <sup>bc</sup> ±0.433    | 4.16 <sup>cdef</sup> ± 0.426 | 4.90 <sup>bcd</sup> ±0.404   | MR       |
| 11             | CML-547(W)  | 4.43 <sup>abc</sup> ±0.088 | 4.66 <sup>defg</sup> ±0.433  | 4.10 <sup>cdef</sup> ± 0.361 | 4.40 <sup>cde</sup> ±0.176   | MR       |
| 12             | V 372       | 4.56 <sup>abc</sup> ±0.186 | 6.06 <sup>b</sup> ±0.219     | 4.50 <sup>bcd</sup> ± 0.265  | 5.04 <sup>bc</sup> ±0.484    | S        |
| 13             | MIL 7-38-3  | 3.76 <sup>de</sup> ±0.058  | 4.66 <sup>defg</sup> ±0.219  | 5.06 <sup>bc</sup> ± 0.601   | 4.49 <sup>cde</sup> ±0.361   | MR       |
| 14             | MIL 7-102-2 | 4.10 <sup>cd</sup> ±0.145  | 5.33 <sup>bcd</sup> ±0.088   | 5.63 <sup>b</sup> ± 1.241    | 5.02 <sup>bc</sup> ±0.513    | MR       |
| 15             | VSL 16      | 4.30 <sup>bcd</sup> ±0.176 | 5.06 <sup>cdef</sup> ±0.406  | 4.33 <sup>cdef</sup> ± 0.176 | 4.56 <sup>cde</sup> ±0.233   | MR       |
| 16             | HUZM 189    | 2.73 <sup>fg</sup> ±0.260  | 4.13 <sup>ghi</sup> ±0.722   | 5.63 <sup>b</sup> ± 0.633    | 4.16 <sup>cdef</sup> ±0.837  | MR       |
| 17             | QIL 7-273   | 4.33 <sup>bc</sup> ±0.033  | 5.26 <sup>bcd</sup> ±0.491   | 4.73 <sup>bcd</sup> ± 0.120  | 4.77 <sup>bcd</sup> ±0.260   | MR       |
| 18             | DMRE 63     | 2.33 <sup>gh</sup> ±0.120  | 3.76 <sup>hi</sup> ±0.367    | 3.23 <sup>f</sup> ± 0.133    | 3.11 <sup>ef</sup> ±0.406    | R        |
| 19             | CM 202      | 4.76 <sup>ab</sup> ±0.167  | 7.33 <sup>a</sup> ±0.033     | 5.06 <sup>bc</sup> ± 0.296   | 5.72 <sup>ab</sup> ±0.821    | S        |
| <b>SE(m)</b>   |             | 0.209                      | 0.295                        | 0.440                        | 0.326                        |          |
| <b>F value</b> |             | 21.542                     | 12.332                       | 4.632                        | 4.012                        |          |
| <b>P value</b> |             | <0.001                     | <0.001                       | 0.00005                      | 0.00019                      |          |

Means with the same letter are not significantly different. Each value represents the mean of three replications. R, Resistant; MR, Moderately Resistant; S, Susceptible. DAI-Days after infestation

**Table 4: Classification of maize genotypes against fall armyworm based on leaf damage rating (1-9 scale)**

| Sl. No. | Genotypes  | LDR   | Categorization       | Number genotypes |
|---------|--|-------|----------------------|------------------|
| 1       | CML -73, DMRE 63   | 1-4   | Resistant            | 2                |
| 2       | CML 71, CML 67, CML 144, HUZM 189, CML-563 -B, CML 426, CML-547 (W), MIL 7-38-3, CML 327, VSL 16, QIL 7-273, MIL 7-102-2, CML 33, MIL 7-16-163 | 4.1-6 | Moderately resistant | 14               |
| 3       | V 372, BML 6, CM 202   | 6.1-9 | Susceptible          | 3                |

The current results align with Wiseman *et al.* (1981), who reported differential damage by fall armyworm between moderately resistant and susceptible genotypes which might be due to antixenosis and or antibiosis mechanisms, Ni *et al.* (2011) observed two genotypes, Mp 708 and FAW 706, as resistant to fall armyworm based on foliar damage rating. Conversely, Ab24E and EPM 6 were found to be the most susceptible genotypes. Varma *et al.* (2022) similarly identified resistant and susceptible genotypes against fall armyworm, with GAYMH 3 (2.39), GAYMH 1 (2.60), GAWMH 2 (3.07), NARMADA MOTI (3.66) and GM 6 (3.74) as resistant genotypes whereas GSCH 0918 (5.80) as susceptible genotype. Furthermore, the current study's findings are consistent with those of Lakshmi-Soujanya *et al.* (2022), who noted that genotypes such as DMRE-63, DML163-1, CML 71, CML 141, CML 337, CML 346, and the wild ancestor *Z. mays spp. parviglumis* exhibited reduced leaf damage due to fall armyworm. These observations suggest their potential utility in maize breeding programs to enhance resistance. Moreover, the present study observations align with earlier findings of Gowda *et al.* (2022), Where, CML 71, CML 67, DMRE 63, CML 561, AEBy-1, CML 335, CML 345, and CML 337 showed moderate resistance with mean LDR of 3.93, 4.00, 4.17, 4.36, 4.42, 4.57, 4.72, and 4.80, respectively. Matova *et al.* (2022) found peak fall armyworm foliar damage at the V6 whorl leaf stage in maize genotypes. The decrease in LDR score was observed in genotype CML543/CML334 from the 4<sup>th</sup> week (6.43) to the 8<sup>th</sup> week (5.70) after germination. This is in accordance with the current study in the majority of genotypes which was noticed from 14<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> DAI. Sneha *et al.* (2023) observed that maize genotype ADV-768 (2.72) recorded minimum leaf damage, whereas SWEET GLORY (8.52) had maximum leaf damage. Darshan *et al.* (2024) reported that Kaveri minchu recorded the highest mean leaf damage score (4.62) whereas, the hybrid PMH 224 recorded the lowest mean leaf damage score (0.73).

In the present study, LDR was recorded at the 7<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> DAI, but for categorizing the genotypes into resistant, moderately resistant, and susceptible LDR of 14 DAI was considered. Assessing damage at 7 days after infestation (DAI) is premature because larvae in the mid-growth stages (first to third instar) have not reached their peak damage potential. These early instar larvae of the fall Armyworm are small and consume only 2% of foliage during their life cycle. In contrast, fourth, fifth, and sixth instar larvae consume 4.7%, 16.3%, and 77.2% respectively, heavily defoliating crops (Sparks, 1979). By the time larvae pupate around 21 DAI, plants begin to recover from initial damage, making the rating at this stage not fully indicative of the larvae's impact. Therefore, assessing damage at 14 DAI provides a more accurate reflection of both the complete leaf damage caused by FAW and the host plant's response to the infestation. Furthermore, the lower feeding rate of early instars (first and second) (Ren *et al.*, 2020) is likely to get a low damage rating at 7 DAI. By 14 DAI, the larvae will attain the fourth and fifth instars and are feeding heavily, leading to increased damage levels. According to Zalucki *et al.* (2002), mortality in the early larval stages is generally high in Lepidoptera. As per Davis *et al.*, (1996), the 7-day scale reduces leaf damage from mid-instar FAW larvae migration, while the 14-day scale shows overall feeding damage and helps detect any delayed plant resistance to insects that may not be evident at 7 days.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The study revealed that among the 19 genotypes screened, the genotypes namely CML 71 and DMRE 63 were found to be resistant, while, the genotypes namely HUZM 189, CML 144, CML 67, CML 73, CML 563 -B, CML 426, CML 547 (W), MIL 7-38-3, CML 327, VSL16, QIL 7-273, MIL 7-102-2, CML 33, MIL 7-16-163, were observed as moderately resistant. At the same time, the remaining genotypes V 372, CM 202, and BML 6 were found susceptible. The resistant genotypes identified in this study can be used in breeding programs aimed at developing hybrids resistant to Fall Armyworm (FAW).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Parihar CM, Jat SL, Singh AK, Kumar RS, Hooda KS, GK C, Singh DK (2011) Maize production technologies in India. *DMR Technical Bulletin*. Directorate of Maize Research, Pusa Campus, New Delhi-110012. 30.
- [2] Farias CA, Brewer MJ, Anderson DJ, Odvody GN, Xu, W, & Setamou M. (2014). Native maize resistance to corn earworm, *Helicoverpa zea*, and fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda*, with notes on aflatoxin content. *Southwestern Entomologist*, 39, 411-426.
- [3] Goergen G, Kumar PL, Sankung SB, Togola A, Tamo M (2016) First report of outbreaks of the fall armyworm *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), a new alien invasive pest in West and Central Africa. *PLoS ONE* 11(10): e0165632-e0165641.
- [4] Prasanna BM, Bruce A, Winter S, Otim M, Asea G, Sevgan S, Ba M, van den Berg J, Beiger R, Gichuru L, Trevisan W, Williams P, Oikeh S, Edge M, Huesing JE, Powell T (2018) Host plant resistance to fall armyworm. In: Prasanna BM et al (eds) *Fall armyworm in Africa: a guide for integrated pest management*, 1st edn. Mexico, CDMX, CIMMYT, pp 45-62.
- [5] Sharabasappa, Kalleshwaraswamy CM, Asokan R, Mahadevaswamy HM, Maruthi MS, Pavithra HB, et al. (2018) First report of the fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J E Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), an alien invasive pest of maize in India. *Pest Manag Hort Ecosyst* 24(1): 23-29.
- [6] Prasanna BM, Huesing JE, Peschke VM, Nagoshi RN, Jia X, Wu K, Trisyono YA, Tay T, Watson A, Day R, Eddy R (2021) Fall armyworm in Asia: Invasion, impacts, and strategies for sustainable management. In: Prasanna BM et al (eds) *Fall armyworm in Asia: a guide for integrated pest management*. 1st edn. Mexico, CDMX: CIMMYT; pp 1-20.
- [7] Pashley DP (1986) Host-associated genetic differentiation in fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae): a sibling species complex? *Ann Entomol Soc Am* 79:898–904.
- [8] Nagoshi RN, Silvie P, Meagher RL Jr (2007) Comparison of haplotype frequencies differentiate fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) corn-strain populations from Florida and Brazil. *J Econ Entomol* 100:954–961.

- [9] Padhee AK, Prasanna BM (2019) The emerging threat of Fall Armyworm in India. *Indian Farming* 69(1): 51-54.
- [10] Mohankumar S, & Ramasubramanian T. (2014). Role of genetically modified insect-resistant crops in IPM: Agricultural, ecological and evolutionary implications. In D. P. Abrol (Ed.), *Integrated pest management* (pp. 371– 399). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier Inc.
- [11] Singh AK and Rembold H. (1992). Maintenance of the cotton bollworm, *Heliothis armigera* Hubner (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in laboratory culture-I. Rearing on semi-synthetic diet. *International Journal of Tropical Insect Science*. 13(3): 333- 338.
- [12] Wiseman BR, Williams WP, Davis FM. 1981. Fall armyworm resistance mechanisms in selected corns. *Journal Economic of Entomology*. 74: 622-624.
- [13] Ni, X, Chen Y, Hibbard BE, Wilson JP, Williams WP, Buntin GD, Ruberson JR and Li, X. (2011). Foliar resistance to fall armyworm in corn germplasm lines that confer resistance to root-and ear-feeding insects. *Florida Entomologist*. 94(4): 971-981.
- [14] Varma HS, Suthar MD, Zala MB, Patel MB, Parmar PK, Thumar RK, Sisodiya DB, Patel JK (2022) Screening of maize cultivars/genotypes for resistance against fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith). *Pharma Innov J* 11(8): 1468-1472.
- [15] Soujanya PL, Sekhar JC, Yathish KR, Karjagi CG, Rao KS, Suby SB, Jat SL, Kumar B, Kumar K, Vadessery J, Subaharan K (2022) Leaf damage based phenotyping technique and its validation against fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith), in maize. *Front Plant Sci* 13: 906207-906221.
- [16]. Gowda MP, Sekhar J, Soujanya P, Yathish K, Rahman S, Malliah B (2022) Screening of maize genotypes against fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith), under artificial infestation. *Biol Forum* 14: 249-254.
- [18]. Matova PM, Kamutando CN, Kutwayo D, Magorokosho C, Labuschagne M (2022) Fall armyworm tolerance of maize parental lines, experimental hybrids, and commercial cultivars in southern Africa. *Agronomy* 12(6): 1463.
- [16]. Tiwari S, Deole S, Mehta N (2023) Field screening of maize genotypes against fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *J Adv Biol Biotechnol* (in press).
- [19]. Darshan R, Prasanna PM, Hegde JN (2024) Screening of popular maize hybrids against fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda*. *J Adv Biol Biotechnol* 46(5): 306-312.
- [20]. Sparks AN (1979) A review of the biology of the fall armyworm. *Fla Entomol* 62: 82-87. doi: 10.2307/3494083.

[21]. Ren Q, Haseeb M, Fan J, Wu P, Tian T, Zhang R (2020) Functional response and intraspecific competition in the fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Insects* 11(11): 806.

[22]. Zalucki MP, Clarke AR, Malcom SB (2002) Ecology and behavior of first instar larval Lepidoptera. *Annu Rev Entomol* 47: 361-393.

[23]. Davis FM, Wiseman BR, Williams WP, Widstrom NW (1996) Insect colony, planting date, and plant growth stage effects on screening maize for leaf-feeding resistance to fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Fla Entomol* 79: 317.

UNDER PEER REVIEW