

Comparative Efficacy of Selected Chemicals and Bio-pesticides against Gram Pod Borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner)] on Chickpea (*Cicer arrietinum* L.)

Abstract

The experiment was conducted at Central Research Farm (CRF), Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj during Rabi season in 2023-24. The experiment was carried out in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with eight treatments viz., Neem oil 2% @ 2ml/lit, *Beauveria bassiana* 1×10^{10} conidia/ml @ 2gm/lit, Profenofos 40% + Cypermethrin 4% @ 3ml/lit, *Bacillus thuringiensis* @ 2gm/lit, Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 0.5ml/lit, Spinosad 45 SC @ 0.5ml/lit, Emamectin benzoate 5% SG @ 1gm/lit and untreated control, with three replications. The data recorded on larval population of pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) on third, seventh and fourteen days after two sprays revealed that Emamectin benzoate 5% SG was superior among all treatments with larval population of 2.12 and with highest cost benefit ratio and marketable yield of 1:3.65 and 29.16 q/ha, followed by Spinosad 45 SC with larval population of 2.42 and cost benefit ratio and yield 1:3.14 and 26.66 q/ha, Indoxacarb 14.5 SC with a larval population, cost benefit ratio and yield of 2.57, 1:3.12 and 25.83 q/ha, Profenofos 40% + Cypermethrin 4% EC with a larval population, cost benefit ratio and yield of 2.79, 1:2.81 and 22.5 q/ha, *Bacillus thuringiensis* @ 5mg/ml with larval population, cost benefit ratio and yield of 3.04, 1:2.79 and 21.25 q/ha, *Beauveria bassiana* @ 1×10^{10} conidia/ml with a larval population, cost benefit ratio and yield of 3.25, 1:2.26, 17.08 q/ha.

Keywords: Bio-

pesticides, Chickpea, Chemical, Cost benefit ratio, Efficacy, (*Helicoverpa armigera*), larval population, yield

Introduction

Gram, commonly known as a 'chickpea' or chana, is a very important pulse crop that grows as a seed of a plant named *Cicer arietinum* in the Leguminosae family. India is the largest chickpea producer as well as consumer in the world. Chickpea is the world's third most important legume crop. However, the most important chickpea producing countries are India, Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, Mexico, Australia, Ethiopia, Myanmar, and Canada. Chickpea is currently grown on about 11 million hectares worldwide with 65 and 8 per cent share belonging to India and Pakistan, respectively. Average annual production of chickpea is about

9 million tons with 95

percent of chickpea cultivation and consumption occurring in developing countries.

Chickpea is the most largely produced pulse crop in India accounting to a share of 68 to 70 percent of the total area (13.20 m ha), production of 11.62 mt and productivity of 995 kg/ha respectively, this makes India, the leading chickpea producing country in the world. Chickpea ranks third among the pulse crops and accounts for 11.67 million tons annually. This ranking places chickpea behind beans (25.66 million tons) and peas (11.69 million tons) with mean annual production of 11.67 million tons from 2013 to 2017 (Singh *et al.*, 2015).

Chickpea is attacked by 57 insect species, but (*Helicoverpa armigera*) (Hubner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), is the most important pest of chickpea (Sarwar, 2012). *H. armigera*, commonly known as cotton bollworm or American bollworm, is a major noctuid pest in Asia, causing heavy damage to agricultural, horticultural and ornamental crops (Talekar *et al.*, 2006).

H. armigera is the most serious pest of chickpea and other crop plants all over the world. In severe cases, it causes about 75 to 90 % losses in seed yield, and it was pointed out that gram pod borer damaged leaves, tender shoots, apical tips, floral buds and pods. Among these, the major damage is caused by gram pod borer which is polyphagous in nature; *Helicoverpa armigera* is one of the serious pests of chickpea, which feeds more than 150 crop plants throughout the world. Gram pod borer is widely distributed and a serious pest of chickpea causing heavy crop losses (20-

60%) throughout India. *Helicoverpa armigera* is the major and most devastating pest of chickpea which can cause crop loss up to 80 per cent under congenial weather conditions (Vikrant *et al.*, 2018). While the later instars make a more or less circular hole in the pods and insert its head and former portion of body into it and

is a charismatic and one of the most dominant insect pests in agriculture, accounting for half of the total insecticide usage in India for protection of crops. This pest damages the chickpea plants from seedling stage to crop maturity stage and its larvae can thrive on leaves, tender twigs, flowers and pods. In recent years, various types of insecticides belonging to different chemical groups have been used to manage the pests and excessive reliance on these chemicals has led to the problem of resistance, environmental pollution and health threat to the consumer thus it has become essential to use the insecticides in optimal dosages so as to reduce and control the damage to environment and human health as well as to reduce the pest incidence. Hence an investigation was undertaken to evaluate the performance of certain chemical insecticides and bio-pesticides at their recommended dosages against diamondback moth in cabbage.

Materials and methods

The experiment was conducted at the Central Research Farm, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, during the *Rabi* season of 2023-

24. The experiment was conducted in Randomized Block Design with eight treatments replicated three times. Variety PUSA 362 seeds were used in a plot size of 2m x 1m at the spacing of 45cm x 15cm, following a recommended package of practice excluding plant protection. The treatments were Neem oil 2% @ 2ml/lit, *Beauveria bassiana* 1×10^{10} conidia/ml @ 2gm/lit, Profenofos 40% + Cypermethrin 4%, @ 3ml/lit, *Bacillus thuringiensis* @ 2mg/lit, Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 0.5ml/lit, Spinosad 45 SC @ 0.5ml/lit, Emamectin benzoate 5% SG @ 1gm/lit.

The numbers of larvae were counted on 5 randomly selected plants in each plot. The pre-treatment count was taken a day before the first spray and second spray whereas, the post-treatment counts were taken on 3rd, 7th and 14th day after each spray. The larval population over control against gram pod borer was calculated by considering the mean of three observations of both sprays.

The insect population was counted from randomly selected plants in every plot and population per 5 plants was noted. After that mean of three replications was calculated for each treatment and the same was done with the untreated plot. Healthy pods were harvested and their weight from each treatment was expressed as marketable yield in quintal per hectare. Ultimately, the cost benefit ratio was calculated on the basis of prevailing market price of yield, insecticides and spraying cost (Devi and Tayde, 2017).

Gross return was calculated by multiplying total yield with the market price of the produce. Cost of cultivation and

and cost benefit ratio by following formula.

$$\text{Benefit Cost Ratio} = \frac{\text{Gross Returns}}{\text{Total Cost of Cultivation}}$$

(Thumaretal.,2020)

Result and discussion:

The data recorded after 1st and 2nd spray revealed that all the treatments were significantly superior over the control.

The data revealed that all the treatments were significantly superior over control after first spray. Among the different treatments least number of larval population of gram pod borer was recorded in Emamectin benzoate 5 SG (2.57 larvae per 5 plants), followed by Spinosad 45SC (2.79), Indoxacarb 14.5SC (2.90), Profenofos 40% + Cypermethrin 4% (3.08), *Bacillus thuringiensis* @ 5 mg/ml (3.33), and *Beauveria bassiana* @ 1×10^{10} conidia/ml (3.50), Neem oil 2% (3.88), was found to be least effective among all the treatments as compared to Control (5.11)

The data revealed that all the treatments were significantly superior over control after second spray. Among all the treatments the least larval population of pod borer, was recorded in Emamectin benzoate 5 SG (1.68), followed by Spinosad 45SC (2.06), Indoxacarb 14.5SC (2.24), Profenofos 40% + Cypermethrin 4% (2.50), *Bacillus thuringiensis* @ 5 mg/ml (2.75), and *Beauveria bassiana* @ 1×10^{10} /ml (3.00), Neem oil 2% (3.26) was found to be least effective among all the treatments as compared to Control (6.17).

The yields among the different treatment were significantly superior over control. The highest yield was recorded in Emamectin benzoate 5% (29.16 q/ha), followed by Spinosad (26.66 q/ha), Indoxacarb 14.5 SC (25.83 q/ha), Profenofos 40% + Cypermethrin 4% (22.5 q/ha), *Bacillus thuringiensis* (21.25 q/ha), and *Beauveria bassiana* (17.08 q/ha). The treatment Neem oil 2% (13.33 q/ha) was least effective among all the treatments as compared to Control (11.00 q/ha).

Among the different treatment studied, the best and most economical treatment found was Emamectin benzoate 5% with a cost benefit ratio of (1:3.65), followed by Spinosad 45 SC (1:3.14), Indoxacarb (1:3.12), Profenofos 40% + Cypermethrin 4% (1:2.81), *Bacillus thuringiensis* (1:2.79), and *Beauveria bassiana* (1:2.26), Neem oil 2% (1:1.76) recorded minimum cost benefit ratio among all the treatments as compared to Control (1:1.54).

Table1: Efficacy of selected chemicals and bio-pesticides against gram pod borer on chickpea during Rabi 2023-2024

Treatment	Treatment Details	Mean Larval Population										Yield (q/ha)	Benefit Cost Ratio
		First spray					Second spray						
		1DBS	3DAS	7DAS	14DAS	MEAN	1DBS	3DAS	7DAS	14DAS	MEAN		
T ₀	Control	4.60	5.00	5.13	5.20	5.11	5.11	5.60	6.53	6.40	6.17	11.00	1:1.54
T ₁	Neem oil 2% @ 2ml/lit	4.80	4.06	3.66	3.93	3.88	3.88	3.66	2.86	3.26	3.26	13.33	1:1.76
T ₂	<i>Beauveria bassiana</i> 1x10 ¹⁰ conidia/ml @ 2gm/lit	4.73	3.66	3.40	3.46	3.50	3.50	3.40	2.60	3.00	3.00	17.08	1:2.26
T ₃	Profenofos 40 % + Cypermethrin 4% EC @ 3ml/lit	4.93	3.20	2.93	3.13	3.08	3.08	3.00	2.06	2.46	2.50	22.50	1:2.81
T ₄	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i> @ 2gm/lit	4.80	3.60	3.13	3.26	3.33	3.33	3.20	2.33	2.73	2.75	21.25	1:2.79
T ₅	Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 0.5ml/lit	4.86	3.13	2.66	3.93	2.90	2.90	2.60	1.86	2.26	2.24	23.30	1:3.12
T ₆	Spinosad 45SC @ 0.5ml/lit	4.93	3.06	2.53	2.80	2.79	2.79	2.40	1.66	2.13	2.06	26.66	1:3.14
T ₇	Emamectin benzoate 5% SG @ 1gm/lit	5.06	2.80	2.33	2.60	2.57	2.57	2.20	1.20	1.66	1.68	29.16	1:3.65
	F-test	NS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	-	-
	C.D.(P=0.05)	-	0.381	0.111	0.224	0.204	0.204	0.177	0.255	0.22	0.569	-	-

*DBS - Day Before Spraying, DAS - Day After Spraying, NS - Non-Significant, S - Significant.

The data on mean population after first and second spray revealed that all the insecticides were found very effective and significantly superior over untreated control. Among all seven treatments minimum larval population was found in Emamectin benzoate 5% (2.12) similar findings were reported by (**Kambrekar et al., 2012**). Spinosad 45SC was found the next effective treatment with larval population (2.42) similar finding was reported by **Lavanya and Kumar (2022)** and **Gayathri and Kumar (2021)**. Indoxacarb 14.5S C (2.57), Profenofos 40% + Cypermethrin 4% was found the next best effective treatments with the larval population (2.79) which was similarly to the findings of (**Jadhav et al., 2021**). Among all the treatments the higher cost benefit ratio was obtained from Emamectin benzoate (1:3.65) which is in support to the findings of (**Shah et al., 2013**), (**Bharti et al., 2015**) followed by Spinosad 45SC with a cost benefit ratio of (1:3.14) similar finding was found by, (**Keval et al., 2016**) followed by Indoxacarb 14.5SC (1:3.12).

Conclusion

various types of insecticides belonging to different chemical groups have been used to manage the pests and excessive reliance on these chemicals has led to the problem of resistance, environmental pollution and health threat to the consumers thus it has become essential to use the insecticides in optimal dosage so as to reduce and control the damage to environment and human health as well as to reduce the pest incidence.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc. have been used during the writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

References

- Bajia, R. and Bairwa, B. (2015).** Eco-friendly Integrated Pest Management of Gram Podborer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) (Hübner) in Chickpea Ecosystem. *Popular Kheti*, **3**(1):70-72.
- Bharti, P., Singh, S.P.N. and Kumar, N. (2015).** Efficacy of some insecticides, bio-products and their phytotoxic effect against gram pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera* Hub.) in chickpea. *Current Biotica* **9**, 247–255.
- Chitralkha, G. S. and Verma, T. (2018).** Efficacy of insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* on chickpea. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, **6**(3):1058-1061.
- Devi, H.D. and Tayde, A.R. (2017).** Comparative Efficacy of Bio-Agents and Botanicals on the Management of Diamondback Moth (*Plutella xylostella* Linn.) on Cabbage under Allahabad Agroclimatic Conditions. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, **6**(7):711-716.
- Gayathri, L. and Kumar, A. (2021).** Field efficacy of certain insecticides against podborer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea in Prayagraj. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, **9**(3):280-283.
- Jadhav, K.U., Chavan, A.P., More, S.A., Kulkarni, S.R. and Karande, R.A. (2021).** To study the efficacy of molecule combinations against gram podborer (*Helicoverpa*

armigera Hubner) in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, **9**(6):164-170

Kambrekar, D. N., Somanagouda, G., Basavarajappa, M. P. and Halagalimath, S. P. (2012). Effect of different dosages of Emamectin benzoate 5SG and Indoxacarb 14.5SC on pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* infesting chickpea. *Legume Research-An International Journal*, **35**(1):13-17.

Keval, R., Yadav, A., Srivastava, C. P. and Kumar, R. (2016). Evaluation of certain newer insecticides against pod fly (*Melanagromyza obtusa*) and pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) on long duration pigeonpea. *Research on Crops*, **17**(1):129-133.

Lakshmikanth, R. and Kumar, A. (2018). Comparative efficacy of selected chemicals and Biopesticides against gram pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner)] (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on cowpea [*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.]. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, **7**(3):3307-3309.

Lavanya, V. and Kumar, A. (2022). Efficacy of certain chemicals against gram pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner)] on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *The Pharma Innovation Journal*; **11**(3):1293-1297.

Nithish, A., Joshi, B., Jayaram, C. S. and Kariyanna, B. (2015). Bio-efficacy of Some Newer Insecticides against Gram Pod Borer (*Helicoverpa armigera*) in Pigeonpea under Field Conditions. *Research Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, **6**(3):563-566.

Santhosh, K. and Kumar, A. (2022). Comparative efficacy of selected insecticides and neem products against chickpea pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner)]. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. **11**(6):1558-1562.

Sarwar, M. (2012). Competency of natural and synthetic chemicals in controlling gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea crop. *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, **2**(4):132-135.

- Shah, J. A., Inayatullah, M., Sohail, K., Shah, S. F., Shah, S., Iqbal, T. and Usman, M. (2013).** Efficacy of botanical extracts and chemical pesticide against tomato fruitworm, *Helicoverpa armigera*. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*, **29**(1):93-96.
- Singh, P., Singh, R., Kumar, S., Kumar, V. and Kumar, S. (2015).** Bio-efficacy of certain new insecticides against larval population of gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) in chickpea. *The Ecoscan*, **7**:315-318.
- Talekar, N. S., Opena, R. T., and Hanson, P. (2006).** *Helicoverpa armigera* management: a review of AVRDC's research on host plant resistance in tomato. *Crop Protection*, **5**:461-467.
- Thumar, R. K., Zala, M. B., Varma, H. S., Dhobi, C. B., Patel, B. N., Patel, M. B. and Borad, P. K. (2020).** Evaluation of insecticides against fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J. E. Smith) infesting maize. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*, **8**(4):100-104.
- Vijaykumar, L., Anusha, S. B., Ashwini, S. B. and Divya, B. (2022).** Bio-efficacy of *Beauveria bassiana* against gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* Hubner (Noctuidae: Lepidoptera) in chickpea. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, **11**(2):197-201.
- Vikrant, D. R. S., Kumar, S., Kishor, K. and Kewal, R. (2018).** Bio-efficacy of insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* in Chickpea. *Legume Research*, LR-3960 [1-6].
- Yadav, R. K., Chandra, U., Veer, R., Raj, A., Gautam, C. P. N., Kumar, S. and Singh, G. (2019).** Relative efficacy of newer insecticides against gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera*. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, **8**(4):599-601.