

Efficacy of various insecticides against leaf folder *Cnaphalocrocis medinalis* (Guenee) in rice and the calculation of the benefit-cost ratio

ABSTRACT:

The present investigation was conducted at HeeraPuri research field, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Sciences, DeenDayalUpadhyaya Gorakhpur University, Gorakhpur during *Kharif*, 2023. The relative effectiveness of six insecticides viz., Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC, Chlorpyrifos 20 EC, Acephate 95 SC, Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC, Fipronil 5 SC, Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP and Control. The study revealed that the treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC, and Fipronil 5 SC whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot. The significantly higher grain yield was obtained in Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC treated plots which are followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml/l, Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP, Acephate 95 SC and Chlorpyrifos 20 EC. The highest increase in yield over control was reported in the plot treated with Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml/l, Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP, Acephate 95 SC, and Chlorpyrifos 20 EC. The economics of various treatments based on net profit and cost of plant protection revealed that the highest cost: benefit ratio of Chlorpyrifos 20 EC was followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC, followed by Acephate 95 SC, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml/l and the lowest benefit-cost ratio was reported in plots treated with Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP.

Keywords: Bio efficacy, rice, *Oryza sativa*, leaf folder, BC Ratio, Gorakhpur, Eastern Uttar Pradesh

1. INTRODUCTION

Rice, *Oryza sativa* L. is an important cereal crop of the world, known as the king of cereals, and forms the staple food crop for more than two-thirds of the population of India and more than 65 percent of the world population (Mathur *et al.*, 1999, Islamet *et al.*, 2022). The slogan "Rice is life" is the most important for India as this crop plays a vital role in our national food security and is a means of livelihood for millions of rural households (Leihaothabamet *et al.*, 2020, Alamet *et al.*, 2022). Decreases in rice yields have been attributed to a number of several biotic and abiotic factors. Insects, mites, and nematode pests are the key biotic stresses limiting rice production in India (Prakash *et al.*, 2006). The annual yield loss due to insect pests in India varies from 21 to 51 percent (Singh and Dhaliwal, 1994), and in the world, it varies from 26 to 34 percent (Widowsky and Toole, 1996). About 1,000 species of invertebrate pests have been reported to infest rice in fields of which one dozen species cause significant economic losses in Asian countries (Behera *et al.*, 2013) including the yellow stem borer, *Scirpophaga incertulas* (Walker), leaf folder, *Cnaphalocrocis medinalis* (Guenee), brown plant hopper, *Nilaparvatalugens* (Stal.), green leaf hopper, *Nephotettix virescens* (Distant) and Asian rice gall midge, *Orseolia oryzae* (Wood-Mason) (Singh and Singh, 2014). The crop growth period between 30-60 days after transplanting was the most vulnerable resulting in major yield losses (20- 68%) mainly due to stem borer, gall midge, leaf folder, and brown plant hopper. Beyond 60 days from transplanting, the crop damage is inflicted by stem borer and leaf folder causing 10 to 48% damage (Krishnaiah and Varma, 2011). The rice leaf folder acquired the status of a major pest throughout the world's tropical and subtropical rice-growing countries in the last three decades (Teng *et al.*, 1993). The shift from minor to major pest status has been attributed to the adoption of new rice-growing practices that accompanied the introduction of high-yielding varieties (Kulshreshtha *et al.*, 1970; Litsinger, 1989). These practices included increased cropping intensity, irrigation and a high input of nitrogenous fertilizers and pesticides (Loevinsohn *et al.*, 1988). A large number of field trials, however, have shown that increasing nitrogenous fertilization usually leads to higher leaf folder injury levels (Dale, 1994).

Leaf folder infestation usually occurs during the late growth stages of rice crops. It inflicts the crop in vegetative and heading stages (Prasad *et al.*, 2004). It damages the crop in its larval stage. Maximum damage to rice crops by the folder is caused by to reduction in the photosynthetic area of the flag leaf in the heading stage (Murugesan and Chelliah, 1983). In severely affected the crop gives a scorched whitish appearance to infested plants and consequently drying of leaves (Kulshrestha, 1973). Leaf folder damage can be observed at any stage of crop growth but is generally conspicuous during active tillering to the booting stage (Khan *et al.*, 1988; Krishnaiah and Varma, 2011). Each larva is capable of destroying several leaves by its feeding (Upadhyay *et al.*, 1975). A ten

Formatted: Justified

Comment [BK1]: check

Comment [BK2]: check

Comment [BK3]: check

Comment [BK4]: add conclusion line

Comment [BK5]: check research hypothesis with reserach objectives

percent increase in flag leaf damage by the leaf folder reduces grain yield by 0.13 g per tiller and reduces the number of filled grains by 4.5 percent (Murugesan and Chelliah, 1987). The peak incidence of rice leaf folder occurred in mid-September when the crop was at the panicle emergence stage (Qadeer *et al.*, 1988). High humidity and optimum temperature appeared to be important factors in increasing the population of the pest (Pathak, 1968). Application of high levels of nitrogen coupled with cloudy weather and low sunlight favours pest build-up.

Comment [BK6]: add research objectives

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted in the HeeraPuri research field, DeenDayal Upadhyaya Gorakhpur University during the kharif 2023 in randomized block design (RBD) with 7 treatments including control replicated thrice. The insecticide treatments include T1: Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC, T2: Chlorpyrifos 20 EC, T3: Acephate 95 SC, T4: Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC, T5: Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹, T6: Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP, T7 Control. The variety Samba Mahsuri (BPT-5204) was grown in a plot size of 3x4 m with spacing of 20x20 cm with a recommended package of practices excluding plant protection. Spraying was given by using a hand compression knapsack high-volume sprayer during morning hours. The required spray fluid per plot is one [litre](#). The plot in each treatment was sprayed with respective insecticides ensuring uniform coverage of insecticide. The treatments were imposed as and when the pest reached ETL. The data was recorded on the percent leaf damage by leaf folder in 10 randomly selected hills from each plot recorded one day before the application of treatments and 2, 7 and 10 DAS (Days After Spray). These percentages were transformed to the corresponding values and subjected to ANOVA and those mean values were compared by using the Least significant difference (LSD). The percent reduction of leaf folder damage over control at each count was also calculated by using Abott's formula as given by Fleming and Retnakaran (1985).

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The field bio-efficacy of certain insecticides against the leaf folder of rice during *Kharif* 2016 was assessed. The crop received two sprays during the crop period according to the ETL level of the pest population. The pretreatment data was recorded one day before spraying and the post-treatment data on the 3rd, 7th and 10th day after each spray. The mean reduction in the population was calculated for analysis. The pre-treatment observation showed that the percentage of leaf infestation varied from 14.46 to 14.58 per plant. This indicated that there were no significant variations across the treatments, suggesting that the pest infestation on the crop under study was relatively similar. The data presented in Table 1 and Fig. 1 revealed that three days after treatment, all the treatments were found significantly superior over the control (untreated) against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice. The treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 7.36 percent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 7.59 percent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (8.36 percent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (8.49 percent), Acephate 95 SC (11.39 percent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (11.42 percent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 15.47 percent infestation. The data presented in Table 1 and Fig. 1 revealed that seven days after treatment, all the treatments were found significantly superior over the control (untreated) against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice. The treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 5.33 percent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 6.53 percent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (7.08 percent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (7.76 percent), Acephate 95 SC (8.39 percent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (9.89 percent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 15.97 percent infestation. The data presented in Table 1 and Fig. 1 revealed that ten days after treatment, all the treatments were found significantly superior over the control (untreated) against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice. The treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 4.45 percent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 5.26 percent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (6.23 percent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (6.91 percent), Acephate 95 SC (8.47 percent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (8.71 percent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 22.15 percent infestation. The mean data presented in Table 3 and Fig. 3 revealed all the treatments were found significantly superior over the control (untreated) against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice. The treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 5.71 percent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 6.46 percent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (7.22 percent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (7.72 per cent), Acephate 95 SC (9.42 per cent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (10.01 per cent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 17.86 per cent

infestation. The data presented in Table 2 and Fig. 2 revealed that three days after the second treatment, all the treatments were found significantly superior over the control (untreated) against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice. The treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 6.68 per cent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 9.72 per cent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (10.44 per cent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (10.65 per cent), Acephate 95 SC (11.55 per cent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (11.75 per cent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 13.61 per cent infestation. The data presented in Table 2 and Fig. 2 revealed that seven days after treatment, all the treatments were found significantly superior over the control (untreated) against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice. The treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 4.97 per cent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 6.89 per cent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (7.53 per cent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (7.82 per cent), Acephate 95 SC (8.11 per cent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (9.85 per cent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 14.53 per cent infestation. The data presented in Table 2 and Fig. 2 revealed that ten days after treatment, all the treatments were found significantly superior over the control (untreated) against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice. The treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 3.51 per cent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 4.95 per cent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (6.11 per cent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (6.45 per cent), Acephate 95 SC (8.01 per cent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (8.56 per cent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 12.16 per cent infestation. The mean data presented in Table 3 and Fig. 3, revealed all the treatments were found significantly superior over the control (untreated) against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice. The treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 5.05 per cent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 7.19 per cent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (8.03 per cent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (8.31 per cent), Acephate 95 SC (9.22 per cent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (10.05 per cent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 13.43 per cent infestation. The overall mean data of both the sprays revealed that the treatment Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC was found most effective with a minimum infestation of 5.38 per cent followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC which registered 6.82 per cent infestation, Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (7.63 per cent), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (8.01 per cent), Acephate 95 SC (9.32 per cent), Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (10.03 per cent) whereas the highest infestation was recorded in the control plot with 15.65 per cent infestation. The superiority of flubendiamide conformed with the findings of Raju *et al.*, 2018, who reported a 3.69 per cent reduction in population. Similarly, Misra (2008) reported a 69.65 per cent reduction in the population over control and a lower leaf folder incidence (1.43 %) with flubendiamide @ 25g a.i/ha 10 days after spray. Similarly, Sekhet *et al.* (2007) also recorded that the number of leaf folder-damaged leaves was reduced with flubendiamide @ 24 and 30 g a.i/ha (1.66 and 0.7/ hill). Javaregowda and Krishna Naik (2005) stated that flubendiamide @ 25 and 50 g a.i/ha was effective against leaf folder with 0.61 and 0.44 leaf folder damaged leaves per hill at 7 days after spray, respectively. The cumulative yield data revealed that the grain production gradually increased when the rice leaf folder was treated with different insecticides and marketable grain yield ranged from 52.24 to 59.87 q per ha. in contrast to the untreated plot, which produced the lowest fruit yield of 45.56 q per ha. The significantly higher grain yield (59.87 q per ha) was obtained in Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC treated plots which are followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (58.12 q per ha), Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (56.21 q per ha), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (54.26 q per ha), Acephate 95 SC (53.21 q per ha) and Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (52.24 q per ha) (Table 4 & Figure 4). The increase in yield percentage over control ranged between 14.66 to 31.41. The highest increase in yield over control was reported in plot treated with Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC (31.41) followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (27.57), Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (23.38), Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (19.10), Acephate 95 SC (16.79) and Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (14.66) (Table 4). The economics of various treatments based on net profit and cost of plant protection (Table 5) revealed that the highest cost: benefit ratio is Chlorpyrifos 20 EC (9.76) followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (8.74), followed by Acephate 95 SC (7.17), Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml⁻¹ (6.68) and the lowest benefit-cost ratio was reported in plots treated with Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP (6.20). The highest B: C ratio of Chlorpyrifos 20 EC may be due to its low price and dose concentration.

Comment [BK7]: recheck this paragraph

Table 1. Efficacy of different treatments against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice 1st spray during Kharif, 2023.

S.no	Treatment	Dose	Percentage infestation of leaf folder in rice				
			Before one day of spray	After 3 days of spray	After 7 days of spray	7 days of spray	After 10 days of spray
T1	Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC	0.20 ml/l	14.52 (3.93)	7.36 (2.89)	5.33 (2.51)	4.45 (2.33)	
T2	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	5%	14.58 (3.94)	11.42 (3.52)	9.89 (3.29)	8.71 (3.11)	
T3	Acephate 95 SC	0.5g/l	14.52 (3.93)	11.39 (3.53)	8.39 (3.06)	8.47 (3.077)	
T4	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	3%	14.46 (3.93)	7.59 (2.93)	6.53 (2.74)	5.26 (2.50)	
T5	Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml -l	5ml/l	14.48 (3.93)	8.36 (3.06)	7.08 (2.84)	6.23 (2.68)	
T6	Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP	0.4g/l	14.55 (3.93)	8.49 (3.08)	7.76 (2.96)	6.91 (2.81)	
T7	Control	Water	14.56 (3.94)	15.47 (4.05)	15.97 (4.11)	22.15 (4.81)	
SE +- C.D.9P=0.05)			0.004 NA	0.005 0.016	0.006 0.017	0.006 0.019	

Formatted Table

Table 2 Efficacy of different insecticides against leaf folder leaf infestation in rice 2nd spray

S.no	Treatments	Percentage infestation of leaf folder in rice		
		3 days after the spray	7 days after the spray	10 days after the spray
T1	Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC	6.68 (2.77)	4.97 (2.44)	3.51 (2.12)
T2	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	11.75 (3.57)	9.85 (3.29)	8.56 (3.09)
T3	Acephate 95 SC	11.55 (3.54)	8.11 (3.018)	8.01 (3.02)
T4	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	9.72 (3.27)	6.89 (2.809)	4.95 (2.43)
T5	Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml -l	10.44 (3.83)	7.53 (2.921)	6.11 (2.66)
T6	Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP	10.65 (3.41)	7.82 (2.970)	6.45 (2.72)
T7	Control	13.61 (3.82)	14.53 (3.940)	12.16 (3.62)
SE +- C.D.9P=0.05)		0.006 0.020	0.007 0.023	0.005 0.015

Formatted Table

Table 3 Efficacy of different insecticides against leaf folder leaf infestation

S. No	Treatment	Dose	1 st spray mean	2 nd spray mean	Overall mean
T1	Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC	0.20 ml/l	5.71	5.05	5.38
T2	Chlorpyrifos 20 EC	5%	10.01	10.05	10.03
T3	Acephate 95 SC	0.5g/l	9.42	9.22	9.32

Formatted Table


T4	Chlorantraniliprole SC	18.5	3%	6.46	7.19	6.82
T5	Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml ⁻¹		5ml/l	7.22	8.03	7.63
T6	Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP		0.4g/l	7.72	8.31	8.01
T7	Control		Water	17.86	13.43	15.65

Table 4. Influence of various insecticide treatments on rice yield and increase in yield (%) compared to control

Number	Treatment	Yield	Increase in percentage over control
T 1	Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC	59.87	31.41
T 2	Chlorpyriphos 20 EC	52.24	14.66
T 3	Acephate 95 SC	53.21	16.79
T 4	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	58.12	27.57
T 5	Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml ⁻¹	56.21	23.38
T 6	Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP	54.26	19.10
T 7	Control	45.56	0.00


Table 5. Economics of different insecticides against rice leaf folder

S.No.	Treatment	Yield(q/ha)	Insecticide Cost	Total cost of Plant Protection	Gross Income	Net Income	Benefit over control	B:C ratio
1	Flubendiamide 39.35 % SC	59.87	4110	5010	125128.3	120118.3	24897.9	4.97
2	Chlorpyriphos 20 EC	52.24	398	1298	109181.6	107883.6	12663.2	9.76
3	Acephate 95 SC	53.21	1057	1957	111208.9	109251.9	14031.5	7.17
4	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	58.12	1795	2695	121470.8	118775.8	23555.4	8.74
5	Fipronil 5 SC @ 1.2 ml ⁻¹	56.21	2000	2900	117478.9	114578.9	19358.5	6.68
6	Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP	54.26	1625	2525	113403.4	110878.4	15658	6.20
7	Control	45.56			95220.4	95220.4		




Comment [BK8]: add error ber and letting

Comment [BK9]: add error ber and letting



Comment [BK10]: add error ber and letting






Fig 4. Impact of various treatments on Yield (q/ha).

Comment [BK11]: add error bar and lettering

4. Conclusion

The study investigated the field bio-efficacy of various insecticides against the leaf folder pest in rice during the Kharif season of 2016. Flubendiamide 39.35% SC emerged as the most effective treatment, followed by Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC, Fipronil 5 SC, Cartap hydrochloride 50% SP, Acephate 95 SC, and Chlorpyrifos 20 EC. These treatments significantly reduced leaf folder infestation compared to the control plot, with the mean reduction in leaf folder population ranging from 5.38% to 15.65% across treatments. Consequently, Flubendiamide 39.35% SC resulted in the highest grain yield (59.87 q/ha), followed by other treatments, with the increase in yield percentage over control ranging from 14.66% to 31.41%. The economic analysis revealed that Chlorpyrifos 20 EC had the highest cost-benefit ratio (9.76), followed by other treatments. Overall, Flubendiamide 39.35% SC proved to be a viable option for managing leaf folders in rice crops, offering effective pest control and higher grain yield.

REFERENCES

- Alam F, Rahman GMM, Wadud MA, Islam ATMM, Dutta S, and Khan AU. Effects of Tree Leaf Biomass on the Yield and its Yield Contributing Characters of Hybrid Rice. *Bangladesh Journal of Agriculture*. 2022;47(2):44-52 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3329/bjagri.v47i2.63325>.
- Behera KS, Jena M, Dhua U, Prakash A. Emerging insect pests and diseases of rice under various rice ecosystems. *Innovations in Rice Production*. 2013;93-103.
- Fleming R, Retnakaran A. Evaluating single treatment data using Abbott's formula with reference to insecticides. *J Econ Entomol*. 1985;78(6):1179-1181.
- Islam ATMM, GMM, Wadud MA, Alam F, Ahmad F, and Khan AU. Effect of Tree Leaf Biomass on SQR6r6 Hybrid Rice in Agroforestry System. *Bangladesh Journal of Agriculture*; 2022;47(2):133-142. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3329/bjagri.v47i2.63332>.
- Javearegowda, Krishna Naik L. Bio efficacy of fluid end amide 20 WDG (RIL 038) against paddy pests and their natural enemies. *Pestology*. 2005;29(11):58-60.
- Khan ZR, Barrion AT, Litsinger JA, Castilla NP, Joshi RC. A bibliography of rice leaf folders. *Int J Trop Insect Sci*. 1988;9(2):129-174.

- Krishnaiah K, Varma NRG. Changing insect pest scenario in the rice ecosystem - A national perspective. *Rice Knowledge Management*. 2011;1-28.
- Kulshreshtha JP, Kalode MB, Prakasa RPS, Misra BC, Vama A. High yielding varieties and the resulting changes in the pattern of rice pests in India. *Oryza*. 1970;7:61-64.
- Leihaothabam NS, Singh AT, Stina K, Singh MS, Singh RS, Vivekananda Y, et al. Study on training needs assessment of rice growing farmers in Imphal East district, Manipur, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2020;9(3):66-74.
- Mathur KC, Reddy PR, Rajamali S, Moorthy BTS. Integrated pest management of rice to improve productivity and sustainability. *Oryza*. 1999;36(3):195-207.
- Misra HP. Management of the rice leaf folder, *Cnaphalocrocismedinalis* Guenee by newer insecticides. *Oryza*. 2008;45(3):252-254.
- Murugesan S, Chelliah S. Yield losses and economic injury by leaf folder. *Indian J Agric Sci*. 1987;56(4):282-285.
- Pathak MD. Ecology of common insect pests of rice. *Annual Review of Entomology*. 1968;13:257-294.
- Prakash A, Rao J, Rath PC, Behera KS. Pests of rice. *Indian Farm*. 2006;56(7):4-9.
- Qadeer GA, Arya SP, Tomer OS. Leaf folder (LF) outbreak in Haryana. *Int Rice Res Newsl*. 1988;13(3):38.
- Raju KA, Krishnayya PV, Kumar DSR, Krishnaveni B, Kumar VM. Evaluation of certain newer insecticides against Rice leaf folder, (*Cnaphalocrocismedinalis*) Guenee (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae). *Andhra Agric J*. 2018;65(1):132-137.
- Sekh K, Nair N, Gosh SK, Somchoudhury AK. Evaluation of flubendiamide 480 SC (NN-0001) against stemborer and leaf folder of rice and effects on their natural enemies. *Pestology*. 2007;31(1):32-34.
- Singh BB, Singh R. Major rice insect pests in Northeastern UP. *Int J Life Sci Biotechnol Pharma Res*. 2014;1(3):124-143.
- Teng PS, Heong KL, Keith M. Advances in tropical rice pest management research. In: Muralidharan K, Siddiq EA, editors. *New frontiers in rice research*. Directorate of Rice Research; 1993. p. 255.
- Upadhyay VR, Desai ND, Shah AH. Extent of damage and varietal susceptibility by rice leaf folder, *Cnaphalocrocismedinalis* (Guenee) (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) in Gujarat. *Pesticides*. 1975;8(10):27-28.
- Widowsky DA, Toole JC. Prioritization of rice research agenda for Eastern India. In: Evenson RE, Herdt RW, Hussain M, editors. *Rice research in Asia: Progress and priorities*. International Rice Research Institute; 1996. p. 109-129.