

Spinetoram 6% + Methoxyfenozide 30% premix insecticidal action against non-target insects in pigeonpea

Abstract

The present study was conducted to investigate the efficacy of premix formulation of spinetoram and methoxyfenozide towards predatory insects viz., coccinellids and spiders. Many insecticides have been evaluated against these pests without considering the specificity to manage these pests besides increasing residues, environment hazards and toxic to non-target organisms. An experiment was conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Virinjipuram, Vellore during 2019-20 and 2020-21 to study the bioefficacy of premix formulation of (spinetoram 6% + methoxyfenozide 30%) to gram podborer, *H. armigera* and spotted podborer, *M. vitrata* in pigeonpea and its safety to natural enemies viz., coccinellids and spiders, along with phytotoxicity studies. Analysis is performed using R 3.2.1 and Box-Cox method is applied to determine the transformation function when needed, Residual Vs fitted value plots and Q-Q plots were checked to ensure the Equal variance and normality assumptions are satisfied. There was a significant difference in the population of natural enemies among the treatments, none of the treatments were reported with zero occurrence of natural enemies which is toxic to non-target organisms and there was an increase in the population of natural enemies in treated as well as untreated plots gradually with respect to increase in the host population.

Key words: Premix formulation, Spinetoram + methoxyfenozide, safety, coccinellids, spiders

INTRODUCTION

Pigeonpea or Red gram (*Cajanus cajan* L.) is one of the most important grain legume crops of tropical and subtropical countries. India is the world's largest producer and consumer of pulses including pigeonpea. About 90 % of the global area is in India (4.9 million ha.) and contributing 93 % of the global production (Anonymous, 2011). About 250 insect species have been found to infest from seedling to harvest in pigeonpea. Among all, the podborer complex is reported to reduce the yield up to 27.77 per cent (Sahoo *et al.*, 2002). Many insecticides have been evaluated against these pests without considering the specificity to manage these pests besides increasing residues, environment hazards and toxic to non-target organisms. Therefore, keeping these views in mind, present study was also conducted the efficacy of premix formulation of spinetoram and methoxyfenozide towards predatory insects viz., coccinellids and spiders.

Comment [Onyeka Nw1]: Your abstract is showing that the study considered the insecticidal action against both target and non-target. Please if this is right, I may suggest a better title to be - " The Insecticidal Action of the Premix Formulation of Spinetoram and Methoxyfenoside against Target and Non-target Insects of Pigeonpea".

Comment [Onyeka Nw2]: italicize

Comment [Onyeka Nw3]: italicize

Comment [Onyeka Nw4]: The abstract is not convincing and it is also confusing. it lacks the sharp information needed by any reader. Please rearrange the abstract by starting with a sentence introduction of what resulted to the study, followed by the aim of the study, then the methodologies used, then the results (the results you stated are not clear enough), then concluding statement. Please re-write your Abstract to clearly show your study.

Comment [Onyeka Nw5]: what is this? it's not a keyword. kindly separate. Mention them separately as keywords.

Comment [Onyeka Nw6]: Please write enough background on the aspects of your study. The introduction here did not say much. It is quite below a work that should be published in a journal.

You haven't said anything in the Introduction. Explore your Introduction. What are the pests of Pigeonpea, what are the economic implications, what insecticides have been used, what are the implications of Spinetoram and Methoxyfenozide, why the formulation of both. Reference studies in this area etc.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Your introduction should be able to lay a good background on your research study.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Comment [Onyeka Nw7]: Arrange your Methodology well. Check the statement below the material and method for guide.

An experiment was conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Virinjipuram, Vellore during 2019-20 and 2020-21 to study the bioefficacy of premix formulation of (spinetoram 6% + methoxyfenozide 30%) to gram podborer, *H. armigera* and spotted podborer, *M. vitrata* in pigeonpea and its safety to natural enemies *viz.*, coccinellids and spiders, along with phytotoxicity studies. CO 7 variety was sown during late *kharif* season in a plot size of 5 m x 4 m with 45 cm (R-R) and 30 cm (P-P) spacing. An experiment was laid out in randomized block design (RBD) with three replications and eight treatments. Three doses of (spinetoram 6% + methoxyfenozide 30%) combinations (350, 375 & 400 ml ha⁻¹) along with single dose of their individual components *viz.*, spinetoram 12% (200 ml ha⁻¹) and methoxyfenozide 24% (517 ml ha⁻¹), emamectin benzoate 5% (220 g ha⁻¹) and Spinosad 45% (162 ml ha⁻¹) were sprayed to assess its efficacy against podborers. During the cropping season, two rounds of spraying were applied, the first round was applied at 50% flowering, and the second round was applied at intervals of 15 days using a knapsack sprayer and 500 litres of spray fluid per hectare

Comment [Onyeka Nw8]: please stop using "viz"

Impact on natural enemies of combinations (350, 375, and 400 ml) of (spinetoram 6% + methoxyfenozide 30%) was also studied to know its safety nature. The number of coccinellids and spiders from ten randomly selected plants from each plot was counted before application (pre-treatment) and again at 1, 3, 7, and 10 days after spraying (DAS) was observed. Data from multiple trial is analyzed using Linear mixed model with treatment as fixed factor and trial and rep as random factor and all Pair wise comparison of treatments was done using Turkey adjustment at significance level of 0.05 (Alpha). Analysis is performed using R 3.2.1 and Box-Cox method is applied to determine the transformation function when needed, Residual Vs fitted value plots and Q-Q plots were checked to ensure the Equal variance and normality assumptions are satisfied.

Your Methodology should be arranged properly with sub-titles for clarity and better understanding. There should be sub-titles like Site of Experiment, Collection of Insects, Experimental Design, Formulation of Doses, Assessment of Insecticidal Action, etc. Make sure the Statistical Analysis Method used is mentioned too.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Prior to the application of treatments, the adult population of coccinellids and pre-count non-target grubs varied throughout all experimental plots, ranging from 1.1 to 4.0. Ten days following the initial application, the population in T₈: untreated was 3.1, then T₇: spinosad 45% @ 162 ml ha⁻¹ (2.1), T₆: emamectin benzoate 5% @ 220 g ha⁻¹ (1.8), and T₁ & T₂: spinetoram 6% w/v (5.66% w/w) + methoxyfenozide 30% w/v @ 350 & 375 ml ha⁻¹ (1.8) and T₃: spinetoram 6% w/v (5.66% w/w) + methoxyfenozide 30% w/v @ 400 ml ha⁻¹ (1.7). Following a second application, reports of the same trend of population safety for coccinellids were made (Table 1 & Figure 1)

Prior to the application of treatments, the pre-count non-target spider population in each of the experimental plots varied from 0.7 to 1.3. No discernible variation exists between the treatments. Ten days following the initial application, the population in T₈: untreated was 2.7, followed by T₅: methoxyfenozide 24% @ 517 ml ha⁻¹ (1.9), T₇: spinosad 45% @ 162 ml ha⁻¹ (1.6) and T₆: emamectin benzoate 5% @ 220 g ha⁻¹ (1.2). Additionally, T₁: spinetoram 6% w/v (5.66% w/w) + methoxyfenozide 30% w/v @ 350 ml ha⁻¹ (1.0) and T₂ & T₃: spinetoram 6% w/v (5.66% w/w) + methoxyfenozide 30% w/v @ 375 & 400 ml ha⁻¹ (0.3 & 0.4, respectively). Following a second application, reports of the same trend of population safety for coccinellids were made (Table 2 & Figure 2). Even though, there was a significant difference in the population of natural enemies among the treatments, none of the treatments were reported with zero occurrence of natural enemies which is toxic to non-target organisms and there was an increase in the population of natural enemies in treated as well as untreated plots gradually with respect to increase in the host population.

Individual insecticidal activity of methoxyfenozide is highly specific to lepidopteran pests but has a low toxicity towards other insect orders (Smagheet *al.*, 2003). Safety of methoxyfenozide 24 SC was reported by Pavviya and Muthukrishnan (2017) with maximum population of coccinellids in untreated check followed by methoxyfenozide @ 180 and 210 g.a.i/ha with 2.9 and 2.8 no.s /plant, respectively. Methoxyfenozide appears to be safer for

Comment [Onyeka Nw9]: The results are not well discussed. What are the implications of the result, are there comparison with any similar studies, what may be the causes of your results, what are the recommendations arising from your results. please discuss your results deeply.

beneficial organisms than conventional products was reported by Medina *et al.*, 2004; Schneider *et al.*, 2004 and Baur *et al.*, 2003. With so many benefits, premix formulation insecticides aid in improved target toxicity, safety against natural enemies, environmental friendliness, and a low rate of target organism resistance development.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 2011. NICRA team of pigeonpea pest surveillance, Manual for pigeonpea pest surveillance published by National centre for Integrated pest management, New Delhi and Central Research Institute for dryland Agriculture and Indian Institute of Pulses Research, Kanpur. Pp29
- Baur, M.E., Ellis, J., Hutchinson. K and Boethel., D.J. 2003. Contact toxicity of selective insecticides for non-target predaceous hemipterans in soybeans. *J. Econ. Entomol.***38**: 269-277
- Medina, P., Budia, F., Del Estal, P. and Vinuela, E. 2004. Influence of azadirachtin, a botanical insecticide on *Chrysoperla carnea* reproduction: toxicity and ultrastructural approach. *J. Econ. Entomol.***97**: 43-50
- Pavviya, A. and Muthukrishnan, N. 2017. Field evaluation of methoxyfenozide 24 SC against leaf miner, *Aproaerema modicella* (Deventer) and its effect on predatory coccinellids of groundnut. *Legume Research*, 40 (5): 949-957.
- Sahoo, B.K., Patnaik, H.P and Mishra, B.K. 2002. Field screening of early maturing pigeonpea cultivars against the podborers in Orissa. *Indian Journal of Plant Protection*, **30**: 13-15.
- Schneider, M.I. Smagghe, G., Pineda, S. and Vinuela, E. 2004. Action of insect growth regulators and Spinosad on life history parameters and absorption in third-instar larvae of the end parasitoid *Hyposoter didymator*, *Biocontrol*. **31**:189-198.
- Smagghe, G., Pineda, S., Carto, B., Del, E.P., Budha, F and Vinuela, E. 2003. Toxicity and kinetics of methoxyfenozide in greenhouse selected *Spodoptera exigua* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), *Pest Manag.Sci.* **59**: 1203-1209.

Comment [Onyeka Nw10]: For this study, your references is very poor and small. there suppose to be enough references. This is because you failed to extensively introduce your study, your Methodology, your result discussion.

The research study is very significant to the scientific world but it is very poorly presented for publication. A thorough major revision should be done using the guides provided in this review

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 1. Effect of Spinetoram 6% w/v (5.66% w/w) + Methoxyfenozide 30% w/v (28.33% w/w) on coccinellids

Natural Enemies	Application	Treatment Evaluation Interval	T _{1,3} : Spinetoram+Methoxyfenozide						T ₄ : Spinetoram		T ₅ : Methoxyfenozide		T ₆ : Emamectin benzoate		T ₇ : Spinosad		T ₈ : Untreated check
			350 ml ha ⁻¹		375 ml ha ⁻¹		400 ml ha ⁻¹		200 ml ha ⁻¹		517 ml ha ⁻¹		220 g ha ⁻¹		162 ml ha ⁻¹		Count
			Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count
		Precount	1.2 ^a	6.5	1.2 ^a	7.2	1.2 ^a	15.7	0.7 ^a	40.0	1.3 ^a	6.9	1.2 ^a	7.2	0.8 ^a	38.4	1.3 ^a
		1DAS	0.9 ^{ab}	57.5	0.4 ^a	69.9	0.4 ^{ab}	75.0	1.1 ^{abc}	55.7	1.3 ^{bc}	45.4	0.8 ^{ab}	60.8	1.1 ^{abc}	56.0	2.8 ^c
		3DAS	0.7 ^{abc}	76.2	0.3 ^a	89.0	0.4 ^{ab}	85.8	1.3 ^c	54.0	1.6 ^c	47.4	1.0 ^{bc}	66.0	1.1 ^c	61.6	2.9 ^d
		7DAS	1.5 ^{ab}	40.6	1.1 ^a	58.6	0.9 ^a	62.6	1.9 ^b	22.4	2.0 ^b	25.8	2.7 ^b	14.2	2.1 ^b	18.9	2.6 ^b
		10DAS	1.0 ^b	61.3	0.3 ^a	88.7	0.4 ^a	86.4	1.3 ^{bc}	50.5	1.9 ^{cd}	30.8	1.2 ^{bc}	55.3	1.6 ^{bcd}	42.1	2.7 ^d
		Precount	2.4 ^{ab}	63.1	2.1 ^a	68.0	2.5 ^{ab}	62.6	2.2 ^a	67.4	3.2 ^{bc}	51.6	4.1 ^c	38.9	4.1 ^c	38.8	6.7 ^d
		1DAS	0.8 ^{bc}	57.7	0.3 ^a	82.9	0.4 ^{ab}	76.5	1.4 ^{de}	14.9	1.8 ^e	6.6	0.9 ^{cd}	51.3	1.4 ^{de}	17.0	1.7 ^e
		3DAS	1.1 ^{ab}	37.9	0.7 ^a	55.6	0.7 ^a	60.7	1.3 ^{ab}	35.4	1.4 ^{ab}	27.8	1.2 ^{ab}	36.8	1.1 ^{ab}	44.5	2.3 ^b
		7DAS	1.4 ^{bc}	48.9	1.0 ^{ab}	65.5	0.8 ^a	70.6	1.8 ^{cd}	35.9	2.0 ^{cd}	29.0	2.3 ^{cd}	19.8	2.5 ^{cd}	20.8	2.8 ^d
		10DAS	1.4 ^{bc}	52.3	0.6 ^{ab}	81.0	0.4 ^a	87.4	1.4 ^c	52.0	2.3 ^{cd}	27.1	3.0 ^{cd}	26.7	2.9 ^{cd}	23.3	3.1 ^d

Means followed by same letter or symbol do not significantly differ (P=0.05, Tukey's HSD). DAS- Days after spraying.

Table 2. Effect of Spinetoram 6% w/v (5.66%w/w) + Methoxyfenozide 30% w/v (28.33%w/w) on spiders

Natural Enemies	Application	Treatment Evaluation Interval	T _{1,3} : Spinetoram+Methoxyfenozide						T ₄ : Spinetoram		T ₅ : Methoxyfenozide		T ₆ : Emamectin benzoate		T ₇ : Spinosad		T ₈ : Untreated check
			350 ml ha ⁻¹		375 ml ha ⁻¹		400 ml ha ⁻¹		200 ml ha ⁻¹		517 ml ha ⁻¹		220 g ha ⁻¹		162 ml ha ⁻¹		Count
			Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count	Percent Control	Count
	T ₁	Precount	1.5 ^a	46.7	1.1 ^a	58.0	1.1 ^a	56.2	1.6 ^a	45.6	2.2 ^a	35.0	2.7 ^a	21.5	2.3 ^a	35.8	4.0 ^a
		1DAS	1.2 ^a	0.8	1.2 ^a	1.3	0.8 ^b	28.0	0.8 ^b	27.8	1.2 ^a	2.8	1.2 ^a	1.5	0.7 ^b	28.6	1.0 ^a
		3DAS	1.0 ^a	9.9	1.2 ^a	2.1	0.8 ^b	34.6	1.1 ^a	7.1	1.2 ^a	0.5	1.2 ^a	0.7	1.0 ^a	10.5	1.2 ^a
		7DAS	1.5 ^a	22.7	1.2 ^b	40.0	1.5 ^a	22.3	1.7 ^a	8.1	1.7 ^a	8.5	1.5 ^a	22.5	1.5 ^a	22.8	2.0 ^a
		10DAS	1.8 ^{bc}	39.8	1.8 ^{bc}	38.4	1.7 ^c	42.9	1.7 ^{bc}	41.5	1.5 ^d	51.0	1.8 ^{bc}	40.0	2.1 ^{ab}	29.6	3.1 ^a
		Precount	1.4 ^a	20.8	1.4 ^a	19.8	1.5 ^a	21.8	1.3 ^a	28.4	1.2 ^a	27.8	1.4 ^a	16.4	1.4 ^a	21.1	1.8 ^a
	T ₂	1DAS	1.2 ^a	3.2	1.1 ^{ab}	5.9	0.8 ^c	32.3	0.9 ^{bc}	24.7	1.2 ^a	3.9	1.2 ^a	0.5	0.9 ^{bc}	25.3	1.2 ^a
		3DAS	1.4 ^b	5.7	1.2 ^{ab}	13.5	0.9 ^a	31.2	1.4 ^b	0.0	1.5 ^b	0.0	1.3 ^{ab}	7.3	1.2 ^{ab}	9.7	1.4 ^b
		7DAS	1.4 ^{ab}	48.5	1.1 ^a	56.7	1.0 ^a	62.2	1.8 ^{ab}	37.9	2.1 ^{abc}	29.6	2.1 ^{abc}	31.6	2.3 ^{bc}	25.1	3.3 ^c
		10DAS	1.7 ^a	41.4	1.3 ^a	54.4	1.4 ^a	44.4	1.8 ^a	34.6	2.1 ^a	33.0	2.5 ^a	30.3	2.5 ^a	27.9	3.8 ^a

Means followed by same letter or symbol do not significantly differ (P=.05, Tukey's HSD). DAS- Days after spraying.

Figure1. Evaluation of (Spinetoram 6% w/v (5.66%w/w) + Methoxyfenozide 30% w/v (28.33%w/w)) on cocciliids



DAS- Days after spraying.

Figure2. Evaluation of (Spinetoram 6% w/v (5.66% w/w) + Methoxyfenozide 30% w/v (28.33% w/w)) on spiders

