# Field evaluation of some novel insecticides against pod borer, *helicoverpa* armigera (hubner) in chickpea

# S. S. DHAKA, A. KUMAR<sup>1</sup>, DEVENDRA PAL<sup>1</sup> AND RAM NARESH<sup>2</sup> *KVK*, *Pilibhit (SVPUA&T, Meerut) U.P.*

#### Abstract

A field experiment was conducted to determine the comparative efficacy of insecticides i.e. Lambda Cyhalothrin 5 EC @ 500 ml/ha, Carbosulfan 25 EC @ 1000 ml/ha, Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 500 ml/ha, Bifenthrin 20 EC @ 500 ml/ha, Novaluron 10 EC @ 750 ml/ha, Flubendiamide 39.35 EC @ 75 ml/ha, Spinosad 45 SC @ 500 ml/ha and Cypermethrin 25 EC @ 1250 ml/ha Biopesticide viz., B t @ 1.5 kg/ha and Botanical viz., Neemarin 1500 ppm @ 3000 ml/ha, which were sprayed on chickpea variety Surya against pod borer, Helicoverpa armigera (Hubner) during Rabi 2020-21 and 2021-22. The effect of these applications was also recorded on the yield attributes. All the treatments had the comparable lower number of larvae as well as pod infestation than un-treated control. Flubendiamide was best with lowest pod infestation of 10.73 and 12.59 per cent, respectively and 16.84 q/ha yield followed by Indoxacarb, Spinosad, Novaluron, Carbosulfan, Bifenthrin, Lambda Cyhalothrin, Cypermethrin, Neemarin and Bt, which gave 15.96, 15.11, 14.89, 14.16, 13.88, 13.23, 13.02, 12.21 and 11.49 q/ha yield respectively.

Keywords: Efficacy, Novel insecticides, Helicoverpa armigera, Flubendiamide, Chickpea

#### Introduction

Chickpea (Cicer arietinum) is very important pulse crops of India. India is the largest producer with 75% of world acreage and production of gram. India produces 5.3 mt of chickpea from 6.67 mha with an average production of 844 kg/ha (www.iipr.res.in). Chickpea is cultivated for the seeds to be consumed as pulses. Pulses are important sources of protein for India's large and growing population. Among the biotic constraints, the losses caused by insect pests are a major limiting factor in realization of optimum yield of the chickpea crop. It is known to be ravaged by several insect pests during its various crop stages. Among the insect pests particularly pod borer, Helicoverpa armigera (Hubner) is one of the main constraints which limit the production of chickpea. The pod borer H. armigera appear during the flowering and pod stage which seriously damage the crop and is considered major limiting factor for the production of chickpea. The yield loss in chickpea due to pod borer was 10 -60 per cent in normal weather conditions (Bhatt and Patel, 2001). Pesticides continue to be one of the most powerful tools available for the control of insect-pests and increasing crop yields. Presently, chemical control is the only practical method for a farmer to respond to an increasing pod borers' infestation. The use of conventional insecticides causes sudden decrease in the number of natural enemies also. Keeping in view the importance of chickpea crop, the present study was undertaken to test the relative efficacy of some novel insecticides, biopesticide and botanical with conventional insecticide against pod borer, *H. armigera* in chickpea crop.

## **Materials and Methods**

The experiment was conducted at Research Block, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Pilibhit of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Meerut-250110 (U.P.) for two consecutive years during *Rabi* 2020-21 and 2021-22. The experiment was laid in randomized block design (RBD), having 11 treatments (Lambda Cyhalothrin 5 EC @ 500 ml/ha, Carbosulfan 25 EC @ 1000 ml/ha, Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 500 ml/ha, Bifenthrin 20 EC @ 500 ml/ha, Novaluron 10 EC @ 750 ml/ha, Flubendiamide 39.35 EC @ 75 ml/ha, Spinosad 45 SC @ 500 ml/ha, *B t* @ 1.5 kg/ha, Neemarin 1500 ppm @

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>KVK Sambhal, Sambhal (SVPUA&T, Meerut) U.P. <sup>2</sup>ICAR- ATARI ZONE III, KANPUR

2500 ml/ha, Cypermethrin 25 EC @ 1250 ml/ha and untreated (control) which were replicated thrice. The plot size was  $4 \times 2.5$  m with a spacing of  $30 \times 10$  cm. Normal fertilizers doses and recommended agronomical practices were adopted. All these insecticides and bio-pesticides were sprayed with knapsack sprayer twice. First spray was done at pod forming stage when 50 % of pods were formed and second spray at 15 days after the first spray. The count of pod borers' larvae and infested pods was taken one day before spraying and three and nine days after first and second spray, from ten randomly selected plants in each plot. The percentage of pod damage was worked out by the following formula:

#### Number of damaged pods

Pod/seed damage (%) = 
$$\dots$$
 x 100  
Total number pods

The pods were counted one day before and three and nine days after the application of treatments. The seed yield was recorded at harvest and converted into q/ha. The data were statistically analyzed as suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1985).

# **Results and Discussions**

All the treatments were significantly effective in reducing the number of pod borer's larvae as compared to the control (Table 1). In treated plots, the pod borers' larval population ranged from 0.83 to 14.17 as against 16.67 per ten plants in control, nine days after second spray. Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 0.5 lit. / ha was found most effective against pod borer in minimizing the number and was followed by Carbosulfan 25 EC @ 1000 ml /ha. > Lambda-Cyhalothrin 5 EC (a) 500 ml/ha > Novaluron 10 EC (a)750 ml/ha > Bifenthrin 20 EC @ 500 ml/ha > Spinosad 45 SC @ 500 ml/ha > Flubendiamide 39.35 SC @ 75 ml/ha > Cypermethrin 25 EC (a) 1250 ml/ha in the decreasing order, nine days after second spray. The bio-pesticidal treatments of Neemarin recorded 8.00 while B. thuringiensis 14.17 larvae per ten plants. The highest larval population of 16.67 larvae per ten plants was recorded with untreated control. It was evident that chemical insecticides including biopesticides suppressed the population of pod borer. The insecticide Indoxacarb has been observed to be very effective against pod borers, H. armigera and E. zinckenella (Gehan and Abdalla, 2006) which corroborates present finding. Further, Murray et al. (2005) reported that this chemical provided very good control of *H.armigera* in cereal crops, while Singh et al. (2010) obtained the similar result against H. armigera in black gram. Hakim Ali Sahito et al. (2012) reported Spinosad and Bifenthrin to be effective in reducing the number of larvae in chickpea crop and this is also corroborative with the present study.

As far as the per cent infested pods are concerned, it was found to be minimal with Flubendiamide closely followed by Indoxacarb during both the years as clearly shown by pooled data of two years (Table 2). The most effective treatment was Flubendiamide in which minimum per cent infestation of pods was recorded 11.09 and 10.73 three and nine days after second spray, respectively. The next best

Table 1: Pooled effect of different treatments on larval population of H. armigera on chickpea

| Treatments                                 | Dose/ha | Number of larvae/10 plants |              |              |              |              |              |  |
|--|---------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|
|  |         | First Spray                |              |              | Second Spray |              |              |  |
|  |         | Before Spra                | ay 3 DAS     | 9 DAS        | Before Spray | 3 DAS        | 9 DAS        |  |
| T <sub>1</sub> Lambda cyhalothrin 5 EC     | 500 ml  | 13.33 (3.78)               | 2.83(1.90)   | 2.33(1.80)   | 11.33 (3.51) | 2.17(1.77)   | 1.50(1.58)   |  |
| T, Carbosulfan 25 EC                       | 1000 ml | 13.67 (3.83)               | 2.67(1.87)   | 2.00(1.68)   | 11.67 (3.55) | 2.17(1.73)   | 1.00(1.41)   |  |
| T <sub>3</sub> Indoxacarb 14.5 SC          | 500 ml  | 14.00 (3.87)               | 2.50(1.86)   | 1.83(1.67)   | 10.67 (3.41) | 1.83(1.65)   | 0.83(1.32)   |  |
| $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{A}}$ Bifenthrin 20 EC | 500 ml  | 13.67 (3.83)               | 3.17(2.00)   | 1.83(1.62)   | 10.33 (3.36) | 2.67(1.87)   | 1.83(1.68)   |  |
| T <sub>5</sub> Novaluron 10 EC             | 750 ml  | 13.83 (3.85)               | 4.17 (2.27)  | 3.33 (2.07)  | 10.00(3.31)  | 2.67(1.91)   | 1.67(1.61)   |  |
| $\mathbf{T}_{6}$ Flubendiamide 39.35 EC    | 75 ml   | 14.00 (3.87)               | 6.00(2.64)   | 4.67 (2.38)  | 9.67 (3.26)  | 4.17(2.27)   | 2.17(1.74)   |  |
| $T_7$ Spinosad 45 SC                       | 500 ml  | 13.33 (3.78)               | 5.17(2.47)   | 3.67 (2.16)  | 10.33 (3.25) | 3.17(2.04)   | 1.83(1.68)   |  |
| T <sub>8</sub> Bacillus thuringiensis      | 1500 g  | 14.00 (3.87)               | 12.67 (3.69) | 13.50(3.79)  | 11.33 (3.50) | 13.83 (3.85) | 14.17 (3.88) |  |
| T <sub>9</sub> Neemarin 1500 ppm           | 3000 ml | 13.67 (3.83)               | 10.83 (3.43) | 11.00(3.45)  | 12.00 (3.60) | 10.50(3.38)  | 8.00(2.99)   |  |
| T <sub>10</sub> Cypermethrin 25 EC         | 1250 ml | 12.67 (3.69)               | 6.33 (2.71)  | 5.00(2.44)   | 13.00(3.74)  | 4.33 (2.27)  | 4.83 (2.39)  |  |
| T <sub>11</sub> Untreated Control          | -       | 12.83 (3.72)               | 14.83 (3.98) | 16.00 (4.11) | 16.33 (4.16) | 17.50 (4.30) | 16.67 (4.20) |  |
| "SEm±                                      |         | -                          | 0.18         | 0.18         | -            | 0.21         | 0.18         |  |
| CD (0.05)                                  |         | -                          | 0.54         | 0.54         | -            | 0.61         | 0.54         |  |

Data in parentheses are square root transformed values DAS = Day after spraying

| Treatments                                 | Dose/ha % damage of pods |             |         |       |              |       |       |
|--|--------------------------|-------------|---------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|
|  |                          | First Spray | t Spray |       | Second Spray |       |       |
|  | Be                       | fore Spray  | 7 3 DÂS | 9 DAS | Before Spray | 3 DÁS | 9 DAS |
| T <sub>1</sub> Lambda cyhalothrin 5 EC     | 500 ml                   | 11.38       | 11.83   | 12.15 | 12.36        | 12.10 | 11.36 |
| T, Carbosulfan 25 EC                       | 1000 ml                  | 10.64       | 11.37   | 11.73 | 12.12        | 11.48 | 11.09 |
| T <sub>3</sub> Indoxacarb 14.5 SC          | 500 ml                   | 10.70       | 11.17   | 11.28 | 11.89        | 11.18 | 10.77 |
| $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{A}}$ Bifenthrin 20 EC | 500 ml                   | 10.95       | 11.40   | 11.78 | 12.34        | 11.97 | 11.12 |
| $\mathbf{T}_{5}$ Novaluron 10 EC           | 750 ml                   | 10.81       | 11.78   | 12.04 | 12.46        | 11.48 | 10.92 |
| $\mathbf{T}_{6}$ Flubendiamide 39.35 EC    | 75 ml                    | 11.63       | 10.95   | 11.84 | 12.14        | 11.09 | 10.73 |
| $T_{7}$ Spinosad 45 SC                     | 500 ml                   | 11.03       | 11.08   | 11.69 | 12.67        | 11.18 | 10.86 |
| T's Bacillus thuringiensis                 | 1500 g                   | 10.54       | 13.10   | 16.57 | 17.89        | 19.31 | 21.28 |
| T <sub>o</sub> Neemarin 1500 ppm           | 3000 ml                  | 10.89       | 12.39   | 15.65 | 16.78        | 18.16 | 18.57 |
| T <sub>10</sub> Cypermethrin 25 EC         | 1250 ml                  | 11.42       | 12.29   | 14.39 | 15.78        | 15.57 | 16.02 |
| T <sub>11</sub> Untreated Control          | -                        | 10.85       | 14.19   | 19.30 | 21.23        | 22.37 | 26.60 |
| "SEm±                                      |                          | -           | 0.44    | 0.63  | -            | 0.60  | 0.85  |
| CD (0.05)                                  |                          | -           | 1.31    | 1.88  | -            | 1.77  | 2.53  |

| Table 2: Pooled effect of different treatments on po | od damage by <i>H. armigera</i> on chickpea |
|--|---|
|  |   |

Data in parentheses are angular transformed values

treatment in order were Indoxacarb, Spinosad, Novaluron, Carbosulfan, Bifenthrin, Lambda Cyhalothrin and Cypermethrin with pod infestation per cent of 11.18, 11.18, 11.48, 11.48, 11.97, 12.10 and 15.97 after three days and 10.77, 10.86, 10.92, 11.09, 11.12, 11.36 and 16.02 after nine days of second spray, respectively. All treatments were statistically at par with each other as well as with the best treatment. The less effective treatments were Neemarin and *B. thuringiensis* with 18.16 and 19.31 after three days while 18.57 and 21.28 per cent pod infestation nine days after second spray, respectively. The maximum per cent pod infestation of 22.37 and 26.07 three and nine days after second spray, respectively, were found with the untreated control.

These findings are in confirmation with Ebbinghaus *et al.* (2007) who also found that Flubendiamide shows excellent performance for the control of a broad range of Lepidopterous pests. Chitralekha *et al.* (2018) also reported the effectivity of Novaluron 10 EC in managing pod borer in chickpea. Ashok Kumar and Shivaraju (2009) reported that Flubendiamide was highly effective against pod borers of black gram, *H. armigera* and *E. zinckenella*. Nauen *et al.* (2007), Hirooka *et al.* (2007) and Latif *et al.* (2009) also reported the supremacy of Flubendiamide against Lepidopterous pests in their experiments.

All the treatments resulted higher seed yield and were proved significantly superior over untreated control during both the years (Table 3). The highest

DAS = Day after spraying seed yield of 16.84 q/ha was harvested with Flubendiamide. The yield with Indoxacarb, Spinosad, Novaluron, Carbosulfan, Bifenthrin, Lambda Cyhalothrin, Cypermethrin, Neemarin and Bt, ranged from 15.96 to 11.49 q/ha. Untreated control recorded lowest pod yield of 10.54 q/ha. By working out the cost benefit ratio (Table 3), it was revealed that Flubendiamide ranked 1st with highest cost benefit ratio (1:13.73) and was followed by Indoxacarb, Carbosulfan, Bifenthrin, Lambda Cyhalothrin, Cypermethrin, Novaluron, Neemarin and Spinosad with 12.54, 11.62, 11.12, 10.60, 8.06, 7.17, 3.85 and 1.69 C: B ratio, respectively. The lowest C:B ratio (1:1.50) was observed under the treatment of *B*. *thuringiensis*. Ashok Kumar and Shivaraju (2009) reported that Indoxacarb is highly effective in control of H. armigera and gave high returns. Latif et al. (2009) reported that Flubendiamide treatment plots gave higher yield and controlled the damage against L. orbonalis on brinjal and Memon and Memon (2005) also reported that the application of Spinosad in lentil field gave high yield and returns as compared with other treatments. Rao et al. (2007) found Spinosad and Indoxacrb as effective and economical treatments in the term of C:B ratio. The results revealed that since the plots treated with Flubendiamide 39.35 EC had the lowest pod damage percentage and produced maximum seed yield than other treatments and it was followed by Indoxacarb 14.5 SC and Novaluron 10 EC, so all these can be recommended for the management of the pod borer in chickpea.

FIELD EVALUATION OF SOME NOVEL ------*HELICOVERPA ARMIGERA* (HUBNER) IN CHICKPEA 85 Table 3. Economics of different treatments against pod borer, *H. armigera* in chickpea on pooled yield

| Treatments                              | Dose/ha | Yield  | Increase in yield | Value of increase | Cost of      | Net profit | Cost benefit |
|---|---------|--------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
|   |         | (q/ha) | over control q/ha | yield (Rs./ha)    | treatment/ha | (Rs./ha)   | ratio        |
| T, Lambda cyhalothrin 5EC               | 500 ml  | 13.23  | 2.69              | 14795.00          | 3733.00      | 14010.00   | 10.60        |
| T, Carbosulfan 25 EC                    | 1000 ml | 14.16  | 3.62              | 19910.00          | 4038.00      | 17890.00   | 11.62        |
| T <sub>3</sub> Indoxacarb 14.5 SC       | 500 ml  | 15.96  | 5.42              | 29810.00          | 4808.00      | 25220.00   | 12.54        |
| T Bifenthrin 20 EC                      | 500 ml  | 13.88  | 3.34              | 18370.00          | 3879.00      | 16789.00   | 11.12        |
| $T_{5}$ Novaluron 10 EC                 | 750 ml  | 14.89  | 4.35              | 23925.00          | 5987.00      | 19226.00   | 7.17         |
| $\mathbf{T}_{6}$ Flubendiamide 39.35 EC | 75 ml   | 16.84  | 6.30              | 34650.00          | 4783.00      | 29205.00   | 13.73        |
| T, Spinosad 45 SC                       | 500 ml  | 15.11  | 4.57              | 25135.00          | 14758.00     | 11445.00   | 1.69         |
| T <sub>8</sub> Bacillus thuringiensis   | 1500 g  | 11.49  | 0.95              | 5225.00           | 5878.00      | 4035.00    | 1.50         |
| T <sup>°</sup> Neemarin 1500 ppm        | 3000 ml | 12.21  | 1.67              | 9185.00           | 4258.00      | 8895.00    | 3.85         |
| $T_{10}$ Cypermethrin 25 EC             | 1250 ml | 13.02  | 2.48              | 13640.00          | 3708.00      | 13090.00   | 8.06         |
| $T_{11}$ Untreated Control              | -       | 10.54  | -                 | -                 | -            | -          | -            |

\* Labour charges - @ Rs. 250.00/day/labour

\* Market price of chickpea seeds - @ Rs. 5500.00/qt.

## References

- Ashok Kumar, C. T. and Shivaraju, C. (2009). Evaluation of newer insecticide molecules against pod borers of black gram. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, **22**(3-Spl. Issue): 521-523.
- Bhatt, N. J. and Patel, R. K. (2001). Screening of chickpea cultivars for their resistance to gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa* armigera. Indian J. Ento., 63(3): 277 – 280.
- Chitralekha; Yadav, G. S. and Tarun Verma. (2018). Efficacy of insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* on chickpea. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*. **6**(3): 1058-1061.
- Duke, J.A. (1981). Hand book of legumes of world economic importance. Plenum Press, New York. p. 199-265.
- Ebbinghaus, D.; Schnorbach, H. J. and Elbert, A. (2007). Field development of flubendiamide - a new insecticide for the control of lepidopterous pests. *Pflanzenschutz-Nachrichten-Bayer.*, **60**(2): 219-246.
- Gehan, Y. A. and Abdalla, E.F. (2006). Evaluation of some selected pesticides against the two pod borers *Helicoverpa armigera* and *Etiella zinckenella* population infesting cowpea in the newly reclaimed regions. *Res. J. Ag. Bio. Sci.*, 2(6): 578-583.
- Hakim Ali Sahito; Mohammad Nadeem Sidhu; Khalid Hussain Dhiloo and Ghulam Mustafa Sahito (2012).
  Efficacy of different insecticides against gram pod borer on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) *Intl. J. Farm.* & *Alli. Sci.*, 1(3): 62-66.
- Hirooka, T.; Kodama, H.; Kuriyama, K. and Nishimatsu, T. (2007). Field development of flubendiamide (Phoenix, Takumi) for lepidopterous insect control on vegetables, fruits, tea, cotton and rice. *Pflanzensc hutz-Nachrichten Bayer.*, **60**(2): 203-218.

\* Rental value of sprayer - @ Rs. 45.00/day.

- Latif, M. A.; Rahman, M. M.; Alam, M. Z. and Hossain, M. M. (2009). Evaluation of flubendiamide as an IPM component for the management of brinjal shoot and fruit borer, *Leucinodes orbonalis* Guenee. *Mun. Ent. and Zool.*, 4(1): 257-267.
- Memon, N. A. and Memon, A. A. (2005). Efficacy of different insecticides against lentil pod borer (*Helicoverpa* spp). *Res. J. Agric. & Biol. Sci.*, 1(1): 94-97.
- Murray, D. A. H., Lloyd, R. J. and Hopkinson, J. E. (2005). Efficacy of new insecticides for management of *Helicoverpa* spp. (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in Australian grain crops. *Australian J. Entomol.*, 44(1) : 62-67.
- Nauen, R.; Konanz, S.; Hirooka, T.; Nishimatsu, T. and Kodama, H. (2007). Flubendiamide: a unique tool in resistance management tactics for pest lepidoptera difficult to control. *Pflanzenschutz-Nachrichten-Bayer.*, **60**(2): 247-262.
- Panse V.G. and Sukhatme, P.V. (1985). Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi.
- Rao, GV.R.; Kumari, P.R.A.; Rao, V.R. and Reddy, Y.V.R. (2007). Evaluation of spinosad and indoxacarb for the management of legume pod borer, *Maruca vitrata* (Geyer) in pigeonpea. *J. Food Legumes.*, **20**(1):126-127.
- Singh, G.; Prasad, C.S.; Anil Sirohi, Kumar, A.; Dhaka, S.S. and Ali, N. (2010). Effect of bio-pesticides against stem fly and pod borer complex in field pea. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.*, **18**(1): 10-12.