

Original Research Article

Efficacy of selected biopesticides with Chlorantraniliprole-chlorantraniliprole against gram Pod-pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was conducted at the research plot of Department of Entomology at CRF, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj during the *Rabi* season of 2023-2024. The experiment was conducted in Randomized Block Design (RBD) using eight treatments each replicated thrice viz., Neem-neem oil 2-% @ 20.0 ml/lit, Spinosad-spinosad 45-% SC @ 0.3 ml/lit, NSKE 5% @ 5.0 ml/lit, *Bacillus thuringiensis* @ 2.5 gm/lit, *Beauveria bassiana* @ 2.5 gm/lit, Emamectin benzoate 5%_SG @ 2.0 ml/lit, Chlorantraniliprole-chlorantraniliprole 18.5-S @ 1.5 ml/lit and untreated control. Among the biopesticides and insecticides evaluated, Chlorantraniliprole-chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC recorded lowest mean population of pod borer population *i.e.* (1.79) which was significantly superior over control followed by Spinosad-spinosad 45-% SC (2.02%), Emamectin emamectin benzoate 5%_SG (2.23%), Neem-neem oil 2% (2.41%), NSKE 5% SC (2.61%), *Bacillus thuringiensis* (1.83%) and *Beauveria bassiana* (2.99%) was least effective among all the treatments. Among the treatment studied the best and most economical treatment was Chlorantraniliprole-chlorantraniliprole 18.5_SC with highest yielded and cost benefit ratio of 28.3 q/h and 1:3.1 followed by Spinosad-spinosad 45-%_SC with 26.7 q/h yield, 1:3.0 C:B ratio; Emamectin benzoate 5%_SG 25.8q/h and 1:2.9, Neem oil 2-% 22.5 q/h, 1:2.4, NSKE 5% 21.2 q/h, 1:2.2, *Bacillus thuringiensis* 17.0 q/h, and 1:1.9, *Beauveria bassiana* 11.7 q/h, and 1:1.2 as compared to control 9.3 q/h and 1:1.1.

Keywords: Benefit Cost Ratio, Biopesticide, Chemical insecticides, Chickpea, Efficacy, *Helicoverpa armigera*

1. INTRODUCTION

Chickpea, *Cicer arietinum* (L.) family Leguminaceae (Fabaceae) ~~is~~was originated in South-~~E~~eastern Turkey and spread to other parts of world. According to De Candolle, the fact that gram has a Sanskrit name “Chanaka” which indicates that the crop was under cultivation in India longer than in any other country in the world. It is adapted to relatively cooler climates. In India it is also known as ‘King of pulses’ Chickpea is used for human consumption as well as for feeding to animals. Its seeds eaten as green vegetable, fried, roasted, as snack food and ground to obtain flour and dhal. (Lavanya and Kumar, 2022).

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

The International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) has reported that chickpea seeds contain on average 23% protein, 64% total carbohydrates (47% starch, 6% soluble sugars), 5% fat, 6% crude fiber and 3% ash. Studies have also shown that chickpea is helpful for lowering blood cholesterol (Pittaway *et al.*, 2008).

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) is the world’s third most important legume food and is currently grown on about 11 million hectares, with 96% cultivated in the developing countries. Chickpea production has increased during the past 30 years from 7.3 million tonnes to 8.4 mt because of increase in productivity from 693 to 786 kg/ha during this period. (Ambule *et al.*, (2015)).

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Helicoverpa armigera is a cosmopolitan and widely distributed insect pest in world. It is a serious pest of all the legumes. In India, it has been observed to feed on 181 cultivated and uncultivated species belonging to 45 families. *H. armigera* is found in the Palearctic, Oriental, Ethiopian and Australian provinces, south of a line at approximately 52°N. This range occupied by the species includes tropical, dry and temperate climates. (Choudhary *et al.*, (2017)).

Commented [A1]: Merge paragraphs

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

This is an era of ~~Integrated-integrated~~ pest management involving several eco-friendly approaches. Realizing the importance of chemical and botanicals in ~~Integrated-integrated~~ pest management on sustainable basis the present investigation were undertaken to evaluate different Bio- pesticides and insecticidal combination against chickpea pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera*.

Commented [A2]: Merge paragraphs

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at the experimental research plot of the Department of Entomology, Central Research Farm, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, during the *rabi* season of 2023-24. The experimental design was laid in Randomized Block Design using PUSA 362 variety with 8 treatments, each replicated thrice. The plot size was 2m × 1m with a spacing of 30 cm × 10 cm. The treatments included – Neem oil 2% @20ml/lit., Spinosad 45 % SC @0.3ml/lit., NSKE 5% @5ml/lit., *Bacillus thuringiensis* 1x10⁹ CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit., *Beauveria bassiana* 1x10⁸ CFU/ml @2.5gm/lit., Emamectin benzoate 5% SG @ 2ml/lit., Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @1.5ml/lit. and a control. Application of the two rounds of insecticidal treatments were applied at 15 days interval.

The numbers of larva were counted on 5 randomly selected plants in each plot. The pretreatment count was made a day before the spray whereas, the post-treatment counts were made 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 recorded at 3rd, 7th, and 14th day after spray.

3. RESULTS

The data larval population of *Helicoverpa armigera* over control after two sprays revealed that (Table 1) all the treatments were significantly superior over control. The treatment Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 % SC (0.3ml/lit) recorded low overall mean infestation of pod borer population *i.e.*, (1.79) which was significantly superior over control followed by Spinosad 45 % SC (2.02), Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (2.23), Neem oil (2.41%), NSKE (2.61), *Bacillus thuringiensis* (1.86) and *Beauveria bassiana* (2.99) was least effective among all the treatments.

The yield among the treatments was significant. The highest yield was recorded in T₇ Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 % SC (28.3q/ha) followed by T₂ Spinosad 45 % SC (26.7 q/ha), T₆ Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (25.8q/ha), T₁ Neem oil 2 % (22.5q/ha), T₃ NSKE (21.2q/ha), T₄ *Bacillus thuringiensis* (17.0q/ha), and T₅ *Beauveria bassiana* (11.7q/ha) as compared to T₀ Control (9.3q/ha).

When the benefit cost ratio was worked out, an interesting results was achieved. Among the treatment studied the best and most economical treatment was T₇ Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 % SC (1:3.1) followed by T₂ Spinosad (1:3.0), T₆ Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (1:2.9), T₁ Neem oil 2 % (1:2.4), T₃ NSKE 5% (1:2.2), T₄ *Bacillus thuringiensis* (1:1.9), and T₅ *Beauveria*

bassiana (1:1.2) as compared to control T₀ (1:1.1).

Commented [A3]: All the insecticides name, the first word should not be written in capital. Litre should be written as 'l' only. Please follow the corrected abstract format.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 1. Efficacy and economics of different insecticide against gram ~~Pod~~-pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.)”

S. No.	Treatments	Larval population										Yield (q/ha)	C:B ratio	
		1 st Spray					2 nd Spray							Overall mean (1 st and 2 nd spray)
		1 DBS	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	Mean	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	Mean				
T ₁	Neem oil 2% @20 ml/l	5.0	3.26	2.40	3.00	2.86	2.73	1.53	1.73	1.96	2.41	22.5	1:2.4	
T ₂	Spinosad45 % SC@0.3 ml/l	5.4	3.00	1.93	2.66	2.42	2.26	1.26	1.53	1.63	2.02	26.7	1:3.0	
T ₃	NSKE 5% @5 ml/l	4.87	3.53	2.66	3.26	3.10	2.96	1.66	1.93	2.13	2.61	21.2	1:2.2	
T ₄	<i>Bacillus thurngiensis</i> 1× 10 ⁹ CFU/ml @2.5gm/l	4.40	3.80	2.80	3.60	3.40	3.06	1.60	2.06	2.26	1.86	17.0	1:1.9	
T ₅	<i>Beauveria bassiana</i> 1× 10 ⁸ CFU/ml @2.5gm/l	4.0	3.93	2.93	3.66	3.53	3.26	1.86	2.40	2.46	2.99	11.7	1:1.2	
T ₆	Emamectin benzoate 5% SG@2 ml/l	5.0	3.13	2.20	2.73	2.66	2.46	1.40	1.60	1.80	2.23	25.8	1:2.9	
T ₇	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 % SC@1.5ml/l	5.73	2.73	1.86	2.20	2.22	2.13	0.93	1.06	1.36	1.79	28.3	1:3.1	
T ₀	Control	6.20	6.93	7.13	8.46	7.56	7.93	8.33	8.86	8.37	7.96	9.3	1:1.1	
F- test		NS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S				
CD _{at} 0.05%			0.93	0.93	0.81	0.51	0.93	0.40	0.65	0.53				
S. Ed. (+)			5.31	5.31	6.75	3.54	6.939	5.31	6.753	3.54				

Commented [A5]: Before spray?

Commented [A4]: Try to calculate pooled value.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

4-DISCUSSION

All the treatments were found to be significantly superior to control in reducing larval population. The minimum overall mean larval population was recorded in Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (1.79). The results were similar to be findings reported by Nitharwal *et al.* (2017), Sushma *et al.* (2016), Roopa and Kumar (2014). Spinosad 45% SC was found to be next best treatment. The results of Spinosad (2.02) were supported by Pal *et al.* (2018), Singh *et al.* (2017) and Gautam *et al.* (2018). Emamectin benzoate 5%SG (2.23) found to be next best effective treatment. These results were similar finding of Khademul *et al.* (2020), Kumar and Sarada (2015).

Among all the treatments the higher yield (28.3q/ha) and higher cost benefit ratio was obtained from Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC and lowest in control plot (9.3q/ha). Similar findings made by Nitharwal *et al.* (2017) who recorded the highest cost benefit ratio in Chlorantraniliprole Pal *et al.* (2018) reported that the Spinosad was the best and most economical treatment recorded (26.7q/ha) and cost benefit ratio (1:3.0). Khademul *et al.* (2020) reported highest yield and cost benefit ratio in Emamectin benzoate.

From the above discussion it was found that, spraying of insecticides significantly reduced the pod borer population in chickpea. The present findings conclude that the new generation insecticides Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 Sc were found effective against lepidopteran caterpillar *Helicoverpa armigera* along with an additional yield level in chickpea.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Commented [A6]: All the insecticides name, the first word should not be written in capital. Litre should be written as 'l' only. Please follow the corrected abstract format.

REFERENCES

Ambule, R., Shinde, A., Patil, T. and Dinesh, C.U.L. (2015). Relative efficacy of newer insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) in tomato under South Gujarat condition. *International Journal of Plant Protection*, 8(2): 250-255

Choudhary, R., Kumar, A., Jat, G.C., Vikram. and Deshwal, H.L. (2017). Comparative Efficacy of Certain Bio- Pesticides against Tomato Fruit Borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.). *International Journal of Current Microbial Applied Sciences*, 6(8): 1068- 1081.

Deshmukh, S.G., Sureja, B.V., Jethva, D.M. and Chatar, V.P. (2010). Field efficacy of different insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) infesting chickpea. *Legume Research*, 33 (4): 269–273.

Gautam, M.P., Chandra, U.S. N., Singh, S. K., Yadav and Giri, S.K., (2018). Studies on Efficacy of Botanicals against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *International*

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 7: 612-618. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Ghosal, A., Chatterjee, M. L. and Manna, D. (2012). Studies on some insecticides with novel mode of action for the management of tomato fruit borer (*Helicoverpa armigera* Hub.). *Journal of Crop and Weed*, 8(2):126-129. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Jat, S.K. and Ameta O.P. (2013). Relative efficacy of biopesticides and newer insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (hub.) in tomato. *The Bioscan*, 8(2):579-582. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Khademul, MD.I., Howlader, M.T.H. and Ahmed, K. S. (2020). Management of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) infesting tomato using bio-pesticides under field condition and its effect on tomato yield. *Journal of Bangladesh Agriculture University*, 18(1):1-5. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Kumar, S.G.V. and Sarada, O. (2015). Field efficacy and economics of some new insecticide molecules against lepidopteran caterpillars in chickpea. *Current Biotica*, 9(2):153-158. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

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):1293-7. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Nitharwal, R.S., Kumar, A., Jat, S.L. and Chula, M.P. (2017). Efficacy of newer molecules against gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 6(4): 1224-1227. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Ojha, P.K., Kumari, R. and Chaudhary R.S. (2017). Field evaluation of certain bio- pesticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* Hubner (Noctuidae: Lepidoptera) and its impact on pod damage and per plant yield of chickpea. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, 5(2): 1092-1099. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Pal, S., Singh, D.K., Umrao, R.S. and Sharma, O. (2018). Eco-Friendly Management of Tomato Fruit Borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* under Hill Condition, Uttrakhand, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 7(10): 3008- 3013. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Pittaway, J., Robertson, I.K. and Ball, M.J., (2008). Chickpea may influence fatty acid and fiber intake in an ad libitum diet, leading to small improvements in serum lipid profile and glycemic control. *Journal of American Dietetic*, 108(6):1009-13. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Roopa, M. and Kumar, C.T. (2014). Bio-efficacy of new insecticide molecules against capsicum fruit borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner). *Global Institute for Research and Education*, 3(3):219-221. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Singh, N., Dotasara, S.K., Kherwa, B. and Singh, S. (2017). Management of tomato fruit borer by incorporating newer and bio-rational insecticides. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, 5(2): 1403- 1408. **Formatted: Font: Not Bold**

Sushma, D. and Bharpoda (2016). Field evaluation of biopesticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) in tomato, *Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill. Under middle Gujarat condition. *International Journal of Applied Agriculture and Horticulture Sciences*, 8(1):1266-1518.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

UNDER PEER REVIEW