



EFFICACY OF INSECT GROWTH REGULATORS AGAINST APHIDS AND THRIPS ON BT COTTON

BHAGYASHRI KAMBLE, BHALKARE S K*, ABHISHEK BHONDE, PRADNYA DABHADE AND UNDIRWADE D B

Department of Entomology, Dr Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola 444104, Maharashtra, India

*Email: sunilento@gmail.com (corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Eight insecticidal treatments (including insect growth regulators) were evaluated against aphids (*Aphis gossypii* Glover) and thrips (*Thrips tabaci* Lindeman) in Bt cotton. The results revealed that buprofezin 25%SC proved effective in minimizing the *A. gossypii*. However, it was found at par with pyriproxyfen 10%EC. Buprofezin 25%SC also led to minimum number of *T. tabaci* and was found at par with pyriproxyfen 10%EC, buprofezin 25%SC+ NSKE 5%, pyriproxyfen 10%EC+ NSKE 5% and NSKE 5%. No deleterious effect of these were observed on the natural enemies. Maximum seed cotton yield was obtained with buprofezin 25%SC and it proved to be the economically viable with ICBR of 1: 6.6.

Key words: *Aphis gossypii*, *Thrips tabaci*, Bt cotton, insect growth regulators, buprofezin, pyriproxyfen, NSKE, yield, incremental cost benefit ratio, chrysopids, spiders

Cotton (*Gossypium spp*) is one of the most important commercial cash crops. Damage inflicted by sucking insect pests is one of the major constraints in attaining high production of seed cotton. The avoidable yield loss due to major sucking pests of Bt cotton was 33.73% (Ghelani et al. 2014). The use of insecticides to counter this results in environmental problems (Moreira et al., 1996). Alternative ecofriendly methods with greater selectivity and less toxicity to non-target organisms can overcome such problems (Faria, 2009). Insect growth regulators (IGR's) have a role to play in such alternatives as these provide hormonal control that are related to moulting, metamorphosis and reproduction (Tunaz and Uygun, 2004). Since its potential discovery, credited to the "paper factor" related by Slama and Williams (1965), IGR's have been commercialized at an industrial level and widely used in pest control. Keeping these in view, the present study evaluates the efficacy of some of these IGRs against aphids (*Aphis gossypii* Glover) and thrips (*Thrips tabaci* Lindeman) on Bt cotton.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was conducted at the experimental farm of Department of Agricultural Entomology, Dr Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola during kharif 2019-20. The trial was laid out in a randomized block design (RBD) with eight treatments including control, each replicated thrice. The Bt Cotton (Ajeet-155 BG II) was dibbled at 90x 60 cm spacing. All recommended package and practices were followed, with four treatment sprays applied at 15 days interval. The data on the incidence of *A. gossypii* and *T. tabaci* were

collected 24 hr pretreatment and 3, 7 and 14 days of post-treatment. The treatments included buprofezin 25%SC, pyriproxyfen 10%EC, diflubenzuron 25%WP, NSKE 5%, buprofezin 25%SC + NSKE 5%, pyriproxyfen 10%EC + NSKE 5% and diflubenzuron 25%WP + NSKE 5%. Similarly, data were also collected on the natural enemies and seed cotton yield. The data obtained were subjected to appropriate transformations before statistical analysis to test the level of significance as per Gomez and Gomez (1984). Incremental cost benefit ratio was worked out to find out the cost effective treatment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data in Table 1 pertaining to effect of IGR's against *A. gossypii* after four sprays revealed more or less same trend of efficacy at 3, 7 and 14 days after spray; cumulative mean data showed that buprofezin 25%SC was superior against *A. gossypii* (4.94/ leaf). This treatment was at par with pyriproxyfen 10%EC (6.19/ leaf). The treatment of NSKE 5% showed moderate effect, whereas, diflubenzuron 25%WP + NSKE 5% and diflubenzuron 25%WP were the least effective. These findings are in agreement with those of Shivaray et al. (2021) on the effectiveness of pyriproxyfen 10%EC and buprofezin 25%SC; and those of Sahar (2019) under laboratory and field experiments. Thumar et al. (2018) observed pyriproxyfen 10% EC @ 1000 ml/ ha as effective, whereas, Choudhary and Singh (2015) found three sprays of pyriproxyfen at 10 days interval as effective. Hole et al. (2015) and Karkar et al. (2014) obtained significant reduction with application of NSKE 5%.

Table 1. Effect of insecticides (IGRs) against *A. gossypii*, *T. tabaci* and predators on *Bt* cotton

| S. No | Treatments | No. of aphids/ leaf | | | | | | No. of thrips/ leaf | | | | | | Occurrence of predators (No/ plant) | | | Seed cotton yield (q/ ha) | Value of increased yield over control (Rs./ ha) | Net gain over control | ICBR |
|-------|--|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|------|
| | | 1 DBS | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 14 DAS | Mean | 1 DBS | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 14 DAS | Mean | LLB | Chrysopid | Spiders | | | | | | |
| 1. | Buprofezin 25%SC (0.05%) @ 1000 ml/ha | 12.59 (3.54) | 3.52 (1.78) | 4.27 (1.93) | 7.03 (2.39) | 4.94 (2.03) | 7.79 (2.79) | 4.82 (2.18) | 4.17 (2.02) | 4.79 (2.17) | 4.60 (2.12) | 1.17 (1.12) | 1.00 (0.99) | 1.29 (1.13) | 13.40 | 34540 | 29972 | 1:6.6 | | |
| 2. | Pyriproxyfen 10%EC (0.02%) @ 1000 ml/ha | 12.25 (3.50) | 5.73 (2.30) | 5.03 (2.14) | 7.81 (2.59) | 6.19 (2.34) | 8.27 (2.87) | 5.87 (2.40) | 4.99 (2.20) | 5.45 (2.32) | 5.44 (2.31) | 1.12 (1.09) | 0.95 (0.97) | 1.24 (1.12) | 12.39 | 28985 | 21745 | 1:3.0 | | |
| 3. | Diflubenzuron 25%WP (0.015%) @ 300 g/ha | 21.78 (4.66) | 10.56 (3.20) | 10.98 (3.25) | 12.93 (3.40) | 11.49 (3.28) | 9.29 (3.04) | 8.83 (2.95) | 9.57 (3.06) | 9.88 (3.11) | 9.43 (3.04) | 1.02 (1.06) | 0.83 (0.90) | 1.11 (1.07) | 9.77 | 19690 | 12394 | 1:1.7 | | |
| 4. | NSKE 5% @ 25 kg/ha | 13.63 (3.69) | 8.30 (2.83) | 7.00 (2.58) | 9.35 (2.93) | 8.22 (2.78) | 8.11 (2.84) | 6.46 (2.52) | 6.04 (2.45) | 6.56 (2.55) | 6.35 (2.51) | 1.35 (1.25) | 1.42 (1.18) | 1.45 (1.20) | 11.09 | 14575 | 11535 | 1:3.8 | | |
| 5. | Buprofezin 25%SC (0.05 %) + NSKE (5%) | 13.78 (3.71) | 6.64 (2.49) | 5.34 (2.22) | 8.36 (2.73) | 6.78 (2.48) | 6.97 (2.64) | 5.66 (2.37) | 5.06 (2.24) | 5.77 (2.40) | 5.50 (2.34) | 1.32 (1.21) | 1.39 (1.17) | 1.41 (1.19) | 11.79 | 25685 | 20117 | 1:3.6 | | |
| 6. | Pyriproxyfen 10% EC (0.02 %) + NSKE (5%) | 13.20 (3.63) | 8.05 (2.77) | 6.35 (2.45) | 8.70 (2.79) | 7.70 (2.67) | 7.86 (2.80) | 6.09 (2.46) | 5.49 (2.33) | 6.09 (2.45) | 5.89 (2.41) | 1.27 (1.10) | 1.28 (1.12) | 1.39 (1.18) | 11.37 | 23375 | 15135 | 1:1.8 | | |
| 7. | Diflubenzuron 25% WP (0.015 %) + NSKE (5%) | 16.85 (4.10) | 10.99 (3.25) | 10.50 (3.18) | 11.42 (3.22) | 10.97 (3.22) | 8.73 (2.95) | 8.30 (2.87) | 8.28 (2.85) | 8.46 (2.89) | 8.35 (2.87) | 1.19 (1.09) | 1.14 (1.05) | 1.34 (1.16) | 10.70 | 21835 | 13539 | 1:1.6 | | |
| 8. | Untreated control | 12.84 (3.58) | 14.10 (3.68) | 14.90 (3.75) | 14.00 (3.59) | 14.33 (3.67) | 10.23 (3.20) | 14.89 (3.85) | 16.70 (4.08) | 17.48 (4.17) | 16.36 (4.03) | 1.48 (1.22) | 1.59 (1.25) | 1.53 (1.24) | 7.12 | - | - | 1:6.6 | | |
| | SE (m) ± | NS | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 0.14 | NS | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.56 | | | | | | |
| | CD (p=0.05) | - | 0.42 | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0.43 | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.40 | - | - | - | 1.72 | | | | | | |

Figures in parentheses square root transformed values; LLB: lady bird beetle; DAS: day after spraying; DBS: day before spray; No. of sprays= 4; Cost of insecticides: Buprofezin 25%SC @ 632/ 1000 ml; Pyriproxyfen 10%EC @ 1300/ 1000 ml; Diflubenzuron 25%WP @ 1314/ 300 gm; NSKE @ 250/ 25 kg; Labour and sprayer charges =2040 Rs/ ha; price of seed cotton Rs. 5500/ q

The cumulative means also led the observation that buprofezin 25%SC is superior against *T. tabaci* (4.60/ leaf) found at par with pyriproxyfen 10%EC, buprofezin 25%SC + NSKE 5%, pyriproxyfen 10%EC + NSKE 5% and NSKE 5% (5.44, 5.50, 5.89 and 6.35 thrips/ leaf, respectively). These results are in tune with those of Shivaray et al. (2021) with pyriproxyfen 10%EC and buprofezin 25%SC. Binu and Bhede (2019) reported buprofezin 25%SC as effective. Thumar et al. (2018), Ambarish et al. (2017) and Zafar et al. (2017) also obtained similar results with pyriproxyfen. The natural enemies revealed non-significant differences among the treatments, and proved less detrimental to spiders, chrysopids and coccinellids. This observation corroborates with those of Adhikari et al. (2019), Binu and Bhede (2019) and Naik et al. (2017) with buprofezin on predators. Sahar (2019) classified buprofezin and pyriproxyfen as harmless on coccinellids. Ananthi et al. (2017) found the neem seed kernel extract 5% protecting the natural enemies like spiders and coccinellids against imidacloprid in chilli.

Maximum seed cotton yield was obtained with buprofezin 25%SC (13.40 q/ ha), at par with pyriproxyfen 10%EC (12.39 q/ ha) and buprofezin 25%SC + NSKE 5% (11.09 q/ ha). Also, buprofezin 25%SC was the most economically viable with maximum ICBR (1:6.6). These results find support from Shivaray et al. (2021) on the effectiveness of pyriproxyfen 10%EC and buprofezin 25%SC giving higher seed cotton yield. Thumar et al. (2018) harvested maximum seed cotton yield with pyriproxyfen 10%EC, while Nemade et al. (2017) obtained this with buprofezin 25SC. Kalyan et al. (2017) also reported the cost effectiveness of buprofezin 25SC, while Hole et al. (2015) harvested the satisfactory yield with NSKE 5%.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors thank the Dean, Faculty of Agriculture Dr Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola for providing necessary facilities and support.

REFERENCES

- Adhikari B, Padhi J, Sthitapragyan S. 2019. Efficacy of new molecules against green leafhopper in rice. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 7 (2): 194-197.
- Ambarish S, Shashi K C, Somu G, Navi S. 2017. Studies on the Bio-efficacy of new insecticide molecules against insect pests in cotton AICRP on cotton. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 5(6): 544-548.
- Ananthi M, Selvaraju P, Sundaralingam K. 2017. Evaluation of seed biopriming with biocontrol agents and biopesticides spraying on pests and its effect on seed yield and quality in chilli. *Journal of Environmental Zoology Sciences* 5(4): 667-672.
- Binu V, Bhede B V. 2019. Impact of repeated application of synthetic insecticides on thrips and their natural enemies on *Bt* cotton. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences* 8(8): 277-289.
- Choudhary R K, Singh S B. 2015. Evaluation of pyriproxyfen 10EC against sucking insect pests of cotton. *Journal of Cotton Research and Development* 29(1): 99-102.
- Faria A B C. 2009. Revisao sobre alguns grupos de insecticidas utilizados no manejo integrado de pragas florestais. *Ambiencia- Revista do Setor de Ciencias Agrarias e Ambientais* 5(2): 345-358.
- Ghelani M K, Kabaria B B, Chhodavadia S K. 2014. Field efficacy of various insecticides against major sucking pests of *Bt* cotton. *Journal of Biopesticides* 7 (27): 32.
- Gomez K A, Gomez A A. 1984. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. John Wiley and Sons. New York, Brisbane, Singapore. pp. 139-240.
- Hole U B, Gangurde S M, Sarode N D, Bharud R W. 2015. Bio efficacy of wild plant extract for biological control of insect pests of *Bt* cotton. *Asian Journal of Bio-science* 10(2): 167-170.
- Kalyan R K, Saini D P, Meena B M, Pareek A, Naruka P, Verma S and Joshi S. 2017. Evaluation of new molecules against jassids and whiteflies of *Bt* cotton. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 5(3): 236-240.
- Karkar D B, Korat D M, Dabhi, M R. 2014. Evaluation of botanicals for their bio efficacy against insect pests of brinjal. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Science* 27 (2):145-147.
- Moreira L F, De Oliveira J S, De Araujo J G F, Braga G M. 1996. Impacto Ambiental e administracao de problemas toxicologicos na utilizacao de insecticidas agricolas. *Organizacoes Rurais e Agroindustriais, Lavras* 8(1): 28-35.
- Naik V C, Kranthi S, Viswakarma R. 2017. Impact of newer pesticides and botanicals on sucking pest management in cotton under high density planting system (HDPS) in India. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 5(6): 1083-1087.
- Nemade P W, Rathod T H, Deshmukh S B, Ujjainkar V V, Deshmukh V V. 2017. Evaluation of new molecules against sucking pests of *Bt* cotton. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 5(6):659-663.
- Sahar E Eldesouky. 2019. Effectiveness of certain insecticides against cotton aphid, *Aphis gossypii* and their adverse impacts on two natural enemies. *Egyptian Scientific Journal of Pesticides* 5(3) 7-13.
- Salma K, Williams C M. 1965. Paper factor as an inhibitor of the metamorphosis of red cotton bug, *Dysdercus koenigii* F. *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 54.
- Shivaray Navi, Shashikumar C, Somu G, Meena N, Krishna Kishore R, Rajendra B. 2021. Effect of pyriproxifen 10% EW against sucking insect pest population in cotton *International Journal of Chemical Studies* 9(1): 1313-1316.
- Thumar R K, Borad P K, Pathan N P, Bharpoda T M, Saiyad M M, Chaudhary H K. 2018. Bio-efficacy of diafenthiuron 25% + pyriproxyfen 5% SE against sucking insect pests of *Bt* cotton. *Journal Entomology and Zoology Studies* 6(5): 1024-1029.
- Tunaz H, Uygun N. 2004. Insect growth regulators for insect pest control. *Turkish Journal of Agriculture and Forestry* 28: 377-387.
- Zafar H S, Hakim A S, Tasneem K, Muhammad M R, Faheem A J, Wali M M. 2017. Integrated pest management of cotton thrips, *Thrips tabaci* (Lindeman, 1889) through selected pesticides under vitro conditions. *International Journal of Research Studies in Zoology* 3(4): 76-83.

(Manuscript Received: May, 2021; Revised: September, 2021;

Accepted: September, 2021; Online Published: January, 2022)

Online First in www.entosocindia.org and indianentomology.org Ref. No. e21113