

EFFICACY OF BIOPESTICIDES AND CHLORANTRANILIPROLE AGAINST TOMATO FRUIT BORER HELICOVERPA ARMIGERA (HUBNER)

CHALLAGURGULA KUSHAL^{1*} AND ASHWANI KUMAR¹

Department of Entomology, Naini Institute of Agriculture, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj 211007, Uttar Pradesh, India
*Email: kushalch1999@gmail.com (corresponding author): ORCID ID 0009-0006-3192-6510

ABSTRACT

Field trial was conducted at the Central Research Farm, during rabi, 2022-2023. The experiment was laid out in RBD (randomized block design). Eight treatments were evaluated against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner). Insecticides with treatment T_1 chlorantraniliprole 18.5%SC (1:10.) was the best. This was chlorantraniliprole 18.5%SC, ½ dose chlorantraniliprole + nisco sixer plus 2ml/1 (O. sanctum 13%+A. nardus 4%), spinosad 45%SC, nisco sixer plus 2ml/1 (O. sanctum 13%+A. nardus 4%) recorded the least fruit infestation. The highest yield was noticed in chlorantraniliprole 18.5%SC (240.5 q/ha), followed by ½ dose chlorantraniliprole + nisco sixer plus 2ml/1 (O. sanctum 13%+A. nardus 4%).

Key words: Chlorantraniliprole, cost benefit ratio, *Helicoverpa armigera*, incidence, spinosad, tomato, treatments, spinosad, NSKE, azadirachtin, nisco sixer plus, Ocimum, fruit infestation

Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) is an important vegetable ranks second among vegetables in area and production and occupies an area of 1.20 million ha. with a production of 19.4 mt with yield of 16.1 mt hectare. Among the various insect pests, tomato fruit borer *Helicoverpa armigera* is highly destructive causing serious damage. It has been found to cause a yield loss of 35 to 37.79% (Biswas et al., 2019). This study evaluates some biopesticides alongwith insecticides against the pest.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted under field conditions at the Central Research Farm, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh during rabi 2022-2023. Randomized block design with three replications was followed with plots 2× 1 m size maintaining 30 cm borders as a bunds and treatments was assigned randomly. The observations on infestation of *H. armigera* was recorded visually from five randomly selected tagged plants. The insecticides were sprayed at recommended doses when infestation reached ETL threshold. On seventh and fourteenth days after spraying observations were made on the number of fruits. Descriptive statistics was calculated using MS-EXCEL. ICAR WASP Statistics software was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The insecticides viz., T₁ chlorantraniliprole

18.5%SC, T₂ ½ dose chlorantraniliprole + nisco sixer plus, T₃ Spinosad 45%SC, T₄ nisco sixer plus 2ml/ l, T₅ neem seed kernal extract, T₆ azadirachtin 5%, T₆ azadirachtin 5%, T., Beauvaria bassiana were evaluated against tomato fruit borer *H. armigera*. The spray was carried out during peak period of fruit borer and the data was recorded one day before treatment (DBT) and then on 7th and 14th day after treatment (DAT). The data on the efficacy of the treatments given in Table 1 revealed significant reduction in incidence after 7 and 14 days after treatment (DAT). Among all the treatments minimum percent infestation of fruit borer was recorded in T₁ chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC (8.57%) as compared to T₀ – untreated control (21.87%) similar to the findings reported by Jamir et al. (2022), Patil et al. (2018). Among all the treatments lowest number of fruit borer was recorded in chlorantraniliprole 18.5%SC. Second most effective treatment was recorded in T₂ ½ dose chlorantraniliprole + nisco sixer plus 2ml/ l (9.604%) these results were similar to the findings reported by Lalhluzuala and Kumar (2022). Third effective treatment was recorded in T₂ Spinosad 45%SC (10.66%), which are similar with Harshita et al. (2018). Fourth effective treatment was recorded in T₄ nisco sixer plus 2ml/1(11.35%) these findings agree with those of Tejeswari et al., and Kumar (2021).

Dol. No.: 10.55446/IJE.2023.1518

Higher yield (240.5 q/ ha) and higher cost: benefit ratio (1:10.4) was obtained from chlorantraniliprole 18.5%SC treated plots and lowest (110 q/ ha) in untreated control plot. These findings agree with

Table 1. Infestation of H. armigera in tomato

| 5 | | | | Fruit | Fruit infestation (5 plants) in % | (5 plants) | % ui | | | Mean | Yield | C:B |
|------|--|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|---------|--------|
| . N | Treatments | | First | First spray | | | Secon | Second spray | | | (q/ ha) | ratio |
| 140. | | DBS | 7DAS | 14DAS | Mean | DBS | 7DAS | 14DAS | Mean | | | |
| TI | Chlorantraniliprole18.5%SC 1ml/ & | 21.67 | 8.44 | 10.59 | 9.515 | 11.85 | 6.64 | 8.62 | 7.63 | 8.57 | 240.5 | 1:10.4 |
| Т2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ Dose chlorantraniliprole + Nisco sixer plus 2 ml/1 0.5 ml/ ℓ + 2 ml/ ℓ | 19.48 | 90.6 | 11.37 | 10.216 | 13.43 | 8.9 | 80.6 | 8.99 | 09.6 | 232.5 | 1:10.0 |
| T3 | Spinosad 45%SC 0.4 ml/ ℓ | 18.69 | 10.25 | 12.05 | 11.15 | 14.43 | 9.63 | 10.0 | 9.81 | 10.66 | 200 | 1:8.7 |
| T4 | Nisco sixer plus 2 ml/ ℓ | 18.91 | 11.23 | 13.07 | 12.15 | 14.87 | 10.52 | 10.59 | 10.56 | 11.35 | 187.5 | 1:8.1 |
| T5 | Neem seed kernel extract 5% 50 ml/ ℓ | 18.31 | 15.00 | 13.86 | 14.43 | 15.32 | 11.29 | 11.60 | 11.44 | 12.93 | 160 | 1:6.9 |
| 9L | Azadirachtin 5% 5ml/ ℓ | 18.02 | 16.31 | 15.31 | 15.81 | 16.86 | 12.80 | 12.50 | 12.65 | 14.23 | 150.5 | 1:6.5 |
| T7 | Beauvaria bassiana 2 g/ ℓ | 20.36 | 17.66 | 16.17 | 16.92 | 17.51 | 14.39 | 13.46 | 13.92 | 15.42 | 135.5 | 1:5.8 |
| T0 | Control | 21.53 | 23.19 | 25.33 | 24.26 | 23.14 | 18.86 | 19.49 | 19.17 | 21.87 | 110.5 | 1:4.9 |
| | F-test | NS | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | ı | |
| | S. Ed. (±) | 1.38 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.85 | 0.39 | 0.31 | 0.15 | 0.42 | 0.58 | ı | |
| | C.D. (p=0.05) | | 1.047 | 0.995 | 2.842 | 1.175 | 0.941 | 0.463 | 1.396 | 1.954 | , | , |
| DBS | DBS - Day Before Spray; DAS- Day After Spray; NS-Non significant; S- Significant | S-Non sign | ificant; S- | Significant | | | | | | | | |

those of Jamir et al. (2022) who reported that the chlorantraniliprole 18.5%SC is the best and most economical treatment recorded yield (222.54g/ha) and cost benefit ratio (1:9.14). Next highest yield and benefit cost ratio was recorded in T₂-½ dose chlorantraniliprole + nisco sixer plus 2ml/1(232.5 q/ha and 1:10.0) similarfindings made by Lalhluzuala and Kumar (2022). Bandhavi and Kumar (2019) who reported that the T₂ spinosad 45%SC is the best and most economical treatment which is similar to yield (200 q/ha) and cost benefit ratio (1:8.7). The results concluded that among all the treatments in chlorantraniliprole % SC with minimum mean 8.57% and maximum yield of 240.5g/ ha proved to be the best treatment which is followed by ½ chlorantranilirpole + nisco Sixer Plus 2ml/l mean of 9.6% and yield with 232.5 q/hac, and at last untreated control with mean of 21.87% and yield is 110.5q/ ha in managing H. armigera reduction. Recommended dose of chemicals may be useful in devising proper strategy against fruit borer of tomato.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors Prof (Dr) Rajendra B. Lal Hon'ble Vice Chancellor, SHUATS, Prof (Dr) Shailesh Marker, Director of Research, (Dr) Deepak Lal, Dean of PG Studies, Prof (Dr) Gautam Gosh, Dean, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj for making encouragement.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

This work was supported by Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh – 211007 (India).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

This work was carried out equally by both authors.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Bandhavi H L, Kumar A. 2022. Efficacy and economics of different insecticides against fruit borer [Helicoverpa armigera (Hubner)] on tomato crop. The Pharma Innovation Journal 2022-11(6): 1254-1258.

Biswas D Uddin, M M, Ahmad M. 2019. Biorational management of tomato fruit borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) in winter under field condition of Bangladesh. Fundamental and Applied Agriculture 4(2): 792-797.

Harshita A P, Saikia D K, Deeve A, Bora L C, Phukan S N. 2018. Seasonal incidence of fruit borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* and its eco-friendly

- management in tomato, *Solanum lycopersicum*. International Journal of Chemical Studies 6(5): 1482-1485.
- Lalhluzuala I, Kumar A. (2022). Management of tomato fruit borer [Helicoverpa armigera (Hubner)] in trans Yamuna region of Prayagraj (UP). The Pharma Innovation Journal 2022 SP-11(9): 2685-2689.
- Mengistie G Y, Awlachew Z T. 2022 Evaluation of the Plant Growth Promotion Effect of Bacillus Species on Different Varieties of Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) Seedlings. Hindawi Advances in Agriculture, Article ID 1771147
- Patil P V, Pawar S V, Kadu R V, Pawar D B. 2018. Bio-efficacy of newer insecticides, botanicals and microbial against tomato fruit borer *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) infesting tomato. Journal of

- Entomology and Zoology Studies 2018 6(5): 2006-2011.
- Rahman A K, Haque M M, Alam S N, Mahmudunnabi, Dutta M N K.2014. Efficacy of Botanicals against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) in Tomato A Scientific Journal of Krishi Foundation.
- Rijal J P, Dhoj Y G C, Thapa R B, Kafle L. 2008. Efficacy of Metarhizium anisopliae and Beauveria bassiana against Helicoverpa armigera in Chickpea, under Field Conditions in Nepal. Formosan Entomolgy 28: 249-258.
- Tejeswari K, Kumar A. 2021. Comparative efficacy of chemicals with biopesticides against tomato fruit borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on Tomato, *Solanum lycopersicum* (L.) under field conditions. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies 9(5): 475-479

(Manuscript Received: July, 2023; Revised: July, 2023; Accepted: July, 2023; Online Published: July, 2023)
Online First in www.entosocindia.org and indianentomology.org Ref. No. e23383