

Indian Journal of Entomology 85(3): 762-764 (2023)

EVALUATION OF INSECTICIDES AGAINST GALL WEEVIL ALCIDODES COLLARIS (PASCOE) ON PIGEONPEA

RAKSHITHA T N¹*, SUBHASH KANDAKOOR¹, M G HEGDE¹ AND GANAJAXI MATH¹

¹Department of Agricultural Entomology, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad 580005, Karnataka, India Email: tnrakshitha@gmail.com (corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Pigeonpea is attacked by many insect pests, and of these the gall weevil *Alcidodes collaris* (Pascoe) causes threat to pigeonpea at seedling stage by attacking basal portion of the stem and resulting in the gall formation. Evaluation of some insecticides revealed that less incidence was observed using seed treatment with imidacloprid 600FS followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC spray (1.17 galled plants/ 10 plants) after 20 days of emergence. This also resulted in maximum reduction of galled plants (79.37%). Imidacloprid 600FS seed treatment with drenching of profenophos 50EC at 20 days after the crop emergence was observed to be the next best. Seeds treatment with imidacloprid 600FS followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC spray gave maximum yield of 23.38 q/ ha.

Key words: Pigeonpea, *Alcidodes collaris*, seed treatment, imidacloprid 600FS, chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC, profenophos 50EC, galled plants, yield

Pigeonpea Cajanus cajan is a tropical and subtropical legume known as red gram or tur and cultivated for its edible seeds. This crop is damaged by a wide range of insect pests both in the field and storage. Almost all parts of plant are damaged (Upadhyay et al., 1998), and in transitional belt of Karnataka mainly in Dharwad the gall weevil Alcidodes collaris (Pascoe) is one of the regular and major pest. This causes 25-30% loss in yield. Alcidodes collaris belongs to the subfamily Alcidinae of family Curculionidae and order Coleoptera. Damage is initiated by the female adult by scraping the basal region of seedlings for oviposition. After hatching grubs feed on living tissues inside the stem, and this leads to gall formation at the collar region (Parchabhavi et al., 1972). Due to the gall formation dislodging and drying of seedlings occurs (Rachappa and Lingappa, 2006). In the later stages, adult nibbles the tender shoots which lead to drooping of young tips (Hugar, 2001). Since the pest attacks basal portion of stem and inhabits the soil, its damage goes unnoticed. More importantly, this pest is known to damage early stage of the crop without any visual symptoms which leads to difficulties at farmer's level. There are very few studies on managing the pest, and hence, the present study evaluates management with some insecticides.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted at the Main Agricultural Research Station, Dharwad in pigeonpea

in randomized block design with 11 treatments with 3 replications, along with untreated check. Wilt resistant variety TS-3R with the spacing 90x 30 cm was used with plot size of 15 m². Sowing was done during 1st week of July, and recommended package of practices were followed except plant protection in the early stage and in the later stage chemical spray was made against *Helicoverpa armigera*. The observations on the total number of plants and the gall formed plants were recorded at 25 and 50 days after emergence, with the plant stand at harvest observed with % reduction in plant stand. Yield was observed and cost economics data were worked out. The data were subjected to statistical analysis to evaluate the statistical significance of treatments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results revealed that the least incidence of *A collaris* was observed when seeds were treated with imidacloprid 600FS followed by spray of chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC (T_9) at 20 days after emergence. Maximum reduction in galled plants was also observed with this treatment followed by imidacloprid 600FS seed treatment+ profenophos 50EC (T_3) drenching at 20 days after emergence. Imidacloprid 600FS seed treatment+ chlorpyriphos 20EC drenching was also found effective; and least efficacy was observed with thiamethoxam 35FS seed treatment + fipronil 5SC spray (Table 1). These results corroborate

S.	Treatment	No. of galled plants		%	Yield	Cost of	Total	Gross	Net	
No.		25	50	Mean	reduction	(q/ ha)	treatment	cost	return	return
		DAE*	DAE*		over		(/ ha)	(/ ha)	(/ ha)	(/ ha)
Т.	Imidachloprid 600FS	1.67	2.67	2.17	61.72	18.56	537.50	37441.50	103936.00	66494.50
1	seed treatment	(1.46) ^{ab}	$(1.77)^{bc}$	(1.63) ^{bc}		(4.34) ^b				
	10 ml/ kg of seeds									
T_2	Thiamethoxam 35FS	2.33	2.67	2.50	55.91	17.96	81.25	36985.25	100576.00	63590.75
	seed treatment	(1.68) ^c	$(1.77)^{bc}$	$(1.73)^{\circ}$		(4.28) ^₀				
т	T + Profemonhos	1.00	2.00	1.50	73 54	22.24	674 30	37578 30	124544.00	86965 70
1 ₃	50EC drenching	$(1.22)^{ab}$	$(1.56)^{b}$	$(1.41)^{b}$	75.54	(4.76) ^{ab}	074.50	57576.50	12+3++.00	00705.70
	2 ml/ 1 at 20 DAE		()	()						
T_4	T_2 + Profemophos	1.33	3.00	2.16	61.90	20.53	218.05	37122.05	114968.00	77845.50
	50EC drenching	(1.34)	$(1.86)^{bc}$	$(1.63)^{bc}$		$(4.55)^{abc}$				
т	2 ml/ I at 20 DAE	1 (7	2 2 2	2.50	55 01	16.22	017 50	27721 50	01449.00	5272(50)
1 ₅	1_1 + Fipronii 5SC spray 1 ml/1 at 20 DAE	$(1.0)^{bc}$	$(1.94)^{bc}$	$(1.73)^{\circ}$	55.91	$(4 08)^{bc}$	817.50	3//21.30	91448.00	55/20.50
Τ.	T. + Fipronil 5 SC	2.00	3.33	2.67	52.91	15.67	361.25	37265.25	87752.00	50486.75
- 6	spray 1 ml/ 1 at	(1.58) ^c	(1.93) ^{bc}	(1.78) ^c		(3.99) ^{bc}				
	20 DAE									
T ₇	T1 + Chlorpyriphos	0.67	2.33	1.50	73.54	20.78	633.50	37537.50	116368.00	78830.50
	20EC drenching	$(1.05)^{a}$	(1.68) ^₀	(1.41) ^₀		(4.59) ^{abc}				
т	$T_{\rm s} = 0.5 \text{ m}/1 \text{ at } 20 \text{ DAE}$	1 22	2 2 2	2 2 2	58 01	10.80	177 25	37081 25	111384.00	74302 75
18	20EC drenching	(1.34)	$(1.95)^{bc}$	$(1.68)^{bc}$	56.91	$(4.49)^{abc}$	177.23	57001.25	111304.00	/4302.75
	1.5 ml/1 at 20 DAE	abc	(()		()				
T ₉	T ₁ +Chlorantraniliprole	0.67	1.67	1.17	79.37	23.38	1113.50	38017.50	130928.00	92910.50
	18.5SC spray	$(1.05)^{a}$	$(1.46)^{a}$	$(1.29)^{a}$		$(4.88)^{a}$				
T	0.2 ml/ llat 20 DAE	1 (7	• • • •	2 00	(1.50	01.00	(0.7.5 (1.0.5	115512 00	00150 55
I ₁₀	1_2 + Chlorantraniliprole	$(1.6)^{bc}$	$(1.68)^{b}$	$(1.58)^{bc}$	64.72	(1.02)	657.25	3/561.25	11//12.00	80150.75
	0.2 ml/lit at 20 DAE	(1.40)	(1.00)	(1.58)		(4.01)				
Τ.,	Untreated check	5.00	6.33	5.67		12.89		36904.00	72184.00	35280.00
11		$(2.34)^{d}$	$(2.61)^{d}$	(2.48) ^d	_	(3.63) ^c				
	SEm±	0.11	0.14			0.32				
	CD (p=0.05)	0.33	0.40			0.95				
	CV (%)	13.46	12.74			12.77				

TT 1 1 1	T 00	0.1	• • •	11	•
I ahla I	Httpppov	of incontinidad	against A	collaria in	ningonnog
Table I.		or modulutes	against A.	<i>conuris</i> m	Digeondea
					- O

*Mean of three replications. Other expenditure = Rs. 36,904; Cost of pigeonpea (Rs./q) = 5600; Cost of chemicals: Imidacloprid 600FS = Rs. 430/100 ml; Thiamethaxam 35FS = Rs. 650/1; Profenophos 50EC = Rs. 600/1; Chloropyriphos 20EC = Rs. 100/250 ml; Fipronil 5SC = Rs. 175/100 ml; Chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC = Rs. 180/10 ml; Values in parentheses square root transformation; DAE- Days after emergence

with those of Hugar (2001) and Shivaji and Basavana Goud (2003) that chlorpyriphos drenching was superior. As regards yield, pigeon pea seeds treated with imidacloprid 600FS followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC (T_9) spray gave maximum yield of 23.38 q/ha, with highest net return. Imidacloprid 600FS seed treatment + drenching with profenophos 50EC and imidacloprid seed treatment 600FS + drenching with chlorpyriphos 20EC were the next best, while thiamethoxam 35 FS (seed treatment) + fipronil 5SC spray gave the least yield of 15.67 q/ ha (Table 1). Hugar (2001) also reported that drenching with chlorpyriphos

gave maximum yield and incremental benefit cost ratio. Shivaji and Basavana Goud (2003) obtained maximum yield with chlorpyriphos drenching. Thus, imidacloprid 600FS seed treatment followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC spray can be recommended for managing gall weevil incidence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks the Department of Agricultural Entomology, College of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad for providing guidance, encouragement and facilities.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

All authors equally contributed.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Hugar M B. 2001. Bioecology and management of gall weevil, *Alcidodes collaris* (Pascoe) on redgram. M Sc (Ag) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.

Panchabhavi K S, Thammaiah G, Mutalik Desai K S. 1972. Report

on the incidence of *Alcidodes collaris* (Pascoe) (Curculionidae: Coleoptera) on pigeon pea at Dharwad. Science Culture 38: 325-326.

- Rachappa V, Patil R K, Lingappa S. 2006. Exploitation of *Metarhizium* anisopliae (Metch.) Sorokin for management of gall weevil, *Alcidodes collaris* (Pascoe) in pigeonpea. Annals of Plant Protection Science 14(2): 315-318.
- Shivaji B, Basavana Goud K. 2003. Incidence of gall weevil, *Alcidodes collaris* (Pascoe) on pigeonpea at different stages of crop growth and its influence on yield. Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences 18 (4): 959-961.
- Upadhyay R, Mukerji K G, Rajak R L. 1998. Integrated pest management system in Agriculture. 4 Pulses, New Delhi. 99 pp.

(Manuscript Received: July, 2021; Revised: December, 2021;

Accepted: December, 2021; Online Published: April, 2022)

Online First in www.entosocindia.org and indianentomology.org Ref. No. e21175