

Effectiveness of different insecticides against sucking pests in brinjal

■ A.A. SHAIKH, J.B. BHUT* AND M.V. VARIYA

Main Vegetable Research Station, Anand Agricultural University, ANAND (GUIJARAT) INDIA

ARTICLE INFO

Received : 21.04.2014
Revised : 27.07.2014
Accepted : 13.08.2014

KEY WORDS :

Effectiveness, Insecticides, Sucking pests, Avoidable losses

ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted to study the bio-efficacy of nine different insecticides (triazophos 0.08 %, imidacloprid 0.002 %, profenophos 0.05 %, diafenthiuron 0.05 %, clothianidin 0.025 %, cartap hydrochloride 0.05 %, thiamethoxam 0.025 %, thiacloprid 0.012 % and spiromesifen 0.024 %) against sucking pests viz., jassid and whitefly in brinjal (GBH 1) at Main Vegetable Research Station, Anand Agricultural University, Anand during *Rabi* season of 2011-12. Among different insecticides evaluated, thiamethoxam, diafenthiuron and thiacloprid emerged as most effective; profenophos, clothianidin and imidacloprid were mediocre; while cartap hydrochloride, spiromesifen and triazophos were found least effective against jassid. So far whitefly is concerned, spiromesifen, diafenthiuron and triazophos emerged as most effective; imidacloprid, profenophos and cartap hydrochloride as mediocre, while clothianidin, thiamethoxam and thiacloprid emerged as least effective. Diafenthiuron exhibited significantly higher brinjal fruit yield (350.57 q/ha), whereas triazophos and cartap hydrochloride hosted significantly lower fruit yield. The minimum and maximum per cent avoidable losses were recorded in diafenthiuron (0.00) and control (55.25), respectively. The highest Net ICBR (71.83) was obtained from the plots treated with profenophos followed by thiacloprid (56.10), cartap hydrochloride (43.93), imidacloprid (39.10) and diafenthiuron (27.69).

*Corresponding author:
Email: jignesh1315@gmail.com

How to view point the article : Shaikh, A.A., Bhut, J.B. and Variya, M.V. (2014). Effectiveness of different insecticides against sucking pests in brinjal. *Internat. J. Plant Protec.*, 7(2) : 339-344.
