# The effect of insecticides on sucking pests and bollworms in cotton

P.B. KEDAR, D.S. SURYAWANSHI, P.K. WAGHMARE AND D.B. WAGHMODE

International Journal of Plant Protection (October, 2010), Vol. 3 No. 2: 203-205

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to : **P.B. KEDAR** 

Department of Entomology, Marathwada Agriculture University, PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA

## **SUMMARY**

The field investigations on the effect of plant protection on sucking pests and bollworms in cotton *viz*. aphids, jassids, thrips, whitefly, spotted bollworms, *Helicoverpa* and pink bollworms were carried out under rainfed conditions at the Research Farm, Department of Agronomy, Marathwada Agriculture University, Parbhani during *Kharif* 1999-2000 and 2000-200. The plant protection with carbosultan 25 STD @ 60 g/kg as seed treatment and foliar application of dimethoate, NSKE and endosulfan 35 EC a month after sowing showed significantly lower incidence of sucking pests as well as bollworm complex successfully over untreated check. However, plant protection treatment did not influence the yield significantly.

est management is one of the major factors to attain a higher sustainable production of cotton. Insects are very sensitive to nutritional changes in the host plants. These changes ensure from manures (KYW) through plants for particular interest in response to measures. A good knowledge on the effect of plant nutirents on pest incidence is necessary for loss assessment and formulation of pest management programme. The study was, therefore undertaken to determine the incidence of sucking pests as well as bollworms with different levels of manures (FYM) on cotton crop in retention of plant protection in Marathwada region of Maharahstra state at Parbhani.

Key words:

Plant protection, Sucking pests, Bollworms, Yield and cotton, Insecticides

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during *Kharif* 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 at Research farm, Department of Agronomy, Marathwada Agricultural University Parbhani. The soil of the experimental field in both the years was well drained clayey soil, low in nitrogen (0.04 and 0.05 for the year 1999 and 2000, respectively), moderate in available phosphorus (0.002 - 0.0025 for the year 1999 and 2000, respectively) and high in available potash (0.63 and 0.64 for the year 1999 and 2000, respectively).

The cotton variety, NHH-44 was used for the study. Experiments were conducted in a split plot design with 16 treatment combinations replicated thrice. Out of them, the treatments comprised of four levels of chemical fertilizers, two levels of manure treatments and two plant protection treatments *viz.*, unprotected check (P0) and a plant protection treatment comparising seed treatment with carbosulfan, spraying of dimethoate, NSKE, endosulfan, quinalphos and cypermethrin as sub plot treatments.

The experimental field was thoroughly prepared by ploughing followed by two harrowings and subsequently cleaned by picking stubbles in summer. Before sowing, manure (FYM) was applied by broadcasting at the rate of 10 tonnes/ha and the field was subsequently harrowed for mixing FYM. During the initial stage of crop plant establishment, two hoeings and two weedings were carried out in treated and untreated plots. For sowing, marking was done by marker to maintain the spacing of 90 x 60 cm followed by sowing with dibbling method by placing two seeds per hill. Gap filling was done after 10 days followed by thining after 30 days of sowing. During the initial stage of crop plant establishment, two hoeings and two weedings were carried out in treated and untreated plots.

For controlling the sucking pests and bollworm complex of cotton, seed treatment was carried out with carbosulfan 25 STD @ 60 g/kg in all plots with plant protection (p1) treatment at the time of sowing as well as spraying of diamethoate 30 EC 0.03 per cent

Accepted: May, 2010

on ETL and spraying with insecticides viz., NSKE 5 % as well as cypermethrine 25 EC @ 0.007 % on ETL, respectively.

Observations on incidence of sucking pests were recorded on 5 plants, selected randomly from net plot area of each treatment. Methodology for separating different damaged bollworms as described by Patel *et al.* (1986) was followed in the present investigations for recording pest complex incidence.

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data pertaining to incidence of sucking pests were significantly affected by plant protection treatment

(Table 1). However, aphids, jassids, whitefly and thrips, population was found significantly less in plots treated with plant protection  $(P_1)$  *i.e.* (37.92), (6.21) and (7.12) compared to the plots without plant protection  $(P_0)$  *i.e.* (40.63), (6.33) and (7.21), respectively, while in case of whitefly, population was higher in plant protection treatment  $(P_1)$  *i.e.* (11.78) as compared to without plant protection  $(P_0)$  *i.e.* (11.72) during 1999-2000. Similar trend was observed in 2000-2001. However, exceptions *viz.*, population of jassids and whiteflies was observed significantly higher in plot with plant protection  $(P_1)$  *i.e.* (5.89) and (10.90) as compared to without insecticides  $(P_0)$  *i.e.* (5.46) and (10.39) during 2000-2001, respectively.

Table 1: Effect of plant protection on per cent infestation of sucking pests in cotton							
Spraying pests	Years	Treatments		S.E. <u>+</u>	C.D. (P=0.05)		
		$P_0$	$P_1$	5.E. <u>T</u>	C.D. (1 =0.03)		
Aphids	1999-2000	40.63 (6.22)	37.92 (6.05)	0.041	0.12		
	2000-2001	38.88 (6.11)	36.17 (5.93)	0.039	0.11		
	Pooled	39.75 (6.16)	37.04 (5.99)	0.05	0.16		
Jassids	1999-2000	6.33 (2.54)	6.21 (2.51)	0.008	0.026		
	2000-2001	5.46 (2.40)	5.89 (2.34)	0.014	0.044		
	Pooled	5.89 (2.47)	5.77 (2.42)	0.017	0.051		
Thrips	1999-2000	7.21 (2.70)	7.12 (2.69)	0.012	NS		
	2000-2001	6.33 (2.57)	6.25 (2.53)	0.017	NS		
	Pooled	6.77 (2.63)	6.68 (2.61)	0.037	NS		
Whitefly	1999-2000	11.72 (3.38)	11.78 (3.41)	0.008	0.026		
	2000-2001	10.39 (3.25)	10.90 (3.31)	0.016	0.049		
	Pooled	10.83 (3.31)	11.34 (3.36)	0.017	0.051		

NS- Non-significant

Bollworms	Years	cent infestation of bollworms in cotton  Treatments		C.F.	CD (D 0.05)
		$P_0$	$P_1$	- S.E. <u>+</u>	C.D. (P=0.05)
Spotted bollworms in	1999-2000	7.82 (15.65)	7.17 (15.12)	0.11	0.36
square	2000-2001	8.42 (16.24)	7.77 (15.74)	0.08	0.24
	Pooled	8.12 (15.94)	7.47 (15.43)	0.10	0.30
Spotted bollworm in	1999-2000	6.65 (14.24)	6.17 (13.85)	0.090	0.27
green boll	2000-2001	6.95 (14.74)	6.29 (14.03)	0.069	0.20
	Pooled	6.80 (14.49)	6.23 (13.94)	0.18	0.54
Pink bollworm in	1999-2000	27.25 (30.15)	24.60 (28.89)	0.10	0.30
locule	2000-2001	26.38 (29.60)	23.72 (28.27)	0.11	0.33
	Pooled	26.81 (29.87)	24.16 (28.58)	0.26	0.78
Helicoverpa in square	1999-2000	23.46 (28.09)	21.51 (27.03)	0.082	0.24
	2000-2001	21.71 (26.95)	19.76 (25.71)	0.10	0.32
	Pooled	22.58 (27.52)	20.63 (26.37)	0.073	0.219
Helicoverpa in green	1999-2000	8.33 (16.26)	7.68 (15.72)	0.03	0.11
boll	2000-2001	7.45 (15.39)	6.81 (14.68)	0.06	0.19
	Pooled	7.89 (15.82)	7.24 (15.20)	0.20	0.61

Table 3: Effect of plant protection on average yield of seed cotton (kg/ha)								
Parameters	Years	Treatments		- S.E.+	C.D. (P=0.05)			
	Tears	$P_0$	$P_1$	3.E. <u>+</u>	C.D. (I =0.03)			
Yield	1999-2000	815.88	843.38	19.07	NS			
	2000-2001	837.75	874.62	19.27	NS			
	Pooled	826.81	859.00	19.21	NS			

NS-Non significant

The results of the pooled data also revealed significant effects. However, plant protection  $(P_1)$  showed significantly lesser sucking pests population viz., aphid, jassids and thrips *i.e.* (37.04), (5.77) and (6.68) and (11.34) over untreated check  $(P_0)$  *i.e.* (39.75), (5.89) and (6.77), respectively, except whitefly population increased with plant protection  $(P_1)$  *i.e.* (11.34) over untreated check  $(P_0)$  *i.e.* (10.83). The results are also in a accordance with the findings of Gahukar (2000) and Jackson *et al.* (1973).

The infestation of bollworm complex significantly differed with plant protection treatment. However, the spotted bollworm in squares and green bolls, pink bollworm in locules, *Helicoverpa* in squares and green bolls was significantly lower in sprayed plots (P<sub>1</sub>) i.e. (7.17), (6.17), (24.60), (21.51) and (7.68) as compared to unsprayed plots (P<sub>0</sub>) *i.e.* (7.82), (6.65), (27.25), (23.46) and (8.33), respectively during 1999-2000 (Table 2). Similar trend was observed during 2000-2001. Significant lower infestation was observed in plant protection treatment (P<sub>1</sub>) than untreated check (P<sub>0</sub>). The result of the pooled data was also significant. The plant protection treatment (P<sub>1</sub>) for spotted bollworm in squares and green bolls, pink bollworm in locule, *Helicoverpa* in squares and green bolls were found effective in reducing damage *i.e.* (7.47), (6.23), (24.16), (20.63) and (7.24) over untreated check (P<sub>0</sub>) *i.e.* (8.12), (6.80), (26.81), (22.58) and (7.89). Similar results were obtained by Singh et al. (1995) and Simwat and Dhawan (1996).

The difference in yield was non-significant among the plant protection treatments. The insecticidal sprayings over unprotected treatment (815.88 kg/ha) during 1999-2000. While in 2000-2001 the yield of seed cotton was not influenced by the plant protection treatments. However, numerically higher yield was obtained in protected plots (874.62 kg/ha) than unprotected plots (837.75 kg/ha). However, the result of pooled data was found non-significant. Numerically, it was higher with plant protection ( $P_1$ ) *i.e.* (859.00 kg/ha) over untreated check ( $P_0$ ) *i.e.* 826.81 kg/ha. Supporting findings were made by Nimbalkan *et al.* (1996) and Sharma (1993).

Authors' affiliations:

**D.S. SURYAWANSHI,** Department of Entomology, Marathwada Agricultural University, PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA

P.K. WAGHMARE AND D.B. WAGHMODE, Department of Agronomy, Marathwada Agricultural University, PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA

### REFERENCES

Butter, N.S., Singh, T.H. and Kular, J.S. (1994). Efficacy of insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.). *J. Cotton Res. & Dev.*, 8(1):159-162.

**Gahukar, R.T. (2000).** Use of neem products /pesticides in cotton pest management. *Internat. J. Pest Manag.*, **46**(2):149-160.

**Jackson, J.E., Burhan, H.O. and Hussain, H.M. (1973).** Effect of season, sowing date, nitrogenous fertilizer and insecticides spraying on the incidence of insect pests on cotton in Sudan Geziera. *J. Agric. Sic. Camb.*, **81**:491-505.

Nimbalkar, S.A., Kulat, S.S., Dhurve, S.B. and Tambe, V.J. (1996). Bioefficacy of insecticides and biocides for the bollworm management of cotton. *J. Soils & Crops*, **6**(2):162-164.

**Reddy, A.S. and Apparao, P. (1982).** Importance of integrated control of cotton pests. Proc. of the seminar on "Integrated pest management system for cotton". Regional. Station, Coimbatore (T.N.).

**Sharma, P.D.** (1993). Relative efficiency of different insecticides for the control of cotton bollworms. *J. Insect Sci.*, **6**(1):152-153.

**Simwat, G.S. and Dhawan, A.R.** (1996). Management of bollworms through variable insecticidal spray sequences of cotton. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, **66**(8):504-506.

Singh, J., Sandhu, B.S., Singh, G. and Sharma, R.K. (1988). Effect of nitrogen, irrigation and insecticides on bollworm incidence and yield of seed cotton. *J. Cotton Res. & Dev.*, 2(2):81-83.

\*\*\*\*\*