

## Antifeeding effect of different neem based pesticides against diamond back moth, *Plutella xylostella* Linn

NEELAM YADAV, ASHOK KUMAR, RANJANA YADAV, RENU YADAV AND MANISH KUMAR

International Journal of Plant Protection (October, 2010), Vol. 3 No. 2 : 396-397

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to :  
NEELAMYADAV  
Department of  
Zoology, D.A.V. (P.G.)  
College, KANPUR  
(U.P.) INDIA

### SUMMARY

Studies were conducted to determine the antifeeding effect of different neem based pesticides viz., Neemazal, Bioneem, Neemgold, Nimbicidine and Achook against third instar larvae of diamond back moth, *Plutella xylostella* Linn. by leaf area method on cabbage leaves. Neemazal gave better protection (87.65) than other neem based pesticides. Achook was found to be the least effective antifeedant and offered 72.84 per cent protection on cabbage leaves. The other neem based pesticides demonstrated intermediary feeding deterring action.

Antifeedants may prove effective as insect controlling agents. They have been found to act as inhibitors of the gustatory reflexes and thereby function as feeding deterrent because they neither kill nor repel the insect pests.

Pradhan *et al.* (1962) first demonstrated that a 10 ppm aqueous suspension of crushed neem kernel sprayed on cabbage plants totally stopped feeding by the desert locust, *Schistocerca gregaria*, on treated foliage; feeding by the migratory *Locust migratoria*, was deterred at 100 ppm. Joshi and Ramaprasad (1975) have reported the antifeedant property of neem. Ketkar (1976) listed 95 publications on insect repellent and antifeedant effect of neem derivatives.

A study, therefore, was conducted to know the antifeeding effect of neem based pesticides on *Plutella xylostella* Linn.

The antifeeding effects of different neem based pesticides were tested against *Plutella xylostella* Linn. by allowing them to feed on cabbage leaves. For this purpose, leaf pieces of 2.0 cm sq. were cut from the cabbage leaf by means of rectangular metal designed. Measured leaf pieces were dipped in neem based pesticide solution for 2 seconds and solvent was evaporated under fan for ½ hour. On 24 hour starved larvae were released on the treated leaf material in each Petridish. Each treatment was replicate three times. Observations were recorded after 48 hours and

area of leaf piece left over was measured. Percentage feeding was calculated by the following formula:

$$\text{Percentage feeding} = \frac{\text{Leaf area given} - \text{corrected leaf area}}{\text{Leaf area given}} \times 100$$

All the neem based pesticides were tested at the concentration of their LC<sub>50</sub> values against the pest.

The data presented in (Table 1 and Fig. 1) indicate that the Neemazal has manifested best performance as antifeedant and gave 87.65 per cent protection at 2.5 per cent concentration against the larvae of *Plutella xylostella* Linn.

It was closely followed by Bioneem (85.58%), Neemgold (81.47%) and Nimbicidine (77.35%) and Achook (72.82%), which were used for evaluating their effectiveness as antifeedant. Whereas, Achook proved to be the least effective neem based pesticide. However, the work of Raman *et al.* (1992) reported the antifeeding effect of Achook against *Helicoverpa armigera* and *Earias vitella* at the higher concentration of 2.0 and 3.0 per cent. In the present investigation it was also recorded antifeeding properties at its higher concentration of 2.5 per cent and thus found a line with the finding of Raman *et al.* (1992). But no one has made attempt to evaluate the antifeeding activity of the recently introduced neem based pesticides like Neemazal, Bioneem, Neemgold, Nimbicidine and Achook against

### Key words :


Diamond back  
moth larvae, Leaf  
area method,  
Neem based  
pesticides

Accepted :  
May, 2010

**Table 1: Effect of neem based pesticides on the leaf area protected against *Plutella xylostella* Linn.**

Sr. No.	Formulations/ Treatments	Dose concentration 2.5%		
		Mean feeding per cent	Mean per cent protection	Corrected per cent protection due to treatment
1.	Neemazal	11.42	88.58	87.65 (69.49)*
2.	Bioneem	13.33	86.67	85.58 (67.74)
3.	Neemgold	17.14	82.86	81.47 (64.53)
4.	Nimbicidine	20.95	79.05	77.35 (61.60)
5.	Achook	25.14	74.86	72.82 (58.59)

\* Figures in angular transformed values

**Fig.1 : Effect of different neem based pesticides on per cent protection of leaf area against *Plutella xylostella***

*Plutella xylostella*. Purwar and Sharma (2006) also recorded antifeedant activity of Azadirachtin against *Spodoptera litura*. Many workers have proved the antifeedant activity of neem also.

Authors' affiliations:

**ASHOK KUMAR**, Department of Zoology, D.A.V. College, KANPUR (U.P.) INDIA

**RANJANA YADAV**, Department of Zoology, N.D. College, KANPUR (U.P.) INDIA

**RENU YADAV**, Department of Zoology, C.C.S. (P.G.) College, Heonra, ETAWAH (U.P.) INDIA

**MANISH KUMAR**, Department of Chemistry, C.C.S. (P.G.) College, Heonra, ETAWAH (U.P.) INDIA

## REFERENCES

**Joshi, B.G. and Ramaprasad, G. (1975).** Neem Kernel as an antifeedant against the tobacco caterpillar, *Spodoptera litura* F. *Phytoparasitica*, **3** (1): 59-61.

**Ketkar, C.M. (1976).** Utilization of neem (*Azadirachta indica* A. Juss) and its bye-products. Directorate of Non-edible oils and soap industry, Khadi and village industries commission, Bombay India, p. 234.

**Pradhan, S., Jotwani, M.G. and Rai, B.K. (1962).** The neem seed deterrent to locusts. *Indian Fmg.*, **12**: 7-11.

**Purwar, J.P. and Sharma, B.N. (2006).** Effect of antifeedant activity of Azadirachtin against *Spodoptera litura*. *Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci.*, **14** (1): 218-277.

**Raman, K., Ganesan, S. and Vyas, B.N. (1992).** Studies on the effects of neem rich insecticides on feeding, development and control cotton and vegetable pests. *Neem Newsletter*, **9** (4): 56-57.

\*\*\*\*\*