INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PLANT PROTECTION VOLUME 8 | ISSUE 2 | OCTOBER, 2015 | 245-249



RESEARCH PAPER

DOI: 10.15740/HAS/IJPP/8.2/245-249

Monitoring of ear head worm *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) through sex pheromone in pearl millet crop

■ R.P. JUNEJA, G.M. PARMAR*, Y.H. GHELANI¹, K.D. MUNGRA², P.R. PATEL³ AND N.N. CHAUDHARI³

Department of Entomology, Junagadh Agricultural University, JAMNAGAR (GUJARAT) INDIA ¹Director of Research, Junagadh Agricultural University, JUNAGADH (GUJARAT) INDIA ²Department of Plant Breeding, Junagadh Agricultural University, JAMNAGAR (GUJARAT) INDIA ³Department of Plant Physiology, Junagadh Agricultural University, JAMNAGAR (GUJARAT) INDIA

ARITCLE INFO

Received:28.02.2015Revised:26.07.2015Accepted:10.08.2015

KEY WORDS:

Helicoverpa armigera, Pheromone traps, Moth catches, Larval counts, Correlation

*Corresponding author: Email: dr_gmparmar@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT

Monitoring of adults of ear head worm *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) through male sex pheromones was studied during *Kharif* 2002 to 2011 in pearl millet crop at Jamnagar, Junagadh Agriculture University, Junagadh. Highest number of moth catches was recorded during 35^{th} MSW *i.e.* 27^{th} August to 2^{nd} September. Adult moth catches were found negatively correlated with maximum temperature (r = -0.1698). Farmers are advised to install sex pheromone trap for monitoring and mass collection of adult male moth of *H. armigera* @ 5 traps/ha at a height of 2.0 m from 1st week of August to 2^{nd} week of September.

How to view point the article : Juneja, R.P., Parmar, G.M., Ghelani, Y.H., Mungra, K.D., Patel, P.R. **and** Chaudhari, N.N. (2015). Monitoring of ear head worm *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) through sex pheromone in pearl millet crop. *Internat. J. Plant Protec.*, **8**(2) : 245-249.

INTRODUCTION

In India, pearl millet *Pennisetum typhoides* or bajra is grown in about 11.0 million hectares in arid and semi arid regions. Among 116 pests infesting pearl millet, a dozen pose serious problems in the field (Prem Kishore and Solomon, 1989). Among them, ear head worm *Helicoverpa armigera* Hubner appears since 1980 in Gujarat state. Recently during last few years it has been noticed in some parts of Rajasthan also. Larval damage is observed at ear head stage and the cater pillar starts damaging floral parts, milky grains, mature grains which ultimately reduces the grain yield and quality also. Juneja and Raghvani (2000) recorded 10-15 per cent reduction in yield by this pest in pearl millet. Hence there was a high need to develop the strategy which can be helpful to the farmers for taking plant protection measures at a right time and thus experiments were conducted.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The field experiments were conducted on monitoring of adults of ear head worm *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) through male sex pheromones and to know the larval fluctuations in pearl millet crop during *Kharif* seasons, 2002 to 2011 at Main Pearl Millet Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, Jamnagar. Total five pheromone traps of Helicoverpa armigera (Helilures) were installed at a distance of 100 meters in bajra crop. Every alternate day moths were collected and counted. Total catches per week were worked out during sowing to harvest of the crop. Lures were changed every 20 days interval. Simultaneously, larval population was also counted on randomly selected 25 ear heads nearby each trap thus total larval counts per 125 ear heads were worked out on week basis. Weather data were recorded as per Meteorological Standard Week (MSW) and thus correlation was worked out.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study as well as relevant discussion have been presented under the following heads:

Helicoverpa moth catches :

Year wise Helicoverpa moth catches recorded from Kharif- 2002 to 2011 during the bajra crop period (Table 1) revealed that minimum moth catches were recorded during Kharif-2011 (36 adults/5 traps) and highest catches were recorded during Kharif-2003 (795 adults/5traps). Meteorological Standard Week wise moth catches reveals that moths were trapped during 26th to 44th MSW (majority of the crop period) and highest numbers (405 adults / 5 traps) of moths were recorded during 35th MSW (27th August to 2nd September).

Helicoverpa larval catches:

Year wise Helicoverpa larval counts recorded from Kharif-2002 to 2011 during the bajra crop period (Table 2) revealed that maximum larval counts were recorded during Kharif-2009 (531 larvae/125 ear heads) and minimum larval counts were recorded during Kharif-2011 (36 larvae/125 ear heads). Meteorological Standard Week wise Helicoverpa larval counts recorded revealed that the incidence commenced in 31st MSW (30th July to 5th August) with maximum during 37th MSW i.e. 10-16th September (439 larvae/125 ear heads).

Correlation co-efficient of Helicoverpa moth catches:

Year wise data presented in Table 3 on correlation

| Table 1: Statement showing MSW and year wise Helicoverpa moth cathes/ 5 traps (Kh-2002 to 2011) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--------------|------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Y | lear | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | |
| Sr. | S | owing date | | (20/6) | (21/6) | (27/6) | (8/7) | (7/7) | (1/7) | (12/7) | (5/7) | (11/7) | |
| No. | MSW | Period | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
| 1. | 25 | 18-24 " | * | 0 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 0 |
| 2. | 26 | 25Ju-1 July | * | 18 | 2 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 20 |
| 3. | 27 | 2-8 July | 23 | 21 | 0 | 11 | * | * | 0 | * | * | * | 55 |
| 4. | 28 | 9-15 " | 33 | 24 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 75 |
| 5. | 29 | 16-22 " | 44 | 22 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 94 |
| 6. | 30 | 23-29 " | 54 | 35 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 122 |
| 7. | 31 | 30 Ju5 Aug. | 30 | 124 | 69 | 76 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 315 |
| 8. | 32 | 6-12 Aug. | 16 | 100 | 88 | 88 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 312 |
| 9. | 33 | 13-19 " | 8 | 33 | 86 | 47 | 31 | 10 | 33 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 251 |
| 10. | 34 | 20-26 " | 2 | 14 | 70 | 21 | 73 | 21 | 79 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 309 |
| 11. | 35 | 27 Aug2 sep. | 34 | 77 | 41 | 9 | 81 | 30 | 60 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 405 |
| 12. | 36 | 3-9 Sept. | 53 | 56 | 22 | 7 | 58 | 25 | 13 | 66 | 20 | 6 | 326 |
| 13. | 37 | 10-16 Sept. | 21 | 39 | 16 | 4 | 34 | 46 | 1 | 59 | 21 | 8 | 249 |
| 14. | 38 | 17-23 " | 18 | 52 | 11 | 2 | 16 | 48 | 0 | 30 | 20 | 10 | 207 |
| 15. | 39 | 24-30 " | 20 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 22 | 14 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 155 |
| 16. | 40 | 1-7 Oct. | 29 | 57 | 14 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 145 |
| 17. | 41 | 8-14 " | 31 | 30 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 83 |
| 18. | 42 | 15-21 " | 38 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| 19. | 43 | 22-28 " | 29 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 80 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 |
| 20. | 44 | 29 Oct4 Nov. | 11 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 147 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 |
| | | Total counts | 494 | 795 | 446 | 294 | 594 | 223 | 220 | 283 | 113 | 36 | 3498 |

Internat. J. Plant Protec., 8(2) Oct., 2015 : 245-249 246

HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE

co-efficient of Helicoverpa moth catches with different weather parameters revealed that results were found significant during Kharif-2004 to 2011. Whereas, during the rest of years i.e. Kharif- 2002 and Kharif-2003 the results were found nonsignificant. As far as pooled over 10 years is concerned the correlation of Helicoverpa moth catches with maximum temperature was found negatively significant (-0.1698*) amongst various weather parameters.

| Table 2 : Statement showing MSW and year wise Helicoverpa larval counts/ 125 ear heads (Kh-2002 to 2011) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|----------------|--------|--------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Y | lear | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | |
| Sr. | S | owing gate | (29/6) | (20/6) | (21/6) | (27/6) | (8/7) | (7/7) | (1/7) | (12/7) | (5/7) | (11/7) | |
| No. | MSW | Period | | . | | | | | | | | | Total |
| 1. | 25 | 18-24 " | * | 0 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 0 |
| 2. | 26 | 25Ju-1 July | * | 0 | 0 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | 0 |
| 3. | 27 | 2-8 July | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | * | * | 0 | * | * | * | 0 |
| 4. | 28 | 9-15 " | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. | 29 | 16-22 " | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. | 30 | 23-29 " | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. | 31 | 30 July-5 Aug. | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| 8. | 32 | 6-12 Aug. | 0 | 31 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| 9. | 33 | 13-19 " | 0 | 65 | 58 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 |
| 10. | 34 | 20-26 " | 0 | 103 | 43 | 61 | 16 | 4 | 62 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 304 |
| 11. | 35 | 27 Aug2 Sept. | 15 | 76 | 53 | 39 | 27 | 17 | 100 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 347 |
| 12. | 36 | 3-9 Sept. | 15 | 38 | 73 | 18 | 30 | 7 | 96 | 52 | 16 | 0 | 345 |
| 13. | 37 | 10-16 Sept. | 14 | 47 | 42 | 8 | 49 | 23 | 24 | 204 | 21 | 7 | 439 |
| 14. | 38 | 17-23 " | 35 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 21 | 51 | 1 | 213 | 18 | 11 | 389 |
| 15. | 39 | 24-30 " | 61 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 61 | 11 | 39 | 16 | 13 | 232 |
| 16. | 40 | 1-7 Oct. | 55 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 18 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 122 |
| 17. | 41 | 8-14 " | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 18. | 42 | 15-21 " | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 25 |
| 19. | 43 | 22-28 " | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 20. | 44 | 29 Oct4 Nov. | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| | | Total counts | 287 | 393 | 401 | 175 | 159 | 165 | 320 | 531 | 103 | 36 | 2570 |

| Tabl | e 3 : Correlation | co-efficie | nts of <i>He</i> | licoverpa a | <i>rmigera</i> mo | th catches v | with weath | er parame | ters (Kh-2 | 002 to 201 | 1) | |
|------------|-------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|----------|
| Sr. No. | Year | Kh-02 | Kh-03 | Kh-04 | Kh-05 | Kh-06 | Kh-07 | Kh-08 | Kh-09 | Kh-10 | Kh-11 | Pooled |
| 1. | No. of cases | 18 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 178 |
| 2. | Corr. with larval | -0.0559 | 0.1431 | 0.7514** | 0.1417 | 0.1991 | 0.6340** | 0.6867** | 0.5110* | 0.7461** | 0.8975** | 0.3507** |
| | counts | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Temp. maxi. °C | 0.1590 | -0.3561 | -0.8114** | -0.5903** | 0.2123 | -0.2551 | -0.2890 | -0.2367 | -0.2099 | -0.2868 | -0.1698* |
| 4. | Temp. mini. °C | -0.4083 | 0.2686 | 0.3955 | 0.1337 | -0.5958* | 0.3762 | 0.0167 | 0.2251 | 0.2682 | -0.4006 | -0.0520 |
| 5. | Diff of temp. °c | 0.0280 | -0.3395 | -0.7140** | -0.4268 | 0.4660 | -0.3806 | -0.1701 | -0.2564 | -0.3114 | 0.0750 | -0.0824 |
| 6. | RH morn. (%) | 0.1900 | 0.1353 | 0.4847* | 0.2754 | -0.7080** | 0.4678 | 0.2272 | 0.1614 | 0.2126 | 0.3882 | -0.0132 |
| 7. | RH even. (%) | 0.0978 | 0.3793 | 0.5007* | 0.4499 | -0.4924* | 0.3001 | 0.0658 | 0.2558 | 0.1268 | 0.2066 | 0.1009 |
| 8. | Rainfall (mm) | -0.4398 | 0.4078 | 0.7455** | 0.4084 | -0.2941 | 0.0994 | -0.1826 | 0.0036 | 0.0254 | 0.2353 | 0.0817 |
| 9. | Rainy days | -0.3135 | 0.1799 | 0.6480** | 0.2243 | -0.4084 | 0.1499 | -0.1845 | -0.0461 | -0.1124 | 0.1056 | 0.0152 |
| 10. | Critical value (2 | 0.4670 | 0.4426 | 0.4543 | 0.4670 | -0.4807 | 0.4807 | 0.4670 | 0.4807 | 0.4807 | 0.4807 | 0.1471 |
| | tail 0.05%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | Critical value (2 | 0.5900 | 0.5610 | 0.5750 | 0.5900 | 0.6060 | 0.6060 | 0.5900 | 0.0606 | 0.6060 | 0.6060 | 0.1950 |
| | tail 0.01%) | | | | | | | | | | | |

N.B. * and ** indicates significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

Internat. J. Plant Protec., 8(2) Oct., 2015: 245-249

247 Internat. J. Plant Protec., 8(2) OCL, 2013. 243-247 HIND AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING INSTITUTE

R.P. JUNEJA, G.M. PARMAR, Y.H. GHELANI, K.D. MUNGRA, P.R. PATEL AND N.N. CHAUDHARI

| Table 4 : Correlation co-efficients of <i>Helicoverpa</i> larval counts with weather parameters (Kh-2002 to 2011) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------|----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Sr. No. | Year | Kh-02 | Kh-03 | Kh-04 | Kh-05 | Kh-06 | Kh-07 | Kh-08 | Kh-09 | Kh-10 | Kh-11 | Pooled |
| 1. | No. of cases | 18 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 178 |
| 2. | Temp. maxi. °C | 0.4388 | -0.4688* | -0.6810** | -0.1756 | -0.0699 | -0.0056 | -0.0397 | 0.0303 | -0.2157 | -0.1577 | -0.0609 |
| 3. | Temp. mini °C | -0.3093 | 0.2353 | 0.2958 | 0.0361 | 0.2441 | 0.2048 | 0.0817 | -0.0075 | 0.1492 | 0.6015* | -0.0259 |
| 4. | Diff of temp. °C | 0.5741* | -0.3760 | -0.5759** | -0.1247 | -0.1725 | -0.1280 | -0.0730 | 0.0170 | -0.2296 | 0.2740 | -0.0421 |
| 5. | RH morn (%) | -0.4484 | 0.2839 | 0.3961 | 0.1171 | 0.1807 | 0.2795 | 0.0955 | 0.0401 | 0.1078 | 0.2148 | 0.0236 |
| 6. | RH even (%) | -0.4532 | 0.3829 | 0.3697 | 0.1662 | 0.0677 | 0.1052 | -0.0389 | 0.0184 | 0.0221 | 0.0059 | 0.0432 |
| 7. | Rainfall (mm) | -0.2200 | -0.0717 | 0.3996 | -0.2045 | -0.2610 | -0.0680 | -0.11733 | -0.2280 | -0.1244 | -0.0534 | -0.1143 |
| 8. | Rainy days | -0.2738 | -0.0886 | 0.2824 | -0.1968 | 0.2624 | 0.0128 | -0.2052 | -0.2605 | -0.1852 | -0.1231 | -0.1294 |
| 9. | Critical value (2 | 0.4670 | 0.4426 | 0.4543 | 0.4670 | 0.4807 | 0.4807 | 0.4670 | 0.4807 | 0.4807 | 0.4807 | 0.1471 |
| | tail 0.05%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | Critical value (2 | 0.5900 | 0.5610 | 0.5750 | 0.5900 | 0.6060 | 0.6060 | 0.5900 | 0.6060 | 0.6060 | 0.6060 | 0.1950 |
| | tail 0.01%) | | | | | _ | | | | | | |

N.B. * and ** indicate significance of value at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

Correlation co-efficient of *Helicoverpa* moth catches with larval counts:

Year wise data presented in Table 3 on correlation co-efficient of *Helicoverpa* moth catches with *Helicoverpa* larval counts revealed that the results were found significant positively correlated during majority of the years. Moreover, during *Kharif*-2004, 2007, 2008, 2010 and 2011 the results were highly significant. In case of pooled over 10 years the results were found positive and highly significant (0.3507**).

Correlation co-efficient of *Helicoverpa* larval counts:

Year wise data presented in Table 4 on correlation co-efficient of *Helicoverpa* larval counts with different weather parameters revealed that results were found significant during *Kharif*-2002, 2003, 2004 and 2011 only. Whereas, during the rest of years and overall pooled over 10 years the results were found non- significant. Similar work related to the present topic was also done by Khorasiya *et al.* (2014); Jagadeesh and Mallikarjun (2012); Rathod *et al.* (2014) and Barad *et al.* (2014) on pigeonpea, Choudhary *et al.* (2014) and Chatar *et al.* (2010) on chickpea, Gandhi *et al.* (2013) on Sorghum and Ghanta *et al.* (2011).

Acknowledgement:

The authors are thankful to The honorable Vice-Chancellor and Director of Research and Dean P.G. Studies, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh for providing necessary facilities to conduct this experiment.

REFERENCES

Barad, A.H., Kapadia, M.N. and Jethva, D.M. (2014). Residual toxicity of *Nomuraea rileyi* (Farlow) Samson against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on pigeonpea. *Internat. J. Plant Protec.*, **7**(1): 246-247.

Chatar, V.P., Raghvani, K.L., Joshi, M.D., Ghadge, S.M., Deshmukh, S.G. and Dalave, S.K. (2010). Population dynamics of pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) infesting chickpea. *Internat. J. Plant Protec.*, **3** (1): 65-67.

Choudhary, O.M., Anwala, R. and Sharma, M.M. (2014). Studies on varietal screening and date of sowing of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) on chickpea [*Cicer arietiinum* (L.)]. *Adv. Res. J. Crop Improv.*, **5** (2) : 149-153.

Gandhi, B. Kiran, Shekharappa and Balikai, R.A.(2013). Estimation of per cent earhead damage and yield loss due to earhead caterpillar, *Helicoverpa armigera* under natural condition on *Kharif* sorghum . *Internat. J. Plant Protec.*, **6**(1) : 168-170.

Ghante, Vijaykumar N., Benki, A.M., Ranjithkumar, L. and Chowdhary, L. Rajesh (2011). Negative cross resistance of cry 1Ac toxin selected *Helicoverpa armigera* to chemical insecticides. *Internat. J. Plant Sci.*, 6 (2): 257-261.

Jagadeesh Babu, C.S. and Mallikarjun (2012). Evaluation of different insecticides and bio-pesticides for control of pigeonpea pod borer (*Helicoverpa armigera* Hubner. *Internat. J. Plant Protec.*, **5**(2): 272-274.

Juneja, R. P. and Raghvani, K. L. (2000). Feeding behaviour of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) and its damage in pearl millet. *Insect. Environ.*, **6**(3): 141-142.

Khorasiya, S.G., Vyas, H.J., Jethva, D.M. and Joshi, P.H. (2014). Screening of pigeonpea varieties for resistance against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) Hardwick. *Internat. J. Forestry & Crop Improv.*, **5** (1): 25-27.

Prem Kishore and Solomon, S. (1989). Research needs and future strategy for controlling insect pest problems on bajra

based cropping system. Seeds & Farm, 15 (7&8): 23-26.

Rathod, N.P., Vala, G.S., Dudhat, A.S. and Kachhadiya, N.M. (2014). Field-efficacy of bio-pesticides alone and in combination with newer insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* of pigeonpea. *Internat. J. Plant Protec.*, 7(1): 128-131.

8 Year **** of Excellence