International Journal of Plant & Soil Science

Volume 35, Issue 18, Page 423-426, 2023; Article no.IJPSS.102730
ISSN: 2320-7035

Effect of Selected Biopesticides and Chemicals against Pod Borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (L.)] on Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.)

Manoj Singh Bhati [a], Tayde Anoorag Rajnikant [a*], Sudhir Pratap Singh [a] and Ashok Sakharam Chandar [a]

[a] Department of Entomology, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higgingbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj -211007, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2023/v35i183306

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/102730

Original Research Article

Received: 05/05/2023
Accepted: 09/07/2023
Published: 18/07/2023

ABSTRACT

The research work was undertaken at Central Research Farm (CRF) Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences (SHUATS), Naini, Prayagraj during *Rabi* season in 2022-23. Experiment consists of eight treatments including control *viz.* Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.3ml/lit, Emamectin benzoate 1.9 EC @ 5ml/lit, *Bacillus thurigiensis* 1x10^9 CFU/ml @ 2.5g/lit, Spinosad 45 SC @ 0.3ml/lit, Indoxcarb 14.5 SC @ 0.5ml/lit, *Metarhizium anisiopilae* 1x10^9 CFU/ml @ 2.5gm/lit, *Beauvaria bassiana* 1.15 % WP @ 2.5gm/lit and untreated control in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications. Data was taken on the mean larval population of chickpea pod borer *Helicoverpa armigera* on third, seventh and fourteen days after spray. Spraying revealed that the treatment Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (2.36) found to be superior followed by Spinosad 45 SC (2.70), Emamectin benzoate 1.9EC (2.77), Indoxcarb 14.5 SC (2.98), *Bacillus thurigiensis* 1x10^9 CFU/ml (3.17), *Beauvaria bassiana* 1.15% WP (3.45), *Metarhizium anisiopilae*

**Corresponding author: E-mail: anurag.tayde@shiats.edu.in;*

1x10^9 CFU/ml (3.79) was found to be least effective among all the treatments as compared to control (5.64). Based on yield and cost benefit ratio the best and most economical treatment was Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (26.83 q/ha) (1:3.49), followed by Spinosad 45SC (23.08 q/ha) (1:2.83), Emamectin benzoate 1.9EC(20.03q/ha) (1:2.66), *Bacillus thurigiensis* 1x10^9 CFU/ml (17.50 q/ha) (1:2.32), Indoxcarb 14.5 SC (17.66 q/ha) (1:2.29), *Beauvaria bassiana* 1.15 % WP (12.00 q/ha) (1:1.60), *Metarhizium anisiopilae* 1x109 CFU/ml (11.08 q/ha) (1:1.47) and untreated control (9.08) (1:1.27) ratio.

Keywords: Biopesticides; chemicals; Cicer arietinum, economics; efficacy; Helicoverpa armigera.

1. INTRODUCTION

Chickpea *(Cicer arietinum* L.), a member of Fabaceae, belongs to family "Leguminosae", subfamily "Papilonidae" having diploid number of chromosomes 2n=16 is an important pulse crop. "It is a self-pollinated crop and is second most important food legume crop after common bean. It is an ancient cool season food legume crop cultivated by man and has been found in middle eastern archaeological sites dated 7500- 6800 BC. In India, chickpea is known by various names like chana or gram or Bengal gram or chani in Haryana, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, Uttar pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chattisgarh, Bihar, Jharkhand, etc.; chole in Punjab, Jammu and Kashmir and Delhi; chola in West bengal; Harbara in Maharastra; Boot in Orissa; Sanagulu in Andhra pradesh; Kadale in Karnataka; kadalai in Tamil nadu; and kadala in Kerala, indicating its wide spread cultivation and knowledge of utilization" [1].

Chickpea is used for human consumption as well as for feeding to animals. Its seeds are eaten as green vegetable, fried, roasted, as snack food and ground to obtain flour and dhal [2]. Which has been considered as 'King of Pulses'. "It is generally grown under rainfed or residual soil moisture conditions in Rabi season and the plant grows to 20-50 cm height and has small, feathery leaves on either side of the stem" [3].

Nevertheless chickpea is attacked by several pests, mainly insects. Sarwar, [4] recorded "57 insect species, namely Lepidoptera as *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), commonly known as cotton bollworm or American bollworm, is a major noctuid pest in Asia, causing heavy damage to agricultural, horticultural and ornamental crops" [5].

"In India, the extent of losses due to *H. armigera* in chickpea is up to 27.9 per cent in North West Plain Zone, 13.2 per cent in North East Plain Zone, 24.3 per cent in Central Zone and 36.4 per cent in South Zone. The crops have been noticed to suffer an avoidable loss of 9 to 60 per cent by this insect. In Uttar Pradesh alone 15.3 per cent of the chickpea crop worth Rs.462.5 million is lost annually due to *H. armigera* attack, 17.2 per cent in Karnataka and 28.5per cent in Delhi. Yield losses of chickpea grain due to *H. armigera* were 75.90 per cent and in some places the losses were up to 100 per cent" [6].

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted during the *Rabi* season 2022- 2023 in Central Research farm (CRF), Uttar Pradesh, India. All the facilities necessary for cultivation, including labour was made available in the department. The site selected was uniform, cultivable with typical Sandy loam soil having good drainage. The experiment was conducted in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with eight treatments including control with three replications. The plot size taken was 2 m×1 m. The crops of Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) were used for sowing by maintaining 45 cm inter-row and15 cm intra-row distance with the seed rate of 70-100 kg/ha. The spray solution was applied withthe help of a handcompression sprayer. Spraying was done at dawn and desk time and there mustnot be much windcurrents.

The Biopesticides and Chemicals used for spraying are Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC(Coragen) @ 0.3ml/lit, Emamectin benzoate 1.9 EC(Larvi claim) @5 ml/lit, *Bacillus thurigiensis* 1x10^9 CFU/ml(Vecto bac) @2.5 g/lit, Spinosad 45 SC(Tracer) @0.3 ml/lit, Indoxcarb 14.5 SC(King Carb)@0.5 ml/lit, *Metarhizium anisiopilae(*Biomet*)* 1x10^9 CFU/ml @2.5 gm/lit, *Beauvaria bassiana*(Atmanam) 1.15% WP @ 2.5 gm/lit and untreated control.

The numbers of larva were counted on 5 randomly selected plants in each plot. The pre-treatment count was made a day before the first spray and second spray whereas, the post-treatment counts were made on 3rd, 7th and 14th day after each spray. The larval population over

Table 1. Efficacy of certain biopesticides and chemicals on larval population of gram pod borer (*H. armigera*) on chickpea after first, second spray and C:B ratio

Treatments		larval population of gram pod borer (*H. armigera*) on chickpea										Yield (q/ha)	C: B Ratio
		1st spray					2nd spray						
		One day before spray	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	Mean	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	Mean	Overall mean (1&2 spray)		
T1	Chlorantraniprole 18.5% SC @0.3ml/lit	5.46	3.00^{e}	2.53^{f}	2.66^{f}	2.73^{g}	2.33^{f}	1.80^{g}	1.86^{g}	1.99^{f}	2.36^{e}	26.83	1:3.49
T2	Emamectin banzoate 1.9% SC @5ml/lit	5.33	3.33^{de}	2.86^{de}	3.00^{e}	3.06^{ef}	2.73^{e}	2.26^{ef}	2.46^{ef}	2.48^{e}	2.77^{cde}	20.03	1:2.66
T3	*Bacillus thuringiensis* 1 X 10^{9}CFU/ml @2.5g/lit	5.20	3.80^{c}	3.26^{c}	3.40^{d}	3.48^{d}	3.13^{cd}	2.66^{d}	2.80^{d}	2.86^{d}	3.17^{bcd}	17.50	1:2.32
T4	Spinosad 45% SC @0.3ml/lit	5.33	3.26^{de}	2.73^{ef}	3.00^{e}	2.99^{f}	2.73^{e}	2.20^{f}	2.33^{f}	2.42^{e}	2.70^{de}	23.08	1:2.83
T5	Indoxcarb 14.5%SC @ 0.5ml/lit	5.40	3.40^{d}	3.13^{cd}	3.26^{d}	3.26^{e}	2.93^{de}	2.53^{de}	2.66^{de}	2.70^{de}	2.98^{cde}	17.66	1:2.29
T6	*Metarhizium Anisiopilae 1×10^{9}* CFU/ml @2.5g/lit	5.46	3.26^{b}	3.86^{b}	4.00^{b}	4.04^{b}	3.73^{b}	3.40^{b}	3.53^{b}	3.55^{b}	3.79^{b}	11.08	1:1.47
T7	*Beauvaria bassiana* 1.15% WP @2.5g/lit	5.13	3.86^{c}	3.60^{b}	3.66^{c}	3.70^{c}	3.40^{bc}	3.00^{c}	3.20^{c}	3.20^{c}	3.45^{bc}	12.00	1:1.60
T8	Control	5.13	5.20^{a}	5.33^{a}	5.40^{a}	5.31^{a}	5.66^{a}	5.93^{a}	6.20^{a}	5.97^{a}	5.64^{a}	9.08	1:1.27
Overall Mean		5.30	3.63	3.41	3.54	3.57	3.33	2.97	3.13	3.14	3.35		
F- test		NS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
S. Ed. (±)		0.17	0.18	0.14	0.12	0.19	0.16	0.14	0.10	0.15	0.31		
C. D. (P = 0.05)		N/A	0.381	0.297	0.261	0.212	0.354	0.302	0.215	0.325	0.745		

control against gram pod borer was calculated by considering the mean of three observations recorded at 3rd, 7th, and14th day after first and second spray.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data after spraying reveled that all the treatment were significantly superior over control. Among all the treatments most effective treatment in controlling larval population of gram pod borer was recorded in Chlorantraniprole 18.5 SC (2.36 larvae per 5 plants) followed by Spinosad 45 SC (2.70), Emamectin banzoate 1.9 EC (2.77), Indoxcarb 14.5 SC (2.98), *Bacillus thuringiensis* 1×10^9 CFU/ml (3.17) and *Beauvaria bassiana* 1.15% WP (3.45), *Metarhizium anisiopilae* 1×10^9 CFU/ml (3.79) was found to be least effective among all the treatments as compared to control(5.64).

When the cost benefit ratio worked out data revealed that among all the treatments the higher cost benefit ratio was obtained from Chlorantraniprole 18.5 SC (1:3.49) similar results were reported by Chitralekha et al., [7] followed by Spinosad 45 SCwith a cost benefit ratio of (1:2.83) which was reported by Kale and Men [8] followed by Emamectin banzoate 1.9EC with a cost benefit ratio of (1:2.66) Yadav and Verma [9] also reported the effectiveness of Emamectin banzoate 1.9 EC.

4. CONCLUSION

This study highlights the effect of selected biopesticides and chemicals against pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (L.)] on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Chickpea is used for human consumption as well as for feeding to animals. Its seeds are eaten as green vegetable, fried, roasted, as snack food and ground to obtain flour and dhal. The larval population over control against gram pod borer was calculated by considering the mean of three observations recorded at 3rd, 7th, and14th day after first and second spray.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Gayathri L, Kumar A. Field efficacy of certain insecticides against pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chick pea in Prayagraj. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2021;9(3):280-283.
2. Lavanya V, Kumar A. Efficacy of certain chemicals against gram pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner)] on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;11(3):1293-1297.
3. Spoorthi GS, Singh R, Sharma R, Amit A, Singht N, Tomar SS. Efficacy of insecticide and bio pesticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea in Western Uttar Pradesh. Journal of Pharmacology and Phytochemistry. 2017;1:1034-1039.
4. Sarwar M. Competency of natural and synthetic chemicals in controlling gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea crop. International Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2012;2(4):132-135.
5. Talekar NS, Opena RT, Hanson P. *Helicoverpa armigera* management: A review of AVRDC's research on host plant resistance in tomato. Crop Protection. 2006;5:461-467.
6. Singh P, Singh R, Kumar S, Kumar V, Kumar S. Bioefficacy of certain new insecticides against larval population of gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) in chickpea. The Ecoscan. 2015;7:315-318.
7. Chitralekha GS, Verma T. Efficacy of insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* on chickpea. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2018;6(3):1058-1061.
8. Kale SN, Men UB. Efficacy of microbial insecticides and their combinations against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea. Journal of Biological Control. 2008;22(1):205-208.
9. Yadav JB, Verma RA. Efficacy of certain synthetic insecticides and biopesticides used as foliar application against the gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* Hubner. Journal of Entomological Research. 2007;31(4):327-32.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/102730