

Bioefficacy of Different Insecticides Against Sapota Bud Worm, Anarsia Sp. (Lepidoptera: Gelechidae)

S. K. Ghirtlahre^{*1}, C. M. Sahu^{*}, Y. P. S. Nirala^{*}, A. Kerketta^{*} and K. L. Paikra^{*}

ABSTRACT: Field studies were carried out to evaluate efficacy of insecticides viz Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (0.05%), Spinosad 45 SC (0.0169%), Indoxacarb 14.5 SC (0.0145%), Polytrin-C 44 EC (0.044%), Karanj oil (Pongamia pinnata) (0.03%), Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP (0.0075%) against the bud borer, Anarsia sp. (Lepidoptera : Gelechidae). Results showed that among different treatments Spinosad 45 SC (0.0169%), Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP (0.0075%) and Polytrin-C 44 EC (0.044%) with lowest percent fruit infestation of 2.99, 4.51 and 5.35 highest fruit yield of 2757, 1945 and 1467kg/ ha were recorded, respectively followed by hydrochloride 50 SP (0.05%) recorded 7.36 percent fruit infestation and 1121 kg/ha fruit yield. While among the insecticides of Karanj oil (Pongamia pinnata) (8.54%), followed by Indoxacarb 14.5 SC (7.92 percent fruit infestation) with mean fruit yield of 959 and 1298 kg/ha were obtained, respectively. The economics of different insecticidal treatments revealed that Polytrin-C 44 EC @ 0.044 per cent had highest C: B ratio i.e., 1:9.03 followed by Bacillus thuringiensis5 WP @ 0.0075 per cent (1:8.36).

Key words: Anarsia sp., Bioefficacy, Bud Worm, Sapota.

INTRODUCTION

India is considered to be the largest producer of sapota in the world with an area of about 1.60 lakh hectares and production of 1424 metric tones as reported by Anonymous [1]. According to Anonymous [2] Chhattisgarh, covers 220 hectare area and yielding 748.5 metric tones of sapota fruits. Various factors are there which affects the yield of Sapota, among which damage caused by insect pests is one of the important factors. More than 25 insect pests attacks sapota [3, 7]. Among these, bud worm is a major and regular pest causing damage to the sapota crop. The larva of bud worm bore into the fruits, fungus attacked on infested fruit later drop down resulting direct impact on fruit yield. Jhala [5] recorded that bud borer damage ranged from 2.0 to 15.0 per cent and according to Sathish [6] bud borer damage ranged from 2.14 to 11.29 per cent. Excessive use of chemicals to control this pest not only causes economical restrain on farmers but also produces the harmful side effects on the environment as well as human beings. The best way to overcome this situation is application of appropriate insecticides with proper dose to destroy the pest at its initial stage of the life cycle. Hence, an investigation on bioefficacy of different insecticides against sapota bud worm, *Anarsia sp.* was carried out.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The current experiment was conducted during August, 2013 – June, 2014 at the Horticulture Instructional Farm, TCB College of Agriculture and Research Station Bilaspur, a constituent College of Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) India, with seven treatments, replicated thrice in Randomized Block Design. Twenty one trees of sapota variety Kalipatti were randomly selected and the insecticidal treatments (Table 1) were applied with the help of foot sprayer on the onset of maximum pest incidence. Pre treatment observation were recorded a day before treatment. After treatment, observations were recorded on trees randomly selected of which four twigs in four directions (North,

^{*} Department of Entomology, Indira Gandhi KrishiVishwavidyalaya, Raipur-492012, Chhattisgarh, India. ¹E- mail: sanjayentomology@gmail.com

South, East, West) and the number of damaged fruit were recorded from randomly selected twenty fruit after 3,10 and 20 days of the first insecticidal application. The treatments were repeated after 28 days as the second round of spray schedule. Twenty fruit were observed from each direction per tree to record the damage caused by bud worm. The number of healthy and damaged fruit per twig was counted and percentage of infestation was worked out. The data thus generated was analyzed using arc sine transformations. The cost benefit ratio for each treatment was also worked out.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results presented in Table 1 indicates that the pretreatment observation, the fruit infestation was ranged from 7.08 to 9.58 per cent, which were recorded non significant differences among different treatments (Table 1). Three days after first spray, the fruit infestation was almost similar in all the treated trees in the range of 5.00 to 8.33 per cent and there were no significant differences among all the treatments. At ten days after first spray, the trees treated with Spinosad 45 SC recorded least fruit infestation (2.92%), it was at par with *Bacillus thuringiensis* 5 WP (5.42%) and Polytrin-C 44 EC (6.25%) but differed significantly from Indoxacarb 14.5 SC (8.33%), Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (8.75%), Karanj oil (Pongamia pinnata) (9.58%) and untreated control (10.00%). At twenty days after spray, the trees treated with Spinosad 45 SC recorded least fruit infestation (1.25%), but differed significantly from *Bacillus thuringiensis* 5 WP (4.58%). The highest fruit infestation was recorded in Karanj oil (Pongamia pinnata) (10.83%) which was at par with Polytrin-C 44 EC (8.33%), Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (9.17%) and Indoxacarb 14.5 SC (10.42%). The second spray was done 28 days after first spray. Pre treatment observations were recorded a day before treatment, in which the fruit infestation ranged from 7.50 to 9.58 per cent with non significant differences. After three days of treatment the fruit infestation ranged from 4.17 to 8.33 per cent, which differed non significantly among treatments. After ten days of spray, all treatments were superior over untreated control. The trees treated with Polytrin-C 44 EC and Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP recorded least fruit infestation of 2.50 and 2.50 per cent, respectively, which was at par with Spinosad 45 SC (2.92%). Karanj oil (Pongamia pinnata) @ 0.03 per cent treatment

observed least effective against bud worm, Anarsia sp. with highest fruit infestation of 7.08 per cent. Twenty days after spraying of insecticides, all treatments were significantly superior over untreated control. The trees treated with Spinosad 45 SC recorded least fruit infestation (1.25%). It was at par with Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP with (1.67%) but differed significantly from Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (7.92%) and Indoxacarb 14.5 SC (8.33%). The highest fruit infestation (9.58 %) was recorded in Karanj oil (Pongamia pinnata) @ 0.03 per cent, which was at par with Polytrin-C 44 EC (5.42%) and untreated control (10.83%). Thus, the overall per cent fruit damage data revealed that Spinosad 45 SC @ 0.0169 per cent was found most effective against bud worm, Anarsia sp., as it recorded lowest fruit infestation of 2.99 per cent. The second best treatment was Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP (4.51%) followed by Polytrin-C 44 EC (5.35%). Karanj oil (Pongamia pinnata) @ 0.03 per cent recorded highest fruit infestation (8.54 %) and declared least effective.

In this study, Spinosad 45 SC @0.0169 per cent was recorded most effective against bud worm, Anarsia sp. followed by Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP and Polytrin-C 44 EC. Similarly, Survavanshi and Patel [8] reported that Polytrin-C 44 EC @0.044 and Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP @ 0.05 per cent effectively controlled the bud boring insect, Anarsia achrasella with 0.69 per cent and 1.75 per cent bud infestation, respectively. Deshmukh [4] also reported that Polytrin-C @ 0.044 per cent was effectively controlled the bud borer (A. achrasella and N. eugraphella). The highest fruit yield of sapota (2757 kg/ha) was recorded in Spinosad 45 SC treatment followed by Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP (1945 kg/ha), Polytrin-C 44 EC (1467 kg/ha), Indoxacarb 14.5 SC (1298 kg/ha), Cartap hydrochloride 50 SP (1121 kg/ha), Karanj oil (Pongamia pinnata) (959 kg/ha) and untreated control (859kg/ha).

The economics of different insecticidal treatments presented in (Table 2.) indicated that Polytrin-C 44 EC @ 0.044 per cent had highest C: B ratio *i.e.*, 1:9.03 followed by *Bacillus thuringiensis*5 WP @ 0.0075 per cent (1:8.36), Spinosad 45 SC @ 0.0169 per cent (1:6.60), Karanj oil (*Pongamia pinnata*) @0.03 per cent (1:4.56), Cartap hydrochloride50 SP @ 0.05 per cent (1:2.83) and Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 0.0145 per cent (1:2.97). The present findings are in agreement with Suryavanshi and Patel [8] who also reported that Polytrin-C 44 EC @ 0.044 per cent had highest C: B ratio *i.e.*, 1:16.34.

Is Concentr- ation (%) Before 1° First Spray 3 DAS To DAS 20 20 rydrochloride50 SP (4 5 SC 0.005 5.50 (15.82) 6.25 (14.41) 8.75 (15.83) 9.17 I 45 SC 0.0169 8.33 (16.74) 5.42 (13.42) 2.92 (9.76) 1.22 trb 14.5 SC 0.0145 9.85 (17.45) 9.83 (15.40) 8.33 10.83 C 44 EC 0.03 6.67 (14.91) 5.83 (15.40) 8.33 10.8 a control 0.03 6.67 (14.91) 5.83 (15.40) 8.33 10.8 a control 0.03 6.67 (14.91) 5.83 (15.40) 8.33 10.8 a control 0.03 6.67 (14.91) 5.83 (15.40) 8.33 10.8 a control 0.03 6.67 (14.91) 5.83 (15.40) 5.83 (15.40) 10.8 a control 0.03 5.07 (14.91) 5.83 (15.80) 5.83 (15.80) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12.8) 5.81 (12	Per cent fruit damage	amage			11 - man	
Treatmentsation (%) 1^* SprayTreatmentsation (%) 1^* SprayCartap hydrochloride50 SP0.05 7.50 (15.88Spinosad 45 SC0.0145 9.58 (17.83Polytrin-C 44 EC0.0144 7.92 (16.11Raranj oil (Pongamia prinnata)0.03 6.67 (14.95Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP0.0075 9.17 (17.44Untreated control $ 7.08$ (15.49Bacillus thuringiensis 5 WP 0.0075 9.17 (17.41Untreated control $ 7.08$ (15.49SEm \pm $ 1.35$ CD at 5% $ -$ Days after spray $ -$ res in parentheses are arc sin transformed values arcolumn treatment means marked with same letter dad 45 SC 0.0145 ad 45 SC 0.0145 acarb 14.5 SC 0.0145 0.0145 $ 0.036$ 0.0145 acarb 14.5 SC 0.0145 0.0145 $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0166$ $ 0.0166$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0145$ $ 0.0166$ $ 0.0166$ $ 0.0166$ $ 0.01755$ <th>Before</th> <th></th> <th>Second Spray</th> <th></th> <th>Uver all dama 9 e</th>	Before		Second Spray		Uver all dama 9 e	
1 Cartap hydrochloride30 SP 0.05 7.50 (15.82) 6.25 (14.41) 8.75 (15.83) 9.17 (11) 2 Spinosad 45 SC 0.0169 8.33 (16.74) 5.23 (13.91) 8.33 (16.74) 10.42 (13) 4 Polytine 44 EC 0.0146 8.33 (16.74) 5.23 (13.91) 8.33 (15.74) 10.42 (13) 5 Karanjoil (Pongamia primuta) 0.03 6.67 (14.91) 5.83 (13.90) 9.33 (16.74) 10.42 (13) 6 Bacillus fluringicnes 5 WP 0.0075 9.17 (14) 7.54 (14.31) 8.33 (16.74) 10.00 (18.93) 11.25 (11) 7 Untreated control - 7.08 (15.40) 8.33 (16.74) 10.00 (18.93) 11.25 (11) 5.83 (13.91) 8.33 (15.74) 10.23 (11) 11.25 (11) 11.25 (11) 11.25 (11) 13.45 <th>DAS 2nd Spray</th> <th>3 DAS</th> <th>10 DAS</th> <th>20 DAS</th> <th>(%)</th>	DAS 2 nd Spray	3 DAS	10 DAS	20 DAS	(%)	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	9.17 (17.59)° 8.75 (17.11)	1) 7.50 (15.40)	$4.58(12.31)^{b}$	7.92 (16.25) ^{bc}	7.92 (16.25) ^{bc} 7.36 (15.69) ^b	
3 Indoxacarb 14.5 SC 0.0145 9.58 (17.83) 7.08 (15.40) 8.33 (6.74) 10.42 (18.35) 5 Karanjoil (Porgamia primuta) 0.003 5.7 (14.91) 5.33 (15.74) 10.35 (13.00) 5.83 (13.80) 9.58 (13.80) 9.58 (13.81) 4.50 (12.51) 4.53 (12.51) 4.53 (12.51) 4.53 (12.51) 4.55 (13.21) 4.56 (13.21) 4.56 (13.21) 5.24 (13.31) 4.56 (13.21) 5.51 (12.51) 5.51 (12.51) 4.56 (13.21) 4.56	$(6.29)^{a}$	2) 4.17 (11.70)	$2.92 (9.76)^a$		2.99 (9.92) ^a	
4 Polytrin-C 44 EC 0.044 7.92 (16.13) 5.00 (12.81) 6.52 (13.91)* 8.33 (1 5 Karanjoil (Pongamia pinnata) 0.003 6.7 (14.91) 5.83 (13.80) 9.58 (17.45) 1.083 (1 7 Untreated control $ 1.35$ 1.06 1.48 1.42 7 Untreated control $ 1.35$ 1.00 (18.38) 1.125 (1 5 SEm ± $ 1.35$ 1.06 1.48 1.42 5 State spray $ 1.35$ 1.00 (18.38) 1.125 (1 5 DAS-Days after spray $ 1.35$ 1.06 1.42 * Figures in parentheses are arc sin transformed values and those outside are original values. 1.42 1.42 * Figures in parentheses are arc sin transformed values and those outside are original values. 1.42 1.42 * Figures in parentheses are arc sin transformed values and those outside are original values. 1.42 1.42 * Figures in parentheses are arc sin transformed values and those outside are original values. 1.42	$10.42 (18.19)^{\circ} 9.17 (17.49)$	9) 7.92 (16.13)	5.42 (13.30) ^c	$8.33 (16.54)^{\rm bc}$	8.33 (16.54) ^{bc} 7.92 (16.25) ^b	
5 Karanjoil (Pongamia pinnata) 0.03 67 (14.91) 5.83 (17.45) 10.83 (15.43) 5.83 (17.45) 10.83 (15.43) 5.43 (13.31) 4.56 (13.31) 4.51 (13.31) 4.53 (17.45) 1.02 (18.91) 1.02 (18.91) 1.22 (13.31) 4.53 (13.61) 4.33 (15.74) 10.20 (13.31) 4.53 (13.61) 4.51 (13.31) 4.51 (13.31) 4.53 (13.61) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21) 4.51 (13.21)	8.33 (16.67)° 7.92 (16.25)	_	2.50 (8.83) ^a	5.42 (12.88) ^c	$5.42 (12.88)^{\circ} 5.35 (13.16)^{ab}$	
			7.08 (15.26) ^d	$9.58(18.01)^{\circ}$	$9.58(18.01)^{\circ} 8.54(16.89)^{b}$	
7Untreated control $-$ 7.08 (15.40)8.33 (16.74)11.25 (12)SEm ± $-$ 1.351.061.481.451.45SEm ±CD at 5% $-$ NS4.564.35* DAS-Days after spray* In a column treatment means marked with same letter do not show significant difference at 5 r1.45* In a column treatment means marked with same letter do not show significant difference at 5 rTable 2* In a column treatment means marked with same letter do not show significant difference at 5 rTable 2Table 2Economics of different insecticides against America0Table 2ConcentrationQuantity ofTreatmentsper cent(kg or Lit/ha)Indoxacarb 14.5 SC0.01450.075Spinosad 45 SC0.01450.075Bacillus thurnigensis 5 WP0.0070.755Bacillus thurnigensis 5 WP0.0070.755Bacillus thurnigensis 5 WP0.0070.755Bacillus thurnigensis 5 WP0.0070.755Bacillus thurnigensis 5 WP0.0750.755Bacillus thurnigensis 5 WP0.07			2.50 (6.90) ^a	$1.67 (7.23)^{a}$	$(7.23)^{a}$ 4.51 $(12.05)^{a}$	
SEm \pm -1.351.061.481.42* DAS-Days after sprayNS4.564.354.35* DAS-Days after spray-NS4.564.35* In a column treatment means marked with same letter do not show significant difference at 5 rTable 2* In a column treatment means marked with same letter do not show significant difference at 5 rTable 2Economics of different insecticides against AnarsiaCartap hydrochoride 50 SP0.052.50Spinosad 45 SC0.01690.94Indovacarb 14.5 SC0.01452.10Polytrin-C 44 EC0.0072.50Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Shinse function $per tanper tanIndovacarb 14.5 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC0.01690.05Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC0.01452.10Spinosad 45 SC1.45Scillus thuringensis 5 WP0.0075Spinosad 45 SC-Stant-C.D. at 5 %-Stant-Stant-Stant-Stant-Stant-Stant-Stant-Stant$	11.25 (19.51)° 7.50 (15.82)	2) 7.92 (15.89)	8.33 (16.74) ^e	$10.83 (19.14)^{\circ} 9.44 (17.83)^{b}$	9.44 (17.83) ^b	
* DAS-Days after spray * Post-Days after spray * Figures in parentheses are arc sin transformed values and those outside are original values. * In a column treatment means marked with same letter do not show significant difference at 5 r Table 2 Foromics of different insecticides against Anarsia Concentration Treatments Treat	.42 0.12 20 NIC	1.90 NG	0.21	1.27 2.01	0.70	
Table 2 Economics of different insecticides against AuarsiaFeonomics of different insecticides against AuarsiaCommity of insectides usedTotal costTreatmentsConcentrationPrimaPrintTreatmentsConcentrationPrintPrintTreatmentsConcentrationPrintFreatmentsConcentrationPrintFreatmentsConcentrationPrintFreatmentsConcentrationPrintFreatmentsConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrintPrintConcentrationPrint <th c<="" th=""><th>5 per cent level of s:</th><th>ignificance.</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th>	<th>5 per cent level of s:</th> <th>ignificance.</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	5 per cent level of s:	ignificance.			
Quantity of insectides used per ha (kg or Lit/ha) 2.50 0.94 2.10 2.50 0.75 3.75 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	sia sp. in sapota, Ac	chras sapota L.				
<i>per ha</i> (kg or Lit./ha) 2.50 0.94 2.10 2.50 0.75 3.75 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	st of plant		Net rea	Net realization		
(Ag or Larynu) 2.50 0.94 2.10 2.50 0.75 3.75 3.75 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	protection +	Fruit yield	000	over control	יודים מיט	
. 1200 Per kg 11500 Per litr	1900 IND01	(ml/Sylin)		(mu/svi)	C.D MILL	
. 1200 Per kg 11500 Per litr	3692	1121		10474	1:2.84	
. 1200 Per kg 11500 Per litr	11479	2757		75935	1:6.62	
. 1200 Per kg 11500 Per litr	5905	1298		17559	1:2.97	
. 1200 Per kg . 11500 Per litr	2692	1467		24336	1:9.04	
. 1200 Per kg . 11500 Per litt	875.3	959		4005	1:4.58	
	5192	1945		43436	1:8.37	
	I	859		I	I	
	I	1.51		I	I	
	I	4.66		I	Ι	
	I	25.35		I	Ι	
ride 50 SP = Rs. = Rs. 5C = Rs.						
= Rs. 5C = Rs.						
sc = Rs.						
= Rs.						
Raranj 011 (Pongamia pinnata) = KS. 244.44 Fer litte Rocilius thurinoineis 5 MD						

Vol. 33, No. 2, April-June 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are thankful to Head Department of Entomology, IGKV,COA Raipur, Dean TCB COA, Bilaspur and all the advisory committee members for providing necessary facilities during the tenure of investigation.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous, (2011), Indian Horticultural Data Base, National Horticultural Board, Gurgaon, India., pp. 125.
- Anonymous , (2012), Directorate of Horticulture, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
- Butani D. K., (1979), Insect and Fruits, *Periodical Expert Book Agency*, Delhi, 87-94.
- Deshmukh D. V., (2001), Varietal screening of sapota against pest complex, comparative biology of *Anarsia achrasella*

B. and bioefficacy of chemical insecticides against bud boring insects of sapota. *M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis,* Gujarat Agric. Univ., Sardarkrushinagar, Gujarat (India).

- Jhala R. C., A. H. Shah, C. B. Patel, and S. H. Patel., (1986), Population dynamics of some insect pests of sapota in south Gujarat, *GAU Res. J.*, **11**: 69-71.
- Sathish R., Naik D. J. and K. B. Niranjana, (2012), Seasonal incidence of chiku bud borer (*Anarsia achrasella* Bradley) on sapota under hill zone of Karnataka, *International journal of advances in pharmacy, biology and chemistry*, **3(1)**: 21-23.
- Shukla A., (2011), Insect pests of sapota and their management, Rashtriya Krishi., **6(1):** 51-52.
- Suryavanshi S. S. and B. R. Patel., (2009), Evaluation of different insecticides against sapota bud borer, *Anarsia achrasella* Bradley, *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, **22**:722-723.