EFFECT OF CYANTRANILIPROLE 10.26 OD AGAINST MAJOR LEPIDOPTERAN AND SUCKING INSECTS ON OKRA AND CABBAGE

LAKSHMAN CHANDRA PATEL* AND HAFIZUR RAHAMAN

Department of Entomology, College of Agriculture (BCKV), Burdwan Sadar, West Bengal, 713101, India Corresponding author, E-mail: patel123lakshman@gmail.com

Abstract: The present study is conducted to evaluate bio-efficacy of cyantraniliprole during late *kharif* of 2020 against major sucking and lepidopteran insects of okra and cabbage. On okra, cyantraniliprole @ 120 g a.i./ha depicted the highest population reduction of *Aphis gossypii* (79.57 %), *Bemisia tabaci* (82.25 %), *Helicoverpa armigera* (91.98 %), *Earias vitella* (94.69 %) and *Spodoptera litura* (94.95 %), which was significantly at par with 90 g a.i./ha. On cabbage, cyantraniliprole @ 75 g a.i./ha resulted highest population reduction of *Brevicoryne brassicae* (87.50 %), *Lipaphis erysimi* (87.00 %), *Plutella xylostella* (90.55 %) and *Spodoptera litura* (89.79 %). Such dose in cabbage was statistically at par with 60 g a.i./ha to manage these pests. Significantly at par yield was also obtained for both of these respective doses of cyantraniliprole on okra (10.90 to 10.87 t/ha) and cabbage (61.67 to 61.33 t/ha), respectively. Based on the result, it can be concluded that cyantraniliprole at 90-120 g.a.i./ha on okra and 60 -75 g a.i./ha on cabbage can be recommended to manage above mentioned major respective insects.

Keywords: Efficacy, Cyantraniliprole, Okra, Cabbage, Sucking, Lepidopteran, Insect

INTRODUCTION

Okra or Bhendi or Lady's finger [Abelmoschus esculentus (L.) Moench] is one of the important delicious vegetable crops grown in India. Okra can be cultivated all-round the year especially in the tropical and sub-tropical countries (Khoso, 1994). In India, it can be grown throughout the year but summer and kharif are generally most favourable seasons for its cultivation. Globally India ranks first in okra production having area of 509 thousand hectares with an annual production of 6094.9 thousand tons and productivity of 12 million tonnes/ha (Moulana et al., 2020). The major okra producing states in India are Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Assam (Anonymous, 2011). Apart from being a very good vegetable crop, fruits of okra are also used in culinary preparation as sliced and dried pieces and also used as thickening gravies

and soups because of mucilage content. They are also good source of vitamins (A, B, C and D), proteins, carbohydrates, salts, minerals (iron, calcium, magnesium, iodine, potassium etc.) and acids (rhamnose, galacturonic and amino acid) (Arkroud, 1963; Hamon and Charrier, 1985; Wagon et al., 2014). Various biotic and abiotic factors are known to affect the productivity of the bhendi (Jiskani, 2006). Among the biotic factor ravages caused by insect pests during different growth stages of the crop are significant (Sarkar et al., 2016). As high as 72 species of insects have been recorded on okra (Srinivasan and Rajendran, 2003). Among different insect pests, few viz., sucking pests like aphids, whiteflies, leafhoppers etc. and borers & defoliators like fruit borer, fruit & shoot borer, tobacco caterpillar and other minor pests are the pests which cause considerable vield loss in okra crop (Pal, 2013). Research

revealed that a total of 69% of the okra yield was affected by insect pests (Mani *et al.,* 2005).

Similarly, cabbage is another important vegetable crop grown in different parts of India (Sahu et al, 2019) and is used as salad, boiled vegetable, in curries, pickling as well as dehydrated vegetable (Bana et al., 2012). It prefers winter temperature for optimum growth and yield, although today off season cultivation is also increasing with the introduction of suitable varieties. India ranks second after China for cabbage production with 12 % of world production (Sharma et al, 2017). In India, the area under cabbage cultivation is around 4.02 lakh hectare with 90.35 lakh tones production during 2018 The major cabbage producing states are West Bengal, Odisha, Madhyapradesh, Bihar, Assam, Gujrat, Chattisgarh, Haryana, Jharkhand and Uttarpradesh. West Bengal is the leading producer of cabbage (22.89 lakh ton) in India but the productivity is highest in Uttarpradesh (33.44 t/ha) (Majid, 2020). Various nutrients are available in cabbage including calcium, zinc, molybdenum, thiamine, vitamin C, folic acid, protein, fibre, phosphorus, magnesium, copper, chromium, potassium, riboflavin, choline, folic acid, carbohydrate, iron, fat, manganese, carotene and niacin (Tamta et al., 2014). Its production is possible only with intensive agricultural technology and chemical protection, because cabbage is also attacked by a large number of harmful insects. Thirty seven insect pests have been reported to feed on cabbage in India (Lal, 1975). Most important insects that can cause huge economic losses to the crop are aphids (Brevicoryne brassicae, Lipaphis erysimi) (Bana et al., 2012), diamond back moth (Plutella xylostella) and tobacco caterpillar (Spodoptera litura) (Sahu *et al.*, 2019)

Among the different pest management options, use of insecticides is most important and widely used management practice (Chirinos *et al.*, 2020) that substantially reduces the yield losses caused by insect pests. Due to lack of proper knowledge about the insecticides, farmers are indiscriminately spraying conventional chemicals that have led to increase in cost of cultivation and causing environmental pollution (Guo *et al.*, 1999; Handigol and Kulkarni, 2010). The evaluation of recently available effective insecticides could help in choosing the suitable insecticide for combating both sucking and lepidopteran insect pests of okra and cabbage. Keeping this in view, the present investigation was carried out to evaluate the efficacy of recently introduced novel insecticide; cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD at different concentrations along with recently recommended other insecticides against major lepidopteran and sucking insects on okra and cabbage.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at research farm of College of Agriculture, BCKV, Burdwan, West Bengal, India during late kharif 2020. The trial crops i.e okra (var. NS 862) and cabbage (var. Rare ball) were raised in randomized block design with 3 replications in 5 m x 5 m individual plot for each treatment maintaining recommended horticultural package of practices. The number of treatments were seven [cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD at 4 different concentrations (i.e. 0.06, 0.12, 0.18 and 0.24 %), thiamethoxam 25 WG (0.02 %), emamectin benzoate 5 SG (0.03 %) and untreated control in okra and cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD again at 4 different concentrations (i.e. 0.06, 0.9, 0.12 and 0.15 %), chlorfluazuron 5.4 EC (3 %), acetamiprid 20 SP (0.015 %) and untreated control in cabbage] for both the said crops. Three sprays @ 500 litre water ha⁻¹ are given at 15 days interval using knapsack sprayer fitted with hollow cone nozzle starting first spray at 40 days after transplanting (cabbage) and sowing (okra).

In both crops, the target pest wise population was recorded at 0, 3, 7 and 10 days after each spray from randomly selected 5 plants per plot and accordingly the percent (%) insect reduction was calculated over untreated Control. Data recorded in okra for aphid, *Aphis gossypii* and whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* was represented as number per plant based on population from 3 and 5 fully expanded leaves of upper plant canopy, respectively. Here, observations for *Helicoverpa armigera* and *Earias vitella* were also recorded by counting of larval numbers and percent (%) fruit damage. Whereas, only larval numbers were counted for *Spodoptera litura* and expressed as number of larvae per 5 plants. Similarly, in cabbage data recorded on population of aphid (*Brevicoryne brassicae* and *Lipaphis erysimi*) was expressed as numbers per plant. Whereas, it was expressed as numbers/5 plants for *Plutella xylostella* and *Spodoptera litura*.

Plot wise yield was recorded at each picking for both the crops. Total respective marketable yield was calculated after multiple numbers of pickings on per plot basis. The yield was expressed in ton per ha.

The data were subjected to appropriate transformations wherever necessary and analyzed statistically as per valid experimental design using MSTATC.

RESULTS

Efficacy of cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD against major sucking and lepidopteran insects of okra Sucking insects

Aphid (Aphis gossypii)

There was non-significant difference with respect to aphid population before spraying among treatments and the count ranged from 17.67 to 19.00 aphids/3 leaves/plant. Whereas, aphid's population started to show significant differences after the spray of chemicals (Table 1).

The observations recorded at different days after three sprays of insecticides depicted the lowest mean population of aphids (5.07/3)leaves/plant) in Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @120 g a.i. / ha with the overall highest reduction (79.57 %) of pest over control. It was at par with 78.97 % reduction by cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @ 90 g a.i./ha receiving 5.22 aphids/3 leaves/ plant. Whereas, the highest mean population of aphids (24.80 / 3 leaves/plant) was recorded in untreated control treatment (Table 1) followed by emamectin Benzoate 5% SG @ 8.5 g a.i./ (24.80/3 leaves/plant), cyantraniliprole ha 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha (9.94 /3 leaves/plant), thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 25 g a.i./ha (9.60 /3 leaves/plant) and cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @ 60 g a.i./ha (9.00 / 3 leaves/plant)

Whitefly (Bemisia tabaci)

The data recorded on whitefly population (Table 2) depicted non-significant differences before spraying and its population ranged from 13.67

to 14.07/5 leaves/plant. Whereas, significant differences among the treatments with respect to whitefly population was started to notice at different days after the imposition of insecticides.

The observations recorded at different days after three sprays of insecticides depicted the lowest mean population of whitefly (3.29/5 leaves/plant) in cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @120 g a.i. /ha with the overall highest reduction (82.25 %) of pest over control. It was at par with cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @ 90 g a.i./ha (3.43/5 leaves/plant, 81.49 % reduction). Whereas, the highest mean population of whitefly (17.91/5)leaves/plant) was recorded in untreated control treatment followed by cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha (8.08/5 leaves/plant), emamectin benzoate 5 SG @ 8.5 g a.i./ha (6.30/5 leaves/ plant), cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha (5.70/5 leaves/plant) and thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 25 g a.i./ha (5.70/5 leaves/plant).

Lepidopteran insects

Fruit borer (Helicoverpa armigera)

The observations made on fruit borer larval population (1.27 to 1.37 larva/ 5 plants) depicted no significant difference among the different treatments before spraying. Significant differences among the treatments started to notice at different days after the imposition of the chemicals (Table 3). Significantly the lowest mean larval population (0.30/5 plants) of fruit borer was recorded in cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @120 g a.i./ha which was found on par (0.32/5)plants) with 90 g a.i./ha. The respective overall reduction of larval population over untreated control was 91.98 and 90.74 %. Untreated control treatment has recorded the highest mean larval population of fruit borer (2.32 larva/ 5 plants) followed by thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 25 g a.i./ ha (1.30 larva/plant), cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha (1.29 larva/ 5 plants), emamectin benzoate 5 SG @ 8.5 g a.i./ha (1.6 larva/ 5 plants) and cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha (0.60 larva / 5 plants).

The percent fruit damage (23.59 to 29.70 %) recorded in Table 4 was non-significant among the treatments before the spray. Significant differences among the treatments was started

Tabl	le 1: Effica	ncy of Cyanti	raniliprole	10.26 % Ol	D against aț	ohids, Aph	is gossypii	population	/3 leaves/p	lant in okra	a crop		
E	Dose		First sprai			Second spr	ay		Third spray			Mean C	verall %
I reatments	g a.i./ha	Pre-count	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	R	OC
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	30	17.67 (4.26)	11.67 (3.49)	10.87 (3.37)	12.20 (3.56)	8.67 (3.03)	8.33 (2.97)	10.33 (3.29)	7.20 (2.77)	9.87 (3.22)	10.33 (3.29)	9.94 5	9.92
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	60	18.47 (4.35)	11.07 (3.40)	10.47 (3.31)	11.60 (3.48)	8.13 (2.94)	7.40 (2.81)	8.87 (3.06)	6.67 (2.68)	8.13 (2.94)	8.67 (3.03)	9.00	3.71
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	90	18.40 (4.35)	7.07 (2.75)	(2.61)	7.07 (2.75)	5.53 (2.46)	4.87 (2.32)	5.27 (2.40)	3.27 (1.94)	2.87 (1.83)	4.67 (2.27)	5.22 7/	8.97
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	120	18.67 (4.38)	6.93 (2.73)	6.27 (2.60)	6.93 (2.73)	5.27 (2.40)	4.73 (2.29)	5.13 (2.37)	3.07 (1.89)	2.80 (1.82)	4.47 (2.23)	5.07 7	9.57
Thiamethoxam 25% WG	25	18.60 (4.37)	11.20 (3.42)	10.60 (3.33)	12.53 (3.61)	8.60 (3.02)	8.07 (2.93)	9.47 (3.16)	7.00 (2.74)	8.53 (3.01)	10.40 (3.30)	9.60 6	1.29
Emamectin Benzoate 5% SG	8.5	19.00 (4.41)	12.20 (3.56)	11.67 (3.49)	13.93 (3.80)	9.87 (3.22)	9.20 (3.11)	11.87 (3.52)	8.67 (3.03)	11.33 (3.44)	12.20 (3.56)	11.22 5.	4.78
Untreated control		18.13 (4.32)	19.27 (4.45)	19.60 (4.48)	21.93 (4.74)	24.80 (5.03)	25.87 (5.13)	26.17 (5.16)	28.00 (5.34)	28.53 (5.39)	29.00 (5.43)	24.80 -	
S.Em±	1	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.06	1 1	
CD@5%	-	0.19	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.15	0.18	-	
DAS - Day After Spray, Figure Table	es in the pá 2. Efficacy	arenthesis ar y of Cyantra:	e square ro niliprole 1 0	oot $(\sqrt{x+0.5})$ 0.26 % OD	5) transforn against whi	ned values, itefly, <i>Bem</i> u	, ROC – Re esia tabaci	duction Ove population	er Control, T	NS – Non si op (5 leaves	ignificant s/plant)		
			First spray			Second spr	'ay		Third spra	y		Mean	
Treatments	Dose g a.i./ha	Pre-count	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS		% ROC
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	30	13.67 (3.76)	9.60 (3.18)	8.67 (3.03)	10.00 (3.24)	7.67 (2.86)	6.87 (2.71)	8.67 (3.03)	7.33 (2.80)	6.87 (2.71)	7.00 (2.73)	8.08	56.43
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	60	13.80 (3.78)	7.00 (2.74)	6.40 (2.63)	7.07 (2.75)	5.40 (2.43)	4.47 (2.23)	5.80 (2.51)	5.13 (2.37)	4.80 (2.30)	5.27 (2.40)	5.70	69.22
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	06	13.93 (3.80)	4.13 (2.15)	3.20 (1.92)	3.87 (2.09)	4.00 (2.12)	3.33 (1.96)	3.60 (2.02)	3.07 (1.89)	2.60 (1.76)	3.07 (1.89)	3.43	81.49
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	120	13.87 (3.79)	4.07 (2.13)	3.13 (1.91)	3.73 (2.06)	3.87 (2.20)	3.20 (1.92)	3.27 (1.94)	2.93 (1.85)	2.47 (1.72)	2.93 (1.85)	3.29	82.25

on significant
Over Control, NS – Nc
ROC - Reduction
transformed values,
$\sqrt{x+0.5}$)
sures in the parenthesis are square root (,
S – Day After Spray, Fig

3.20 (1.92)

3.73 (2.06)

69.22

5.70

5.13 (2.37)

4.67 (2.27)

5.13 (2.37)

65.98

6.30

7.20 (2.77)

6.33 (2.61)

5.73 (2.50)

 $\begin{array}{r}
5.27 \\
(2.40) \\
5.67 \\
(2.48) \\
19.00 \\
(4.41)
\end{array}$

5.93 (2.54) 5.60 (2.47) 18.53 (4.36)

7.20 (2.77)

6.00 (2.55) 17.00 (4.18)

7.20 (2.77)

6.00 (2.55)

14.07(3.82)

25

Thiamethoxam 25% WG

 $\begin{array}{c} 4.07 \\ (2.13) \\ 6.27 \\ (2.60) \\ 6.73 \\ (2.69) \\ 16.00 \\ (4.06) \end{array}$

14.00 (3.81)

8.5

Emamectin Benzoate 5% SG

(4.30)

14.00 (3.81)

Untreated control

17.91

14.00 (4.48)

19.67(4.49)

20.00 (4.53) 0.05 0.14

 $\begin{array}{c} 5.73 \\ (2.50) \\ 6.27 \\ (2.60) \\ 19.00 \\ (4.41) \\ 0.05 \\ 0.15 \end{array}$

0.05 0.16

0.06 0.19

0.05 0.16

0.04 0.13

0.05 0.14

0.04 0.13

0.04 0.12

NS i.

CD@5% S.Em±

					Avg. no.	of larva/5 p	lants					Mean	
Twootwoods	Dose	,	First spray			Second spr	ay		Third spra	y		<u> </u>	
1 1 CULUTE 1115	g a.i./ha	rre-count	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS		
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 %	00	1.27	0.97	1.40	1.77	1.30	1.30	1.47	1.03	1.13	1.23	00 1	00.71
OD -	nc	(1.33)	(1.21)	(1.38)	(1.50)	(1.34)	(1.34)	(1.40)	(1.24)	(1.28)	(1.31)	1.29	nc.0±
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 %	07	1.33	0.63	06.0	1.33	0.70	0.97	1.10	0.87	1.00	1.13	20.0	1000
OD -	00	(1.35)	(1.06)	(1.18)	(1.33)	(1.08)	(1.21)	(1.26)	(1.17)	(1.22)	(1.28)	070	PU.04
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 %	00	1.30	0.00	0.27	1.30	0.00	0.27	0.47	0.00	0.23	0.30		12.00
OD _	06	(1.34)	(0.71)	(0.88)	(0.94)	(0.71)	(0.87)	(0.98)	(0.71)	(0.86)	(0.89)	70.0	70.74
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 %	100	1.37	0.00	0.23	1.37	0.00	0.27	0.43	0.00	0.17	0.23		00 10
OD _	170	(1.37)	(0.71)	(0.86)	(1.00)	(0.71)	(0.88)	(0.96)	(0.71)	(0.82)	(0.85)	00.0	21.70
	LL C	1.27	06.0	1.40	1.27	1.30	1.37	1.60	1.13	1.30	1.40	00 1	10.01
1 mametnoxam 23 % WG	0	(1.33)	(1.18)	(1.38)	(1.32)	(1.34)	(1.37)	(1.45)	(1.27)	(1.34)	(1.38)	, nc.1	17.01
	L1 0	1.27	0.70	0.80	1.27	1.10	1.17	1.30	0.87	1.07	1.23	70 1	26.47
EIIIaIIIECIIII DEIIZOAIE 2 % 30	0.0	(1.33)	(1.09)	(1.14)	(1.59)	(1.26)	(1.29)	(1.34)	(1.17)	(1.25)	(1.32)	00'T	11.00
[nutare bottonial]		1.30	1.63	1.90	1.30	2.20	2.30	2.47	2.70	3.13	3.23		
	ı	(1.34)	(1.46)	(1.55)	(1.34)	(1.64)	(1.67)	(1.72)	(1.78)	(1.91)	(1.93)	70.7	
S.Em±	1	1	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.04	-	
CD@5%	ı	NS	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.11	0.15	0.10	0.05	0.12	-	
DAS - Day After Spray, Figures	in the paren	thesis are squ	lare root $(\sqrt{x+0})$	(1) transformed	I values, ROC	- Reduction	Over Contr	ol, NS – Nc	on significa	nt			

Table 3: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against fruit borer, Helicoverpa armigera population in okra crop

do	
aci	
okr	
ı in	
gere	<u> </u>
rmi	
aa	
arac	
icor	
Hel	
rer,	•
50q	
ruit	
N D	`
ed b	
aus	
Je C	
mag	
t da	
ruil	
ntf	
I Ce	
n pe	-
00	
õ	
% 9	
10.2	
ole	
ipro	
anil	
Intr	
Q Va	,
9	
acv	2
Ĕ	
4:1	
uble	
E,	

	•	•		•)	\$)	•		
			First spray			Second spri	hι		Third spre	h		Mean	
Treatments	Dose 8 a.i./ha	Pre-count	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS		% ROC
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	30	29.70 (5.49)	16.67 (4.13)	14.58 (3.87)	15.93 (4.04)	15.28 (3.96)	13.43 (3.61)	15.28 (3.93)	14.91 (3.87)	14.66 (3.84)	16.20 (4.06)	15.22	52.33
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	60	26.59 (5.18)	11.13 (3.41)	9.38 (3.10)	10.72 (3.35)	10.21 (3.27)	8.44 (2.90)	10.03 (3.19)	9.88 (3.16)	9.75 (3.14)	11.54 (3.45)	10.12	68.31
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	90	27.62 (5.27)	6.94 (2.70)	5.19 (2.14)	6.94 (2.70)	6.69 (2.66)	5.03 (2.11)	6.69 (2.66)	6.54 (2.62)	6.44 (2.60)	8.20 (2.91)	6.52	79.58
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	120	27.78 (5.30)	6.72 (2.69)	4.34 (2.00)	6.43 (2.62)	6.19 (2.58)	4.76 (1.75)	6.98 (2.41)	5.79 (2.24)	5.66 (2.21)	7.21 (2.74)	6.01	81.18
Thiamethoxam 25% WG	25	28.19 (5.35)	17.57 (4.24)	15.72 (4.00)	17.57 (4.24)	16.93 (4.17)	13.51 (3.73)	15.18 (3.93)	15.00 (3.90)	14.55 (3.84)	16.21 (4.07)	15.80	50.52
Emamectin Benzoate 5% SG	8.5	28.33 (5.36)	11.03 (3.33)	9.27 (3.02)	10.23 (3.23)	9.95 (3.18)	8.81 (2.93)	10.66 (3.14)	10.51 (3.10)	10.44 (3.09)	11.52 (3.34)	10.27	67.84
Untreated control		27.29 (5.26)	30.79 (5.59)	30.79 (5.59)	30.99 (5.60)	31.16 (5.62)	32.75 (5.77)	34.60 (5.92)	32.24 (5.72)	31.24 (5.63)	32.83 (5.76)	31.93	1
S.Em±	1	1	0.25	0.34	0.24	0.25	0.56	0.52	0.49	0.50	0.37	1	1
CD@5%	1	NS	0.75	1.02	0.72	0.76	1.68	1.57	1.47	1.51	1.11	ı	1
DAS - Day After Spray, Figures in	the parenthes	sis are square 1	root $(\sqrt{x+0})$	$\overline{5}$) transform	ned values, R	OC – Reduci	tion Over Cor	ntrol, NS – l	Non signifi	cant			

to notice at different days after the spray of insecticides. The data recorded after three sprays of insecticides depicted the lowest per cent of mean fruit damage (6.01 %) with the highest overall pest reduction over control (81.18 %) in cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @120 g a.i./ha, which was found on par with cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @ 90 g a.i./ha achieving 6.52 % damage and 79.58 % pest reduction. Untreated control treatment recorded the highest per cent fruit damage (31.93 %) followed by thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 25 g a.i./ha (15.80 %), cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha (15.22 %), emamectin benzoate 5 SG @ 8.5 g a.i./ha (10.27 %) and cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha (10.12 %).

Shoot and fruit borer (Earias vitella)

Before spray, the larval population of shoot and fruit borer was non-significant among all the treatments and it ranged from 2.00 to 2.23 larva per 5 plants. Significant differences between the treatments started to notice after the imposition of the chemicals (Table 5). Significantly less larval population (0.17/5 plants) of shoot and fruit borer was recorded in cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @120 g a.i./ha which was found on par (0.23/5 plants) with cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @90 g a.i./ha. The respective overall reduction of larval population over untreated control was 94.69 and 92.85 %. Untreated control treatment has recorded the highest mean larval population of shoot and fruit borer (3.21 larva/ 5 plants) followed by thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 25 g a.i./ ha (1.91 larva/plant), cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha (1.61 larva/plant), emamectin benzoate 5 SG @ 8.5 g a.i./ha (1.21 larva/plant) and cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha (1.06 larva/plant)

The fruit damage (31.05 to 33.42 %) was non-significant among all the tested treatments before the spray. The per cent fruit damage started to notice significant differences among the treatments after the spray of the chemicals (Table 6). The data recorded after three sprays of insecticides depicted the lowest per cent of mean fruit damage (8.91 %) with the highest overall pest reduction over control (83.69 %) in cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @120 g a.i./ha, which was found on par with cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @ 90 g a.i./ha attaining 9.13 % fruit damage and 82.83 % reduction. Untreated control treatment recorded the highest per cent fruit damage (37.76 %) followed by thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 25 g a.i./ha (14.38 %), cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha (14.12 %), emamectin benzoate 5 SG @ 8.5 g a.i./ha (12.60 %), and cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha (12.13 %). Here the respective pest reductions over control were 67.71, 68.40, 72.87 and 73.78 %.

Tobacco caterpillar (Spodoptera litura)

The data on larval population of tobacco caterpillar (Table 7) revealed non-significant differences before spraying and the population ranged from 2.53 to 2.80 larvae/5plants. Whereas, significant differences among the treatments was started to notice after the imposition of insecticides. The data recorded at different days after three sprays revealed the lowest mean larval population of tobacco caterpillar (0.18 larvae/5 plants) with highest overall per cent of pest reduction over control (94.95 %) in cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @120 g a.i./ha, which was found on par with the treatment, cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @90 g a.i./ha having 0.25 larva/5 plants with 93.14 % pest reduction. The highest population of tobacco caterpillar (3.67 larvae/5 plants) was recorded in untreated control treatment, followed by other treatments like thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 25 g a.i./ha, cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ ha, emamectin benzoate 5 SG @ 8.5 g a.i./ha and cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha with larval population and reduction over control ranged from 1.74 to 1.08/5 plants and 52.67 to 70.43 %, respectively.

Effect of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD on yield of okra

Significant differences in the yield of okra were recorded (Table 8) .among the treatments over the untreated control. However, the significantly highest yield was recorded in cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @120 g a.i./ha (10.90 t/ha) and it was on par with cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 90 g a.i./ha (10.87 t/ha). However, the untreated check recorded relatively the lowest yield (5.40 t/ha), followed by thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 25 g a.i./ha

Tab	le 5: Effica	icy of Cyantrai	niliprole 1().26 % OD	against Sh	oot and fru	uit borer, Ea	rias vitella <u>I</u>	population	in okra crc	dc		
			First spray			Second spra	ĥi		Third spra	Ń		Mean	
Treatments	Dose g a.i./ha	Pre-count	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	10 DAS		% ROC
Cvantranilinerila 10.26 % OD	30	2.17	1.33	1.57	2.20	1.47	1.80	2.13	1.00	1.33	1.67	1 61	40.81
	20	(1.63)	(1.35)	(1.44)	(1.64)	(1.40)	(1.51)	(1.62)	(1.22)	(1.35)	(1.47)	10.1	10.01
	07	2.00	0.83	1.13	1.60	0.73	1.00	1.27	0.80	1.00	1.20	701	00 77
Cyanirarunproje 10.20 % UD	00	(1.58)	(1.15)	(1.28)	(1.45)	(1.11)	(1.22)	(1.33)	(1.14)	(1.22)	(1.30)	00.T	00.09
	00	2.13	0.00	0.13	0.40	0.00	0.27	0.53	0.00	0.27	0.47		
Cyantrarunprole 10.20 % UD	20	(1.62)	(0.71)	(0.79)	(0.94)	(0.71)	(0.87)	(1.01)	(0.71)	(0.87)	(0.98)	C7.U	C0.76
	100	2.10	0.00	0.07	0.27	0.00	0.13	0.40	0.00	0.20	0.47	<u>7</u> 10	07 50
Cyanitranunproje 10.20 % UD	170	(1.61)	(0.71)	(0.75)	(0.87)	(0.71)	(0.79)	(0.94)	(0.71)	(0.84)	(0.98)	0.1/	74.07
	ц С	2.03	1.40	1.63	2.33	1.33	1.93	2.60	1.40	2.13	2.40	1 01	10 50
	07	(1.59)	(1.38)	(1.46)	(1.68)	(1.35)	(1.56)	(1.35)	(1.38)	(1.62)	(1.70)	1.71	40.00
	ц о	2.20	0.97	1.13	1.80	1.00	1.20	1.330	0.67	1.27	1.53	1 01	20.02
EIIIaIIIECIIII DEIIZOAIE 7 % 30	0.0	(1.65)	(1.21)	(1.27)	(1.52)	(1.22)	(1.30)	(1.97)	(1.08)	(1.33)	(1.43)	17.1	02.21
[Interchool contec]		2.17	2.67	3.00	3.40	3.27	3.13	3.40	3.33	2.93	3.80	2 21	
OIIIIEAIEA COIIII OI	-	(1.63)	(1.78)	(1.87)	(1.97)	(1.94)	(1.91)	(2.45)	(1.96)	(1.85)	(2.07	17.0	-
S.Em±		I	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.03	-	-
CD@5%	1	NS	0.09	0.08	0.10	0.11	0.13	0.17	0.11	0.14	0.08	1	ı

DAS – Day After Spray, Figures in the parenthesis are square root ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) transformed values, ROC – Reduction Over Control, NS – Non significant

-
Ľ
Ú
5
Ð.
0
-
.1
a
11
e^{-1}
'n
5
1 S
1.
11
ш
1
E.
Ĕ.
2
it
P
f
D.
ŭ
ต
Ť
0
ŭ
5
5
5
ŝ
S
n
g
0
5
ŝ
В
a
q
÷
E
Э
-
nt
cent
rcent
vercent
percent
st percent
nst percent
ainst percent
gainst percent
against percent
D against percent
)D against percent
OD against percent
% OD against percent
5 % OD against percent
26 % OD against percent
0.26 % OD against percent
10.26 % OD against percent
e 10.26 % OD against percent
ole 10.26 % OD against percent
role 10.26 % OD against percent
iprole 10.26 % OD against percent
lliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
niliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
aniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
traniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
ntraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
/antraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
7 of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
cy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
acy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
icacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
fficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
5: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
e: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
le 6: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
ble 6: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent
able 6: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against percent

JUa //	MULC NUC	01.02	00.40	01 01	01.01	0000	07.20	07 60	60.00	77 71	1/./0	10 CL	10.71			-	-	
Mean		C F F F	14.12	0101	C1.21	0.10	ст.ч	0 01	0.71	00 1 1	14.00	07 01	12.00	74 40	0/./0	1	1	
	10 DAS	13.72	(3.76)	12.95	(3.65)	9.33	(3.10)	9.38	(3.11)	15.53	(3.95)	12.33	(3.53)	41.66	(6.40)	0.43	1.30	
ų	7 DAS	12.68	(3.61)	10.86	(3.31)	6.10	(2.53)	6.05	(2.52)	14.45	(3.79)	11.16	(3.35)	40.51	(6.32)	0.50	1.50	
Third spra	3 DAS	11.57	(3.47)	9.75	(3.17)	5.12	(2.35)	5.10	(2.35)	13.34	(3.67)	10.18	(3.23)	39.17	(6.23)	0.39	1.18	
	10 DAS	12.46	(3.58)	10.07	(3.24)	6.00	(2.53)	5.63	(2.45)	12.35	(3.57)	10.30	(3.26)	38.58	(6.23)	0.27	0.82	
ray	7 DAS	10.71	(3.34)	8.49	(2.95)	4.81	(2.28)	4.30	(2.19)	11.02	(3.39)	8.97	(3.06)	38.58	(6.23)	0.27	0.81	
Second sp	3 DAS	10.40	(3.29)	8.26	(2.92)	4.72	(2.26)	4.18	(2.16)	10.75	(3.35)	8.71	(3.02)	37.59	(6.15)	0.27	0.82	
	10 DAS	13.45	(3.70)	11.06	(3.37)	9.40	(3.14)	8.19	(2.90)	12.03	(3.52)	12.42	(3.58)	37.67	(6.01)	0.39	1.16	
у	7 DAS	12.40	(3.56)	9.88	(3.14)	7.42	(2.76)	7.31	(2.71)	10.92	(3.34)	10.24	(3.27)	36.16	(5.98)	0.43	1.28	
First spra	3 DAS	11.35	(3.40)	8.91	(2.99)	6.18	(2.57)	6.00	(2.52)	10.75	(3.35)	9.05	(3.07)	34.24	(5.87)	0.32	0.96	
	Pre-count	32.48	(5.74)	31.05	(5.61)	32.26	(5.70)	32.94	(5.76)	32.64	(5.76)	32.64	(5.76)	33.42	(5.82)	-	NS	
	Dose g a.i./ha	00	00	07	00	00	90	001	170	ЦС	C7	Ц	0.0		1	-	-	
	Treatments		Cyanirariunprole 10.20 % UD		Cyaninaniniproje 10.20 % UD		Cyantraniiiproie 10.20 % OD		Cyaninaniniproje 10.20 % UD					T Tation to the second of the	Olliteated collicol	S.Em±	CD@5%	

DAS – Day After Spray, Figures in the parenthesis are square root ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) transformed values, ROC – Reduction Over Control, NS – Non significant

tra population in okra crop
Spodoptera liti
co caterpillar, S
against Tobac
ole 10.26 % OD
Cyantranilipro
Table 7: Efficacy of

ute	% ROC	156 01		CF 02	(10.40		40.14	01 05	0.4.70	C 1	10.26 +	27.00	07.00		1	1	I	
Meä	1	1	1	1 00	D'T		0.42	10	0.10	7	г./-7	ć 7	17.1	1 0	70°C	ı	ı	
	10 DAS	1.60	(1.45)	1.20	(1.30)	0.40	(0.94)	0.33	(0.91)	2.33	(1.68)	1.47	(1.40)	3.93	(2.11)	0.04	0.13	
y	7 DAS	1.27	(1.33)	1.07	(1.25)	0.20	(0.84)	0.20	(0.84)	2.07	(1.60)	1.33	(1.35)	3.87	(2.09)	0.03	0.10	
Third spra	3 DAS	1.07	(1.25)	0.80	(1.14)	0.07	(0.75)	0.00	(0.71)	1.33	(1.35)	0.80	(1.14)	4.00	(2.12)	0.03	0.09	
	10 DAS	2.00	(1.58)	1.33	(1.35)	0.40	(0.94)	0.27	(0.87)	2.00	(1.58)	1.53	(1.42)	3.87	(2.09)	0.04	0.13	
ray	7 DAS	1.73	(1.49)	1.07	(1.25)	0.27	(0.87)	0.20	(0.83)	1.47	(1.40)	1.27	(1.33)	3.80	(2.07)	0.06	0.17	
Second sp	3 DAS	1.20	(1.30)	0.73	(1.10)	0.07	(0.75)	0.00	(0.71)	1.33	(1.35)	0.93	(1.19)	3.60	(2.02)	0.07	0.22	
	10 DAS	2.27	(1.66)	1.53	(1.42)	0.40	(0.94)	0.33	(0.91)	1.87	(1.54)	1.47	(1.40)	3.47	(1.99)	0.04	0.13	
Ŋ	7 DAS	1.63	(1.46)	1.20	(1.30)	0.27	(0.87)	0.20	(0.84)	1.70	(1.48)	1.13	(1.27)	3.33	(1.96)	0.03	0.09	
First spra	3 DAS	1.47	(1.40)	0.83	(1.15)	0.20	(0.83)	0.13	(0.79)	1.53	(1.42)	0.97	(1.21)	3.20	(1.92)	0.05	0.14	
	Pre-count	2.53	(1.74)	2.60	(1.76)	2.70	(1.79)	2.53	(1.74)	2.60	(1.76)	2.53	(1.74)	2.80	(1.81)	1	NS	
	Dose g a.i./ha	30	00	07	na	00	90	100	170	ЦС	C7	1 O	C.0		1	-	-	
	[reatments	Trantranilinrole 10.26 % OD		Contractilization 26 % OD	-yanıranılıprole 10.20 % OD		-yanıranılıprole 10.20 % OD		-yanıranınıprole 10.20 % OD			US //3		[outers [outers]		5.Em±	CD@5%	

DAS – Day After Spray, Figures in the parenthesis are square root ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) transformed values, ROC – Reduction Over Control, NS – Non significant

7

Г

Treatments	Dose g a.i./ha	Yield (t/ha)
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	30	7.17
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	60	8.00
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	90	10.87
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	120	10.90
Thiamethoxam 25% WG	25	6.83
Emamectin Benzoate 5% SG	8.5	7.80
Untreated control	-	5.40
S.Em±	-	0.44
CD@5%	-	1.30

Table 8: Effects of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD on yield of okra

(6.83 t/ha), cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ ha (7.17 t/ha), emamectin benzoate 5 SG @ 8.5 g a.i./ha (7.80 t/ha) and cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha (8.00 t/ha).

Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD against major sucking and lepidopteran insects of cabbage

Sucking insects

Aphids (Brevicoryne brassicae and Lipaphis erysimi)

The pest population before spray was uniformly established in the experimental plots as there was no significant difference in the population. The data recorded for surviving mean population of cabbage aphid (*Brevicoryne brassicae*) (Table 9) and mustard aphid (*Lipaphis erysimi*) (Table 10) indicated significant differences in their population at 3, 7 and 10 days after sprays. All the insecticide treatments recorded significantly lowered the pest population than untreated control (UTC).

The treatment with cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 75 g a.i./ha showed excellent efficacy against *Brevicoryne brassicae* with 87.50 % reduction in population over UTC at 10 days after 3rd application. Here, the next superior at par treatment was cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @ 60 g a.i./ha, which recorded 86.25 % reduction of pest population over UTC. The mean number of Cabbage aphid population in untreated control at 10 days after 3rd application 5.40 EC @ 75 g a.i./ha (11.00/plant), cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30

g a.i./ha (8.00/plant), cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 45 g a.i./ha (6.33/plant) and acetamiprid 20 SP @ 15 g a.i./ha (5.00/plant). Here the respective reductions of aphid population over control were 58.76, 70.00, 76.25 and 81.25 %.

Similar trend was also observed against another aphid species, Lipaphis erysimi. cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 75 g a.i./ha recorded 3.47 aphids/plant with the highest mortality (87.00 %) over UTC at 10 days after 3rd application. The next superior treatment was cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @ 60 g a.i./ha, having 3.53 aphids/plant with 86.75 % reduction over UTC. Both the treatments were statistically at par with each other. The mean number of mustard aphid's population per plant in UTC at 10 days after 3rd application was 26.67, followed by 10.67 (chlorfluazuron 5.40 EC @ 75 g a.i./ha), 8.33 (cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha), 6.53 (cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 45 g a.i./ha) and 5.33 (acetamiprid 20 SP @ 15 g a.i./ha). The respective reductions of pest over UTC were 60.00, 68.75, 75.50 and 80.00 %.

Lepidopteran insects

The pest population before spray was uniformly established in the experimental plots as there was no significant difference in the population. The data was recorded for surviving mean larval population of diamond Back moth (*Plutella xylostella*) (Table 11) and tobacco caterpillar (*Spodoptera litura*) (Table 12). Here, the differences in their larval population were significant at 3, 7 and 10 days after sprays. All the insecticide treatments recorded significantly lower larval population than untreated control.

Diamond back moth (DBM) (Plutella xylostella)

The treatment with cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 75 g a.i./ha showed excellent efficacy against *Plutella xylostella* with 90.55 % reduction of DBM larval population (2.07/5 plants) over UTC at 10 days after 3rd application. The next superior treatment was cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha which recorded 2.13 larva/5 plants with 90.25 % reduction of pest over UTC. Both these treatments found statistically at par. The mean number of larval population per 5 plant in UTC at 10 days after 3rd application was 21.87,

		% KUL		00.07	10.00	30 74	C7.07	3C 70	C7.00	07 EO	00.10	20 176	07.00	3C 10	67.10				1
			10 DAA	8.00	(2.91)	6.33	(2.61)	3.67	(2.02)	3.33	(1.95)	11.00	(3.38)	5.00	(2.35)	26.67	(5.20)	0.16	0.47
Table 9: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against <i>Brevicoryne brassicae</i> on cabbage			7 DAA	7.33	(2.80)	5.33	(2.33)	4.67	(2.11)	2.67	(1.59)	14.00	(3.55)	5.00	(2.26)	26.67	(5.61)	0.11	0.32
ıge		3 rd spray	3 DAA	8.20	(2.95)	5.20	(2.38)	4.47	(2.23)	3.00	(1.86)	12.33	(3.58)	5.00	(2.34)	29.00	(5.43)	0.12	0.36
Table 9: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against <i>Brevicoryne brassicae</i> on cabbage	ie/ Plant		10 DAA	12.33	(3.57)	8.00	(2.91)	5.00	(2.34)	3.53	(2.01)	14.97	(3.89	6.20	(2.59)	31.67	(5.67)	0.07	0.22
	yne brassica		7 DAA	8.00	(3.08)	4.67	(2.74)	2.00	(2.22)	1.67	(1.72)	12.67	(3.67)	4.00	(2.65)	25.67	(5.37)	0.11	0.33
	of Brevicor	2 nd spray	3 DAA	11.00	(3.39)	8.00	(2.91)	5.00	(2.32)	5.00	(2.34)	16.00	(4.06)	7.33	(2.80)	29.00	(5.43)	0.13	0.39
	Population		10 DAA	9.67	(3.18)	7.33	(2.79)	3.27	(1.94)	3.00	(1.87)	15.00	(3.93)	6.00	(2.54)	27.00	(5.24)	5.33	0.33
			7 DAA	8.47	(2.99)	6.27	(2.59)	2.47	(1.72)	1.73	(1.48)	12.33	(3.57)	5.13	(2.37)	26.67	(5.21)	0.13	0.39
		1 st spray	3 DAA	8.87	(3.06)	6.33	(2.61)	2.80	(1.82)	1.80	(1.52)	12.33	(3.58)	5.20	(2.38)	24.00	(4.95)	0.10	0.29
		Before	spray	22.33	(4.78)	22.00	(4.74)	22.00	(4.74)	22.33	(4.78)	22.10	(4.76)	20.93	(4.63)	21.93	(4.74)		NS
		1100	/rut																_
Tab	Dose		8 u.i.	00	nc	11	C 1	07	na	ц Т	C /	Ц Ц	C/	ц 7	CT				
Table 9: Efficacy of Cyantranilipr		Treatments			Cyantranuiproie 10.20 % UD		Cyantranuiproie 10.20 % UD		Cyantranuiproie 10.26 % UD		Cyalifiatunprote 10.20 % OD		CILOTILIAZUTOII UD.40% EC	A contraction of CD	ACERTITIPITU 20 % OF	[Tataor bottom	OIIITEALEU COIIITOI	S.Em.±	C.D. at 5%

Figures in parenthesis are ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) transformed values; DAA - days after application; NS- Non significant; % ROC - Reduction over control @ 10 days after 3rd spray

Table 10: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against Lipaphis erysimi on cabbage

					Popul	lation of Li	paphis erysi	mi/Plant				
Treatments	2 2 i 11.2	Before	1 st spray			2 nd spray			3 rd spray			% ROC
	8 un/111	spray	3 DAA	7 DAA	10 DAA	3 DAA	7 DAA	10 DAA	3 DAA	7 DAA	10 DAA	
	06	32.33	9.53	9.20	11.00	9.67	9.13	11.00	8.67	7.40	8.33	20 75
Cyantranniprole 10.20 % OD	nc	(5.73)	(3.17)	(3.21)	(3.39)	(3.19)	(3.10)	(3.39)	(3.02)	(2.81)	(2.96)	c7.00
	16	31.67	6.67	6.27	7.67	7.67	6.80	7.67	6.33	4.70	6.53	
Cyantranniproie 10.20 % OU	C 1	(5.67)	(2.68)	(2.51)	(2.85)	(2.85)	(2.70)	(2.85)	(2.60)	(2.28)	(2.64)	NC.C/
	07	32.33	3.40	3.07	3.60	3.67	3.00	3.67	2.80	2.00	3.53	07 JE
	οn	(5.73)	(1.97)	(1.91)	(2.02)	(2.04)	(1.87)	(2.03)	(1.80)	(1.56)	(2.00)	67.00
	76	33.67	2.13	1.80	3.13	3.60	2.67	3.20		1.80	3.47	00 20
Cyantranunprote 10.20 % OD	C/	(5.85)	(1.62)	(1.82)	(1.90)	(2.02)	(1.78)	(1.92)	2.4/	(1.51)	(1.99)	01.10
	76	33.27	12.67	12.00	15.33	13.00	12.53	14.00	11.67	11.00	10.67	00.02
Chioffiuazuron 05.40 % EC	c/	(5.81)	(3.62)	(3.53)	(3.97)	(3.67)	(3.60)	(3.81)	(3.49)	(3.39)	(3.33)	00.00
	1	32.73	5.13	4.93	6.33	6.67	6.20	6.33	4.67	4.33	5.33	00.00
	CT	(5.760)	(2.37)	(2.33)	(2.61)	(2.68)	(2.59)	(2.61)	(2.27)	(2.20)	(2.41)	00.00
T Tates of Contract		34.00	35.00	34.33	27.33	29.33	29.67	30.67	31.33	31.67	26.67	
הזווובמובת כסוונדסו	1	(5.87)	(5.96)	(5.90)	(5.28)	(5.46)	(5.49)	(5.58)	(5.64)	(5.67)	(5.20)	
S.Em.±		1	0.07	0.13	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.12	0.11	0.18	1
C.D. at 5%		NS	0.20	0.38	0.26	0.34	0.26	0.24	0.18	0.33	0.55	1

Figures in parenthesis are ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) transformed values; DAA - days after application; NS- Non significant; % ROC - Reduction over control @ 10 days after 3rd spray

	% ROC		71.04	/ T.U 4	75 01	10.07		C7.UK	00 55	CC.UK		17.01	61 EO	6C'TO				1	
		10 DAA	6.33	(2.60)	5.40	(2.43)	2.13	(1.62)	2.07	(1.60)	5.93	(2.53)	8.40	(2.98	21.87	(4.73)	0.09	0.26	
		7 DAA	5.00	(2.34)	4.47	(2.23)	1.87	(1.53)	1.80	(1.51)	5.73	(2.49)	8.00	(2.91)	21.00	(4.64)	0.11	0.32	
	srd spray	DAA	00.9	2.54)	67	2.48)	53	1.74)	2.40	1.70	00.9	2.54)	3.47	2.99)	1.33	4.67)	.10	.30	
a/5 Plants	m	DAA 3	00 6	.91) (19.	07 5	75) ((67 2	.04)	40 2	.97) (79.	80 6	.88)	0.20	.27)	0.67	.60) (0	0 00	26 C	
u tella xylostell		DAA 10	.00 8.	2.54) (2	.40 7.	2.43) (2	.67 3.	1.77 (2	.60 3.	1.76) (1	.13 7.	2.57) (2	.80 11	3.05) (3	9.67 2(4.49) (4	.10 0.	.29 0.	
pulation of Pli	2 nd spray	3 DAA 7	6.87 6	(2.71)	5.47 5	(2.44) (2	2.93 2	(1.85) (7)	2.87 2	(1.83) (5)	6.33 6	(2.60) (2	9.00 8	(3.08) (3	18.67 1	(4.38)	0.09 0	0.28 0	
Pc		10 DAA	7.80	(2.87)	7.00	(2.74)	4.00	(2.11)	3.93	(2.10)	7.07	(2.38)	10.73	(2.83)	17.00	(3.65)	0.13	0.39	
		7 DAA	6.67	(2.67)	6.27	(2.60)	3.33	(1.94)	3.13	(1.89)	6.53	(2.75)	10.07	(3.35)	16.00	(4.18)	0.13	0.40	
	1 st spray	3 DAA	7.00	(2.73)	6.40	(2.63)	3.53	(2.00)	3.20	(1.92)	7.00	(2.73)	10.00	(3.24)	11.67	(14.67)	0.10	0.31	
	Before	spray	13.33	(2.85)	13.00	(2.93)	14.00	(3.29)	13.00	(3.29)	13.00	(3.29)	13.67	(3.40)	13.33	(3.55)	1	NS	
Dose		8 u.1./hu	00	30		45		00	76	c/	16	c/	ц т	CT		1			
	atments $\left \begin{array}{c} D \\ g \end{array} \right $			Cyantranuiproie 10.20 % OD		CINOTINAZUTON 03.40 % EC	A minimized 200% CD	AcetaIIIIpIIU 20 % SF	I Tatach hotom	Olliteated collicol	S.Em.±	C.D. at 5%							

Table 11: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against Plutella xylostellaon cabbage

Table 12: Efficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD against Spodoptera litura on cabbage.

Figures in parenthesis are ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) transformed values; DAA - days after application; NS- Non significant; % ROC - Reduction over control @ 10 days after 3rd spray

	Dose	Populatio	on of Plute	llax ylostei	Ila/ 5 Plants							
Treatments		Before	1 st spray			2 nd spray			3 rd spray			% ROC
		spray	3 DAA	7 DAA	10 DAA	3 DAA	7 DAA	10 DAA	3 DAA	7 DAA	10 DAA	
	00	4.00	2.93	2.47	2.67	2.00	1.80	2.13	1.67	1.47	2.93	EE OO
Cyantranunprole 10.20 % UD	nc	(2.11)	(1.85)	(1.72)	(1.77)	(1.58)	(1.52)	(1.62)	(1.47)	(1.40)	(1.85)	00.00
	11	4.20	2.47	1.87	2.27	1.33	1.13	1.47	1.07	0.87	1.87	71 11
Cyantranunprole 10.20 % UD	C 1	(2.16)	(1.72)	(1.52)	(1.66)	(1.35)	(1.27)	(1.40)	(1.25)	(1.17)	(1.53)	11.41
	60	4.47	1.00	0.40	0.80	0.33	0.20	0.40	0.13	0.07	0.73	00 77
Cyanin'animprole 10.20 % UD	00	(2.22)	(1.22)	(0.94)	(1.14)	(0.91)	(0.83)	(0.94)	(0.79)	(0.75)	(1.11)	00.//
	76	4.33	0.87	0.20	0.60	0.20	0.13	0.40	0.07	0.00	0.67	00 70
Cyantranuiprole 10.20 % UD	c/	(2.20)	(1.17)	(0.83)	(1.05)	(0.83)	(0.79)	(0.94)	(0.75)	(0.71)	(1.07)	07.19
	11	4.67	2.47	1.93	2.80	1.87	1.60	1.93	1.40	0.80	1.93	70.20
CIUOTIUAZUTON UD.40 % EC	c/	(2.27)	(1.72)	(1.56)	(1.82)	(1.54)	(1.45)	(1.56)	(1.38)	(1.14)	(1.56)	60.07
A contraction of 20% CD	ш 7	4.33	3.07	2.20	3.27	2.73	2.13	2.07	1.53	1.13	2.33	
AcetalIupriu 20 % Sr	CT	(2.19)	(1.89)	(1.64)	(1.94)	(1.80)	(1.62)	(1.60)	(1.42)	(1.27)	(1.68)	04.27
[Tatenchod control		4.60	5.20	5.53	6.07	5.53	6.07	6.20	6.00	5.93	6.53	
		(2.25)	(2.38)	(2.45)	(2.56)	(2.45)	(2.56)	(2.59)	(2.55)	(2.54)	(2.65)	
S.Em.±		-	0.13	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.07	1
C.D. at 5%		NS	0.23	0.20	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.20	0.13	0.20	1

Effect of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD against major Lepidopteran and Sucking Insects on Okra and Cabbage

Figures in parenthesis are ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) transformed values; DAA - days after application; NS- Non significant; % ROC - Reduction over control @ 10 days after 3rd spray

Treatments	Dose g a.i./ha	Yield (t/ha)
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	30	44.33
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	45	52.32
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	60	61.33
Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD	75	61.67
Chlorfluazuron 05.40% EC	75	51.67
Acetamiprid 20% SP	15	50.67
Untreated control	-	34.67
S.Em.±		1.46
C.D. at 5%		4.37

Table 13: Effect of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD on yield of cabbage

followed by 8.40 (acetamiprid 20 SP @ 15 g a.i./ ha), 6.33 (cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ ha), 5.93 (chlorfluazuron 5.40 EC @ 75 g a.i./ha), and 5.40 (cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 45 g a.i./ ha).

Tobacco caterpillar (Spodoptera litura)

The same trend was also observed in controlling Spodoptera litura. Cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 75 g a.i./ha recorded 0.67 larva/5 plants resulting the highest larval mortality (89.79 %) over UTC at 10 days after 3rd application. The next superior treatment was cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha, which recorded 0.73 larva/5 plants with 88.78 % larval reduction over UTC. Cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 75 g a.i./ha statistically found similar with cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha. The mean larval population per 5 plants in UTC was 6.53, followed by 2.93 (cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha), 2.33 (acetamiprid 20 SP @ 15 g a.i./ha), 1.93 (chlorfluazuron 5.40 EC @ 75 g a.i./ha) and 1.87 (cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 45 g a.i./ha) at 10 days after 3rd application. The respective reductions in larval population over UTC were 55.08, 64.27, 70.39 and 71.41 % at 10 days after 3rd application.

Effect of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD on yield of cabbage

All the treatments showed significantly higher yield than untreated control (Table 13). Maximum cabbage yield (61.67 t/ha) was recorded with the application of cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 75 g a.i./ha, which was at par with cyantraniliprole

10.26 % OD @ 60 g a.i./ha (61.33 t/ha). Untreated control recorded only 34.67 t/ha, followed by cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 30 g a.i./ha (44.33 t/ha), acetamiprid 20 SP @ 15 g a.i./ha (50.67 t/ha), chlorfluazuron 5.40 EC @ 75 g a.i./ha (51.67 t/ha) and cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 45 g a.i./ha (52.32 t/ha)

DISCUSSION

Cyantraniliprole is a third generation anthranilic diamide insecticide with a mode of action (ryanodine receptor modulator) similar to chlorantraniliprole and flubendiamide. It has systemic activity with some translaminar movement and is effective against lepidopteran (larva) and sucking insects. The anthranillic diamide insecticide group possesses antifeedant properties that differ between chemicals of this group and insects (Gonzales-Coloma et al., 1999) which might be the reason of record of low population of pests. In this connection, the present study results have direct or indirect confirmations from the following previous works.

Considering the significant bio-efficacy and yield, cyantraniliprole @ 90 g a.i./ha was recommended for effective control of sucking pests in cotton ecosystem (Patel *et al.*, 2014; Karthik *et al.*, 2017), that strongly support the present findings obtained against *Aphis gossypii* and *Bemisia tabaci* on okra.

Effectiveness of cyantraniliprole was reported against whitefly on okra (Patel and Kher, 2012a) and other crops like brinjal (Patel and Kher, 2012b), tomato (Patel *et al.*, 2011; Govindappa *et al.*, 2013), cotton (Patel *et al.*, 2014) and gherkins (Balikai and Mallapur, 2015).

Thara et al. (2019) reported 69 to 81.76 % larval population reduction of Helicoverpa armigera over control in okra with cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD @ 1.80 ml/l of water and fruit damage reduction varied from 35.36 to 65.08 % for the same. But, comparatively greater efficacy in present findings might be due to variations in respect of pest susceptibility, season, climate etc. However, both the lethal and sublethal of cyantraniliprole effects suppressed Н. assulta population growth in tobacco bv reducing the insect's survival, development and reproduction (Dong *et al.,* 2017). The treatment of cyantraniliprole 10 OD @ 60 g a.i./ha provided excellent protection against *H. armigera* in potato (Lodaya *et al.* (2017)).

Information is scanty regarding effect of cyantraniliprole against *Earias vitella* on okra, although work has done on cotton. cyantraniliprole 10 OD @ 90 g a.i./ha resulted lowest per cent bud and boll damage by *Earias vittella* (Patel *et al.*, 2014).

As per present observation cyantraniliprole was most effective in reducing *S. litura* population in okra and cabbage, which is in line of work done by Yadav *et al.* (2012) on grapes.

The present findings related to pest management of cabbage are in full agreement with Shalu and Math (2017). They observed this insecticide @ 60 g a.i./ha as broad spectrum and quite effective to manage both sucking (B. Brassicae and L. Erysimi) and lepidopteran (P. xylostella and S. Litura) insects with higher marketable cabbage heads. Different species of aphids in cabbage, B. Brassicae and L. erysimi were highly susceptible to cyantraniliprole @ 60 g a.i./ ha and recorded the highest mortality at 80 and 86 % respectively. The same also resulted 100 % mortality against third instar *P. xyllostela* at 48 hours after treatment (Kodandaram *et al.*, 2017). Stansly and Kostyk (2012) reported a significant decrease in the number of larvae and damage of the *P. xylostella* in a cauliflower crop using foliar applications of cyantraniliprole.

Cyantraniliprole as the third generation diamide insecticide is the first one that has activity on both chewing and sucking insect pests. This new molecule will be crucial for strengthening integrated pest management (IPM) and remain an effective insecticide partner for rotation in insecticide resistance management (IRM) programs in India. Based on the present investigation, it can be concluded that cyantraniliprole 10.26 OD at 90-120 g a.i./ ha can be recommended to control aphids (Aphis gossypii), white fly (Bemisia tabaci), fruit borer (Helicoverpa armigera), shoot and fruit borer (Earias vitella) and tobacco caterpillar (Spodoptera *litura*) in okra crop. Whereas, the same insecticide at 60 to 75 g a.i./ha was found to be very effective in reducing the major lepidopteran (Plutella

xylostella and *Spodoptera litura*) and sucking insect pests (*Brevicoryne brassicae* and *Myzus persicae*) of cabbage.

Acknowledgement

We extend my deep sense of reverence and gratitude to FMC India Pvt. Ltd, Mumbai for providing financial assistance and test chemical.

References

- Anonymous. 2011. Indian Horticulture Database. pp. 154-68.
- Aykroud, W. R. 1963. ICMR Special Report series. No. 42.
- Balikai, R. A. and Mallapur, C. P. 2015. Bioefficacy of cyazypyr 10% OD, a new Anthranilic diamide insecticide, against the insect pests of gherkins and its impact on natural enemies and crop. J. Exp. Zool. India. 18(1): 89-96.
- Bana, J.K., Jat B.L. and Bajya, D.R. 2012. Seasonal incidence of major pests of cabbage and their natural enemies. Indian Journal of Entomology. 74(3): 236-240 (2012).
- Chirinos, D. T., Castro, R., Cun, J., Castro, J., Peñarrieta, S., Solis, L. And Geraud, F. 2020. Insecticides and agricultural pest control: the magnitude of its use in crops in some provinces of Ecuador. Ciencia y Tecnología Agropecuaria. 21(1): e1276
- Dong, J., Wang, K., Li, Y. and Wang, S. 2017. Lethal and sublethal effects of cyantraniliprole on *Helicoverpa* assulta (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology. 136: 58-63.
- Gonzales-Coloma, A., Gutierrez, C., Hubner, H., Achenbach, H., Terrero, D. and Fraga, B.M. 1999. Selective insect antifeedant and toxic action of ryanoid diterpenes. J. Agric. Food Chem. 47: 4419-4424.
- Govindappa, M. R., Bhemanna, M., Arunkumar, H. and Ghante, V. N. 2013. Bio-efficacy of newer insecticides against tomato leaf curl virus disease and its vector whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci*) in tomato. Int. J. Appl. Biol. Pharm. 4(3): 226-231.
- Guo, M., Zhu, D. and Li, L. 1999. Selection of *Trichogramma* species for controlling the diamondback moth *Plutella xylostella* (L.). Insect Science. 6(2): 187-192.
- Hamon, S. and Charrier, A. 1985. Large variation of okra collected in Bénin and Togo. FAO/IBPGR, Plant Genetic Resources-Newsletter. 56: 52-58.
- Handigol, J. A. and Kulkarni, V. A. 2010. Pesticide use in cabbage production in Belgaum district of Karnataka: an economic analysis. Green Farm. 1(3): 290-293.

- Jiskani, M. M. 2006. Okra diseases and IPDM. http://www.pakissan.com/ english/allabout/ horticulture/ okra diseases and. ipdm. Shtm.
- Karthik, P., Thiruveni T., Indirakumar K., Gunasekaran K., Kuttalam, S. and Srinivasan, V.M. 2017. Bioefficacy and Safety of Cyantraniliprole 10 % (W/V) OD against sucking pests in Cotton. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 6(2): 1405-1417. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2017.602.159
- Khoso, A.W. 1994. Growing vegetable in Sindh and Balochistan. 2nd Ed:138 pp.
- Kodandaram, M.H., Rai, A.B. and Haldhar, J. 2017. Effectiveness of new anthranilic diamide insecticide Cyantraniliprole 10% OD against diamondback moth and sucking insect pests of cruciferous vegetables. Mysore J. Agric. Sci. 51(A): 77-82
- Lal, O. P. 1975. A compendium of insect pest of vegetables in India. Bull. Entomol. Res. 16: 31-56.
- Lodaya, J.P., Patel, N.B., Patel, R.D. and Acharya, R.R. 2017. Bioefficacy of Cyantraniliprole 10% OD W/V (HGW86 10 OD) against pests of potato. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 6(7): 309-317. doi: https://doi. org/10.20546/ijcmas.2017.607.036
- Majid, R. 2020. Production technology of cabbage. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.12764.41605
- Mani, M., Krishnamoorthy, A. and Gopalakrishnan, C. 2005. Biological control of lepidopterous pests of horticultural. Agric. Res. 26:39–49.
- Moulana, S., Prasad, V. M. and Kumar P. S. 2020. Economic importance and production technology of Okra. Agriculture & Food E-Newsletter. 2 (1): 338-340.
- Pal, S., Maji, T.B. and Mondal, P. 2013. Incidence of insect pest on okra, *Abelmoschus esculentus* (L) Moench in red lateritic zone of West Bengal. The Journal of Plant Protection Sciences. 5(1): 59-64.
- Patel, J. J. and Kher, H. R. 2012a. Testing the bio-efficacy and phytotoxicity of cyantraniliprole 10% OD against insect pests of okra. Final report, Main Vegetable Research Station, Anand Agricultural University, Anand. pp.20-23.
- Patel, J. J. and Kher, H. R. 2012b. Testing the bio-efficacy and phytotoxicity of cyantraniliprole 10% OD against pests of brinjal. Final report, Main Vegetable Research Station, Anand Agricultural University. Anand. pp. 19-22.
- Patel, J. J., Patel, H. C. and Kathiria, K. B. 2011. Testing the bioefficacy and phytotoxicity of cyantraniliprole 10% OD against pests of tomato. Final report: Main Vegetable Research Station, Anand Agricultural University. Anand. pp.16-18.

- Patel, R. D., Bharpoda, T. M., Patel, N. B. and Borad, P. K. 2014. Bio-efficacy of cyantraniliprole 10% OD an anthranilic diamide insecticide against sucking pests of cotton. The Bioscan. 9(1): 89-92.
- Patel, R.D., Bharpoda, T.M., Prajapati, H.V., Patel, N.B. and Borad, P.K. 2014. Bio-efficacy of novel anthranilic diamide insecticide cyantrannilliprole 10% OD (Cyazypyr) against cotton bollworms. Pestology. 38(1): 67-73.
- Sahu, B., Pachori, R., Navya, N. And Patidar, S. 2019. Pest succession of major insect pest of cabbage. J. Exp. Zool. India. XX(X): 1-7.
- Sarkar, S., Patra, S. and Samanta, A. 2016. Efficacy of different bio-pesticides against sucking pests of okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* L. Moench). Journal of Applied and Natural Science. 8(1): 333 – 339.
- Shalu, V. and Math, M. 2017. Management of insect pests of cabbage with a newer anthranilic diamide insecticide, cyantraniliprole 10% OD. The Bioscan. 12(2): 703-708
- Sharma, P., Kumawat, K.C. and Jhumar, L. 2017. Seasonal abundance of diamondback moth and natural enemies on cabbage. J. Entomol. Zool. Stud. 5(3): 176-179.
- Srinivasa, R. and Rajendran, R. 2003. Joint action potential of neem with other plant extracts against the leaf hopper *Amrasca devastans* (Distant) on Okra. Pest Management and Economic Zoology. 10: 131-36
- Stansly, P., and Kostyk. C. 2012. Control of diamondback moth on cauliflower. Arthropod Management Tests. 37:E21.
- Tamta, S., Jaipaul, Choudhary, A.K., Negi, M.S. and Kumar, A. 2014. Scientific cultivation of cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* L. var. *capitata*) advances in vegetable. Agronomy. 79-86
- Thara, K.T., Sharanabasappa, Narasa, R.G., Kalleshwara, S.C.M and Sandeep, A.R. 2019. Bio-efficacy of newer insecticide molecules against okra fruit borer, *Helicoverpa armigera*. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 8(1): 2564-2567.
- Wagan, T. A., Khaskheli, M. I., Abbasi, Q. D., Jiskani, M. M. and Wagan, S. A. 2014. Effect of irrational use of pesticides on insect pests and yield of okra. Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare. 4(25): 74-78.
- Yadav, D. S., Kamte, A. S. and Jadhav, R. S. 2012. Bioefficacy of cyantraniliprole, a new molecule against *Scelodonta strigicollis* Motschulsky and *Spodoptera litura* Fabricius in grapes. Pest Manag. Hort. Ecosyst. 18(2): 128-134.