INTRODUCTION

Cotton one of the major commercial crops grown in India by majority of the farmers. In India, cotton ecosystem harbours about 162 insect pest species and the monetary value of estimated yield losses due to insect pests has been estimated to be Rs 3,39,660 million annually (Dhaliwal et al, 2010). Pink bollworm (Pectinophora gossypiella), American bollworm (Helicoverpa armigera) and spotted bollworm (Earis spp.) are the major boll feeders (Babar et al, 2013). After introduction of Boll guard technology (Bt) in 2002, the productivity of cotton increased, losses due to insect pests decreased and the insecticide use was also reduced. Even the quantity of spray fluid required for the rolling stem applicator was very less i.e. 750-1250 ml/ha. The number of labour required for application was less for making use of rolling stem applicator i.e. 2-3 labour to cover one hectare area which ultimately reduced the cost incurred for labour on plant protection. Even, the time required for application by rolling stem applicator was found to be less and therefore, within a span of 6 hr of time by rolling stem applicator 1.6-2.4 ha area could be covered in a day. Thus, use of the rolling stem applicator reduced the cost of cultivation to a farmer, drudgery, saved input and safe to natural enemies.
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ABSTRACT

The present study was taken to assess the performance of Rolling stem applicator in comparison with normal traditional method of hand spraying in cotton for sucking pests. The study revealed that Rolling stem applicator was more efficient than spraying for increased crop protection and reducing cost of cultivation. With the rolling stem applicator, the time period and quantity of insecticide required for the application were lesser as compared to spraying, subsequently the cost was also reduced. Even the quantity of spray fluid required for the rolling stem applicator was very less i.e. 750-1250 ml/ha. The number of labour required for application was less for making use of rolling stem applicator i.e. 2-3 labour to cover one hectare area which ultimately reduced the cost incurred for labour on plant protection. Even, the time required for application by rolling stem applicator was found to be less and therefore, within a span of 6 hr of time by rolling stem applicator 1.6-2.4 ha area could be covered in a day. Thus, use of the rolling stem applicator reduced the cost of cultivation to a farmer, drudgery, saved input and safe to natural enemies.
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of times, increase cost of cultivation due to more number of labourers required for spraying and more quantity of pesticides, increase risk of human beings to the hazardous chemicals, indirect toxic effect on the beneficial insects and other creatures. Non-availability or shortage of labour during peak crop stages make the farmer to postpone or delay in spraying which ultimately increase the pest load and cause difficult to manage the pests after its severity.

Keeping in view of all the problems faced by the cotton farmers, to combat the difficulty in spraying the pesticides for sucking pests, by studying all the factors and taking into consideration, KVK, Wyra, Khammam has developed a simple technology of controlling the sucking pests without spraying i.e. Rolling Stem applicator. Hence, study was conducted to assess the general attributes, its use and the performance, cost incurred of Rolling stem applicator and its comparison with hand spraying of pesticides.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study has been conducted in Nacharam village under NICRA of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Wyra, Khammam district, Telangana State. The advantages and benefits of hand spraying and rolling stem applicator were compared.

**Specifications of Rolling Stem Applicator**

- High density foam (35 mm X 160 mm)
- Plastic handle (Length 2.5 feet, 2.5 cm diameter)
- Foam holder
- Weight of the applicator (250g)

The cost involved in hand spraying and rolling stem applicator and quantity of insecticide required for hand spraying and rolling stem applicator were assessed. Under NICRA Project at Nacharam village of Khammam District, Telangana State, the rolling stem applicator was assessed in cotton fields of farmers and compared with hand spraying. As per the recommendation of pesticides for sucking pests in cotton, two pesticides i.e. Monocrotophos and water (1:4) at 30, 45 days of sowing and Imidacloprid and water (1:20) at 60d of sowing were taken and applied to the cotton field with rolling stem applicator. The control plot was maintained where the application of pesticides done by traditional hand spraying. All the factors regarding the quantity of insecticide required, time taken for application, cost of chemical and labour, ease of application were studied (Image 1).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The rolling stem applicator consisted of a 2.5 feet length pipe with 2.5 cm diameter, a foam holder with high density foam (Sponge) and the weight of the applicator is 250g. The applicator can be easily operated by simply dipping the high density foam (Sponge) into the spray fluid prepared in a small bucket by mixing the enough quantity of chemical and water. Once it is dipped into the spray liquid bucket, the spray fluid will be absorbed into the high density foam and easily it can be applied to the base of the stem for about 15-20 plants. Likewise, the application can be done with two pesticides i.e. Monocrotophos and water (1:4) at 30, 45 days of sowing and Imidacloprid and water (1:20) at 60 days of sowing for the control of sucking pests. With one rolling stem applicator by hiring one labour, the chemical can be applied to any number of plants and any number of acres of land. The applicator can be again reused for the next season crop and many number of crop seasons (Image 2). Moreover, unlike the disadvantages of hand spraying, all the drudgery, drift hazard, risk to human beings and other beneficial insects were reduced in case of rolling stem applicator.
Rolling Stem Applicator

Table 1. Output of Rolling Stem Applicator in Cotton over Hand Spraying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Rolling Stem Applicator</th>
<th>Hand Spraying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quantity of insecticide required/ha</td>
<td>Monocrotophos - 375 ml</td>
<td>625-1250 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 500 ml</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imidacloprid - 62.5 ml</td>
<td>100-125 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 75 ml</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Time required/ha</td>
<td>2.5-3.75 hr</td>
<td>3.75-5.0 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drudgery</td>
<td>Very less</td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quantity of insecticide solution required/ha</td>
<td>750-1250 ml</td>
<td>450-500 lt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No. of labour required/ ha</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Area covered/day (6 hr)</td>
<td>1.6-2.4 ha</td>
<td>1.2-1.6 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Money spent on insecticide/ ha</td>
<td>Rs.300/-</td>
<td>Rs.977/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Drift losses</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Toxicity to natural enemies</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Environmental pollution</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Inhalation of pesticide while application</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No. of plants covered/hour</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ease of application</td>
<td>Very easy and comfortable</td>
<td>Highly laborious and require more energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the time period of 2.5-3.75 hr, with an quantity of 375-500 ml of Monocrotophos and 62.5-75 ml of Imidacloprid, the application of chemical can be done easily by the rolling stem applicator unlike the time period of 3.75-5 hr with an quantity of 625-1250 ml of Monocrotophos and 100-125 ml of Imidacloprid. As the quantity of chemical required for application by rolling stem applicator was very less, subsequently the cost was also reduced. The cost incurred for the monocrotophos was Rs. 170/- for application by rolling stem applicator and Rs.420/ for application by spraying. Similarly, the cost incurred for imidacloprid was Rs. 130/- for application by rolling stem applicator and Rs. 257.5/- for application by spraying. Even the quantity of spray fluid required for the rolling stem applicator was very less i.e. 750-1250 ml as compared to spraying which require 450-500 litres of solution per hectare. With the small quantity of spray fluid, the application by rolling stem applicator was easy and the number of labour required for application was very less i.e. 2-3 labour is sufficient to cover one hectare which ultimately reduces the cost incurred for labour for plant protection, unlike the traditional spraying method where more number of labour required i.e. 4-5 (2 or 3 men + 2 woman) which increases the cost of cultivation to farmer. The time of application by rolling stem applicator was very less and within a short time more number of area can be covered i.e. within a span of 6 hours of time by rolling stem applicator 1.6-2.4 Ha can be covered in a day whereas 1.2-1.6 Ha of area per day can be covered in the span of 6 hours of time period by spraying. Thus, more area can be covered in a short time which enables the farmer to go for timely plant protection measure of a larger area in a shorter time period. Thus, in overall the application by rolling stem applicator reduces the
cost of cultivation to farmer, drudgery, input saving and safe to natural enemies.

**Advantages**

1. The technique is well suited for areas where there is severe water scarcity because small quantity of water is required.
2. It does not need any costly equipment and involves no skill.
3. No harm to natural enemies as the chemical is not exposed to the wind.
4. No drudgery because the applicator can be easily carried without much energy and not require to bag it on the shoulders.
5. No drift hazards as like spraying the chemical will be drifted when applied to the plants because of wind and other factors.
6. Easy in application because the equipment is light in weight.
7. Insecticide saving because the chemical will be absorbed into the sponge will be directly applied to the plant without any wastage as like hand spraying where the chemical wasted because of drift and more requirement of water.
8. No environmental pollution because the chemical is not exposed to environment.
9. Labour saving because the application can be done easily as the requirement of water is less, quantity of chemical is less and once the spray fluid is ready, it can be applied.
10. Risk of exposure to human beings is less because the chemical is not drifted or not exposed to the wind.
11. Cost incurred is very less as the amount of chemical reduced.
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**Image 2. Application of chemical by Rolling Stem Applicator in Cotton**
CONCLUSION

Cotton is an important crop and sprayings done by the farmers for control of sucking pests require more number of labour and more quantity of chemical required which increases the cost of cultivation of the farmers for growing the crop and also also risk of exposure to human beings and beneficial insects is increased. Even, the drudgey produced during spraying is more which cause pain to the labour engaged for application. For a small and marginal farmer, it will be a more burden when the cost of cultivation increases. Rolling stem applicator will serve as an effective eco friendly tool in the IPM strategy of cotton as it is very easy to handle and apply, less risk to human beings, environment and beneficial insects, no drift hazard and overall reduces the cost of cultivation to the farmers which benefits the poor small and marginal farmers.
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