

Bio-efficacy of Different Doses of Noval Insecticide Against Sap Feeder Insect Pests Infesting Pomegranate

Suresh Kumar Jat¹ Lekha² and Mahendra Choudhary^{*3} Agriculture University, Kota (Rajasthan)

ABSTRACT

Field experiments were conducted to evaluate the bio-efficacy of novel insecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD 200, 250, 300, 400 g/ha along with two standard checks i.e., Lambda-cyhalothrin 4.9% CS and Fipronil 5% SC @ 2000 ml/ha against sap feeder insect pests infesting pomegranate at KVK, Jhalawar during the years 2021 and 2022. The pomegranate variety Sindhuri was transplanted in a Randomized Block Design with seven treatments with three replications. Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD was equally effective @ 400 and 300 g/ha to control major sap feeder insects like aphid, thrips and whitefly on pomegranate crop and better than other standard treatments. The mean maximum yield of pomegranate was recorded in the treatment of Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha which was 98.20 q/ha and 109.20 q/ha during respective year in comparison to control.

Key Words: Bio efficacy, Noval insecticides, Sap feeder, Pomegranate

INTRODUCTION

Pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) is one of the important fruit crops in India, cultivated in arid and semi-arid regions of Gujarat, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu (Balikai et al, 2011). The adaptability of the crop to extremes of temperature $(-12 \text{ to} + 44^{\circ}\text{C})$, suitability to marginal lands with poor fertility, rocky lands with shallow depth etc., pave the way for its potential production in various ecosystem (Pal et al, 2014). Till date 91 insects, 6 mites and 1 snail has been reported as pest on pomegranate crop in India (Balikai et al, 2011 and Gurjar et al, 2023). Among this pest complex, damage due to sucking pests viz., thrips, mealy bugs, aphids and whitefly is major in India. Yield loss incurred due to pest problem results in the reduced income, poverty, food insecurity and loss of biodiversity. Earlier the management measures for these pests included the use of broad-spectrum pesticides. Concerns for health hazards, disruption of the natural ecosystem, increasing in the chances of pest resurgence and development of resistance

in pests due to indiscriminate use of pesticides, stimulated the need of using eco-friendly pesticides. In present study, the bio-efficacy of novel insecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD against sucking pests of pomegranate was carried out for the evaluation of bio-efficacy on pomegranate against sap feeder insect pests.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment to evaluate the bioefficacy of novel insecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD against sap feeder insect pests infesting pomegranate ten-year-old orchard at different doses was conducted at KVK, Jhalawar during the years 2021 and 2022. The pomegranate variety Sindhuri was transplanted in a Randomized Block Design with seven treatments including one untreated control with three replications. Other package and practice were followed as per university recommendation. Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD was evaluated at different doses *i.e.*, @ 200, 250, 300, 400 g/ha along with two standard checks i.e., Lambdacyhalothrin 4.9% CS and Fipronil 5% SC @ 2000

Corresponding Author's Email - entomahendra07@gmail.com

¹Agriculture University, Kota

² Agriculture University, Jodhpur

³ICAR-CAZRI, Jodhpur

Suresh Kumar Jat et al

| | | | Dose | Number of aphids/ 5 cm twig | | | | | | | Per cent |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sr. | Treatment | g | Formulation | Pre | First spray | | | Second spray | | | ROC @ 10 |
| No. | | a.i./ha | (ml or g/ha) | count | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | days after 2 nd spray |
| T_1 | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 60 | 200 | 10.55* (3.39)** | 9.22 (3.20) | 8.45 (3.07) | 11.36 (3.51) | 10.66 (3.41) | 9.75 (3.28) | 8.78 (3.13) | 49.51 |
| T ₂ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 75 | 250 | 11.45 (3.53) | 7.33 (2.89) | 4.92 (2.43) | 8.33 (3.05) | 6.22 (2.69) | 5.17 (2.48) | 4.11 (2.26) | 76.37 |
| T ₃ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 90 | 300 | 11.55 (3.54) | 6.11 (2.67) | 3.89 (2.21) | 6.86 (2.80) | 3.67 (2.15) | 2.25 (1.80) | 1.36 (1.54) | 92.18 |
| T ₄ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 120 | 400 | 10.89 (3.45) | 5.94 (2.63) | 3.78 (2.19) | 6.75 (2.78) | 3.44 (2.11) | 2.11 (1.76) | 1.22 (1.49) | 92.98 |
| T ₅ | Lambda-cyhalothrin 4.9% CS | 25 | 500 | 11.75 (3.57) | 8.89 (3.14) | 7.95 (2.99) | 10.67 (3.42) | 9.47 (3.24) | 8.97 (3.16) | 8.45 (3.07) | 51.41 |
| T ₆ | Fipronil 5% SC | 100 | 2000 | 10.94 (3.45) | 9.05 (3.17) | 8.14 (3.02) | 11.03 (3.47) | 9.78 (3.28) | 9.45 (3.23) | 8.61 (3.10) | 50.49 |
| T7 | Untreated control | - | - | 11.72 (3.57) | 12.36 (3.66) | 13.75 (3.84) | 15.11 (4.01) | 15.75 (4.09) | 16.61 (4.20) | 17.39 (4.29) | - |
| | S. Em± | | | - | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.04 | - |
| | CD at 5 % | NS | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.12 | - | | |

Table 1. Bio-efficacy of different doses of novel insecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD againstaphids in pomegranate during 2021.

*Original values; **Square root transformed values; DAS – Days After Spray, NS – Non significant; ROC – Reduction Over untreated Control

 Table 2. Bio-efficacy of different doses of novel insecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% ODagainst aphids in pomegranate during 2022.

| | | | Dose | Number of aphids/ 5 cm twig | | | | | | | Per cent |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sr. | Treatment | g | Formulation | Pre | First spray | | | Second spray | | | ROC @ 10 |
| No. | | a.i./ha | (ml or g/ha) | count | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | days after 2 nd spray |
| T_1 | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 60 | 200 | 8.75* (3.12)** | 8.03 (3.00) | 7.25 (2.87) | 10.33 (3.36) | 9.22 (3.20) | 7.95 (2.99) | 7.59 (2.93) | 50.13 |
| T ₂ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 75 | 250 | 9.22 (3.19) | 6.45 (2.73) | 5.08 (2.47) | 7.22 (2.87) | 5.69 (2.59) | 4.22 (2.29) | 3.22 (2.05) | 78.84 |
| T ₃ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 90 | 300 | 8.56 (3.09) | 4.78 (2.40) | 3.00 (2.00) | 5.89 (2.62) | 3.56 (2.13) | 1.64 (1.62) | 0.92 (1.39) | 93.96 |
| T ₄ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 120 | 400 | 9.44 (3.23) | 4.56 (2.36) | 2.89 (1.96) | 5.78 (2.60) | 3.41 (2.10) | 1.50 (1.58) | 0.78 (1.33) | 94.88 |
| T_5 | Lambda-cyhalothrin 4.9% CS | 25 | 500 | 8.94 (3.15) | 7.53 (2.92) | 6.78 (2.79) | 9.75 (3.28) | 8.67 (3.11) | 7.53 (2.92) | 7.06 (2.84) | 53.61 |
| T ₆ | Fipronil 5% SC | 100 | 2000 | 9.75 (3.28) | 7.81 (2.97) | 7.00 (2.83) | 10.11 (3.33) | 8.89 (3.14) | 7.67 (2.94) | 7.20 (2.86) | 52.69 |
| T7 | Untreated control | - | - | 9.61 (3.25) | 10.05 (3.32) | 11.69 (3.56) | 13.22 (3.77) | 13.89 (3.86) | 14.64 (3.95) | 15.22 (4.03) | - |
| | S. Em± | | | | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.05 | - |
| | CD at 5 % | | | NS | 0.09 | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.14 | - |

*Original values; **Square root transformed values; DAS – Days After Spray, NS – Non significant; ROC – Reduction Over untreated Control

ml/ha against sap feeder insect pests infesting pomegranate. Each treatment was applied twice first when the sap feeder population crossed the ETL and second was after 10 days interval. Observation on pest population of aphids, thrips and whiteflies were recorded at before spray and 3, 7 and 10 d after each spray. Population of aphids, thrips and whiteflies were recorded from 5 cm shoot length per twig. Four twigs were randomly selected from each plant from four directions (East, West, South and North). Three plants from each plot were randomly selected for taking the observations and data recorded was represented as number per 5 cm twig. Per cent reduction of pest population over untreated control was calculated at 3, 7 and 10 days after each spray. Data recorded on pest population were transformed to square root before the statistical analysis.

Bio-efficacy of Different Doses of Noval Insecticide Against Sap Feeder

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Bio-efficacy against Aphids (Aphis punicae).

The aphids (Aphis punicae) mean population was recorded before first spray and 3, 7 and 10 d after each spray during first and second seasons have been presented in Table 1 and 2. The data revealed that before first spray aphid population was uniform in various treatments since the difference in population was not significant. After spray all the treatments were found significantly effective in controlling the aphid population when compared to untreated control. Amongst the treatments Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha was more effective at each observation with low pest population which was at par with Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha during both the year. Next treatment in order of effectiveness was Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 200 g/ha followed by Lambda-cyhalothrin 4.9% CS 500 ml/ha, which was at par with Fipronil 5% SC @ 2000 ml/ha. The highest aphid population was recorded in untreated control. The per cent reduction in aphid population over control was also calculated and presented in Table 1 and 2. The higher population reduction over control was recorded with the treatment of Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha, which was 92.98 % and 94.88% in second spray 10 days after application during Kharif 2021 and 2022, respectively.

Bio-efficacy against Thrips (Scirtothrips dorsalis)

Thrips (Scirtothrips dorsalis) mean population was recorded before first spray and at different time intervals after each spray during first and second seasons have been presented in Table 3 and 4. The data revealed that before first spray the thripspopulation was uniform in various treatments since the difference in population was not significant. After spray all the treatments were found significantly effective in controlling the thripspopulation when compared to untreated control. Amongst the treatments Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha was more effective at each observation time with low pest population which was at par with Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha during both the year. Next treatment in order of effectiveness was Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 200 g/ha followed by Lambdacyhalothrin 4.9% CS 500 ml/ha, which was at par with Fipronil 5% SC @ 2000 ml/ha. The highest aphid population was recorded in untreated control. The per cent reduction in thrips population over control was also calculated and presented in Table 3 and 4. The higher population reduction over control was recorded with the treatment of Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha, which was 92.84 % and 95.38% in second spray 10 days after application during Kharif 2021 and 2022, respectively.

Table 3. Bio-eficacy of different doses of novelinsecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% ODagainstthrips in pomegranate during 2021.

| | Treatments | | Dose | Number of thrips/ 5 cm twig | | | | | | | Per cent |
|----------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sr. | | g a.i./ | Formulation | Pre | First spray | | | Second spray | | | ROC @ 10 |
| No. | | ha | (ml or g/ha) | count | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | days after 2 nd spray |
| T_1 | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 60 | 200 | 11.47* (3.52)** | 10.75 (3.43) | 9.42 (3.22) | 12.89 (3.73) | 11.19 (3.49) | 10.67 (3.41) | 9.81 (3.29) | 49.49 |
| T ₂ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 75 | 250 | 12.15 (3.62) | 6.03 (2.65) | 3.72 (2.17) | 7.22 (2.87) | 4.94 (2.44) | 3.22 (2.05) | 1.61 (1.61) | 91.71 |
| T ₃ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 90 | 300 | 11.67 (3.55) | 5.69 (2.59) | 3.47 (2.11) | 7.03 (2.83) | 4.78 (2.40) | 3.00 (2.00) | 1.53 (1.59) | 92.12 |
| T ₄ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 120 | 400 | 12.50 (3.67) | 5.44 (2.54) | 3.19 (2.05) | 6.78 (2.79) | 4.53 (2.35) | 2.75 (1.93) | 1.39 (1.54) | 92.84 |
| T ₅ | Lambda-cyhalothrin 4.9% CS | 25 | 500 | 11.21 (3.49) | 8.75 (3.12) | 6.78 (2.79) | 9.33 (3.21) | 8.58 (3.09) | 7.44 (2.90) | 6.53 (2.74) | 66.37 |
| T ₆ | Fipronil 5% SC | 100 | 2000 | 12.78 (3.71) | 9.08 (3.17) | 7.22 (2.87) | 9.72 (3.27) | 8.89 (3.14) | 7.67 (2.94) | 6.78 (2.79) | 65.09 |
| T ₇ | Untreated control | - | - | 11.45 (3.52) | 12.55 (3.68) | 13.42 (3.80) | 15.33 (4.04) | 17.33 (4.28) | 18.33 (4.40) | 19.42 (4.52) | - |
| | S. Em± | | | - | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.06 | - |
| | CD at 5 % | NS | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.20 | _ | | |

*Original values; **Square root transformed values; DAS – Days After Spray, NS – Non significant; ROC – Reduction Over untreated Control

| | | | Dose | Number of thrips/ 5 cm twig | | | | | | | Per cent |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sr. | Treatment | a | Formulation | Pre | First spray | | | Second spray | | | ROC @ 10 |
| No. | | g a.i./ha | (ml or g/ha) | count | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | days after 2 nd spray |
| T_1 | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 60 | 200 | 10.19* (3.34)** | 8.22 (3.03) | 7.22 (2.87) | 10.53 (3.39) | 9.22 (3.20) | 8.44 (3.07) | 7.89 (2.98) | 51.36 |
| T ₂ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 75 | 250 | 9.44 (3.22) | 3.89 (2.21) | 2.08 (1.75) | 5.70 (2.59) | 4.22 (2.28) | 2.20 (1.79) | 1.11 (1.45) | 93.16 |
| T ₃ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 90 | 300 | 10.78 (3.43) | 3.67 (2.16) | 1.83 (1.68) | 5.47 (2.54) | 3.97 (2.23) | 1.78 (1.65) | 1.00 (1.41) | 93.83 |
| T ₄ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 120 | 400 | 9.83 (3.28) | 3.45 (2.11) | 1.67 (1.63) | 5.22 (2.49) | 3.78 (2.18) | 1.58 (1.61) | 0.75 (1.32) | 95.38 |
| T ₅ | Lambda -cyhalothrin 4.9% CS | 25 | 500 | 10.58 (3.40) | 6.56 (2.75) | 4.64 (2.37) | 8.33 (3.05) | 6.22 (2.69) | 5.42 (2.53) | 4.97 (2.44) | 69.36 |
| T ₆ | Fipronil 5% SC | 100 | 2000 | 9.33 (3.20) | 6.72 (2.78) | 4.83 (2.41) | 8.47 (3.08) | 6.70 (2.77) | 5.89 (2.62) | 5.25 (2.49) | 67.63 |
| T ₇ | Untreated control | - | - | 10.09 (3.32) | 10.78 (3.43) | 11.33 (3.51) | 13.56 (3.81) | 14.67 (3.96) | 15.33 (4.04) | 16.22 (4.15) | - |
| | S. Em± | | | - | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.06 | - |
| | CD at 5 % | NS | 0.20 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.23 | 0.20 | - | | |

Table 4. Bio-efficacy of different doses of novel insecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% ODagainst thrips in pomegranate during 2022.

*Original values; **Square root transformed values; DAS – Days After Spray, NS – Non significant; ROC – Reduction Over untreated Control

Bio-efficacy against whitefly (*Siphoninus phillyreae*)

The data revealed that before first spray whitefly population was uniform in various treatments since the difference in population was not significant. After spray all the treatments were found significantly effective in controlling the whitefly population when compared to untreated control. Amongst the treatments Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha was more effective at each observation time with low pest population which was at par with Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha during both the year. Next treatment in order of effectiveness was Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 200 g/ha followed by Lambdacyhalothrin 4.9% CS 500 ml/ha, which was at par with Fipronil 5% SC @ 2000 ml/ha. The highest whitefly population was recorded in untreated control. The per cent reduction in whitefly population over control was also calculated and presented in Table 5 and 6. The higher population reduction over control was recorded with the treatment of Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha, which was 91.91 % and 93.94% in second spray 10 days after application during *Kharif* 2021 and 2022, respectively.

The result of effectiveness of different insecticidal treatments against pomegranate sap feeders showed that all the treatments were significantly superior over control in terms of population reduction. The findings of present investigation indicated that Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha was more effective during each observation with low pest population. Observation recorded at 10 days after 2nd spray revealed that lowest population of 1.22 aphids and 0.78/5 cm twig was recorded in Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/haand it was found at par with Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@300 g/ha (1.36 aphids and 0.92/5 cm twig), respectively during Kharif2022 and 2023. Highest population of aphids /5 cm twig i.e. 17.39 and 15.22, respectively during both the year was recorded inuntreated control. Whereas, the reduction in population of thrips over untreated control recorded at 10 days after 2nd spray revealed that highest reduction in the population of thrips over untreated control was recorded in Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha(92.84 %) which was found similar with Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 300 g/ha(92.12%) during 2022 and during 2023 the maximum reduction of thrips population over untreated control was recorded in

Bio-efficacy of Different Doses of Noval Insecticide Against Sap Feeder

Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 400 g/ha(95.38 %) which was found similar with Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 300 g/ha (93.83 %). In whitefly observation recorded at 10 days after 2nd spray revealed that lowest population of 0.53 whiteflies/ 5 cm twig was recorded in Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@400 g/hawhich was at par with Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 300 g/ha(0.61 whiteflies/5 cm length of twig). Highest population of whiteflies/5 cm twig i.e. 6.55 was recorded inuntreated control during 2021. Thereafter, during 2022 data recorded at 10 days after 2nd spray revealed that lowest population of 0.36 whiteflies/5 cm twig length was recorded in Cvantraniliprole 10.26% OD@400 g/ha which was at par with Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD@ 300 g/ha (0.42 whiteflies/5 cm twig). Highest population of whiteflies/5 cm twig length i.e. 5.94 was recorded inuntreated control.

The results are in close agreement with the findings of Bhut *et al* (2013) and Thilagam *et al* (2020) reported that two sprays of chlorantraniliprole proved most effective followed by flubendiamide, novaluron, thiodicarb, endosulfan and malathion. Whereas, Kambrekar *et al* (2015) observed that emamectin benzoate 5 SG @ 0.25 g/ 1 ha gave highest reduction in the fruit damage followed by

spinosad 45 SC 0.20 ml/l. Kumar and Gupta (2018) found rynaxypyr, spinosad, emamectin benzoate and cyazypyr effective; and quinalphos (infestation) and flubendiamide were moderately effective. Rajeshwari et al (2019) evaluated different insecticides, and observed that the treatment with Spinosad 45 SC @ 0.2 ml/l was found to be significantly superior in recording a minimum population of thrips (0.92 thrips/three leaves) and aphids (7.54 aphids/three leaves) respectively. Solankar et al (2021) observed that the treatment of Cyantraniliprole 10.26 % OD @ 0.9 ml and combination treatment of Lambdacyhalothrin 4.9 CS (each at 0.3ml) + Propineb 50 WP (1gm) with soluble fertilizer (00:52:34) (5 g/l) were found equally effective for the control of sucking pests viz. aphids and thrips on pomegranate followed by treatment of Flubendiamide 19.92 %+ Thiacloprid 19.92 SC at (a) 0.4 ml/l of water. Gaikwad *et al* (2023) showed that the most effective spray treatment forthe reduction in the population of thrips was Cyantraniliprole 10 OD, followed by Spinosad 45 SC and flonicamide 50 WG, indicating that these insecticides were comparable to one another and somewhat more effective than the other spray treatments.

| | | | Dose | Number of whiteflies / 5 cm twig | | | | | | | Per cent |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sr. | Treatment | a | Formulation | Pre | First spray | | | Second spray | | | ROC @ 10 |
| No. | Treatment | g a.i./ha | (ml or g/ha) | count | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | days after 2 nd spray |
| T1 | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 60 | 200 | 4.95* (2.44)** | 4.22 (2.28) | 3.89 (2.21) | 5.42 (2.53) | 4.95 (2.44) | 4.31 (2.30) | 3.61 (2.15) | 44.89 |
| T ₂ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 75 | 250 | 5.47 (2.54) | 2.56 (1.89) | 1.70 (1.64) | 3.47 (2.11) | 2.61 (1.90) | 2.11 (1.76) | 1.45 (1.56) | 77.86 |
| T ₃ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 90 | 300 | 5.89 (2.62) | 1.86 (1.69) | 0.86 (1.36) | 2.44 (1.86) | 1.53 (1.58) | 1.03 (1.42) | 0.61 (1.27) | 90.69 |
| T ₄ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 120 | 400 | 4.78 (2.40) | 1.78 (1.66) | 0.78 (1.33) | 2.25 (1.80) | 1.45 (1.56) | 0.94 (1.39) | 0.53 (1.24) | 91.91 |
| T ₅ | Lambda -cyhalothrin 4.9% CS | 25 | 500 | 5.75 (2.60) | 3.22 (2.05) | 2.39 (1.84) | 4.58 (2.36) | 4.00 (2.24) | 3.67 (2.16) | 3.22 (2.05) | 50.84 |
| T ₆ | Fipronil 5% SC | 100 | 2000 | 5.81 (2.61) | 3.44 (2.11) | 2.66 (1.91) | 4.67 (2.38) | 4.11 (2.26) | 3.75 (2.18) | 3.30 (2.07) | 49.62 |
| T ₇ | Untreated control | - | - | 4.89 (2.42) | 5.17 (2.48) | 5.36 (2.52) | 5.89 (2.62) | 6.08 (2.66) | 6.33 (2.71) | 6.55 (2.75) | - |
| | S. Em± | | | - | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.01 | - |
| | CD at 5 % | | | NS | 0.14 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.09 | 0.05 | - |

 Table 5. Bio-efficacy of different doses of novel insecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% ODagainst whiteflies in pomegranate during 2021.

*Original values; **Square root transformed values; DAS – Days After Spray, NS – Non significant; ROC – Reduction Over untreated Control

Suresh Kumar Jat et al

| | | | Dose | | Number of whiteflies / 5 cm twig | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Sr. | Treatment | g | Formulation | Pre | First spray | | | Second spray | | | ROC @ 10 | |
| No. | Treatment | a.i./ha | (ml or g/ha) | count | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | 3 DAS | 7 DAS | 10 DAS | days after 2 nd spray | |
| T_1 | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 60 | 200 | 3.86* (2.21)** | 3.67 (2.16) | 3.28 (2.07) | 4.44 (2.33) | 3.83 (2.20) | 3.47 (2.11) | 3.21 (2.05) | 45.96 | |
| T ₂ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 75 | 250 | 4.00 (2.23) | 1.94 (1.72) | 1.14 (1.46) | 2.67 (1.91) | 2.19 (1.79) | 1.61 (1.62) | 1.22 (1.49) | 79.46 | |
| T ₃ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 90 | 300 | 3.67 (2.16) | 1.28 (1.51) | 0.53 (1.24) | 2.00 (1.73) | 1.31 (1.52) | 0.72 (1.31) | 0.42 (1.19) | 92.93 | |
| T ₄ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 120 | 400 | 3.83 (2.19) | 1.19 (1.48) | 0.47 (1.21) | 1.89 (1.70) | 1.25 (1.50) | 0.61 (1.27) | 0.36 (1.17) | 93.94 | |
| T5 | Lambda -cyhalothrin 4.9% CS | 25 | 500 | 4.06 (2.25) | 2.86 (1.96) | 2.33 (1.83) | 3.67 (2.16) | 3.28 (2.07) | 3.00 (2.00) | 2.81 (1.95) | 52.69 | |
| T ₆ | Fipronil 5% SC | 100 | 2000 | 3.89 (2.21) | 2.95 (1.99) | 2.44 (1.86) | 3.78 (2.19) | 3.39 (2.09) | 3.11 (2.03) | 2.89 (1.97) | 51.35 | |
| T ₇ | Untreated control | - | - | 3.97 (2.23) | 4.39 (2.32) | 4.72 (2.39) | 5.03 (2.45) | 5.33 (2.52) | 5.64 (2.58) | 5.94 (2.63) | - | |
| | S. Em± | | | - | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | - | |
| | CD at 5 % | | | NS | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.07 | - | |

Table 6. Bio-efficacy of different doses of novel insecticide, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% ODagainst whiteflies in pomegranate during 2022.

*Original values; **Square root transformed values; DAS – Days After Spray, NS – Non significant; ROC – Reduction Over untreated Control

| C | and 2022. |] | Dose | F | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Sr. No. | Treatment | g a.i./ha | Formulation (ml or g/ha) | Fruit yield (t/ha) 2021 | Fruit yield (t/ha) 2022 | | |
| T 1 | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 60 | 200 | 5.76 | 6.82 | | |
| T ₂ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 75 | 250 | 9.11 | 10.05 | | |
| T ₃ | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 90 | 300 | 9.31 | 10.53 | | |
| T 4 | Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD | 120 | 400 | 9.82 | 10.92 | | |
| T ₅ | Lambda- cyhalothrin 4.9% CS | 25 | 500 | 7.56 | 8.73 | | |
| T ₆ | Fipronil 5% SC | 100 | 2000 | 7.14 | 8.23 | | |
| T ₇ | Untreated control | - | - | 3.89 | 4.62 | | |
| | S. Em± | | | 0.37 | 0.41 | | |
| | CD at 5 % | | | 1.13 | 1.27 | | |

Bio-efficacy of Different Doses of Noval Insecticide Against Sap Feeder

CONCLUSION

The treatment Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD @ 120 g a.i./ha and @ 90 g a.i./ha were found superior and at par in reducing aphids and whiteflies. Doses of Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD @ 120 g a.i./ha, @ 90 g a.i./ha and @75 g a.i./ha were found superior and at par in reducing thrips in pomegranate and also recorded higher yield. On the basis results it can be concluded thatCyantraniliprole 10.26% OD @ 90 g a.i./ha can be recommended to control aphids and whiteflies whereas, Cyantraniliprole 10.26% OD @ 75 g a.i./ha can be recommended to control thrips infestation on pomegranate.

REFERENCES

- Balikai RA, Kotikal Y K and Prasanna PM (2011). Status of pomegranate pests and their management Strategies in India. Proc. IInd IS on pomegranate and Minor, including Mediterranean Fruits. Acta Hort 569-583.
- Balikai R A, Kotikal Y K and Prasanna P M (2011). Status of pomegranate pests and their management strategies in India. *Acta Hort* **890**: 569-583.
- Bhut J B, Borad P K and Gandhiya H A (2013).
 Bionomics and evaluation of different biocides against anar butterfly, *Virachola isocrates* (Fabricius) infesting pomegranate. *Int J Pl Prot* 6: 338-343.
- Gaikwad D S, Lad A G, Fand D N, Deokar B D and Khedkar P B (2023). Efficacy of newer insecticides against pomegranate thrips (*Scirtothrips dorsalis / Rhipiphoro thrips cruentatus*). The Pharma Innov J SP-12 (12): 1511-1514

- Gurjar R A, Shah K A, Prabhu Nayaka, Salunkhe S R and Chauhan N M (2023). Performance of bio fertilizers on yield of mango and sapota in navsari district of Gujarat. J Krishi Vigyan 11 (2): 269-273
- Kambrekar D N, Biradar A P, Karabhantanal S S (2015). New insecticides for the management of pomegranate fruit borer, *Deudorix isocrates*(F.). *Indian J Ento* 77: 240-244.
- Kumar N and Gupta D (2018). Bioefficacy of insecticides and biopesticides against pomegranate fruit borer, *Deudorix epijarbas* (Moore). *Inter J Agri* **5**: 1-9.
- Pal R K, Babu K D, Singh N V, Maity A, Gaikwad N (2014). Pomegranate research in India–status and future challenges. *Progr Hort* **46** (2):184-201
- Rajeshwari G, Reddy N A, Chakravarthy A K, Sridhar V and Murthy B N S (2019). Bioefficacy of biorational insecticides against thrips and aphids on pomegranate and their safety to natural enemies. *J Entomol and Zool Stud* **7** (3): 1141-1144
- Solankar R D, Walunj A R, Kabre G B and More P E (2021). Bioefficacy and compatibility of new insecticides molecules against sucking pests of pomegranate. *The Pharma Innov J* SP-10 (11): 669-672.
- Thilagam P and Gopikrishnan A (2020). Integrated pest management module against pod borer complex in pigeon pea (Cajanus cajan L.). *J Krishi Vigyan* **9**(1): 180-183

Received on 22/07/2024 Accepted on 21/08/2024