Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com

E-ISSN: 2278-4136
P-ISSN: 2349-8234
www.phytojournal.com
JPP 2020; 9(2): 1865-1868
Received: 05-01-2020
Accepted: 10-02-2020

SD Patil
Assistant Professor, Department of Entomology, Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Igatpuri, Tal. Igatpuri, Nasik, Maharashtra, India

HM Patil
Associate Professor, Department of Agronomy, Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Igatpuri, Tal. Igatpuri, Nasik, Maharashtra, India

KD Bhoite
Assistant Professor, Department of Botany, Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Igatpuri, Tal. Igatpuri, Nasik, Maharashtra, India

DV Kusalkar
Associate Director of Research, Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Igatpuri, Tal. Igatpuri, Nasik, Maharashtra, India

Corresponding Author:
SD Patil
Assistant Professor, Department of Entomology, Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Igatpuri, Tal Igatpuri, Nasik, Maharashtra, India

Evaluation of insecticides against brown plant hopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal) in rice, *Oryza sativa* L.

SD Patil, HM Patil, KD Bhoite and DV Kusalkar

Abstract
A field experiment was conducted to determine the comparative efficacy of some insecticides against brown plant hoppers (BPH) in rice during *kharif* 2019. The treatments were acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L, clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L, fipronil 5 SC @ 2.0 ml/L (6.93), flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L (6.70) imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 0.20ml/L, thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 0.20g/L, quinalphos 25EC @ 2.0ml/L and untreated control. Flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L found to the most effective treatment for the control of BPH by recording the highest per cent reduction of 95.11% over control among all the treatments and it was follwed by acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (85.60), clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (85.16) and imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 0.20ml/L (83.37). The untreated control recorded maximum of 36.36, 36.43 and 34.96 number of BPH/hill at 3, 7 and 14 days after second spray. The grain yield differnce due to various insecticidal treatments were significant. The treatment with flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L recorded highest yield of 56.33 q/ha. However, it was at par with acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (53.62 q/ha), clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (52.71 q/ha), thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 0.20g/L (50.90 q/ha), imidacloprid 17.8 SL @0.20ml/L (50.63 q/ha), fipronil 5 SC @ 2.0 ml/L (49.45 q/ha) and quinalphos 25EC @ 2ml/L (44.58 q/ha). The lowest of 34.62 q/ha grain yield was recorded in untreated control. The highest 54.88 per cent increase in yield over control was recorded in treatment with flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L. It was followed by acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (54.88%) and clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (52.25%).

Keywords: Rice insect pests, brown plant hopper, insecticides, hopper burn

Introduction
India is world's second largest rice producer and consumer next to China. In India total area under rice 43.79 million hectors with production of 109.70 million tonnes with productivity of 2494 kg/ha (Anonymous, 2018) [1]. However, in Maharashtra state it is cultivated over an area about 14.66 lakh/ha with production about 34.19 lakh tonnes having productivity 1.84 tonnes/ha (Anonymous, 2018) [2]. Major Rice growing districts in Maharashtra are Thane, Ratnagiri, Raigad, Sindhudurg Kolhapur and Nashik.

Rice, *Oryza sativa* a cereal crop, belongs to the family Gramineae. It is staple food for more than half of human population. Rice constitutes 52 per cent of total food grain production and 55 per cent of total cereal production in India (Sexena and Sing, 2003) [16]. It is one of the world's most important crops providing a staple food for more than half of the global population (Kulagod *et al*., 2011) [12]. It is the predominant dietary energy source for 17 countries in Asia and the Pacific, 9 countries in North and South America and 8 countries in Africa. It alone provides 20% of the world's dietary energy supply (FAO, 2004) [8]. But, rice production is hampers by infestation of a large number of insect pests. Nearly 300 species of insect pests attack the rice crop at different stages and among them only 23 species cause notable damage (Pasalu and Katti, 2006) [14]. Brown plant hopper is one of the major culprits for huge economic crop losses of rice. It attacks the crop from late vegetative stage to grains hardening stage. Both the nymphs and adults suck the sap from the plant resulting in chlorotic, wilting and drying up of rice plant. This feeding symptoms of damage is commonly known as 'hopper-burn' which begins in patches but spread rapidly as the hoppers move from dying plants to adjacent plants. Generally the yield losses due to hoppers ranges from 10% to 90% but if timely control measures are not taken up, there may be possibility of total crop loss within a very short period. Beside this direct feeding damage, it also serves as the vector of Rice Grassy Stunt and Ragged Stunt Viruses (Ling, 1977) [13]. Most of the farmers depends on insecticides for their management and almost 50% of the insecticides used in rice are targeted against this pest alone (Reddy *et al*., 2012) [15].

Many conventional insecticides though have been evaluated against this insect, yet, most of the chemicals have failed to provide adequate control. Hence, new insecticides are being evaluated with an aim to least disruption of environmental system. For this purpose, the present study was carried out to find the efficacy of certain new insecticide against Brown plant hoppers in rice.

Materials and Methods

Field experiment was conducted in the experimental farm of Zonal Agriculture Research Station, Igatpuri Dist. Nashik, Maharashtra during *kharif*, 2019 in Randomized Block Design (RBD), having 8 treatments which were replicated thrice in plot size of 3.75mx2.95m i.e. 16 rows of 3.20m length with 15x25cm spacing. Nursery of rice variety Indrayani sown in the second week of June in *kharif*, 2019 and transplanting was done after 30 days of sowing at 15×25 cm^2 hill spacing. All the agronomic practices were followed during crop growth period. The treatments were *viz*., acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L, clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L, fipronil 5 SC @ 2.0 ml/L (6.93), flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L (6.70) imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 0.20ml/L, thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 0.20g/L, quinalphos 25EC @ 2ml/L and untreated control. The insecticides were applied as high volume sprays @ 500 lits of spray fluid/ha. Sprayings was given by using a hand compression knapsack high volume sprayer during morning hours. The plot in each treatment was sprayed with respective insecticides ensuring uniform coverage of insecticide. The treatments imposed when the pest reached ETL. The data were recorded on population of BPH on 10 randomly selected hills from each plot at one day before the application of treatments as a pre count and post count at three, seven and fourteen days after spray. The per cent population reduction of brown plant hopper at each count were calculated. Finally the grain yield was recorded on plot basis and expressed in quintal/ha. The data obtained for field experiments were subjected to statistical analysis.

Results and Discussion

Data pertaining to effect of various insecticides on brown plant hopper control in rice is depicted in Table 1 to 3. The data indicated significant differences among the treatments at 3, 7 and 14 days after first and second spray. There were no significant differences among the treatments before the application of first spray. The data indicated that the treatments clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L proved to be significantly effective against control of BPH which recorded minimum number of 6.30 number of BPH/hill at 3 days after spray. It was at par with imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 0.20ml/L (6.46), acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (6.56), fipronil 5 SC @ 2.0 ml/L (6.93), flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L (6.70) and thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 0.20g/L (8.13). At 7 days after spray, the population of BPH were not recorded in treatment with acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L, clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L and flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L i.e. cent percent control of BPH was observed. At 14 DAS, flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L recorded signifcantly minimum of 7.26 number of BPH/hill. It was followed by acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (9.16), clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (10.73), imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 0.20ml/L (10.78) and thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 0.20g/L (10.80). The untreated control recorded significantly maximum number of 19.30, 22.96 and 33.33 number of BPH hill at 3, 7 and 14 days after first spray. The data regarding the efficacy of treatments after first spray revealed that Flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L proved to be the most effective treatment by recording the highest percent population reduction of 81.17 over untreated control after first spray. It was followed by acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (79.51%), clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (78.39%) and fipronil 5 SC @ 2.0 ml/L (75.36%).

The data presented in Table 2 revealed the significant differences among the treatments at 3, 7 and 14 days after second spray. At 3 days after second spray the significantly minimum of 2.73 number of BPH were recorded in treatment flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L and it was followed by clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (4.83), acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L and imidacloprid 17.8 SL @0.20ml/L (5.23). At 7 days after spray, the treatment with clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L recorded minimum of 0.93 number of BPH/hill and it was at par with acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (1.23) and flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L (1.30). At 14 days after second spray, the treatment with flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L recorded minimum of 1.26 number of BPH/hill and it was at par imidacloprid 17.8 SL @0.20ml/L (1.76). The data regarding the overall per cent population reduction over control, the flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L found to the most effective treatment for the control of BPH by recording the highest per cent reduction of 95.11% over control among all the treatments. The untreated control recorded maximum of 36.36, 36.43 and 34.96 number of BPH/hill at 3, 7 and 14 days after second spray.

Data from Table 3 revealed that the treatment with flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L recorded highest per cent reduction of BPH over control at first and second spray and it was follwed by acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (85.60), clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (85.16) and imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 0.20ml/L (83.37).

The data presented in Table 3 revealed that the grain yield differnce due to various insecticidal treatments were significant. The treatment with flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L recorded highest yield of 56.33 q/ha. However, it was at par with acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (53.62 q/ha), clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (52.71 q/ha), thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 0.20g/L (50.90 q/ha), imidacloprid 17.8 SL @0.20ml/L (50.63 q/ha), fipronil 5 SC @ 2.0 ml/L (49.45 q/ha) and quinalphos 25EC @ 2ml/L (44.58 q/ha). The lowest of 34.62 q/ha grain yield was recorded in untreated control. The highest 54.88 per cent increase in yield over control was recorded in treatment with flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L. It was followed by acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L (54.88%) and clothianidin 50 WDG @ 0.05g/L (52.25%). All the treatments were superior in brown plant hopper management and differ significantly for untreated control. Different scientist were reported the effectiveness of thiamethoxam 25 WG for management of BPH (Kendappa *et al*., 2005, Hegde and Nidagundi, 2009 and Suri *et al*., 2012) [10, 9, 16, 17]. The results of present findings are also in corroboration with result of Bhavani and Rao (2005) [4] who reported the higher yield of rice in plots treated with thiamethoxam @ 0.025kg.a.i/ha (4.98 t/ha), acetamiprid @ 0.020kg.a.i/ha (4.52 t/ha) and clothianidin @ 0.015 kg.a.i/ha (4.48 t/ha). Deekshita *et al*., 2017 evaluated various newer insecticide *viz*., imidacloprid 17.8 SL, thiamethoxam 25 WG and acetamiprid 20 SP were found effective for the control of BPH in rice over untreated control. The results of the present findings are in conformity with those reported by Deekshita *et al*., 2017 [6] and Atana Seni and Bhima Sen Naik, 2017 [3]. Many scientist documented the good efficacy of acephate 75SP against hoppers on rice (Bhavani and Rao, 2005, De-Jin *et al*., 2010, Fabellar and Heinrichs, 2003) [4,5,7].

Table 1: Effect of different insecticides on population of brown plant hopper (BPH) after first spray and per cent population reduction over control

TN	Name of the insecticide	Dose Per liter	Population of brown plant hopper/hill				Per cent population reduction over control			Overall reduction (%)
			Pre count	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	3DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	
1	Acephate 75 SP	1.50 g	14.53 (3.94)	6.56 (2.75)	0.00 (1.00)	9.16 (3.19)	66.01	100.00	72.51	79.51
2	Clothianidin 50 WDG	0.05 g	13.06 (3.75)	6.30 (2.70)	0.00 (1.00)	10.73 (3.42)	67.36	100.00	67.81	78.39
3	Fipronil 5 SC	2.00 ml	13.00 (3.74)	6.93 (2.82)	0.60 (1.26)	11.80 (3.58)	64.09	97.39	64.60	75.36
4	Flonicamid 50 WG	0.30 g	13.70 (3.83)	6.70 (2.77)	0.00 (1.00)	7.26 (2.87)	65.28	100.00	78.22	81.17
5	Imidacloprid 17.8 SL	0.20 ml	14.50 (3.94)	6.46 (2.73)	2.13 (1.77)	10.76 (3.43)	66.53	90.72	67.72	74.99
6	Thiamethoxam 25 WG	0.20 g	13.86 (3.85)	8.13 (3.02)	1.83 (1.68)	10.80 (3.44)	57.88	92.03	67.60	72.50
7	Quinalphos 25EC	2.00 ml	13.30 (3.78)	9.10 (3.18)	5.90 (2.63)	18.66 (4.43)	52.84	74.30	44.01	57.05
8	Untreated control	-	13.26 (3.78)	19.30 (4.51)	22.96 (4.89)	33.33 (5.86)	-	-	-	-
	SE +		0.06	0.13	0.03	0.05	-	-	-	-
	CD at 5%		NS	0.40	0.08	0.14	-	-	-	-

DAS- Days after spray, figures in parentheses indicate V_{n+1} transformed value

Table 2: Effect of different insecticides on population of brown plant hopper (BPH) after second spray and per cent population reduction over control

TN	Name of the insecticide	Dose Per liter	Population of brown plant hopper/hill				Per cent population reduction over control			Overall reduction (%)
			Pre count	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	
1	Acephate 75 SP	1.50 g	9.16 (3.19)	5.23 (2.50)	1.23 (1.49)	2.50 (1.87)	85.61	96.62	92.85	91.69
2	Clothianidin 50 WDG	0.05 g	10.73 (3.42)	4.83 (2.41)	0.93 (1.39)	2.93 (1.98)	86.72	97.45	91.62	91.93
3	Fipronil 5 SC	2.00 ml	11.80 (3.58)	6.86 (2.80)	4.43 (2.33)	2.00 (1.73)	81.13	87.84	94.28	87.75
4	Flonicamid 50 WG	0.30 g	7.26 (2.87)	2.73 (1.93)	1.30 (1.52)	1.26 (1.50)	92.49	96.43	96.40	95.11
5	Imidacloprid 17.8 SL	0.20 ml	10.76 (3.43)	5.23 (2.50)	1.96 (1.72)	1.76 (1.66)	85.62	94.62	94.97	91.74
6	Thiamethoxam 25 WG	0.20 g	10.80 (3.44)	5.26 (2.50)	2.30 (1.81)	2.96 (1.99)	85.53	93.69	91.53	90.25
7	Quinalphos 25EC	2.00 ml	18.66 (4.43)	11.23 (3.50)	5.56 (2.56)	4.50 (2.34)	69.11	84.74	87.13	80.33
8	Untreated control	-	33.33 (5.86)	36.36 (6.11)	36.43 (6.12)	34.96 (5.99)	-	-	-	-
	SE +		0.05	0.02	0.04	0.07	-	-	-	-
	CD at 5%		0.14	0.05	0.14	0.20	-	-	-	-

DAS- Days after spray, figures in parentheses indicate V_{n+1} transformed value,

Table 3: Cumulative efficacy of different insecticides against brown plant hopper *Nilparvata lugens* (Stal.) and their effect on grain yield

TN	Name of the insecticide	Dose/ liter	Per cent population reduction over control			Grain Yield q/ha	Per cent increase in yield over control
			First spray	Second spray	Mean		
1	Acephate 75 SP	1.50 g	79.51	91.69	85.60	53.62	54.88
2	Clothianidin 50 WDG	0.05 g	78.39	91.93	85.16	52.71	52.25
3	Fipronil 5 SC	2.00 ml	75.36	87.75	81.56	49.45	42.84
4	Flonicamid 50 WG	0.30 g	81.17	95.11	88.14	56.33	62.71
5	Imidacloprid 17.8 SL	0.20 ml	74.99	91.74	83.37	50.63	46.24
6	Thiamethoxam 25 WG	0.20 g	72.50	90.25	81.38	50.90	47.02
7	Quinalphos 25EC	2.00 ml	57.05	80.33	68.69	44.58	28.77
8	Untreated control	-	-	-	-	34.62	-
	SE +		-	-	-	4.03	-
	CD at 5%		-	-	-	12.19	-

DAS- Days after spray

Conclusion

All the tested insecticides are found effective for brown plant hopper management but among these insecticides flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.30g/L, acephate 75 SP @ 1.50g/L, clothianidin50 WDG @ 0.05g/L, imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 0.20ml/L and fipronil 5 SC @ 2.0 ml/L can be used for the effective management of brown plant hopper in *kharif* rice.

References

1. Anonymous, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, 2018.
2. Anonymous, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Economic Survey of Maharashtra, Government of Maharashtra, 2018.
3. Atanu Seni, Bhima Sen Naik. Evaluation of Some Insecticides Against Brown Plant Hopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal) in Rice, *Oryza sativa* L. International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management. 201; 8(2):268-271.
4. Bhavani B, Rao PRM. Bio-efficacy of certain insecticides against rice plant hoppers *vis-a-vis* Natural enemies under irrigated field condition. Indian Journal of Plant Protection. 2005; 33(1):64-67.
5. De-Jin XU, Zhong-Yan GU, Guang-Chun XU, Xiao-Long XU, Peng F. Pymetrozine application techniques against *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stål) and safety evaluation to its natural enemies. Chinese Journal of Eco-Agriculture, 2010. http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/ CJFDTOTAL-ZGTN201005028.htm.
6. Deekshita Konchada, Rama Rao V Chennamasetty, Sandhya Rani Choragudi. Evaluation of Newer Insecticides Aganist Brown Planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal.) Infesting Rice. Chemical Science and Review Letter. 2017; 6(23):1423-1427.
7. Fabellar LT, Heinrichs EA. Relative toxicity of insecticides to rice plant hoppers and their predators. Crop Protection. 2003; 5(4):254-258.
8. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. The state of food security in the world, FAO, Rome, Italy, 2004, 30-31.
9. Hegde M, Nidagundi J. Effect of newer chemicals on planthoppers and their mirid predator in rice. Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2009; 22:511-513.
10. Kendappa GN, Mallikarjunappa S, Shankar G, Mithyantha MS. Evaluation of new insecticide, Applaud 25 SC (buprofezin) against brown planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal.) (Family:Delphacidae, Order: Hemiptera). Pestology. 2005; 29:5–8.
11. Kirankumar R. Efficacy of Pymetrozine 50 WG against brown planthopper *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal) on paddy *Oryza sativa* L. International Journal of Plant Protection. 2016; 9(1):68–78.
12. Kulagod SD, Hegde M, Nayak GV, Vastrad AS, Hugar PS, Basavanagoud K. Evaluation of insecticides and bio-rationals against yellow stem borer and leaf folder on rice crop. Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2011; 24(2):244–246.
13. Ling KC. Rice ragged stunt disease. International Rice Research Newsletter. 1977; 5:6-7.
14. Pasalu IC, Katti G. Advances in ecofriendly approaches in rice IPM. Journal of Rice Research. 2006; 1(1):83–90.
15. Reddy AV, Devi RS, Reddy DVV. Evaluation of botanical and other extracts against plant hoppers in rice. Journal of Bio-pesticides. 2012; 5(1):57–61.
16. Sexena RC, Singh RK. Rice research in India and the asian perspective, Asian Biotech Dev. Rev, Neem Foundation, Gurgaon, India. Formerly with IRRI, Philippines, 2003, 81-96.
17. Suri KS, Kumar V, Brar DS. Field evaluation of insecticides for the management of rice plant hoppers, *Sogatella furcifera* and *Nilaparvata lugens*. Indian Journal of Plant Protection. 2012; 40(2):153–156.