



Field Efficacy and Economics of Certain Biopesticides and Chemicals against Gram Pod Borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on Greengram [*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek]

Gummalla Deepthi ^{a+++} and Ashwani Kumar ^{a#}

^a Department of Entomology, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, 211007, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2024/v36i74805>

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/118212>

Original Research Article

Received: 10/04/2024

Accepted: 13/06/2024

Published: 02/07/2024

ABSTRACT

In the kharif season of 2023–2024, a field experiment was carried out at the in Eight treatments—Spinosad 45SC, Ha NPV 1X109ml/min, Neem seed kernel extract 10% WP, Emamectin Benzoate 5%SG, Azadirachtin (Neem oil) 0.03% WSP, Chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC, Bacillus thuringiensis 4% WSP, and untreated Control—were used in the RBD experiment. Each treatment was replicated three times. After the first and second sprays, data on the *Helicoverpa armigera* larval population

⁺⁺ M.Sc. Scholar;

[#] Associate Professor;

^{*}Corresponding author: E-mail: gdeepthi.186@gmail.com;

Cite as: Deepthi, Gummalla, and Ashwani Kumar. 2024. "Field Efficacy and Economics of Certain Biopesticides and Chemicals Against Gram Pod Borer, *Helicoverpa Armigera* (Hubner) on Greengram [*Vigna Radiata* (L.) Wilczek]". *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science* 36 (7):930-36. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2024/v36i74805>.

showed that all treatments were much better than the control. Following Chlorantraniliprole (18.5%SC) (0.323) as the least amount of larvae was recorded among all the treatments, Spinosade (45%SC) (0.456), Emamectin benzoate (5%SG) (0.578), Azadirachtin (Neem oil) 00.03%EC (0.712), Neem seed kernel extract (10% The highest documented larval population in this case was 1x108CFU (1.112) of *Bacillus thuringiensis*. However, the treatment that produced the best yield (15.36 q/ha) was chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC. An intriguing outcome was obtained when the cost-benefit ratio was calculated. The study found that, when compared to a control plot of 1:1.04, the most effective and cost-effective treatment was Chlorantraniliprol 18.5 SC (1:3.65), followed by Spinosade 45% SC (1:3.26), Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (1:2.94), and Azadirachtin (Neem oil) 00.03%EC (1:1.89), Neem seed kernel extract 10% WP (1:1.92), Ha NPV 1X109 POB ml/min (1:1.62), and *Bacillus thuringiensis* 1x108CFU (1:1.58).0.978, 1X 109 POB/ml/min. WP (0.845), and Ha NPV 1X 109 POB/ml/min (0.978) were the next five treatments.

Keywords: *Biopesticides; chemicals; greengram; Helicoverpa armigera; pod borer.*

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most crucial pulse crops in India, green gram (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek. 2n=22) is a legume food that is farmed all over the world in tropical and sub-tropical climates and is considered to be commercially significant. This legume's value stems from its beneficial qualities, which include a high protein content (25-28%), lower flatulence than other pulses, broad adaptability, low requirement for agricultural inputs, and the capacity to improve soil fertility. Because they are high in vitamins and minerals, green gram sprouts and green pods are an excellent and costly source of nutritional protein for those in poverty [1].

Green gram stands out among pulse crops for its impressive adaptability to diverse environmental conditions, making it a resilient choice for farmers in various regions. This adaptability, coupled with its low input requirements, allows for cost-effective cultivation, making it a popular crop in resource-limited settings. Furthermore, green gram plays a pivotal role in sustainable agriculture by its capacity to fix atmospheric nitrogen, thereby improving soil fertility and reducing dependency on synthetic fertilizers.

Mung beans are known for having a lot of nutrients. Mung beans are high in protein, fat, vitamins, and minerals and contain between 55% and 65% carbohydrates. Its protein content ranges from 20% to 50% of the total dry weight, with albumin (25%) and globulin (60%) serving as the main storage proteins. Mung beans are recognized as a major source of dietary protein, with an annual production of 13.45 lakh tonnes and a cultivation area of approximately 30.48 lakh hectares. India is the leading producer of

grain legumes or pulses globally, contributing to 70% of the world's greengram production. India achieves an annual production of 1.5 to 2.0 million tonnes of mung beans from approximately 3 to 4 million hectares of land, with an average yield of 798 kg per hectare [2].

India is the major producer and user of greengrams globally. India's mung bean production spans 3 to 4 million hectares of land annually, yielding between 1.5 to 2.0 million tonnes. The average productivity is approximately 500 kg per hectare. Major mung bean cultivation is concentrated in Gujarat, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, and Bihar states. Rajasthan (26%), followed by Maharashtra (20%), account for the first two places among these five states, providing more than 46% of the total production. Andhra Pradesh makes up over 10% of the nation's total production, whereas Gujarat and Bihar combined make up approximately 13% [3].

Despite its high productivity, the cultivation of greengram faces significant challenges, particularly from the gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera*. This pest is recognized for its prolific reproductive capacity, migratory habits, ability to adapt to diverse agroclimatic conditions, and development of resistance to various insecticides, posing a potentially polyphagous threat to numerous crops, including greengram [4].

The larvae of *Helicoverpa armigera* cause substantial damage by consuming the tender leaves and penetrating the pods to feed on developing seeds. Typically, the front portion of the larva remains within the pod, while the rear portion protrudes outside, leading to considerable yield losses [5]. Effective pest

management strategies are essential to mitigate the impact of *Helicoverpa armigera* and ensure the sustained productivity of greengram crops in India.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

An experiment was carried out during the Kharif season of 2023 at SHUATS, Prayagraj, India, employing a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with eight treatments, replicated three times. The Kamad 60 variety was utilized, grown in plots measuring 2 m x 1 m, spaced at 30 x 10 cm intervals. The agricultural practices followed adhered to recommended standards, with the exception of plant protection measures. The soil type at the experimental site was well-drained and of medium elevation.

Eight treatments were tested against the gram pod borer: Spinosad 45SC (T1), Ha NPV 1x10⁹ ml/min (T2), Neem seed kernel extract 10% WP (T3), Emamectin Benzoate 5% SG (T4), Azadirachtin (Neem oil) 0.03% WSP (T5), Chlorantraniliprol 18.5% SC (T6), *Bacillus thuringiensis* 4% WSP (T7), and an untreated control (T8). Pesticides were applied at specified concentrations when the larval population reached the Economic Threshold Level (ETL) of 10% damaged pods. Observations were recorded on the number of larvae per plant at pre-count, and at 3, 7, and 14 days after each application, based on three randomly selected plants per plot. The number of mature pods damaged by *Helicoverpa armigera* was counted and expressed as the larval population. Grain yield per plot was calculated after threshing all pods from each treatment and reported per hectare.

Cost-effectiveness of each treatment was evaluated based on net returns, which were calculated by subtracting the total cost of treatment (including cultivation and plant protection costs) from the gross returns.

Formulae used:

Larval population = Number of Larvae / Total number of selected plants

Economics:

Cost Benefit ratio

C:B ratio = *Gross returns / Total cost incurred*

Gayathri and Kumar [5]

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

All treatments showed significantly better results compared to the control when comparing the mean larval population of *H. armigera* after the first and second sprays. Among the treatments, T6 Chlorantraniliprol 18.5% SC recorded the lowest larval population (0.323), followed by T1 Spinosad 45% SC (0.456), T4 Emamectin benzoate (0.578), T5 Azadirachtin (Neem oil) 0.03% WSP (0.712), T3 Neem seed kernel extract 10% WP (0.845), and T2 Ha NPV 1x10⁹ POB ml/min (0.978). The highest larval population was observed in T7 *Bacillus thuringiensis* 1x10⁸ CFU (1.112).

Data from the first and second sprays indicate that all treatments, except the untreated control, were effective. Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC was the most effective in reducing the larval population (0.323). Similar studies by Rahman et al. [6] and Mahajan et al. [7] found that Spinosad 45% SC (0.456) was the next best treatment. These findings are consistent with those of Singh et al. [8], who reported that Spinosad 45% SC was highly effective in reducing the population of greengram pod borer and increasing yield. Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (0.578) was identified as the second-best treatment, as noted by Kale [9].

The next successful treatment is discovered to be azadirachtin (Neem oil) 0.03%WSP (0.712), which is consistent with the findings of Chandra et al. [10] and Moraly et al [11]. The next successful therapy is neem seed kernel extract (0.845), which is consistent with the results of Byrapa et al. [12] and Moraly et al. [11] The next successful treatment is determined to be Ha NPV 1X10⁹ml/min (0.978), which is consistent with the findings of Kale [9], Byrapa et al. [12] and Rahman et al [6].

The differences in yields between the various treatments were noteworthy. Every therapy was better than the control. Chlorantraniliprole 18.5%SC (15.36 q/ha) had the highest yield, followed by Spinosad 45%SC (14.15 q/ha), Emamectin benzoate (12.21 q/ha), Azadirachtin (neem oil) 0.03%WSP (8.1 q/ha), Neem seed kernel extract 10%WP (7.93 q/ha), HaNPV1X10⁹ml/min (7.09 q/ha), *Bacillus thuringiensis* 4%WSP (6.5 q/ha). An intriguing outcome was obtained when the cost-benefit ratio was calculated [13-16]. T1 Spinosad

45%SC (1:3.26), T4 Emamectin benzoate 5%SG (1:2.94), and T5 Azadirachtin (Neem oil) 00.03%WSP (1:1.89) were the most effective and economical of the treatments examined [17,18]. T3 Neem seed kernel extract 10% WP

(1:1.92), T2 Ha NPV 1X109ml/min (1:1.62), and T7 Bacillus thuringiensis 1x108CFU (1:1.58) were the next best and most cost-effective treatments. Cherry [19] Babariya et al. [20], Rashid et al. corroborate these findings [21-24].




Fig. 1. Efficacy of biopesticides and chemicals on the larval population of pod borer on greengram (First spray)




Fig. 2. Efficacy of biopesticides and chemicals on the larval population of pod borer on greengram (Second spray)

Table 1. Field efficacy of biopesticides and chemicals on larval population of pod borer on greengram and Yield and C:B ratio

T.No	Treatments	Number of Larval Population per 5 Plants									Overallmean	Yield (q/ha)	C:B Ratio
		1 st Spray					2 nd Spray						
		1DBS	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	Mean	3 DAS	7DAS	14DAS	Mean			
T ₁	Spinosad 45SC	1.200	0.867	0.533	0.667	0.689	0.333	0.067	0.267	0.222	0.456	14.15	1:3.26
T ₂	Ha NPV 1X10 ⁹ ml/min	1.133	1.667	1.333	1.400	1.467	0.600	0.333	0.533	0.489	0.978	7.09	1:1.62
T ₃	Neem seed kernel extract10%WP	1.933	1.467	1.133	1.200	1.267	0.533	0.267	0.467	.422	0.845	7.93	1:1.92
T ₄	Emamectin benzoate 5%SG	1.400	1.067	0.733	0.800	0.867	0.400	0.133	0.333	0.289	0.578	12.21	1:2.94
T ₅	Azadirachtin (Neem oil) 00.03%WSP	0.867	1.267	0.933	1.000	1.067	0.467	0.200	0.400	0.356	0.712	8.1	1:1.89
T ₆	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC	1.333	0.667	0.333	0.467	0.489	0.267	0.000	0.200	0.156	0.323	15.36	1:3.65
T ₇	Bacillus thuringiensis 4%WSP	1.600	1.867	1.533	1.600	1.667	0.667	0.400	0.600	1.556	1.112	6.5	1:1.58
T ₈	Control	2.400	2.600	2.767	2.800	2.722	3.200	3.733	4.067	3.667	3.195	4.3	1:1.14
	F-test	NS	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		
	S. Ed. (±)	0.142	0.003	0.111	0.001	0.004	0.006	0.008	0.009	0.015	0.097	-	-
	C.D. (P = 0.05)	-	0.143	0.279	0.094	0.173	0.209	0.310	0.252	0.313	1.070	-	-

4. CONCLUSION

From the critical analysis of the present findings, it can be concluded that Chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC is more effective in controlling larval population of green gram pod borer followed by Spinosad 45SC, Emamectin benzoate, Azadirachtin (Neem oil) 00.03%WSP, Neem seed kernel extract 10%WP in managing green gram pod borer. Among the treatments studied, the best and most economical treatment was Chlorantraniliprole 18.5SC gave the cost benefit ratio of (1:3.65) and marketing yield of (15.36 q/ha) followed by Spinosad 45SC(1:3.94 and 14.15q/ha), Emamectin benzoate(1:2.94 and 12.21 q/ha), Azadirachtin(Neem oil) 00.03 WSP (1:1.89 and 8.1 q/ha), Neem seed kernel extract 10% WP (1:1.92 and 7.93q/ha), *Ha NPV* 1X10⁹ml/min (1:1.62 and 7.09 q/ha), and *Bacillus thuringiensis* 1x10⁸CFU (1:1.58 and 6.5 q/ha). Hence this can be a part of integrated pest management in order to avoid indiscriminate use of pesticides for ecofriendly management and to balance flora and fauna from ecosystem which causes pollution in the environment and also it was be less harmful to beneficial insects and human beings. Respectively as such more trails are required in future to validate the findings.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to Prof. (Dr.) Rajendra B. Lal, Hon'ble Vice Chancellor, SHUATS, Prof. (Dr.) Alok Milton Lall, Director of Research, Prof. (Dr.) Biswarup mehera, Dean, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, technology and Sciences, Prayagraj for making their keen interest and encouragement to carry out this research work.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Mehandi S, Quatadah S, Mishra SP, Singh I, Praveen N, Dwivedi N. Mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. wilczek): Retrospect and

- prospect. In LEGUME Crops- Characterization and Breeding for improved Food Security. 2019;49- 66.
2. Sireesha BS, Kumar A. Efficacy of selected insecticides against pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner)] on green gram. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;11(8): 944-948.
3. Anonymous. Ministry of agriculture & farmers welfare, directorate of pulses development, annual report. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. International Journal of Plant Protection. 2016-17;9(8):3117-3124; 6:108-110.
4. Kambrekar DN, Kulkarni KA, Giraddi RS, Kulkarni JH, Fakrudin B. Management of chickpea pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) through Nuclear Polyhedral Virus isolates. Precision Agriculture. 2009;10:450–457.
5. Gayathri L, Kumar A. Field efficacy of certain insecticides against pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chick pea in Prayagraj. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2021;9(3):280-283.
6. Rahman AKMZ, Haque MA, Alam SN, Dutta NK. Efficacy of microbials as insecticides for the management of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*) Fruitworm, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner). The Agriculturists. 2014;12(1): 68-74.
7. Mahajan SS, Kumar A, Warghat NA, Kolhe, PS, Jagarlamudi SMR. Comparative Efficacy of Latest Chemical Insecticides and Bio- Pesticides against (*Leucinodes orbonalis* Guenee.) on Brinjal at Trans Yamuna Region of Prayagraj (U.P.). International Journal of Current Microbiological Applied Sciences. 2020;9 (7):3414-3429.
8. Singh PS, Shukla RK, Yadav NK. Bio-efficacy of some insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Journal of food legumes. 2012;25(4):291-293.
9. Kale SN, Men UB. Efficacy of microbial insecticides and their combinations against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea. Journal of Biological Control. 2022(1): 205-208.
10. Chandra U, Gautam MP, Singh SN, Yadav SK, Giri SK. Studies on efficacy of botanicals against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2018;7: 612-618.

11. Moraly RS, Sornaik DN, Satpute VS, Sadwarte AK. Effect of plant products on growth and development of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on cotton. *Pestology*. 2000;14(1): 26-28.
12. Byrappa AM, Kumar NG, Divya M. Impact of biopesticides application on pod borer complex in organically grown field bean ecosystem. *Journal of Biopesticides*. 2012; 5(2):148.
13. Muhammad TH, Muhammad AM. and Naveed. Studied on the management of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) with different insecticides, *Pakistan Journal of Agriculture*. 2005;42(1-2).
14. Rashid A, Habib AS, Lal HA, Sabir ZS, Arshad M. Comparative efficacy of various insecticides to control gram pod borer (*H.armigera* Hub.) on chickpea. *Asian Journal of Plant Sciences*. 2003;2(4):403-405.
15. Vikrant Singh DR, Kumar S, Kishor K Kewal R. Bio-efficacy of Insecticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* in Chickpea. *Legume Research*; 2018.
16. 22Mushinamwar DR, Yadav U, Gafar BB, Rajawat S. Efficacy of Selected Biopesticides against Mustard Aphid, *Lipaphis erysimi* (Kalt.) (Hemiptera: Aphididae). *J. Adv. Biol. Biotechnol*. 2024; 27(6):702-7. Available:<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/article/view/930> [Accessed on 2024 May 28].
17. 23 Roopwan, Yadav U, Madhu B. Efficacy of Biopesticides for the Management of Rice Yellow Stem Borer *Scirpophaga incertulas* (Walker) in Rice at Prayagraj, U.P, India. *Int. J. Plant Soil Sci*.2024;35 (18):888-93. Available:<https://journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/article/view/3354> [[Accessed on 2024 May 28].
18. 24 Malinga LN, Laing MD. Efficacy of three biopesticides against cotton pests under field conditions in South Africa. *Crop Protection*. 2021;145: 105578.
19. Cherry AJ, Rabindra RJ, Parnell MA, Geetha N, Kennedy JS, Grzywacz D. Field evaluation of *Helicoverpa armigera* nucleopolyhedrovirus formulations for control of the chickpea pod-borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner), on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* var. Shoba) in southern India. *Crop Protection*. 2000;19 (1):51-60.
20. Babariya PM, Kabara SN, Patel VN, Joshi MD. Chemological activities of control of gram pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* pigeonpea. *Legume Research*. 2010;33(3):224 -226.
21. Fite T, Tefera T, Negeri M, Damte T, Sori, W. Evaluation of *Beauveria bassiana*, *Metarhizium anisopliae*, and *Bacillus thuringiensis* for the management of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) (*Lepidoptera: Noctuidae*) under laboratory and field conditions. *Biocontrol Science and Technology*. 2000;30(3): 278-295.
22. Kumar A, Tripathi MK, Chandra U, Veer R. Efficacy of botanicals and bio-pesticide against *Helicoverpa armigera* in chickpea. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*. 2019;7 (1):54-57.
23. Kumar L, Bisht RS, Singh H, Kumar A, Pandey N, Kumar M. Bio efficacy and economics of some newer insecticides and bio-pesticides against *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) on chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) crop. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2018;1739-1744.
24. Meena LK, Raju SVS. Bioefficacy of newer insecticides against tomato fruit borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on tomato, *Lycopersicon esculentum* mill under field conditions. *The Bioscan*. 2014; 9(1):347-350.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/118212>