



Efficacy of Newer Insecticide Molecules for the Management of Emerging Pests of Rice in the Cauvery Delta Zone of Tamil Nadu, India

P. Anandhi ^{a*}, V. Ambethgar ^a and S. Elamathi ^a

^a *Tamil Nadu Rice Research Institute, Aduthurai, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author PA designed the study, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author VA is the Director of this Institute and provided the facilities for the conduct of the study and author SE performed the statistical analysis and managed the literature searches. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2022/v34i2031201

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/89035>

Original Research Article

Received 15 April 2022
Accepted 28 June 2022
Published 01 July 2022

ABSTRACT

Seven treatments including 5 insecticides, Azadirachtin and untreated control were evaluated in field conditions against emerging pests of Rice viz., Rice hispa, *Dicladispa armigera*, (Oliver), (Chrysomelidae: Coleoptera), Whorl maggot, *Hydrellia sasakii* Yuasa and Isitani (Diptera: Ephydriidae) and Rice black bug, *Scotinophara lurida* (Burmeister), (Pentatomidae: Hemiptera) during 2019 and 2020 at Tamil Nadu Rice Research Institute, Aduthurai. All the tested newer insecticide molecules were effective against the above-mentioned emerging pests of Rice. Two sprays of Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150ml/ha at 35 and 75 days after transplanting (DAT) has reduced the highest reduction of hispa, whorl maggot and black bug (91.80, 92.25, 84.51 percent reduction over control) followed by Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40g/ha (88.46, 89.60 and 83.39 percent reduction over control). Higher yield was recorded from Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC (6075 kg/ha) treated plots followed by Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40g/ha (5950 kg/ha). Cost-benefit analysis showed that Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150ml/ha spray was the most viable treatment by recording the highest cost-benefit ratio of 1: 3.17. Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150ml/ha recorded more number of spiders and coccinellids (1.51 and 1.75 no./plant) followed by Carbosulfan 25% EC @ 1000ml/ ha (1.40 and 1.75 no./plant) which was on par with control (2.98 and 2.88 no./plant).

*Corresponding author: E-mail: anandhi.aaidu@gmail.com;

Keywords: *Rice hispa*; *dicladispa armigera*; *whorl maggot*; *hydrellia sasaki*; *rice black bug*; *scotinophara lurida*; *chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC*.

1. INTRODUCTION

Rice, *Oryza sativa* (Linnaeus) is the principle cereal crop and is being the staple food for more than 65 percent of the world population [1]. It is cultivated in almost all the tropical, subtropical and temperate countries of the world. Rice is the staple food for more than two-thirds of the India population contributing to 40 % of the total food grain production. In India it is grown in about a 43million hectares (m ha) and produced a record of 127.93 million tonnes of rice during 2021-22 [2]. The sudden occurrence of pest and diseases at different stages of the crop growth is one of the major constraints on rice production and low productivity in India. The rice plant is subject to attack by more than 100 insect species and 20 of them causes economic damage [3]. Among the minor pests, Rice hispa, *Dicladispa armigera*, (Oliver), Chrysomelidae: Coleoptera, a coleopteran pest, is a problem in specific rice ecologies viz., irrigated paddy fields as well as lowland rice cultivation in Tamil Nadu (Fig 1), West Bengal, Assam and North-East Indian states [4]. This pest causes extensive damage to the vegetative stage of plants resulting 35-65% loss in yield throughout Assam [5,6].

The reasons for the outbreak of the minor pests are extensive cultivation of high- yielding varieties, growing of susceptible varieties, monocropping which is providing constant niches for pest multiplication, indiscriminate use of fertilizers, particularly the application of high levels of nitrogen, non-judicious use of insecticides resulting in pest resistance to insecticides, and resurgence of pests and outbreaks of minor pests [7,8]. Major pests such as plant hoppers, stem borer and leaf folders have consistently posed serious challenges in rice cultivation. Some minor pests such as Rice hispa, Whorl maggot and Black bug etc. due to their suddenness of occurrence and spread, rice farmers are taking panic actions to protect their crops at any cost.

Loss due to Whorl maggot, *Hydrellia sasaki* Yuasa and Isitani (Diptera: Ephydriidae) is 30% and resulted in stunted root growth which results in poor nutrient uptake and reduced photosynthesis interfering with carbohydrate metabolism [9,10]. Past few years, the farmers of the Cauvery delta zone (Rice bowl of Tamil

Nadu) are facing the problem of whorl maggot and they are loading the field with many chemicals to control this emerging pest (Fig 3).

Rice black bug, *Scotinophara lurida* (Burmeister), (Pentatomidae: Hemiptera) damages rice plants by sucking the sap from the stem. The heavily infested field plants turn yellowish-brown and die of plants causing characteristic 'bug burned' areas. In Tamil Nadu sporadic but severe outbreak of the pest was reported [11,12,13]. Rice black bug is an emerging insect pest on rice in the Cauvery Delta region from 2013 to 2018. *S. lurida* was monitored using a light trap at Aduthurai during *kharif* 2013-2021 indicated that their peak populations (nos/trap/week) were as high as 60083, 23808, 6564, 9023, 15946, 14791, 15633, 29161 and 6049 in respect of 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021. The peak abundance of *S. lurida* was higher whenever pre-*kharif* abundance was high (Fig 2). The farmers of this region got annoyed due to the sudden incidence of Black bugs and applied many pesticides to control this emerging pest [14].

Sparks [15] Opined that the need for more selective insecticides was one of the key themes during the evolution of poison-free management of insect pests. The use of selective chemical insecticides, in combination with an effective natural enemy provided more comprehensive prophylactic and remedial treatment than a single approach [16]. For the management of the above pests a more chemical insecticide have been used many years back by the local farmers of the Cauvery delta zone of Tamil Nadu, though no literature is available from the delta zone so far. Hence, the newer chemicals for the above emerging pests, economics and safer for natural enemies are to be tested and published.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The Field experiments was conducted during 2019 and 2020 at Tamil Nadu Rice Research Institute, Aduthurai, Tamil Nadu to evaluate the efficacy of newer insecticides against emerging pests and its impact on natural enemies in rice. The trials were laid out with seven treatments and replicated thrice in a randomized block design (RBD) using ADT 49 rice variety as a test



Fig. 1. Rice hispa, *Dicladispa armigera*, (Oliver), (Chrysomelidae: Coleoptera) & damage symptom



Fig. 2. Rice black bug, *Scotinophara lurida* (Burmeister), (Pentatomidae: Hemiptera) & damage symptom



Fig. 3. *Hydrellia sasakii* Yuasa and Isitani (Diptera: Ephydriidae) & damage symptom

crop and transplanted at a spacing of 20 x 15 cm. The treatments selected for the study included Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40g/ha, Thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 100g/ha, Carbosulfan 25% EC @ 1000ml/ha, Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150ml/ha, Diafenthiuron 50 WP@ 600g/ha, Azadirachtin 10000ppm @ 1000ml/ha and Untreated check. The treatments were imposed on the crop at 35 and 75 days after transplanting.

Observations on the emerging pests viz., Rice hispa, Black bug and whorl maggot percent

damage incidence were counted on 5 and 14 days after treatment at ten randomly selected plants per plot from each replication at 50 and 90 days after transplanting. Spider and coccinellid populations also calculated from each plant randomly after the first and second spray of the insecticides. Grain yield was recorded in each plot after harvest and converted into kg/ha. Percentage data values were arc sine transformed prior to analysis of variance [17].

Table 1. Effect of newer insecticide molecules on emerging pests in Rice (Pooled observations 2019 & 2020) (Mean of three replications)

Treatments	Damaged Leaves_50 DAT (after first application) (% incidence)						Damaged Leaves_90 DAT (after second application) (% incidence)				% reduction over control		
	5 DAT			14 DAT			5 DAT		14 DAT		Hispa	WM	Black bug
	Hispa	WM	Black bug	Hispa	WM	Black bug	WM	Black bug	WM	Black bug			
Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40 g/ ha	3.50 (10.41)	4.25 (7.95)	6.50 (14.28)	7.00 (15.01)	6.50 (12.64)	8.39 (15.01)	3.00 (9.61)	6.10 (13.97)	5.25 (12.91)	8.83 (16.80)	88.46	89.60	83.39
Thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 100 g/ ha	8.25 (16.32)	7.5 (14.93)	4.09 (11.28)	10.25 (18.41)	9.80 (15.55)	11.00 (12.64)	9.50 (17.49)	4.6 (11.70)	11.25 (19.29)	6.00 (13.68)	79.67	79.21	85.69
Carbosulfan 25% EC @ 1000ml/ ha	5.0 (12.547.5)	5.5 (12.96)	8.5 (15.14)	6.75 (13.60)	8.00 (15.01)	10.50 (18.96)	4.40 (11.50)	7.75 (15.37)	7.00 (14.94)	9.00 (18.56)	87.0	86.38	80.09
Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150 ml/ ha	2.08 (8.16)	3.77 (11.85)	6.46 (14.41)	5.39 (7.98)	5.89 (11.28)	7.50 (15.01)	2.25 (7.27)	6.60 (12.72)	2.27 (12.61)	7.25 (15.32)	91.80	92.25	84.51
Diafenthiuron 50 WP @ 600 g/ ha	7.05 (15.14)	8.55 (16.48)	7.55 (15.51)	8.86 (17.41)	10.0 (17.08)	9.00 (15.02)	6.75 (14.21)	8.20 (16.12)	8.00 (16.09)	10.00 (17.95)	82.52	81.79	80.65
Azadirachtin 10000ppm @ 1000 ml/ha	12.5 (20.26)	16.0 (23.27)	15.05 (19.43)	18.0 (21.33)	21.00 (26.77)	16.50 (22.33)	15.00 (21.83)	17.50 (22.84)	17.05 (19.85)	19.25 (25.61)	66.48	62.23	61.95
Untreated check	40.0 (38.83)	52.5 (29.19)	41.00 (31.14)	51.00 (43.30)	57.00 (54.37)	45.50 (33.30)	34.00 (35.94)	35.50 (37.29)	39.50 (36.45)	57.50 (49.60)	-	-	-
SE.D	3.85	5.57	3.9	5.22	5.90	1.8	4.60	4.16	2.96	4.95	-	-	-
CV	25.02	32.40	21.61	28.11	29.83	11.8	30.96	25.10	19.80	24.57	-	-	-
CD (p = 0.05)	7.7	11.33	10.78	10.48	11.58	3.9	9.02	8.35	6.33	9.95	-	-	-

DAT- Days after treatments; Figures in parentheses are arc sine transformed values.

Table 2. Economics of newer insecticide molecules on emerging pests in Rice (Pooled observations 2019 & 2020) (Mean of three replications)

S. No	Treatments	Grain yield Kg/ha	Yield increase over control (%)	Net Income (Rs./ha)	Cost benefit ratio (C:B)
1.	Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40 g/ ha	5950	52.17	64576	2.77
2.	Thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 100 g/ ha	5800	48.33	79070	3.14
3.	Carbosulfan 25% EC @ 1000ml/ ha	5637	44.16	75520	3.03
4.	Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150 ml/ ha	6075	55.37	83220	3.17
5.	Diafenthiuron 50 WP @ 600 g/ ha	5725	46.41	77820	3.12
6.	Azadirachtin 10000ppm @ 1000 ml/ha	5250	34.27	68720	2.89
7.	Untreated check	3910		42870	2.21
	SE.D	180.7			
	CV	3.64			
	CD (p = 0.05)	364.4			

Cost of insecticides and sale price of rice were considered as per local markets of Aduthurai

Table 3. Effect of newer insecticide molecules on Beneficial insects in Rice (Pooled observations 2019 & 2020) (Mean of three replications)

Treatments	Spiders (no./ plant)			Coccinellids (no./ plant)			% reduction over control	
	I Application	II Application	mean	I Application	II Application	mean	Spiders	Coccinellids
Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40 g/ ha	0.64 (0.77)	1.22 (1.10)	0.93	0.84 (0.90)	1.0 (1.0)	0.92	68.79	65.77
Thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 100 g/ ha	0.80 (0.88)	1.45 (1.17)	1.12	0.75 (0.85)	1.37 (1.13)	1.06	62.40	61.07
Carbosulfan 25% EC @ 1000ml/ ha	0.79 (0.88)	2.01 (1.38)	1.4	1.25 (1.10)	2.26 (1.48)	1.75	53.02	39.23
Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150 ml/ ha	0.98 (0.99)	2.04 (1.09)	1.51	1.50 (1.20)	2.0 (1.39)	1.75	49.32	39.23
Diafenthiuron 50 WP @ 600 g/ ha	0.48 (0.67)	1.12 (1.09)	0.8	0.62 (0.76)	1.50 (1.20)	1.06	73.15	63.19
Azadirachtin 10000ppm @ 1000 ml/ha	1.97 (1.40)	2.3 (1.49)	2.13	1.92 (1.36)	2.26 (1.48)	2.09	28.52	27.43
Untreated check	2.55 (1.58)	3.42 (1.82)	2.98	2.75 (1.64)	3.01 (1.70)	2.88	-	-
SE.D	1.71	1.18	-	1.88	1.28	-	-	-
CD (p = .05)	0.20	0.22	-	0.13	0.12	-	-	-

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results revealed that all the treatments significantly reduced the percent incidence of the Rice hispa, whorl maggot and black bug damage when compared to control and at the same time a significant increase in grain yield was also recorded due to application of insecticides. Two sprays of Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150ml/ha reduced the incidence of hispa, whorl maggot and black bug (91.80, 92.25, 84.51 percent reduction over control) followed by Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40g/ha (88.46, 89.60 and 83.39 percent reduction over control). Azadirachtin 10000ppm @ 1000 ml/ha recorded 66.48, 62.23 and 61.95 percent reduction over control of hispa, whorl maggot and black bug (Table 1).

Highest yield was recorded from Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC (6075 kg/ha) treated plots followed by Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40ml/ha (5950 kg/ha). Cost-benefit analysis of the different newer insecticides revealed that the application of Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150ml/ha was the most economically viable treatment by recording the highest cost-benefit ratio of 1: 3.17 followed by Thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 100 g/ ha (1: 3.14). The reason for the highest cost-benefit ratio (CBR) was the fact that the treatment of Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC @ 150ml/ha recorded the maximum yield and the treatment of Thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 100 g/ ha recorded not only the maximum yield but also low cost as compared to others. The CBR in descending order was Diafenthiuron 50 WP @ 600 g/ ha (3.12) followed by Carbosulfan 25% EC @ 1000ml/ ha (3.03), Azadirachtin 10000ppm @ 1000 ml/ha (2.89) and Clothianidin 50 WDG @ 40 g/ ha (2.77) (Table 2).

All the tested new chemicals were on par in the reduction of the above emerging pests. The Impact of the above chemicals on natural enemies viz., coccinellids and spiders were identified (Table 3). Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 % SC @ 150ml/ha recorded more number of spiders and coccinellids (1.51 and 1.75 no./plant) followed by Carbosulfan 25% EC @ 1000ml/ ha (1.40 and 1.75 no./plant) which was on par to control (2.98 and 2.88 no./plant). The similar findings of safety of chlorantraniliprole towards spider and other natural enemies were reported [18] in greengram. Minimum reduction over control of coccinellids (49.32) and spiders (39.23) was recorded from Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% SC and Carbosulfan 25% EC treated plots. [19]

reported that fenvalerate, cypermethrin and monocrotophos reduced the rice hispa effectively and increased the grain yield over untreated control. However, the reported chemicals synthetic pyrethroids and organochlorines, which are very toxic and causing a resurgence in rice field. [20] reported excellent control of rice whorl maggot lasted up to 28 days after treatment with carbosulfan 25 EC, benfuracarb 40 F, carbofuran 12 F, and furathiocarb 40 EC. Carbosulfan 25 EC effectiveness against rice whorl maggot is corroborated with our findings. The ovicidal effect of some insecticides against rice black bugs was reported the same finding [21].

4. CONCLUSIONS

Many years pesticides have proved to be a boon for the many rice-growing delta farmers of Tamil Nadu as well as throughout the world by increasing yield and by innumerable benefits to the society directly. Hence, the eco- friendly effective chemical identified in this study can be recommended to manage the emerging pests of Rice. Hence, this Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 % SC can be recommended as part of an integrated pest control system, since the chemical recorded minimum pests (Rice hispa, whorl maggot and black bug) infestation and increased population of free living natural enemies (spider and coccinellid) with highest cost benefit ratio of 1: 3.17.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Mathur KC, Reddy PR, Rajamali S, Moorthy BTS. Integrated pest management of rice to improve productivity and sustainability. *Oryza*. 1999;36(3):195-207.
2. Director Message, ICAR- Indian Institute of Rice Research, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad- 500 030, T. S, India; 2022. Available:<https://www.icar-iirr.org/index.php/en/>.
3. Pathak MD, Khan ZR, Insect pests of rice. International rice research institute, P.O box 933, 10999, Manila, Philippines. 1994;1-17.
4. Partha Pratim Bhattacharjee, Ray DC. Bioefficacy of insecticides against rice

- hispa, *Dicladispa armigera* (Olivier) (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) on paddy, Journal of Entomological Research. 2012; 36(2):151-155.
5. Dutta BC, Hazarika LK. Reaction of summer and winter rice cultivars to Hispa in Assam. Int. Rice Res. Newsl. 1992; 17:10-11.
 6. Urvi Sharma, Ajai Srivastava, Chitra Shanker. The occurrence of rice hispa, *Dicladispa armigera* (Oliver) and its parasitoid, *Chrysonotomyia* sp. under mid-hill conditions of Himachal Pradesh. Journal of Biological Control. 2018; 32(2):87-94. DOI: 10.18311/jbc/2018/16274
 7. Sain M, Prakash A. Changing pest scenario of cereal crops. Presented in National Conference on “Pest management strategies for food security” at IGKV, Raipur on 2-3 May, 2008, Souvenir: lead papers. 2008;27-29.
 8. Prakash A, David BV, Bambawale OM. Plant protection in India: Challenges and research priorities, AZRA. 2014;170-174.
 9. Shepard BM, Justo HD JR, Rubia EG, Estano DB. Response of the rice plant to damage by the rice whorl maggot *Hydrellia philippina* Ferino (Diptera: Ephydriidae). Journal of plant Protection in the Tropics. 1990;7:173- 177.
 10. Ramamurthy VV, Kumarasamy T, Jayaraj, S. Effect of whorl maggot damage on the contents of chlorophyll and reduced sugars and uptake of nutrients in rice seedlings. Madras Agricultural Journal. 1977;64(6):405-406.
 11. Sundarababu PC, Muthusamy M, Sadasivam R. Occurrence of black bug on rice. Tamil Nadu Agricultural University Newsletter. 1984;14(5):3-4.
 12. Uthamasamy S, Mariappan V. Occurrence of black bug in Tamil Nadu. International Rice Research Newsletter. 1985; 10(2):15a.
 13. Anandhi P, Pillai MAK, Savita Varma. Population dynamics, species composition and feeding site preference of rice black bug. Entomon. 2008;33(1):1-4.
 14. AICRIP Rice Progress Report, ICAR-Indian Institute of Rice Research, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad- 500 030, T. S, India; 2015–2017.
 15. Sparks, TC. Insecticide discovery: An evaluation and analysis. Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology. 2013; 107:08-17.
 16. Gentz MC, Murdoch G. King GF. Tandem use of selective insecticides and natural enemies for effective. Reduced –risk pest management, Bio control. 2010;52(3):208-215.
 17. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical procedures for Agricultural Research, (Eds.). John Wiley and Sons, New York. 1984;7-20.
 18. Sujayanand GK, Pandey S, Bandi SM. Efficacy of coragen 20 SC against lepidopteran pest in greengram and its compatibility with *Bacillus thuringiensis* isolates. Legume Research. 2021; 44(12):1521-1528. DOI: 10.18805/LR-4481
 19. Singh P, Sukhija HS, Singh J. Biological effectiveness of insecticides for controlling rice stem borer and hispa in rice. Oryza. 1992;29:392-393.
 20. Litsinger JA., Barrion AT, Canapi BL, Lumaban MD, Pantua PC, Aquino GB. The rice whorl maggot, *Hydrellia philippina* Ferino (Diptera: Ephydriidae) in the philippines: A review, Philipp Ent. 2013; 27(1):1-57.
 21. Anandhi P, Pillai MAK. Ovicidal activity of some insecticides against black bug on rice. J.ent.Res. 2006;30(1):65-66.

© 2022 Anandhi et al.; 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/89035>