



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695  
 ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
 NAAS Rating: 5.23  
 TPI 2021; SP-10(9): 405-406  
 © 2021 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
 Received: 04-07-2021  
 Accepted: 05-08-2021

**PS Nile**

Department of Entomology,  
 R.C.S.M. College of Agriculture,  
 Kolhapur, DY Patil College of  
 Agriculture Talsande Kolhapur,  
 Maharashtra, India

**AS Bagde**

Department of Entomology,  
 R.C.S.M. College of Agriculture,  
 Kolhapur, DY Patil College of  
 Agriculture Talsande Kolhapur,  
 Maharashtra, India

**RR Patil**

Department of Entomology,  
 R.C.S.M. College of Agriculture,  
 Kolhapur, DY Patil College of  
 Agriculture Talsande Kolhapur,  
 Maharashtra, India

## Effect of insecticides against pod borer *Maruca vitrata* of French bean

PS Nile, AS Bagde and RR Patil

**Abstract**

Field experiment was conducted in Rabi 2017-18 on French bean with nine treatment, replicated thrice in the 'Randomized Block Design' with gross plot size 4×3 m and net plot size 3×2.5 m. The treatment Spraying of Flonicamide 50% WG @ 0.3 gm/lit +spraying of Flubendamide 39.35% SC @ 0.1ml/ha. (11.40%) was found as the best treatment against pod borer with 63.60 per cent reduction over control. The next promising treatment in increasing order were Trap crop of two rows of Marigold + spraying of NSE 5%+spraying of *Beauveria bassiana* @ 5gm /lit+ spraying of chlorantraniliprole @ 0.25 ml/ha. (15.07%), spraying of 5gm /lit *Metarhizium anisopliae*+ Spraying of Spinosad 48% SC @ 0.2 gm/lit. (17.83%) which were found equally effective in the order of efficacy against pod borer.

**Keywords:** pod borer, French bean

**Introduction**

French bean, *Phaseolus vulgaris* belongs to family Leguminosae and locally known as "Rajmah" French bean is nutritionally superior to other pulses. It is consumed as tender pods. Its tender green pod is highly nutritious, rich in protein, carbohydrates and vitamins, which is used as a delicious vegetable. It contains protein (1.7 gm), calcium (50 mg), phosphorous (28 mg), iron (1.7 mg), carotene (132 mg), thiamine (0.08 mg), riboflavin (0.06 mg) and vitamin C (24.0 mg) per 100 gm of edible part (Dixit and Naimuddin, 2003). Pod borer causes 31-35% losses of the crop (Ghoshal 2013), Hence, present investigation was undertaken to study the effect of insecticides against pod borer *Maruca vitrata* of French bean.

**Materials and Methods**

Field experiment was conducted in Rabi 2017-18 on French bean with nine treatment, replicated thrice in the 'Randomized Block Design' with gross plot size 4×3 m and net plot size 3×2.5 m on horticulture field, RSCM College of Agriculture, Kolhapur (Maharashtra).

**Table 1:** Treatment details

Treatments	Treatment Details
T-1	Spraying of NSE 5% +spraying of fenvalerate @ 0.6ml/lit.
T-2	Spraying of 5gm /lit <i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i> + Spraying of Spinosad 48% SC @ 0.2 G/lit.
T-3	Spraying of imidacloprid 17.8% SL @ 0.5 ml/lit + spraying of NSE 5%
T-4	Spraying of 5gm /lit <i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i> + flubendamide 39.35% SC @ 0.1 ml/L.
T-5	Spraying of lamda cyhalothrin 1% EC @ 1ml/lit+ spraying of imidacloprid 17.8% SL 0.5 ml/L
T-6	Trap crop of two rows of Marigold + spraying of NSE 5%+spraying of <i>Beauveria bassiana</i> @ 5 G /lit+ spraying of chlorantraniliprole @ 0.25 ml/L.
T-7	Spraying of imidacioprid 17.8% SL @ 1ml/lit + spraying of <i>Metarhizium</i> @ 5G/lit
T-8	Spraying of flonicamide 50% WG @ 0.3 gm/lit +spraying of flubendamide 39.35% SC @ 0.1ml/ha.
T-9	Untreated control.

**Method of recording observations**

The efficacy of the different treatments against pod borer was judged on the basis of the percent pod infestation at each picking on number basis. For recording pod infestation, during harvesting pods from each plot were separated as infested and healthy pods at each picking. The pods showing exit holes of insect will considered as infested pods. Total three pickings were carried out starting from 45 days after planting.

**Corresponding Author**  
**AS Bagde**

Department of Entomology,  
 R.C.S.M. College of Agriculture,  
 Kolhapur, DY Patil College of  
 Agriculture Talsande Kolhapur,  
 Maharashtra, India

These healthy and infested pods were counted separately. Further the percent of pod infestation was worked out on the basis of number of the pod at each picking for different treatments. The data recorded on percent pod infestation was then subjected to angular transformation for statistical analysis.

## Results and Discussion

The present investigations were carried out on pests of French bean to evaluate the efficacy of insecticides against pod borer (*Maruca vitrata*).

### Pod borer infestation

The result of experiment conducted during kharif 2017-18 are summarized in Table 1.

### At different picking

Data pertaining to the per cent infestation of pod borer of French bean on number basis at each picking presented in

Table 2. All the treatments were found to be significantly superior in reducing population of pod borer when observation were recorded at 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> picking. Among the treatments, Spraying of Flonicamide 50% WG @ 0.3 gm/lit + spraying of Fluebamdamide 39.35% SC @ 0.1ml/ha. Was found most effective (11.07%, 12.19%, 11.40% infestation respectively) and significantly superior to all other treatments. Treatment T6 i.e. Trap crop of two rows of Marigold + spraying of *NSE* 5%+spraying of *Beauveria bassiana* @ 5gm /lit+ spraying of chlorantraniliprole @ 0.25 ml/ha. (15.20%, 14.07% respectively), spraying of 5gm /lit *Metarhizium anisopliae*+ Spraying of Spinosad 48% SC @ 0.2 gm/lit. (17.87%, 19.10%, 16.54% respectively) were found to be equally effective and next in the order of efficacy. Maximum per cent infestation of pod borer was found in the treatment Spraying of *NSE* 5% +spraying of Fenvalerate @ 0.6ml/lit. (28.87%) among the treatments as compared to untreated control (30.50%).

**Table 2:** Percent pod borer infestation at harvesting

Sr. No.	Treatment	1 <sup>st</sup> Picking	2 <sup>nd</sup> picking	3 <sup>rd</sup> Picking	Mean	Per cent mortality over control
1	T1	28.87 (32.50)	29.95 (33.18)	28.77 (32.84)	29.19 (32.89)	6.89
2	T2	17.87 (25.01)	19.10 (25.91)	16.54 (24.00)	17.83 (25.26)	43.12
3	T3	26.95 (31.27)	27.95 (31.92)	26.50 (30.98)	27.03 (31.93)	13.77
4	T4	20.38 (26.84)	22.30 (28.18)	18.96 (25.81)	20.54 (27.11)	34.48
5	T5	22.95 (28.62)	24.65 (29.77)	23.31 (27.67)	23.63 (28.87)	24.62
6	T6	15.20 (22.95)	15.96 (23.54)	14.07 (22.03)	15.07 (23.20)	51.92
7	T7	25.10 (30.07)	26.10 (30.72)	24.87 (29.91)	25.35 (30.32)	19.13
8	T8	11.07 (19.43)	12.19 (20.43)	10.96 (19.33)	11.40 (20.09)	63.60
9	Untreated control	30.50 (33.52)	32.77 (34.92)	30.80 (33.71)	31.35 (34.62)	-
10	SE	0.8197	0.8676	0.9035		
11	CD	2.4575	2.6011	2.7086		
12	CV	7.0602	6.2201	6.7036		

Figures in parenthesis are arcsine transformed values

From overall performance of all the treatments, it was found that all the treatments were significantly superior over control in reducing pod borer infestation. The treatment Spraying of Flonicamide 50% WG @ 0.3 gm/lit +spraying of Fluebamdamide 39.35% SC @ 0.1ml/ha. (11.40%) was found as the best treatment with 63.60 per cent reduction over control. The next promising treatment in increasing order were Trap crop of two rows of Marigold + spraying of *NSE* 5%+spraying of *Beauveria bassiana* @ 5gm /lit+ spraying of chlorantraniliprole @ 0.25 ml/ha. (15.07%), spraying of 5gm /lit *Metarhizium anisopliae*+ Spraying of Spinosad 48% SC @ 0.2 gm/lit. (17.83%) which were found equally effective in the order of efficacy. Present findings are in conformity with Pattapu *et al.*, (2016) reported that higher mortality was recorded in the population treated with spinosad 75 g a.i./ha followed by chlorantraniliprole 30 g a.i./ha, flubendamide 100 g a.i./ha and imidacloprid 518 g a.i./ha which showed a per cent mortality of 97.28.

## References

1. Abhijit Kar, Samsal. Relative efficacy and economics of seed treatment and newer insecticides against sucking and borer pests of summer mung bean. Journal of Entomology and zoology studies 2018.
2. Ashok Kumar CT, Shivaraju C. Evaluation of newer insecticide molecules against pod borers of black gram. Karnataka J Agri. Sci 2009;22:521-23.
3. Biradar AP, Jagginavar SB, Teggalli RG, Sunitha ND. Efficacy of thiodicarb 75 WP (Larvin) against Bengal

- gram pod borer. Insect Environment 1998;4(4):144-145.
4. Byrappa NG, Kumar, Divya M. Impact of biopesticides application on pod borer complex in organically grown field bean ecosystem. J Biopest 2012;5(2):148-160.
5. Jackai LEN. Relationship between cowpea crop phenology and field infestation by the legume pod borer, *Maruca testulalis*. Ann. Ent. Soc. Am 1981;74:402-408.
6. Jackai LEN, Oghiakhe S. Pod wall trichomes and resistance of two wild cowpea *Vigna unguiculata* (L.) accessions to *Maruca testulalis* (Geyer) and *Clavigralla tomentosicollis* Stall. Bull. Entomol. Res 1989;79(4):595-605.
7. Jayadeep H, Srinivasan S, Muralikrishna T. Role of various biophysical factors on distribution and abundance of spotted pod borer, *Maruca vitrata* (Geyer) on mung bean. Ann. Pl. Protec. Sci 2006;14(1):49-51.
8. Lalasangi MS. Bionomics, loss estimation and control of the pod borer, *Maruca testulalis* (Geyer) (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) on cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* W.). M. Sc. (Agri) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Bangalore, Karnataka India 1984.