www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation



ISSN (E): 2277-7695 ISSN (P): 2349-8242 NAAS Rating: 5.23 TPI 2022; 11(6): 981-988 © 2022 TPI www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 02-06-2022 Accepted: 10-07-2022

Jyoti G Dulera

AINPVPM, Department of Agriculture, ICAR Unit-9, Anand Agriculture University, Anand, Gujarat, India Fruit damage by rose-ringed parakeet, *Psittacula krameri* (Scopoli) in pomegranate orchard

Jyoti G Dulera

Abstract

Loss of production in pomegranate orchard due to rose-ringed parakeet, *Psittacula krameri* (Scopoli) was observed as 6.38 per cent. Fruit damage and number of parakeet bird was higher in morning hours than evening hours.

Keywords: Rose-ringed parakeet, pomegranate, "V" shape mark

Introduction

Pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) can be considered as one of the most ideal crops for dry Deccan Plateau region of India. Its cultivation has become highly remunerative agriculture business in India. The parakeet has acquired the status as a serious vertebrate pest for the agricultural and horticultural crops (Shafi *et al.* 1986; Khan & Beg, 1998) ^[7, 2]. Seven species of birds were recorded in pomegranate orchards in India, of which rose-ringed parakeets (*P. krameri*) and house crow (*Corvus splendens*) were predominant and inflicting damage to the fruits in Punjab (Malhi and Kaur, 1998). The parakeet is the most common and the destructive bird of India which inflicts huge damage to grain of standing crops, orchard fruits and vegetable crops. (Kushwaha and Prabhat, 2004). Khan *et al.* (2006) ^[3] reported 20.1% - 40% damage by parakeet on Guava fruits. Fruits and vegetables form an important part of the economy of India. The rose-ringed parakeet serves as the worst vertebrate pest of India not only damages the food sources, but also causes considerable economic losses to farmers and national economy. Due to its wide feeding niche, it is regarded as one of the most destructive vertebrate pests. Thus, the present experiment was planning to assess parakeet depredation on pomegranate fruits.

Materials and Methods

The present study was carried out in middle Gujarat, Taluka: Dholka, Village: Nesda (Latitude: 22.7023, Longirude: 72.4329). Net plot size was 50 m X 30 m. Total 20 trees of Super Bhagwa variety of pomegranate was selected from Nesda village of dholka (Plate-1) and tagged for observation. Observation of parakeet damage by observing 'V' shape marking on fresh fruit was recorded from March to November. Depredations on fruits were estimated through direct field observations. Observations were recorded during morning (7:30 am to 9:30 am) and evening (5:00 pm to 7:00 pm). Parakeet depredations inflicted fruits were numbered, weighed.

Corresponding Author: Jyoti G Dulera AINPVPM, Department of Agriculture, ICAR Unit-9, Anand Agriculture University, Anand, Gujarat, India

https://www.thepharmajournal.com



https://www.thepharmajournal.com



Plate 1: Experimental view of Pomegranate orchard and damaged fruit by Rose ringed parakeet.

Result and Discussion

During the period, total 560 observations were recorded for visitation of parakeet on pomegranate tree. Average 17.57 mean number of birds was recorded in pomegranate orchard during morning, while average 11.59 mean numbers of birds was recorded during evening in the year 2019 (Table-1). Average 1.92 mean numbers of birds was recorded in pomegranate orchard during morning, while average 1.51

mean numbers of birds was recorded during evening in the year 2021 (Table-2). So, after pooled over period over years, Average 7.51 mean number of birds was recorded in pomegranate orchard during morning, while average 5.11 mean numbers of birds was recorded during evening (Table-3). Difference in bird visitation during both periods was found statistically significant (Table: 4 to 6).

Table 1: Number of	parakeet and damaged	fruit in pomegranate	orchard at weekly	interval (2019)

	Average number of parakeet/2 hr at 10 minute interval/tree							
Observation week	Morning	parakeet	Evening parakeet					
	parakeet	Damage	Parakeet	Damage				
1	11.55	0.55	5.35	0.40				
2	21.65	0.55	17.1	0.25				
3	20.55	0.85	11.15	0.35				
4	28.4	0.70	20.5	0.40				
5	24.9	1.25	14.5	0.60				
6	21.15	1.40	15	0.70				
7	21.35	1.30	13.3	0.60				
8	16.05	0.85	14.3	1.00				
9	5.85	0.60	2.9	0.65				
10	4.25	0.75	1.8	0.50				
Total	175.70	8.80	115.90	5.45				
Average	17.57	0.88	11.59	0.55				

Table 2: Number of	parakeet and da	maged fruit in	pomegranate o	orchard at weekly	interval (2021)

	Average number of parakeet/2 hr at 10 minute interval/tree							
Observation week	Morning	parakeet	Evening parakeet					
	parakeet	Damage	parakeet	Damage				
1	1.05	0.20	0.90	0.25				
2	1.65	0.25	1.10	0.20				
3	1.20	0.45	1.00	0.35				
4	1.80	0.55	1.50	0.25				

5	1.55	0.60	1.05	0.35
6	1.40	0.40	1.20	0.35
7	1.90	0.50	1.60	0.40
8	0.95	0.55	0.70	0.45
9	1.75	0.45	1.55	0.45
10	1.50	0.35	1.05	0.45
11	2.15	0.35	1.90	0.20
12	2.55	0.35	2.00	0.20
13	1.90	0.70	1.45	0.10
14	2.30	0.45	1.85	0.20
15	2.65	0.95	2.10	0.30
16	3.00	1.05	2.40	0.60
17	2.75	1.10	2.05	0.45
18	2.45	0.85	1.80	0.85
Total	34.50	10.10	27.20	6.40
average	1 92	0.56	1.51	0.36

Note: total parakeet per 20 plants in each period

 Table 3: Parakeet visitation in pomegranate orchard at weekly interval (pooled)

	Average number of parakeet/2 hr at 10 minute interval/tree								
Observation week	Morning	parakeet	Evening	parakeet					
	Parakeet	Damage	Parakeet	Damage					
1	11.55	0.55	5.35	0.4					
2	21.65	0.55	17.1	0.25					
3	20.55	0.85	11.15	0.35					
4	28.4	0.7	20.5	0.4					
5	24.9	1.25	14.5	0.6					
6	21.15	1.4	15	0.7					
7	21.35	1.3	13.3	0.6					
8	16.05	0.85	14.3	1					
9	5.85	0.6	2.9	0.65					
10	4.25	0.75	1.8	0.5					
11	1.05	0.2	0.9	0.25					
12	1.65	0.25	1.1	0.2					
13	1.2	0.45	1	0.35					
14	1.8	0.55	1.5	0.25					
15	1.55	0.6	1.05	0.35					
16	1.4	0.4	1.2	0.35					
17	1.9	0.5	1.6	0.4					
18	0.95	0.55	0.7	0.45					
19	1.75	0.45	1.55	0.45					
20	1.5	0.35	1.05	0.45					
21	2.15	0.35	1.9	0.2					
22	2.55	0.35	2	0.2					
23	1.9	0.7	1.45	0.1					
24	2.3	0.45	1.85	0.2					
25	2.65	0.95	2.1	0.3					
26	3	1.05	2.4	0.6					
27	2.75	1.1	2.05	0.45					
28	2.45	0.85	1.8	0.85					
Total	210.20	18.90	143.10	11.85					
average	7.51	0.68	5.11	0.42					

Table 4: Visit of Rose ringed parakeet, Psittacula krameri during morning and evening in experimental plot (Year 2019)

Variable (Pair 1)	Ν	Mean	Std. deviation		Std. Error Mean		
Morning Parakeet	200	17.57	8.317		0.588		
Evening Parakeet	200	11.59	6.583		0.466		
Paired Sample T- Test							
Pair 1	Т		Df	Sig. (2- tailed)			
Pair t Test	17.33	36 **	199 0.00		0.00		

**significant at 1%

N means number of observation during study period

Table 5: Visit of Rose ringed parakeet, Psittacula krameri during morning and evening in experimental plot (Year 2021)

Variable (Pair 1)	Ν	Mean	Std. de	eviation	Std. Error Mean			
Morning Parakeet	360	1.92	1.1	146	0.060			
Evening Parakeet	360	1.51	1.1	156	0.061			
Paired Sample T- Test								
Pair 1	Т		Df		Sig. (2- tailed)			
Pair t Test	6.74	8**	359		0.00			
¥						_		

*significant at 1%

N means number of observation during study period

*In year 2020, data was not collected because observation period falls under covid-19.

Table 6: Visit of Rose ringed parakeet, Psittacula krameri during morning and evening in experimental plot (pooled)

Variable (Pair 1)	Ν	Mean	Std. de	eviation	Std. Error Mean		
Morning Parakeet	560	7.51	9.046		0.382		
Evening Parakeet	560	5.11	6.2	297	0.266		
Paired Sample T- Test							
Pair 1	Т		Df	Df Sig. (2- tailed)			
Pair t Test	13.98	30 **	559	59 0.00			

*significant at 1%

*In year 2020, data was not collected because observation period falls under covid-19.

The mean fruit damage by parakeet was 0.88% and 0.55% recorded (Plate-1) in morning and evening period, respectively (Table-7). The mean fruit damage by parakeet was 0.56% and 0.36% recorded in morning and evening

period, respectively (Table-8). The mean fruit damage by parakeet was 0.68% and 0.42% recorded in morning and evening period, respectively (Table-9). The difference of bird damage was significant statistically.

Table 7: Intensity of rose-ringed parakeet depredations in experimental plot (Year 2019)

Variable (Pair 1)	Ν	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Morning Damage	200	0.88	0.747	0.053			
Evening Damage	200	0.55	0.608	0.043			
Paired Sample T- Test							
Pair 1	Т		Df	Sig. (2- tailed)			
Pair t Test	5.24	2*	199	0.00			

*significant at 1%

Table 8: Intensity of rose -ringed parakeet depredations in experimental plot (2021)

Variable (Pair 1)	Ν	Mean	Std. devia	ation Std. Error Mean			
Morning Damage	360	0.56	0.626	6 0.033			
Evening Damage	360	0.36	0.608	8 0.027			
Paired Sample T- Test							
Pair 1	Т	1	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)			
Pair t Test	5.26	68 **	359	0.00			
*_::£: 10/							

*significant at 1%

*In year 2020, data was not collected because observation period falls under covid-19.

Table 9: Intensity of rose –ringed parakeet depredations in experimental plot. (pooled)

Variable (Pair 1)	Ν	Mean	Std. de	viation	Std. Error Mean		
Morning Damage	560	0.68	0.688		0.029		
Evening Damage	560	0.42	0.556		0.023		
Paired Sample T- Test							
Pair 1	Т		Df	Sig. (2- tailed)			
Pair t Test	7.409**		559	0.00			

*significant at 1%

*In year 2020, data was not collected because observation period falls under covid-19.

Other bird community also recorded during study period (Plate-2).

Table	10:	List	of	Birds	vi	siting	; in	ez	xper	ime	ental	l plo	t at	fa	rme	er's	fai	m,	Dho	olka

Sr. No	Name of bird	Scientific Name
1	Rose- Ringed Parakeet	Psittacula krameri (Scopoli)
2	Purple Sunbird	Nectarinia asiatica (Latham)
3	Red vented bulbul	Pycnonotus cafer (Linnaeus)
4	Common Pigeon	Columba liviadomestica (Gmelin)
5	House Sparrow	Passer domesticus (Linnaeus)
6	Indian pea fowl	Pavo cristatus (Linnaeus)
7	Black Drongo	Dicrurus macrocercus (Vieillot)
8	Greater Coucal	Centropus sinensis (Stephens)
9	Common Myna	Acridotheres tristis (Linnaeus)
10	House crow	Corvus splendens (Vieillot)
11	Red Wettled Lapwing	Vanellus indicus (Boddaert)
12	Red naped Ibis	Pseudibis papillosa (Temminck)
13	Cattle Egret	Bubulcus ibis (Linnaeus)
14	Bee eater	Merops orientalis (Rafinesque)
15	Rosy starling	Sturnus roseus (Linnaeus)
16	Indian roller	Coracias benghalensis (Linnaeus)



The Pharma Innovation Journal

https://www.thepharmajournal.com



Plate 2: View of other birds observed in Pomegranate Orchard during March-2019 to June-2019

Out of 20 sampled trees tested, 1756 number of total fruit, 113 was damaged and 2187 numbers were healthy. Average per cent fruit damage was 4.94 % while fruit yield was 98.71% per plant. Total weight of damaged fruit and healthy fruit was 1.33 kg/plant and 34.71 kg/plant, respectively. So, yield obtained as 38,528 kg per hectare after parakeet depredation (Table-11). Out of 20 sampled trees tested, 2300 number of total fruit, 146 was damaged and 1610 numbers were healthy. Average per cent fruit damage was 8.30 % while fruit yield was 165.96% per plant. Total weight of

damaged fruit and healthy fruit was 1.75 kg/plant and 25.76 kg/plant, respectively. So, yield obtained as 28,594 kg per hectare after parakeet depredation (Table-12). Out of 20 sampled trees tested, 2028 number of total fruit, 129.50 was damaged and 1898.50 numbers were healthy. Average per cent fruit damage was 6.38 % while fruit yield was 93.62% per plant. Total weight of damaged fruit and healthy fruit was 1.05 kg/plant and 26.04 kg/plant, respectively. So, yield obtained as 28,904 kg per hectare after parakeet depredation (Table-13).

|--|

No of two		Number of Fruits/	tree	Total weight of	Fruit damage (%)	
No. of tree	Total fruit	Damaged fruit	Healthy Fruit	Damaged fruit	Healthy Fruit	_
1	130	19	111	4.32	35.52	14.62
2	128	7	121	1.68	38.72	5.47
3	127	5	122	1.20	39.04	3.94
4	116	7	109	1.92	34.88	6.03
5	115	7	108	1.68	34.56	6.09
6	112	4	108	0.96	34.56	3.57
7	101	7	94	1.20	30.08	6.93
8	113	4	109	0.96	34.88	3.54
9	112	2	110	0.48	35.2	1.79
10	113	3	110	0.72	35.2	2.65
11	121	5	116	1.20	37.12	4.13
12	124	4	120	0.96	38.4	3.23
13	130	5	125	1.20	40	3.85
14	132	6	126	1.44	40.32	4.55
15	127	5	122	1.20	39.04	3.94
16	120	3	117	0.72	37.44	2.50
17	109	4	105	0.96	33.6	3.67
18	102	5	97	1.20	31.04	4.90
19	92	5	87	1.20	27.84	5.43
20	76	6	70	1.44	16.8	7.89
Total	2300	113	2187	26.64	694.24	98.71
Mean	115	5.65	109.35	1.33	34.71	4.94
Yield/Ha	-	-	-	-	38.528	

Table 12: Total pomegranate fruits and weight after parakeet predation in experimental plot (2021)

No of two		Number of Fruits/	tree	Total weight of	Fruit damage (%)	
No. of tree	Total fruit	Damaged fruit	Healthy Fruit	Damaged fruit	Healthy Fruit	
1	91	22	69	5.28	22.08	24.18
2	93	10	83	2.40	26.56	10.75
3	85	8	77	1.92	24.64	9.41
4	96	8	88	1.92	28.16	8.33
5	91	9	82	2.16	26.24	9.89
6	71	3	68	0.72	21.76	4.23
7	81	7	74	1.68	23.68	8.64

8	92	5	87	1.20	27.84	5.43
9	87	3	84	0.72	26.88	3.45
10	95	4	91	0.96	29.12	4.21
11	89	7	82	1.68	26.24	7.87
12	96	5	91	1.20	29.12	5.21
13	97	6	91	1.44	29.12	6.19
14	89	9	80	2.16	25.60	10.11
15	94	7	87	1.68	27.84	7.45
16	83	4	79	0.96	25.28	4.82
17	76	6	70	1.44	22.40	7.89
18	87	5	82	1.20	26.24	5.75
19	86	9	77	2.16	24.64	10.47
20	77	9	68	2.16	21.76	11.69
Total	1756	146	1610	35.04	515.20	165.96
Mean	87.8	7.3	80.5	1.75	25.76	8.30
Yield/Ha	-	-	-	-	28,594	-

Table 13: Total pomegranate fruits and weight after parakeet predation in experimental plot (pooled)

No. of two		Number of Fruits/	tree	Total weight of	Fruit damage	
No. of tree	Total fruit	Damaged fruit	Healthy Fruit	Damaged fruit	Healthy Fruit	(%)
1	110.5	20.5	90	3.38	24.80	18.55
2	110.5	8.5	102	1.34	28.18	7.69
3	106	6.5	99.5	1.05	27.66	6.13
4	106	7.5	98.5	1.29	27.52	7.08
5	103	8	95	1.29	25.79	7.77
6	91.5	3.5	88	0.68	24.21	3.83
7	91	7	84	1.19	23.02	7.69
8	102.5	4.5	98	0.73	27.22	4.39
9	99.5	2.5	97	0.39	30.05	2.51
10	104	3.5	100.5	0.56	26.95	3.37
11	105	6	99	0.95	27.25	5.71
12	110	4.5	105.5	0.73	28.32	4.09
13	113.5	5.5	108	0.95	30.11	4.85
14	110.5	7.5	103	1.17	28.96	6.79
15	110.5	6	104.5	0.95	28.24	5.43
16	101.5	3.5	98	0.56	27.02	3.45
17	92.5	5	87.5	0.78	23.94	5.41
18	94.5	5	89.5	0.85	24.24	5.29
19	89	7	82	1.05	21.80	7.87
20	76.5	7.5	69	1.17	15.54	9.80
Total	2028	129.5	1898.5	21.06	520.77	127.69
Mean	101.4	6.48	94.93	1.05	26.04	6.38
Yield/Ha	-	-	-	-	28,904	-

Conclusions

Difference in bird visitation during morning and evening period was found statistically significant. The fruit damage of 0.68% and 0.42% was recorded in morning and evening period, respectively. Out of 20 sampled trees tested, 2028 number of total fruit, 129.50 was damaged and 1898.50 numbers were healthy. Average per cent fruit damage was 6.38 % per tree. Total weight of damaged fruit and healthy fruit was 1.05 kg/plant and 26.04 kg/plant, respectively. So, yield obtained as 28,904 kg per hectare after parakeet depredation.

References

- Iftikhar H, Shahid M, Shakeel A, Aziz Khan A. Bird pest damage to guava fruits, Islamabad. Pakistan J Agri. Sci. 1991;28(1):5-8.
- Khan, HA, Beg MA. Roosts and roosting habits of roseringed parakeet (*Psittacula krameri*) in Central Punjab, Pakistan. Pakistan J Biol. Sci. 1998;(1):37-38.
- 3. Khan HA, Anwar N, Perveen S. Abundance of Roseringed parakeet (*Psittacula krameri*) and house sparrow

(*Passer domesticus*) on guava and sunflower farmlands in an agro- ecosystem in Faisalabad Pakistan. J of Agri. and Social Sciences. 2006;(2):125-128.

- 4. Kushwaha P, Kumar P. Ecology of Psittaculla Karmeri, Scopoli, a ferruginous birds with special reference to its role as a pest of crop and fruits. Lucknow. J of science. 2004 Issue 1.
- 5. Malhi CS, Tejdeep Kaur. On avian damage to pomegranate. Indian J. of forestry. 2004;21(1):31-33.
- Rana BD, Banakr GJ. Damage to pomegranate fruits by rose ringed parakeet, *Psittacula krameri*, at Jodhpur. Pavo. 1992;30(1-2):1-3.
- Shafi MM, Khan AA, Hussain I. Parakeet damage to Citrus fruit in Punjab. J Bombay Nat. His. Soc. 1986;(83):439–444.