

Original Research Article

Efficacy of chemical insecticide and biopesticide combinations against major insect pests on long duration pigeonpea [*Cajanus cajan* (L.) Millsp.]

ABSTRACT

Aim: To evaluate the comparative efficacy of different chemical insecticide and biopesticide combinations against tur pod fly [*Melanagromyza obtusa* (Malloch)], gram pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner)] and tur pod bug (*Clavigralla gibbosa* Spinola) on pigeonpea.

Study Design: Randomized Block Design with three replications.

Place and Duration of Study: Field experiments were conducted at Agriculture Research Farm, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi during *Kharif* seasons of 2015-16 and 2016-17.

Methodology: The experiment consisted of eight treatments having different combinations of insecticides and biopesticides including untreated control. Effectiveness of these treatment modules was determined on the basis of per cent pod and grain damage due to major insect pests and grain yield of pigeonpea.

Results: Treatment modules having combinations of chemical insecticides and biopesticides were found to be more effective in comparison to treatments modules where there was sole use of biopesticides. Among all the treatment modules, Module 1 with sequential application of Multineem 0.03% followed by second spray of Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC 30g a.i./ha and third spray of Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha at 15 days interval provided significantly better control of *M. obtusa*, *H. armigera* and *C. gibbosa* on pigeonpea in terms of lower pod and grain damage

23 and higher grain yield. However, all the insecticidal treatment modules were found significantly
 24 superior over untreated control.

25 **Conclusion:** Sequential application of Multineem 0.03% - Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha -
 26 Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha may be considered for recommendation in alternate sprays for
 27 managing major insect pests on long duration pigeonpea in Varanasi region of Indo-Gangetic
 28 plain.

29 **Key words:** Pigeonpea, Insect pests, Efficacy, Novel insecticides, Biopesticides.

30 INTRODUCTION

31 Pigeonpea [*Cajanus cajan* (L.) Millsp.] is a valuable grain legume grown in semi-arid
 32 tropical and sub-tropical areas of the world [1]. It is the second most important pulse crop grown
 33 in India after chickpea [2]. Though India contributes for nearly 90% of world's total pigeonpea
 34 production [3], the yields of this crop has remained stagnant over the past few decades largely
 35 due to its vulnerability to several biotic and abiotic stresses [4]. The average national yield (about
 36 712 kg/ha) is disappointingly low in comparison to potential yields of 1.2-1.5 tons/ha in short
 37 duration and 2.0-3.0 tons/ha in long duration cultivars [5].

38 Nearly 250 species of insect pests are known to infest pigeonpea crop at its various
 39 growth stages in India [6] but the damage caused by gram pod borer [*Helicoverpa armigera*
 40 (Hübner)], tur pod fly [*Melanagromyza obtusa* (Malloch)] and tur pod bug [*Clavigralla gibbosa*
 41 Spinola] results in major reduction in grain yield [7]. Considerable loss in grain yield is inflicted
 42 on account of their association with fruiting bodies [8].  *armigera* and *M. obtusa* cause
 43 adequate economic damage in pigeonpea leading to very low yield levels of 500 to 800 kg ha⁻¹ as
 44 against the potential yield of 1800 to 2000 kg ha⁻¹ [9]. Similarly, feeding by nymphs and adults

of *C. gibbosa* causes deformation of pods and shriveling of grains [10] resulting in predominant grain yield loss that has been worked out to the tune of 50,000 tonnes annually for Uttar Pradesh alone [11].

A number of insecticides have been reported to be effective for controlling pod pest complex on pigeonpea [12]. However, in the wake of widespread resistance and cross resistance to chemical insecticides [13], a need for an alternative that has higher potency, selective action and less negative impact on beneficial organisms than conventional insecticides is increasingly felt [14]. At present the alternative the use of target specific newer insecticides having novel mode of action along with biopesticides for the eco-friendly management of these pests [15]. Blending of the biopesticides along with new insecticides not only helps in reducing the reliance on these insecticides alone but also to prolong the utility of these effective molecules in the management of insect pests [16]. Hence, an attempt has been made to evaluate the efficacy of certain novel insecticides along with biopesticides in order to devise an effective module for the management of major insect pests of pigeonpea.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiments on pigeonpea (var. Bahar) were conducted at Agriculture Research Farm, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi during *Kharif* seasons of 2015-16 and 2016-17. The crop was grown at a spacing of 75 cm X 10 cm with three replications and eight treatments including control (Table 1) in randomized block design. Three applications of respective insecticides, first at 50 % flowering and remaining at 15 days after first spray were made using knapsack sprayer with hollow cone nozzle. All the recommended agronomic practices were adopted for raising the crop. Pod damage at crop maturity was recorded from pods of ten plants selected at random in each plot. Sampled pods were critically

examined for the damage of major insect pests' viz. *M. obtusa*, *H. armigera* and *C. gibbosa*, as described by Yadav and Dahiya [17]. The total yield per plot including the yield of pods sampled earlier for assessment of pod and grain damage was then computed on kilogram per hectare basis. The data recorded during the course of investigation were subjected to statistical analysis by using analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique for Randomized Block Design to compare means of different treatments as suggested by Gomez and Gomez [18].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the present investigation as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under the following heads:

3.1 Effects of various treatments on per cent pod and grain damage due to tur pod fly

The different insecticidal treatments applied showed significant difference in the per cent pod and grain damage due to *M. obtusa* (Table). Application of module 1, where sequential application of Multineem 0.03% – Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha was done at 15 days interval, recorded minimum pod and grain damage due to *M. obtusa* during both the years of investigation. This was closely followed by NSKE (Neem Seed Kernel Extract) 5% – *Bt* @ 1kg/ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha sequential application treated plots. Module 7 where three sprays of NSKE 5% were made was found to be least effective against *M. obtusa*. However, all the insecticidal treatment modules were found significantly superior over untreated control. Thus, out of seven insecticidal modules tested against pod fly in the present study, the most promising treatment appeared to be module 1 (Multineem 0.03% - Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha).

Sambathkumar *et al.* [19] also found Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 30 g a.i./ha and Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 75 g a.i./ha highly effective against *M. obtusa* in pigeonpea that resulted in significantly lower per cent pod damage (11.7% and 13.0%, respectively) as compared to 21.7% in untreated control. Effectiveness of Indoxacarb against *M. obtusa* has also been reported by [20, 21]. Patange and Chiranjeevi [22] also reported that Rynaxypyr 18.5 SP @ 30 g a.i./ha rendered effective control of pod fly on pigeonpea, while Patel and Patel [23] observed Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 30 g a.i./ha and Chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + Lambda cyhalothrin 4.6% ZC @ 37.5 g a.i./ha to be most effective against pod fly and other lepidopteran pod borers in pigeonpea. These reports further support the present findings. The findings of Sharma *et al.* [24] about higher potency of crude neem kernel seed extract (5%) and neem oil (3000 ppm) against *M. obtusa* also fall in line with present findings. More recently, Rahman *et al.* [25] also found Indoxacarb (0.004%) and NSKE (4%) combinations highly effective against pod fly in pigeonpea.

3.2 Effects of various treatments on per cent pod and grain damage due to gram pod borer

The different insecticidal treatments applied also showed significant differences in the per cent pod and grain damage due to *H. armigera* (Table 1). The per cent pod damage by *H. armigera* was found to be minimum (3.67% and 3.00%, respectively) in Multineem @ 0.03% – Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha sequential application treated plots, during both the years of investigation. The lowest per cent grain damage (1.51% and 1.29%, respectively) was also recorded from Module 1, closely followed by NSKE 5% – *Bt* @ 1kg/ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha sequential application treated plots. Module 7 where three sprays of NSKE 5% were made was found to be least effective against *H. armigera*.

111 However, all the insecticidal treatment modules were found significantly superior over untreated
112 control.

113 The present findings are in accordance with findings of Chakravarty and Agnihotri [15]
114 who reported that among ten different insecticidal treatments tested against *H. armigera* on
115 pigeonpea, alternate spray of Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha and Spinosad 45 SC @ 56g
116 a.i./ha was found to be most effective with minimum total per cent pod damage of 10.44% and
117 maximum grain yield of 1346.67 kg/ha. However alternate spray of Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g
118 a.i./ha and *Beauveria bassiana* 5%  @ 2000g/ha was found most economical with maximum
119 benefit: cost ratio of 6.29 : 1. The findings of Satpute and Barkhade [26] and Patange and
120 Chiranjeevi [22] about higher potency of Rynaxypyr against pod borer complex of pigeonpea
121 also fall in line with present findings. Maurya *et al.* [27] also reported Cyantraniliprole 10 SE @
122 60g a.i./ha to be highly efficacious against *H. armigera* on pigeonpea that resulted in cent per
123 cent reduction of larval population over control while Chandi and Suri [28] observed Indoxacarb
124 14.5 SC @ 500mLha⁻¹ to be most effective against *H. armigera* in tomato.

125 3.3 Effects of various treatments on per cent pod and grain damage due to tur pod bug

126 The different insecticidal treatments applied also showed significant differences in the
127 per cent pod and grain damage due to *C. gibbosa* (Table 1). The per cent pod damage by *C.*
128 *gibbosa* was found to be minimum (7.33% and 6.77%, respectively) in Multineem @ 0.03% –
129 Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha sequential application
130 treated plots, during both the years of investigation. The lowest per cent grain damage (5.84%
131 and 5.27%, respectively) was also recorded from Module 1, closely followed by NSKE 5% – *Bt*
132 @ 1kg/ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha sequential application treated plots. Module 7
133 where three sparys of NSKE 5% were made was found to be least effective against *C. gibbosa*.

134 However, all the insecticidal treatment modules were found significantly superior over untreated
135 control.

136 Indrasen *et al.* [29] also found Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73 g a.i/ha highly effective against
137 tur pod bug in pigeonpea that resulted in minimum per cent pod damage (9.67%) as compared to
138 16.00% in untreated control. Gopali *et al.* [30] also investigated the efficacy of
139 some insecticides, botanicals and biological control agents against *C. gibbosa* on pigeonpea and
140 found Dimethoate and NSKE moderately effective in reducing the pod bug population. Chandra
141 and Singh [31] also found Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 60 g a.i/ha and Rynaxypyr 20 SC @ 40 g a.i/ha
142 highly effective against pod bug in long duration pigeonpea (cv. NDA-1). Narasimhamurthy and
143 Keval [11] also reported that spraying of Indoxacarb 14.5 SC @ 60 g a.i/ha and NSKE 5%
144 attributed to lesser incidence of *C. gibbosa* and pod damage in red gram.

145 **3.4 Effect of various treatment modules on grain yield**

146 During both the years of experimentation (2015-16 and 2016-17), significantly highest
147 grain yield (1031 kg/ha and 1035 kg/ha, respectively) was recorded from treatment module 1
148 where sequential application of Multineem @ 0.03% – Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha –
149 Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha was done at 15 days interval. Minimum grain yield (679 kg/ha
150 and 682 kg/ha, respectively) was obtained from untreated control followed by treatment module
151 7 where three sprays of NSKE 5% was done at 15 days interval (830 kg/ha and 835 kg/ha,
152 respectively). The present findings are in accordance with Jakhar *et al.* [32] who reported that
153 maximum grain yield of 2144.17 kg/ha was obtained from Indoxacarb 15.8 EC and it was
154 statistically on par with neem soap @ 10 g/l (2100.0 kg/ha). Dabhi *et al.* [33] also found
155 Indoxacarb 15 EC @ 73g a.i./ha most effective for the control of pod borers in pigeonpea and it
156 also resulted in significant higher grain yield during both the years of experimentation (1753 and

1652 kg/ha), respectively. The present findings are also in accordance with the earlier reports of Nishantha *et al.* [34] and Chowdary *et al.* [35] who reported Rynaxypyr 20 SC @ 30g a.i./ha as superior molecule in recording lower pod damage and higher grain yield in pigeonpea against pod borer complex.

161 4. CONCLUSION

162 The present study concluded that application of module 1 where first spray of Multineem
163 @ 0.03% followed by second spray of Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha and third spray of
164 Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha was done at 15 days interval provided better control of *M.*
165 *obtus*, *H. armigera* and *C. gibbosa* on pigeonpea. Higher grain yield was also obtained from
166 module 1 treated plots as compared to other insecticidal treatments and untreated control. Hence
167 sequential application of these insecticides may be considered for recommendation in alternate
168 sprays for managing tur pod fly, gram pod borer and tur pod bug on long duration pigeonpea.
169 During the course of present study, it was also found that treatment modules having
170 combinations of chemical insecticides and bio-pesticides proved to be more effective in
171 comparison to treatments modules where there was sole use of bio-pesticides only.

172 COMPETING INTERESTS

173 Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

174 REFERENCES

- 175 1. Shanower TG, Romeis T, Minja EM. Insect pests of pigeonpea and their management. Annual
176 Rev Entomol 1999;44:77-96.
- 177 2. Pandey V, Srivastava CP. Mechanism of resistance in long duration pigeonpea against pod fly
178 (*Melanagromyza obtusa*). Ann Plant Prot Sci. 2012;20:290-3.

- 179 3. Khamoriya J, Keval R, Chakravarty S, Mishra VK. Evaluation of sequential application of
180 insecticides against major insect pests on long duration pigeonpea [*Cajanus cajan* (L.)
181 Millsp.]. J Entomol Zool Stud. 2017;5(3):1891-4.
- 182 4. Basandrai AK, Basandrai D, Duraimurugan P, Srinivasan T. Breeding for biotic stresses. In:
183 Biology and Breeding of Food Legumes. Pratap A and Kumar J (Eds). CAB International,
184 Oxford shire, U.K., 2011;220-40.
- 185 5. Srivastava CP, Joshi N. Insect pest management in pigeonpea in indian scenario: A critical
186 review. Indian J Entomol. 2011;73(1):63-75.
- 187 6. Lal SS, Singh NB. The pigeonpea and future strategies. In: Proceedings of National
188 Symposium on management of biotic and abiotic stresses in pulse crops. 1998;65-80.
- 189 7. Srilaxmi K, Paul R. Diversity of insect pest of pigeonpea (*Cajanus cajan* L. Millsp.) and their
190 succession in relation to crop phenology in Gulbarga, Karnataka. The Ecoscan. 2010;4:273-6.
- 191 8. Srivastava CP, Joshi N, Trivedi TP. Forecasting of *Helicoverpa armigera* populations and
192 impact of climate change. Indian J Agric Sci. 2010;80(1):3-10.
- 193 9. Durairaj C, Shanower TG. Reaction of eight short duration pigeonpea genotypes against pod
194 borer complex in Tamil Nadu, India. Int Chickpea Pigeonpea Newsl. 2003;10:47-8.
- 195 10. Chakravarty S, Agnihotri M., Kumar L, Ahmad MA. Influence of weather parameters on
196 natural egg parasitization of pod bug, *Clavigralla gibbosa* Spinola (Hemiptera: Coreidae) on
197 pigeonpea. The Bioscan. 2016;11(3):1759-63.

11. Narasimhamurthy GM, Keval R. Field evaluation of some insecticides and bio-pesticides against tur pod bug, *Clavigralla gibbosa* Spinola in long duration pigeonpea. Afr J Agric Res. 2013;8(38):4876-81.
12. Wadaskar RM, Bhalkare SK, Patil AN. Field efficacy of newer insecticides against pod borer complex of pigeonpea. J Food Legumes. 2013;26:62-6.
13. Armes NJ, Jadhav DR, DeSouza KR. A survey of insecticides resistance in *Helicoverpa armigera* in the Indian sub-continent. Bull Entomol Res. 1996;86:499-514.
14. Jeyarani S, Karuppuchamy P. Investigations on the enhancing efficacy of granulovirus on nucleopolyhedrovirus of *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner). J Biopest. 2010;3:172-6.
15. Chakravarty S, Agnihotri M. Evaluation of certain novel insecticides along with biopesticides for the management of major insect pests of pigeonpea. J Exp Zool India. 2016;19(2):843-850.
16. Vinayaka T, Murali S. Evaluation of new insecticides with bioagent for the management of pod borer complex of pigeonpea. Trends Biosci. 2013;6:486-9.
17. Yadav GS, Dahiya B. Evaluation of new insecticides/ chemicals against pod borer and pod fly on pigeonpea. Ann Biol. 2004;20:55-6.
18. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. John Wiley and Sons. 1984;644-5.

- 216 19. Sambathkumar S, Durairaj C, Ganapathy N, Mohankumar S. Field evaluation of newer
217 insecticide molecules and botanicals against pod borers of red gram. Legume Res.
218 2015;38(2):260-7.
- 219 20. Singh SK, Kumar J. Management of pod borers in pigeonpea (*Cajanus cajan* L.) through bio
220 and novel insecticides. Trends Biosci. 2012;5(2):154-6.
- 221 21. Narasimhamurthy GM, Keval R. Field evaluation of chemical insecticides on pod fly
222 (*Melanagromyza obtusa* Malloch) in long duration pigeonpea. J Food Legumes.
223 2012;25(3):250-1.
- 224 22. Patange NR, Chiranjeevi B. Bioefficacy of newer insecticides against pigeonpea (*Cajanus*
225 *cajan* L. Millsp.) pod borers. J Entomol Zool Stud. 2017;5(3):28-31.
- 226 23. Patel SA, Patel RK. Bio-efficacy of newer insecticides against pod borer complex of
227 pigeonpea [*Cajanus cajan* (L.) Millspaugh]. Agres. 2013;2(3):398-404.
- 228 24. Sharma OP, Bhosle BB, Kamble KR, Bhede BV, Seeras NR. Management of pigeonpea pod
229 borers with special reference to pod fly (*Melanagromyza obtusa*). Indian J Agric Sci.
230 2011;81(6):539-543.
- 231 25. Rahman SMAS, Kumar KP, Naik SO, Chakravarthy AK. Bio-efficacy of select insecticides
232 and plant products against the pigeonpea pod fly, *Melanagromyza obtusa* (Malloch)
233 (Diptera: Agromyzidae). Int J Pure App Biosci. 2017;5(2):826-35.
- 234 26. Satpade NS, Barkhade UP. Evaluation of Rynaxypyr 20 SC against pigeonpea pod borer
235 complex. J Food Legumes. 2012;25:162-3.

- 236 27. Maurya RP, Gupta AK, Tiwari S, Sharma S. Cyantraniliprole, a novel insecticide for the
237 management of lepidopteran insect pests in pigeonpea. Pestic Res J. 2016;28(2):215-220.
- 238 28. Chandi RS, Suri KS. Field efficacy of newer insecticides against tomato fruit borer,
239 *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner). Pestic Res J. 2016;28(1):15-9.
- 240 29. Indrasen, Keval R, Mishra VK, Kumar R. Efficacy of some newer insecticide against major
241 insect pests in pigeonpea agro-ecosystem. J Exp Zool India. 2017;20(1):245-8.
- 242 30. Gopali JB, Sharma OP, Yelshetty S, Rachappa V. Effect of insecticides and biorationals
243 against pod bug (*Clavigralla gibbosa*) in pigeonpea. Indian J Agric Sci. 2013;83(5):582-5.
- 244 31. Chandra N and Singh DC. Evaluation of newer insecticides against pod borer complex in
245 pigeonpea. Prog Agric. 2014;14(1):200-2.
- 246 32. Jakhar BL, Panickar B, Ravindrababu Y. Evaluation of botanicals for the management of pod
247 borers and pod fly in pigeonpea. Res Crops. 2015;16(2):293-5.
- 248 33. Dabhi MV, Patel HM, Bharpoda TM, Jhala RC. Bio-efficacy of indoxacarb 15 EC against
249 pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hübner) Hardwick infesting pigeonpea. Int J Plant Prot.
250 2015;8(1):65-8.
- 251 34. Nishantha KMDWP, Bhosle BB, Patange NR, Bhute NK. Rynaxypyr, a new insecticide for
252 managing pod borer complex in pigeonpea. Indian J Entomol. 2009;71(2):179-83.
- 253 35. Chowdary LR, Bheemanna M, Kumar LR. Bioefficacy of rynaxypyr 20 SC against fruit
254 borer *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) in okra. Int J Plant Prot. 2010;3(2):379-81.

Table 1: Effect of certain novel insecticides and biopesticides combinations per cent pod and grain damage by pod pest complex on long duration pigeonpea during *Kharif* 2015-16 and 2016-17.

Treatment	PER CENT POD DAMAGE						PER CENT GRAIN DAMAGE						GRAIN YIELD	
Module	<i>M. obtusa</i>		<i>C. gibbosa</i>		<i>H. armigera</i>		<i>M. obtusa</i>		<i>C. gibbosa</i>		<i>H. armigera</i>		(kg/ha)	
	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17
Module 1	10.67 (19.02)	9.33 (17.76)	7.33 (15.65)	6.67 (14.89)	3.67 (10.86)	3.00 (9.88)	4.00 (11.47)	3.67 (11.01)	5.84 (13.96)	5.27 (13.26)	1.51 (6.99)	1.29 (6.49)	1031	1035
Module 2	13.33 (21.39)	11.00 (19.35)	13.00 (21.12)	8.00 (16.40)	5.33 (13.34)	4.00 (11.47)	7.33 (15.70)	5.33 (13.26)	6.75 (15.03)	5.92 (14.06)	1.97 (8.04)	1.75 (7.59)	914	916
Module 3	14.33 (22.20)	11.67 (19.95)	9.67 (18.10)	8.33 (16.73)	6.33 (14.50)	5.33 (13.29)	8.00 (16.40)	5.67 (13.68)	7.83 (16.25)	6.35 (14.58)	2.41 (8.92)	2.07 (8.27)	894	900
Module 4	16.67 (24.08)	12.67 (20.83)	11.00 (19.35)	9.67 (18.10)	8.00 (16.40)	7.67 (16.06)	8.67 (17.07)	6.33 (14.50)	7.26 (15.62)	7.00 (15.33)	3.28 (10.43)	2.93 (9.84)	863	869
Module 5	12.00 (20.25)	10 (18.33)	9.33 (17.78)	7.67 (16.06)	4.00 (11.47)	3.67 (11.01)	6.00 (14.14)	4.67 (12.46)	6.30 (14.47)	5.63 (13.72)	1.81 (7.68)	1.53 (7.05)	987	995
Module 6	16.33 (23.81)	12.00 (20.25)	10.67 (19.02)	8.67 (17.09)	6.67 (14.95)	5.67 (13.75)	8.33 (16.73)	6.00 (14.14)	8.17 (16.60)	6.74 (15.03)	2.65 (9.35)	2.10 (8.33)	880	887
Module 7	22.00 (27.95)	17.00 (24.33)	15.00 (22.77)	13.33 (21.39)	10.67 (19.02)	10.00 (18.41)	13.89 (21.82)	11.33 (19.65)	9.32 (17.75)	8.87 (17.28)	3.99 (11.51)	3.70 (11.08)	830	835
Module 8	32.00 (34.43)	30.67 (33.61)	22.67 (28.42)	21.33 (27.49)	14.33 (22.23)	15.00 (22.78)	20.33 (26.77)	18.33 (25.33)	14.97 (22.75)	13.40 (21.45)	6.66 (14.92)	6.92 (15.22)	679	682
SEm ±	0.72	0.69	0.51	0.73	0.88	0.60	0.89	0.75	0.58	0.42	0.50	0.35	3.18	2.57
CD at 5%	2.20	2.13	1.55	2.24	2.70	1.83	2.72	2.29	1.77	1.28	1.54	1.07	9.64	7.79

Figures presented in parentheses are angular transformed values

Module 1: Multineem 0.03% - Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha; **Module 2:** NSKE 5% - Bt. @ 1kg/ha – Rynaxypyr 18.5 SC @ 30g a.i./ha; **Module 3:** NSKE 5% - Multineem 0.03% - Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha; **Module 4:** NSKE 5% - Bt. @ 1kg/ha - Dimethoate 30 EC @ 600g a.i./ha; **Module 5:** NSKE 5% - Bt. @ 1kg/ha – Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha; **Module 6:** NSKE 5% - NSKE 5% - Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha; **Module 7:** NSKE 5% - NSKE 5% - Indoxacarb 15.8 EC @ 73g a.i./ha; **Module 8:** Untreated control.)

263

264