Field Efficacy of Newer Insecticides against Whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* (Gennadius) In Brinjal

D.M. Jethva¹, K.L. Raghvani², D.V. Jadav³ and T. K. Balas⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Department of Entomology Junagadh Agricultural University Junagadh- 362 001, Gujarat E-mail: ¹dr_dharmraj@yahoo.co.in, ²entomology@jau.in, ³dharmeshjadav4@gmail.com, ⁴tusharbalas@gmail.com

Abstract—A field experiment was conducted to determine the efficacy of different insecticides against whitefly Bemisia tabaci (Gennadius) infesting brinjal in variety GJb-1 at Junagadh Agricultural University Junagadh during rabi season of 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. The pooled results showed that the bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02%, chlorantraniliprole 18.5% EC 0.002%, difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06%, buprofazin 25% SC 0.06% were found the most effective in reducing the whitefly population and damage in brinjal. The highest fruit yield of brinjal was obtained in the treatment of in bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02% (32698 kg/ha). The next better treatments were chlorantraniliprole 18.5% EC 0.002% (27368 kg/ha), difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06% (25898 kg/ha) and buprofazin 25% SC 0.06% (24985 kg/ha). The highest ICBR was obtained in the treatments of bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02% (1:46.01) followed by 0.05% (1:13.73), imidacloprid 17.8% SL 0.007% (1:12.39), difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06% (1:9.80), chlorantraniliprole 18.5% EC 0.002% (1:9.56) and buprofazin 25% SC 0.06% (1:8.77). So bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02% was found most effective insecticide for the control of whitefly in brinjal.

1. INTRODUCTION

Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.), an important vegetable crop is attacked by several insect pests of which the sucking pests viz, whitefly, Bemisia tabaci (Gennadius), leaf hopper, Amrasca devastan Distant and aphid, Aphis gossypii Glover are major importance and destructive pests causing about 70% loss in yield (Subratram and Butani, 1982 and Ghosh et al, Several conventional insecticides have 2004). been recommended for management of these sucking pests (Umapathy and Baskaran 1991, Palumbo, 2001 Berlinger 1986, Mohd Rasdi, 2005, Syed, 2000). However, some newer molecules were available and reported to be more effective as it provide longer protection against whitefly. Therefore, this trial was proposed.

2. MATERIALS AND METHOD

The field experiment on brinjal (GJb-1) was conducted at the entomology farm, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh during *Rabi* 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. The crop was grown at 75 cm x 60 cm with 3 replication and 10 treatments inculding control (Table 1) in randomized block design. Seedling of brinjal was transplanted during *rabi* season. The

spraying of insecticides was done when whitefly population appeared. The observations on population of whitefly (Nymph and adults) was recorded at early in morning from 5 randomly selected plants of each treatment one day before spray and 3, 7 and 10 day of spray. The population of whitefly was counted from three leaves each from top, middle and bottom of the selected plant. Second and subsequent spraying of insecticides was applied on need base at 15 days interval. Yield of fruits was recorded at every picking from each treatment.

3. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

The pooled results showed that the difference in population of whitefly was found non significant before spray, but all the treatments were found significant in three spray over control. The significantly lowest population of whitefly (0.84 whitefly/3 leaves/ plant) was recorded in the treatment of bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02%

| Table: 1 Effect of different insecticides on whitefly population |
|--|
| after first spray in brinjal |

| | | nt a ay | at first, second | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|------|--|--|--|
| | Treatments | | Pooled of 2011-12, 2012-13 & 2013-14 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ν | | Befo | 3 | DAS | | 7 DAS | | | 10 DAS | | | | | |
| 0. | Treatments | re | | seco | thir | | seco | thir | | seco | thir | | | |
| | | spra | first | nd | d | first | nd | d | first | nd | d | | | |
| | | У | spra | spra | spr | spra | spra | spr | spra | spra | spr | | | |
| | | | у | у | ay | у | у | ay | у | у | ay | | | |
| 1 | Buprofazin | | | | 1.3 | | | 1.2 | | | 1.5 | | | |
| | 25% SC | 4.94 | 1.67 | 1.70 | 4 | 1.58 | 1.67 | 6 | 1.71 | 1.74 | 6 | | | |
| | 0.06% | (23.8 | (2.27 | (2.39 | (1.3 | (1.98 | (2.30) | (1.0) | (2.42 | (2.53 | (1.9 | | | |
| | | 9) |) |) | 0) |) |) | 8) |) |) | 2) | | | |
| 2 | Imidacloprid | | | | 1.9 | | | 1.8 | | | 2.0 | | | |
| | 17.8% SL | 5.04 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 5 | 2.15 | 2.22 | 8 | 2.26 | 2.26 | 9 | | | |
| | 0.007% | (24.9 | (4.55 | (4.58 | (3.2 | (4.13 | (4.44 | (3.0 | (4.61 | (4.62 | (3.8 | | | |
| | | 1) |) |) | 9) |) |) | 2) |) |) | 5) | | | |
| 3 | Acephate | | | | 1.5 | | | 1.4 | | | 1.6 | | | |
| | 75% SP | 4.87 | 1.83 | 1.85 | 6 | 1.76 | 1.81 | 6 | 1.88 | 1.87 | 5 | | | |
| | 0.075% | (23.2 | (2.85 | (2.93 | (1.9 | (2.60) | (2.77 | (1.6 | (3.02 | (2.98 | (2.2 | | | |
| | | 2) |) |) | 2) |) |) | 3) |) |) | 2) | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | _ |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|-------|------------|------------|------|------------|------------|-------|
| 4 | Bifenthrin | | | | 1.1 | | | 1.0 | | | 1.3 |
| | 10% EC | | 1.16 | | 1 | 1.07 | 1.27 | 3 | 1.23 | 1.37 | 4 |
| | 0.02% | (25.7 | (0.84) | (1.27) | (0.7 | (0.64 | (1.11) | (0.5 | (1.01) | (1.38) | (1.3 |
| | | 2) |) |) | 4) |) |) | 6) |) |) | 0) |
| 5 | Acetamiprid | | | | 2.0 | | | 2.0 | | | 2.1 |
| | 20% SP | 5.02 | 2.46 | 2.48 | 7 | 2.38 | 2.45 | 0 | 2.45 | 2.48 | 7 |
| | 0.004% | (24.6 | (5.55 | (5.66 | (3.7 | (5.14 | (5.50 | (3.4 | (5.49 | (5.63 | (4.1 |
| | | 8) |) |) | 7) |) |) | 9) |) |) | 9) |
| 6 | Cartap | | | | 1.8 | | | 1.7 | | | 1.9 |
| | hydrochlorid | 5.03 | 2.05 | 2.06 | 5 | 1.99 | 2.03 | 6 | 2.08 | 2.08 | 7 |
| | e 50% WP | (24.7 | (3.72 | (3.74 | (2.9 | (3.47 | (3.62 | (2.6 | (3.81 | (3.82 | (3.3 |
| | 0.05% | <u>9</u>) |) |) | 1) |) |) | 0) |) |) | 7) |
| 7 | Difenthiuron | | | , | 1.1 | , | , | 1.1 | , | | 1.3 |
| | 50% WP | 5.21 | 1.43 | 1.48 | 8 | 1.34 | 1.43 | 1 | 1.47 | 1.53 | 9 |
| | 0.06% | (26.6 | (1.54 | (1.68 | (0.9 | (1.29 | (1.55 | (0.7 | (1.67 | (1.84 | (1.4) |
| | | 9) |) |) | 0) |) |) | 3) |) |) | 3) |
| 8 | Thiamethoxa | | | | 2.3 | | | 2.3 | | | 2.6 |
| | m 25%WG | 5.02 | 3.15 | 3.14 | 7 | 3.07 | 3.10 | 0 | 3.13 | 3.11 | 6 |
| | 0.0088% | (24.6 | (9.45 | (9.38 | (5.1 | (8.91 | (9.14 | (4.7 | (9.28 | (9.17 | (6.5 |
| | | 6) |) | `) | 2) | `) |) | 7) |) |) | 5) |
| 9 | Chlorantranil | | | | 1.1 | | | 1.0 | | | 1.3 |
| | iprole 18.5% | 5.19 | 1.40 | 1.46 | 8 | 1.31 | 1.40 | 9 | 1.47 | 1.49 | 5 |
| | EC 0.002% | (26.4 | (1.45 | (1.64 | (0.8 | (1.21) | (1.45 | (0.6 | (1.66 | (1.73 | (1.3) |
| | | 6) | `) | `) | 9) | `) | `) | 9) | `) | `) | 1) |
| 10 | Control | | | | 2.7 | | | 2.7 | | | 3.1 |
| | Untreated | 5.10 | 3.69 | 3.73 | 9 | 3.64 | 3.69 | 4 | 3.71 | 3.69 | 4 |
| | (Check) | (25.4) | (13.0 | | (7.2) | | (13.1 | (7.0 | (13.2) | | (9.3 |
| | | 6) | 8) | 9) | 9) | 8) | 4) | 2) | 9) | 2) | 4) |
| | S.Em.± for | - / | - / | - / | 0.0 | - / | / | 0.0 | - / | , | 0.1 |
| | treatment | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 1 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 2 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 3 |
| C | D. at 5 % ± | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.3 |
| f | or treatment | NS | 0.02 | 0.03 | 2 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 5 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 8 |
| | | | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| S.I | Em.± for year | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 1 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 7 |
| | D. at 5 % for | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.2 |
| 0 | year | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 1 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 3 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 1 |
| S.Em.± year x | | | | | 0.1 | | | 0.1 | | | 0.1 |
| treatment | | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 5 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 6 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 5 |
| C_{1} | D. at 5 % year | 5.22 | 5.12 | 5.11 | | 5.15 | 5.15 | | 5.10 | 5.10 | 5 |
| | x treatment | 0.62 | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| <u> </u> | | 5.02 | 115 | 11.4 | 15. | 12.7 | 12.6 | 16. | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13. |
| | C.V. % | 7 59 | 9 71 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 2 | 90 | 9 | 3 | 23 |
| C.V. % 7.59 9.71 7 12 8 2 90 9 3 23 | | | | | | | | | | | |

 $\sqrt{X+0.5}$ transformation used. Data in parantheses are retransformed values

after 3days of first spray. The next best treatments were found chlorantraniliprole 18.5% EC 0.002% (1.45 whitefly/3 leaves/ plant), difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06% (1.54 whitefly/3 leaves/ plant) and buprofazin 25% SC 0.06% (2.27 whitefly/3 leaves/ plant). While at 7 days after first spray, significantly the lowest population of whitefly/3 leaves/ plant). The next best treatments were chlorantraniliprole 18.5% EC 0.002% (1.21 whitefly/3 leaves/ plant), difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06% (1.29 whitefly/3 leaves/ plant), difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06% (1.29 whitefly/3 leaves/ plant) and buprofazin 25% SC 0.06% (1.98 whitefly/3 leaves/ plant). Similar trend wasalso found at 10 days after first spraying. More or less similar trends in reducing the whitefly population were recorded in second and third spray.

3.1 Yield

The pooled data was found significant in all the treatments over control. However, significantly the highest fruit yield of brinjal was obtained in the treatment of in bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02% (32698 kg/ha). The next best treatments was chlorantraniliprole 18.5% EC 0.002% (27368 kg/ha), difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06% (25898 kg/ha) and buprofazin 25% SC 0.06% (24985 kg/ha).

3.2 ICBR

The highest ICBR was obtained in the treatments of bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02% (1:46.01) followed by acephate 75% SP 0.075% (1:29.48), acetamiprid 20% SP 0.004% (1:16.96) and cartap hydrochloride 50% WP 0.05% (1:13.73), imidacloprid 17.8% SL 0.007% (1:12.39), difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06% (1:9.80), chlorantraniliprole 18.5% EC 0.002% (1:9.56) and buprofazin 25% SC 0.06% (1:8.77).

| NT | | Yield (kg/ha) |
|-----|--|----------------------------|
| Ν | Treatments | Pooled of 2011-12, 2012-13 |
| 0. | | & 2013-14 |
| 1 | Buprofazin 25% SC 0.06% | 24985 |
| 2 | Imidacloprid 17.8% SL | 23856 |
| | 0.007% | |
| 3 | Acephate 75% SP 0.075% | 24757 |
| 4 | Bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02% | 32698 |
| 5 | Acetamiprid 20% SP 0.004% | 23235 |
| 6 | Cartap hydrochloride 50% WP | 23981 |
| | 0.05% | |
| 7 | Difenthiuron 50% WP 0.06% | 25898 |
| 8 | Thiamethoxam 25%WG | 22612 |
| | 0.0088% | |
| 9 | Chlorantraniliprole 18.5% EC | 27368 |
| | 0.002% | |
| 10 | Control Untreated (Check) | 22229 |
| S.E | $m.\pm$ for treatment | 192 |
| C.E | D . at 5 %. \pm for treatment | 572 |
| S.E | m.± for year | 105 |
| C.E | D. at 5 % for year | 313 |
| S.E | m.± year x treatment | 1764 |
| C.E | D. at 5 % year x treatment | 5004 |
| | /. % | 12.14 |

Table 2: Effect of different treatments on yield of brinjal

 Table 3: Yield and economics of different treatments for the control of brinjal whitefly

| N 0. | Treatmen t | oi sp ra | ease over | oss inc om e | ntity of | icides (Kg- Lit/ha | Expen re / C (Rs Insect icides | lost .) Lab | Total Expen diture (Rs.) | Net Ret urn (Rs.) | IC BR |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | Buprofazi n 25% SC 0.06% | 3 | 275 6 | 551 20 | 1552 | 3.725 | 5594 | 690 | 6284 | 488 36 | 1:8. 77 |

| 2 | Imidaclop rid 17.8% SL 0.007% | 3 | 162 7 | 325 40 | 1552 | 0.605 | 1936 | 690 | 2626 | 299 14 | 1:1 2.3 9 |
|--------|--|---|-----------|------------|------|-------|-------|-----|-------|------------|-----------------|
| 3 | Acephate 75% SP 0.075% | 3 | 252 8 | 505 60 | 1552 | 1.552 | 1025 | 690 | 1715 | 488 45 | 1:2 9.4 8 |
| 4 | Bifenthrin 10% EC 0.02% | 3 | 104 69 | 209 380 | 1552 | 3.104 | 3861 | 690 | 4551 | 204 829 | 1:4 6.0 1 |
| 5 | Acetamipr id 20% SP 0.004% | 3 | 100 6 | 201 20 | 1552 | 0.310 | 496 | 690 | 1186 | 189 34 | 1:1 6.9 6 |
| 6 | Cartap hydrochlo ride 50% WP 0.05% | 3 | 175 2 | 350 40 | 1552 | 1.552 | 1862 | 690 | 2552 | 324 88 | 1:1 3.7 3 |
| 7 | Difenthiur on 50% WP 0.06% | 3 | 366 9 | 733 80 | 1552 | 1.862 | 6800 | 690 | 7490 | 658 90 | 1:9. 80 |
| 8 | Thiameth oxam 25%WG 0.0088% | 3 | 383 | 766 0 | 1552 | 0.546 | 1475 | 690 | 2165 | 249 5 | 1:3. 54 |
| 9 | Chlorantr aniliprole 18.5% EC 0.002% | 3 | 513 9 | 102 780 | 1552 | 0.737 | 10060 | 690 | 10750 | 920 30 | 1:9. 56 |
| 1 0 | Control Untreated (Check) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

- 1. Labour charges was calculated Rs. 23. 00/ hrs.
- 2. Market price of brinjal fruit was calculated Rs. 20/kg
- 3. Spray solution was used 618 liter per hectare (Avg. of first, second and third spray)
- 4. Quantity of water used in first, second and third spray (556, 648 and 648 lit/ha)

REFERENCES

- [1] Berlinger, M. J. "Host plant resistance to *Bemisia tabaci*", Agriculture, Ecosystem & Environment, 1986, 17: 69-82
- [2] Ghosh, S. K., Laskar, N., Basak, S. N. and Senapati, S. K.. Seasonal fluctuation of *Bemisia tabaci* Genn. on brinjal and field evaluation of some pesticides against *Bemisia tabaci* under terai region of West Bengal. *Environmental Ecology*, 2004, 22(4): 758-762.
- [3] Mohd Rasdi, Z. "Biology, distribution and effect of selected insecticides against whitefly (*Trialeurodes vaporariorum* Westwood and *Bemisia tabaci* Gennadius) on brinjal, Solanum melongena L", Master Thesis submitted to Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia 2005
- [4] Palumbo, J. C. Horowitz, A. R. and Prabhaker, N. "Insecticidal Control and Resistance Management for *Bemisia tabaci*", *Crop Protection*, 2001, 20: 739-765
- [5] Subbaratnam, G. V. and Butani, D. K. Chemical control of insect pest complex of brinjal. *Entomon*, 1982, 7: 97-100
- [6] Umapathy, G. and Baskaran, P. Bio efficacy of certain synthetic pyrethorids against major pests of brinjal. *Madras agricultural Journal*, 1991, 78(14): 8-10.