



E-ISSN: 2320-7078

P-ISSN: 2349-6800

JEZS 2018; 6(2): 32-36

© 2018 JEZS

Received: 08-01-2018

Accepted: 09-02-2018

Tahseen Qamar Jugno

Department of Entomology,
University of Agriculture,
Faisalabad, Pakistan

Waheed ul Hassan

Department of Plant Protection,
Faculty of Agriculture, Bogor
Agricultural University, Bogor,
16680, Indonesia

Nawaz Haider Bashir

Faculty of Plant Protection,
Yunnan Agricultural University,
Kunming 650201, Yunnan,
China

Muhammad Sufian

Department of Entomology,
University of Agriculture,
Faisalabad, Pakistan

Talha Nazir

Institute of Plant Protection,
Chinese Academy of Agricultural
Sciences, Beijing 100193, PR
China

Tauqir Anwar

Department of Entomology,
University of Agriculture,
Faisalabad, Pakistan

Abdul Hanan

Institute of Plant Protection,
Chinese Academy of Agricultural
Sciences, Beijing, 100193, PR
China

Correspondence

Nawaz Haider Bashir

Faculty of Plant Protection,
Yunnan Agricultural University,
Kunming 650201, Yunnan,
China

Potential assessment of *Metarhizium anisopliae* and *Bacillus thuringiensis* against Brinjal insect pests *Amrasca bigutulla* (Jassid) and *Aphis gossypii* (Aphid)

Tahseen Qamar Jugno, Waheed ul Hassan, Nawaz Haider Bashir, Muhammad Sufian, Talha Nazir, Tauqir Anwar and Abdul Hanan

Abstract

The present study was conducted to investigate the pathogenicity of entomopathogenic fungi and bacteria against aphid and jassid at Youngwala, Entomological Research Area, University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan. Experiment performed on brinjal plants with field recommended doses of PACER® (*Metarhizium anisopliae*) at 1×10^7 conidia and LIPEL™ (*Bacillus thuringiensis*) at 1×10^8 spores to assess percent mortality under randomized complete block design (RCBD). The data regarding mortality were recorded after 12 hours, 24 hours, 48 hours, 72 hours, 7 days and then on weekly basis of exposure period of application treatment. Alone treatments of *Bacillus thuringiensis* (LIPEL™) showed maximum mortality 52.92% of jassid (*Amrasca bigutulla*), 52.46% of aphid (*Aphis gossypii*) and *Metarhizium anisopliae* (PACER®) gave 66.75% of jassid (*Amrasca bigutulla*), 58.66% of aphid (*Aphis gossypii*) after maximum days. Mortality in combined used of these treatments showed 83.33% of jassid and 72.45% of aphid. It is concluded that these bio-insecticides can efficiently be used against insect pests of brinjal and can also be integrated along with each other.

Keywords: Entomopathogenic fungi, *Metarhizium anisopliae*, *Bacillus thuringiensis*, Brinjal insect pests, Aphid, Jassid

1. Introduction

Brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.) is one of the most important kharif season vegetable, belongs to the family Solanaceae^[1] and common vegetable crops grown in Pakistan and probably native to India^[2]. Eggplant generally recognized as brinjal, is an economically important common vegetable grown and consumed throughout the world^[3]. The area cultivated under this crop was 9,000 hectares with production of 89,000 million tons in Pakistan which stands at 18th position in world ranking^[4]. It is a good supply of minerals and vitamins particularly iron, as compared to other commonly used vegetables, and it is nutritionally comparable to tomato^[5].

The most common sucking insect pests' attacks on brinjal are aphid (*Aphis gossypii*), jassid (*Amrasca biguttula*) and whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci*)^[6]. The jassid inject the toxic substances and suck the cell sap of the leaves and causes 24.45% yield loss^[7]. The damage of different insect pests varies from year to year depending upon intensity of insect pest attack^[8]. Keeping in view, brinjal as a cheap source of nutrition for masses, it becomes important to increase yield by controlling the losses inflicted especially by insect pests^[9].

These insect pests are controlled by using several fumigants and synthetic residual insecticides worldwide causing environmental hazards, insecticide resistance development and chemical residues in foodstuffs^[10,11]. Control of these insects using other alternative means have been attempted to overcome the undesirable side-effects associated with the frequent use of chemical control^[12]. Due to development of this high level of resistance in insects and accumulation of pesticide residues in are investigating to shift over the use of safer biological control agents^[13]. Biological control due to their low mammalian toxicity and high level of virulence against insect pests; entomopathogenic fungi have been acknowledged as worthy substitute to conventional fumigants and residual insecticides^[14].

A group of fungi that kill an insect by attacking and infecting its insect host is called entomopathogenic fungi^[15].

Life cycle of insect pathogenic fungi need an infectious spore phase that germinates on the host cuticle, later on a germ tube is formed penetrating into the host cuticle and eventually occupies the host [16]. Entomopathogenic fungi have been tested in both laboratory as well field and these experimentations showed a great success in control of various insect pest species [17-21]. The use of entomopathogenic fungi as alternative means to chemical control is a novel approach to control insect pests of vegetables [22]. Researchers made a focus on the assortment of virulent strains for the target insect pests and their improvement as biological control agents [23]. Entomopathogenic fungi have the ability to re-establish in the form of inoculum from the dead cadavers and can persist for longer time periods [24]. Additionally, the fungal conidia may be augmented with several carriers like mineral oils, inert dusts and botanical insecticides to improve their insecticidal activity [25].

Moreover a Gram-positive soil bacterium *Bacillus thuringiensis* also bear a high potential to control insect pests due to β -endotoxins that it produce and which act as an influential intestinal toxin for various insect pests [26]. Many studies involve *Bacillus thuringiensis* in which the bacteria produce spores and crystal toxins in the mid-gut of susceptible insect pests [27]. The pH value of fluid present in the gut of host is an important key factor [28]. Nevertheless, the triggered crystal toxin damages the gut cells, subsequently causing leakage of hemlymph into the midgut thus lowering pH, and permitting the spores to propagate [29]. Mixtures of Bt spore crystals are being used effectively as bio-insecticides against coleopteran, dipteran and lepidopterous insects [30].

Keeping in view these facts, the present study was conducted to achieve the following objectives; (a) to assess the individual performance of biopesticides *Beauveria bassiana* and *Bacillus thuringiensis* against brinjal pests *Amrasca bigutulla* and *Aphis gossypii* (b) combined effectiveness of these bio-pesticides (c) finding out that the bio-pesticides are the best alternative of conventional insecticides.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Experimental layout

Field experiment was conducted in Youngwala, Entomological Research Area at main campus, University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan, during 2016. The seeds of Dudhia variety of eggplant were sown in mid of June.

2.2 Pot Experiment

The nursery plants with 4-5 leaves were shifted to pots at the end of August. The pots were irrigated with 2-3 days interval.

The experiment was laid out in RCBD with four treatments and three replications. The treatments were applied by foliar application method when pests were near to economic threshold level.

2.3 Source of Bio Insecticides

Below mentioned Bio insecticide formulations were imported from Agri Life Medak District (Hyderabad), Andhra Pradesh, India.

Fungal Formulation: *Metarhizium anisopliae* (PACER®)

Bacterial formulation: *Bacillus thuringiensis* var. *Kurstaki* (LIPEL TM)

2.4 Data Analysis

Insect's population data was collected by visual observation on per plant. The data was taken after 12, 24, 48, and 72 hours and then on weekly basis after application. The collected data was transformed into percent population reduction/increase by the following formula:

$$\text{Percent Population Reduction} = \frac{PBTA \times PATA}{PBTA} \times 100$$

PBTA = Population Before Treatment Application

PATA = Population After Treatment Application

2.5 Statistical Analysis

Data obtained in various treatments were compared by ANOVA technique, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD). For the analysis of data statistical software (8.1) was used.

3. Results

3.1 Aphid

All post treatment of different biopesticides ANOVA table indicated that all treatments (biopesticides + control) have significant impact on population reduction percentage of aphid (*Aphis gossypii*). Maximum population reduction was observed after 72 hours (31.22%) of post application of plots treated with biopesticides (*Metarhizium anisopliae* + *Bacillus thuringiensis*) which was 10.69 times higher than control. *Metarhizium anisopliae* (25.12%) was 8.60 times while *Bacillus thuringiensis* (19.55%) 6.69 times higher than that of control (Table 1). Maximum population reduction was observed after 21 days 72.45%, 58.66% and 52.46% of post application of plots treated with biopesticides *Metarhizium anisopliae* + *Bacillus thuringiensis*, *Metarhizium anisopliae* and *Bacillus thuringiensis*, respectively (Table 2).

Table 1: All-Pairwise Comparisons Test regarding population reduction percentage of aphid (*Aphis gossypii*) after 12, 24, 48 and 72 hours of post treatment application of different biopesticides

Treatments	Population Change			
	12 hrs	24 hrs	48 hrs	72 hrs
<i>M. anisopliae</i> & <i>B. thuringiensis</i>	2.55 ^A ±0.51	5.33 ^A ±0.21	18.22 ^A ±0.43	31.22 ^A ±0.44
<i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i>	1.48 ^B ±0.43	3.77 ^B ±0.54	12.32 ^B ±0.21	25.12 ^B ±0.22
<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>	1.12 ^C ±0.22	2.61 ^C ±0.15	10.65 ^C ±0.22	19.55 ^C ±0.87
Control	0.00 ^D ±0.11	0.00 ^D ±0.76	0.77 ^D ±0.76	2.92 ^D ±0.32

Table 2: All-Pairwise Comparisons Test regarding population reduction percentage of aphid (*Aphis gossypii*) after 7, 14, 21 and 28 days of post treatment application of different biopesticides

Treatments	Population Change			
	7 days	14 days	21 days	28 days
<i>M. anisopliae</i> & <i>B. thuringiensis</i>	52.21 ^A ±0.35	68.55 ^A ±0.11	72.45 ^A ±0.11	46.78 ^A ±0.11
<i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i>	43.43 ^B ±0.22	55.23 ^B ±0.56	58.66 ^B ±0.56	37.68 ^B ±0.56
<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>	38.85 ^C ±0.77	49.81 ^C ±0.12	52.46 ^C ±0.12	29.22 ^C ±0.12
Control	4.12 ^D ±0.23	5.31 ^D ±0.33	5.99 ^D ±0.33	5.58 ^D ±0.33

3.2 Jassid

All post treatment of different biopesticides ANOVA table indicated that all treatments (biopesticides + control) have significant impact on population reduction percentage of jassid (*Amrasca bigutulla*). Maximum population reduction was observed after 72 hours (22.55%) of post application of plots treated with biopesticides (*Metarhizium anisopliae* + *Bacillus thuringiensis*) which was 29.28 times higher than control. *Metarhizium anisopliae* (18.22%) was 23.66 times

while *Bacillus thuringiensis* (14.88%) 19.32 times higher than control (Table 3). Maximum population reduction was observed after 21 days (83.33%) of post application of plots treated with biopesticides (*Metarhizium anisopliae* + *Bacillus thuringiensis*) which was 18.68 times higher than control. *Metarhizium anisopliae* (66.75%) was 14.96 times and *Bacillus thuringiensis* (52.92%) 11.86 times higher than control (Table 4).

Table 3: All-Pairwise Comparisons Test regarding population reduction percentage of jassid (*Amrasca bigutulla*) after 12, 24, 48 and 72 hours of post treatment application of different biopesticides

Treatments	Population Change			
	12 hrs	24 hrs	48 hrs	72 hrs
<i>M. anisopliae</i> & <i>B. thuringiensis</i>	2.12 ^A ±0.88	4.44 ^A ±0.66	12.44 ^A ±0.67	22.55 ^A ±0.66
<i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i>	1.43 ^B ±0.45	3.86 ^B ±0.43	9.43 ^B ±0.11	18.22 ^B ±0.43
<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>	1.05 ^C ±0.21	1.88 ^C ±0.33	8.22 ^C ±0.23	14.88 ^C ±0.89
Control	0.00 ^D ±0.01	0.00 ^D ±0.87	0.15 ^D ±0.32	0.77 ^D ±0.22

Table 4: All-Pairwise Comparisons Test regarding population reduction percentage of jassid (*Amrasca bigutulla*) after 7, 14, 21 and 28 days of post treatment application of different biopesticides

Treatments	Population Change			
	7 days	14 days	21 days	28 days
<i>M. anisopliae</i> & <i>B. thuringiensis</i>	54.33 ^A ±0.65	79.43 ^A ±0.89	83.33 ^A ±0.89	55.22 ^A ±0.89
<i>Metarhizium anisopliae</i>	40.98 ^B ±0.43	63.65 ^B ±0.25	66.75 ^B ±0.25	42.26 ^B ±0.25
<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>	32.15 ^C ±0.33	48.98 ^C ±0.87	52.92 ^C ±0.87	39.44 ^C ±0.87
Control	2.99 ^D ±0.77	3.12 ^D ±0.03	4.46 ^D ±0.03	3.47 ^D ±0.03

4. Discussion

The results revealed that combination of two treatments *Bacillus thuringiensis* (LIPEL™) and *Metarhizium anisopliae* (PACER®) were proved to be most effective against the particular insect pest after the time interval of 21 days showing mortality of aphid and jassid, 72.45% and 83.33%, respectively. These results are quite similar to Shafiqhi *et al.*, 2014 [31] where they have used same chemical along with resistant varieties and reported that alone as well as in combination these chemicals caused maximum and reasonable population reduction of tested insect pests. Current research are also similar with the findings of Janaki *et al.*, 2010 [32]; Sandhu *et al.*, 2012 [33]; Erler and Ates 2015 [34]; Chinniah *et al.*, 2016 [35]; Shahzad *et al.*, 2016 [36]; where they have used same biocontrol agents and reported that these biocontrol agents have caused mortality for different life stages of insect pests of brinjal and gives maximum results for population reduction. Ursani *et al.*, (2014) [37] also founded that the population of brinjal pests has been depressed by the use of different biopesticides. The findings of this research are in resemblance with present research. Srinivasan (2012) [38] performed an experiment to carry out the effects of biopesticides on pest management with collaboration of other management techniques such as resistant varieties, natural enemies. Integration of biopesticide can increase performance of IPM strategies. For instance, with the adoption of *Bacillus thuringiensis* and it based biopesticides, along with parasitoids such as *Cotesia plutellae*, *Diadegma semiclausum* and *Diadromus collaris* and reported that *Bacillus thuringiensis* and it based biopesticides caused maximum population reduction in form of mortality and proved as good control agents against pests on brassicas. Sharma and tayde (2017) [39] founded that *Metarhizium anisopliae*, *Beauveria bassiana*, Neem oil, Spinosad, Emamectin benzoate, *Verticillium lecanii*, Cypermethrin were evaluated against fruit and shoot borer and found that these all chemicals in combination and alone as well caused maximum

mortality of invested pests which supports present findings where used *B. thuringiensis* along with some botanicals against lepidopterous insect pests, provided mortality up to 85% and then reported that whenever all elements are combined they are proved to be helpful in controlling insect pests.

5. Conclusion

It is concluded that combination of *Bacillus thuringiensis* and *Metarhizium anisopliae* proved to be effective against the particular insect pest and can efficiently be used in integrated pest management strategies of brinjal insect pests.

6. References

- Shukla A, Khatri S. Incidence and abundance of brinjal shoot and fruit borer *Leucinodes orbonalis* Guenee. Bioscan. 2010; (5):305-308.
- Hanson PM, Yang RY, Tsou SC, Ledesma D, Engle L, Lee TC. Diversity in eggplant (*Solanum melongena*) for superoxide scavenging activity, total phenolics, and ascorbic acid. Journal of Food Composition and Analysis. 2006; (19):594-600.
- Whitaker BD, Stommel JR. Distribution of hydroxycinnamic acid conjugates in fruit of commercial eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.) cultivars. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry. 2003; (51):3448-3454.
- Ullah Z, Anwar S, Javed N, Khan S, Shahid M. Response of six eggplant cultivars to Meloidogyne Incognita. Pakistan Journal of Phytopathology. 2011; (23):152-155.
- Kaloo G. Eggplant: *Solanum melongena* L. Genetic improvement of vegetable crops: Elsevier, 1993, 587-604.
- Srinivasan R. Insect and mite pests on eggplant: AVRDC-World Vegetable Center, 2009.
- Javed H, Khan M, Ahmad M. Role of physico-chemical factors imparting resistance in cotton against some insect

- pests. Pakistan Entomologist. 1992; (14):53-55.
8. Oerke EC. Crop losses to pests. The Journal of Agricultural Science. 2006; 144:31-43.
 9. Rajasekaran B. An Indigenous Duck-Fish Production System in South India. Impact on Food and Nutritional Security. Saignaw MI: Draft for Consortium for International Earth Science Information Network. 2001, 004-200.
 10. Sajid M, Bashir NH, Batool Q, Munir I, Bilal M, Jamal MA *et al.* In-vitro evaluation of biopesticides (*Beauveria bassiana*, *Metarhizium anisopliae*, *Bacillus thuringiensis*) against mustard aphid *Lipaphis erysimi* kalt. (Hemiptera: Aphididae). Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2017; 5(6):331-335.
 11. Hassan W, Anwar T, Bashir NH, Ranjha MH, Nazir T. Nutritional Indices of Larvae of *Trogoderma Granarium* (Everts) on Diets and Their Response to A Plant Extract and Synthetic Igr's. The 3rd International Indonesian Forum for Asian Studies. 2017, 1415-1421.
 12. Arthur FH. Control of lesser grain borer (Coleoptera: Bostrichidae) with chlorpyrifos-methyl, bioresmethrin, and resmethrin: effect of chlorpyrifos-methyl resistance and environmental degradation. Journal of Economic Entomology. 1992; 85:1471-1475.
 13. Ferizli AG, Beris G, Baspinar E. Mortality and F1 production of *Rhyzopertha dominica* (F.) on wheat treated with diatomaceous earth: impact of biological and environmental parameters on efficacy. Journal of Pest Science. 2005; 78:231.
 14. Ismail M, Wakil W, Bashir NH, Hassan W, Muhammad UW. Entomocidal Effect of Entomopathogenic Fungus *Beauveria bassiana* and New Chemistry Insecticides against *Spodoptera litura* (Fabricius) (Noctuidae: Lepidoptera) Under Controlled Conditions. International Journal of Agriculture Innovations and Research. 2017; 5(6):2319-1473.
 15. Singkaravanit S, Kinoshita H, Ihara F, Nihira T. Cloning and functional analysis of the second geranylgeranyl diphosphate synthase gene influencing helvolic acid biosynthesis in *Metarhizium anisopliae*. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology. 2010; (87):1077-1088.
 16. Akbar S, Freed S, Hameed A, Gul HT, Akmal M, Malik MN *et al.* Compatibility of *Metarhizium anisopliae* with different insecticides and fungicides. African Journal of Microbiology Research. 2012; 6:3956-3962.
 17. Akbar W, Lord JC, Nechols JR, Howard RW. Diatomaceous earth increases the efficacy of *Beauveria bassiana* against *Tribolium castaneum* larvae and increases conidia attachment. Journal of Economic Entomology. 2004; 97:273-280.
 18. Kavallieratos N, Athanassiou C, Michalaki M, Batta Y, Rigatos H, Pashalidou F *et al.* Effect of the combined use of *Metarhizium anisopliae* (Metschnikoff) Sorokin and diatomaceous earth for the control of three stored-product beetle species. Crop Protection. 2006; 25:1087-1094.
 19. Batta Y. Control of rice weevil (*Sitophilus oryzae* L., Coleoptera: Curculionidae) with various formulations of *Metarhizium anisopliae*. Crop Protection. 2004; 23:103-108.
 20. Sabbour M, Shadia E, Aziz A. Efficiency of Some Bioinsecticides Against Broad Bean Beetle, *Bruchus rufimanus* (Coleoptera: Bruchidae). Research Journal of Agriculture and Biological Sciences. 2007; 3:67-72.
 21. Sabbour M. Efficacy of some bioinsecticides against *Bruchidius incarnatus* (Boh.) (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) infestation during storage. Journal of Plant Protection Research. 2010; 50:28-34.
 22. Shah P, Pell J. Entomopathogenic fungi as biological control agents. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology. 2003; (61):413-423.
 23. Amer M, Sayed ET, Bakheit H, Moustafa S, Sayed YA. Pathogenicity and genetic variability of five entomopathogenic fungi against *Spodoptera littoralis*. Research Journal of Agriculture and Biological Sciences. 2008; (4):354-367.
 24. Athanassiou CG, Kavallieratos NG, Vayias BJ, Tsakiri JB, Mikeli NH, Meletsis CM *et al.* Persistence and efficacy of *Metarhizium anisopliae* (Metschnikoff) Sorokin (Deuteromycotina: Hyphomycetes) and diatomaceous earth against *Sitophilus oryzae* (L.) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) and *Rhyzopertha dominica* (F.) (Coleoptera: Bostrychidae) on wheat and maize. Crop Protection. 2008; (27):1303-1311.
 25. Akbar W, Lord JC, Nechols JR, Loughin TM. Efficacy of *Beauveria bassiana* for red flour beetle when applied with plant essential oils or in mineral oil and organosilicone carriers. Journal of Economic Entomology. 2005; (98):683-688.
 26. Vidyarthi A, Tyagi R, Valero J, Surampalli R. Studies on the production of *B. thuringiensis* based biopesticides using waste water sludge as a raw material. Water Research. 2002; 36:4850-4860.
 27. Fast P. The crystal toxin *Bacillus thuringiensis*. In Microbial Control of Pests and Plant Diseases, 1970-1980 (HD Burgess, Ed.): Academic Press, New York, 1981, 35-43.
 28. Burgerjon A, Martouret D. Determination and significance of the host spectrum of *Bacillus thuringiensis*. Microbial control of insects and mites. Academic Press, New York. 1971, 305-325.
 29. Heimpel A, Harshbarger JC. Symposium on microbial insecticides. V. Immunity in insects. Bacteriological Reviews. 1965; 29:397-405.
 30. Schnepf E, Crickmore NV, Van RJ, Lereclus D, Baum J, Feitelson J *et al.* *Bacillus thuringiensis* and its pesticidal crystal proteins. Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews. 1998; 62:775-806.
 31. Shafiqhi Y, Ziaee M, Ghosta Y. Diatomaceous earth used against insect pests, applied alone or in combination with *Metarhizium anisopliae* and *Beauveria bassiana*. Journal of Plant Protection Research. 2014; 54:62-66.
 32. Janaki I, Suresh S, Karuppuchamy PT. Efficacy and economics of biopesticides for the management of papaya J Biopest 5(1): 1-6 mealybug, *Paracoccus marginatus* (Williams and Granara de Willink) in brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.) Journal of Biopesticides. 2010; 5(1):87-90.
 33. Sandhu SS, Sharma AK, Beniwal V, Goel G, Batra P, Kumar A *et al.* Myco-Biocontrol of Insect Pests: Factors Involved, Mechanism, and Regulation. Journal of Pathogens. 2012, 1-10.
 34. Erler F, Ozgur AA. Potential of two entomopathogenic fungi, *Beauveria bassiana* and *Metarhizium anisopliae* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae), as biological control agents against the June beetle. Journal of Insect Science. 2015; 15(1):44-50.
 35. Chinniah C, Ravikumar A, Kalyanasundaram M, Parthiban P. Management of sucking pests, by

- integration of organic sources of amendments and foliar application of entomopathogenic fungi on chilli. *Journal of Biopesticides*. 2016; 9(1):34-40.
36. Shahzad AS, Ahmad SS, Ahmed S, Rizwana H, Siddiqui S, S. Ali S, *et al.* Effect of Biopesticides against Sucking Insect Pests of Brinjal Crop under Field Conditions. *Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences*. 2016; 12:41-49.
 37. Ursani TJ, Malik S, Chandio JI, Palh ZA, Soomro NM, Lashari KH *et al.* Screening of Biopesticides against insect Pests of Brinjal. *International journal of Emerging Science and Technology*. 2014; (6); 918-931.
 38. Srinivasan R. Integrating biopesticides in pest management strategies for tropical vegetable production. *Journal of Biopesticides*. 2012, 36-45.
 39. Sharma JH, Anoorag RT. Evaluation of Bio-Rational Pesticides, against Brinjal Fruit and Shoot Borer, *Leucinodes orbonalis* Guen. On Brinjal at Allahabad Agroclimatic Region. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2017; 6(6):2049-2054.