



E-ISSN: 2320-7078

P-ISSN: 2349-6800

JEZS 2017; 5(5): 46-48

© 2017 JEZS

Received: 10-07-2017

Accepted: 11-08-2017

**Anuj Kumar**

Department of Entomology,  
Naini Agricultural Institute,  
SHUATS, Allahabad, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Dr. Ashwani Kumar**

Department of Entomology,  
Naini Agricultural Institute,  
SHUATS, Allahabad, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Rakesh kumar meena**

Department of Entomology,  
Naini Agricultural Institute,  
SHUATS, Allahabad, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Punam**

Department of Plant Pathology,  
Naini Agricultural Institute,  
SHUATS, Allahabad, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Correspondence**

**Anuj Kumar**

Department of Entomology,  
Naini Agricultural Institute,  
SHUATS, Allahabad, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

## Field efficacy of seven insecticides against *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) on maize (*Zea mays* L.) in Allahabad

**Anuj Kumar, Dr. Ashwani Kumar, Rakesh Kumar Meena and Punam**

### Abstract

A field experiment was conducted during *khari*, 2016 at SHUATS, Allahabad (U.P.) to compare the efficacy of selected insecticides against *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) on maize (*Zea mays* L.) in Allahabad. All the seven treatments Carbofuran (7.70%), followed by Cypermethrin (9.86%) and Fipronil (13.38%) are at par with each other, followed by Indoxacarb (14.44%), Cartap recorded (15.37%), Profenophos (17.63%) then the treatment Imidacloprid (19.47%) was least effective reduced the infestation as compared to the untreated control. Result revealed that all the treatments were significantly superior over control among all the treatments Carbofuran recorded highest reduction of *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) population *i.e.* (7.70%) which was significantly superior over control followed by followed by Cypermethrin (9.86%) and Fipronil (13.38%) are at par with each other, followed by Indoxacarb (14.44%), Cartap recorded (15.37%), Profenophos (17.63%) then the treatment Imidacloprid (19.47%) was least effective among all the treatments. Among the treatment studied, the best and most economical treatment was T<sub>3</sub> Carbofuran (1:1.91), followed by T<sub>5</sub> Cypermethrin (1:1.88), T<sub>2</sub> Fipronil (1:1.70), T<sub>1</sub> Indoxacarb (1:1.59), T<sub>4</sub> Cartap (1:1.41), T<sub>6</sub> Profenophos (1:1.32), T<sub>7</sub> Imidacloprid (1:1.20) as compared to T<sub>0</sub> Control (1:1.11).

**Keywords:** *Chilo partellus*, efficacy, economics, Incidence, Insecticides, *Zea mays* L

### Introduction

Maize (*Zea mays* L.) is an annual plant which belongs to family Gramineae. Maize is an important cereal of crop of world which is grown under diverse climatic conditions. Maize occupies a pride place among cereal crops in India and due to its high yield potential called the queen of cereals (Handbook of agriculture, ICAR). In India, maize (*Zea mays* L.) is the third most important cereal crop after rice and wheat. The production of maize is 17.01mt (Annual report, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India 2015). It provides food, feed, fodder and serves as a sources of basic raw material for the number of industrial products viz. starch, protein, oil, alcoholic beverages, food sweeteners, cosmetics, more recently as bio-fuel etc. (Govt. of india). No other cereal is being used in as many ways as maize. Maize grain has elevated nutritive value as it contains about 72% starch, 10% protein, 4.8% oil, 5.8% fiber and 3% sugar (Rafiq *et al.*, 2010) <sup>[11]</sup>.

India is the fifth largest producer of maize in the world contributing 3 per cent of the global production. At present, out of the total maize produced, 55% is used for food purpose, about 14% for live stock, 18 % for poultry feed, 12 % for starch and one per cent as seed. (Rathore *et al.*, 2001) <sup>[10]</sup>.

### Materials and method

The trial was conducted in *khari*, season 2016 the central research field, SHUATS, Allahabad (U.P.). Trial was laid out in a randomized block design consisting of seven different treatments. Each treatment was replicated thrice and maize variety GA-85 was used for study. Application of treatments for the management of the *Chilo partellus* was initiated as soon as 5% ETL of infestation observed in experimental field. Subsequent application was under taken at an interval of 15 days and one applications were made during experimental period. The observation was recorded on weekly intervals throughout the cropping season. To assess the incidence of stem borer at weekly intervals the total number of plants and number of infested plants (number of dead hearts and pin holes present on the leaves) was were counted from each plot. The incidence was determined by correlating with weather parameter.

Farid *et al.* (2003). The data were subjected to statistical analysis. The yield per plot was also recorded.

The percentage infestation of the maize stem borer was calculated according to the following equation:

$$\text{Percent infestation} = \frac{\text{Number of infested plants}}{\text{Total number of plants}} \times 100$$

(Syed *et al.* 2015)

## Results and Discussion

Carbofuran (7.70%) was found to be effective against controlling the infestation by stem borer *Chilo partellus* followed by Cypermethrin (9.86%) and Fipronil (13.38%) are at par with each other, followed by Indoxacarb (14.44%), Cartap recorded (15.37%), Profenophos (17.63%) then the treatment Imidacloprid (19.47%) was least effective among all the treatments (Table 1). The statistical analysis of data showed that all the treatments are significantly effective. The treatments all were found to be significant. However, significant reduction in infestation was observed in carbofuran, when compared to all other treatments.

As far as infestation was concerned carbofuran (7.70%) showed the best result in controlling the stem borer infestation and was significant to remaining treatment followed by other treatments. The statistical analysis of data showed that all the treatments are significantly effective.

Carbofuran was more effective in per cent infestation same result of carbofuran also reported by Ahmed *et al.* (2003) [1]

and Pavani *et al.* (2013) [8]. In the present finding Fipronil reported (13.38%) infestation of this result of Fipronil is supported by Kumar *et al.* (2015) [4], Sidar *et al.* (2017) [12] and similarly reading were found by Neupane *et al.* (2016) [7] and Singh *et al.* (2014) [13].

Out of seven different chemicals spray highest yield was recorded in T<sub>3</sub> Carbofuron (42.72 q/ha) followed by T<sub>5</sub> Cypermethrin (40.80 q/ha), T<sub>2</sub> Fipronil (37.44 q/ha), T<sub>1</sub> Indoxacarb (34.79 q/ha), T<sub>4</sub> Cartap (31.68 q/ha), T<sub>6</sub> Profenophos (28.54 q/ha), T<sub>7</sub> Imidacloprid (25.49 q/ha) as compared to T<sub>0</sub> Control (23.57 q/ha) were least effective in recording the marketable yield. The statistical analysis of data showed that all the treatments are significantly recorded highest marketable yield compared to control. However, significant in recording highest marketable yield was observed in Carbofuran (T<sub>3</sub>), when compared to all other treatments.

The treatments results supported by Kulkarni *et al.* (2015) [5] also reported that carbofuran 3G applied treatment registered highest grain yield (95.22q/ha). Singh *et al.* (2014) [13] also found that the maximum C:B ratio was obtained in plot treated with furadan (carbofuran 3G). similarly Radha *et al.* (2006) [9] also reported that in granular insecticides carbofuran 3G was found to be superior in their efficacy against *C.partellus*.

Bhatt and Baba (2007) [2] reported that the treatments of imidacloprid and cypermethrin 10EC recorded the highest yield of 40.00 and 37.16q/ha.

**Table 1:** To evaluate the seven chemical insecticides in the management of maize stem borer *Chilo partillus* (Swinhoe).

S. No.	Treatments	Per cent infestation				
		1 DBS	3 DAS	7 DAS	14 DAS	Mean
T <sub>1</sub>	Indoxacarb 14.5SC	22.72	17.32	14.24	11.78	14.44
		(29.76)	(26.15)	(22.91)	(23.20)	(28.15)
T <sub>2</sub>	Fipronil 0.3G	22.92	15.87	13.19	11.08	13.38
		(30.02)	(25.07)	(20.74)	(28.65)	(23.01)
T <sub>3</sub>	Carbofuron 3G	23.12	12.72	7.24	3.14	7.70
		(30.51)	(20.98)	(13.10)	(9.79)	(15.01)
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap 3G	22.62	19.26	14.57	12.29	15.37
		(30.08)	(29.08)	(23.94)	(21.99)	(27.51)
T <sub>5</sub>	Cypermethrin 10%EC	22.69	13.84	9.30	6.44	9.86
		(30.40)	(20.06)	(17.20)	(17.45)	(20.80)
T <sub>6</sub>	Profenophos 40%EC	23.88	19.94	17.55	15.41	17.63
		(31.52)	(29.67)	(27.55)	(28.81)	(29.61)
T <sub>7</sub>	Imidacloprid 0.3G	22.44	20.19	19.64	18.58	19.47
		(29.62)	(30.10)	(35.15)	(39.20)	(34.85)
T <sub>0</sub>	Control	22.87	24.57	26.49	29.65	26.90
		(30.18)	(36.60)	(39.47)	(57.81)	(48.15)
Overall Mean		22.90	17.96	15.27	13.54	15.59
F- test		NS	S	S	S	S
S. Ed.(±)		1.49	0.27	0.33	0.23	0.11
C. D. (P = 0.05)		3.16	0.57	0.63	0.47	0.34

**Table 2:** Economics of Cultivation:

Sr. No	Treatment	Yield q/ha	Cost of yield Rs/q	Total cost of yield in Rs	Common cost in Rs	Treat ment cost in Rs	Total cost in Rs	C:B ratio
T <sub>1</sub>	Indoxacarb 14.5SC	34.79	1500	52185	31835	930	32765	1:1.59
T <sub>2</sub>	Fipronil 0.3%G	37.44	1500	56160	31835	1200	33035	1:1.70
T <sub>3</sub>	Carbofuron 3G	42.72	1500	64080	31835	1700	33535	1:1.91
T <sub>4</sub>	Cartap 3G	31.68	1500	47520	31835	1795	33630	1:1.41
T <sub>5</sub>	Cypermethrin 10% EC	40.80	1500	61200	31835	630	32465	1:1.88
T <sub>6</sub>	Profenofos 40%EC	28.54	1500	42810	31835	575	32410	1:1.32
T <sub>7</sub>	Imidacloprid 0.3G	26.49	1500	39735	31835	1100	32935	1:1.20
T <sub>0</sub>	Untreated/Control	23.57	1500	35355	31835	-	31835	1:1.11

## References

1. Ahmed S, Anjum S, Naeem M, Ashraf MY. Determination of Efficacy of Cypermethrin, Regent and Carbofuran against *Chilo partellus* Swin. and Biochemical Changes Following Their Application in Maize Plants. International journal of agriculture & biology, 2003; 5(1):30-35.
2. Bhat ZH, Baba ZA. Efficacy of different insecticides against maize stem borer *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) and maize aphid *rhopalosiphum maidis* (fitch) infesting maize. Journal of Pakistan. Entomology. 2007; 29(2):73-76.
3. Farid A, Khan MIN, Khan A, Khan SU, Khattak A, Sattar A. Studies on Maize Stem Borer, *Chilo partellus* in Peshawar Valley Pakistan Journal of Zoology. 2007; 39(2):127-131.
4. Kumar P, Mahla MK, Ahir KC, Rathore HK. Population dynamics of stem borer, *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) and its interaction with natural enemies in maize the *Bio scan*. 2015; 11(4):2083-2085.
5. Kulkarni S, Mallapur CP, Balikai RA. Bio efficacy of insecticides against maize stem borer Journal of Zoology India. 2015; 18(1):233-236.
6. Mallapur CP, Chouraddi. Bio efficacy of insecticides against stem borer and their phytotoxicity on maize plants. Journal Experimental Zoology India. 2014; 17(1):197-202.
7. Neupane S, Bhandari G, Sharma SD, Yadav S, Subedi S. Management of stem borer (*Chilo partellus* Swinhoe) in maize using conventional pesticides in Chitwan, Nepal. Journal of Maize Research and Development. 2016; 2(1):13-19
8. Pavani T, Maheswari TU, Sekhar JC. Evaluation of efficacy of different insecticides and bioagents against *Sesamia inferens* Walker in maize. European Journal of Zoological Research. 2013; 2(4):98-102.
9. Radha ITS, Madhumathi T, Rao PA, Rao VS. Studies on management of major insect pests on maize with different groups of insecticides. Indian Journal of Plant protection. 2006; 34(2):252-255.
10. Rathore MD. Ecology of common insect pests of Rice. Annual Rev. Entomology. 2001; 13:257-294.
11. Rafiq UA, Sattar S, Ahmad S, Mahmood MM. Overwintering Population of Maize Stem Borer *Chilo partellus* (Swinhoe) at high altitudes of Kashmir. Journal of Biological Science. 2010; 2(1):18-24.
12. Sidar YK, Deole S, Gajbhiye RK, Nirmal A. To evaluate the bio efficacy of granular insecticide molecules against pink stem borer. Journal of entomology and zoology studies. 2017; 5(2):1114-1120.
13. Singh A, Kumar A, Dwivedi A, Mishra PK. Management of stem borer, *Chilo partellus* Swinhoe on maize crop. Progressive Research. 2014; 9(2):284-286.
14. Saleem Z, Iqbal J, Khattak SG, Khan M, Muhammad N, Iqbal Z *et al.* Effect of Different Insecticides Against Maize Stem Borer Infestation at Barani Agricultural Research Station, Kohat, KPK, Pakistan During Kharif International Journal of Life Sciences Research. 2014; 2(1):23-26.