# ASSESSMENT OF INSECTICIDAL ALTERNATION AGAINST ONION THRIPS (THRIPS TABACI LINDEMAN) IN MALWA REGION, MADHYA PRADESH

## S.B. SINGH, S.N. UPADHYAY AND R.K. CHOUDHARY

Department of Agricultural Entomology, RVSKVV, College of Agriculture, Indore, M (M.P.) 452001

Received: July, 2016; Revised accepted: October, 2016

## **ABSTRACT**

The experiment was carried out in rabi season of 2014-15 at experimental farm, College of Agriculture, Indore (M.P.) in randomized block design with eight treatments and 3 replications on onion variety Pusa red. Each treatment was made of two insecticides for their alternate use in each spray with three sprays at 11 days interval. After all the sprays insect population reduction and foliage loss was recorded. Results revealed that the average population reduction of three sprays was maximum in T6- fipronil 5 SC @ 50 g.a.i./ ha and thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 15 g.a.i. / ha (31.25%) followed with T3- imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 15 g.a.i. / ha and beta-cyfluthrin 2.45 SC @ 15 g.a.i. / ha (24.83%) whereas minimum was recorded in T7- spinosad 45%SC @ 73 g.a.i./ha and difenthiouron 50 WG @ 300 g.a.i./ha (18.99%). Further the overall maximum insect population reduction was noted in T6 (69.2%) followed by T3 (62.7%) and lowest in T7 (46.5%). Further the minimum foliage loss was observed in T6 (21.8%) followed by T3 (22.9%), and maximum in T5 (26.1%). The onion bulb yield and cost benefit ratio were highest in T6 (241.66 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 2.23) followed by T3 (233.74 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 1.2.20) whereas it was lowest in T7 (166.66 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 1.45).

Key words: Onion, Thrips tabaci Lindeman, Assessment and Insecticidal alternation

#### INTRODUCTION

Onion thrips, Thrips tabaci Lindeman (Thysanoptera: Thripidae), is a global pest of onion, and the principal vector of Iris yellow spot virus (IYSV) that cause 100% crop losses( Montano et al, 2012). Further onion is the most economically important monocot grasses. The crop suffers severe damage from onion thrips. cosmopolitan а and polyphagous insect pest (Boateng et al., 2014). The pest status of onion thrips can be attributed to its polyphagous nature, high reproductive rate, short generation time, high survival of cryptic (non feeding prepupa and pupa) instars, ability to reproduce without mating (parthenogenesis), ability to transmit plant pathogens, and development of resistance to insecticides (Diaz-Montano et al.,, 2011). Extensive feeding by onion thrips not only results in plant stunting and reduced bulb weight, but it also predisposes onion plants to various fungal and bacterial pathogens and transmits Iris yellow spot virus (IYSV) (Bunyaviridae: Tospovirus), which further exacerbates the damage they cause and can ultimately result in complete crop failure. Owing to the irruptive outbreaks of onion thrips in onion fields, insecticides have been the primary mode to control this pest (Nault and Shelton, 2010). Yet, over-reliance on certain

insecticides in the organophosphate, carbamate, and pyrethroid classes has led to resistance development in populations of onion thrips (Shelton *et al*, 2006). Alternation of insecticides to insure the desired effectiveness against pests is already in tradition. Viewing to the above situations, an experiment was planned to test the insecticides of various group in their alternation.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

The experiment was carried out in randomized block design with eight treatments and 3 replications in rabi season of 2014-15 at experimental farm, College of Agriculture, Indore (M.P.). Onion variety Pusa red was transplanted on 29<sup>th</sup> November, 2014 with 10 cm and 20 cm plant to plant and row to row spacing, respectively. Insecticidal spray was started at the ETL of insect @ 600 litre water/ hectare in net plot size of 4m x 3m with knapsack with a duromist nozzle. Each treatment was made of two insecticides for their alternate use in each spray with three sprays at 11 days interval. The treatments were T<sub>1-</sub> Untreated check, T<sub>2-</sub> dimethoate 30 EC @ 250 g.a.i. /ha. and cypermethrin 25 EC @ 15 g.a.i. /ha, T<sub>3</sub> . imidacloprid 17.8 SL 15 g.a.i. /ha and betacyfluthrin 2.45 SC 15 g.a.i. /ha, T<sub>4-</sub> acetamprid 20 SP @15 g.a.i. /ha and lambda-cyhalothrin 9.5

ZC@15 g.a.i. /ha,  $T_{5-}$  thiacloprid 21.7 SC@ 65 g.a.i. /ha and lambda-cyhalothrin 9.5 ZC @15 g.a.i. /ha, T<sub>6</sub> \_fipronil 5 SC@ 50 g.a.i. /ha and thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 15 g.a.i. /ha, T<sub>7</sub> . spinosad 45%SC @ 73 g.a.i. /ha difenthiuron 50 WG @ 300 g.a.i. /ha and T<sub>8</sub> . triazophos 40 EC@ 250 g.a.i. /ha and deltamethrin 10 EC @ 15 g.a.i. /ha. population was counted one day before and 11 days after each spray from five randomly selected plants of each plot using hand lens. Per cent population reduction was calculated for each spray, averaged for three sprays and finally overall population reduction was calculated based on pretreatment observation and last observation of third and last spray. Per cent leaf infestation was also observed visually from the same five randomly selected plants of each plot during last observation of each spray by observing the vellowing of leaves weathering appearance on plants and averaged. The yield of the onion was recorded in each plot and converted into yield (kg.) per hectare. The cost benefit ratio was also calculated. The data obtained form the observations for each character were tabulated analyzed and statistically.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

After first spray the least thrips population was recorded in fipronil 5 SC @ 50 g.a.i./ ha (16.2) and differed significantly with rest of the treatments (Table 1). The next best treatment was T3- imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 15 g.a.i. /ha (19.2) and found to be at par with T2 dimethoate 30 EC @ 250 g.a.i. /ha (21.06). Remaining treatments exhibited comparatively effectiveness. Similarly the maximum reduction in insect population was recorded in T6 fipronil 5 SC (45.6%) followed by T3 imidacloprid 17.8 SL (36.6 %). In second spray with the alternate insecticidal treatment, minimum population was noted in T6- thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 15 q.a.i. / ha (13.9). The maximum population reduction was noted in T3- beta-cyfluthrin 2.45 SC (26.7%) followed by T6- thiamethoxam 25 WG (14.3%). After third spray, lowest insect population was noted in treatment T6- fipronil 5 SC @ 50 g.a.i./ ha (09.2) and found significantly superior to rest of the treatments. Further, treatment T3imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 15 g.a.i. /ha (11.3) ranked second and found at par with T4acetamprid 20 SP @ 15 g.a.i. /ha (13.5). In relation to population reduction it was again observed highest in T6- fipronil 5 SC (33.8 %) but followed with T4-acetamprid 20 SP (27.8 %). The average population reduction of three sprays revealed that it was maximum in T6 (31.2%) followed with T3 (24.8%) whereas minimum was recorded in T7 (19.0 %). Overall insect population reduction was noted maximum in T6- fipronil 5 SC @ 50 g.a.i./ ha and thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 15 g.a.i. / ha (69.5%) followed with T3- imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 15 g.a.i. /ha and beta-cyfluthrin 2.45 SC @ 15 g.a.i. /ha (62.7%) and T4-acetamprid 20 SP @ 15 g.a.i. /ha and lambda-cyhalothrin 9.5 ZC@ 15 q.a.i. /ha(58.7%), while it was calculated minimum in T7- spinosad 45%SC @ 73 g.a.i./ha and difenthiouron 50 WG @ 300 g.a.i./ha (46.5%). The findings of Singh et al., (2013), Kumar et al., (2013), Krishna Moorthy et al., (2013), Patil et al., (2009) and Reddy et al., (2007) are in the line of agreement as they reported the highest efficacy of fipronil in their studies. Further Reddy et al., (2005), Mandi and Senapati (2009) and Agale et al., (2010) found the most effectiveness of thiamethoxam against chilli thrips in reducing the pest population and supported the present study. Furthermore the results of Sarangi and Panda (2004) showed the effectiveness of thiamethoxam as seedling root dip against chilli thrips (Scirtothrips dorsalis Hood) which is also in support of present investigation.

In present study (Table 2) the foliage loss ranged between 37.7 and 42.9%. It was noted minimum in T6- fipronil 5 SC @ 50 g.a.i./ ha and thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 15 g.a.i. / ha (21.8%) followed with T3- imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 15 g.a.i. /ha and beta-cyfluthrin 2.45 SC @ 15 g.a.i. /ha (22.9%), and maximum in T5- thiacloprid 21.7 SC @ 65 g.a.i./ha and lambda cyhalothrin 9.5 ZC @ 15 g.a.i./ha (26.1%). Montano et al., (2011), Montano et al., (2012) and Boateng et al., (2014) reported similar results. In respect of onion bulb yield and cost benefit ratio, it was noted highest in T6 as 241.66 g ha<sup>-1</sup> and 2.23 followed by T3 as 233.74 g ha-1 and 2.20 whereas it was recorded lowest in T7 as 166.66 g ha<sup>-1</sup> and 1.45. Krishna Moorthy et al., (2013)

Table 1: Effect of treatments on thrips population

| Treatments** | Thrips population           |        |                          |                             |               |                             |               | Average                       | Overall       |
|--------------|-----------------------------|--------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
|              | After 1 <sup>st</sup> spray |        |                          | After 2 <sup>nd</sup> spray |               | After 3 <sup>rd</sup> spray |               | population                    | population    |
|              | Pre-treatment               | 11 DAS | Population reduction (%) | 11 DAS                      | Population    | 11 DAS                      | Population    | reduction (%) of three sprays | reduction (%) |
|              |                             |        |                          | IIDAS                       | reduction (%) | IIIDAS                      | reduction (%) |                               |               |
| T1           | 23.8                        | 29.81  | -                        | 34.81                       | -             | 30.65                       | -             | -                             | _             |
|              | (4.90)*                     | (5.50) |                          | (5.90)                      |               | (5.60)                      |               |                               | -             |
| T2           | 31.92                       | 21.06  | 34.02                    | 18.81                       | 10.68         | 14.72                       | 21.74         | 22.14                         | 53.88         |
|              | (5.70)                      | (4.60) |                          | (4.40)                      |               | (3.90)                      |               |                               |               |
| Т3           | 30.35                       | 19.25  | 36.57                    | 14.11                       | 26.70         | 11.31                       | 19.84         | 27.70                         | 62.73         |
|              | (5.60)                      | (4.40) |                          | (3.80)                      | 20.70         | (3.40)                      |               |                               | 02.73         |
| T4           | 32.82                       | 21.02  | 35.95                    | 18.77                       | 10.70         | 13.54                       | 27.86         | 24.83                         | 58.74         |
|              | (5.80)                      | (4.60) |                          | (4.40)                      |               | (3.70)                      |               |                               |               |
| T5           | 30.63                       | 22.10  | 27.84                    | 19.15                       | 13.34         | 15.16                       | 20.83         | 20.67                         | 50.50         |
|              | (5.60)                      | (4.80) |                          | (4.40)                      |               | (4.00)                      |               |                               |               |
| Т6           | 29.87                       | 16.25  | 45.59                    | 13.92                       | 14.33         | 9.21                        | 33.83         | 31.25                         | 69.16         |
|              | (5.50)                      | (4.10) |                          | (3.80)                      |               | (4.10)                      |               |                               |               |
| Т7           | 31.39                       | 23.28  | 26.83                    | 20.26                       | 12.97         | 16.78                       | 17.17         | 18.99                         | 46.54         |
|              | (5.60)                      | (4.90) |                          | (4.60)                      |               | (4.20)                      |               |                               |               |
| Т8           | 32.25                       | 24.12  | 25.20                    | 20.75                       | 13.97         | 16.10                       | 22.40         | 20.52                         | 50.07         |
|              | (5.70)                      | (5.00) |                          | (4.60)                      |               | (4.10)                      |               |                               | 00.07         |
| S Em±        |                             | 0.08   |                          | 0.09                        |               | 0.10                        |               |                               |               |
| CD (p=0.05)  | NS                          | 0.24   |                          | 0.27                        |               | 0.31                        |               |                               |               |
| CV %         |                             | 6.08   |                          | 7.42                        |               | 8.30                        |               |                               |               |

<sup>\*</sup>The values in parentheses are square root transformed value, DAS = Days after spray

<sup>\*\*</sup>T1- Untreated check, T2 – Dimethoate 30 EC @ 250 g.a.i./ha and Cypermethrin 25 EC @ 15 g.a.i./ha, T3 – Imidacloprid 17.8 SL @ 15 g.a.i./ha and beta-cyfluthrin 2.45 SC @ 15 g.a.i./ha, T4 – Acetamprid 20 SP@ 15 g.a.i. / ha and lambda- cyhalothrin 9.5 ZC@ 15 g.a.i. / ha. T5- Thiacloprid 21.7 SC@ 65 g.a.i / ha and lambda- cyhalothrin 9.5 ZC@ 15 g.a.i. / ha, T6 – Fipronil 5 SC @ 50 g.a.i. / ha and thiamethoxam 25 WG@ 15 g.a.i. / ha, T7 – Spinosad 45 SC @ 73 g.a.i / ha and difenthiouron 50 WG @ 300 g.a.i. / ha, T8 – Trizophos 40 EC @ 250 g.a.i. / ha and deltamethrin 10 EC @ 15 g.a.i. / ha.

Foliage loss Onion Cost Overall foliage After 1<sup>st</sup> spray After 2<sup>nd</sup> spray After 3<sup>rd</sup> spray **Treatments** bulb yield benefit Pre-treatment loss (%) (q ha<sup>-1</sup>) 11 DAS 11 DAS 11 DAS ratio 41.08 45.2 52.47 56.73 51.46 121.80 T1 (39.86)(42.24)(46.42)(48.90)38.60 29.6 24.96 21.55 25.37 177.77 1.57 T2 (32.97)(27.65)(38.41)(29.98)39.70 28.69 23.70 20.58 24.32 233.74 2.20 T3 (39.06)(32.40)(29.12)(26.99)226.80 19.48 24.73 2.08 38.28 30.33 24.38 T4 (38.22)(33.40)(29.60)(26.20)27.13 188.88 42.10 32.29 27.29 21.82 1.66 T5 (40.45)(34.60)(31.50)(27.80)37.66 27.42 25.52 17.85 23.59 241.66 2.23 T6 (37.86)(31.60)(30.35)(24.99)41.33 32.27 26.22 20.09 26.19 195.83 1.68 **T7** (40.1)(34.60)(30.80)(26.63)42.95 26.08 166.66 1.45 30.2 26.95 21.10 T8 (33.30)(31.27)(27.34)(40.9)

1.16

3.29

7.25

1.03

3.09

7.15

Table 2: Effect of treatments on foliage loss due to onion thrips

1.31

3.93

7.15

reported economic yield with the application of fipronil against onion thrips. Patil *et al.*, (2009) against thrips. Sarangi and Panda (2004) recorded with thiamethoxam the better green chilli yield and benefit-cost ratio against chilli thrips, *S. dorsalis*. Moraes *et al.*, (2006) concluded that the thiamethoxam effectively

NS

harvested highest seed cotton yield with higher dosage of fipronil 5% SC @ 800 g/ha applied controlled thrips infesting groundnut and gained higher crop yield. Mehra and Singh (2013) recorded the highest garlic bulb yield with thiamethoxam after imidacloprid.

9.50

28.23

9.83

## **REFERENCES**

S Em±

CD at 5 %

(p=0.05) CV %

Agale, D. A.; Yadav, G. A.; Bhosle, B. B. and Bhede, B. V. (2010) Bioefficacy and economics of insecticides against thrips (*Scritothrips dorsalis* Hood) on Bt cotton. *Indian Journal of Entomology* **72** (1):29-32.

Boateng, C.O.; Schwartz, H.F.; Havey, M.J. and Otto, K. (2014) Evaluation of onion germplasm for resistance to iris yellow spot (*Iris yellow spot virus*) and onion thrips, *Thrips tabaci. Southwestern Entomologist* **39** (2):237-260.

Diaz-Montano J., Fuchs M., Nault B.
A., Fail J., Shelton A. M. (2011) Onion thrips (Thysanoptera: Thripidae): A global pest of increasing concern in onion. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **104**: 1–13.

Krishna Moorthy P. N., Shivaramu K., Krishna Kumar N. K., Ranganath H. R., Saroja S. (2013) Comparative efficacy of neem products, essential oils and synthetic insecticides for the management of onion thrips, *Thrips tabaci*Lindeman. *Pest Manag. Hortic. Ecosyst* 19: 23–26.

Kumar, V.; Dhawan, A. K. and Singh G. (2013) Bioefficacy of fipronil (Jump 80 WG) against *Thrips* tabaci Lindeman on cotton. *Journal of Insect Science* **26** (1):126-129.

Mandi N. and Senapati A. K. (2009) Integration of chemical botanical and microbial insecticides for control of thrips, *Scirtothrips dorsalis* Hood infesting chilli. *The Journal of Plant Protection Sciences* **1** (1): 92-95.

<sup>\*</sup>The values in parentheses are angular transformed (arc sin) values, DAS = Days after spray

- Mehra, K. and Singh, V. (2013) Bioefficacy of new insecticides against *Thrips tabaci* Lindeman on garlic. *Indian Journal of Entomology*. **75** (3):239-241.
- Montano, Diaz J.; Fuchs, M.; Nault, B. A.; Fail, J. and Shelton, A. M. (2011) Onion thrips (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) a global pest of increasing concern in onion. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **104** (1):1-13.
- Montano, Diaz J.; Fuchs, M.; Nault, B. A.; Fail, J. and Shelton, A. M. (2012) Resistance to onion thrips (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) in onion cultivars does not prevent infection by *Iris yellow spot virus* following vector-mediated transmission. *Florida Entomologist* **95** (1):156-161.
- Moraes, A. R. A.; Moraes, S. A.; Lourencao, A. L.; Godoy, I. J. and Martins, A. L. M. (2006) Effect of thiamethoxam application to thrips control on the reduction of peanut scab severity. *Fitopatologia Brasileira*. **31** (2):164-170.
- Patil, S.D.; Chandele, A.G.; Wayal, C.B. and Game, B.C. (2009) Efficacy of different newer chemicals and bio-insecticides against onion thrips in *kharif* season. *International Journal of Plant Protection* **2** (2):227-230.

- Reddy, A. V.; Srihari, G. and Kumar, A. K. (2007) Evaluation of certain new insecticides against chilli thrips (*Scirtothrips dorsalis*) and mites (*Polyphagotarsonemus latus*). *Asian Journal of Horticulture* **2** (2):8-9.
- Reddy, A.V.; Sreehari, G. and Kumar, A.K. (2005) Evaluation of certain new insecticides against chilli thrips (*Scirtothrips dorsalis*) and mites (Polyphagotarsonemus latus). Research on Crops. **6** (3): 625-626.
- Sarangi, P. K. and Panda, P. K. (2004)
  Chemical management of thrips,
  Scirtothrips dorsalis Hood in chilli.
  Journal of Plant Protection and
  Environment 1 (1/2): 15-18.
- Shelton A. M., Zhao J. Z., Nault B. A., Plate J., Musser F. R., Larentzaki E. (2006) Patterns of insecticide resistance in onion thrips (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) in onion fields in New York. Journal of Economic Entomology 99: 1798–1804.
- Singh D.; Shakhawat, R.P.S. and Naruka, I.S.; (2013) Performance of novel insecticides for management of onion thrips (*Thrips tabaci* L.). *Journal of Applied Horticulture* **15** (2):114-116.