Original Research Article

Field Evaluation of Newer Insecticides against Spotted pod borer [Maruca vitrata (Geyer)], on Rice fallow Blackgram in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh

Abstract :

The spotted pod borer, Maruca vitrata (Geyer) is a serious pest of rice fallow blackgram throughout the growth period especially in flowering and pod development stages in North Coastal Andhra Pradesh and management of this pest becomes difficult due to its concealed nature of feeding inside the flowers and pods. The present study was carried out at College farm Agricultural College, Naira during Rabi 2017-18 with different newer insecticides were evaluated for the management of M. vitrata in blackgram on cultivar LBG-752 under rice fallow situations. The results revealed that among all the insecticidal treatments chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6% @ 0.5 ml l^{-1} was found to be very effective by recording 75.91 per cent overall mean reduction in *M. vitrata* larval population with lowest pod damage (7.04%) over control grain yield $(8.31 \text{ g } \text{ha}^{-1})$ (60.58 %) and also recorded highest followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037% and flubendiamide @ 39.35 SC 0.00787% with 72.04 and 67.30 per cent overall reduction in mean larval population of M. vitrata over untreated control. The cost - benefit ratio calculated for all the treatments revealed that chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037% was highly economical with a C: B ratio of 1: 17.14 followed by spinosad 45 SC with 1:15.28.

Keywords: chlorantraniliprole + λ cyhalothrin, chlorantraniliprole, flubendiamide, cost - benefit ratio, management, pod damage, spotted pod borer, blackgram

Introduction:

Blackgram, *Vigna mungo* (L.) Hepper which is commonly called as urdbean is the fourth important pulse crop in India and the second most important crop in Andhra Pradesh in terms of extent of cultivation. It is a short duration, highly remunerative crop. In most parts of the country it is grown traditionally as *kharif* (wet season) crop, but in A.P it is being cultivated mostly in *rabi* (dry) season both in uplands and in rice fallow conditions. Spotted pod borer *Maruca vitrata* has emerged as a major threat in blackgram during the months of Jan- Feb in coastal region of Andhra Pradesh, India (Rangarao *et* *al.*, 2007). Spotted pod borer, *Maruca vitrata* (Geyer) is a major constraint for the production of blackgram at critical stages like flowering and pod formation stages in the Southern Zone districts of Andhra Pradesh (Chandrayudu *et al.*, 2008). Larvae feed the webbed mass of leaves, flowers and pods by remaining inside due to its concealed feeding habit protects the larvae from adverse conditions, natural enemies and even from insecticidal sprays. This typical nature complicates the management strategies of this pest. Chemical insecticides are the only option for the effective management of this internal feeder. Several insecticides have been evaluated against *Maruca* on blackgram (Lakshmi *et al.* 2002, Patil *et al.* 2008, Mahalakshmi *et al.* 2012, Ramu *et al.* 2018). The repeated use of older class chemicals results in development of resistance to insecticides. Now, several novel insecticides with novel mode of action with lower doses are effective against target pests and safe to natural enemies. Keeping in view, the present study was carried out to evaluate of some newer insecticide formulations was tested against *M. vitrata* in rice faloow blackgram in north coastal Andhra Pradesh.

Materials and Methods

A Field experiment was conduced at Agricultural College farm, Naira during *Rabi* 2017-2018 with popularly growing blackgram cultivar LBG - 752 under rice fallow conditions. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design (RBD) with 10 treatments including untreated control in three replications with row spacing of 30 cm and plant to plant spacing of 10 cm in plot size of 20 m². The treatments (insecticide spray) were imposed at 30 and 50 days after sowing. The observations on larval population of *M. vitrata* were recorded at randomly tagged ten plants per replication at one day before the application of treatments as pre treatment count and at 1, 3, 5 and 10 days after spraying as post treatment counts. The pod damage due to *M. vitrata* was identified by presence of circular small holes (Soundararajan and Chitra, 2011). Per cent pod damage in each treatment was computed by counting the total number of damaged pods to the total number of healthy plants. The yield data were also recorded in the plots. The per cent population reduction after each treatment with reference to untreated control can be calculated by using modified Abbot's formula (Fleming and Ratnakaran, 1985).

Per cent population reduction =





Per cent pod damage = $\dots \times 100$

Total no. of pods

Cumulative efficacy of all treatments was worked out from two sprayings. Per cent pod damage was analysed in each treatment at the time of harvest. The documented data were subjected for evaluating the relative efficacy of different treatments over control and transformed into angular or square - root values as per the standard requisites (Gomez and Gomez, 1984).

Results and Discussion

The pooled data of the two sprays indicated that, all the treatments were significantly superior over untreated control in recording higher per cent reduction in mean larval population of *M. vitrata* (**Table 1 & Figure 1**). Among all evaluated insecticides at one day after spraying chlorantraniliprole $9.3\% + \lambda$ cyhalothrin 4.6% @ 0.5 mL L⁻¹ was found to be very effective by recording 45.26 per cent reduction in mean larval population of *M. vitrata* over untreated control and was significantly superior to all other treatments followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037% and flubendiamide 39.35 @ 0.00787 % which were on par with each other with 37.38 and 33.09 per cent reduction in mean larval population of *M. vitrata* over untreated control, respectively. The lowest per cent

reduction over control was recorded by flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.02% (10.66%). Three days after spraying, same trend in the efficacy of insecticides was followed chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6% @ 0.5 mL L⁻¹ being superior to all other insecticides with 90.68 per cent reduction in mean larval population of M. vitrata over untreated control and also followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037 % with 88.00 per cent reduction in mean larval population of M. vitrata over control, while low per cent reduction was recorded in flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.02% (23.61%). Five days after spraying, chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6% (a) 0.5 mL L⁻¹ was significantly superior (93.76%) to rest of the treatments with respect to per cent reduction in mean larval population of M. vitrata over control, followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037% with 91.01 per cent reduction in mean larval population of *M. vitrata* over control, whereas the low per cent reduction among all the treatments were recorded in flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.02% (31.43%). Even at 10 days after spraying, chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6% @ 0.5 mL L⁻¹ (73.96%), chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037% (71.78%) and flubendiamide @ 39.35 SC 0.00787% (69.95%) were found superior and on par with each other. The minimum per cent reduction of mean larval population of M. vitrata over control was recored with thiacloprid 21.7 SC @ 0.0325% (23.86%) and flonicamid 50WG @ 0.02% (20.57%).

The overall efficacy of both the sprays resulted that all the chemical insecticides were effective against the spotted pod borer and the results were statistically significant. Chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6% @ 0.5 mL L⁻¹ was found to be most effective with 75.91 per cent reduction in mean larval population of M. vitrata over control, followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037% and flubendiamide @ 39.35 SC 0.00787% with 72.04 and 67.30 per cent overall reduction in mean larval population of M. vitrata over untreated control. The lowest per cent reduction in mean larval population of *M. vitrata* over control was recorded with thiacloprid 21.7 SC @ 0.0325% was on par with flonicamid 50 WG @ 0.02% with 23.78% and 20.13% over control. The present results are in agreement with the findings of Baskaran et al. (2009) and Jose et al. (2015) against M. vitrata and Helicoverpa armigera by recording 90.21 per cent reduction over control. Haritha (2008), Sambathkur et al. (2015), Jakar et al. (2016) against M. vitrata, Babu et al., (2015) against Thysanoplusia orichalcea in blackgram and Devi and Reddy (2012) and Sachan et al., (2018) against stem borer in paddy. The findings of Patil et al. (2008), Ameta et al. (2011), Dey et al. (2012), Mahalakshmi et al. (2012) and Priyadarshini et al. (2013), Anusha et al. (2014) against

M. vitrata and Kumar *et al.* (2010) against *Helicoverpa armigera* in tomato conforming the outcome of the present study pertaining the efficacy of flubendiammide.

Pod damage and yield

The data on pod damage revealed that lowest pod damage (7.04%) (**Table 1**) was recorded with chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6% @ 0.5 mL L⁻¹ followed by chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037 % (11.55%) . In the untreated control plot, maximum pod damage of 60.58 per cent was recorded. The data on the yield of blackgram in different treatments revealed that maximum yield of 8.31 q ha⁻¹ was obtained from chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6% @ 0.5 mL L⁻¹ followed by chloroantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037 % with 7.25 q ha⁻¹ (**Table 2**). In the control plot lowest yield (2.38 q ha⁻¹) was recorded. The results are in conformity with Basakaran *et al.* (2009) who reported that the maximum yield of seed cotton can be obtained with application of chlorantraniliprole + λ cyhalothrin @ 400 ml ha⁻¹. The highest yield obtained with chlorantraniliprole was also evidenced by Mohanraj *et al.* (2012) and Babu *et al.* (2015).

Cost benefit ratio

It is ratio of the value of yield gain to the cost of treatment. The cost benefit ratios (CBR) among various insecticidal treatments varied between 17.14 and 0.38 (**Table 3 & Figure 2**) Maximum (1:17.14) CBR was recorded with chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (17.14) followed by spinosad 45 SC (15.28) and least cost benefit ratio was recorded with flonicamid 50 WG (0.03). The cost effectiveness of chlorantraniliprole might be due to their lower doses against the pod borer coupled with their low market price these treatments recorded higher cost benefit ratio which was in accordance with Kumar and Sarada (2015).

Hence, it could be concluded that pest *M. vitrata* can be effectively managed with two sparys of chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6% @ 0.5 mL L⁻¹ or chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC @ 0.0037%. The reduction in larval population is more with these chemicals than with other conventional chemicals, and chances of development of insecticide resistance in this pest might be low against these chemicals and could be recommended for farmers for the effective management of *M. vitrata* and enchanced yield of blackgram. As blackgram is short duration crop and within 65 - 75 days the crop

is harvested, it is worth and best option to use such chemicals to manage the legume pod borer.

Conclusions :

The present findings conclude that the new generation insecticides like chlorantraniliprole 9.3% + λ cyhalothrin 4.6%, chlorantraniliprole were found effective against spotted pod borer *M. vitrata* along with an additional yield level in rice fallow blackgram. Further, it was observed that the cost- benefit ratio was also high with chlorantraniliprole and spinosad. Hence, it is suggested that the reduction in larval population is more with these chemicals than with other conventional chemicals, and chances of development of insecticide resistance in this pest might be low against these chemicals. As blackgram is short duration crop and within 65 - 75 days the crop is harvested, it is worth and best option to use such chemicals to manage the legume pod borer.

Table 1: Efficacy of insecticides against spotted pod borer (<i>Maruca vitrata</i>) and mean per	
cent pod damage on blackgram during <i>rabi</i> , 2017-18	

		Per c	ent popul	ation redu	ction over	r control	Mean per
Treatments	РТС	1DAS	3DAS	5 DAS	10	OVERA	cent pod
					DAS	LL	damage
						MEAN	
T ₁ : Thiamethoxam 25WG	45.83	19.45	29.60	36.24	31.87	29.29	36.67
$(0.2g L^{-1})$	(42.99)**	(26.21)	(33.52)	(37.17) ^f	(34.76)	$(32.27)^{\rm f}$	(37.17) ^f
		e	f		d		
T_2 : Thiacloprid 21.7SC (1.5	48.50	13.39	26.44	31.43	23.86	23.78	41.99
mL L^{-1})	(44.14)	(21.56)	(30.98)	(34.14) ^g	(29.00)	(29.67) ^g	(40.11) ^g
		f	g		e		
T ₃ : Flonicamid 50 WG (0.4g L ⁻	49.66	10.66	23.61	25.76	20.57	20.13	46.20
1)	(45.29)	(19.52)	(29.00)	$(30.98)^{h}$	(26.92)	(26.92) ^g	$(43.05)^{h}$
		g	g		e		

T ₄ : Spinosad 45 SC (0.3mL L ⁻	46.49	28.62	69.16	81.83	62.61	60.55	16.32
1)	(43.57)	(32.27)	(56.48)	$(64.52)^{d}$	(52.24)	(51.06 ^{)d}	(23.97) ^c
		с	d		b		
T ₅ : Flubendiamide 39.35 SC	48.17	33.09	79.20	86.96	69.95	67.30	14.52
(0.2 mL L^{-1})	(44.14)	(35.37)	(63.08)	(69.30) ^c	(56.48)	(55.24) ^c	$(22.38)^{c}$
		b	с		а		
T ₆ : Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC	46.99	37.38	88.00	91.01	71.78	72.04	11.55
$(0.2 \text{ mL } \text{L}^{-1})$	(43.57)	(37.76)	(70.18)	$(73.05)^{b}$	(58.37)	(58.37) ^b	$(20.70)^{b}$
		b	b		a		
T ₇ : Acetamiprid 4% + Fipronil	49.49	21.03	25.09	29.62	27.08	25.77	33.40
4 %	(44.71)	(27.63)	(30.33)	(33.52) ^g	(31.63)	(30.98 ^{)f}	(35.37) ^e
(2 mL L ⁻¹)		d	g		d		
T ₈ : Flubendiamide19.9 %+	49.99	26.32	60.70	71.84	53.40	52.06	22.82
Thiachloprid 19.9 % (1 mL L ⁻	(45.29)	$(3.98)^{d}$	(51.08)	(58.37) ^e	(47.01)	$(47.01)^{\rm e}$	$(29.00)^{d}$
1)			е	\sim	с		
T ₉ : Chlorantraniliprole 9.3% +	48.16	45.26	90.68	93.76	73.96	75.91	7.06
λ Cyhalothrin 4.6% (0. mL L ⁻	(44.14)	(42.42)	(73.05)	$(76.44)^{a}$	(59.56)	$(61.00)^{a}$	$(15.89)^{a}$
1)		a	a		а		
T ₁₀ : Untreated check	50.33	0.00		0.00	0.00		60.58
	(50.33)		0.00			0.00	(51.06) ⁱ
F test	NS	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.
SEm <u>+</u>		1.03	0.81	1.0	1.09	0.98	1.12
CD (p= 0.05)		3.07	2.40	2.97	3.24	2.92	3.341

PTC = Pre Treatment count DAS= Day After Spraying Sign= Significant NS = Non

Significant

Figures in Parentheses are ** Arc sin Transformed Values

 Table 2: Influence of insecticidal sprays on blackgram yield during rabi, 2017-18

	Yield					
Treatments	Kg/Plot	Kg/ha	Per cent			
			increase			
			over			
			control			

T_1 : Thiamethoxam 25WG (0.2g l ⁻¹)	0.62	311.67	41.06
T_2 : Thiacloprid 21.7SC (1.5ml l ⁻¹)	0.55	273.33	23.84
T_3 : Flonicamid 50 WG (0.4g l ⁻¹)	0.57	286.66	30.27
T_4 : Spinosad 45 SC (0.3ml l ⁻¹)	0.80	401.66	82.40
T_5 : Flubendiamide 39.35 SC (0.2ml l ⁻¹)	0.91	453.33	104.93
T_6 : Chlorantraniliprole 18.5 SC (0.2 ml l ⁻¹)	1.45	725.00	228.7
T_7 : Acetamiprid 4% + Fipronil 4 % (2 ml l ⁻¹)	0.60	300.00	36.01
T ₈ : Flubendiamide19.9 %+ Thiachloprid 19.9	0.69	345.00	56.80
%			
(1ml l ⁻¹)			
T_9 : Chlorantraniliprole9.3%+ λ Cyhalothrin	1.66	831.67	275.18
$4.6\% (0.5 \text{ml } l^{-1})$		\sim	
T ₁₀ : Untreated check	0.44	221.67	0.00
F test	Sig .	Sig .	Sig.
SEm <u>+</u>	0.03	18.92	7.24
CD (p= 0.05)	0.11	56.21	21.52

Table 3: Influence of insecticidal sprays on blackgram yield and their Cost Benefit Ratio during rabi, 2017-18

	Dos	Cost	Cost	Y	lield	Inco	Labour	Total	Ne	C:B
Treatments	a-ge L/	of the insecti	Rs L/kg		Additio nal	me Rs.	costs Rs.	Cost of plant	t pr	Rati 0
	kg ha ⁻¹	Rs.	па	q/na	Yield/h			on	Rs.	
		/kg			a			Rs. Ha		
T ₁ : Thiamethoxam 25WG	0.1k	3000	300.					800.00	35	
	g		00						20.	
$(0.2g l^{-1})$	ha ⁻¹			3.11	0.80	4320	500		00	4.06
T ₂ : Thiacloprid 21.7SC	0.75	2840	21,3					2630.00	17	
	l ha ⁻		0.00						8.0	0.06
$(1.5 \text{ml } l^{-1})$	1			2.73	0.52	2808	500		0	
T ₃ : Flonicamid 50 WG	0.2k	10200	2040					2540.00	97	0.38
$(0.4g l^{-1})$	g		.00	2.86	0.65	3510	500		0.0	0.50

	ha ⁻¹								0	
T ₄ : Spinosad 45 SC (0.3ml	0.15	2357	353.					853.55	88	15.2
1^{-1})	1 ha ⁻		55						99.	0
	1			4.01	1.80	9720	500		45	0
T ₅ : Flubendiamide 39.35	0.11									
SC	ha ⁻¹	20000	2200					2700		
						12,52			98	3.64
$(0.2 \text{ml } l^{-1})$				4.53	2.32	8	500		28	
T ₆ : Chlorantraniliprole 18.5	0.11	10000	1000						25	
SC	ha ⁻¹		.00					1500.00	71	17.1
(0.2						27 21			60	4
ml l ⁻¹)				7 25	5 04	6	500		0.0	
T ₇ · Acetamiprid 4%	1	1660	1660	,0				2160.00	21	
+ Fipronil 4 % $(2 \text{ ml } 1^{-1})$	lha ⁻¹	1000	00						06	0.97
				3.00	0.79	4266	500		00	5
T ₈ : Flubendiamide19.9 %				\bigcirc					40	
+ Thiachloprid 19.9 % (1ml	0.51	11,590	5795					6295.00	1.0	
l ⁻¹)	ha ⁻¹		.00	3.45	1.24	6696	500		0	0.06
T9:									29	
Chlorantraniliprole9.3%+λ	0.25	10625	2656					3156.25	78	
Cyhalothrin 4.6% $(0.5 \text{ml } \text{l}^{-1})$	l ha ⁻		.25						3.7	9.43
	1			8.31	6.1	32940	500		5	
T ₁₀ : Untreated check										
)-	-	-	2.21	-	-	-	-		
		I	I	I	I	1	I	1	1	



Figure 1. Cumulative efficacy of two sprays against spotted pod borer (*M. vitrata*) and per cent pod damage on blackgram during *rabi*, 2017-2018





Figure 2. Effect of different insecticides in increasing the yield of blackgram and C: B ratio

REFRENCES

Ameta, O. P., Sharma ,U. S and Jeengar, K. L. Efficacy of flubendiamide 480 SC against podborers, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) and *Maruca testulalis* (Geyer) in pigeonpea. Indain Journal of Entomology . 2011. 73 (3) : 191-195.

Anusha, Ch., Balikai, R. A. and Pati, I R. H. Management of cowpea pests through newer and conventional insecticides. International Journal of Agricultural and Statistics Sciences 2014. 10(1): 157-160.

Babu ,S. R., Dudwal, G. R. and Meena, P. K. Filed efficacy of newer insecticide molecules against green semilooper, *Thysanoplusia orichalcea* in blackgram. Indian Journal of Plant Protection. 2015.43(3) : 273-275.

Baskaran, M. R. K., Rajavel, D. S., Suresh, K., Jayaraj, J. and Palanisamy, N. Efficacy of ampligo 150 ZC (chlorantarniliprole 9.6% + lambda cyhalothrin 4.6%) against bollworm complex in cotton. Pestology. 2012.36 (6) : 55-58.

Chandrayadu, E., Srinivasan, S. and Venugopala Rao, N. Evaluation of certain new insecticides against spotted podborer, *M. Vitrata* (Geyer) on cowpea(*Vigna ungiculata* (L) Walp). Current Biotica. 2008. 2(2): 240-243.

Devi, R.S. and Reddy, A. V. Bio- efficacy of combination formulation of chlorantraniliprole + thiamethoxam (Syn 15645) 40 WG against yellow stem borer in paddy. The Andhra Agricultural Journal. 2012. 59(3) : 440-443.

Dey, P. K., Chakarborty, G. and Somchoudhry, A. KEvaluation of flubendiamide 480 SC against lepidopteran pod borers of pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan (L) Millsp.). Journal of Inter academicia . 2012. 16 : 857-862.

Flemming, R., and Ratnakaran, A. Evaluation of single treatment data using Abotts's formula with refrence to insects. Indian Journal of Economic Zoology. 1985.78 : 1179-1181

Gomez, A. K., and Gomez, A. A. 1984. Statistical procedures for agricultural research, Singapore: JohnWileyand Sons, Inc.

Haritha, B. Biology and management of Maruca vitrata (Geyer) in pigeonpea *M.Sc.(Ag.) Thseis*, submitted to Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Rajendranagar Hyderabad. 2008.

Jakhar, B. L., Kumar, S., and Ravindrababu, Y. Efficacy of different newer insecticides againstlegume pod borer, *Maruca vitrata* (Geyer) on pigeonpea. Research on Crops. 2016.17(1): 134-136.

Jose, F. J. G., Andre, L. F. L., and Crebio, J. Field efficacy of chemical pesticides against Marucavitrata Fabricius (Lepidoptera : Crambide) infesting soybean in Brazil. 2015. American Journal of Plant Sciences 6:537-544.

Kumar., G.V.S, and Sarada, O. Field efficacy and economics of some new insecticide molecules against lepidopteran caterpillars in chickpea. Current Biotica. 2015.9(2): 153-158

Kumar, B. V., Kumaran, N., Kubendran, D., and Kuttalam, S. Combination of flubendiamide + thiacoprid 480 SC (RM) against bollworms and sucking peats of cotton. Madras Agricultural Journal. 2010.97 (4-6):157-160.

Lakshmi, P. S. R., Sekhar, P. R. and Rao, V. R. S. Bio efficacy of certain insecticides against spotted pod borer on urdbean. Indian Journal of Pulses Research. 2002. 15: 201-202.

Mahalakshmi, M. S., Ramarao, C. V. and Koteswararao, Y. Efficacy of certain newer insecticidesagainst legume pod borer, *Maruca vitrata* in urdbean. Indian Jo0urnal of Plant Protection. 2012.40(2) : 115-117.

Mahapatra, S. D., and Srivastava, C. P. Bioefficacy of chemical and bio rational insecticides against incidence of legume pod borer, Maruca vitrata (Geyer) in short duration pigeonpea. Indian Journal of Plant Protection. 2000. 30 : 22-25.

Mohanraj ,A., Bharathi, K. and Rajavel ,D. S. Evaluation of chlorantraniliprole 20% SC against pests of blackgram. Pestology. 2012. 36(4) : 39-43.

Patil, S. K., Deshmukh, G. P. and Patil, J. V. Efficacy of flubendiamide 480 SC against podborersin blackgram. Pestology. 2008. 32(9): 20-22.

Priyadarshini, G., Narendraredy, C. and Jadishwar Reddy, D. Bio- efficacy of selective insecticides against lepidopteran pod borers in pigeonpea. Indian Journal of Plant Protection. 2013.41(1):6-10.

Ramu, P. S., Swathi, K. and Rao, S. G. A review on seasonal incidence and insecticidal management of spotted pod borer *Maruca vitrata* (Geyer) with special reference to urdbaen in India. Journal of Entomology and Zoology studies. 2018.6(4): 926-931.

Rangarao, G. V., Ashwini Kumar, P. R., Rameswar Rao . and Reddy ,Y. V. R. Evaluation ofspinosadand indoxacarb for the managenet of legume pod borer *Maruca vitrata* (Geyer) in pigeonpea. Journal of Food Legumes. 2007.20 : 126-127.

Sachan, S. K., Kashyap, A. K., Sharma, R., Verma, K. D. and Singh, H. R. Efficacy of somenovelinsecticides against yellow stem borer, *Scirpophaga incertulus* (Walker) in Basmati rice. Journal of Pharmacology and Phytochemistry 2018. SPI: 195-197.Pp.

Sahoo, B. K., and Senapati, B. Natural enemies of pod borers in pigeonpea. International Chickpea and Pigeonpea Newsletter. 2002.7 : 57-59.

Sambathkumar, S., Durairaj, C., Ganapathy, N. and Mohan Kumar, S. Filed evaluation of newer insecticide molecules and botanicals against pod borers of redgram. Legume Research. 2015. 38(2): 260-267.

Soundararajan, R. P. and Chitra, N. Effect of bioinoculants on sucking pests and pod borer complexin urdbean. Journal of Bio pesticides. 2011.4 : 7-11.