Agric. Res. J. Keraia, 1983, 21 (I), 21-26

# CONTROL OF HELOPELTIS ANTONII SIGNORET INFESTING CASHEW USING DUSTING POWDER FORMULATIONS OF SOME COMMON INSECTICIDES

G. Madhavan Nair and C. C. Abraham<sup>1</sup>

College of Horticulture, Vellanikkara 680 654, Kerala.

The mirid bug *Helopeltis antonii* Signoret (Heteroptera: Miridae) is the most serious pest of cashew in Kerala, causing blossom blight and shoot damage. Abraham (1958) estimated the average damage due to pest infestation at 25% for shoots, 30% for panicles and 15% for tender nuts.

Damodaran and Nair (1969) reported that two sprayings of DDT 0.2%, carbaryl 0.1%, endrin 0.03% or dieldrin 0.05% at fifteen day's intervals commencing soon after the manifestation of the initial symptoms, were effective in controlling *H. antonii.* Insecticidal trials carried out at the Central Plantation Crops Research Institute. Kasargod revealed that endosulfan 0.05% applied as high volume spray or 0.1% as low volume spray at the periods of emergence of new flushes and panicles and at the time of fruit-set initiation was effective in controlling the pest (Pillai and Abraham, 1975).

Traditional cashew plantations in Kerala are mostly situated in hilly terrains. Acute water scarcity is experienced in such plantations during December-February and this is an important limiting factor in conducting spraying operations against the pest. The present experiment was therefore undertaken to evaluate the relative efficiency of dusting powder formulations of some of the commonly available insecticides in controlling *H. antonii*.

## **Materials and Methods**

The field experiment was conducted at a Cashew Research Station. Madakkathara, Trichur during the period from October-February in 78-79, 80-81 and 81-82 adopting the randomised block design. There were six treatments including control (Table 1) each being replicated four times. Five year old seedling trees were selected at random for the experiment and a single tree constituted one treatment. Dusting powder formulations of the insecticides were applied using rotary duster by directing the discharge nozzle towards the canopy. Five hundred grammes of the dusting powder formulations were used for each tree.

The first round of **dusting** was given in October at the time of emergence of new flushes and the second round in the third week of November, synchronising with the flowering phase. The last round of **dusting** was given in the first week of January at the time of fruit-set initiation.

Twenty number of healthy shoots were selected at random from all segments of the canopy-spread, immediately prior to the first round of dusting and

the extent of shoot damage after dusting was registered a fortnight later on a 0-4 scale as per the following norms:

- 0 No lesion/streak
- 1 : One necrotic lesion
- 2 : Two coalescing or non-coalescing lesions/streaks
  - 3 Three coalescing or non-coalescing lesions/streaks
    - 4 Lesions/streaks more than three and often confluent

For secondary panicle damage, twenty panicles were randomly selected from all sectors of the canopy-spread and the damage ratings were also recorded on a 0-4 scale based on the above norms.

The weighted mean scores from each treatment were analysed separately.

## **Results and Discussion**

During the year 1978–79, the dusting powder formulations of carbaryl and phosalone were equally effective (Table 1) and superior to control and mercaptothion in reducing the shoot damage caused by *H. antonii*. But all the DP formulations were found to be ineffective in reducing damage to freshly emerged panicles and also to panicles beyond fruit-set initiation.

During the year 1980-81 (Table 2) phosalone, carbaryl and BHC were found to be on par and superior to mercaptothion and control in reducing shoot damage by the pest. As in the year 1978-79 no significant results were obtained in controlling panicle damage at the stage of panicle emergence and fruit-set initiation.

During the year 1981-82, the experiment was not found to be significant with regard to shoot damage and panicle damage beyond fruit-set inititiation (Table 3) whereas the insecticides were found to be effective in reducing damage to freshly emerged panicles.

Analysis of pooled data (Table 4) revealed that the insecticides as dust formulations were effective only in controlling the shoot damage by *H. antonii.* They were ineffective in controlling damage to the panicles at emergence and also beyond fruit-set initiation. In respect of control of shoot damage, phosalone and carbaryl were found to be equally effective and superior to mercaptothion.

it has been reported that the populations of *H. antonii* show progressive increase. commencing from September—October to February—March (Ambika and Abraham, 1979), The effectiveness of dust formulations in reducing shoot damage is perhaps explicable on the basis of the relatively low level of population of the pest at the time of emergence of fresh shoots. But during the flowering and fruit-set initiation stages the population of the insect would have increased considerably

## Table 1

Relative efficiency of dusting powder formulation of some common insecticides in controlling *H. antonii* infesting cashew, 78-79

| Treatments (               | Shoot damage<br>mean score values) | Panicle damage<br>(mean score values) |                             |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                            |                                    | Freshly emerged<br>panicles           | Beyond fruit-set initiation |
| Phosalone (Zolone 4%)      | 1.434                              | 2.675                                 | 3 300                       |
| BHC (BHC 10%)              | 1.900                              | 2.962                                 | 3.425                       |
| Mercaptothion (Cythion 109 | %) 2.325                           | 3.212                                 | 3.687                       |
| Quinalphos (Ekalux 4%)     | 1.832                              | 2.775                                 | 3.337                       |
| Carbaryl (Sevin 10%)       | 1.280                              | 2 587                                 | 3.337                       |
| Control                    | 2.175                              | 3.037                                 | 3.675                       |
| C D (0.05)                 | 0.46S                              | NS                                    | NS                          |

NS — Not significant

Table 2

Relative efficiency of DP formulation of some common insecticides in controlling *H, antonii* infesting cashew, 80-81

| Treatments                | Shoot damage<br>(mean score value |       | Panicle damage<br>s) (mean score values) |                                |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--|--------------------------------|
|                           |                                   |       | Freshly emerged panicles                 | Beyond fruit-set<br>initiaticn |
| Phosalone (Zolone 4%)     |                                   | 1.512 | 1.737                                    | 2.037                          |
| BHC(BHC10%)               |                                   | 1.575 | 1.600                                    | 2.175                          |
| Mercaptothion (Cythion 10 | %)                                | 1.875 | 2.025                                    | 2 550                          |
| Quinalphos (Ekalux 4%)    |                                   | 1.775 | 1.962                                    | 2,437                          |
| Carbaryl (Sevin 10%)      |                                   | 1.562 | 1.550                                    | 2.100                          |
| Control                   |                                   | 2.275 | 2.162                                    | 2675                           |
| CD (0.05)                 |                                   | 0.269 | NS                                       | NS                             |

NS = Not significant

Relative efficiency of DP formulations of some common insecticides in controlling H. antonii infesting cashew, 81-82

|                             | Shoot damage<br>(mean score value) | Panicle damage<br>(mean score value) |                                |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Treatments                  |                                    | Freshly emerged panicle              | Beyond fruit-set<br>initiation |
| Phosalone (Zolone 4%)       | 1.600                              | 1.862                                | 2.362                          |
| BHC (BHC 10%)               | 8 712                              | 2.087                                | 2.537                          |
| Mercaptothion (Bythion 10%) | 2.112                              | 2.325                                | 2.825                          |
| Quinalphos (Ekalux 10%)     | 1.637                              | 1.937                                | 2475                           |
| Carbaryl (Sevin 10%)        | 1.875                              | 1.900                                | 2.512                          |
| Control                     | 2.600                              | 2 812                                | 3.487                          |
| C. D. (0.05)                | NS                                 | 0.766                                | NS                             |
|                             |                                    |                                      |                                |

NS = Not. significant

## Table 4

Relative efficiency of DP formulation of some common insecticides in controlling *H. antonii* infesting cashew (Mean of pooled data for 78-79, 80-81 and 81-82)

|                             | Shoot damage<br>(mean score values) | Panicle damage<br>(mean score value) |                                |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Treatments                  |                                     | Freshly emerged panicle              | Beyond fruit-set<br>initiation |
| Phosalone (Zolone 4%)       | 1.515                               | 2091                                 | 2.565                          |
| BHC (BHC 10%)               | 1.729                               | 2216                                 | 2.712                          |
| Mercaptothion (Cythion 10%) | 2.104                               | 2.554                                | 3.021                          |
| Quinalphos (Ekalux 10%)     | 1.748                               | 2,225                                | 2,749                          |
| Carbaryl (Sevin 10%)        | 1.572                               | 2.012                                | 2.649                          |
| Control                     | 2.350                               | 2.670                                | 3279                           |
| C. D, (0.05)                | 0.465                               | NS                                   | NS                             |

NS = Not significant

and the dust powder formulations of the insecticides were, therefore, ineffective in controlling large populations of the pest at later stages. The failure of the dust formulations to control panicle damage can also be explained on the basis of the unstatisfactory coverage of floral branches due to strong winds experienced during the period November—January and the consequential drift of insecticidal dust particles.

#### Summary

The relative efficiency of the dusting powder formulations of phosalone (Zolone 4%), BHC (BHC 10%). mercaptothion (Cythion 10%), quinalphos (Ekalux 4%) and carbaryl {Sevin 10%) against *Helopeltis antonii* S. (Heteroptera: Miridae) was evaluated in a field experiment conducted in the Cashew Research Station, Madakkathara, during October—February in 1978–79, 80-81 and 81–82. Three rounds of dusting were given, synchronising with the emergence of flushes, flowering and fruit initiation stages and the intensity of damage was scored on a 0-4 scale based on observations on twenty randomly selected shoots and panicles.

Dusting powder formulations of carbaryl, and phosalone were found equally effective and superior to mercaptothion in reducing shoot damage caused by *H. antonii.* None of the chemicals was effective in reducing damage to freshly emerged panicles and also the floral branches beyond fruit set initiation.

### സംഗ്രഹം

കശുമാവിൻറ ഇളം തളിരുകളേയും പൂങ്കുലകളേയും ബാധിക്കുന്ന തേയിലക്കൊതു കുകളെ (ഹെലോപെൽററിസ് അന്റേറാണി) പൊടിരൂപത്തിലുള്ള കീടനാശിനികയ ഉപയോഗിച്ച് നിയന്ത്രിക്കുന്നതു സംബന്ധിച്ച്, മാടക്കത്ര കശുമാവു ഗവേഷണ കേന്ദ്ര ത്തിൽ 1978–79, 1980–81, 1981-82 എന്ന് വർഷങ്ങളി raft നടത്തിയ പരീക്ഷണങ്ങളിൽ ഫൊസാലോൺ (സോളോൺ), കാർബറിൽ (സെവിൻ) എന്നീ പൊടിമരുന്നുകയ തളിരിടുന്ന സമയത്തെ ബാധ നിയന്ത്രിക്കുന്നതിന് ഫലപ്രദമാണെന്നു കാണുകയുണ്ടായി. എന്നാൽ, പൂങ്കുലകളിലെ കീടബാധ നിയന്ത്രിക്കുന്നതിന് പൊടിരൂപത്തിലുള്ള കീടനാശിനികയ ഒന്നുംതന്നെ ഫലപ്രദമായിക്കണ്ടില്ല.

#### Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to the Associate Dean. College of Horticulture, Vellanikkara and to M/s. K. K. Vidyadharan and P. G. Veeraraghavan, Associate Professors, Cashew Research Station, Madakkathara for the facilities provided and

the **help** rendered in the conduct of the experiment. The statistical analysis of the data was conducted by Sri. V. K. G. Unnithan, Associate Professor of Agricultural Statistics and the authors are grateful to him for this.

## References

- Abraham, E. V. 1958. Pests of cashew (Anacardiumoccidentale L.) in S. India: Indian J. sgric. Sci. 78: 531-534.
- Ambika, B. and Abraham, C. C. 1979. Bio-ecology of *Helopeltis antonii* Signoret (*Miridae: Hemiptera*) infesting cashew trees. *Entomon* 4: 335-342.
- Damodaran, V. K. and Nair, M. P. B. 1969. Studies on the insecticidal control of Helopeltis antonii Sign. on cashew. Agric. Res. J. Kerala 9 28-30.
- Pillai, G. B. and Abraham, V. A. 1975. Tea mosquito—a major menace to cashew. Indian Cashew J. 10 (1): 5–7.