

BIO-EFFICACY OF INSECTICIDES AGAINST SUCKING PESTS IN BRINJAL

SHAIKH, A. A.* AND PATEL, J. J.

MAIN VEGETABLE RESEARCH STATION,
ANAND AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY, ANAND – 388 110 GUJARAT, INDIA

*E-mail: baca_arif@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted to study the bio-efficacy of nine different insecticides (triazophos 0.08%, imidacloprid 0.002%, profenophos 0.05%, diafenthiuron 0.05%, clothianidin 0.025%, cartap hydrochloride 0.05%, thiamethoxam 0.025%, thiacloprid 0.012% and spiromesifen 0.024%) against sucking pests viz., jassid and whitefly in brinjal (GBH 1) at Main Vegetable Research Station, Anand Agricultural University, Anand during *rabi* season of 2011-12. Among different insecticides evaluated, thiamethoxam, diafenthiuron and thiacloprid emerged as most effective, profenophos, clothianidin and imidacloprid were mediocre, while cartap hydrochloride, spiromesifen and triazophos found least effective against jassid. So far whitefly is concerned, spiromesifen, diafenthiuron and triazophos emerged as most effective, imidacloprid, profenophos and cartap hydrochloride as mediocre, while clothianidin, thiamethoxam and thiacloprid emerged as least effective. Diafenthiuron exhibited significantly higher brinjal fruit yield (350.57 q/ha), whereas triazophos and cartap hydrochloride hosted significantly lower fruit yield. The minimum and maximum per cent avoidable losses were recorded in diafenthiuron (0.00) and control (55.25), respectively. The highest Net ICBR (71.83) was obtained from the plots treated with profenophos followed by thiacloprid (56.10), cartap hydrochloride (43.93), imidacloprid (39.10) and diafenthiuron (27.69).

KEY WORDS: Bio-efficacy, insecticides, sucking pests, economics, avoidable losses

INTRODUCTION

Brinjal (*Solanum melongena* Linnaeus) is known as a “King of vegetables” originated from India, where a wide range of wild types and land races occurs (Thompson and Kelly, 1957). In world, the production of brinjal is about 4.18 crore metric tonnes (MT). India is the second largest producer of brinjal after China (Anonymous, 2010a). In India, the crop is extensively cultivated in about 5.7 lakh hectares with a production of 96 lakh tonnes. In India, it is cultivated mainly in West Bengal, Orissa, Bihar and Gujarat states. In Gujarat, it is cultivated in 0.65 lakh hectares with an annual production of 11.44 lakh tonnes and a productivity of 17.37 tonnes per hectare (Anonymous, 2010b). Brinjal crop suffers severely due to the attack of various insect pests, which reduces its fruit yield and quality. In India, the crop is damaged by more than 30 insect pests obtaining from nursery stage (Regupathy *et al.*, 1997). Of which shoot and fruit

borer, *Leucinodes orbonalis* Guenee; jassid, *Amrasca biguttula biguttula* (Ishida); whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* Gennadius, aphid, *Aphis gossypii* Glover, mites, *Tetranychus cinnabarinus* Boisduval and epilachna beetle, *Henosepilachna vigintioctopunctata* (Fab.) are the major and important insect pests. Chemical insecticides are used as the frontline defense sources against insect pest in India. However, their indiscriminate and continuous used creates a number of problems. Hence, new insecticides available in the market are needed to evaluate for their efficacy against sucking pests of brinjal. Hence, the present investigation was conducted at Main Vegetable Research Station, Anand Agricultural University, Anand during *rabi* season of 2011-12 to evaluate different insecticides against sucking pests of brinjal.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Brinjal crop was transplanted during second week of September and raised by adopting recommended agronomical practices. Nine different insecticides (triazophos 0.08%, imidacloprid 0.002%, profenophos 0.05%, diafenthiuron 0.05%, clothianidin 0.025%, cartap hydrochloride 0.05%, thiamethoxam 0.025%, thiacloprid 0.012% and spiromesifen 0.024%) were evaluated along with control. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design replicated 3 times in the plot size of 4.2 x 3.6 m with the spacing of 90 x 60 cm. First spray of respective insecticides was given on appearance of sucking pests and subsequent 2 sprays were given at 14 days interval using manually operated Knapsack sprayer with duromist nozzle at a constant pressure of 2.5 kg/cm². Each spray application was given to the extent of slight run off stage. For recording observations, five plants were selected randomly in each net plot area and the observations on sucking pests viz., jassid and whitefly were recorded from three (one from top, middle and bottom) leaves of same selected 5 plants. The observations were made prior to 24 hrs of first spray as well as 3, 7, 10 and 14 days after each spray. The fruit yield was recorded picking wise from each net plot. Thus, the data obtained on population were analyzed after transforming them in to square root, while the fruit yield data were analyzed without any transformation. The data were analyzed periodically (spray wise) as well as pooled over periods over sprays to see the consistency of the treatment performance.

Per cent reduction in sucking pests population was calculated by comparing the pest population obtained from the unprotected plot with the crop protected by different insecticide treatments using following formula.

$$\text{Per cent reduction} = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{X_1} \times 100$$

Where, X_1 = sucking pest population in unprotected plot

X_2 = sucking pest population in protected plot

Per cent loss in yield was calculated by comparing the highest yield obtained from the treatment with different treatments using following formula.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Per cent} \\ \text{avoidable loss} \\ \text{in yield} \end{array} = \frac{\text{Highest yield in treated plot} - \text{yield in treated plot}}{\text{Highest yield in treated plot}} \times 100$$

Economics and Net Insecticidal Cost Benefit Ratio (NICBR) were also worked out by work out by standard procedure.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIN

Evaluation based on jassid population

The data pooled over periods on number of jassid per leaf over sprays presented in Table 1 and also depicted in Figure 1 are discussed hereunder. Among the different insecticides tested, thiamethoxam recorded significantly lower (4.21 jassid per leaf) jassid population after first spray, and it was at par with diafenthiuron (4.56 jassid per leaf), thiacloprid (5.02 jassid per leaf) and profenophos (5.21 jassid per leaf). Diafenthiuron was significantly superior to Triazophos and spiromesifen, but was at par with rest of the insecticides. Triazophos (7.45 jassid per leaf) and spiromesifen (7.91 jassid per leaf) recorded significantly higher jassid population among the insecticides tested and both were at par with each other.




Fig. 1: Efficacy of insecticides against jassid in brinjal

After second spray, thiamethoxam (3.19 jassid per leaf) recorded significantly lower jassid population as compared to cartap hydrochloride, triazophos and spiromesifen, whereas it was at par with diafenthiuron (3.46 jassid per leaf), thiacloprid (3.70 jassid per leaf), profenophos (4.25 jassid per leaf), clothianidin (4.47 jassid per leaf) and imidacloprid (4.88 jassid per leaf). Diafenthiuron (3.46 jassid per leaf) was significantly superior to triazophos (7.34 jassid per leaf) and spiromesifen (7.68 jassid per leaf), but was at par with rest of the insecticides. Later two insecticides recorded significantly higher jassid population among the insecticides tested and both were at par with each other as well as with cartap hydrochloride (5.36 jassid per leaf).

Among the different insecticides evaluated, after third spray thiamethoxam (1.30 jassid per leaf) recorded significantly lower jassid population than rest of the treatments, except diafenthiuron (1.40 jassid per leaf) and thiacloprid (1.93 jassid per leaf) with which it was at par. Diafenthiuron also found significantly effective in reducing the jassid population than rest of the insecticides except thiacloprid with which it was at par. Imidacloprid was at par with

profenophos, clothianidin and cartap hydrochloride. Triazophos (7.06 jassid per leaf) recorded significantly higher jassid population among the insecticides tested but was at par with spiromesifen (6.16 jassid per leaf).

The data on pooled over sprays revealed that thiamethoxam (2.78 jassid per leaf) recorded significantly lower jassid population than rest of the treatments, except diafenthiuron (3.00 jassid per leaf) and thiacloprid (3.42 jassid per leaf), with which it was at par. Diafenthiuron also found significantly effective in reducing the jassid population than rest of the insecticides except thiacloprid (3.42 jassid per leaf) and profenophos (3.95 jassid per leaf), with which it was at par. Imidacloprid (4.74 jassid per leaf) was at par with clothianidin (4.47 jassid per leaf) and profenophos (3.95 jassid per leaf) on one hand and with cartap hydrochloride (5.40 jassid per leaf) on another hand of chronological order of effectiveness. Triazophos (7.28 jassid per leaf) and spiromesifen (7.23 jassid per leaf) recorded significantly higher jassid population among the insecticides tested and both were at par with each other.

The per cent reduction in jassid population over control in different treatments ranged from 12.01 (spiromesifen 0.024%) to 53.17 (thiamethoxam 0.025%) after first spray. During second spray, the per cent reduction was in the range of 22.19 (spiromesifen) and 67.68 (thiamethoxam). However, it was ranged from 32.05 (triazophos 0.08%) to 87.49 (thiamethoxam) after third spray. The data pooled over periods over sprays indicated that the per cent reduction in different treatments ranged between 25.26 (triazophos) and 71.46 (thiamethoxam).

In nut-shell, thiamethoxam 0.025%, diafenthiuron 0.05% and thiacloprid 0.012% recorded significantly lower jassid population emerged as most effective; profenophos 0.05%, clothianidin 0.025% and imidacloprid 0.002% were mediocre, while cartap hydrochloride 0.05% spiromesifen 0.024% and triazophos 0.08% recorded significantly higher jassid population emerged as least effective insecticides for jassid control.

Many research workers have evaluated and reported the bio-efficacy of insecticides against jassid in brinjal. Spray application of thiamethoxam 25 WG @ 37.5 and 50 g a.i./ha effectively reduced jassid population in okra. However, diafenthiuron 50 WP @ 50 and 60 g a.i./ha found effective against jassid in brinjal (Anonymous, 2001a). Sharma and Lai (2002) reported that thiamethoxam was superior against leaf hoppers infesting brinjal. According to Patel *et al.* (2006), diafenthiuron @ 50 and 60 g a.i. /ha found highly effective against jassid infesting brinjal. Pareet and Basavanagoud (2009) found that diafenthiuron (1 g/lit) was the most effective against jassid in brinjal. Thiacloprid 240 SC @ 750 ml/ha recorded significantly lower jassid population after 3 and 7 days of spray in comparison to spinosad, endosulfan and triazophos (Anonymous, 2011).

Evaluation based on whitefly population

The data pooled over periods over sprays on number of whitefly per leaf presented in Table 2 and also depicted in Figure 2 are discussed hereunder. Among the different insecticides

evaluated, spiromesifen recorded significantly lower whitefly population (3.83 whitefly per leaf) as compared to thiacloprid (5.55 whitefly per leaf), cartap hydrochloride (5.75 whitefly per leaf), clothianidin (6.16 whitefly per leaf) and thiamethoxam (6.63 whitefly per leaf), whereas it was at par with diafenthiuron (4.34 whitefly per leaf), triazophos (4.61 whitefly per leaf), imidacloprid (4.98 whitefly per leaf) and profenophos (5.21 whitefly per leaf) after first spray. Triazophos found significantly superior to thiamethoxam, but was at par with all the insecticides. Thiamethoxam recorded significantly higher whitefly population and was at par with clothianidin, cartap hydrochloride, thiacloprid, profenophos and imidacloprid.




Fig. 2: Efficacy of insecticides against whitefly in brinjal

After second spray, spiromesifen (2.00 whitefly per leaf) recorded significantly lower whitefly population as compared to profenophos (3.70 whitefly per leaf), cartap hydrochloride (4.17 whitefly per leaf), clothianidin (4.47 whitefly per leaf), thiamethoxam (4.70 whitefly per leaf) and thiacloprid (4.84 whitefly per leaf), whereas it was at par with diafenthiuron (2.12 whitefly per leaf), triazophos (2.53 whitefly per leaf) and imidacloprid (2.85 whitefly per leaf). Thiacloprid recorded significantly higher whitefly population than spiromesifen, diafenthiuron, triazophos and imidacloprid but was equally effective as thiamethoxam, clothianidin, cartap hydrochloride and profenophos.

Among the different insecticides, spiromesifen (0.80 whitefly per leaf) recorded significantly lower whitefly population than rest of the insecticides, except diafenthiuron (1.04 whitefly per leaf) and triazophos (1.63 whitefly per leaf), with which it was at par after third spray. Imidacloprid was at par with profenophos and thiacloprid on one hand and with triazophos on other hand of chronological order. Thiamethoxam (5.36 whitefly per leaf) recorded significantly higher whitefly population but was at par with clothianidin, cartap hydrochloride and thiacloprid.

The data on pooled over sprays revealed that spiromesifen (2.06 whitefly per leaf) recorded significantly lower whitefly population than rest of the insecticides except diafenthiuron (2.35 whitefly per leaf) and triazophos (2.81 whitefly per leaf), with which it was

at par. Diafenthiuron and triazophos found significantly superior to profenophos, cartap hydrochloride, thiacloprid, clothianidin and thiamethoxam but was at par with each other and also with spiromesifen and imidacloprid. Profenophos was at par with imidacloprid on one hand and with cartap hydrochloride, thiacloprid and clothianidin on other hand of chronological order. Thiamethoxam (5.55 whitefly per leaf) recorded significantly higher whitefly population but was at par with later three insecticides.

The per cent reduction in whitefly population over control in different treatments ranged from 30.14 (thiamethoxam 0.025%) to 59.64 (spiromesifen 0.024%) after first spray. During second spray, the per cent reduction was in the range of 55.96 (thiacloprid 0.012%) and 81.80 (spiromesifen). However, it was ranged from 41.16 (thiamethoxam) to 91.22 (spiromesifen) after third spray. The data pooled over periods over sprays indicated that the per cent reduction in different treatments ranged between 43.77 (thiamethoxam) and 79.13 (spiromesifen).


Overall, spiromesifen 0.024%, diafenthiuron 0.05% and triazophos 0.08% recorded significantly lower whitefly population emerged as most effective; imidacloprid 0.002%, profenophos 0.05% and cartap hydrochloride 0.05% were mediocre, while clothianidin 0.025%, thiamethoxam 0.025% and thiacloprid 0.012% recorded significantly higher whitefly population emerged as least effective insecticides.

Many research workers have been reported the efficacy of various insecticides against whitefly in brinjal. According to Kumar *et al.* (2001), triazophos (0.05%) exerted superior control (75.22%) of whiteflies. Diafenthiuron 0.025% proved effective for controlling whitefly infesting brinjal (Anonymous, 2001b and 2003, and Narangalkar, 2003). Thus, these above reports for the effectiveness of diafenthiuron and triazophos are strongly supported the present findings.

Jarande and Dethe (1994), Singh *et al.* (2001) and Mhaske and Mote (2005) reported the effectiveness of imidacloprid against whitefly in brinjal. However, Singh *et al.* (2003) found profenophos as effective for the control of whitefly. These reports are also tally with the results of present findings as both above insecticides were emerged as mediocre.

Efficacy based on fruit yield

The data on brinjal fruit yield, per cent avoidable losses and economics are presented in Table 3 and depicted in Figure 3. Among the various insecticides, diafenthiuron exhibited significantly higher fruit yield (350.57 q/ha) as compared to imidacloprid (284.72 q/ha), spiromesifen (232.33 q/ha), clothianidin (226.85 q/ha), triazophos (225.05 q/ha) and cartap hydrochloride (224.28 q/ha), whereas it was at par with thiamethoxam (342.34 q/ha), thiacloprid (328.19 q/ha) and profenophos (307.10 q/ha). Imidacloprid (284.72 q/ha) was also at par with thiamethoxam, thiacloprid and profenophos on one hand, while with spiromesifen and clothianidin on other hand of chronological order for brinjal fruit yield. Triazophos and cartap hydrochloride hosted significantly lower fruit yield and both were at par with each other and also with clothianidin and spiromesifen.



The reports of Patel *et al.* (2006) and Anonymous (2001a), who noted that diafenthiuron registered higher brinjal fruit yield. Thiacloprid 240 SC @ 750 ml/ha registered significantly higher fruit yield (Anonymous, 2011). In present investigation also diafenthiuron, thiamethoxam and thiacloprid exhibited higher brinjal fruit yield. Thus, above reports are tally with present results of investigation.

The minimum (0.00) per cent avoidable losses were recorded in diafenthiuron followed by thiamethoxam (2.35), thiacloprid (6.38) and profenophos (12.40). However, the maximum per cent avoidable losses were recorded in control plot (55.25) followed by cartap hydrochloride (36.02), triazophos (35.80) and clothianidin (35.29).

The economics of various insecticides (Table 3) revealed that the highest Net ICBR (71.83) was obtained from the plots treated with profenophos 0.05% followed by thiacloprid 0.012% (56.10), cartap hydrochloride 0.05% (43.93), imidacloprid 0.002% (39.10), diafenthiuron 0.05% (27.69), triazophos 0.08% (23.23) and thiamethoxam 0.025% (22.55). Though, diafenthiuron emerged as most effective against sucking pests as well as also registered higher brinjal fruit yield, the net ICBR was low. It might be due to very high market price of the insecticide. On other hand, cartap hydrochloride emerged as least effective with lower brinjal fruit yield, the Net ICBR was higher, it might be due to very low market price of the insecticide.

CONCLUSION

Among different nine insecticides evaluated for their bio-efficacy against sucking pests infesting brinjal, thiamethoxam, diafenthiuron and thiacloprid emerged as most effective against jassid. However, spiromesifen, diafenthiuron and triazophos emerged as most effective for the control of whitefly. Diafenthiuron exhibited significantly higher brinjal fruit yield. The minimum and maximum per cent avoidable losses were recorded in diafenthiuron and control plot, respectively, whereas the highest Net ICBR was obtained from the plots treated with profenophos.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous (2001a). Final Report of Novartis India Ltd., Mumbai sponsored project on testing the bio-efficacy of Actara 25 WG and Polo 50 WP against pests of okra and brinjal cultivated in middle Gujarat. pp. 18-21.
- Anonymous (2001b). 3rd PPSC Report, held at Junagadh, GAU, Sardar Krushinagar. pp. 22-23
- Anonymous (2003). Final Report of Agrolex (India) Industries, New Delhi sponsored project on bio-efficacy of carbofufan (Master 25 EC) for the control of thrips in chili and insect pest complex in cotton. pp. 22-28.
- Anonymous (2010a). FAO, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brinjal>.
- Anonymous (2010b). Area and Production of Brinjal. Directorate of Agriculture, Gujarat State, Gandhinagar. (www.agri.gujarat.org)
- Anonymous (2011). Final report of Bayer CropScience Ltd., Mumbai sponsored projects on bioefficacy of thiacloprid (Alanto) 240 SC against sucking pests and shoot and fruit borer in brinjal. pp. 22-26.
- Jarande, N. T. and Dethe, M. D. (1994). Effective control of brinjal sucking pests by imidacloprid. *Pl. Prot. Bull. Faridabad*, **46**(2/3): 43-44.
- Kumar, B. A., Rao, B. N. and Sriramulu, M. (2001). Efficacy of some mixed formulations of insecticides against whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* (Gennadius) on brinjal. *J. Res. ANGRAU*, **29**(2/3): 17-21.
- Mhaske, B. M. and Mote, U. N. (2005). Studies on evaluation of new insecticides against brinjal pest complex. *J. Maharashtra Agri. Univ.*, **30**(3): 303-306.
- Narangalkar, A. L. (2003). Population dynamics and management of pest complex of okra [*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.) Moench]. Ph.D. Thesis, Gujarat Agricultural University, Sardar Krushinagar
- Pareet, J. D. and Basavanagoud, K. (2009). Evaluation of bio-pesticides against brinjal shoot and fruit borer and sucking pests. *Ann. Pl. Prot. Sci.*, **17**(2): 463-464.
- Patel, J. J., Patel, B. H., Bhatt, H. V., Maghodia, A. B. And Bhalala, M. K. (2006). Bioefficacy of difenthiuron 50 WP against sucking pests of brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). *Ind. J. Ent.*, **68**(3): 272-273.
- Regupathy, A., Palaniswami, S., Chandramohan, N. and Gupta, K. (1997). Guide on Crop Pests. Sooriya Desk Top, Coimbatore.

-
- Sharma, D. R. and Lai, O. P. (2002). Bio-efficacy of thiomethoxam in comparison to recommended insecticides against leaf hopper and whitefly of brinjal (*Solanum melingena* L.). *J. Ent. Res.*, **26**(3): 257-262.
- Singh, D. Jaglan, R. S. and Chauhan. R. (2003). Field studies on the efficacy of insecticides against brinjal whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci* Genn.). *Annals Bio.*, **19**(1): 109-112.
- Singh, D., Jaglan, R. S. and Singh, D. (2001). Efficacy of seedling root dip method of insecticides against whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci* Genn.) on brinjal. *J. Ent. Res.*, **25**(4): 293-298.
- Thompson, C. H. and Kelly, C. W. (1957). Vegetable Crops. McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc. USA, pp. 501.

Table 1: Efficacy of different insecticides against jassid in brinjal (pooled over periods over sprays)

Treatments	Number of Jassid per Leaf*			
	First Spray	Second Spray	Third Spray	Pooled Over Sprays
1	2	3	4	5
Triazophos 0.08%	2.82 ^c (7.45)[17.13]	2.80 ^{cd} (7.34)[25.63]	2.75 ^f (7.06)[32.05]	2.79 ^f (7.28)[25.26]
Imidacloprid 0.002%	2.44 ^b (5.45)[39.38]	2.32 ^{ab} (4.88)[50.56]	2.10 ^{cd} (3.91)[62.37]	2.29 ^{de} (4.74)[51.33]
Profenophos 0.05%	2.39 ^{ab} (5.21)[42.05]	2.18 ^{ab} (4.25)[56.94]	1.77 ^{bc} (2.63)[74.69]	2.11 ^{bcd} (3.95)[59.45]
Diafenthiuron 0.05%	2.25 ^{ab} (4.56)[49.28]	1.99 ^{ab} (3.46)[64.94]	1.38 ^a (1.40)[86.53]	1.87 ^{ab} (3.00)[69.20]
Clothianidin 0.025%	2.42 ^b (5.36)[40.38]	2.23 ^{ab} (4.47)[54.71]	2.05 ^{cd} (3.70)[64.39]	2.23 ^{cde} (4.47)[54.11]
Cartap hydrochlor.0.05%	2.48 ^b (5.65)[37.15]	2.42 ^{bc} (5.36)[45.69]	2.39 ^{de} (5.21)[49.86]	2.43 ^e (5.40)[44.56]
Thiamethoxam0.025%	2.17 ^a [4.21][53.17]	1.92 ^a (3.19)[67.68]	1.34 ^a (1.30)[87.49]	1.81 ^a (2.78)[71.46]
Thiacloprid 0.012%	2.35 ^{ab} (5.02)[44.16]	2.05 ^{ab} (3.70)[62.51]	1.56 ^{ab} (1.93)[81.42]	1.98 ^{abc} (3.42)[64.89]
Spiromesifen 0.024%	2.90 ^{cd} (7.91)[12.01]	2.86 ^{cd} (7.68)[22.19]	2.58 ^{ef} (6.16)[40.71]	2.78 ^f (7.23)[25.77]
Control (Water spray)	3.08 ^d (8.99)	3.22 ^d (9.87)	3.30 ^g (10.39)	3.20 ^g (9.74)
ANOVA				
S. Em. + Insecticides (I)	0.08	0.15	0.12	0.09
Periods (P)	0.06	0.05	0.08	0.04
Spray (S)	-	-	-	0.03
I x P	0.14	0.16	0.25	0.10
I x S	-	-	-	0.06
I x P x S	-	-	-	0.19
C.D. (5%) Insecticides (I)	0.24	0.44	0.34	0.26
Periods (P)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Spray(S)	-	-	-	0.08
I x P	NS	NS	NS	NS
I x S	-	-	-	0.17
I x P x S	-	-	-	NS
C.V. (%)	9.83	11.20	18.80	14.15

Notes: 1. Treatment means with letter(s) in common are not significant at 5 % level of significance in respective column
2. Figures in parentheses are retransformed values; those outside are $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ *transformed values
3. Figures in [] are per cent reduction over control

Table 2 : Efficacy of different insecticides against whitefly in brinjal (pooled over periods over sprays

Treatments	Number of Whitefly per Leaf*			
	First Spray	Second Spray	Third Spray	Pooled Over Sprays
1	2	3	4	5
Triazophos 0.08%	2.26 ^{abc} (4.61)[51.42]	1.74 ^{ab} (2.53)[76.98]	1.46 ^{ab} (1.63)[82.11]	1.82 ^{ab} (2.81)[71.53]
Imidacloprid 0.002%	2.34 ^{abcd} (4.98)[47.52]	1.83 ^{abc} (2.85)[74.07]	1.77 ^{bc} (2.63)[71.13]	1.98 ^{bc} (3.42)[65.35]
Profenophos 0.05%	2.39 ^{abcd} (5.21)[45.10]	2.05 ^{bcd} (3.70)[66.33]	1.95 ^{cd} (3.30)[63.78]	2.13 ^{cd} (4.04)[59.07]
Diafenthiuron 0.05%	2.20 ^{ab} (4.34)[54.27]	1.62 ^a (2.12)[80.71]	1.24 ^a (1.04)[88.58]	1.69 ^{ab} (2.35)[76.19]
Clothianidin 0.025%	2.58 ^{cd} (6.16)[35.09]	2.23 ^{cd} (4.47)[59.33]	2.23 ^{de} (4.47)[50.93]	2.35 ^{de} (5.02)[49.14]
Cartap hydrochloride 0.05%	2.50 ^{bcd} (5.75)[39.41]	2.16 ^{cd} (4.17)[62.06]	2.18 ^{de} (4.25)[53.35]	2.28 ^{de} (4.70)[52.38]
Thiamethoxam 0.025%	2.67 ^d (6.63)[30.14]	2.28 ^d (4.70)[57.23]	2.42 ^e (5.36)[41.16]	2.46 ^e (5.55)[43.77]
Thiacloprid 0.012%	2.46 ^{bcd} (5.55)[41.52]	2.31 ^d (4.84)[55.96]	2.11 ^{cde} (3.95)[56.64]	2.29 ^{de} (4.74)[51.98]
Spiromesifen 0.024%	2.08 ^a (3.83)[59.64]	1.58 ^a (2.00)[81.80]	1.14 ^a (0.80)[91.22]	1.60 ^a (2.06)[79.13]
Control (Water spray)	3.16 ^e (9.49)	3.39 ^e (10.99)	3.10 ^f (9.11)	3.22 ^f (9.87)
ANOVA				
S. Em. + Insecticides (I)	0.11	0.13	0.13	0.10
Periods (P)	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.03
Spray (S)	-	-	-	0.03
I x P	0.15	0.18	0.22	0.09
I x S	-	-	-	0.06
I x P x S	-	-	-	0.19
C.D. (5%) Insecticides (I)	0.33	0.40	0.38	0.29
Periods (P)	0.13	0.16	NS	0.09
Spray (S)	-	-	-	0.08
I x P	NS	NS	NS	NS
I x S	-	-	-	0.16
I x P x S	-	-	-	NS
C.V. (%)	10.17	14.58	19.53	14.74

Notes: 1. Treatment means with letter(s) in common are not significant at 5 % level of significance in respective column
2. Figures in parentheses are retransformed values; those outside are $\sqrt{X+0.5}$ *transformed values
3. Figures in [] are per cent reduction over control

Table 3: Economics of different insecticides and its impact on brinjal fruit yield

Treatments	Fruit Yield (q/ha)	Avoidable Losses (%)	Net ICBR
Triazophos 0.08%	225.05 ^d	35.80	23.23
Imidacloprid 0.002%	284.72 ^{bc}	18.78	39.10
Profenophos 0.05%	307.10a ^b	12.40	71.83
Difenthiuron 0.05%	350.57 ^a	00.00	27.69
Clothianidin 0.025%	226.85 ^{cd}	35.29	04.26
Cartap hydrochloride 0.05%	224.28 ^d	36.02	43.93
Thiamethoxam 0.025%	342.34 ^{ab}	02.35	22.55
Thiacloprid 0.012%	328.19 ^{ab}	06.38	56.10
Spiromesifen 0.024%	232.33 ^{cd}	33.73	07.75
Control (Water spray)	156.89 ^e	55.25	-
ANOVA			
S. Em. ±	019.81		
C. D. at 5%	058.85		
C. V. %	012.81		

Notes: Treatment means with letter(s) in common are not significant at 5 % level of significance in respective column

[MS received: October 12, 2012]

[MS accepted: December 03, 2012]