SULFOXAFLOR 24 SC: A NOVEL INSECTICIDE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF PADDY PLANTHOPPERS
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INTRODUCTION

Rice plant hoppers are major pests across the country especially in irrigated rice where intensive rice cropping is being done. Three species of plant hoppers reported on rice are brown planthopper (BPH), *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal), white backed planthopper (WBPH), *Sogatella furcifera* (Horvath) and smaller brown planthopper (SBPH), *Laodelphax striatellus* Fallén. First two of these are of economic importance. Brown planthopper is the most destructive pest of rice in Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu (Chung et al., 1982, Liu et al., 2003).

The plant hoppers suck the plant sap from the phloem vessels through their proboscis. Due to this, plant starts wilting with outer most leaves drying first and then the entire plant dries up - a symptom often called hopper burn (Patcharin, 2011). BPH and WBPH causes huge crop loss in grain yield ranging from 10-70 per cent (Kulshreshtha, 1974) and 35-95 per cent (Sindhu, 1979), respectively. Hence, these two pests combination (BPH & WBPH) have been emerged as the number one pest which limit the rice production in India.

To date, it is well known that pest has developed high resistance to a variety of chemical insecticides including neonicotinoids compounds (Liu et al., 2003). Increases outbreaks and resistance problems in BPH and WBPH has become serious threat in rice production (Wang and Wang, 2007,Balakrishna and Satyanarayana (2013)). These problems therefore urge to search for alternatives to chemical control which are effective and safe to the environment, in this regards present study has been carried to evaluate different dosages of sulfoxaflor insecticides against paddy sucking pests.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment on evaluations of the Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC against paddy sucking insect pests was carried out at Agricultural Research Station, Ganagavati, Karnataka during kharif 2011-12. The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design (RBD) design with 9 treatments replicated thrice. The test product, Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC (supplied by M/s, Dow Agro Sciences India Private Limited) was tested at five different dosages viz., 250,313, 375, 438 and 876 ml/ha for their bio-efficacy and was compared with standard checks viz., Imidacloprid 17.8 SL and Buprofezin 25 SC for the management of sucking pests of paddy (*Oryza sativa* L). Overall the field trials revealed that, Sulfoxaflor 24 SC @ 438 ml/ha emerged as a best and optimum dose as it registered lowest number of brown planthoppers (4.38/hill) and white backed planthoppers (3.39/hill) at 7 days after first and second spray (pooled) and recorded highest yield of 65.30q/ha. Whereas, Imidacloprid 17.8 SL and Buprofezin 25 SC recorded yield of 58.40and 61.20 q/ha respectively. The foregoing studies indicated that all the dosage tested for sucking pests were proved superior over control and the performance of Sulfoxaflor 24 SC @ 438 ml/ha was superior to other dosages in terms of suppression of pest population, relatively safe to predators and harnessing higher yield.
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backed plant hoppers on 10 hills before imposition of the treatment and 3, 5 and 7 days after imposition of treatments at each spray. Observations before and after application of two sprays were averaged for statistical analysis. Data was subjected to square root transformation and applied to statistical analysis as suggested by Gomez and Gomez (1984). Grain yield from each individual plot was converted to hectare basis and computed statistically. Observations were also recorded on number of natural enemies (viz., mirid and spiders on 10 hills).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Observations on pest population were recorded a day before application (DBS), 3 days after application (DAS), 5 DAS and 7 DAS. Natural enemies population and yield was also recorded and presented in table. Efficacy of Sulfoxaflor 24 SC on BPH population

Observations on number of BPH per hill (average of two applications) was non-significant a day before treatment imposition showing uniformity in the incidence of the pests in the experimental plots (Table 1.). The testing insecticide Sulfoxaflor 24 SC both at 876 ml / ha (8.93 and 9.52 BPH /hill) were found to be superior over untreated check (20.54/ hill) and even to the standard check of both Buprofezin 25 SC @ 1000 ml / ha (10.79BPH /hill) and Imidacloprid 17.8 SL (11.36 BPH /hill) at 3 days after first application. The higher dosages of Sulfoxaflor 24 SC excelled statistically over Buprofezin 25 SC and Imidacloprid 17. 8 SL at 5 and 7 days after spray also. The same insecticides at lower dosage were lagged behind over higher dosages but statistically top over standard checks (Table 1).

Efficacy of Sulfoxaflor 24 SC on WBPH population

Average of two sprays also showed same trend. Higher dosages of Sulfoxaflor 24 SC namely 876 ml and 438 ml were on par with each other (5.83 and 6.72 hoppers/hill, respectively) but statistically comparable with standard checks imidacloprid 17.8 SL (7.80/hill) and Buprofezin 25 SC (6.55/hills). All dosages of Sulfoxaflor 24 SC were statistically superior over untreated check. These insecticides maintained their efficacy even at 7 days after of application (Table 1).

Yield

Sulfoxaflor 24 SC @ 876/ha recorded highest yield of 67.80 q/ ha and was at par with Sulfoxaflor 24 SC @ 438 ml / ha (65.30 q/ha) and also with standard check Buprofezin 25 SC (61.20 q/ha). The rest of treatments were statically comparable to higher dosages of Sulfoxaflor 24 SC and also with standard checks (Table 2).

Impact on all natural enemies

Population of natural enemies (spiders and mirid bug) activity was moderately low in all chemical treatments when compared to untreated check (Table 3). Significantly highest number of spiders were found in untreated check (6.80/hill) followed by Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC @ 250ml/ha (3.10/hill). Same trend had followed for mirid bug population also, where significantly highest number was found in untreated check (20.37/hill) followed by Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC @ 250ml/ha (10.54/hill) (Table 2).
Table 2: Impact of Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC on natural enemies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Treatment detail</th>
<th>Dosage(ml/ha)</th>
<th>Spiders /10 hills Mean DBS 7 DAS</th>
<th>Mirid bug / 10 hills Mean DBS 7DAS</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>6.05 (2.64)</td>
<td>3.10 (2.00)</td>
<td>12.47 (3.65) 10.54 (3.39) 63.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>5.70 (2.58)</td>
<td>2.30 (1.81)</td>
<td>12.48 (3.66) 10.17 (3.33) 63.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>5.70 (2.57)</td>
<td>2.10 (1.75)</td>
<td>12.60 (3.68) 9.43 (3.21) 64.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>5.35 (2.48)</td>
<td>1.70 (1.64)</td>
<td>12.70 (3.69) 8.98 (3.13) 65.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sulfoxaflor 24 % SC</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>5.60 (2.54)</td>
<td>1.40 (1.55)</td>
<td>13.30 (3.77) 7.65 (2.92) 67.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Imidacloprid 17.8 SL</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.00 (2.45)</td>
<td>1.20 (1.48)</td>
<td>13.75 (3.82) 6.37 (2.70) 58.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Buprofezin 25 SC</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5.35 (2.52)</td>
<td>1.70 (1.64)</td>
<td>14.00 (3.86) 8.70 (3.10) 61.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Un treated check</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>6.00 (2.65)</td>
<td>6.80 (2.79)</td>
<td>16.30 (4.11) 20.37 (4.62) 38.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.67              11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.23              3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>12.15             11.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in the parenthesis are √x + 1 transferred value

Overall present results are in agreement with findings of Ghosh et al. (2013), who confirmed the superiority of sulfoxaflor 24 % SC compared to other chemicals. In present findings sulfoxaflor and buprofezin performed very good spectrum of action throughout the seasons against BPH and WBPH population and no resurgence phenomenon was noted at all. Sulfoxaflor showed quick knock down in action and restrained to build up the population of BPH to build up the population up to harvesting stage. Buprofezin also performed extremely slow to check the population of both pests inspite of its slow in action. Slow action of buprofezin was also witnessed by Asai et al. (1983). Among the traditional neonicotinoids, imidacloprid showed lower efficacy than sulfoxaflor. The present results on efficacy of novel molecule against paddy plant hoppers has supported by previous reports of BPH control with new molecules of insecticides (cyazypyr-HGW86 @ 120 g. a.i/ha by Venkatreddy, et al., 2012; flonicamide 50 WG @ 150 g.a. i/ha byMisra, 2009b) and reports of WBPH control ( pymetrozine @ 400 g/ha by Muralibaskaran et al. 2009: Misra, 2009a on UPI 206). In the present study, sulfoxaflor was found to be quite safe to nymphs and adults of mirid bug (C. lividipennis) and spiders along with buprofezin. Heinrichs et al. (1984), Krishnaiah et al. (1996), and Hedge and Nidagundi (2009) also observed that buprofezin exhibited good degree of safety to mirid bug, C. lividipennis.

Sulfoxaflor is one of the latest entrances with strong insecticidal activity against sap feeders. It has novel mode of action with high acute toxicity to all hemipteran pests (Galindez, 2010), because of insecticidal symptoms accompanied by discriminative action with quick knock down effect. Sulfoxaflor is very safe to non-target organisms that prove the high selectivity action to hemipteran group of insect pests particularly planthoppers and leafhoppers. Thus, it may be concluded from the present study that the new sulfoxamine insecticide sulfoxaflor 24 % SC @ 438ml/ha may be recommended for the management of paddy sucking insect pest whose efficacy was at par with its higher dose of 876 ml/ha.
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