

International Journal of Biosciences | IJB | ISSN: 2220-6655 (Print) 2222-5234 (Online) http://www.innspub.net Vol. 16, No. 1, p. 308-313, 2020

# **RESEARCH PAPER**

# **OPEN ACCESS**

Screening out effects of plant extracts on management of Sogotella Furcifera in rice

Muhammad Haroon Hulio¹, Naimatullah Leghari², Waqar Ahmed Pahore\*³, Abdul Ghani Lanjar⁴

<sup>1</sup>Department of Entomology, Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto Agricultural College, Dokri, Pakistan <sup>2</sup>Department of Agriculture Engineering, Sindh Agriculture University, Tandojam, Pakistan <sup>3</sup>Department of Soil Science, Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto Agricultural College, Dokri, Pakistan <sup>4</sup>Department of Entomology, Sindh Agriculture University, Tandojam, Pakistan

Key words: Biological management, Field experiment, Population and white backed plant hopper

http://dx.doi.org/10.12692/ijb/16.1.308-313

Article published on January 30, 2020

## Abstract

A field experiment was conducted to screen out possible positive effects of plant extracts on controlling and management of White backed plant hopper *S. Furcifera* in cultivated field. This research study was primarily aimed to determine and explore biological management of *S. Furcifera*. In this study, plant extracts of different nature were used. The study revealed that each kind of plant extracts had significant effects on controlling of population of White backed plant hopper with varying differences. Comparatively, T13-Buprofezin 15% +Acephate 35% WP (1.5g/L) showed most significantly controlled population of *S. Furcifera* that roughly reduced by 85% in all years of experiment. Moreover, in plots treated with Jimsonweed extract (7.5%) also controlled around 50% population followed by Neem Seed Kernel Extract (NSKE) (7.5%) and Seed Kernel Extract (NSKE) (5.0%), where reduction% was recorded by 46% and 45% respectively. However, minimum reduction% was recorded in Euclyptus leaf extract (5.0%) and Custard apple leaf extract (5.0%) that reduced by 18% and 20% respectively. The highest yield production was also achieved in plot where-Buprofezin 15% +Acephate 35% WP (1.5g/L) was used. So, application of plant extracts against *S. Furcifera* can give provide better way in controlling population below injury level.

\* Corresponding Author: Waqar Ahmed Pahore 🖂 Waqar.szabac@gmail.com

### Introduction

Rice, technically known as (Oryza sativa L.) is one of the main cereal growing crop of global world and meeting the food requirement of almost half of the global population (FAO, 2004) and nearly 2.7 billion population of Asian countries are dependent on rice production as a basic source of food (FAO, 1995; PARC, 2003). The rice crop is under threat of many different insect pests that lead to serious yield production damage annually. According to studies that around 100 different insect species attack on rice crop and can impact seriously to average crop productivity (Pathak and Khan, 1994). Among them, plant hoppers such as white backed plant hopper and brown plant hopper are potentially mass devastator in rice crop (Alice P. Sujeetha, 2008). The yield reduction due to these plant hoppers may reach 10 to 90% and around 50% insecticides are only used to control these species in rice fields. Panicle and hardening growth stages of rice crops are critical for attacking of these plant hoppers. Currently, chemically synthetic insecticides are still prominent options to suppress the population of plant hoppers (Mishra, 2006). But after all, continuous indiscriminate use of insecticides is increasing environmental concerns because of their negative impacts on other eco-system mechanisms particularly on host insect and as a result biological control is under threat (Chinnaiah et al., 1998; Anand Prakash et al., 2008). Since last few years, uses of botanical insecticides are getting much attention by researchers and progressive growers to manage insect pests caused by plant hoppers (Isman et al., 2006; Echereobia et al., 2010). Unfortunately, the issues of insect pest have sharply increased in rice production areas that have further intensified over dependence on insecticides as a convenient way to control insect population. On roughly estimation 200 million tons of rice is annually damaged through insect pest and environmental changes (Khan et al., 1991). The botanical pesticides are nature loving and environmental friendly that successfully catch target insect and are biodegradable. In recent years, the use of botanical pesticides and plant extracts for managing and controlling sucking plant insects are getting attention (Sorby et al., 2003). Similarly, the

309 **Hulio** *et al.* 

aim of present study is also linked with environmental friendly management of WBPH in rice field with special focusing on screening out best possible biological parameters in terms of biological produced extracts that may be within ecological system and can give alternate methods to control WBPH rather than over-dependence on insecticides.

## Materials and methods

For this research study, an experiment was carried out in the experimental farm of Rice Research Institute Dokri, District Larkana, Sindh in the season of kharif 2015 and 2016 respectively. This experiment was done through Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with fourteen treatments and three replications spread over 50 acre of field. In this study, potential efficacy of pant extract against the controlling of White Backed Plant Hopper was tried to investigate. The Nursery of IRRI 8 was grown in the last week of June and consequently during last week of July, nursery was transplanted in experimental area while maintaining at hill spacing of 20 x 15cm. The treatments were consisted on: T1-Jimsonweed (Datura) leaf extract (5.0%); T2-Jimsonweed extract (7.5%); T3- Euclyptus leaf extract (5.0%); T4- Euclyptus leaf extract (7.5%); T5- Custard apple leaf extract (5.0%); T6-Custard apple leaf extract (7.5%); T7- Calotropis leaf extract (5.0%); T8-Calotropis leaf extract (7.5%); T9- Neem Seed Kernel Extract (NSKE) (5.0%); T10- Neem Seed Kernel Extract (NSKE) (7.5%); T11- Asafoetida (Heeng) (5.0%); T12- Asafoetida (7.5%); T13- Buprofezin 15% +Acephate 35% WP (1.5g/L) (Standard check) and T14- untreated control. The preparation of Botanical leaf extracts were based on the following manner. Leaves of Jimsonweed, Calotropis, Custard apple and Euclyptus were first gathered and then subsequently chopped into very small pieces. To achieve 5 and 7.5% concentration levels, the chopped leaves 0.5 kg and 0.75 kg of each plant were kept in to 10 liters of water separately and then boiled for 30-50 minutes respectively. Besides, the received concentration of each level of each plant was left for about 2 hours to cool then it was further filtered through muslin cloth. Similarly, to have 5 and 7.5% concentration of Neem Seed Kernel extract (NSKE) and Asafoetida, the

powder of each i.e. NSKE and Asafoetida (0.5 and 0.75kg) was kept 10 liters of water separately in containers and soaked for overnight and thereafter the mixture was filtered through muslin cloth. Finally 10g of detergent powder as adhesive was added to each concentration except mixture of insecticides. The extracts were applied in each replication through napsak hand sprayer when the hopper population was found just crossing the Economic Threshold Level (ETL). During entire cropping season, three sprays at weekly interval were scheduled at the constant rate of 500 liters spray fluid per hectare. Before one day of spray and 7 days after each spray, the efficiency of

plant extracts was monitored by counting hopper population per hill and% Population change of hoppers over control was calculated by using method given by (Flemings and Ratnakaran 1985) formula. Lastly, the grain yield was also described in kg/ha.

% Population change = (1 -PtTPTp/PrTPTp x PrTPCp/PtTPCp) x 100 Where: PtTPTp= Post treatment population in treatment PrTPTp= Pre treatment population in treatment

PrTPCp= Pre treatment population in control

## PtTPCp= Post treatment population in control

### Results

Table 1. Efficacy of certain botanicals and other extracts against plant hoppers.

|                                | Conc. | No. of hoppers/hill |             |           |        |             |           |           |
|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| Treatmonts                     |       | 2015                |             |           |        | 2016        |           |           |
| Treatments                     | (%)   | Before              | After spray | %         | Before | After spray | %         | reduction |
|                                |       | spray               | (7 DAS)     | reduction | spray  | (7 DAS)     | reduction | reduction |
| T1- Jimsonweed leaf extract    | 5     | 40.2                | 17.2        | 43.28     | 56.2   | 24.1        | 43.15     | 43.215    |
| T2- Jimsonweed extract         | 7.5   | 41.2                | 15.9        | 48.84     | 49.52  | 18.5        | 50.48     | 49.66     |
| T3- Euclyptus leaf extract     | 5     | 41.52               | 18.5        | 31.26     | 59.85  | 37          | 18.05     | 24.655    |
| T4- Euclyptus leaf extract     | 7.5   | 34.52               | 15.4        | 40.65     | 48.52  | 25.3        | 30.88     | 35.765    |
| T5- Custard apple leaf extract | 5     | 38.4                | 23.11       | 20.22     | 50.2   | 30          | 20.78     | 20.5      |
| T6- Custard apple leaf extract | 7.5   | 39.5                | 22.9        | 23.15     | 43.5   | 21.4        | 34.79     | 28.97     |
| T7- Calotropis leaf extract    | 5     | 43                  | 20.8        | 35.88     | 50.9   | 29.9        | 22.13     | 29.005    |
| T8- Calotropis leaf extract    | 7.5   | 44.01               | 20.8        | 37.35     | 50.1   | 24.4        | 35.44     | 36.395    |
| T9- Neem Seed Kernel Extract   | 5     | 39.8                | 15.9        | 47.04     | 49.1   | 20.4        | 44.92     | 45.98     |
| T10- Neem Seed Kernel Extract  | 7.5   | 40.1                | 13.5        | 55.37     | 46.52  | 18.7        | 46.71     | 51.04     |
| T11- Asafoetida (Heeng)        | 5     | 38.5                | 24.5        | 15.64     | 49.2   | 27.6        | 25.64     | 20.64     |
| T12- Asafoetida                | 7.5   | 42.5                | 29.7        | 7.22      | 50.9   | 24.2        | 36.98     | 22.1      |
| T13- Buprofezin                | 0.1   | 42.9                | 6.13        | 81.05     | 50.4   | 4.2         | 88.95     | 85        |
| T14- untreated control         |       | 39.5                | 29.8        |           | 41.3   | 60.1        |           |           |
| CD (5%)                        |       | NS                  | 8.19        | 4.11      | NS     | 8.1         | 6.5       | 5.5       |
| S.Em±                          |       |                     | 2.8         | 2.54      |        | 3.01        | 3.4       | 3.1       |

Table 2. Effects of botanical and other plant extracts on yield of rice crop.

| Treatments                             | Cone(%)     | Grain yield (kg/ha) |       |        |  |  |
|--|-------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--|--|
| Treatments                             | Colle.(%) = | 2015                | 2016  | Mean   |  |  |
| T1- Jimsonweed leaf extract            | 5.0         | 4560                | 4087  | 4323.5 |  |  |
| T2- Jimsonweed extract                 | 7.5         | 5280                | 4601  | 4940.5 |  |  |
| T <sub>3</sub> - Euclyptu leaf extract | 5.0         | 4806                | 4120  | 4463   |  |  |
| T4- Euclyptus leaf extract             | 7.5         | 4980                | 4158  | 4569   |  |  |
| T5- Custard apple leaf extract         | 5.0         | 3889                | 4050  | 3969.5 |  |  |
| T6- Custard apple leaf extract         | 7.5         | 4650                | 4087  | 4368.5 |  |  |
| T7- Calotropis leaf extract            | 5.0         | 4741                | 4259  | 4500   |  |  |
| T8- Calotropis leaf extract            | 7.5         | 4803                | 4368  | 4585.5 |  |  |
| T9- Neem Seed Kernel Extract           | 5.0         | 5130                | 4658  | 4894   |  |  |
| T10- Neem Seed Kernel Extract          | 7.5         | 5182                | 4887  | 5034.5 |  |  |
| T11- Asafoetida (Heeng)                | 5.0         | 4152                | 3983  | 4067.5 |  |  |
| T12- Asafoetida                        | 7.5         | 4882                | 4258  | 4570   |  |  |
| T13- Buprofezin                        | 0.1         | 5687                | 5869  | 5778   |  |  |
| T14- untreated control                 |             | 3887                | 3910  | 3898.5 |  |  |
| CD (5%)                                |             | 389.2               | 389.2 | 400.2  |  |  |
| S.Em±                                  |             | 121.9               | 168.2 | 189.3  |  |  |

The Table revealed the combined data of 2015 and 2016 that pertains the percent population change of hoppers in all the treatments. The data indicated that the treatment - T13 Buprofezin 15% +Acephate 35% WP (1.5g/L) was the most effective and significantly reduced hoppers population by 85.00%. The data further revealed that T10-Seed Kernel Extract (NSKE) (7.5%) and T2- Jimson weed extract (7.5%) nonsignificantly reduced hopper population to 51.04 and 49.66 percent, respectively, these were found the best among plant extract. The solutions of leaves extract of Euclyptus, Custard apple, Calotropis and Asafoetida at the rate of 5 and 7.5% concentrations were considered to be inactive against the control of hoppers. However, their efficiency was much better at control (untreated). The plots treated with Buprofezin 15% + Acephate 35% WP (1.5g/L) yielded significantly highest (5778Kg/ha) followed by NSKE and Jimsonweed at 7.5% concentration, which nonsignificantly yielded as (5034.5) and (4940.5) Kg/ha. However, the plots treated with other plant extracts yielded at par with each other, but significantly better than the check plots (control).

## Discussion

In the present experiment showed that the mixture of Buprofezin 15% +Acephate 35% WP (1.5g/L) found the best against the population of white-backed plant hopper on rice crop. It reduced hopper population up to 85.00% and so as the plots treated with the mixture produce highest grain (5778) kg/ha. The results achieved are in agreement with those of (Bhavani and Rao 2005; Ching-Huan Cheng, 1984; Fabellar, Heinrichs, 2003 and Ghosal et al., 2018). The plant extracts of Neem Seed Kernel Extract (NSKE) and Jimsonweed leaves at the rate of 7.5% concentration observed to be effective treatments among botanical extracts against plant hoppers. The previous workers also endorsed the effectiveness of NSKE against plant hoppers in rice, the finding of Sujeetha (2008) showed the confirmation of present results. He mentioned NSKE at 5% against white backed plant hopper was found highly effective in rice. The response of plant hoppers showed trend of shortened life span, extended period of development, minimum growth-index, uneven size and imbalanced

weight of adults. Krishnaiah, and Kalode (1990) reported the response of hopper to Need Seed Kernel Water Extract (NSKWE) as Juvenile hormone mimic activity and reduced population when sprayed at 5000 ppm dose on rice. The growth of plant hoppers was also adversely effected as mentioned by (David 1986; Rajasekaran et al., 1987 and Mohan and Gopalan 1990). Transformation from immature life stage to adult emergence was also affected (Ramraju and Sundarababu, 1989) so as biology of hoppers found unsual (Senthil Nathan et al., 2007). The efficacy of other plant leaf extracts such as Euclyptus, Custard apple, Calotropis and Asafoetida at 5 and 7.5% concentrations were also found to be comparatively better against plant hoppers (Prakash et al., 2008). Rajappan et al. (2000) reported that hopper population declined when NSKE at 5% and jimsonweed leaf extracts were sprayed. (Mariappan et al., 1988) concluded that little mortality in green grass hopper and fewer emergences when pongamia leaf extract was sprayed. Sukumaran et al. (1987) observed that pupal deformity in insect pests of rice crop when the leaf extractwas applied. Mahapatra et al. (2009) mentioned that Vitex leaf extract at 5% concentration gave superior result in suppression of hoppers and leaf folder population. Abbasi et al. (2012) reported that many workers found Calotropi sprocera Aiton (Ak) and Datura alba (Dhatura) the best botanicals against insect pests of store grains. Alim et al. (2017) used root bark of Calotropis gigantea for significant control of larvae and adults of Tribolium castaneum. Shiva Parsia Aref et al. (2016) recommended some essential oils extracted from Eucalyptus floribundi for the management of adults of the Rhyzopertha dominica and Oryzaephilus surinamensis. Sylvia et al. (2017) used leaf extract of C. gigante as deterrent for oviposition and as ovicide against P. pallicornis.

### Conclusion

The attack of sucking insect in rice fields have increased in last decades, particularly in case of White backed plant hopper *S. Furcifera* across Pakistan. As a control measure, many farmers indiscriminately use insecticides to manage insect attack below than serious economic losses. The continuous use of

## Int. J. Biosci.

insecticides has dire consequences on biological resistance and agents, insect causing food contaminations. The present study tried to find out efficiency of botanical and plant extracts against controlling of S. Furcifera in rice field as an effort to minimize insecticide usage and protect biological controlling agents. This research study revealed that botanical and plant extracts have great potential to suppress and manage the population of S. Furcifera below economic injury level. Currently, there is need to raise awareness of local growers about significance of botanical and plant extracts as a bio-insecticide against sucking insect such as S. Furcifera in rice growing areas.

#### Acknowledgements

The first author fully acknowledges the contributions of all authors in organizing, finalizing and writing this research paper.

### References

Alice **RP Sujeetha.** 2008. The biological and behavioral impact of some indigenous plant products on rice white backed plant hopper (WBPH) *Sogatella furcifera* (Horvath) (Homoptera: Delphacidae). Journal of Biopesticides **1(2)**, 193-196.

Alim MA, Song J, Lim UT, Choi JJ, Hossain MA. 2017. Bioassay of plant extracts against *Aleurodicus dispersus* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae). Flor. Ento **100(2)**, 350-357.

**Anand Prakash, Jagadiswari Rao, Nandagopal V.** 2008. Future of botanical pesticides in rice, wheat, pulses and vegetables pest management. Journal of Biopesticides **1(2)**, 154-169.

**Bhavani B, Rao PRM.** 2005. Bioefficacy of certain insecticides against rice plant hoppers Vis-à-Vis Natural enemies under irrigated field condition. Ind. J. Plant Prot **33(1)**, 64-67.

**Chinghuan Cheng.** 1984. Studies on the Integrated control of brown plant hopper, (*Nilaparvatha lugens* Stal) in Taiwan. Paper presented at ROC-JAPAN. In: Seminar on the ecology and control of Brown Plant Hopper, center, Taichang, Taiwan, ROC 13-14. **David PPPMM.** 1986. Effect of slow release nitrogen fertilizers and the foliar spray of neem products on rice pests. Madras Agri. J **73(5)**, 274-277.

**Fabellar LT, Heinrichs EA.** 2003. Relative toxicity of insecticides to rice plant hoppers and their predators. Crop Prot **5(4)**, 254-258.

**Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.** 1995. In: *FAO Quarterly Bulletin of Satatsistics* **8**, 1-2.

**Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.** 2004. The state of food security in the world, FAO, Rome, Italy 30-31 PP.

Khan ZR, Litsinger JA, Barrion AT, Villanueva FFD, Fernandez NJ, Taylo LD. 1999. World bibliography of rice stem borers 1794–1990. International Rice Research Institute, Los Baños

**Krishnaiah NV, Kalode MB.** 1990. Efficacy of selected botanicals against rice insect pests under green house and field conditions. Indian Journal of Plant Protection **18(2)**, 197-205.

**Mishra HP.** 2006. Chemical management of the white backed plant hopper, *Sogatella furcifera* Horvath infesting rice. Indian journal of Entomology **68(4)**, 338-340.

**Mohan K, Gopalan M.** 1990. Studies on the effect of neem products and vegetable oils against major pests of rice and safety to natural enemies. In: National Symposium on problems and prospect of botanical pesticides in Integrated Pest Management 10-11.

**Pakistan Agricultural Research Council.** 2003. Rice production hand book. Balance fertilizer for maximizing economic crop yield. Islamabad 1-67 PP.

Pathak MD, Khan ZR. 1994. Insect pests of rice. IRRI, Manila: 89 P.

**Prakash NJ, Rao Jagadiswari, Nandagopal V.** 2008. Future of botanical pesticides in rice, wheat, pulses and vegetables pest management. J. Biopesti **1(2)**, 154-169.

# Int. J. Biosci.

**Rajappan KC, Ushamalini N, Subramanian, Abdul Kareem.** 2000. Effect of botanicals on the population of Nephotetix virescense, rice Tungro diseases and yield of rice, Phytoparasitica **15(10)**, 15-19

**Rajasekaran B, Jayaraj S, Rghuramman S, Narayanswamy T.** 1987. Use of neem products for the management of certain rice pests and diseases. In: Midterm appraisal Works on Botanical pest control of Rice Based Cropping System **2(1)**, 3-13.

**Ramraju K, Sundarababu PC.** 1989. Effect of plant derivatives on brown plant hopper (BPH) and White backed plant hopper (white backed plant hopper) nymphs.

Senthil-Nathan S, Choi MY, Paik CH, Seo HY, Kim JD, Kang SM. 2007. The toxic effects of neem extract and azadiractin on the brown plant hopper, (*Nilaparvatha lugens* Stal). Chemosphere **6(7)**, 80-88.

**Sorby K, Fleischer G, Pehu E.** 2003. Integrated pest management in development: review of trends and implementation strategies. Agriculture and Rural Development Working paper 5. World Bank, Washington, DC

SukumaranD,KandaswamyC,SrimannarayanaG. 1987.Vitex negundoLinn-potential plant for control of rice pest.In: Proceedings ofAlternatives to Synthetic insecticides 71-74.