## Influence of spacing and non-edible oil cakes on the incidence of rice blue beetle (Leptispa pygmaea)\*

K KARTHIKEYAN1 and SOSAMMA JACOB2

Kerala Agricultural University, Trichur 680 656

Received: 8 May 2008

Key words: Blue beetle, Plant oilcakes, Spacings

Rice blue beetle (*Leptispa pygmaea* Baly) earlier considered as a minor pest (Dale 1994) was reported to cause pest outbreaks and much concern in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) cultivation during both rainy and winter seasons in Kerala, India (Nadarajan 1996). Recently, it has emerged as a serious problem by causing great concern to rice cultivators in the districts of Palakkad, Kannur and Kasargod in Kerala. In this context, an investigation was carried out to assess the role of plant spacing and effect of application of oil cakes for the management of rice blue beetle.

The effect of 3 spacings, viz  $(20 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}, 10 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$  and  $10 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm})$  and 3 types of plant oil cakes, viz neem  $(Azadirachta\ indica\ A.Juss)$ , castor  $(Ricinus\ communis\ L.)$  and pungam  $(Pongamia\ pinnata\ (L.)\ Pierre)\ cakes\ @150\ kg/ha$  on the incidence of  $Leptispa\ pygmaea$  was studied through 2 field experiments during the rainy and winter seasons, 2005-06 at the Regional Agricultural Research Station, Pattambi, Kerala Agricultural University, India. The experiments were laid out in a factorial randomized block design with 9 treatments and 3 replications with the rice  $(Oryza\ sativa)$  variety 'Jyothi'. The combinations of treatments are given below:

T1, neem cake @ 150 kg/ha and 20 cm  $\times$  15 cm spacing; T2, castor cake @ 150 kg/ha and 20 cm  $\times$  15 cm spacing; T3, pungam cake @ 150 kg/ha and 20 cm  $\times$  15 cm spacing; T4, neem cake @ 150 kg/ha and 10 cm  $\times$  15 cm spacing; T5, castor cake @ 150 kg/ha and 10 cm  $\times$  15 cm spacing; T6, pungam cake @ 150 kg/ha and 10 cm  $\times$  15 cm spacing; T7, neem cake @ 150 kg/ha and 10 cm  $\times$  10 cm spacing; T8, castor cake @ 150 kg/ha and 10 cm  $\times$  10 cm spacing and

T9, pungam cake @ 150 kg/ha and  $10 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm}$  spacing

\*Short note

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor (Entomology) (E-mail: profkarthi @yahoo.co.in), Regional Agricultural Research Station, Pattambi 679 306, Kerala, <sup>2</sup>Professor and Head (Entomology) (E-mail: sosxmas54 @yahoo.com), College of Horticulture, Vellanikara, Thrissur 680 656, Kerala.

Field experiments were conduced during rainy and winter seasons, 2005-06, at the Regional Agricultural Research Station, Pattambi, to asses the role of plant spacing and oil cake application in the management of blue beetle (L. pygmaea Baly) in rice (O. sativa L.). Three plant oil cakes, viz neem (A. indica A.Juss), castor (R. communis L.) and pungam (P. pinnata (L.) Pierre) cakes and three spacings were tested .The results showed that closer spacing (10 cm×15 cm and 10 cm × 10 cm) in rice significantly reduced the damage incidence of L. pygmae. Higher damage was observed in the recommended wider spacing of 20 cm × 15 cm. Leaf damage was found to be reduced by 59.02 % in closer spacing of  $10 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm}$  over  $20 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$  spacing. Application of plant oil cakes showed no significant effect on the incidence of L. pygmaea. But the interaction effect of closer spacing (10 cm × 10 cm) with neem cake, castor cake and pungam cake showed significant reduction in the damage of rice blue beetle.

Twenty-two-days old rice seedlings were transplanted @ 2/hill in 21  $\rm m^2$  plots with different spacing as mentioned above. Similarly, different non-edible oil cakes were applied in the plots 7 days after transplanting and each plot was provided with bunds to restrict the movement of water from one plot to the other. The N:P:K were applied @ 70:35:35 kg/ha as per the package of practices. Observations on blue beetle damaged leaves/hill in 10 randomly selected hills/plot were recorded at 10, 20 and 30 days after transplanting. The data were pooled and analyzed statistically by factorial randomized block design and Duncan Multiple Range Test was worked out.

Pooled analysis of rainy (kharif) and winter (rabi) seasons of 2006 results (Table 1) indicated a significant effect of spacing on the incidence of leaf damage by L. pygmaea. At 10 days after transplanting, the leaf damage was 13.05% in 20 cm × 15 cm spacing while it was 5.36% in 10 cm × 10 cm spacing thus showing 59.02% reduction of damage in closer spacing. At 20 days after transplanting, blue beetle damage varied from 6.12 to 13.91 in different spacings. The leaf

Table 1 Effect of spacing on the incidence of *L. pygmaea* (pooled analysis of winter and rainy seasons 2005–06)

Treatment spacin	g Per	Per cent damaged leaves					
	Da	Days after transplanting					
	10	20	30				
20 cm × 15 cm	13.08 (0.37 <sup>b</sup> )	13.91 (0.38 <sup>b</sup> )	9.22 (0.31a)				
$10 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$	9.15 (0.30 <sup>ab</sup> )	$7.46*(0.27^{a})$	9.46 (0.31a)				
$10 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm}$	5.36* (0.23a)	$6.12*(0.24^{a})$	8.16 (0.29a)				

- Figures in parentheses are arc sine transformed values
- Figures followed by different letters are significantly different at P=0.05

damage was significantly reduced in  $10 \times 15$  and  $10 \times 10$  cm spacings resulting in 46.37 and 56% reduction of damage respectively. At 30 days after transplanting, spacing showed no effect on leaf damage probably due to the lower incidence of damage at this stage of the crop. It is thus evident that infestation was significantly higher in wider spacing (20 cm  $\times$  15 cm) than in closer spacing of 10 cm  $\times$  10 cm and it was significantly superior over the other 2 spacings of 10 cm × 15 cm and 20 cm  $\times$  15 cm in reducing the leaf damage at 10 days after transplanting. However at 20 days after transplanting, spacings of  $10 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$  and  $10 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm}$ were at par. This finding is in accordance with Dhaliwal et al. (1979) who reported that widely spaced rice plants were damaged severely than closely planted rice plants by hispa, Dicladispa armigera. This might be because of the ovipositional site on the leaves were better exposed in widely spaced planting. The lower incidence of damage in closer spaced rice plants has been reported in other rice pests also such as stem borer (Israel and Prakash Rao 1969), green leaf hopper and whorl maggot (Kalode and John 1982, Singh and Dhaliwal 1994). The influence of plant spacing on the incidence of rice pests was also reported by Pandey (2000).

Application of oil cakes showed no significant effect on the incidence of rice blue beetle (Table 2). The leaf damage varied from 8.3 to 10.7, 7.77 to 10.13 and 8.78 to 9.2% at 10, 20 and 30 days after transplanting respectively in different

Table 2 Effect of oil cakes on the incidence of *L. pygmaea* (pooled analysis of winter and rainy seasons, (2005–2006)

Treatment	Per cent damaged leaves					
(oil cakes)	Days after transplanting					
	10	20	30			
Neem cake	10.70 (0.32 a)	10.13 (0.31a)	9.20 (0.31 <sup>a</sup> )			
Castor cake Pungam cake	8.30 (0.28 a) 8.60 (0.29a)	9.60 (0.31 <sup>a</sup> ) 7.77 (0.28 <sup>a</sup> )	8.87 (0.30 a) 8.78 (0.30 a)			

- Figures in parentheses are arcsine transformed values
- $\bullet$  Figures followed by different letters are significantly different at P=0.05

oil cake treated plots. This corroborates with the findings of Krishnaiah and Kalode (1984) who reported that non-edible cakes showed no toxicity to brown plant hopper in rice and oil cakes were not effective against gall midge in the field. But Rezaul-karim and Hoque (1999) observed that incorporation of neem cake in rice seed bed nursery reduced rice hispa and green leaf hopper significantly.

The effect of interaction between oil cakes and spacing indicated (Table 3) that the interaction effect of neem cake with 3 spacings showed no significant at 10 days after transplanting. But at 20 days after transplanting, interaction between neem cake and  $10~\rm cm \times 10~\rm cm$  spacing was found significant. But at 30 days after transplanting there was no significant interaction effect.

Interaction effect of castor cake and  $10\,\mathrm{cm} \times 10\,\mathrm{cm}$  spacing (Table 3) was significantly effective at 10 and 20 days after transplanting. However, the interaction effects of castor cake with  $10\,\mathrm{cm} \times 15\,\mathrm{cm}$  and  $10\,\mathrm{cm} \times 10\,\mathrm{cm}$  were at par with 20 days after transplanting. The treatments showed no significant effect at 30 days after transplanting. Pungam cake showed significant interaction effect with  $10\,\mathrm{cm} \times 10\,\mathrm{cm}$  spacing at  $10\,\mathrm{days}$  after transplanting. But at 20 days after transplanting, the interaction effects of  $10\,\mathrm{cm} \times 10\,\mathrm{cm}$  and  $10\,\mathrm{cm} \times 15\,\mathrm{cm}$  with pungam cake were significantly superior to the wider spacing of  $20\,\mathrm{cm} \times 15\,\mathrm{cm}$  similar to the castor cake interaction effect.

Table 3 Effect of interaction between spacing and oilcakes on per cent leaf damage of L. pygmaea

Treatment	Neem cake			Castor cake		Pungam cake			
	10 DAT	20 DAT	30 DAT	10 DAT.	20 DAT	30 DAT	10 DAT	20 DAT	30 DAT
20 cm × 15cm	14.80 (0.40g)	15.91 (0.41 <sup>d</sup> )	10.13 (0.32 <sup>a</sup> )	11.99 (0.35 <sup>def</sup> )	14.89 (0.40 <sup>d</sup> )	8.62 (0.30 a)	12.47 (0.36 <sup>f</sup> )	10.94 (0.41 <sup>d</sup> )	8.93 (0.30 <sup>a</sup> )
$10 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$	9.92 (0.31 <sup>cde</sup> )	6.50 (0.26 <sup>ab</sup> )	9.05 (0.30 a)	8.99 (0.30 <sup>cde</sup> )	8.87* (0.30 <sup>ab</sup> )	9.94 (0.32 <sup>a</sup> )	8.55 (0.29 <sup>cde</sup> )	7.01 (0.26 <sup>ab</sup> )	9.40 (0.31 a)
10 cm × 10 cm	7.40 (0.26 <sup>abc</sup> )	7.98* (0.27 <sup>ab</sup> )	8.41 (0.29 a)	3.90* (0.20 a)	5.02* (0.23 a)	8.06 (0.29 a)	4.78* (0.22ab)	5.37* (0.23a)	8.01 (0.29 a)

Figures in parentheses are arc sine transformed mean values

<sup>\*</sup>Figures followed by different letters are significantly different at P=0.05

DAT, Days after transplanting

The study shows that incidence of rice blue beetle damage was lower in closely spaced ( $10 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm}$  and  $10 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$ ) plants than widely spaced ( $20 \text{ cm} \times 15 \text{ cm}$ ). Application of neem cake, castor cake and pungam cake in the field caused no significant effect on the leaf damage by *L. pygmaea*. But the interaction between closer spacing of  $10 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm}$  with neem cake, castor cake and pungam cake resulted in significant reduction of the blue beetle damage at 10 and 20 days after transplanting of rice. Hence closer spacing could be recommended in the endemic pockets of rice blue beetle.

## **SUMMARY**

Two field experiments in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) were carried out at the Regional Agricultural Research Station, Pattambi, Kerala Agricultural University during rainy and winter seasons of 2005–06 to evaluate the effect of plant spacing and plant oil cakes against the incidence of rice blue beetle, *Leptispa pygmaea* Baly. The results showed that closer plant spacings (10 cm  $\times$  15 cm and 10 cm  $\times$  10 cm) significantly reduced the incidence of *L.pygmaea* than wider spacing of 20 cm  $\times$  15 cm. Application of plant oil cakes, viz neem (*Azadirachta indica* A. Juss), castor (*Ricinus communis* L.) and pungam (*Pongamia pinnata* (L.) Pierre) cakes @ 150 kg/ha showed no significant effect on the rice blue beetle incidence. However, the interaction effect of closer spacing (10 cm  $\times$  10 cm) with the three oil cakes showed significant reduction in the damage of rice blue beetle.

## REFERENCES

- Dale D. 1994. Insect pests of rice plant their biology and ecology. Biology and Management of Rice Insects, pp 779. Heinrichs E A (Ed.). Wiley Eastern Limited and New Age International Ltd.
- Dhaliwal G S, Singh J and Jaswant S. 1979. Effect of spacing on rice hispa incidence. *IRRI Newsletter* **4** (2): 19.
- Israel P and Prakash Rao P S. 1969. Toxicity of some insecticides to pupae of hispa, *Dicladispa armigera* Oliv. *Indian Journal of Entomology* **31** (2): 189–90.
- Kalode MB and John VT. 1982. Strategy for increased productionplant protection. *Paper presented at the 'Annual Workshop of* the All India Co-ordinated Rice Improvement Project', held during 12–14 April 1982.
- Krishnaiah N V and Kalode M B. 1984. Evaluation of neem oil, neem cake and other non-edible cakes against rice pests. *Indian Journal of Plant Protection* 12 (20): 101–07.
- Nadarajan L. 1996. Changing status of rice pests in Kerala. Paper presented at the 'National symposium on Technical Advancement', held during 17-19 June 1996 at Vellanikara. Abstract: 149. p 162.
- Pandey J. 2000. Role of improved agricultural practices and integrated nutrient management in rice IPM, *Training Manual of Rice IPM*, pp 25–29. NCIPM, New Delhi.
- Rezaul-karim A N M and Hoque N M M. 1999. Evaluation of certain neem products against some rice insect pests of Bangladesh. Bangladesh Journal of Entomology 9 (2): 1–7.
- Singh J and Dhaliwal G S. 1994. Insect pest management in rice; A perspective. (in): Dhaliwal G S and Arora R (Eds.), *Trends in Agricultural Insect Pest Management*. pp 56–112. Commonwealth Publishers, New Delhi, India.