number of plants for the combination of characters obtained under each cross (Table 2) indicated that the crosses B and D had relatively high potentiality compared to other crosses.

REFERENCES

ALLARD, R. W. and P. E. HANSCHE, 1964. Some parameters of population variability and their implications in plant breeding, Advan Agron 16: 281-23E

- FINKNER, V. C., C. G PONELEIT and D. L. DAVIS. 1973. Heritablity of rachis node number of Avena sativa L. crop. Sci.. 13 (1): 84-85.
- GOULDEN, C. H. 1952. Methods of statisti: cal Analysis. John wiley and sons Inc., New york.
- Mc GINNIS, R C and L-H. SHEBESKI 1968.

 The reliability of single plant selection in F2. Third International wheat Genetics symposium, 410-15.

https://doi.org/10.29321/MAJ.10.A02190

Madras Agric. J 74 [8 & 9] 364-368; August & September, 1987

EFFECT OF INTERCROPPING OF PULSES AND SUNFLOWER ON THE INCIDENCE OF SUCKING PESTS OF RAINFED COTTON

S. VENKATESAN 1, G. BALASUBRAMANIAN 1, N. SIVAPRAKASAM 1 A. NARAYANAN 1, AND M. GOPALAN

Incidence of sucking pests in cotton based intercropping system was studied in crop combinations of cotton + greengram, cotton + blackgram, cotton + cowpea, cotton + sunflower and cotton + lablab raised in paired rows and were compared with sole crops of cotton, blackgram, greengram, cowpea, lablab and sunflower. The population of leafhopper was significantly less in cotton when intercropped with sunflower, greengram and blackgram. Contrary to this, aphid infestation was less in pure crops of greengram, blackgram and sunflower compared to crop combinations. Among the crop combinations tested, cotton + greengram recorded the highest gross income.

^{1 &}amp; 3 Assistant Professors in Entomology, Regional Research Station, Palyur-635 112

² Associate Professor of Entomology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Colmbatore-641 003

⁴ Registrar, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-641 003

⁵ Professor and Head, Department of Agricultural Entomology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-641 003

Pest outbreaks are commonly less in mixed stands due to crop divertisity than in sole stands. This regulation of pests in intercropping systems occurs either by physical means or by biological interference as reported by Litsinger and Moody (1976) and Van Embden and Willams (1974).

The intercropping system helps a single crop from damage of pests by its compensatory ability or loss of stand in the other crop thereby maintaining an overall stability of production (Bhatnagar and Davies, 1978). In view of its benefits, experiments were conducted to study the effect

of intercrops of pulses and sunflower on the incidence of sucking pests in cotton and the results are presented.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were conducted during 1985-87 in a randomised block design, replicated thrice with eleven treatments with MCU 10 cotton having a plot size of 40 m² at Regional Research Station, Paiyur during the winter seasons of September to March under rainfed situation. Cotton was the base crop raised in paired rows at 30 cm between rows and 60 cm between pairs of rows with the following intercrops:

T₁ - Cotton + greengram (Paiyur 1) - paired rows

T2 - Cotton - blackgram (Co. 5) - paired rows

T_{st} - Cotton + cowpea (Paiyur 1) - paired rows

T₄ - Cotton + sunflower (Suf. 3) - paired rows

T₅ - Cotton + lablab (Mochai/DPI 1281) - paired rows

T₆ - Cotton alone - 45x25 cm

T₂ - Blackgram alone - 30x10 cm

T₈ - Greengram alone - 30x10 cm

T_n - Cowpea alone - 45x15 cm

T₁₀ - Lablab alone - 30x20 cm

T₁₁ - Sunflower alone - 45x20 cm

Observations were made on the incidence of sucking pests viz., leafhopper, aphid and whitefly from 5 plants at random on cotton and 10 plants on intercrops at weekly intervals. The data on population of pests were converted into $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ and were subjected to statistical analysis along with yield data.

Table 1 Date on population of sucking pests, yield and grossincome during 1985-86

Treatment	- Mean population/leaf			Yield (kg/ha)		Gross
	Leaf- hopper	A phid	White- fly	B ase crop	Inter	income (Rs.)
Cotton+greengram (Palyur 1)	1.06	24-66	2 34	583	164	3856
	(1.03)	(4 96)	(1.53)	4	£	
Cotton+blackgram (CO 5)	1.19	25.14	2 62	489	112	2698
	(1.09)	(5.01)	(1-62)			
Cotton+cowpea (Paiyur 1)	6.71	26 01	2.86	410	- 117	2518
	(2-59)	(5.10)	(1,69)			4
Cotton+sunflower (Suf. 3)	1,14	30.25	2 79	380	86	2158
	(1.07)	(5 50)	(1 67)			197
Cotton+lablab/mochai (DPI 1281)	1.44	31.47	2.69	366	97	2238
	(1-20)	(5.61)	(1.64)			
Cotton alone	8 01	23.14	4.77	590	61 <u>22</u>	2950
	(2.83)	(4.81)	(2.18)			
Blackgram alone	4.75	8.76	2.59		188	75
	(2.18)	(2 96)	(1.61)			
Greengram alone	4 20	7.78	2.62	arija :	157	628
	(2.05)	(279)	(1.62)			
Cowpea alone	9.42	16,55	2.79		219	87
	(3.07)	(4.07)	(1.67)			
Lablab alone	6,97	11.49	2.79	-	121	48
	(2-64)	(3.39)	(1.67)			
Sunflower alone	7.13	7.13	2.76		151	604
	(2,67)	(2.67)	(1.66)			
CD (P=0.05)	0.19	0.68	Ns			12

Figures in parentheses are $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ transformed values-

August & September 1987] PEST MANAGEMENT BY INTERCROPPING OF PULSES AND SUNFLOWER IN COTTON

Tables 2. Data on population of sucking pests, yield and grossincome during 1986-87.

Treatments	Mean population/leaf		Yield (kg/ha)		gross	
	Leaf hopper	≠ phid	Whitefly	Base crop	Inter	income (Rs)
Cotton±grecngram (Paiyur 1)	1-17	18.32	2.59	565	151	3353
	(1.08)	(4-28)	(1-61)			
Cotton+blackgram (Co. 5)	1.21	16.16	2.59	500	93	2872
	(1.10)	(4 02)	(1.61)			
Cotton+cowpea (Paiyur 1)	6,55	21-25	2.72	426	121	2553
	(2.56)	(4.61)	(1.65)			
Cotton+sunflower (Suf 3)	0.98	20.25	2.79	372	46	1998
	(0 99)	(4.50)	(1.67)			
Cotton+lablab (DPI 1281)	1.12	25.10	2,99	344	98	2063
	(1.06)	(5.10)	(1.73)			
Cottonalone	6.86	13.99	4.81	668		3340
	(2.62)	(3-74)	(2-19)			
Blackgram alone	7.36	11.34	2 69	منيا	193	79
	(2.71)	(3.37)	(1.67)			
Greengram alone	5.24	9.76	2.79		130	5 54
	(2-29)	(3.12)	(1.67)			
Cowpea alone	6.31	12.42	2 82	e 	20	2 80
	(2.51)	(3.52)	(1,67)	₹,		
Lablab alone	8.24	13.47	2.79		10	6 37
	(2.87)	(3.67)	(1.67)			
Sunflower slone	9.32	14.19	2.76	2-1	13	8 41
	(3.05)	(3.77)	(1.66)			
CD (P=0.05)	0.33	NS	NS			5

Figures in parentheses are $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ transformed values

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Trials conducted during September 1985 revealed that less incidence of leafhopper, Amrasca biguttula biguttula Ishida was recorded on cotton when intercropped with greengram, sunflower and blackgram. But contrary to this, less population of aphids was recorded on sole crop of cotton when compared to intercropping with greengram or blackgram. The population of whitefly was uniform both on pure crop as well as crop combinations (Table 1).

During September 1986, the leafhopper population per leaf on cotton was comparatively low when intercropped with sunflower (0.98), lablab (1.12), greengram (1.17) and blackgram (1.21). There was no signifiwhitefly and aphid on cotton either as pure crop or when intercroroed with pulses and sunflower.

The data on gross return in terms of rupees obtained in each crop combination as well as sole crops during 1985-86 indicated that cotton + greengram recorded the highest gross income of Rs.3,556 and Rs.3,553/ ha during 1986 and 1987 respectively. But this crop combination was on par with raising cotton as sole crop during 1987. Considering the overall reduction in the population of auhid and leafhopper on cotton, this can intercropped with greengram. superior effect of intercropping of cotton with greengram is in agreement with the findings of Rabindra (1985).

REFERENCES

- BHATNAGAR, V. S. and J. S. DAVIES 1978-Cropping Entomology Progress Report for 1977-78- ICRISAT, Hyderabad.
- LITSINGER, J. A. and Y. MOODY, 1976. Integrated Pest Management in multiple cropping systems. In Multiple Cropping (Eds.)
 R. I. Papandick, P. A. Sanchez and G. B. Triplett Spl. Pub. No. 27, American Society of Agronomy, Madison Nisconsin U.S. A. pp. 293-316.
- RABINDRA, R. J. 1985. Transfer of plant protection technology in dry crops. In 'Proceedings of the National Seminar on Integrated Pest and D'scase Management' (Ed. by S. Jayaraj), Tamil Nadu, Agric Univ., Coimbatore pp 377-383.
- V NEMBDEN, H. F and G. WILLIAMS 1974
 Insect stability and diversity in agroecosystem. Ann. Rev. Entomal 19:
 455-475.