SUSCEPTIBILITY OF DIAMONDBACK MOTH, *PLUTELLA XYLOSTELLA* (LEPIDOPTERA: PLUTELLIDAE) TO SOME EUPHORBIACEAE PLANT EXTRACTS UNDER LABORATORY CONDITIONS

Kiran Shehzadi, Munir Ahmad*, Imran Bodlah and Asim Gulzar Department of Entomology, Pir Mehr Ali Shah, Arid Agriculture University Rawalpindi

ABSTRACT

Diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella* is a serious insect pest of brassica crops. Its larvae skeletonize the leaves of host plants. Considering safer to environment, five plant extracts of *Ricinus cummunis*, *Euphorbia heliscopia*, *E. hirta*, *E. milii* and *E. pulcherrima* with a standard insecticide (chlorpyrifos) were tested. Second instar larvae of field collected *P. xylostella* were used for toxicity tests under laboratory conditions and changes in their biological parameters. Chlorpyrifos showed maximum mortality with LC_{50} of 1.13 ppm whereas *R. cummunis* was most effective with LC_{50} of 28.8 ppm followed by *E. heliscopia*, *E. milii*, *E. hirta and E. pulcherrima* of 32.9, 43.7, 44.6 and 40.5 ppm, respectively after 72 hrs exposure. Potential of Euphorbiaceae plant extracts needs further field testing for effective management tool against this important insect pest as safe and alternate bio-insecticide. **Keywords:** Diamondback moth, toxicity, Euphorbiaceae, chlorpyrifos

INTRODUCTION

Diamondback moth. Plutella xvlostella (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae) is а serious worldwide chewing insect pest of many and non-cultivated Brassicaceae cultivated comprising mainly plants cabbages. cauliflower, broccoli and ornamentals (Capinera, 2001; Reddy et al., 2004). It is also found to infest non-cruciferous crops like Amaranthus viridis (Vishakantaiah and Viseweshwargowda, 1975). However, cabbages and cauliflowers are preferred because of their thick and succulent leaves giving important olfactory and gustatory stimuli for better selection and proper colonization (Dubey and Chand, 1977). Severe infestation is caused on crucifers reported from at least 128 countries of the world with losses of about 16 million dollars (Mohan and Gujar, 2003).

Damage on cabbage and cauliflowers by *P. xylostella* is the major problem faced by growers. The degree of infestation changes according to the type of plant, location, level of natural enemies and management techniques utilized (Talekar and Shelton, 1993). Their short generation time and high fecundity rate enable them to become significant insect pest of brassica crops damaging almost all plant growth stages from seedling to head formation (Gujar, 1999). Larvae damage the plant by feeding on leaves and construction of tunnels in

fruit head causing defoliation along with contamination and malformation of heads in cabbages, broccoli, cauliflower etc (Talekar and Shelton, 1993). Larvae skeletonize the leaves firstly feeding on leaves and then peep inside the curd (Sexena et al., 1989). It may reduce the production from 31-100% (Abraham and Padmanabhan, 1968).

Management of this important insect pest mainly relies on use of insecticides due to which it has developed resistance against almost every insecticide (Kumar and Gujar, 2005; Bhatti et al., 2013; Nasir et al., 2013). The use of synthetic insecticides is also causing environmental hazards, food contamination and mortality of naturally occurring biological control agents. Rapidly evolved resistance in DBM is due to its short generation time, large number of offspring and genetic changes in any given population (Freeman et al., 2006). This situation, stresses to find out the alternatives to manage this pest.

Significant reduction in *P. xylostella* population has been observed with application of certain plant extracts including *Alpinia galangal*, *Amomum cardamom*, *Cypeus rotundus* and *Gomphrena globosa* on cultivated cabbage reduced their damage to much extent (Dadang and Ohsawa, 2001). Antifeedant effect of neem and *Lantana camara* extracts was prominent on their larvae with reduced damage of treated cabbage leaves (Liang et al., 2003; Dong et al. 2005). Bing *et al.* (2008) tested the antifeedent activity of momordicine I and II against their

^{*}*Corresponding author:* e-mail: munirahmad@uaar.edu.pk

larvae and found momordicine II more active. For Euphorbiaceae plant extracts, extracts of *Euphorbia antiquorum* and *E. pulcherrima* were more active than others (Karnataka, 2009). Chloroform extract of *Acalypha fruticosa* showed antifeedant and larvicidal activities for their third instar larvae (Lingathurai *et al.*, 2010).

Studies regarding information on deleterious effects of plant extracts as bio-insecticide can contribute in pest management. Sublethal effects responsible for physiological or behavioral changes in individuals are also helpful in their effective control. Reduction in life span, development rate, fertility, fecundity, changes in sex ratio, feeding deterrence etc are important parameters necessary to provide wide picture of their role and contribution in pest management (Wei et al., 2010). Considering the importance of insecticidal properties of some Euphorbiaceae plants, susceptibility of 2nd instar larvae of *P. xylostella* was performed against their plant extracts under laboratory conditions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Insect culture: *Plutella xylostella* larvae (about 200) were collected randomly from cauliflower farmer fields of Taxila for further laboratory rearing at $25\pm2^{\circ}$ C, $50-60\pm5\%$ RH and 14 hours light phase. Leaves of cauliflower were provided as natural diet. Pupae developed from these larvae were collected on daily basis and kept in a separate Petri dish. Adult emerged were reared in a rearing cage ($12"\times9"\times6"$) covered with muslin cloth and provided with 10% honey solution. Two to three fresh leaves of cabbage were provided in cage for oviposition on daily basis. Eggs laid on cabbage leaves were collected and placed in 1kg plastic jars labeled with age information.

Preparation of plant extracts: Plant extracts of *Euphorbia helioscopia*, *E. milii*, *E. hirta*, *E. pulcherrima*, and *Ricinus communis* were used to test their lethal effects against *P. xylostella* larvae. Chlorpyrifos was used as standard to compare the toxicity of botanical extracts. Leaf samples of each plant were kept for 2-3 weeks for drying and then ground to make powder which was stored in glass flasks at 25°C. Samples of dehydrated plants were placed into 250ml flasks with 100ml water and 100 gram powder for 100% stock solution. Flasks were tightened with aluminum foil and kept in shaker for 24h in dark at 24°C. Plant extract was purified first through two-layered cheese cloth followed by vacuum purification. The terminus was further used for bioassays.

Bioassays: Toxicity of plant extracts was assessed against second instar larvae of P. xylostella by using no choice leaf dip method. 5cm diameter plastic Petri dishes were used. Stock solution in 50 ml distilled water was prepared and then diluted in half serial concentrations in 6-8 levels. Moist filter papers were placed at the base of Petri dishes. Fresh non-treated leaves of cauliflower were dipped in stock solution for 5-10 seconds (s) and then removed with the help of forceps and air-dried. Treated leaves were then placed in petri plates lined with moist filter paper. Five second instar larvae were released in each Petri dish. Similar performed with process was other concentrations including control. Petri dish was covered with lid to avoid escape of P. xylostella larvae. Mortality of P. xylostella was recorded after 48, 72 and 168 hr of treatment

Statistical analysis: The data observed were subjected to the statistical analysis using POLO-PC (LeOra, 1987) and SPSS for their respective LC₅₀, fiducial limits and slope \pm SE based on mortality data. Based on LC₅₀ value, comparative rate for change with standard LC₅₀ value of chlorpyrifos was used to find out the relative toxicity effect of plant extracts at the respective time of observations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

LC₅₀ values comparison of the plant extracts and chlorpyrifos used as standard showed the highest toxicity of chlorpyrifos (3.78 ppm) against second instar larvae of P. xylostella at 48 hr observation. R. cummunis plant extract was better with LC₅₀ of 32.8 ppm followed by E. pulcherrima, E. hirta, E. milii and E. helioscopia with LC_{50} s of 34.5, 35.2, 40.5 and 40.6, respectively after 48 hours. When compared with chlorpyrifos, the comparative ratios (CR) of R. cummunis, E. pulcherrima, E. hirta, E. milii and E. helioscopia were 8.67, 9.12, 9.31, 10.7 and 10.7 times less, respectively (Table 1). Comparison of LC_{50} values of five plant extracts and chlorpyrifos used as standard showed the highest toxicity of chlorpyrifos with 1.13 ppm value against second instar larvae of *P. xylostella* at 72 hr observation. *R. cummunis* was the most effective plant extract with LC_{50} of 28.84 followed by *E. helioscopia*, *E. milii*, *E. hirta* and *E. pulcherrima* with LC_{50S} of 32.9, 43.7, 44.6 and 40.5, respectively after 72 hours (Table 1). When compared to the CR of chlorpyrifos, toxicity of *R. cummunis*, *E. helioscopia*, *E. hirta*, *E. milii* and *E. pulcherrima* were 28.8, 32.9, 44.6, 39.9 and 40.5 times less, respectively (Table 1).

After 168 hours of exposure, chlorpyrifos showed the highest toxicity $(0.60 \text{ ppm LC}_{50})$ against second instar larvae of P. xylostella. R. *cummunis* was the most effective plant extract with almost insignificant LC_{50} than that of chlorpyrifos. E. pulcherrima, E. helioscopia, E. hirta and E. milii followed the toxicity of R. cummunis. Comparative ratio with chlorpyrifos showed R. cummunis, E. pulcherrima, E. helioscopia, E. hirta and E. milii with respective decrease trend in their toxicity (Table 1). According to to our results. Euphorbiaceae plant extracts of R. cummunis, E. pulcherrima, E. helioscopia, E. hirta and E. milii showed variable toxic response with respect to exposure time. The toxicity increased with time duration and took more time to exert toxic effect against target pest when compared with chlorpyrifos. Previously E. pulcherrima found active than was more other Euphorbiaceae plant extracts against *P*. xylostella (Karnataka, 2009).

Nature has provided plants with certain allelochemicals which make them to defend themselves against pest problems. Such plant chemicals affecting biology and behavior of certain insect pests have insecticidal, larvicidal and ovicidal properties including Euphorbiaceae plant family as observed against other lepidopteran insect pests (Karnataka, 2009). Present study was based on use of these plant extracts in water, however, organic solvents like hexane, chloroform and ethyl acetate had shown prominently higher toxicity of Hygrophila auriculata, Citrus sinensis, Azadiractin indica, Zingiber officinale and Vitex negundo (Baskar et al., 2011). Significant reduction in P. xylostella population has been observed with Alpinia galangal, Amomum cardamom, Cypeus rotundus and Gomphrena globosa on cabbages with reduced their damage (Dadang and Ohsawa, 2001). They have also shown antifeedant and growth inhibitory effects on different insect pests (Sahayaraj, 1998; Lingathurai et al., 2010). Methanol based extracts of Synedrella nodiflora proved toxic against S. litura (Rathi and Gopalakrishnan, 2005).

Different aspects like antifeedant, ovicidal and larvicidal effects to different biological parameters of different insect pests has shown promising results in past (Liang et al., 2003; Dong et al., 2005; Bing et al., 2008). However, there exist merely 1% of plant based pesticides worldwide focusing isolates and essential elements of active plant extracts (Isman and Grieneisen, 2014). Studies including deleterious effects of plant extracts responsible for physiological or behavioral changes in insect pests can be helpful in pest management (Wei et al., 2010). Considering the importance of insecticidal properties R. cummunis, E. pulcherrima, E. helioscopia and others, further efficacy trials to test different biological and behavioral responses of the pest may be performed. It will be helpful to conduct further field trials and selection for possible utilization of these botanicals for pest control.

of Euphorbiaceae under laboratory conditions								
After 48 hours			After 72 hours			After 168 hours		
LC ₅₀ (FL at 95%)	CR	Slope±SE	LC ₅₀ (FL at 95%)	CR	Slope±SE	LC ₅₀ (FL at 95%)	CR	Slope±SE
32.8 (11.9-602)	8.67	0.75±0.19	28.8 (9.87-953)	25.4	0.63±0.18	0.71 (0.09-1.51)	1.18	0.49±0.16
40.6 (17.1-1162)	10.7	1.53±0.48	32.9 (14.3-280)	29.1	1.10±0.26	4.91 (2.34-33.4)	8.18	0.51±0.16
35.2 (16.0-1212)	9.31	1.80±0.60	44.6 (17.1-706)	39.4	1.09±0.28	4.90 (2.34-33.0)	8.16	0.51±0.16
40.5 (16.5-547)	10.7	1.19±0.31	39.9 (16.5-702)	35.3	1.02±0.26	6.6 (2.87-134)	11.0	0.47±0.16
34.5 (15.7-428)	9.12	1.50±0.42	40.5 (16.5-547)	35.8	1.19±0.31	4.91 (2.18-61.5)	8.18	0.46±0.16
3.78 (1.81-6.48)	1.00	0.70±0.16	1.13 (0.16-2.38)	1.00	0.61±0.16	0.60 (0.07-1.37)	1.00	0.71±0.18
	$\begin{array}{c} LC_{50} \\ (FL at 95\%) \\\hline 32.8 \\ (11.9-602) \\\hline 40.6 \\ (17.1-1162) \\\hline 35.2 \\ (16.0-1212) \\\hline 40.5 \\ (16.5-547) \\\hline 34.5 \\ (15.7-428) \\\hline 3.78 \\\end{array}$	After 48 horLC50 (FL at 95%)CR $32.8(11.9-602)8.6740.6(17.1-1162)10.735.2(16.0-1212)9.3140.5(16.5-547)10.734.5(15.7-428)9.123.781.00$	After 48 hours LC ₅₀ (FL at 95%) CR Slope \pm SE 32.8 (11.9-602) 8.67 0.75 \pm 0.19 40.6 (17.1-1162) 10.7 1.53 \pm 0.48 35.2 (16.0-1212) 9.31 1.80 \pm 0.60 40.5 (16.5-547) 10.7 1.19 \pm 0.31 34.5 (15.7-428) 9.12 1.50 \pm 0.42 3.78 1.00 0.70 \pm 0.16	After 48 hoursAfterLC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%)CRSlope±SELC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%)32.8 (11.9-602)8.67 0.75 ± 0.19 28.8 (9.87-953)40.6 (17.1-1162)10.7 1.53 ± 0.48 32.9 (14.3-280)35.2 (16.0-1212)9.31 1.80 ± 0.60 44.6 (17.1-706)40.5 (16.5-547)10.7 1.19 ± 0.31 39.9 (16.5-702)34.5 (15.7-428)9.12 1.50 ± 0.42 40.5 (16.5-547)3.781.00 0.70 ± 0.16 1.13	After 48 hoursAfter 72 houLC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%)CRSlope±SELC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%)CR 32.8 (11.9-602)8.67 0.75 ± 0.19 28.8 (9.87-953)25.4 40.6 (17.1-1162)10.7 1.53 ± 0.48 32.9 (14.3-280)29.1 35.2 (16.0-1212)9.31 1.80 ± 0.60 44.6 (17.1-706)39.4 40.5 (16.5-547)10.7 1.19 ± 0.31 39.9 (16.5-702)35.3 34.5 (15.7-428)9.12 1.50 ± 0.42 40.5 (16.5-547)35.8 3.78 1.00 0.70 ± 0.16 1.13 1.00	After 48 hoursAfter 72 hoursLC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%)CRSlope±SELC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%)CRSlope±SE 32.8 (11.9-602)8.67 0.75 ± 0.19 28.8 (9.87-953)25.4 0.63 ± 0.18 40.6 (17.1-1162)10.7 1.53 ± 0.48 32.9 (14.3-280)29.1 1.10 ± 0.26 35.2 (16.0-1212)9.31 1.80 ± 0.60 44.6 (17.1-706)39.4 1.09 ± 0.28 40.5 	After 48 hoursAfter 72 hoursAfter 72 hoursLC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%)CRSlope±SELC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%)CRSlope±SELC $_{50}$ (FL at 95%) 32.8 (11.9-602)8.67 0.75 ± 0.19 28.8 (9.87-953)25.4 0.63 ± 0.18 0.71 (0.09-1.51) 40.6 (17.1-1162) 10.7 1.53 ± 0.48 32.9 (14.3-280)29.1 1.10 ± 0.26 4.91 (2.34-33.4) 35.2 (16.0-1212) 9.31 1.80 ± 0.60 44.6 (17.1-706) 39.4 1.09 ± 0.28 4.90 (2.34-33.0) 40.5 (16.5-547) 10.7 1.19 ± 0.31 39.9 (16.5-702) 35.3 1.02 ± 0.26 6.6 (2.87-134) 34.5 (15.7-428) 9.12 1.50 ± 0.42 40.5 (16.5-547) 35.8 1.19 ± 0.31 4.91 (2.18-61.5) 3.78 1.00 0.70 ± 0.16 1.13 1.00 0.61 ± 0.16 0.60	After 48 hoursAfter 72 hoursAfter 168 hours LC_{50} (FL at 95%)CRSlope±SE LC_{50} (FL at 95%)CRSlope±SE LC_{50} (FL at 95%)CR 32.8 (11.9-602)8.67 0.75 ± 0.19 28.8 (9.87-953)25.4 0.63 ± 0.18 0.71 (0.09-1.51)1.18 40.6 (17.1-1162)10.7 1.53 ± 0.48 32.9 (14.3-280)29.1 1.10 ± 0.26 4.91 (2.34-33.4)8.18 35.2 (16.0-1212)9.31 1.80 ± 0.60 44.6 (17.1-706)39.4 1.09 ± 0.28 4.90 (2.34-33.0)8.16 40.5 (16.5-547) 10.7 1.19 ± 0.31 39.9 (16.5-702) 35.3 1.02 ± 0.26 6.6 (2.87-134)11.0 34.5 (15.7-428) 9.12 1.50 ± 0.42 40.5 (16.5-547) 35.8 1.19 ± 0.31 4.91 (2.18-61.5) 8.18 3.78 (3.78 1.00 (0.070\pm0.16 1.13 (1.13) 1.00 (0.61±0.16 0.60 (1.00)

 Table 1: Susceptibility of second instar larvae of *Plutella xylostella* against some plant extracts of Euphorbiaceae under laboratory conditions

hr = hour

FL = Fiducial limits

 LC_{50} = lethal concentration at 50% level CR = Comparative ratio with respective standard LC_{50}

SE = Significant error

REFERENCES

- Abraham EV and Padmanabhan MD, 1968. Bionomics and control of the diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella*. Indian J. Agric. Sci. 20: 513-519.
- Baskar K, Maheshwaran R, Kingsley S and Ignacimuthu S, 2011. Bio-efficacy of plant extracts against Asian army worm, *Spodoptera litura* (Lep.: Noctuidae). J. Agric. Tech. 7(1): 123-131.
- Bing L, Cai WG, Ji Y, Xin ZM and Wen LG, 2008. Antifeedant activity and active ingredients against *Plutella xylostella* from *Momordica charantia* leaves. Agric. Sci. 7(12): 1466-1473.
- Bhatti SS, Ahmad M, Yousaf K and Naeem M, 2013. Pyrethroids and new chemistry insecticides mixtures against *Spodoptera litura* (Noctuidae: Lepidoptera) under laboratory conditions. Asian J. Agric. Biol. 1(2): 45-50.
- Capinera JL, 2001. Hand Book of Vegetable Pest. Academic Press, San Diego, 729pp.
- Dadang and Ohsawa K, 2001. Efficacy of plant extracts for reducing larval populations of the diamond back moth and cabbage webworm and evaluation of cabbage

damage. J App.l Entomol. 36(1): 143-149.

- Dubey RB and Chand P, 1977. Effect of food plants on the development of *Plutella xylostella* (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae). Pestology. 24: 36-37.
- Dong V, Zhang M and Liang B, 2005. Antifeedant effects of crude lantadene from *Lantana camara* on *Plutella xylostella* and *Spodoptera litura* larvae. Chinese J. Appl. Entomol. 16(12): 2361-2364.
- Freeman JL, Quinn CF, Marcus MA, Farkra S and Pilonsmits EAH, 2006. Selenium tolerant diamondback moth disarms hyperaccumulator plant defense. Curr. Biol. 16: 2181-2192.
- Gujar, GT, 1999. Farmers fight against diamondback moth. Pestic. World. 64-65pp.
- Isman MB and Grieneisen ML. 2014. Botanical insecticide research: many publications, limited useful data. Trends Pl Sci. 19(3): 140-145.
- Kumar, KP and Gujar GT. 2005. Baseline susceptibility of the diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella* to *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1A toxins in India. Crop Prot. 24: 207-

Original Article

212.

- Karnataka J, 2009. Efficacy of some Euphorbiaceae plant extracts against cabbage diamondback moth, *P. xylostella*. Agric. Sci. 22: 688-689.
- LeOra software, 1987. Polo-PC. A Users' guide to Probit or Logit analysis. Berkeley, California, 33pp.
- Liang GM, Chen W and Liu TX, 2003. Effects of three neem based insecticides on diamondback moth. Crop Prot. 22: 333-340.
- Lingathurai S, Vendan SE, Paulraj MG and Lgnacimuthu S, 2010. Antifeedant and larvicidal activities of *Acalypha fruticosa* against *Plutella xylostella* larvae. Entomol Res Inst. Loyola College, Chennai, India.
- Mohan M and Gujar GT, 2003. Local variation in susceptibility of diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella* to insecticides and role of detoxification enzymes. Crop Prot. 22: 495-504.
- Nasir M, Imran M and Ahmad M, 2013. Pyrethroids synergize new chemical insecticides in field populations of *Plutella xylostella* (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae). Pakistan J. Zool. 45(3): 629-633.
- Reddy GVP, Tabone E and Smith MT, 2004. Mediation of host selection and oviposition

behavior in the diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella* and its predator *Chrysoperla carnea* by chemical cues from cole crops. Biol Cont. 29: 270-277.

- Rathi MJ and Gopalakrishnan S, 2005. Insecticidal activity of aerial parts of *Syndrella nodiflora* on *Spodoptera litura*. J. Central Eur. Agric. 6(3): 223-228.
- Sexena JD, Rai S, Srivasta KM and Sinha SR, 1989. Resistance in the field populations of diamondback moth to some commonly used synthetic pyrethroids. Indian J. Entomol. 51: 265-268.
- Sahayaraj K, 1998. Antifeedant effects of some plant extracts on Asian army worm, *Spodoptera litura*. Curr sci. 74(6): 523-525.
- Talekar NS and Shelton AM, 1993. Biology, ecology and management of the diamond back moth. Annu. Rev. Entomol. 38: 275-301.
- Vishakantaiah M and Viseweshwargowda BL, 1975. Record of *Plutella xylostella* as a new pest of *Amaranthus viridus* in Karnataka. Curr. Sci. 44: 869.
- Wei H, Juan W, Shan LH, Gao DH and Jun GX, 2010. Sublethal effects of fenvalerate on the development, fecundity and juvenile hormone esterase activity of DBM, *Plutella xylostella*. Agric. Sci. 9(11): 1612- 1622.