



E-ISSN: 2278-4136
P-ISSN: 2349-8234
JPP 2018; 7(3): 2051-2059
Received: 13-03-2018
Accepted: 17-04-2018

VS Bambhaniya
College of Agriculture, Junagadh
Agricultural University,
Junagadh, Gujarat, India

AV Khanpara
College of Agriculture, Junagadh
Agricultural University,
Junagadh, Gujarat, India

HN Patel
College of Agriculture, Junagadh
Agricultural University,
Junagadh, Gujarat, India

Bio-Efficacy of insecticides against sucking pests; whitefly and aphid infesting tomato

VS Bambhaniya, AV Khanpara and HN Patel

Abstract

The field experiment was carried out to study the bio-efficacy of different insecticides against sucking pests; whitefly and aphid infesting tomato at instructional farm, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh-Gujarat during the prevailing year 2017. The results from the three sprays on whitefly have revealed that imidacloprid 0.005 per cent, difenthiuron 0.05 per cent, acetamiprid 0.008 per cent and thiacloprid 0.024 per cent were found to be the most effective insecticides. The results of relative efficacy of nine different insecticides against aphid have revealed that flonicamid 0.015 per cent, imidacloprid 0.005 per cent, clothianidin 0.025 per cent and dimethoate 0.03 per cent gave very good results against aphid.

The highest cost benefit ratio (1:77.51) was obtained from the treatment of imidacloprid 0.005 followed by acetamiprid 0.008 per cent (1:74.83), dimethoate 0.03 per cent (1:74.06) and flonicamid 0.015 per cent (1:26.80). Other insecticides register lower yield and economic. Significantly higher yield of 15278 kg/ha was recorded from plots protected against the sucking pests of tomato while yield of 11620 kg/ha was recorded from the unprotected plots. The increase in yield in protected plots over unprotected plots was found to be 3657 kg/ha. This showed 31.47 per cent increase in yield and 23.93 per cent avoidable loss.

Keywords: tomato, bio-efficacy, whitefly, aphid and yield loss

Introduction

In India, Tomato is one of the most important vegetable crops due to its immense commercial and nutritive value and wide range of climatic adaptability. It ranks second to potato. Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Orissa, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Assam, are the largest producer of tomato in our country. The highest productivity of tomato is incurred by Spain having 66.8 t/ha while India has only 17.50 t/ha⁻¹. When we focus, on national scenario we get that, Madhya Pradesh contributed maximum production 2177 thousand million tonnes but the highest productivity was occupied by Himanchal Pradesh (41.663 t/ha⁻¹) (Anonymous, 2014-15b) ^[2]. The estimated area under tomato in India is 6.33 lakh hectares with 124.25 lakh tonnes of fruit production. In India tomato is cultivated in an area of 8.79 lakh hectares with production of about 182.26 lakh tonnes and productivity of 20.7 tonnes/ha. In Gujarat, this crop occupied 44000 ha area with production of 11.57 lakh tonnes and productivity is 26.3 tonnes/ha (Anonymous, 2014) ^[1].

With increasing quest of higher demand of this vegetable crop in India and elsewhere, there is considerable increase in its area which had earlier no history of its cultivation. Due to this, there is considerable upsurge in the already reported pests and record of new invasive pest like tomato leaf miner south American tomato moth, *Tuta absoluta* (Sridhar *et al.*, 2014) ^[22]. Amongst various pests reported in India, as many as sixteen have been observed feeding from germination to the harvesting stage which not only reduce its yield but also deteriorate the quality (Butani, 1977) ^[4]. The important insect pests of tomato are fruit borer (*H. armigera*), whitefly (*B. tabaci*), leaf hopper (*Amrasca devastans*), leaf miner (*L. trifolii*), potato aphid (*M. persicae*) and hadda beetle (*Epilachana dodecastigma*) (Sharma *et al.*, 2013a). The most common and serious insect pest of tomato is fruit borer, (*H. armigera*) due to its direct attack on fruits, high mobility, voracious feeding habit, high fecundity, multivoltine and overlapping generations.

The tomato crop is attacked by several sucking pests causing appreciable damage to crop the major sucking pest infesting the tomato crop are as under (Butani and Jotwani, 1984 and kalloo, 1986) ^[5, 11].

Among the various insect pest listed above, aphid, *Aphis gossypii* Glover commonly known as plant lice or cotton aphid; whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* (Genedius), commonly known as cotton whitefly are major sucking pest limiting profitable cultivation of tomato in Gujarat state.

Correspondence
VS Bambhaniya
College of Agriculture, Junagadh
Agricultural University,
Junagadh, Gujarat, India

According to Butani and Jotwani (1984) [5] whitefly is a polyphagous pest, found in most of the countries in tropics and sub tropics. Its main host are cotton, tobacco and some winter vegetables, including tomato. The infestation on this crop is sporadically severed. This pest sucks the cell sap from the various plant parts. The affected plant parts become yellowish, the leaves wrinkle and curl downwards and are ultimately shed. Besides the feeding damage, this insect also exudes honey dew which favours the development of sooty mould. In sever infestation, this black coating is so heavy that it interference with the photosynthetic activity of the plant resulting in stunted growth. The incidence and spread of the Tomato Leaf Curl Virus (TLCV) was directly correlated with whitefly population on tomato field (Gupta *et al*, 2007) [9].

Aphid is also phytophagous pest. Though cotton and okra are its main hosts, it also cause severe damage to tomato, brinjal, beans and potato. Both nymph and adult suck the cell sap and secrete honey dew. Which not only attract the black ants but also favours the growth of sooty mould, giving the plants a sticky appearance (Butani and Jotwani, 1984) [5]. The aphid transmitted yellowing virus reduced yield and quality of tomato. Early infection (2-3 week after transplanting) caused the greater plant stunting 8-15 per cent and reduction in yields 60-83 per cent (Zitter and Everett, 1982) [24]. In spite of the fact that insect pests have been an issue in agriculture as the centuries progressed, phenomenon of pest outbreaks have expanded with the change of pest complexities during the recent four decades. Pest richness and distribution changes with abiotic elements and meteorological parameters assume an urgent part in upsurge and biology of any pest. Temperature is the most pivotal abiotic element affecting the rate of growth, development of insect and is particularly critical for insect as pest control measures must be timed precisely. Relative humidity, precipitation, wind velocity and temperature are the major climate parameters that generally

coordinate the action of a specific insect. Relationship between pest migration and abiotic components helps in inferring at precision models that supports estimate of pest occurrence.

In tomato, where pest management plays an important role in harvesting its maximum potential, numbers of insecticide applications though increases the yield, but are economical up to a certain extent. The increased insecticide applications coupled with high cost result in escalation of cost of cultivation which further makes the crop uneconomical due to non-remunerative price of the crop produce. Their massive overuse and frequent misuse has led to the problems of three Rs *viz.*; resistance of pesticides, resurgence of pest and residues as well as toxicity hazards to non-target animals. The present study was planned and undertaken to evaluate efficacy and economics of various insecticides such as imidacloprid, spinosad, acetamiprid, clothianidin, thiacloprid, dinotefuran, difenthiuron, flonicamid and dimethoate for the management of major sucking pests of tomato *viz.*; whitefly and aphid.

Looking to the importance of sucking pest, *viz.*; *B. Tabaci*, *A. gossypii*, and *T. tabaci* and *S. dorsalis* on tomato crop, the following aspect was studied during the course of investigation.

- Bio-efficacy of insecticides against sucking pests; whitefly and aphid infesting *khariif* tomato.

Materials and Methods

The experimental investigation on bio- efficacy of insecticides against sucking pests; whitefly and aphid infesting tomato was carried out at the instructional farm, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh, Gujarat during *Khariif* 2016 under field condition. The detail of the materials used and method employed for the said aspect of study is described here under.

Sr. No	Technical name	Concentration (%)	Dose/10 litre of water	Manufacture name
T ₁	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	0.005%	1.6 ml	Bayer Crop Science Ltd.
T ₂	Spinosad 45 SC	0.009%	2 ml	Dow agro sciences Ltd.
T ₃	Acetamiprid 20 SP	0.008%	4 g	Rallis India Ltd.
T ₄	Clothianidin 50 WDG	0.025%	5 g	Sumitomo Chemical Pvt. Ltd.
T ₅	Thiacloprid 24 SC	0.024%	10 ml	Bayer Crop Science Ltd.
T ₆	Dinotefuran 20 SG	0.01%	5 g	PI Industries Ltd.
T ₇	Difenthiuron 50 WP	0.05%	10 g	Syngenta India Ltd.
T ₈	Flonicamid 50 WG	0.015%	3 g	United Phosphorus Ltd.
T ₉	Dimethoate 30 EC	0.03%	10 ml	Rallis India Ltd.
T ₁₀	Control (No Spray)	--	--	--

Application of treatments

All the recommended agronomical practices were followed. All the insecticides were applied in the form of foliar spray with the help of knapsack sprayer. For deciding the quantity of spray fluid required per plot, the control plot was sprayed with water and the required spray fluids were determined. Spray fluid was prepared by mixing measured quantity of water and insecticide. Care was also taken to rinse the sprayer thoroughly before and after each spray with soap water to avoid contamination from treatment to treatment. First spray was given at appearance of pest. Second and third spray was done at 15 days after first spray.

Method of recording observations

All the recommended practice was adopted for raising the crop. Observations on pest population was recorded from 5 randomly selected plants before 24 hours and after 2, 5 and 10 days of spraying from three leaves were selected representing

top, middle and bottom regions of each plant. The per cent reduction in pest population over control was calculated by using following formula.

$$\text{Per cent reduction in population} = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{X_1} \times 100$$

Where,

X₁ = population in control plots

X₂ = population in treated plots

Yield and economics

With a view to evaluate the effect of different pesticides on the tomato yield, the tomato crop was harvested from each net plot. The harvested yield were weighed and converted on hectare basis. Economics of all treatments will be worked out by considering the price of products' cost of insecticides and

labor charges. CBR will be worked out to compare the economics of different insecticidal treatments. The per cent increased yield over control will be also calculated by using following formula (Pradhan, 1969).

$$\text{Yield increased over control (\%)} = \frac{T - C}{C} \times 100$$

Where,

T= Yield of respective treatment (kg /ha)

C= Yield of control (kg/ha)

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of data was carried out as per the analysis of variance technique given by Panse and Sukhatme (1985) [16].

Results and Discussion

A field experiment was conducted for the chemical control of sucking pests viz; whitefly and aphid of tomato during *kharif* season of the year 2016 at Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh. The results of the experiment are discussed as under.

Whitefly

First spray

Two days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of whitefly recorded at the second day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 1. Treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 44.00 per cent reduction in whitefly population (2.38 whitefly/3 leaves).

Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 43.40 per cent (2.39 whitefly/3 leaves), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 43.11 per cent (2.40 whitefly/3 leaves), Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 41.12 per cent (2.44 whitefly/3 leaves) and Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 34.58 per cent reduction of whitefly over control (2.57 whitefly/3 leaves) and remained statistically at par with each other formed second group of effective treatments. Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 34.39 per cent (2.63 whitefly/3 leaves), Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 34.19 per cent (2.58 whitefly/3 leaves), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 33.99 per cent (2.58 whitefly/3 leaves) and Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 33.89 per cent (2.58 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments.

Five days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of whitefly recorded at the five day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 1. Treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 68.86 per cent reduction in whitefly population (1.87 whitefly/3 leaves).

It was statistically at par with Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 66.01 per cent (1.95 whitefly/3 leaves) and Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 65.83 per cent (1.96 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction over control. Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 64.32 per cent (2.00 whitefly/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 59.34 per cent (2.14 whitefly/3 leaves), Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 59.16 per cent (2.14 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 56.13 per cent (2.22 whitefly/3

leaves), Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 49.46 per cent (2.38 whitefly/3 leaves) and Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 49.73 per cent (2.38 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained least effective than other treatments.

Ten days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of whitefly recorded at the ten day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 1. Treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 55.31 per cent reduction in whitefly population (2.16 whitefly/3 leaves). Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 46.98 per cent (2.35 whitefly/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 46.98 per cent (2.35 whitefly/3 leaves), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 46.41 per cent (2.37 whitefly/3 leaves) and Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 64.32 per cent (2.00 whitefly/3 leaves) and Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 43.15 per cent (2.44 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction over control were next effective group. Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 42.58 per cent (2.45 whitefly/3 leaves), Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 41.62 per cent (2.47 whitefly/3 leaves) and Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 37.79 per cent (2.55 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained least effective than other treatments.

Second spray

Two days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of whitefly recorded at the second day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 2. Treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 65.47 per cent reduction in whitefly population (1.94 whitefly/3 leaves). Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 67.86 per cent (1.87 whitefly/3 leaves), Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 63.72 per cent (1.99 whitefly/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 63.36 per cent (2.00 whitefly/3 leaves), Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 62.53 per cent (2.02 whitefly/3 leaves), Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 33.89 per cent (2.05 whitefly/3 leaves) and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 58.76 per cent (2.12 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed second group of effective treatments. Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 55.64 per cent (2.20 whitefly/3 leaves) and Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 55.28 per cent (2.21 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and formed third group of effective treatments.

Five days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of whitefly recorded at the five day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 2. Data revealed that treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 82.46 per cent reduction in whitefly population (1.37 whitefly/3 leaves). It was statistically at par with Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 84.32 per cent (1.30 whitefly/3 leaves) and Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 80.42 per cent (1.45 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction over control. Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 76.80 per cent (1.58 whitefly/3 leaves), 0.009 per cent with 71.05 per cent (1.77 whitefly/3 leaves), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 70.12 per cent (1.79 whitefly/3 leaves) and Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 69.01 per cent (1.83 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 64.37 per cent (1.96 whitefly/3

leaves) and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 62.80 per cent (2.00 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained less effective than other treatments.

Ten days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of whitefly recorded at the ten day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 2. Data revealed that the treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 76.37 per cent reduction in whitefly population (1.54 whitefly/3 leaves). It was statistically at par with Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 72.77 per cent (1.65 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control. Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 68.06 per cent (1.79 whitefly/3 leaves), Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 63.96 per cent (1.90 whitefly/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 63.36 per cent (1.91 whitefly/3 leaves) and Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 59.45 per cent (2.01 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 58.75 per cent (2.03 whitefly/3 leaves), Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 58.45 per cent (2.04 whitefly/3 leaves) and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 55.95 per cent (2.10 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained least effective than other treatments.

Third spray

Two days after spraying

The per cent reduction in whitefly population over control recorded at the second day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 3. Treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 82.76 per cent reduction in whitefly population (1.29 whitefly/3 leaves). Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 81.41 per cent (1.34 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent. Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 77.88 per cent (1.46 whitefly/3 leaves), Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 74.76 per cent (1.56 whitefly/3 leaves), Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 72.37 per cent (1.63 whitefly/3 leaves) and Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 70.30 per cent (1.69 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 74.76 per cent (1.80 whitefly/3 leaves), Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 64.69 per cent (1.84 whitefly/3 leaves) and Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 56.49 per cent (2.05 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained least effective treatments than other.

Five days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of whitefly recorded at the five day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 3. Treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 90.38 per cent reduction in whitefly population (0.95 whitefly/3 leaves).

It was statistically at par with Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 89.74 per cent (0.98 whitefly/3 leaves) and Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 87.17 per cent (1.10 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed second group of effective treatments. Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 84.08 per cent (1.22 whitefly/3 leaves), Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 83.76 per

cent (1.23 whitefly/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 82.69 per cent (1.27 whitefly/3 leaves) and Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 82.69 per cent (1.27 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 81.62 per cent (1.31 whitefly/3 leaves) and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 80.55 per cent (1.35 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained least effective than other treatments.

Ten days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of whitefly recorded at the ten day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 3. Treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 80.34 per cent reduction in whitefly population (1.30 whitefly/3 leaves). Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 81.51 per cent (1.26 whitefly/3 leaves) and Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 79.06 per cent (1.34 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of Whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed second group of effective treatments. Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 75.81 per cent (1.45 whitefly/3 leaves), Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 72.55 per cent (1.54 whitefly/3 leaves), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 70.58 per cent (1.59 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 69.53 per cent (1.62 whitefly/3 leaves), Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 64.88 per cent (1.74 whitefly/3 leaves) and Flonicamid 0.015 per cent with 64.65 per cent (1.74 whitefly/3 leaves) reduction of whitefly over control and remained least effective than other treatments.

The findings are in close relation with those of Muhammad *et al.* (2009) ^[14], Vichiter and Ramesh (2009) ^[23], Sreekanth and Reddy (2011) ^[21], Idris and Mandal (2014) ^[10], Gosalwad *et al.* (2015) ^[8] and Bharati *et al.* (2015) ^[3].

Aphid

First spray

Two days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of aphid recorded at the second day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 4. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 48.11 per cent reduction in aphid population (2.17 aphid/3 leaves). Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 41.48 per cent (2.30 aphid/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 41.26 per cent (2.30 aphid/3 leaves), Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 41.15 per cent (2.31 aphid/3 leaves) and Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent with 39.38 per cent (2.34 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed second group of effective treatments. Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 36.61 per cent (2.39 aphid/3 leaves), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 27.65 per cent (2.56 aphid/3 leaves) and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 25.22 per cent (2.60 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 21.12 per cent (2.67 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid and it is less effective treatment than other treatment.

Five days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of

aphid recorded at the five day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 4. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 67.23 per cent reduction in aphid population (1.75 aphid/3 leaves). Imidacloprid 0.005 with 57.70 per cent (1.99 aphid/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 57.06 per cent (2.00 aphid/3 leaves) and Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 56.63 per cent (2.01 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed second group of effective treatments. Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 54.71 per cent (2.06 aphid/3 leaves), Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 53.64 per cent (2.08 aphid/3 leaves), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 33.29 per cent (2.50 aphid/3 leaves) and Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 33.29 per cent (2.50 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 30.40 per cent (2.55 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid and it is less effective treatment than other treatment.

Ten days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of aphid recorded at the ten day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 4. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 55.76 per cent reduction in aphid population (2.00 aphid/3 leaves). Imidacloprid 0.005 with 54.32 per cent (2.03 aphid/3 leaves), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 53.88 per cent (2.04 aphid/3 leaves), Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 53.54 per cent (2.05 aphid/3 leaves) and Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 53.54 per cent (2.05 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed second group of effective treatments. Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 42.90 per cent (2.27 aphid/3 leaves), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 39.24 per cent (2.34 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 28.71 per cent (2.54 aphid/3 leaves) and Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 23.94 per cent (2.50 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid and it is less effective treatment than other treatment.

Second spray

Two days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of aphid recorded at the second day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 5. All the treatment found statistically effective against aphid as compared to control. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 64.18 per cent reduction in aphid population (1.73 aphid/3 leaves). It was statistically at par with Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent with 67.50 per cent (2.34 aphid/3 leaves) and Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 67.20 per cent (1.81 aphid/3 leaves) and Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 66.90 per cent (1.88 aphid/3 leaves). Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 64.48 per cent (1.88 aphid/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 64.18 per cent (1.89 aphid/3 leaves), Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 58.85 per cent (2.02 aphid/3 leaves) and Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 57.14 per cent (2.06 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 49.69 per cent (2.24 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid and it is less effective treatment than other treatment.

Five days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pest population over control of aphid recorded at the five day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 5. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 84.36 per cent reduction in aphid population (1.21 aphid/3 leaves). Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent with 81.90 per cent (1.30 aphid/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 81.58 per cent (1.31 aphid/3 leaves) and Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 81.15 per cent (1.33 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed second group of effective treatments. Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 76.01 per cent (1.50 aphid/3 leaves), Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 75.05 per cent (1.53 aphid/3 leaves), Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 65.41 per cent (1.80 aphid/3 leaves) and Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 62.84 per cent (1.86 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained statistically at par with each other formed third group of effective treatments. Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 56.74 per cent (2.01 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid and it is less effective treatment.

Ten days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pestpopulation over control of aphid recorded at the ten day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 5. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 85.26 per cent reduction in aphid population (1.11 aphid/3 leaves). Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent with 75.68 per cent (1.42 aphid/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 75.44 per cent (1.43 aphid/3 leaves), Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 72.93 per cent (1.50 aphid/3 leaves), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 71.73 per cent (1.54 aphid/3 leaves) and Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 71.37 per cent (1.55 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained next effective treatments. Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 51.01 per cent (2.02 aphid/3 leaves), Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 50.65 per cent (2.03 aphid/3 leaves) and Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 50.17 per cent (2.04 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid and it was less effective treatment than other treatments.

Third spray

Two days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pestpopulation over control of aphid recorded at the second day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 6. All the treatment found statistically effective against aphid as compared to control. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 88.91 per cent reduction in aphid population (0.97 aphid/3 leaves). Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent with 84.62 per cent (1.14 aphid/3 leaves), Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 81.04 per cent (1.26 aphid/3 leaves), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 80.69 per cent (1.27 aphid/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 79.49 per cent (1.31 aphid/3 leaves) and Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 78.42 per cent (1.35 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained next effective group of treatments. Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 72.34 per cent (1.52 aphid/3 leaves), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 71.87 per cent (1.54 aphid/3 leaves) and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 71.15 per cent (1.56 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained less effective treatment than other treatments.

Five days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pestpopulation over control of aphid recorded at the five day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 6. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 92.60 per cent reduction in aphid population (0.82 aphid/3 leaves). Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent with 89.29 per cent (0.98 aphid/3 leaves), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 88.96 per cent (1.00 aphid/3 leaves), Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 88.96 per cent (1.00 aphid/3 leaves), Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 87.08 per cent (1.08 aphid/3 leaves) and Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 85.65 per cent (1.14 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained next effective group of treatments. Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 83.22 per cent (1.23 aphid/3 leaves), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 81.67 per cent (1.29 aphid/3 leaves) and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 80.13 per cent (1.34 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained less effective treatment than other treatments.

Ten days after spraying

The per cent reduction in pestpopulation over control of aphid recorded at the ten day after spraying in different insecticidal treatments is presented in Table 6. Treatment of Flonicamid 0.015 per cent proved to be significantly the most effective with 91.18 per cent reduction in aphid population (0.89 aphid/3 leaves). Clothianidin 0.025 per cent with 88.76 per cent (1.01 aphid/3 leaves), Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent with 86.56 per cent (1.11 aphid/3 leaves), Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent with 86.12 per cent (1.12 aphid/3 leaves), Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent with 83.59 per cent (1.22 aphid/3 leaves) and Dimethoate 0.03 per cent with 82.92 per cent (1.25 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained next effective group of treatments. Spinosad 0.009 per cent with 82.48 per cent (1.26 aphid/3 leaves), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent with 79.07 per cent (1.38 aphid/3 leaves) and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent with 78.85 per cent (1.39 aphid/3 leaves) reduction of aphid over control and remained less effective treatment than other treatments.

The findings are in close relation with those of Morita *et al.* (2007) [13], Nderitu *et al.* (2008) [15], Shinde *et al.* (2011) [19], Shivanna *et al.* (2011) [20], Ghosal *et al.* (2013) [7] and Konar *et al.* (2013) [12].

Yield obtained from different insecticidal treatment plots

Treatment wise data on yield of healthy tomato fruit are presented in Table 7 and depicted in Fig. 7 revealed that the highest fruit yield of 21235 kg/ ha was obtained from the treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent which was statistically at par with Flonicamid 0.015 per cent, Clothianidin 0.025 per cent, Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent,

Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent and Dimethoate 0.03 per cent which recorded 20617, 20494, 20123, 19691 and 19012 kg/ ha yield, respectively. The insecticidal treatments of Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent and Spinosad 0.009 per cent were the next in the order giving yields of 17778 and 17593 kg/ ha, respectively. The treatment Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent gave the lowest yield of 16728 kg/ ha and it did not differ significantly from the control treatment which registered 11235 kg/ ha of yield. As far as the increase in yield is concerned, the maximum per cent increase (89.00%) was recorded from the treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent. The treatments which gave higher percentage of yield include Flonicamid 0.015 per cent, Clothianidin 0.025 per cent, Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent, Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent and Dimethoate 0.03 per cent recording 83.50, 82.41, 79.10, 75.26 and 69.22 per cent increase yield over control. The other treatments gave less than 60 per cent increase in yield like Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent and Spinosad 0.009 per cent and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent.

According to Sandeep and Subash (2013) [18] the highest marketable fruit yield and economic returns were obtained in Imidacloprid 17.8 SL + Spinosad 45 SC (259.06q/ha). Patel *et al.* (2009) reported that the plots treated with Difenthiuron registered highest yield (115.75 q/ha) in chili.

Economics of different insecticidal treatments

The data on economics of three applications of the nine different insecticides against tomato sucking pests; whitefly and aphid during *Kharif*-2016 are presented in 8. The data revealed that the cost of treatment was maximum in clothianidin 0.025 per cent (11100/ha) followed by Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent (6525/ha), Spinosad 0.009 per cent (5400/ha), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent (5220/ha) and Flonicamid 0.015 per cent (4275/ha). The gross realization was maximum from treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent (318525/ha) followed by Flonicamid 0.015 per cent (309255/ha), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent (307410/ha), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent (301845/ha), Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent (295365/ha) and Dimethoate 0.03 per cent (285180/ha). Net realization (net gain) was received maximum 150000/ha from treatment of Imidacloprid 0.005 per cent with 77.51 C:B followed by Flonicamid 0.015 per cent (140730/ha with 26.80 C:B), Clothianidin 0.025 per cent (138885/ha with 11.50 C:B), Difenthiuron 0.05 per cent (133320/ha with 21.52C:B), Acetamiprid 0.008 per cent (126840/ha with 74.83 C:B) and Dimethoate 0.03 per cent (116655/ha with 74.06 C:B).The insecticidal treatments of Thiacloprid 0.024 per cent and spinosad 0.009 per cent and Dinotefuran 0.01 per cent were less effective in control of tomato sucking pests (whitefly and aphid) and register the lower yield and economic.

Table 1: Efficacy of insecticides against whitefly, *B. tabaci*, on tomato after first spray during *kharif*2016

Sr. No.	Treatments	Before Spray	Population of whitefly/3 leaves/plant		
			2 DAS	5 DAS	10 DAS
1	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	3.33 (11.11)	2.38*(5.65)[44.00]	1.87(3.50)[68.86]	2.16(4.67)[55.31]
2	Spinosad 45 SC	3.38 (11.42)	2.58(6.64)[34.19]	2.22(4.93)[56.13]	2.44(5.94)[43.15]
3	Acetamiprid 20 SP	3.22 (10.37)	2.39(5.71)[43.40]	1.95(3.82)[66.01]	2.35(5.54)[46.98]
4	Clothianidin 50 WDG	3.21 (10.33)	2.58(6.66)[33.99]	2.38(5.65)[49.73]	2.55(6.50)[37.79]
5	Thiacloprid 24 SC	3.22 (10.35)	2.44(5.94)[41.12]	2.00(4.01)[64.32]	2.39(5.70)[45.45]
6	Dinotefuran 20 SG	3.27 (10.71)	2.63(6.62)[34.39]	2.38(5.68)[49.46]	2.45(6.00)[42.58]
7	Difenthiuron 50 WP	3.23 (10.45)	2.40(5.74)[43.11]	1.96(3.84)[65.83]	2.37(5.60)[46.41]
8	Flonicamid 50 WG	3.17 (10.05)	2.58(6.67)[33.89]	2.14(4.59)[59.16]	2.47(6.10)[41.62]
9	Dimethoate 30 EC	3.25 (10.56)	2.57(6.60)[34.58]	2.14(4.57)[59.34]	2.35(5.54)[46.98]
10	Control	3.46 (11.99)	3.18 (10.09)	3.35 (11.24)	3.23 (10.45)

S.Em. \pm	0.074	0.069	0.076	0.046
C.D. at 5%	NS	0.20	0.22	0.13
C.V.%	3.94	4.63	5.85	3.26

* Square root transformations. Figures in parenthesis () are retransformed values. Figures in parenthesis [] are per cent reductions over control. DAS: Day after spray.

Table 2: Efficacy of insecticides against whitefly, *B. tabaci*, on tomato after second spray during *kharif* 2016

Sr. No.	Treatments	Population of whitefly/3 leaves/plant		
		2 DAS	5 DAS	10 DAS
1	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	1.94*(3.76) [65.47]	1.37(1.89) [82.46]	1.54(2.36) [76.37]
2	Spinosad 45 SC	2.21(4.87) [55.28]	1.77(3.12) [71.05]	2.04(4.15) [58.45]
3	Acetamiprid 20 SP	1.99(3.95) [63.72]	1.45(2.11) [80.42]	1.79(3.19) [68.06]
4	Clothianidin 50 WDG	2.20(4.83) [55.64]	1.79(3.22) [70.12]	2.03(4.12) [58.75]
5	Thiacloprid 24 SC	2.02(4.08) [62.53]	1.58(2.50) [76.80]	2.01(4.05) [59.45]
6	Dinotefuran 20 SG	2.12(4.49) [58.76]	2.00(4.01) [62.80]	2.10(4.40) [55.95]
7	Difenthiuron 50 WP	1.87(3.50) [67.86]	1.30(1.69) [84.32]	1.65(2.72) [72.77]
8	Flonicamid 50 WG	2.05(4.19) [61.52]	1.83(3.34) [69.01]	1.90(3.60) [63.96]
9	Dimethoate 30 EC	2.00(3.99) [63.36]	1.96(3.84) [64.37]	1.91(3.66) [63.36]
10	Control	3.30 (10.89)	3.28 (10.78)	3.16 (9.99)
S.Em. \pm		0.067	0.068	0.075
C.D. at 5%		0.20	0.20	0.22
C.V.%		5.37	6.45	6.46

* Square roottransformations. Figures in parenthesis () are retransformed values. Figures in parenthesis [] are per cent reduction over control. DAS: Day after spray.

Table 3: Efficacy of insecticides against whitefly, *B. tabaci*, on tomato after third spray during *kharif*2016

Sr. No.	Treatments	Population of whitefly/3 leaves/plant		
		2 DAS	5 DAS	10 DAS
1	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	1.29*(1.66) [82.76]	0.95(0.90) [90.38]	1.30(1.69) [80.34]
2	Spinosad 45 SC	1.63(2.66) [72.37]	1.23(1.52) [83.76]	1.54(2.36) [72.55]
3	Acetamiprid 20 SP	1.46(2.13) [77.88]	1.10(1.20) [87.17]	1.34(1.80) [79.06]
4	Clothianidin 50 WDG	1.80(3.23) [74.76]	1.27(1.62) [82.69]	1.59(2.53) [70.58]
5	Thiacloprid 24 SC	1.56(2.43) [74.76]	1.22(1.49) [84.08]	1.45(2.10) [75.81]
6	Dinotefuran 20 SG	1.84(3.40) [64.69]	1.35(1.82) [80.55]	1.74(3.02) [64.88]
7	Difenthiuron 50 WP	1.34(1.79) [81.41]	0.98(0.96) [89.74]	1.26(1.59) [81.51]
8	Flonicamid 50 WG	2.05(4.19) [56.49]	1.31(1.72) [81.62]	1.74(3.04) [64.65]
9	Dimethoate 30 EC	1.69(2.86) [70.30]	1.27(1.62) [82.69]	1.62(2.62) [69.53]
10	Control	3.10 (9.63)	3.06 (9.36)	2.93 (8.60)
S.Em. \pm		0.057	0.035	0.050
C.D. at 5%		0.16	0.10	0.15
C.V.%		5.53	4.40	5.33

* Square root transformations. Figures in parenthesis () are retransformed values. Figures in parenthesis [] are per cent reduction over control. DAS: Day after spray.

Table 4: Efficacy of insecticides against aphid, *A. gossypii*, on tomato after first spray during *kharif* 2016

Sr. No.	Treatments	Before Spray	Population of aphid/3 leaves/plant		
			2 DAS	5 DAS	10 DAS
1	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	3.06(9.36)	2.34*(5.48)[39.38]	1.99(3.95)[57.70]	2.03(4.12)[54.32]
2	Spinosad 45 SC	3.05(9.30)	2.67(7.13)[21.12]	2.50(6.23)[33.29]	2.62(6.86)[23.94]
3	Acetamiprid 20 SP	3.22(10.37)	2.31(5.32)[41.15]	2.06(4.23)[54.71]	2.27(5.15)[42.90]
4	Clothianidin 50 WDG	3.08(9.47)	2.30(5.29)[41.48]	2.01(4.05)[56.63]	2.04(4.16)[53.88]
5	Thiacloprid 24 SC	3.15(9.90)	2.39(5.73)[36.61]	2.08(4.33)[53.64]	2.05(4.19)[53.54]
6	Dinotefuran 20 SG	2.97(8.80)	2.60(6.76)[25.22]	2.55(6.50)[30.40]	2.54(6.43)[28.71]
7	Difenthiuron 50 WP	2.98(8.90)	2.56(6.54)[27.65]	2.50(6.23)[33.29]	2.34(5.48)[39.24]
8	Flonicamid 50 WG	3.18(10.11)	2.17(4.69)[48.11]	1.75(3.06)[67.23]	2.00(3.99)[55.76]
9	Dimethoate 30 EC	3.15(9.90)	2.30(5.31)[41.26]	2.00(4.01)[57.06]	2.05(4.19)[53.54]
10	Control	3.31(10.93)	3.01(9.04)	3.06(9.34)	3.00(9.02)
S.Em. \pm		0.072	0.072	0.094	0.048
C.D. at 5%		NS	0.21	0.28	0.14
C.V.%		4.02	5.04	7.27	3.66

* Square root transformations. Figures in parenthesis () are retransformed values. Figures in parenthesis [] are per cent reduction over control. DAS: Day after spray.

Table 5: Efficacy of insecticides against aphid, *A. gossypii*, on tomato after second spray during *kharif* 2016

Sr. No.	Treatments	Population of aphid/3 leaves/plant		
		2 DAS	5 DAS	10 DAS
1	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	1.80*(3.23) [67.50]	1.30(1.69) [81.90]	1.42(2.03) [75.68]
2	Spinosad 45 SC	2.24(5.00) [49.69]	2.01(4.04) [56.74]	2.03(4.12) [50.65]
3	Acetamiprid 20 SP	1.81(3.29) [66.90]	1.33(1.76) [81.15]	1.55(2.39) [71.37]
4	Clothianidin 50 WDG	1.81(3.26) [67.20]	1.50(2.24) [76.01]	1.54(2.36) [71.73]
5	Thiacloprid 24 SC	1.88(3.53) [64.48]	1.53(2.33) [75.05]	1.50(2.26) [72.93]
6	Dinotefuran 20 SG	2.02(4.09) [58.85]	1.80(3.23) [65.41]	2.02(4.09) [51.01]
7	Difenthiuron 50 WP	2.06(4.26) [57.14]	1.86(3.47) [62.84]	2.04(4.16) [50.17]
8	Flonicamid 50 WG	1.73(2.99) [69.91]	1.21(1.46) [84.36]	1.11(1.23) [85.26]
9	Dimethoate 30 EC	1.89(3.56) [64.18]	1.31(1.72) [81.58]	1.43(2.05) [75.44]
10	Control	3.15 (9.94)	3.06 (9.34)	2.89 (8.35)
S.Em. ±		0.053	0.048	0.046
C.D. at 5%		0.15	0.14	0.13
C.V.%		4.51	5	4.59

* Square root transformations. Figures in parenthesis () are retransformed values. Figures in parenthesis [] are per cent reduction over control. DAS: Day after spray.

Table 6: Efficacy of insecticides against aphid, *A. gossypii*, on tomato after third spray during *kharif* 2016

Sr. No.	Treatments	Population of aphid/3 leaves/plant		
		2 DAS	5 DAS	10 DAS
1	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	1.14*(1.29)[84.62]	0.98(0.97)[89.29]	1.12(1.26)[86.12]
2	Spinosad 45 SC	1.52(2.32)[72.34]	1.23(1.52)[83.22]	1.26(1.59)[82.48]
3	Acetamiprid 20 SP	1.26(1.59)[81.04]	1.08(1.17)[87.08]	1.11(1.22)[86.56]
4	Clothianidin 50 WDG	1.27(1.62)[80.69]	1.00(1.00)[88.96]	1.01(1.02)[88.76]
5	Thiacloprid 24 SC	1.35(1.81)[78.42]	1.14(1.30)[85.65]	1.22(1.49)[83.59]
6	Dinotefuran 20 SG	1.56(2.42)[71.15]	1.34(1.80)[80.13]	1.39(1.92)[78.85]
7	Difenthiuron 50 WP	1.54(2.36)[71.87]	1.29(1.66)[81.67]	1.38(1.90)[79.07]
8	Flonicamid 50 WG	0.97(0.93)[88.91]	0.82(0.67)[92.60]	0.89(0.80)[91.18]
9	Dimethoate 30 EC	1.31(1.72)[79.49]	1.00(1.00)[88.96]	1.25(1.55)[82.92]
10	Control	2.90(8.39)	3.01(9.06)	3.01(9.08)
S.Em. ±		0.029	0.037	0.040
C.D. at 5%		0.087	0.11	0.11
C.V.%		3.42	5	5.09

* Square root transformations. Figures in parenthesis () are retransformed values. Figures in parenthesis [] are per cent reduction over control. DAS: Day after spray.

Table 7: Effect of different insecticidal treatments on the yield of tomato during *kharif*- 2016

Sr. No	Treatments	Yield of healthy tomato fruit (Kg/ha)	Yield increase over control (%)
1	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	21235	89.00
2	Spinosad 45 SC	17593	56.59
3	Acetamiprid 20 SP	19691	75.26
4	Clothianidin 50 WDG	20494	82.41
5	Thiacloprid 24 SC	17778	58.23
6	Dinotefuran 20 SG	16728	48.89
7	Difenthiuron 50 WP	20123	79.10
8	Flonicamid 50 WG	20617	83.50
9	Dimethoate 30 EC	19012	69.22
10	Control	11235	--
S.Em. ±		827	--
C.D. at 5%		2457	--
C.V.%		7.76	--

Table 8: Economics of different insecticidal treatments against sucking pest infesting tomato during *Kharif*- 2016

Sr. No.	Treatment	Insecticide used for 3 spray (ml or gm/ha)	Cost of insecticide (Rs/ha)	Total cost for 3 application* (Rs/ha)	Yield (kg/ha)	Gross** realization (Rs/ha)	Net realization (Rs/ha)	C:B Ratio (CBR)
1	Imidacloprid 30.5 SC	240	960	1935	21235	318525	150000	77.51
2	Spinosad 45 SC	300	5400	6375	17593	263895	95370	14.96
3	Acetamiprid 20 SP	600	720	1695	19691	295365	126840	74.83
4	Clothianidin 50 WDG	750	11100	12075	20494	307410	138885	11.50
5	Thiacloprid 24 SC	1500	3600	4575	17778	266670	98145	21.45
6	Dinotefuran 20 SG	750	6525	7500	16728	250920	82395	10.98
7	Difenthiuron 50 WP	1500	5220	6195	20123	301845	133320	21.52
8	Flonicamid 50 WG	450	4275	5250	20617	309255	140730	26.80
9	Dimethoate 30 EC	1500	600	1575	19012	285180	116655	74.06
10	Control	--	--	975	11235	168525	--	--

*Labour charges @ 325/ha/spray. ** Market value of tomato @ 15/kg.

References

1. Anonymous. Indian horticulture database. National Horticulture Board, Ministry of Agriculture, 2014, 4. [Fide: <http://nhb.gov.in/areapro/IndianHor.2013.pdf>.]
2. Anonymous. Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, or www.nhb.gov.in (NHB Database 2014-2015), 2014-2015b.
3. Bharati MS, Shetgar SS, Sawant CG. Bio-efficacy of different insecticides against brinjaljassid (*Amrasca biguttula biguttula*) and whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci*). Journal of Entomological Research. 2015; 39(4):369-372.
4. Butani DK. Insect pest of vegetables-tomato. Pesticides. 1977; 11:33-36.
5. Butani DK, Jotwani MG. Tomato, in "Insects in Vegetables" publ. By Periodical Expert Book Agency. Delhi, 1984, 22-34.
6. Ghosh A, Chatterjee ML, Chakraborti K, Samanta A. Field evaluation of insecticides against chillithrips (*Scirtothrips dorsalis* Hood). Annals of Plant Protection Science. 2009; 17(1):69-71.
7. Ghosal A, Chatterjee ML, Bhattacharya A. Bio-efficacy of neonicotinoids against *Aphis gossypii* Glover of okra. Journal of Crop and Weed. 2013; 9(2):181-184.
8. Gosalwad SS, Kwathekar BR, Wadnekar DW, Asewar BV, Dhutraj DN. Bioefficacy of newer insecticides against sucking pest of okra. Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities. 2015; 33(3):343-346.
9. Gupta PK, Ansari NA, Tewari HD, Tewari JP. Efficacy of different insecticides against Whitefly (*Bemisia tabaci* Gen.) in tomato crop and control of Tomato Leaf Curl Virus. Pesticide Research Journal. 2007; 19(2):218-219.
10. Idris M, Mandal SK. Newer insecticides against whitefly vector, *Bemisiatabaci* and Tomato Yellow Vein Mosaic Virus. International Journal of Plant Protection. 2014; 42(1):97-98.
11. Kalloo. Insect, mites and nemetodes in "Tomato" Publ. By Allied Publishers Private Limited, Ahmadabad, 1986, 403.
12. Konar A, More KA, Dutta Ray KS. Population dynamics and efficacy of some insecticides against aphid on okra. Journal of Crop and Weed. 2013; 9(2):168-171.
13. Morita M, Ueda T, Yoneda T, Koyanagi T, Haga T. Flonicamid, a novel insecticide with a rapid inhibitory effect on aphid feeding. Pest Management Science. 2007; 63(10):969-973.
14. Muhammad A, Muhammad HB, Muhammad A, Muhammad AK. Efficacy of some insecticides against whitefly (*Bemisiatabaci* Genn.) infesting cotton under field conditions. Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences. 2009; 7(2):140-143
15. Nderitu JH, Kasina JM, Kimenju JW, Malenge F. Evaluation of synthetic and neem based insecticides for managing aphids on okra (Malvaceae) in Eastern Kenya. Journal of Entomology. 2008; 5(3):207-212.
16. Panse VG, Sukhatme PV. Statistical method for agriculture workers. I. C. A. R., New Delhi, 1985, 361.
17. Patel BH, Koshiya DJ, Korat DM, Vaishnav PR. Evaluation of some insecticides against thrips, *Scirtothrips dorsalis* infesting chilli. Karnataka Journal of Agriculture Sciences. 2009; 22(2):327-330.
18. Sandeep K, Subash S. Field efficacy of some systemic insecticides and microbial pesticides (module) against aphid, *Aphis gossypii* (Glover) and fruit borer *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner) on tomato in Punjab. Agriculture for Sustainable Development. 2013; 1(1):1-6.
19. Shinde ST, Shetgar SS, Badgujar AG. Bio-efficacy of different insecticides against major pest of okra. Journal of Entomological Research. 2011; 35(2):133-137.
20. Shivanna BK, Gangadhara NB, Nagaraja R, Basavaraja MK, Kalleswara Swamy CM, Karegowda C. Bioefficacy of new insecticides against sucking insect pests of transgenic cotton. International Journal of Science and Nature. 2011; 2(1):79-83.
21. Sreekanth PN, Reddy KMS. Efficacy of different insecticides against sucking pests of cotton. Environment and Ecology. 2011; 29(4A):2035-2039.
22. Sridhar V, Chakravarthy AK, Asokan R, Vinesh LS, Rebijith KB, Vennila S. New record of the invasive South American tomato leaf miner, *Tuta absoluta* (Meyrick) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) in India. Pest Management in Horticultural Ecosystems. 2014; 20(2):148-154.
23. Vichiter S, Ramesh C. Testing the new molecule polo 50 WP (Diafenthiuron) against cotton whitefly. *Bemisia tabaci* (Gen). Pestology. 2009; 33(3):50-52.
24. Zitter TA, Everett PH. Effect of an aphid-transmitted yellowing virus on yield and quality of staked tomatoes. Plant Disease. 1982; 66:456-458