

Natural enemies of brown planthopper and whitebacked planthopper during rice cropping season at Madurai

J. ALICE, R. P. SUJEETHA* and M. S. VENUGOPAL

Agricultural College and Research Institute

Madurai 625 104, Tamil Nadu, India

E-mail: alicesujeetha @ yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: Studies on the natural enemies of rice planthoppers revealed that *Anagrus* sp. was seen throughout the season, which shot up from the second fortnight of October to the first fortnight of November. *Pseudogonatopus* sp. parasitized more number of Brown Planthopper (BPH). Parasitic efficiency of *Pseudogonatopus* sp. was more when two parasitoid adult females were released per hill. The functional response of a single mirid *Cyrtorhinus lividipennis* prey was greater than when in groups. A single mirid predated 3.33 and 2.66 BPH nymphs and 2.66 and 3.0 WBPH nymphs per day on TNI and ADT36 rice varieties, respectively.

KEY WORDS: *Anagrus* sp., BPH, *Cyrtorhinus lividipennis*, *Pseudogonatopus*, WBPH

Rice is an important crop grown over an area of 40-41 million hectares under diverse conditions in India (Sampath, 1990). Rice is attacked by more than 100 insect species, which cause significant economic loss. More than 22 species of planthoppers occur in South and South-East Asia (Wilson and Claridge, 1991) and only two species cause significant widespread problems. The brown planthopper (BPH), *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stål) and the whitebacked planthopper (WBPH), *Sogatella furcifera* (Horvath) damage plants by direct feeding showing a symptom known as "hopperburn". The BPH also transmits virus diseases. The planthoppers became serious pests of rice in Asia about 30 years ago (Dyck and Thomas, 1979) and continue to be a threat for rice cultivation.

The rice ecosystem is bestowed with lot of natural enemies. More than 200 natural enemies were recorded on BPH (Ooi, 1988). Egg parasitism was often very high. The most commonly reported predator is the mirid bug *Cyrtorhinus lividipennis*, which feeds on all stages (Rajendran, 1994).

Field experiments were conducted to know the activity of egg predators, nymphal parasitoids and predators of BPH and WBPH and the results of which are presented below. The activity of egg parasitoid, parasitoid efficiency of dryinid, *Pseudogonatopus* sp. and the predatory potential of *Cyrtorhinus lividipennis* was studied under field conditions at Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai during Rabi season. The activity

*Present address: Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru College of Agriculture, Karaikal 609 603, Pondicherry

of egg parasitoids of BPH and WBPH was studied by randomly placing potted rice seedlings with hopper eggs in the field and exposed for three days (Otake, 1967). The potted plants were brought back to the insectary and the hopper eggs were allowed to hatch. Emerging nymphs were counted and removed. Once the hatching stopped the seedlings were dissected out, and the orange red eggs were considered as parasitized and percentage parasitization was computed. Parasitoid trapping was done at weekly interval and there were three replications for both BPH and WBPH.

The efficiency of dryinid parasitoid, *Pseudogonatopus* sp. was studied on ADT36 and TN1 plants by using ten fourth instar BPH nymphs in polyester film cages. The female dryinids were released at 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 numbers. Each treatment was replicated four times. Plants with BPH nymphs without the parasitoid served as control. Seven days later, the nymphs were

examined for the presence of abdominal sac to ascertain parasitization and were counted. The observation was taken for three days. A similar experiment was conducted separately for WBPH nymphs.

Predatory potential of the mirid, *Cyrtorhinus lividipennis* was studied by caging twenty-five last instar nymphs of BPH on 30day-old potted plants of ADT36 and TN1. Pre-starved freshly adult predator at densities 1, 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 numbers were released into each cage, separately and each treatment was replicated four times. Number of BPH nymphs killed in a day was recorded. Similar experiment was conducted for WBPH also.

The egg parasitoids were active throughout the cropping season of rice. More than 50 per cent egg parasitization was recorded during the second fortnight of September to the second fortnight of November in case of BPH. In case of WBPH more

than 50 per cent from second fortnight (Table 1). The (84.66%) and 1 during first ovipositional in egg parasitoid parasitization c The planthopper mirid predator was *Anagrus* conformity with (1999).

The results indicated that 70 per cent was three *Pseudogonatopus* 67.5 and 62.5 respectively (Table 1) in WBPH with cent on TN1 at

Table 1. Parasitization of eggs of BPH and WBPH by parasitoids

| Month & fortnight | Per cent parasitization | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | BPH | WBPH |
| August 15 | 0.00(0.90) ^a | 0.00(0.90) ^a |
| August 30 | 15.00(22.72) ^a | 6.33(14.43) ^a |
| September 15 | 48.00(43.85) ^a | 34.00(35.64) ^a |
| September 30 | 53.33(46.91) ^a | 45.00(42.12) ^a |
| October 15 | 62.33 (52.15) ^a | 49.33(44.61) ^a |
| October 31 | 77.00(61.38) ^b | 89.66(71.33) ^a |
| November 15 | 84.66(67.07) ^a | 91.00(72.70) ^a |
| November 30 | 68.00(55.56) ^a | 71.66(57.86) ^b |
| December 15 | 34.00(35.65) ^a | 45.66(42.51) ^a |
| December 31 | 30.66(33.61) ^a | 37.33(37.65) ^a |

Figures in parentheses are arcsine-transformed values.

Means followed by the same letter(s) in a column are not significantly different ($P=0.05$) by DMRT.

Table 2. Parasitoid density (nos)

| Parasitoid density (nos) |
|--------------------------|
| 1 |
| 2 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| Control |

Figures in parentheses are arcsine-transformed values. Means followed by the same letter(s) in a column are not significantly different ($P=0.05$) by DMRT.

abdominal sac to be counted. The days. A similar result was also recorded for WBPH

mirid, *Cyrtorhinus* sp. Twenty-five last instar potted plants were used freshly adult BPH, 15, 20 and 25 per cage, separately and counted four times. The experiment was conducted for

active throughout the day. More than 50 per cent parasitization was recorded during the second and third fortnight of the experiment. WBPH more

than 50 per cent egg parasitization was recorded from second fortnight of October to November (Table 1). The peak egg parasitization of BPH (84.66%) and WBPH (91.0%) eggs was observed during first fortnight of November. The ovipositional injury made by WBPH attracted the egg parasitoids and resulted in maximum parasitization compared to BPH (Kisimoto, 1981). The planthopper eggs were also destroyed by the mirid predator. The predominant egg parasitoid was *Anagrus* sp. The present results are in conformity with the findings of Claridge *et al.* (1999).

The results of efficiency of parasitism indicated that the maximum parasitism of 75 and 70 per cent was recorded at a density of two and three *Pseudogonatopus* sp. in BPH on TN1, while 67.5 and 62.5 per cent on ADT36 variety, respectively (Table 2). A similar trend was noticed in WBPH with a maximum of 80 and 82.5 per cent on TN1 and ADT36, respectively. Overall,

the parasitoid preference was more for WBPH than BPH and the susceptible variety TN1 recorded more parasitization than moderately resistant variety (ADT36). The per cent parasitization of BPH and WBPH decreased with the increase in the number of adult female parasitoids (*Pseudogonatopus* sp.) enclosed in the cage. There was no influence of rice varieties on parasitoid efficiency. Similar results were also reported by Amirtharaj (1996).

The predatory efficiency was high (3.33 BPH nymphs) when a single mirid was enclosed on TN1 rice variety. The predator efficiency decreased with increase in the number of predators enclosed (Table 3). The same trend was observed on WBPH on two rice varieties. Similar results were also reported by Saxena *et al.* (1974) and Poorani (1990) where a single predator consumed more prey than in a group.

Table 2. Parasitization of nymphs of BPH and WBPH by *Pseudogonatopus* sp. on two rice varieties

| Parasitoid density (nos.) | Parasitization (%) | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | BPH | | WBPH | |
| | TN 1 | ADT 36 | TN 1 | ADT 36 |
| 1 | 55.0(48.84) ^b | 55.0 (46.92) ^b | 65.0(52.77) ^a | 57.5(50.85) ^b |
| 2 | 75.09(59.00) ^a | 67.5(54.78) ^a | 80.0(63.43) ^a | 82.5(63.43) ^a |
| 3 | 70.0(56.79) ^a | 62.5(50.77) ^{ab} | 72.5(59.00) ^a | 65.0(54.78) ^b |
| 4 | 47.5(43.07) ^c | 42.5(41.15) ^c | 57.5(48.84) ^c | 47.5(43.07) ^c |
| 5 | 15.0(22.14) ^d | 15.0(22.14) ^d | 25.0(28.78) ^d | 17.5(26.56) ^d |
| Control | 0.0(0.90) ^e | 0.0(0.90) ^e | 0.0(0.90) ^e | 0.0(0.90) ^e |

Figures in parentheses are arcsine-transformed values.

Means followed by same letter(s) in a column are not significantly different (P=0.05) by DMRT.

Table 3. Predation of BPH and WBPH by *C. lividipennis* on two rice varieties

| Predator density | Number of nymphs preyed / day / predator | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | BPH | | WBPH | |
| | TN1 | ADT36 | TN1 | ADT36 |
| 1 | 3.33 ^c | 2.66 ^d | 2.66 ^c | 3.00 ^c |
| 5 | 6.66 ^d | 6.33 ^{bc} | 4.66 ^c | 4.33 ^c |
| 10 | 11.66 ^c | 9.66 ^b | 9.33 ^b | 9.00 ^b |
| 15 | 12.33 ^c | 12.00 ^b | 11.33 ^b | 11.66 ^b |
| 20 | 15.00 ^b | 15.33 ^a | 13.00 ^a | 13.33 |
| 25 | 18.33 ^a | 17.66 ^a | 15.66 ^a | 16.33 ^a |

Means followed by the same letter(s) in a column are not significantly different ($P=0.05$) by DMRT.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The senior author thanks Indian Council of Agricultural Research for the award of Senior Fellowship during the study period.

REFERENCES

- Amirtharaj, S. 1996. Host preference and parasitic efficiency of *Pseudogonatopus* sp. (Hymenoptera: Dryinidae) an ectoparasitoid of rice planthoppers. M. Sc. (Ag.) thesis, submitted to Tamilnadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 115 pp.
- Claridge, M. F., Morgan, J. C., Steenkista, A. E., Im, M. and Damayanthi, D. 1999. Seasonal patterns of egg parasitism and natural biological control of rice Brown Planthopper in Indonesia. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology*, (4): 297-304.
- Dyck, V. A. and Thomas, B. 1979. The Brown planthopper problem. In: *Brown Planthopper: Threat to rice production in Asia*. IRRI, Philippines. pp. 3-17.
- Kisimoto, R. 1981. Development, behaviour, population dynamics and control of the brown planthopper *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal). *Review of plant protection Research*, 14: 26-58.
- Ooi, P. A. C. 1988. Ecology and surveillance of *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal) implications for its management in Malaysia. Ph. D. dissertation, submitted to University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, 121pp.
- Otake, A. 1967. Studies on the egg parasites of the smaller brown planthopper, *Laodelphax striatellus* (Fallen) (Hemiptera: Delphacidae): A device for assessing the parasitic activity, and the result obtained in 1966. *Bulletin of Shikoku Agricultural Experimental Station*, 17: 19-103.
- Poorani, J. 1990. Prey influence on the development and biology of *Cyrtorhinus lividipennis*, a predator of rice hoppers. M. Sc. (Ag.) thesis, submitted to Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, 116pp.
- Rajendran, G. F. 1994. Population sampling of planthoppers and insect predators in eastern Sri Lanka. *Insect Science and its Application*, 15: 159-143.
- Sampath, T. V. 1990. Rice production in India, an overview. *International Rice Communication Newsletter*, 39: 255-264.
- Saxena, K. N., Gandhi, J. R. and Saxena, R. C. M. 1974. Patterns of relationship between certain leafhoppers and plants. *Entomology Experimental Application*, 17: 303-313.
- Wilson, M. R. and Claridge, M. F. 1991. *Handbook for the identification of leafhoppers and planthoppers of Rice*. CAB International, Walling Ford, Oxford, UK, 18pp.

Pathogeni

1

ABSTR

Sorokin ha
(Guenee) (1
conditions x
x 10⁵ spore:
mortality w

KEY W

Rice leaf fo
inhabits the leave
green tissue from
and reducing the
humidity and optir
ecological factors
the leaf folder (Pat
hold levels (ETL
revealed leaf fol
planting to pre-t
initiation to booti
1994). The ETL's
reported to be 10-
plant. Threshold
leaves in the vega
flag leaf damage x
reported in Tamil

Entomopat
candidates for bic
insect pests. *Met*
Sorokin is pathog
pests of Coleopter