



Research Note

Efficacy of biocontrol agents in the management of onion thrips, *Thrips tabaci* (Lind.) on onion

S. SUDHIR KUMAR, C. T. ASHOK KUMAR, C. SHIVARAJU* and M. THIPPAIAH

Department of Agricultural Entomology, UAS, GKVK, Bengaluru, 560065, Karnataka, India Corresponding author E. mail: Shiva.338@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Application of *Beauveria bassiana* (Bals) @ 1x 10⁹ spores/ml twice was found to be best treatment with lowest mean thrips population (9.53/plant) with highest per cent reduction (64.15) followed by *Verticillium lecanii* (Zimmerman) @ $1x10^9$ spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP) with 49.89 per cent reduction. *Chrysoperla zastrowi* sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + *B. bassiana* @ $1x10^9$ spores/ml (30 DAP) with 41.50 per cent reduction was found to be next best treatment. The treatment with *C. z.* sillemi @ 20,000 /ac (20 and 30 DAP) was least effective treatment with lowest per cent reduction (28.59).

KEY WORDS: Chrysoperla zastrowi sillemi, Beauveria bassiana, onion, thrips, Verticillium lecanii

(Article chronicle: Received: 17-2-2012 Revised: 26-6-2012 Accepted: 27-6-2012)

Onion, *Allium cepa* L., is a common and important commercial vegetable belong to family Lilliacae. Onion thrips, *Thrips tabaci* Lind. is serious pest inflicting 34 – 43 per cent loss in yield (Krishna Kumar *et al.*, 2001). Failure to control thrips by timely and effective means causes considerable damage and results in immense economic yield losses to the tune of 50 per cent (Anonymous, 2000). Even 90 per cent loss in yield has also been reported on onion when thrips attack the crop in early stages of crop growth (Anonymous, 1984). Both nymph and adults cause direct damage by puncturing epidermis of the leaves and suck the sap. Numerous white patches are formed on infested leaves (Srinivas *et al.*, 2006).

Farmers extensively use insecticides for controlling thrips which results in mortality of natural enemies, outbreak of secondary pests and development of insecticide resistance (Shitole *et al.*, 2002). Biological control could be a safe option for the management of thrips. Hence, the present investigation was undertaken to evaluate the field performance of different biological control agents against *T. tabaci* infesting onion.

Field experiments were conducted during June 2009 – September 2010 at Zonal Agricultural Research Station, Hiriyur (first season) and M. D. Kote (second and third seasons) to evaluate the bio control agents

against onion thrips. The experiment was carried out with randomized block design with three replications and seven treatments. Bio-control treatments (*C. zastrowi*, *B. bassiana* and *V. lecanii*) were imposed 20 and 30 days after planting when the pest population was at its peak. Dimethoate 30 EC @ 1.7 ml/l was used as check. The observations on the thrips population was recorded at 30 to 44 DAP at seven days intervals on ten plants selected at random. All leaves on each plant were examined under 10X hand lens for the presence of thrips and the population was expressed as No. of thrips/plant.

The data on the effect of various biocontrol agents against thrips on 30, 37 & 44 DAP under field conditions are presented in Table 1.

On 30 DAP, the treatment *Beauveria bassiana* recorded the lowest population (6.86 thrips/plant) with highest per cent reduction (67.47 over control). This treatment was significantly superior to other treatments. This was followed by two applications of *Verticillium lecanii* (10.43/plant) with 50.55 per cent reduction. The highest population of (14.85/plant) with lowest 29.59 per cent reduction was found in the treatment with two releases of *C. z.* sillemi eggs/grubs @ 20,000 / ac (20 and 30 DAP) (Table 1).

t season)
(First
population
tabaci
Thrips
against
agents
biocontrol
various
\mathbf{of}
Evaluation
÷.
Table

Sl. No. Treatments Precount 30 % reduction 37 % reduction 44 % reduction 44 1. <i>Chrysoperla Z. silteni</i> 19.34 14.45 29.59 17.43 28.62 21.33 28.04 17.8 2. <i>Beauveria bassianu</i> 1x10° 22.65 6.86 67.47 8.36 65.77 11.54 61.07 8.9 3. <i>Verticillium lecuni</i> 1x10° 22.65 6.86 67.47 8.36 65.77 11.54 61.07 8.9 3. <i>Verticillium lecuni</i> 1x10° 18.34 10.43 50.55 12.26 49.80 15.11 49.02 12.6 4. $(3.00)ac (20 and 30 DAP) 18.34 10.43 50.55 12.26 49.80 13.763 40.32 14.7 4. (2.0DAP) + k bassiana 1x10° 18.34 14.56 3.85 14.35 17.63 40.55 40.55 40.55 40.55 40.55 40.55 40.55 40.55 40.55 40.55 40.55 $						T	tabaci (No./plant	()			
I. Chrysoperla Z silleni 19.34 14.85 29.59 17.43 28.62 21.33 28.04 17.8 2. $20,000$ (ac (20 and 30 DAP) $(3.92)e$ $(3.92)e$ $(4.23)r$ $(4.23)r$ $(4.67)^a$ $(4.67)^a$ $(4.67)^a$ $(4.2)r$ 2. Beaweria bassiana Ix10° 22.65 6.86 67.47 8.36 65.77 11.54 61.07 $(3.9.2)$ 3. kernicillian lecani Ix10° 22.65 6.86 67.47 8.36 65.77 11.54 61.07 $(3.9.2)$ 3. kernicillian lecani Ix10° 22.65 6.86 67.47 8.36 65.77 11.54 61.07 $(3.9.2)$ 4. czo and 30 DAP) 18.34 10.43 50.55 12.26 49.80 15.11 49.02 14.7 4. $C.2 xilteni 20000 ac 19.34 14.56 33.57 41.28 17.63 40.52 14.7 5. C.2 xilteni 20,000 ac 19.34 14.56$	SI. No.	Treatments	Precount	30 DAP	% reduction over control	37 DAP	% reduction over control	44 DAP	% reduction over control	Mean	% reduction over control
2. Beaweria bassiana 1x10° spores/m1 (20 and 30 DAP) 22.65 6.86 6.747 8.36 65.77 11.54 6107 8.9 3. Verticillium lecanii 1x10° 18.34 10.43 50.55 12.26 49.80 15.11 49.02 13.65 3. Verticillium lecanii 1x10° 18.34 10.43 50.55 12.26 49.80 15.11 49.02 13.65 13.67 33.95 13.67 33.95 33.67 33.95 33.67 33.95 33.67 33.95 33.67 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 34.75 <t< td=""><td>1.</td><td>Chrysoperla Z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 and 30 DAP)</td><td>19.34</td><td>14.85 (3.92)e</td><td>29.59</td><td>17.43 (4.23)$^{\circ}$</td><td>28.62</td><td>21.33 (4.67)^d</td><td>28.04</td><td>17.87 (4.29)^e</td><td>28.66</td></t<>	1.	Chrysoperla Z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 and 30 DAP)	19.34	14.85 (3.92)e	29.59	17.43 (4.23) $^{\circ}$	28.62	21.33 (4.67) ^d	28.04	17.87 (4.29) ^e	28.66
3. Verticilium lecanit 1x10° 18.34 10.43 50.55 12.26 49.80 15.11 49.02 13.13 4. C. Z. sillemi 20,000 / ac 20.08 13.31c 3.575 (3.57)c (3.57)c (3.95) ^b (3.65) (3.65) 4. C. Z. sillemi 20,000 / ac 20.28 12.24 41.96 14.34 41.28 17.63 40.52 14.7 5. C. Z. sillemi 20,000 / ac 19.34 14.56 30.96 16.93 30.67 20.87 (3.97) 5. C. Z. sillemi 20,000 / ac 19.34 14.56 30.96 16.93 30.67 20.87 (4.26) ⁶ <td>2.</td> <td>Beauveria bassiana 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)</td> <td>22.65</td> <td>6.86 (2.71)a</td> <td>67.47</td> <td>8.36 (2.98)^a</td> <td>65.77</td> <td>11.54 $(3.47)^{a}$</td> <td>61.07</td> <td>$(3.07)^{a}$</td> <td>64.39</td>	2.	Beauveria bassiana 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)	22.65	6.86 (2.71)a	67.47	8.36 (2.98) ^a	65.77	11.54 $(3.47)^{a}$	61.07	$(3.07)^{a}$	64.39
4. C. Z. silleni 20,000 $ ac$ 20.28 12.24 41.96 14.34 41.28 17.63 40.52 14.7 20 DAP) + B. bassiana 1x10 ⁹ (3.57)d (3.50)d (4.20)d (4.20)d </td <td>3.</td> <td>Verticillium lecanii 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)</td> <td>18.34</td> <td>10.43 (3.31)c</td> <td>50.55</td> <td>12.26 $(3.57)^{\circ}$</td> <td>49.80</td> <td>15.11 (3.95)^b</td> <td>49.02</td> <td>12.60 (3.62)^c</td> <td>49.70</td>	3.	Verticillium lecanii 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)	18.34	10.43 (3.31)c	50.55	12.26 $(3.57)^{\circ}$	49.80	15.11 (3.95) ^b	49.02	12.60 (3.62) ^c	49.70
5. C. Z. silteni 20,000 / ac (20 DAP) + V. lecanii 1x10° 14.56 (3.88)° 30.96 16.93 (4.17)° 30.67 20.87 (4.62) ^d 29.59 17.4 6. (20 DAP) + V. lecanii 1x10° (3.88)° (3.88)° (4.17)° (4.17)° (4.62) ^d (4.2.7) (4.2.7) 6. Dimethoate 30 EC 23.46 8.36 60.36 9.92 59.38 12.26 58.64 10.1 7. Dimethoate 30 EC 23.46 8.36 0.00 24.42 0.00 29.64 0.01 25.64 10.1 7. Control 18.67 21.09 0.00 24.42 0.00 29.64 0.00 25.64 10.1 7. Control 18.67 21.09 0.00 24.42 0.00 29.64 0.00 25.64 10.1 7. SEm± NS 0.00 24.42 0.00 29.64 0.00 25.64 10.1 8 Em± NS 0.065 14.99' 0.00 25.49' 0.00	4	C. Z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + B. bassiana $1x10^{\circ}$ spores/ml (30 DAP)	20.28	12.24 (3.57)d	41.96	14.34 (3.85) ^d	41.28	17.63 (4.26)°	40.52	14.74 (3.90) ^d	41.16
6. Dimethoate 30 EC 23.46 8.36 8.36 9.92 59.38 12.26 58.64 10.1 $@ 1.7 m/M$ $@ 1.7 m/M$ $(2.98)b$ $(2.98)b$ $(3.23)^b$ $(3.57)^a$ $(3.57)^a$ $(3.23)^a$ $(3.57)^a$ $(3.23)^a$ $(3.57)^a$ $(3.23)^a$ $(3.24)^a$	5.	C. Z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + V. lecanii 1x10° spores/ml (30 DAP)	19.34	14.56 (3.88) ^e	30.96	16.93 (4.17) $^{\circ}$	30.67	20.87 (4.62) ^d	29.59	17.45 (4.24)⁰	30.34
7. Control 18.67 21.09 0.00 24.42 0.00 29.64 0.00 25.6 7. $(4.65)^t$ $(4.65)^t$ $(4.99)^t$ $(5.49)^e$ $(5.49)^e$ $(5.0)^t$ 8 $Bm\pm$ NS 0.062 0.066 0.042 0.042 0.023 CD ($P=0.05$) 0.191 0.203 0.130 0.130 0.15	6.	Dimethoate 30 EC @ 1.7 ml/l	23.46	8.36 (2.98)b	60.36	9.92 (3.23) ^b	59.38	12.26 $(3.57)^{a}$	58.64	10.18 (3.27) ^b	59.36
SEm± NS 0.062 0.066 0.042 0.05 CD (P =0.05) 0.191 0.203 0.130 0.15	7.	Control	18.67	21.09 (4.65) ^f	0.00	24.42 (4.99) ^f	0.00	29.64 (5.49) ^e	0.00	25.05 (5.05) ^f	0.00
CD ($P = 0.05$) 0.191 0.130 0.130 0.15		SEm±	NS	0.062		0.066		0.042		0.050	
		CD $(P = 0.05)$		0.191		0.203		0.130		0.156	

Values in parentheses are square root transformations In a column, means followed by same letter(s) are not significantly different at P = 0.05 as per DMRT, DAP (Days after planting)

Ē
seaso
scond
Š
population
aci
tab
urips
t 77
against
agents
control
bioc
ious
var
n of
atio
valu
Ē
e 2
pl
La

					T	. tabaci (No./plant	(
SI. No.	Treatments	Precount	30 DAP	% reduction over control	37 DAP	% reduction over control	44 DAP	% reduction over control	Mean	% reduction over control
1.	Chrysoperla z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 and 30 DAP)	21.49	13.16 (3.70) ^d	31.95	16.16 (4.08)⁰	30.67	20.93 (4.63) $^{\circ}$	29.39	16.75 (4.15) $^{\circ}$	30.50
5.	Beauveria bassiana 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)	21.39	7.01 (2.74) ^a	63.75	7.73 (2.87) ^a	66.84	10.86 $(3.37)^{a}$	63.36	8.53 (3.00) ^a	64.61
3.	Verticillium lecanii 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)	17.24	9.13 (3.10) ^b	52.79	11.24 (3.43) ^c	51.84	14.76 (3.91) ^c	50.20	11.71 (3.49) ^c	51.41
4.	C. z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + B. bassiana 1x10° spores/ml (30 DAP)	22.34	10.81 (3.36) ^c	44.11	13.23 (3.71) ^d	43.24	17.13 (4.20) ^d	42.21	13.72 (3.77) ^d	43.07
5.	<i>C. z. sillemi</i> 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + <i>V. lecanii</i> 1x10° spores/ml (30 DAP)	18.24	12.93 (3.66) ^d	33.14	15.84 (4.04)⁰	32.05	20.32 (4.56)⁰	31.44	16.36 (4.11) ^e	32.12
6.	Dimethoate 30 EC @ 1.7 ml/l	17.86	7.02 $(2.74)^{a}$	63.70	8.81 (3.05) ^b	62.21	11.45 (3.46) ^b	61.37	9.09 (3.10) ^b	62.28
7.	Control	17.63	19.34 (4.45) $^{\circ}$	0.00	23.31 (4.88) ^f	0.00	29.64 $(5.49)^{f}$	00.00	24.10 (4.96) ^f	0.00
	SEm±	NS	0.049		0.052		0.029		0.020	
	$CD \ (P = 0.05)$		0.150		0.160		0.091		0.062	

Values in parentheses are square root transformations In a column, means followed by same letter(s) are not significantly different at P = 0.05 as per DMRT, DAP (Days after planting)

season)
(Third
population
tabaci
Thrips
against
agents
oiocontrol
various t
of
Evaluation
Table 3.

					T	: tabaci (No./plant				
SI. No.	Treatments	Precount	30 DAP	% reduction over control	37 DAP	% reduction over control	44 DAP	% reduction over control	Mean	% reduction over control
1.	Chrysoperla z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 and 30 DAP)	26.82	18.28 (4.33) ^d	28.12	21.35 (4.67) ^e	27.03	27.35 (5.28)°	26.36	22.33 (4.78) ^e	27.05
2.	Beauveria bassiana 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)	22.48	8.84 (3.05) ^a	65.24	10.62 (3.33) ^a	63.70	13.96 $(3.80)^{a}$	62.41	11.14 (3.41) ^a	63.61
3.	Verticillium lecanii 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)	24.63	12.78 (3.64) ^b	49.74	14.96 (3.93) ^o	48.87	19.24 (4.44)°	48.20	15.66 (4.02) ^c	48.84
4.	C. z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + B. bassiana 1x10° spores/ml (30 DAP)	28.64	15.12 (3.95) ^c	40.54	17.73 (4.27) ^d	39.41	21.72 (4.71) ^d	41.52	18.19 (4.32) ^d	40.57
5.	<i>C. z. sillemi</i> 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + <i>V. lecanii</i> 1x10 ^o spores/ml (30 DAP)	26.34	17.92 (4.29) ^d	29.53	20.85 (4.62) $^{\circ}$	28.74	26.83 (5.23)⁰	27.76	21.87 (4.73)°	28.55
6.	Dimethoate 30 EC @ 1.7 ml/l	22.65	9.76 (3.20)ª	6162	11.61 (3.48) ^b	60.32	15.14 $(3.95)^{b}$	59.24	12.17 (3.56) ^b	60.24
7.	Control	23.49	25.43 (5.09) ^e	0:00	29.26 (5.46) ^f	0.00	37.14 (6.14) ^f	0.00	30.61 $(5.58)^{f}$	
	SEm±	NS	0.052		0.029		0.027		0.017	
	$CD \ (P = 0.05)$		0.161		0.091		0.083		0.052	

Values in parentheses are square root transformations In a column, means followed by same letter(s) are not significantly different at P = 0.05 as per DMRT, DAP (Days after planting)

(p
ole
(P0
opulation
ci p
taba
Thrips
st
again
agents
control
jo
rious ł
val
of
lation
alu
$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{v}}$
4
Table

	% reduction over control	28.59	64.15	49.89	41.50	30.17	60.57	0.00		
	Mean	18.98 (4.41) ^e	9.53 $(3.17)^{a}$	13.32 (3.72)°	15.55 (4.01) ^d	18.56 (4.37) ^e	10.48 (3.31) ^b	26.59 (5.20) ^f	0.041	0.127
	% reduction over control	27.82	62.29	49.07	41.41	29.46	59.71	0.00		
(44 DAP	23.20 (4.87) ^e	12.12 (3.55) ^a	16.37 (4.11) ^c	18.83 (4.40) ^d	22.67 (4.81) ^e	12.95 (3.67) ^b	32.14 (5.71) ^f	0.021	0.065
T. tabaci (No./plan	% reduction over control	28.64	65.32	50.04	41.15	30.36	60.60	00.00		
	37 DAP	18.31 (4.34)°	8.90 (3.07) ^a	12.82 (3.65) ^c	15.10 (3.95) ^d	17.87 (4.29)⁰	10.11 (3.26) ^b	25.66 (5.11) ^f	0.028	0.086
	% reduction over control	29.70	65.51	50.89	42.05	31.03	61.82	0.00		
	30 DAP	15.43 (3.99) ^d	7.57 (2.84) ^a	1078 (3.36) ^c	12.72 (3.64) ^d	15.14 (3.95) ^e	8.38 (2.98) ^b	21.98 (4.74) ^f	0.030	0.092
	Precount	22.55	22.17	20.07	23.75	21.31	21.32	19.93	NS	
	Treatments	Chrysoperla z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 and 30 DAP)	Beauveria bassiana 1x10° spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)	Verticillium lecanii 1x10 [°] spores/ml (20 and 30 DAP)	C. z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + B. bassiana 1x10° spores/ml (30 DAP)	C. z. sillemi 20,000 /ac (20 DAP) + V. lecanii 1x10° spores/ml (30 DAP)	Dimethoate 30 EC @ 1.7 ml/l	Control	SEm±	CD $(P = 0.05)$
	SI. No.	1.	2.	ю.	4	<i>5</i> .	6.	7.		

Values in parentheses are square root transformations In a column, means followed by same letter(s) are not significantly different at P = 0.05 as per DMRT, DAP (Days after planting)

Almost similar findings were recorded on 37 and 44 DAP, the lowest population was noticed in the treatment with two applications of *B. bassiana* (8.36 & 11.54/plant) with maximum per cent reduction (65.77 & 61.07) followed by two applications of *V. lecanii* (12.26 & 15.11 thrips/plant) with 49.80 & 49.02 per cent reduction found to be next best treatment. The highest thrips population (17.43 & 21.33/plant) was found in least effective treatment of two rounds of release of *C. z.* sillemi eggs/grubs 20,000/ac (20 and 30 DAP) (Table 1).

Overall, among biocontrol agents the least number of thrips (8.92/plant) was recorded when *B. bassiana* was applied twice with maximum 64.39 per cent reduction followed by two times applications of *V. lecanii* (12.60/plant). The maximum number of 17.87 thrips/plant was noticed in the treatment of two rounds release of *C. z.* sillemi eggs/grubs 20,000 /ac (20 and 30 DAP) (Table 1).

Almost similar results were observed in second and third seasons; among treatments *B. bassiana* was recorded lowest mean thrips population (8.53 & 11.14/ plant) with highest per cent reduction (64.61 & 63.61) as against *C. z.* sillemi (20 and 30 DAP), which recorded maximum population (16.75 & 22.33 thrips/plant) (Table 2 & 3).

In pooled data also almost similar findings were observed in which *B. bassiana* was found to be best among treatments with lowest mean thrips population (9.53/plant) with highest per cent reduction (64.15). The treatment *C. z.* sillemi (20 and 30 DAP) was found to be least effective treatment with maximum thrips population (18.98/plant) (Table 4). In the present investigation ,application of *B. bassiana* 1 x 10⁹ spores/ml two times at 20 and 30 DAP was found superior to reduce the infestation of thrips population. This is in agreement with the findings of Gillespie (1986) who observed that isolates of *B. bassiana* (Bals) killed all the treated thrips, *T. tabaci* with in four days. Noma

and Strickler (2000) observed that application of *B. bassiana* reduced the thrips population in cotton. Ludwig and Oetting (2002) reported that *B. bassiana* was highly effective against western flower thrips.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous 1984. *Annual Report* : Associated Agricultural Development Foundation, pp. 95–96.
- Anonymous, 2000. Annual Report: National Research Centre for Onion and Garlic, pp. 63–64.
- Gillespie AT. 1986. The potential of entomogenous fungi as control agents for onion thrips, *Thrips tabaci*. *Monograph British Crop Protection Council*, **34**: 237–243.
- Krishna Kumar NK, Veeregowda R, Sreenivas Rao E, Krishna Moorthy PN. 2001. Response of onion genotypes for thrips, *T. tabaci* Lindeman resistance. In: Proceedings of the Second National Symposium on IPM in Horticultural Crops New Molecule Pesticides, Biopesticides, Bangalore, India, pp. 17–19.
- Ludwig WS, Oetting RD. 2002. Efficacy of *Beauveria* bassiana plus insect attractants for enhanced control of *Frankliniella occidentalis* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae). *Florida Entomol.* **85**(1): 270–272.
- Noma T, Strickler K. 2000. Effects of *Beauveria bassiana* on *Lygus hesperus* (Hemiptera: Miridae) feeding and oviposition. *Envir. Entomol.* **29**(2): 394–402.
- Shitole DM, Shankar G, Mithyantha MS. 2002. Evaluation of certain new insecticides against onion thrips, *Pestology* 26: 49–50.
- Srinivas PS, Srivastava KJ, Lawande KE. 2006. Status and prospects of integrated pest management strategies in selected crops: Onion and Garlic. *Integrated pest management: principles and applications*. Vol. 2, CBS publishers and distributors. pp. 394–424.