

# Biocidal Activity of Ficus carica Extract against Sylepta Derogate on OKRA

<sup>[1]</sup> Helen Sheeba.D.K, <sup>[2]</sup> Sundar, S.K.

<sup>[1]</sup> Department of Microbiology, Scott Christian college, Nagercoil.

<sup>[2]</sup> PG Department of Microbiology, MR Govt College of arts and science, Mannarkudi

**Abstract:**-- Sylepta derogate a prominent pest of okra cultivated in the field Mylaudy of Kanyakumari District, Tamil Nadu causes both leaf curling and defoliation of okra leaf. Medicinal plant extract, especially botanical insecticides, are currently studied more and more because of the possibility of their use in plant protection. Biological activity of plant Ficus carica bark with leaf extract using ethanol solvent were studied against 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th instar larvae of leaf roller Sylepta derogate. Larval mortality was observed after 24, 48, 72 hrs of exposure. Both extract showed higher larval mortality. The results suggest ethanol extract of leaf with bark of Ficus Carica have the potential to be used as an eco-friendly approach for the control of the agricultural pests, Sylepta derogate.

**Index Terms**— Sylepta derogate, Ficus carica, ethanol and petroleum ether.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*) is an economically important vegetable crop grown in tropical and subtropical parts of the world. It is quite popular in India, easy for cultivation, dependable and adaptable to varying moisture conditions. One of the important insect pest affecting the yield potential of Okra include leaf roller, *Sylepta derogate* (Fab). The present study was an attempt to assess the larvicidal activity of ethanolic extracts of *Ficus carica* against *S. derogate*.

## II. MATERIAL AND METHOD

### Collection of Insect pest

During preliminary screening with the laboratory trial, the larvae of *S. derogate* were collected from the crop field and identified by Entomologist at Entomology Research Station, St. Xavier's College, Pallayamkotai

### Plant Materials

The leaves with bark of *Ficus carica* were collected from Marunthuvazhmalai hills grown in Mylaudy of Kanya Kumar District. Then it was washed with water, dried in shade at room temperature and powdered with the help of mechanical device and sieved to get the powder. Preparation of Extract

### Ethanolic extraction of Ficus carica (bark and leaves)

50 g of powder was soaked in 100ml of water. This was kept as stock solution. From the stock solution 1ml, 2ml, 3ml, 4ml were taken out and made into 10ml by

adding 9.9ml, 9.8ml and 9.7ml and 9.6ml distilled water correspondingly.

### Screening for larvicidal activity of ethanolic extracts of Ficus carica against Sylepta derogate.

Larvicidal effects of *Ficus carica* were assessed using the standard method of WHO (1996) with some modification. Different concentration of plant extract were prepared from 4 to 15 ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{dl}$ ) in 100ml of water in plastic cups. In each cup, ten 2nd, 3rd, 4th, instar larvae were released. Each experiment was conducted with 5 replicates and control. No food provided during the treatment. Observations were made on 24, 48, 72 hours after treatment. Dead larvae were assessed by non wriggling movement and settlement of the larvae in the bottom of plastic cups. The LC<sub>50</sub> value for each concentration was calculated

### Data analysis

The mortality responses of larvae *Sylepta derogate* exposed to *Ficus carica* extract were subjected to probit analysis (Finney, 1971). For calculating LC<sub>50</sub> and other statistics at 95% upper confidence limit and lower confidence limit was calculated by using the software developed by Reddy et al., (1992).

### PLOT STUDY

Okra was cultivated in many pots including original and replicates (screened). Plant in which lowest concentration of the ethanolic extract of *Ficus carica* was sprayed in all the pots. Control plant was not sprayed at the same time maintained one as control (unscreened). Anioke (1988)

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In my present study when second instar *S. derogata* was exposed to *Ficus carica* ethanolic extract 100 percent mortality was recorded at a concentration 10µg/dl for a period of 24h. At 4µg/dl concentration the mortality was 20percent after 72h (Table 1). Probit analysis of the mortality response showed that the 24h LC50 was 7.669µg/l (Table 2) 48h, 7.191 µg/l (Table 3 and 72h, 6.036 µg/l (Table 4). When third instar *S. derogata* was exposed to *Ficus carica* ethanolic extract 100 percent mortality was recorded at a concentration 11µg/dl for a period of 24h. At 5µg/dl concentration the mortality was 20percent after 72h. Probit analysis of the mortality response showed that the 24h LC50 was 8.8082µg/l 48h, 7.387 µg/l (Table 7) and 72h, 6.661 µg/l. When fourth instar *S. derogata* was exposed to *Ficus carica* ethanolic extract 100 percent mortality was recorded at a concentration 13µg/dl for a period of 24h. At 5µg/dl concentration the mortality was 20percent after 72h. Probit analysis of the mortality response showed that the 24h LC50 was 8.957µg/l. 48h, 8.052 µg/l and 72h, 7.143 µg/l. When fifth instar *S. derogata* was exposed to *Ficus carica* ethanolic extract 100 percent mortality was recorded at a concentration 12µg/dl for a period of 24h. At 6µg/dl concentration the mortality was 20percent after 72h. Probit analysis of the mortality response showed that the 24h LC50 was 9.474µg/l, 48h, 9.486 µg/l and 72h, 8.338µg/l.

**Mortality response of second instar of *Sylepta derogate* to ethanolic extract of *ficus carica***

S.no	Concentration (µg/dl)	Percent mortality		
		24h	48h	72h
1	4		10	20
2	5	10	20	30
3	6	20	30	40
4	7	30	50	60
5	8	50	60	80
6	9	60	70	90
7	10	100		

**Table 2**

Profit analysis of mortality response of second instar of *Sylepta derogate* to ethanolic extract of *ficus carica* exposed for 24hrs.

(1) Dose %	(2) No.	(5) Mor. %	(6) Log dose	(7) Emp. Pro.	(8) Work Pro.	(10) Wt. Coef.	(11) Weight w	(12) wx	(13) wy	(14) y
5.00	10	10.00	1.70	3.72	3.34	3.89	0.21	2.08	8.10	3.14
6.00	10	20.00	1.78	4.16	4.14	4.16	0.47	4.71	19.60	3.93
7.00	10	30.00	1.84	4.48	4.81	4.49	0.63	6.27	28.14	4.60
8.00	10	50.00	1.90	5.00	5.39	4.98	0.60	6.01	29.93	5.18
9.00	10	60.00	1.95	5.25	5.90	5.09	0.47	4.71	23.96	5.70
10.00	10	100.00	2.00	7.33	6.36	6.87	0.30	3.02	20.76	6.16

#### STATISTICS

$$SW = 26.800 \quad SWX = 50.156 \quad X \text{ Bar} = 1.871$$

$$SWY = 130.482 \quad Y \text{ Bar} = 4.869$$

$$SWX * X = 94.060 \quad SWY * Y = 652.956 \quad SWXY = 245.801$$

$$b \text{ Value} = 10.022$$

$$\text{Regression Equation } y = 10.022x - 13.89$$

$$\text{If } y = 5.0 \text{ then } x = 1.885 \text{ This corresponds to dose of } 7.669$$

$$\text{Variaance } 0.0006 \quad \text{Chi-square } 4.45 \text{ (with } 4 \text{ Deg. of freedom } p \text{ )}$$

$$\text{Lower Limit } 1.8380 \text{ Log Dose } 1.8846 \text{ Upper Limit } 1.9311$$

#### Table 3

Profit analysis of mortality response of second instar of *Sylepta derogate* to ethanolic extract of *ficus carica* exposed for 48hrs.

Calculation of Log-dose/profit Regression Line Analysis

#### STATISTICS

(1) Dose %	(2) No.	(5) Mor. dose	(6) Log Pro.	(7) Emp. Pro.	(8) Exp. Pro.	(9) Work Coef.	(10) Wt.	(11) Weight	(12) wx	(13) wy	(14) Y
4.00	10	10.00	1.60	3.72	3.67	3.72	0.34	3.36	5.38	12.51	3.67
5.00	10	20.00	1.70	4.16	4.18	4.16	0.50	5.03	8.55	20.92	4.18
6.00	10	30.00	1.78	4.48	4.59	4.48	0.60	6.01	10.69	26.90	4.59
7.00	10	50.00	1.84	5.00	4.94	5.00	0.63	6.34	11.70	31.70	4.94
8.00	10	60.00	1.90	5.25	5.24	5.26	0.63	6.27	11.93	32.96	5.24
9.00	10	70.00	1.95	5.52	5.51	5.53	0.58	5.81	11.35	32.12	5.51

$$SW = 32.820 \quad SWX = 59.595 \quad X \text{ Bar} = 1.816$$

$$SWY = 157.111 \quad Y \text{ Bar} = 4.787$$

$$SWX * X = 108.609 \quad SWY * Y = 763.311 \quad SWXY = 287.379$$

$$b \text{ Value} = 5.216$$

Regression Equation  $y = 5.216x - 4.68$   
 If  $y=5.0$  then  $x = 1.857$  This corresponds to dose of 7.191  
 Variance 0.0012 Chi-square 0.11 (with 4 Deg. of freedom p)

Lower Limit 1.7878 Log Dose 1.8566 Upper Limit 1.9255

**Table 4**

Profit analysis of mortality response of second instar of *Sylepta derogate* to ethanolic extract of *ficus carica* exposed for 72hrs.

Calculation of Log-dose/profit Regression Line Analysis

(1) Dose %	(2) No. %	(5) Mor. dose	(6) Log Pro.	(7) Emp. Pro	(8) Exp. Pro.	(9) Work Coef.	(10) Wt. w	(11) Weight	(12) wx	(13) wy	(14) Y
4.00	10	20.00	1.60	4.16	3.95	4.20	0.41	4.05	6.49	17.00	3.92
5.00	10	30.00	1.70	4.48	4.53	4.47	0.58	5.81	9.87	25.98	4.51
6.00	10	40.00	1.78	4.75	5.01	4.75	0.64	6.37	11.33	30.28	4.98
7.00	10	60.00	1.84	5.25	5.42	5.25	0.60	6.01	11.09	31.56	5.39
8.00	10	80.00	1.90	5.84	5.77	5.84	0.50	5.03	9.57	29.38	5.74
9.00	10	90.00	1.95	6.28	6.08	6.26	0.41	4.05	7.91	25.36	6.05

STATISTICS  
 SW= 31.320 SWX= 56.258 X Bar= 1.796  
 SWY=159.564 Y Bar= 5.095

SWX\*X= 101.435 SWY\*Y= 827.621 SWXY= 288.903  
 b Value = 6.051

Regression Equation  $y = 6.051x - 5.78$   
 If  $y=5.0$  then  $x = 1.781$  This corresponds to dose of 6.036  
 Variance 0.0009 Chi-square 1.00 (with 4 Deg. of freedom p)  
 Lower Limit 1.7215 Log Dose 1.7806 Upper Limit 1.8397.

**IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION.**

Chinnaperumal et al.,2008 reported the highest larval mortality was found in peel methanolextract of *C.sinensis*,flower ethyl acetate extract of *O.canum* and leaf acetone extract of *O.sanctum* against the larvae of *S.derogate*(LC50=20.27 ).In the Present Study when second instar *S.derogata* was exposed to *Ficus carica* ethanolic extract 100 percent mortality was recorded at a concentration 10µg/dl for a period of 24h.At 4µg/dl concentration the mortality was 20percent after 72h.Probit analysis of the mortality response showed that the 24h LC50 was 7.669µg/l 48h,7.191 µg/l and 72h,6.036 µg/l

Ogbala et al.,2015 observed abscission are caused by the larval stages of *S.derogate* were found to be ellipsoidal,irregular and spherical puncture.In my present study *S.derogata* form the same symptoms in pot(unscreened) which had not sprayed .Kamaraj et al.,2008 reported the caterpillar roll up the leaves in funnel shape and feed from the margin by remaining inside.In the present study ,pot unscreened ie.,which haven't sprayed showed the presence of *S.derogate* and rolled the leaf .The aqueous neem kernel extract sprayed significantly less on crops infested by the *S.derogate* produced higher fruit yield than crops that were unsprayed(Anaso and Lale2002).Anaso (2003) reported that the neem seed oil and aqueous neem seed extract caused significantly less damage by the *S.derogate* and had higher yield than unsprayed pot.In present study leaf sprayed with extract on original and duplicates pot (screened) prevent the entry of *S.derogate* form fruits showed good yield

The aqueous seed extracts of *A.indica* were applied at the rate of 30,50,75 100g/l to control *S.derogate* and reported high fruit yield of okra plant in Ghana(Obeng-Ofori 2003).In my present study Lowest concentration of ethanolic extracts of *ficus carica* showed potential effect against the larvae *S.derogate* and the okra yield was found to be high.

**V. CONCLUSION**

On viewing the above discussion ,many authors reported effect of plant extract against the larvae *S.derogate*. From my work I am also concluding that ethanolic extract of *Ficus carica* showed 100% mortality against the Larvae *S.derogate* from my present study .So by spraying this lowest Concentration of this extract into the Field it will prevent the *S.derogate* infesting the crops so by that leaf will not rolled,defoliate and thus photosynthesis will takes place and during harvesting the farmers will attain high yield

**REFERENCE**

1. Anioke,S.C.(1988)Screening of Okra for resistance to *Sylepta derogate* Fabricius[Pyralidae]in easternNigeria.Tropical pest Management,VOL,34,issue 4,421-422.
2. Obeng-Ofori D(2003)Field evaluation of non-synthetic insecticides for the management of insect pests of okra *Abelmoschus esculentus*(L)Moench in Ghana.Ethiopian journal of sciences 26(2):145-150.
3. Anosa CE(2003)Cost -benefits of spraying sole and intercropped okra with seed extracts and deltamethrin in the Nigerian Sudan Savanna. ASSET-Series A:Agri Enviro3(2):171-177

4. Anaso CE, Lale NES (2002) Spraying intervals and cost-benefit of using aqueous neem kernel extract and deltamethrin against some foliage and fruit pests of okra in Sudan savanna of Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture and the Environment* 4(1):122-128.
5. Chinnaperummal Kamaraj, Ashokan Bgavan, Abdul Rahuman (2008) Screening for antifeedant and larvicidal activity of plant extracts against *Helicoverpa armigera*, *Sylepta derogate* (F.) and *Anopheles stephensi* (Liston). *Parasitol Res*:1361-1368.
6. Finney, D.J. (1971). *Probit Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
7. Kamaraj C, Rahuman AA, Bagavan (2008) Antifeedant and Larvicidal effects of plant extracts against *Spodoptera litura* (F.), *Aedes aegypti* L. and *Culex quinquefasciatus* Say. *Parasitol Res* 103(2):325-331.
8. Ogbalu O.K., Bob Mael, R.B. and Gbarakoro, T. (2015) The role of *Sylepta derogate* [Lepidoptera: Pyralidae] in the abscission and defoliation of okra flowers, seeds and pods in monocarp gardens in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
9. Reddy PJ, Krishna D, Murthy US, Jamil K (1992) A microcomputer FORTRAN program for rapid determination of lethal concentration of biocides in mosquito control. *CABIOS* 8:209-213.
10. WHO (1996) Reports of the WHO informal consultation on the evaluation of the testing of insecticides. CTD/WHON PES/IC/96.1: p 69.