Biology of pulse beetle, *Callosobruchus chinensis* Linn. on different varieties of pigeonpea

PATEL HARSH, PRATAP NALWANDIKAR, GAMBHIRE VISHNUKANT ZATALE NISHANT

Department of Agril. Entomology, Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, College of Agriculture, Latur, Maharashtra, INDIA

Abstract: The overall results indicated that different biological and life fecundity parameters of C. chinensis varied significantly when reared on different varieties of pigeonpea. The mean incubation period was 4.26 days on BSMR-853 followed by BDN-711 (4.35 days), BDN-708 (4.41 days) and BDN-716 (4.65 days). The significantly highest egg hatch was observed on BSMR-853 (96 per cent) followed by BDN-711 (93 per cent), BDN-708 (92 per cent) and BDN-716 (88 per cent). The significantly shortest larval-pupal duration was noticed on BSMR-853 (19.93 days) followed by BDN-711 (20.66 days), BDN-708 (21.84 days) and BDN-716 (22.20 days). Significantly highest growth index was noticed on BSMR-853 (2.75) followed by BDN-711 (2.70), BDN-708 (2.60) and shortest on BDN-716 (2.43). The significantly minimum total developmental period was observed on BSMR-853 (24.17 days) followed by BDN-711 (25.02 days), BDN-708 (26.26 days) and maximum on BDN-716 (26.81 days). Significantly highest adult emergence was observed in the case of those grubs which were reared on BSMR-853 (96.84 per cent) followed BDN-711 (95.73 per cent), BDN-708 (94.49 per cent) and lowest on BDN-716 (88.83 per cent). The significantly highest adult longevity was noticed on BSMR-853 (10.70 days) followed by BDN-711 (10.34 days), BDN-708 (9.69 days) and BDN-716 (9.68 days). Significantly lowest total life cycle duration was noticed on BSMR-853 (34.87 days) followed by BDN-711 (35.37 days), BDN-708 (35.95 days) and BDN-716 (36.47 days). The significantly highest oviposition period was observed on BSMR-853 (7.20 days) followed by BDN-711 (6.80 days), BDN-708 (6.00 days) and BDN-716 (5.60 days). The fecundity (eggs per female) was highest on BSMR-853 (88.20) followed by BDN-711 (82.60), BDN-708 (74.60) and BDN-716 (69.40).

Keywords: Entomology, Agriculture, Callosobruchus chinensis

Received: May 25, 2022. Revised: December 16, 2022. Accepted: January 11, 2023. Published: February 6, 2023.

1. Introduction

Bruchids are serious pest of stored grain pulses all over the world. It is commonly known as pulse beetle having single genus Bruchus with many species. Presence of only one species of genus Bruchus renamed as Callosobruchus chinensis is common in India, has been reported by Raina (1970). It is a serious pest of pulses like Gram, Arhar, Moong etc. Pest cause severe damage to these pulses due to flying habit, beetle starts infesting the plant in field as the grub attacks the whole seed by remaining inside the seed. It is very difficult to observe the damage until the adult emerges by breaking the seed coat (Singh and Jambunathan, 1990). In India found three predominant pest species of pulse beetle C. maculatus, C. analis and C.

chinensis (Dias and Yadav, 1988). The insects spend its entire immature stage in individual legume seeds, where they cause weight loss, decrease in germination potential and diminish the market as well as nutritional value of the commodity (Jat *et al.*, 2013).

Various biological parameters of the Bruchid are affected by seed attributes that could exist physically or chemically. In different pulses, seed surface, seed coat thickness and seed size have been linked with mechanism of resistance. In addition, the Bruchids have their ovipositional preference on basis of seed surface, colour, texture, volume and nutritional value of seed (Singh *et al.*, 1980). The present study was undertaken to determine the biology on four varieties of pigeonpea, aiming at selecting variety with inherent resistance source against *C.chinensis*.

2. Materials and Methods

The present studies on the biology and life-fecundity of pulse beetle, Callosobruchus chinensis Linn. was carried out on different varieties of pigeonpea viz., BDN-708, BDN-711, BDN-716 and BSMR-853 at Department of Agriculture Entomology, College of Agriculture, Latur during 2020-21. The initial culture of the C. chinensis was maintained on disinfected pigeonpea seeds at room temperature. A single pair of C. chinensis was obtained from the stock culture maintained at Department of Agriculture Entomology, College of Agriculture, Latur. Clean seeds of pigeonpea were sterilized at temperature of 55° C for 4 hours in the oven to eliminate the hidden infestation. Twenty-five pairs of one to two days old beetles from the initial culture were released in wide mouth cylindrical plastic box measuring 20 cm x 15 cm containing 250 g seeds of pigeonpea. The boxes were covered with muslin cloth and fasten with rubber band. Subsequently, adult emerged from this culture were used for further study. Necessary care like use of forceps and camel hairbrush was taken in handling the insects and grains.

The sexes were separated on the basis of morphological characters (Southgate, 1958), the male had pectinate antennae, while that of female had serrate (Raina, 1970). The apical regiment will be found elongate and oblong in male and bluntly rounded or ovate in female. Antennal segments will be deeply serrated in male. The serration became more prominent from the fourth segment and onward in male and from fifth segment in female. In male the antennae moved in right and left direction and they were curved towards each other. In female it moved forward and backward and they were straight. Male showed no response to touch, where's females showed the response. The adult male and female measured about 3.2 to 3.36 mm

and 3.43 to 3.56 mm in length, respectively (Khare, 1994).

The studies on biology of pulse beetle, C. chinensis were carried out in a completely randomized design with five replications under laboratory conditions on four different pigeonpea varieties BDN-708, BDN-711, BDN-716 and BSMR-853 obtained from Agricultural Research Station, Badnapur Dist. Jalna during 2020-21. Twenty-five pairs of one to two days old adults of C. chinensis were released for egg laying in rounded plastic boxes (21 cm x 15 cm) containing grains of the pigeonpea variety under study (Plate 3.2). The grains containing the eggs were collected on next day morning. In order to facilitate the observations, only one egg was kept on each grain, while others were removed with the help of a needle. Such one hundred grains were kept individually in plastic vials (6.5 cm x 2.5 cm) under laboratory condition at fluctuating room temperature ranging from 21.1 to 33.9 °C and relative humidity of 67 to 97 per cent. The observations will be taken daily in the morning. The observation on per cent hatching of eggs, incubation period, larval + pupal period, longevity of male and female, growth index and sex ratio were recorded.

The growth index was calculated by using Singh and Pant's (1955) formula.

| | | S |
|--------------|---------|-----------------------|
| Growth | index = | |
| | | Т |
| Where, | | |
| S | = | Percentage of adult |
| emergence | | |
| Т | = | Average developmental |
| period (days | s) | |

| Different varieties | Incubation Period (days) | Egg hatchability (per cent) | Larval-Pupal period (days) | Growth index |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| BDN-708 | 4.41 | 92 (73.57)* | 21.84 | 2.60 |
| BDN-711 | 4.35 | 93 (74.66) | 20.66 | 2.70 |
| BDN-716 | 4.65 | 88 (69.73) | 22.20 | 2.43 |
| BSMR-853 | 4.26 | 96 (78.46) | 19.93 | 2.75 |
| S. E. <u>+</u> | 0.05 | 1.80 | 0.20 | 0.04 |
| C.D. at 5% | 0.16 | 5.41 | 0.59 | 0.14 |
| C.V. (%) | 2.64 | 4.37 | 2.11 | 4.07 |

 Table 1:
 The incubation period, egg hatchability, larval-pupal period and growth index of C.

 chinensis on different varieties of pigeonpea

*Figures in parentheses indicate arcsine transformed values.

3. Results And Discussion 3.1. The incubation period

The significantly higher incubation period (4.65 days) was observed when *C. chinensis* reared on BDN-716. The shortest incubation period (4.26 days) was noticed in BSMR-853 however, it was at par with pigeonpea variety BDN-708 (4.41 Days). Which is quite similar Jaiswal *et al.* (2019) recorded the incubation period of *C. chinensis* varied from 3.85 to 4.15 days on different hosts, it being maximum on chickpea (4.15 days) and green gram (4.10 days) followed by cowpea (4.00 days) and red gram (4.00 days).

3.2. Percentage egg hatched

The data (Table 1) revealed that the highest egg hatchability was recorded in pigeonpea variety BSMR-853 (96 per cent) however, it was at par with on BDN-711 (93 per cent) and BDN-708 (92 per cent). Whereas Sharma *at al.* (2016) reveled that hatching of eggs in pulse beetle ranged from 98.1 to 94.3 per cent.

3.3. Larval-pupal duration

The significantly shorter larval-pupal duration of C. chinensis found on pigeonpea variety BSMR-853 (19.93 days). The highest larval-pupal duration was noticed on pigeonpea variety BDN-716 (22.20 days) and it was at par with larval-pupal duration observed on BDN-708 (21.84 days). While, Jaiswal et al. (2019), documented that the mean larval-pupal duration of C. chinensis varied from 24.90 to 26.70 days on different hosts being maximum on chickpea (26.70 days) and red gram (26.45 days) followed by green gram (25.60 days) and cowpea (25.20 days).

3.4. The growth index

The highest growth index (2.75) was recorded on pigeonpea variety BSMR-853 however it was at par with BDN-711 (2.70). The significantly lowest growth index (2.43) was observed in pigeonpea variety BDN-716. Waghmare and Bantewad (2020) exhibited that the growth index of *C. chinensis* was ranged from (2.64 to 2.79) on 15 different chickpea cultivars. Yewale *et al.* (2020) revealed that the growth index ranged from 2.74 to 3.06 in different varieties of green gram.

3.5. The total developmental period (egg to adult emergence)

The significantly shorter development period (24.17 days) was found in BSMR-853. The longest developmental period was observed on BDN-716 (26.81 days) and it was at par with development period on BDN-708 The results (26.26)days). of present investigation are parallel with the findings of Singh and Mohan (2018) who showed that the total developmental duration of C. chinensis on under controlled conditions varies from 21-25 days in bold variety and 26-32 days in smaller variety.

3.6. The total life cycle duration

The significantly shorter life cycle duration (34.87 days) was reported on pigeonpea variety BSMR-853. The longer life cycle duration (36.49 days) was found on BDN-716 which was at par with BDN-708 (35.95 days). Similar Patel *et al.* (2020) who determined that the average duration of *C. chinensis* life-cycle varied from 33.51 to 43.85 days among different grain pulse, in pigeonpea he observed average life-cycle is 36.70 days.

3.7. The adult emergence

The data (Table 4.3) revealed that highest adult emergence (96.84 per cent) was noticed on BSMR-853 and it was at par with BDN-711 (95.73 per cent) and BDN-708 (94.49 per cent). The significantly lowest adult emergence was observed in BDN-716 (88.83 per cent). Accordance with the findings of Tania *et al.* (2011) who exhibited that the per cent adult emergence of *C. chinensis* was to the extent 97.07 to 93.79 per cent in different mung varieties.

3.8. The adult longevity

It revealed that highest adult longevity (10.70 days) observed in pigeonpea variety BSMR-853 and it was at par with BDN-711 (10.34 days). The lowest longevity reported in BDN-716 (9.68 days) which was at par with BDN-708 (9.69 days). The results of present investigation got the support from the findings of Patel *et al.* (2005) who concluded that the adult longevity on red gram ranged from 8-14 days with mean 12.07 days.

3.9. The sex ratio

The maximum sex ratio of male: female was recorded on BSMR-853 (1:1.21) followed by BDN-716 (1:1.19), BDN-711 (1:1.17) and minimum found on BDN-708 (1:1.02). Sindhura and Godhani (2020) noticed that the sex ratio of pulse beetle highest on cowpea 1:1.1 followed by green gram 1:0.8 and chickpea 1:0.7.

3.10. The pre-oviposition period and ovipositional period

The data on pre oviposition period (Table 4.4) vary significantly. The highest pre-oviposition period (7.60 hours) observed in BSMR-853. The pre oviposition period observed in BSMR-853 was at par with BDN-708 (7.53 hours) and BDN-711 (7.46 hours). The significantly longer oviposition period (7.20 days) was recorded in BSMR-853 and significantly lowest oviposition period in BDN-716 (5.60 days). Similar studied founded Sindhura and Godhani (2020) that the pre-oviposition period ranged from 4 to 10 hours and ovipositional period varied 5 to 10 days on three different pulses.

3.11. The fecundity

The data revealed that significantly highest fecundity was recorded on pigeonpea variety BSMR-853 (88.20 eggs) and significantly lower fecundity observed in BDN-716 (69.40 eggs). Similar Dalal *et al.* (2020) reported the mean fecundity of *C. chinensis* female on blackgram variety Nirali was 89.30 eggs and ranged from 81 to 97 eggs.

| Different varieties | Developmental | Life-cycle duration (days) | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--|--|
| | Period (days) | Mean | Male | Female | | |
| BDN-708 | 26.26 | 35.95 | 34.38 | 37.31 | | |
| BDN-711 | 25.02 | 35.37 | 34.10 | 36.63 | | |
| BDN-716 | 26.81 | 36.49 | 35.16 | 37.61 | | |
| BSMR-853 | 24.17 | 34.87 | 33.75 | 36.02 | | |
| S. E. <u>+</u> | 0.18 | 0.27 | 0.30 | 0.25 | | |
| C.D. at 5% | 0.54 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.75 | | |
| C.V. (%) | 1.56 | 1.67 | 1.96 | 1.53 | | |

Table 2: The mean developmental period and life-cycle duration of *C. chinensis* on different varieties of pigeonpea

Table 3: The per cent adult emergence, adult longevity and sex ratio of *C. chinensis* on different varieties of pigeonpea

| Different varieties | Adult emergence (%) | | Adult longevity (days) | | | Sex ratio | |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------|------|-----------|--------|
| | General | Male | Female | Mean | Male | Female | |
| BDN-708 | 94.49 (76.42)* | 46.72 (43.12) | 47.77 (43.73) | 9.69 | 8.70 | 10.68 | 1:1.02 |
| BDN-711 | 95.73 (78.07) | 43.98 (41.54) | 51.75 (46.00) | 10.34 | 9.22 | 11.36 | 1:1.17 |
| BDN-716 | 88.83 (70.48) | 40.70 (39.64) | 48.12 (43.92) | 9.68 | 8.65 | 10.55 | 1:1.19 |
| BSMR-853 | 96.84 (79.76) | 43.45 (41.24) | 53.38 (46.94) | 10.70 | 9.48 | 11.68 | 1:1.21 |
| S.E <u>+</u> | 1.66 | 0.82 | 0.99 | 0.21 | 0.20 | 0.24 | |
| C.D at 5 % | 4.98 | 2.45 | 2.96 | 0.65 | 0.60 | 0.73 | |
| C.V. (%) | 3.96 | 4.19 | 4.39 | 4.77 | 4.96 | 4.92 | |

*Figures in parentheses indicate arcsine transformed values.

| Different varieties | Pre-oviposition period (hours) | Oviposition period (days) | Fecundity Per female |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| BDN-708 | 7.53 | 6.00 | 74.60 |
| BDN-711 | 7.46 | 6.80 | 82.60 |
| BDN-716 | 7.29 | 5.60 | 69.40 |
| BSMR-853 | 7.60 | 7.20 | 88.20 |
| S. E. + | 0.07 | 0.13 | 1.67 |
| C.D. at 5% | 0.22 | 0.38 | 4.50 |
| C.V. (%) | 2.17 | 4.45 | 4.74 |

Table 4: The pre-oviposition, oviposition period and fecundity of *C. chinensis* on different varieties of pigeonpea

4. Conclusions

The significantly higher incubation period (4.65 days) was observed when C. chinensis reared on BDN-716. The shortest incubation period (4.26 days) was noticed in BSMR-853 which was at par with BDN-708 (4.41 days). The highest egg hatchability observed in BSMR-853 (96 cent) per and lowest hatchability in BDN-716 (88 per cent). The significantly shorter larval-pupal duration of C. chinensis was found in BSMR-853 (19.93 days) whereas, higher larval-pupal duration (22.20 days) was recorded on BDN-716 and it was at par with larval-pupal duration observed in BDN-708 (21.84 days). The highest growth index (2.75) was recorded on pigeonpea variety BSMR-853 and it was at par with BDN-711 (2.70). The significantly lowest growth index (2.43) recorded in BDN-716.

The significantly shorter developmental period (24.17 days) was found in BSMR-853. The longest developmental period (26.81 days) was observed in BDN-716 which was at par with BDN-708 (26.26 days). The significantly shorter life cycle duration (34.87 days) was reported on BSMR-853. The longer life cycle duration (36.49 days) was found in BDN-716 which was at par with BDN-708 (35.95 days). The highest adult emergence (96.84 per cent) was noticed in BSMR-853 however, it was at par with BDN-

711 (95.73 per cent) and BDN-708 (94.49 per The significantly cent). lowest adult emergence (88.83 per cent) observed in BDN-716. The highest male beetle emergence was observed in BDN-708 (46.72 per cent) and incase of females it was highest in BSMR-853 (53.38 per cent). The highest adult longevity (10.70 days) observed on BSMR-853 and was at par with BDN-711 (10.34 days). The lowest longevity reported in BDN-716 (9.68 days) which was at par with BDN-708 (9.69 days). The maximum sex ratio of male: female was recorded on BSMR-853 (1: 1.21) followed by BDN-716 (1: 1.19), BDN-711 (1: 1.17) and minimum on BDN-708 (1: 1.02).

The significantly longer oviposition period (7.20 days) was found on BSMR-853 and significantly lowest oviposition period (5.60 days) on BDN-716. The significantly highest fecundity (88.20 eggs) was noticed on BSMR-853 and significantly lowest fecundity (69.40 eggs) on BDN-716.

References

[1]. Dalal, P.L., Dangi, N.L., Mahla, M.K., Ahir, K.C. & Jat, R. (2020). Biology of pulse beetle, Callosobruchus chinensis (L.) on stored black gram, Vigna mungo (L.). Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 8(5), 1798-1800.

- [2].Dias, C. A. R. & Yadav, T. D. (1988). Incidence of pulse beetle in different legume seeds. Indian Journal of Entomology. 50(4), 457-461.
- [3].Jaiswal, D.K., Raju, S.V.S., Vani, V.M. & Sharma, K.R. (2019). Studies on life history and host preference of pulse beetle, Callosobruchus chinensis (L.) on different pulses. Journal of Entomological Research. 43(2), 159-164.
- [4].Jat, N.R., Rana, B.S. & Jat, S.K. (2013). Estimation of losses due to pulse beetle in chickpea. An International Quarterly Journal of Life Sciences, 8(3), 861-863.
- [5].Khare, B.P. (1994). Stored grain pests and their management. New Delhi: Kalyani publication, 62-66.
- [6].Patel, V.K., Chaudhuri, N. & Senapati, S.K. (2005). Biology of pulse beetle (callosobruchus chinensis Linn.) as influenced by feeding of different grain pulses. Agricultural Science Digest. 25(4), 254 - 256.
- [7].Raina, A.K. (1970). Callosobruchus species infested stored pulses (grain legumes) in India and comparative study of their biology. Indian Journal of Entomology. 32(4), 303-310.
- [8]. Sharma, R., Devi, R., Soni, A., Sharma, U., Yadav, S., Sharma, R. & Kumar, A. (2016). Growth and developmental responses of Callosobruchus maculatus (F.) on various pulses. Legume Research. 39(5), 840-843.
- [9]. Sindhura, K.A. & Godhani, P.H. (2020). Comparative study of pulse beetle Callosobruchus maculatus (F.). Indian Journal of Entomology. 82(2), 232-234.
- [10]. Singh, A. & Mohan, M. (2018). Biology of Callosobruchus chinensis during infestation in two varieties of Arhar under laboratory conditions. Bulletin of Pure & Applied Science- Zoology. 37A(1), 17-20.
- [11]. Singh, K.R.P. & Panth, N.C. (1955). Nutritional studies of Trogoderma granarium effect of various natural foods on the development. Journal of the Zoological Society of India. 7, 155-161.

- [12]. Singh, U. & Jambunathan, R. (1990).
 Pigeon pea postharvest technology. In the Pigeon Pea, Y.L. Nene., S.D. Hill. & V.K. Sheila. (Eds.). Wallingford: CAB Press, 435–455.
- [13]. Singh, Y., Saxena, H.P. & Singh, K.M. (1980). Exploration of resistance to pulse beetles growth and development of Callosobruchus chinensis L. Indian Journal of Entomology. 42(3), 383-389.
- [14]. *Southgate, B.J. (1958). Systemic notes of species of Callosobruchus of economic importance. Bulletin of Entomological Research. 49(3), 383-389.
- [15]. Tania, S.N., Rahman, M.M., Miah, M.R.U. & Alam, M.Z. (2011). Some biological aspects and host preference of pulse beetle (Callosobruchus chinensis L.) on different varieties of mungbean in storage condition. Bangladesh Journal of Seed Science & Technology. 15(1&2), 55-59.
- [16]. Yewale, P.S., Kadam, U.K. & Dalvi, U.S. (2020). Evaluation of bio-chemical constituents in green gram associated with resistance to Callosobruchus maculatus during storage. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 9(5), 2145-2148.