



RESEARCH ARTICLE

CAULIFLOWER GROWERS PESTICIDES USE PATTERN IN CONTROLLING INSECT-PESTS AND DISEASES IN NADIA DISTRICT OF WEST BENGAL

\*<sup>1</sup>Hiralal Jana, <sup>2</sup>Debabrata Basu and <sup>3</sup>Kole, R. K.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, BCKV, Agricultural Farm-713101, Burdwan, West Bengal, India

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, BCKV, Mohanpur-741252, Nadia, West Bengal, India

<sup>3</sup>Department of Agricultural Chemicals, Faculty of Agriculture, BCKV, Mohanpur-741252, Nadia, West Bengal, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 21<sup>st</sup> April, 2016  
Received in revised form  
20<sup>th</sup> May, 2016  
Accepted 04<sup>th</sup> June, 2016  
Published online 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2016

Key words:

Cauliflower growers,  
Pesticides,  
Use pattern,  
Control,  
Insect-pests,  
Diseases,  
Extension agencies,  
Measures,  
Ecological balance,  
Sustainable agriculture.

ABSTRACT

India is an agriculture based country. Imbalance between demand and supply of agricultural production is a major concern to feed the ever-increasing population of our country. To enhance agricultural production, there are several ways. Out of various ways, plant protection occupies prime position. Insect-pests and diseases cause enormous damage to agricultural crops, forests as well as stored agricultural commodities. Almost every economically important plant is attacked by a variety of insect-pests and diseases. Therefore, the study was concentrated on the objective- to portray the plant protection chemicals use behaviour in cauliflower cultivation in controlling insect-pests and diseases. The study was conducted in Nadia district of West Bengal. For the selection of area and respondents of the present study, multi-stage random sampling technique and universe method were followed. The study reveals that (1) at the most 47 percent of respondents had secondary level of education (2) at the most 32 percent of respondents had 1.1 to 2.0 bigha of own cultivable land (3) Nearly half of respondents (45%) had upto 5 katha of non-cultivable land (4) at the most 32 percent of respondents had 1.1 to 2 bigha (20 katha=1 bigha, 3 bigha= 1 acre, 2.5 acre=1 ha=7.5 bigha=150 katha) of land for vegetable cultivation (5) at the most 35 percent of respondents had 21-30 years of experience in vegetable cultivation (6) at the most 20 percent each of respondents had 11-15 years, 16-20 years and above 25 years of experience in pesticides application (7) All the respondents (100%) cultivated cauliflower crop in rabi season mainly (8) majority of the respondents (53%) applied pesticides on 4-7 days interval (9) all the respondents (100%) adopted spraying method for application of pesticides (10) all the respondents' (100%) main personal source of information on pesticides use was agricultural input retailers (11) nearly half of respondents (48%) main impersonal source of information on pesticides use was radio (12) At the most 56 percent of respondents used 30-40 litres of water per bigha for spraying chemicals at seedling stage (13) at the most 66 percent of respondents used 40-80 litres of water per bigha for spraying chemicals at mature stage of the crop (14) at the most 19 percent of respondents used phorate 10G for soil treatment (15) at the most 22 percent of respondents used Mancozeb (Dithane M-45) for seed treatment (16) all the respondents (100%) reported that insect-pests and diseases mainly infested the crop at mature stage (17) according to the report of cauliflower growers (100%), diamond back moth was the most harmful insect-pest of cauliflower crop (18) majority of respondents (51%) reported, downy mildew disease was the most harmful disease of cauliflower crop (19) to control the insect-pests and diseases, respondents used various pesticides with their various brands and in various doses (20) generally, farmers used more amount of chemicals than the recommended amount (dose) for controlling insect-pests and diseases (21) the study also indicated that nowadays the mixed agro-chemicals are coming in market for controlling insect-pests and diseases. (22) the study also revealed that farmers are not following various precautions properly in applying pesticides. Therefore, the various public extension agencies, pesticide companies and non-government organizations should re-orient their extension programmes on the basis of the findings of the present investigation.

Copyright©2016, Hiralal Jana et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Hiralal Jana, Debabrata Basu and Kole, R. K. 2016. "Cauliflower growers pesticides use pattern in controlling insect-pests and diseases in Nadia district of West Bengal", *International Journal of Current Research*, 8, (07), 33932-33941.

INTRODUCTION

With per annum population growth still over 2.1 percent, it will touch 1.4 billion by 2030 and 1.7 billion by 2050 AD,

\*Corresponding author: Hiralal Jana,

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, BCKV, Agricultural Farm-713101, Burdwan, West Bengal, India.

needing annually about 380 million tonnes and 480 million tonnes food grain which account about 52.6 percent and 92.7 percent increase in food production respectively. The rapid and continuing increase in population implies a greater demand for food and nutrition. The growth rate of food grain production decelerated to 1.2 percent during 1990-2007, lower than the population growth of 1.9 percent. The contribution of

agriculture and allied sector has fallen from 61 to 17.5 percent, in the last few years. Marked deceleration in agricultural growth is certainly a cause of serious concern. Hence the task of providing food and nutrition to our vast population poses to be really daunting. Sustainable food and nutrition security involves meeting current needs in agricultural production without sacrificing the prospects for meeting the needs of future generation. Taking note of a sluggish, almost stagnant agricultural growth in the recent years, acting as a drag of country's economic growth, it is imperative to make all round development in agriculture to achieve a turnaround in agricultural production and growth and to make that happen agricultural scientists of the country have to play important roles (Sarkar, 2015). India has moved from scarcity and technological fatigue to technological resurgence and self-reliance in food through the route of intensive agriculture by use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides apart from the genes that provided the green revolution. While reaping benefits of the chemicalisation, India is witnessing signs of its ill-effects that are severely threatening sustainability and safety for food and environment. Thus, to enable trigger hope among growers, there is need to make farming attractive through improvements in sustainability indices so that while maximizing profits, we do not lose our sight of minimizing risks, safeguarding whatsoever is produced (Chattopadhyay, 2015). Though agriculture continues to be the prime mover of Indian economy, we are living in such times where the lands under agriculture either get diverted or get shrunk every other day. Besides, more and more people are leaving agriculture in search of greener pastures. It is high time for us to understand that the saga and the success that we reaped in green revolution are long over. We need to come up with brand new techniques, technologies and approaches to make farming viable; uplift farms, farmers and their resources; and to resuscitate the overall notion of rural development in general (Pathak, 2016). Sustainability means meeting needs without compromising future generations and thus in sustainable agriculture there is a commitment to satisfy human food, fuel, timber and fibre needs and to enhance the quality of life for farmers and society as a whole, now and into the future. With the introduction of modern agricultural technologies, India has moved from an era of chronic food shortages and 'begging bowl' status upto 1960s to food self sufficiency and even food exports. However, Indian agriculture has lost its dynamism in the recent years. The rapid and continuing increase in population implies a greater demand for food and nutrition (Sengupta, 2015).

The pollution of environment, loss of biodiversity, toxic residue in food, development of pest resurgence, outbreak, hazardous to consumers and elimination of natural enemies from crop ecosystem have well illustration in the recent years. This is the fact that 1% of pesticides are reaching to the target pest and rest of 99% is reaching to the non-target sectors (Kumar et al. 2015). Maintaining the productivity level in a sustainable manner considering ecological balance with sound resource management would be key issue in the coming decades (Aswal and Sha, 2011). Among the crops, it is observed that vegetable cultivation is input intensive and care intensive cultivation. Vegetables are the one of the major users of pesticides. Vegetable growers' pesticides use behaviour is dynamic in nature which requires regular research to know

their existing use pattern and their future expectations on the basis of their felt problems. Therefore, collection of reliable information and knowledge about pesticides' use pattern of the vegetable growers becomes crucial for wide range of stakeholders. Considering the importance of the study, the objective –to portray the pesticides' use pattern of cauliflower growers in controlling insect-pests and diseases was undertaken.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was undertaken in the State of West Bengal. For the selection of area and respondents of the present study, multi-stage random sampling technique and universe method were adopted. At the first stage of sampling, Nadia district was selected among the 19 agricultural districts of the State purposively based on its' higher area coverage in vegetable cultivation. Out of 16 blocks of Nadia district, one block (i.e Chakdah) was randomly selected at the second stage of sampling. In the selected block (Chakdah) a relatively homogenous field cultivated with vegetable crops was chosen on the basis of the opinion of the agricultural input retailers. The farmers who were growing cauliflower in that field were selected as respondents (cauliflower growers) of the present study through total enumeration. Thus total 100 farmers ultimately considered as respondents of the study. The data were collected by personal interview method by using local language (Bengali) for getting their exact response and simple percentage method was used for analysis of data statistically to reach at meaningful results and conclusion.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Level of education (table-1):-** The study revealed that at the most 47 percent of respondents had upto secondary level of education and at the lowest 3 percent of respondents had higher secondary level of education. Other levels of education were illiterate (30%), primary level (13%) and graduate level and above (7%).

**Table 1. Level of education (N=100)**

| Level of education       | No. of respondents possessed | Percentage of respondents possessed |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Illiterate               | 30                           | 30                                  |
| Primary level            | 13                           | 13                                  |
| Secondary Level          | 47                           | 47                                  |
| Higher secondary level   | 3                            | 3                                   |
| Graduate level and above | 7                            | 7                                   |

**Own cultivable land (Table-2):-** The table indicates that at the most 32 percent of respondents had 1.1-2.0 bigha of own cultivable land whereas at the lowest 8 percent of respondents had upto 1 bigha of land and other 8 percent of respondents had 4.1-5.0 bigha of own cultivable land. Other respondents came under categories of– 2.1-3.0 bigha (20%), 3.1-4.0 bigha (15%) and above 5.0 bigha of land (17%).

**Non-cultivable land (Table-3):-** It is clear from the table that at the most 45 percent of respondents had upto 5 katha as non-cultivable land and at the lowest 5 percent of respondents each had 10.1-15 katha and 15.1-20 katha. Other respondents came

under categories of- 5.1-10 katha (38%) and above 20 katha of land (7%).

**Table 2. Own cultivable land (N=100)**

| Land possessed (bigha) | Number of respondents | Percentage of respondents |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Upto 1</b>          | 8                     | 8                         |
| <b>1.1-2.0</b>         | 32                    | 32                        |
| <b>2.1-3.0</b>         | 20                    | 20                        |
| <b>3.1-4.0</b>         | 15                    | 15                        |
| <b>4.1-5.0</b>         | 8                     | 8                         |
| <b>Above 5.0</b>       | 17                    | 17                        |

**Table 3. Non- cultivable land (N=100)**

| Land possessed | Number of respondents | Percentage of respondents |
|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Upto 5 katha   | 45                    | 45                        |
| 5.1-10 katha   | 38                    | 38                        |
| 10.1-15 katha  | 5                     | 5                         |
| 15.1-20 katha  | 5                     | 5                         |
| Above 20 katha | 7                     | 7                         |

**Vegetable cultivable land (Table-4):-** The table indicates that at the most 32 percent of respondents had 1.1 to 2 bigha of land for vegetable cultivation whereas at the lowest 5 percent of respondents each had upto 10 katha and above 5.0 bigha of land under vegetable cultivation. Other categories were- 10.1 to 20 katha (23%), 2.1 to 4.0 bigha (25%) and 4.1 to 5.0 bigha (10%). The finding reveals that day by day per capita land holding of farmers is decreasing due to pressure of population.

**Table 4. Vegetable cultivable land (N=100)**

| Land possessed          | Number of respondents | Percentage of respondents |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Upto 10 katha</b>    | 5                     | 5                         |
| <b>10.1-20 katha</b>    | 23                    | 23                        |
| <b>1.1 to 2 bigha</b>   | 32                    | 32                        |
| <b>2.1 to 4 bigha</b>   | 25                    | 25                        |
| <b>4.1.1 to 5 bigha</b> | 10                    | 10                        |
| <b>Above 5.0 bigha</b>  | 5                     | 5                         |

**Number of years cultivating vegetables (Table-5) :-** The table expressed that at the most 35 percent of respondents had 21-30 years of experience in vegetable cultivation whereas at the lowest 5 percent of respondents each had 31-40 and above 40 years of experience in vegetable cultivation. Other categories were- upto 5 years (8%), 6-10 years (7%), 11-15 years (20%) and 16-20 years (20%).

**Table 5. Number of years cultivating vegetables (N=100)**

| Number of years cultivating vegetables | Number of respondents | Percentage of respondents |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Upto 5</b>                          | 8                     | 8                         |
| <b>6-10</b>                            | 7                     | 7                         |
| <b>11-15</b>                           | 20                    | 20                        |
| <b>16--20</b>                          | 20                    | 20                        |
| <b>21-30</b>                           | 35                    | 35                        |
| <b>31-40</b>                           | 5                     | 5                         |
| <b>Above 40</b>                        | 5                     | 5                         |

**Number of years applying pesticides (Table-6):-** The table indicates that at the most 20 percent of respondents each had 11-15 years, 16-20 years and above 25 years of experience in

pesticides application and at the lowest 7 percent of respondents had upto 5 years of experience in pesticides application. Other categories were 6-10 years (18%) and 21-25 years (15%). It is clear from the study that last 20 years; pesticides use has increased upto a great extent (65%).

**Table 6. Number of years applying pesticides (N=100)**

| Number of years applying pesticides | Number of respondents | Percentage of respondents |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Upto 5 years</b>                 | 7                     | 7                         |
| <b>6-10 years</b>                   | 18                    | 18                        |
| <b>11-15 years</b>                  | 20                    | 20                        |
| <b>16-20 years</b>                  | 20                    | 20                        |
| <b>21-25 years</b>                  | 15                    | 15                        |
| <b>Above 25 years</b>               | 20                    | 20                        |

**Season (Table-7):-** Only 18 percent of respondents cultivated the crop in kharif season whereas 100 percent of them preferred to cultivate it in rabi season and in pre-kharif (summer) season no one cultivated the crop. It is clear from the study that cauliflower is not a round the year crop and have market demand only in seasonal basis.

**Table 7. Season (N=100)**

| Season        | Number of respondent cultivated | Percentage of respondent cultivated |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Kharif</b> | 18                              | 18                                  |
| <b>Rabi</b>   | 100                             | 100                                 |
| <b>Summer</b> | 0                               | 0                                   |

**Interval of applying pesticides (Table-8):-** Respondents in the study area preferred to apply pesticides in the following days' interval-1-3 days (21%), 4-7 days (53%), 8-15 days (17%) and more than 15 days (9%).

**Table 8. Interval of applying pesticides (N=100)**

| Days interval | Number of respondent applied | Percentage of respondent applied |
|---------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1-3           | 21                           | 21                               |
| 4-7           | 53                           | 53                               |
| 8-15          | 17                           | 17                               |
| More than 15  | 9                            | 9                                |

**Methods of application of pesticides (Table-9):** -All the respondents in the study area (100%) applied pesticides mainly through spraying whereas 21 percent of cauliflower growers followed dibbling method (dugged the soil and the plant protection chemicals were inserted and filled the hole by soil again especially application of granular pesticides) and only 14 percent of selected farmers also applied the chemicals by following dusting method.

**Table 9. Method of application of pesticides (N=100)**

| Method          | Number of respondent applied | Percentage of respondent applied |
|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Spraying</b> | 100                          | 100                              |
| <b>Dibbling</b> | 21                           | 21                               |
| <b>Dusting</b>  | 14                           | 14                               |

**Personal source of information in using pesticides (Table-10):** - At the most cent percent of respondents' (100%) main source of information in using pesticides was agricultural input retailers who provided information mainly at the time of purchasing whereas at the lowest 5 percent of respondents collected information from agricultural fair. Other categories in this regard are the followings:- Fellow farmers (32%), Neighbours (18%), Big farmers (21%), Relatives (7%), ADOs & KPS (11%), Experts of Agril. University (9%), Company personnel (21%) and crop doctor (22%). Crop doctor is a person of sound agricultural knowledge background provides knowledge to farmers on commercial basis. After collecting the information from various sources, each respondent evaluated it in their level best and finally applied the suitable one. Singh *et al.* (2014) reported that about one-third of the respondents (33.75%) and nearly one-fourth of the respondents (23.75%) had medium and high overall information seeking behaviour respectively. Private dealers, friends, kisan mela and PAU scientists were emerged as the main sources of seeking information. The weed control, plant protection, recommended varieties and fertilizer applications were the major areas for seeking information regarding vegetable cultivation. Most of the respondents shared information with neighbours, friends, relatives and mode of sharing was verbal as stated by 100 percent of the respondents. Nidhi *et al.* (2016) indicated that 63.37 percent of farmers were having very good knowledge about several IPM practices. Among these practices 71.37 percent farmers had very high knowledge with regards to cultural practices for pest management in cauliflower cultivation and only 26.60 percent of farmers had knowledge about bio-control practices. It indicates that farmers had very poor knowledge about bio-control practices under IPM in cauliflower cultivation.

**Table 10. Personal sources of information on pesticides use (N=100)**

| Personal source              | No. of respondents collected | Percentage of respondents collected |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Agricultural input retailers | 100                          | 100                                 |
| Fellow farmers               | 32                           | 32                                  |
| Neighbours                   | 18                           | 18                                  |
| Big farmers                  | 21                           | 21                                  |
| Relatives                    | 7                            | 7                                   |
| ADOs and KPSs                | 11                           | 11                                  |
| Experts of Agril. University | 9                            | 9                                   |
| Company personnel            | 21                           | 21                                  |
| Agricultural Fair            | 5                            | 5                                   |
| Crop doctor                  | 22                           | 22                                  |

(ADO=Agricultural Development Officer; KPS=Krishi Prayukti Sahayak)

**Impersonal sources of information on pesticides use (Table-11):**-Still, radio is playing an important role in disseminating agricultural technologies to farming communities. It is a very convenience mass media to access information compare to other impersonal media and it was reported by 48 percent of respondents. At the lowest 3 percent of respondents told they collected information from magazine. Other impersonal sources were- T.V. (17%), Newspaper (8%), book (5%), internet (6%) and kisan call centre (4%).

**Amount of water used for spraying pesticides (Table-12):**-For application of pesticides, per bigha water requirement was 30 to 40 litres at seedling stage and it was followed by more

than half of respondents (56%). At mature stage, water requirement for spraying was 40-80 litre per bigha and it was followed by majority of the respondents (66%).

**Table 11. Impersonal sources of information on pesticides use (N=100)**

| Impersonal source | No. of respondents collected | Percentage of respondents collected |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Radio             | 48                           | 48                                  |
| T.V.              | 17                           | 17                                  |
| Newspaper         | 8                            | 8                                   |
| Book              | 5                            | 5                                   |
| Magazine          | 3                            | 3                                   |
| Internet          | 6                            | 6                                   |
| Kisan call centre | 4                            | 4                                   |

**Table 12. Amount of water used for spraying pesticides (N=100)**

| Crop stage     | Amount of water required for spraying (per bigha) | Number of respondent followed | PRF |
|----------------|---|-------------------------------|-----|
| Seedling stage | 30-40   | 56                            | 56  |
| Mature stage   | 40-80   | 66                            | 66  |

(PRF= Percentage of respondent followed)

**Soil treatment (Table-13):**- There are many soil borne insect-pests and diseases those infest the crop. To prevent that incidence, the respondents of the study area applied various pesticides. They generally applied two chemical mainly these are -Phorate 10G (19 percent of respondents applied @ 1-3 kg per bigha) and Carbafulan 3G (13 percent of respondents applied @ 2-5 kg per bigha).

**Seed treatment (Table-14):** Seed treatment refers to the application of fungicides, insecticides, or a combination of both, to seeds so as to disinfect and disinfect them from seed borne pathogenic organisms and storage insects. Many diseases can be controlled by a simple chemical seed treatment. Plant disease organisms survive from season to season through spores carried on or in seeds. The young seedling is protected from attack until it is capable of outgrowing attacks from soil borne pathogens. Some chemical seed treatments provide a protective zone around the seed through which soil-borne organisms cannot penetrate. It was seen that in study area 22 percent of respondents used Mancozeb @2.5-5 gm/kg of seed for seed treatment and only 14 of respondents used Carbendazim @3-5 gm/kg of seed for seed treatment. Cauliflower growers also reported information that nowadays purchased seeds are already treated by companies or sellers; therefore, there is no need to treat those seeds again.

**Insect-pests of cauliflower (Table-15):**-Various insect-pests of cauliflower as reported by respondents are given below in the following table:-

Soni *et al.* (2013) reported that the cauliflower growers had lower level of adoption on the following aspects; weed management (38.75%), seed treatment (29.38%), disease management (25.00%) and for insect-pest management (7.50%).

**Table 13. Soil treatment (N=100)**

| Name of agro-chemicals | Commercial name | Recommended dose (per bigha) | Applied dose (per bigha) | No. of respondents applied | Percentage of respondents applied |
|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Phorate 10G</b>     | Thimet          | 1.5 kg                       | 1-3 kg                   | 19                         | 19                                |
| <b>Carbafuran 3G</b>   | Furadon         | 4 kg                         | 2-5 kg                   | 13                         | 13                                |

**Table 14. Chemicals used for seed treatment (N=100)**

| Name of pesticides        | Commercial name | Recommended dose (per kg seed) | Applied dose (per kg seed) | No. of respondents applied | Percentage of respondents applied |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Mancozeb 75% WP</b>    | Dithane M-45    | 3 gm                           | 2.5-5 gm                   | 22                         | 22                                |
| <b>Carbendazim 50% WP</b> | Bavistin        | 2 gm                           | 3-5 gm                     | 14                         | 14                                |

**Table 15. Various insect-pests of cauliflower (N=100)**

| Insect-pests of cauliflower | Number of respondents reported | Percentage of respondents reported |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Diamond back moth</b>    | 100                            | 100                                |
| <b>Tobacco caterpillar</b>  | 30                             | 30                                 |
| <b>Cabbage butterfly</b>    | 50                             | 50                                 |
| <b>Cabbage aphid</b>        | 47                             | 47                                 |
| <b>White fly</b>            | 38                             | 38                                 |

**Table 16. Pesticides used to control diamond back moth (N=100)**

| Brand Name | Pesticides                | Recommended dose per litre of water | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Dose applied (per litre of water) |
|------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ripcord    | Cypermethrine 25%EC       | 0.5ml                               | 35                            | 35                                | 1-3ml                             |
| Padan      | Cartaf Hydrochloride50%SP | 1gm                                 | 15                            | 15                                | 1-2gm                             |
| Ekalux     | Quinalphos 25%EC          | 2.0ml                               | 7                             | 7                                 | 2-3ml                             |
| Metacid    | Methyl Parathion 50%EC    | 1ml                                 | 5                             | 5                                 | 1ml                               |
| Dursban    | Chlorpyrifos 20%EC        | 2.5ml                               | 6                             | 6                                 | 2-3ml                             |
| Regent     | Fipronil 5% EC            | 1ml/litre                           | 3                             | 3                                 | 1-2ml/litre                       |

**Table 17. Pesticides used to control tobacco caterpillar (N=100)**

| Brand Name     | Pesticides           | Recommended dose per litre of water | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Dose (per litre of water) |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Ripcord</b> | Cypermethrine 25%EC  | 0.5ml                               | 30                            | 30                                | 1-3ml                     |
| <b>Thiodan</b> | Endosulfon 35%EC     | 2ml                                 | 21                            | 21                                | 1-3ml                     |
| <b>Nuvan</b>   | Dichlorvos 76% E.C.  | 0.75ml                              | 19                            | 19                                | 1.5-3ml                   |
| <b>Cymbush</b> | Cypermethrine 10% EC | 1ml                                 | 9                             | 9                                 | 1-2ml                     |
| <b>Pyriban</b> | Chloropyrifos 20%EC  | 2.5ml                               | 4                             | 4                                 | 2-3ml                     |

**Table 18. Pesticides used to control cabbage butterfly (N=100)**

| Brand Name      | Pesticides             | Recommended dose per litre of water | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Applied dose (per litre of water) |
|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Ostaad</b>   | Cypermethrine 10%EC    | 1ml                                 | 16                            | 16                                | 1-2ml                             |
| <b>Acephate</b> | Acephate 50% SP        | 0.75gm                              | 8                             | 8                                 | 1-2gm                             |
| <b>Thiodan</b>  | Endosulfon 35%EC       | 2ml                                 | 09                            | 09                                | 1-3ml                             |
| <b>Metacid</b>  | Methyl Parathion 50%EC | 1ml                                 | 10                            | 10                                | 1ml                               |
| <b>Sumidon</b>  | Phosphamidon 40%EC     | 1.5ml                               | 13                            | 13                                | 1-2ml                             |

**Table 19. Pesticides used to control cabbage aphid (N=100)**

| Brand Name | Pesticides          | Recommended dose | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Applied dose (per litre of water) |
|------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Malathion  | Malathion 50% EC    | 2ml              | 13                            | 13                                | 1.5 ml                            |
| Rogor      | Dimethoate 30%EC    | 2ml              | 22                            | 22                                | 2-3 ml                            |
| Ekalux     | Quinalphos 25%EC    | 2ml              | 10                            | 10                                | 2-3ml                             |
| Dursban    | Chlorpyrifos 20% EC | 2.5ml            | 15                            | 15                                | 2-3ml                             |
| Met        | Ethion50%EC         | 1ml              | 4                             | 4                                 | 1-2ml                             |

**Table 20. Pesticides used to control white fly (N=100)**

| Brand Name      | Pesticides             | Recommended dose per litre of water | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Dose (per litre of water) |
|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Ekalux</b>   | Quinalphos 25%EC       | 2ml                                 | 17                            | 17                                | 2-3ml                     |
| <b>Metacid</b>  | Methyl Parathion 50%EC | 1ml                                 | 21                            | 21                                | 1ml                       |
| <b>Dursban</b>  | Chlorpyrifos 20% EC    | 2.5ml                               | 19                            | 19                                | 2-3ml                     |
| <b>Cilcord</b>  | Cypermethrine 25%EC    | 0.5ml                               | 25                            | 25                                | 0.5-1ml                   |
| <b>Confidor</b> | Imidacloprid17.8SL     | 3ml/5 litre of water                | 10                            | 10                                | 3-5ml/5 litre of water    |

Chaturvedi *et al.* (2010) concluded that knowledge gap among the respondents of periphery category were- seed treatment (46.67%), weed management (30.00%), plant protection (33.34%) whereas knowledge gap among the respondents of distant category were- seed treatment (60%), weed management (43.34%) and plant protection measures (53.34%). Jakhar (2014) cauliflower is severely damaged by multiple insect-pests complex and constitutes one of the major limiting factors in crop production. The main insects are diamond back moth (*Plutella xylostella*), head caterpillar (*Crociodomia binotalis*), *Spodotera lutea* and Heliothis (*Helicoverpa armigera*) in India. The yield loss caused by diamond back moth varies from 31 to 100 percent.

#### Pesticides used to control diamond back moth (Table-16):-

**Diamond back moth (*Plutella xylostella*):** - This is a serious pest of cauliflower. The tiny caterpillars bite holes by feeding on the leaves giving a short-hole effect all over the leaves. In dry season they become abundant enough to cause appreciable damage. The moth is greyish brown with narrow wings and pale white markings along the back of the forewings which form a diamond shaped pattern when folded. The hind wings have a fringe of long hairs. The caterpillars are small, slender, pale-green in colour with short thin hairs on the body. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (table-16):- Cypermethrin 25%EC @ 1-3ml/litre of water (35%), Cartaf hydrochloride 50 %SP@ 1-2gm/litre of water (15%), Quinalphos 25%EC@ 2-3ml/litre of water (7%), Methyl Parathion 50%EC@ 1ml/litre of water (5%), Chlorpyrifos 20%EC @ 2-3ml/litre of water (6%) and Fipronil 5% EC@ 1-2ml/litre of water (3%). It is seen from the table that farmers are using lot of chemicals to control a insect-pest, but, practically one application of a particular chemical is effective for controlling other insect-pests also. Therefore, farmers are using limited number of chemicals. Lad and Peshkar (2016) reported that recommended insecticide Quinalphos 0.05% offered maximum per cent mean reduction in the larval population to the extent of 73.79 per cent followed by *Trichogrammatoidea bactrae* @1.5 lakh eggs /ha, *Bacillus thuringiensis* @1000ml/ha, *T. chilonis* @ 1.5 lakh eggs /ha, registering percent mean larval population reduction to the tune of 52.19, 50.41 and 45.22 respectively. It is concluded that Quinalphos 0.05% still effective as recommended for the management of Diamond back moth. Senguttuvan *et al.* (2014) revealed that Lufenuron 5.4 EC, Indoxacarb 15.8 EC and Cartap Hydrochloride 50 SP. were effective in reducing diamond back moth population in cauliflower. Lufenuron 5.4 EC at 60g a.i. /ha showed highest mortality in first (80.83%) and second (75.07%) season trials against the pest. Lufenuron 5.4 EC at all the doses was comparatively less toxic to *Cotesia* (21.27-33.17%) in first and (23.90-47.28%) in second season trials on cauliflower, when compared to standard check indoxacarb. Cartaf hydrochloride was more toxic *Cotesia* by recording a cumulative mean per cent reduction of 50.78, 46.87 at first and 61.49, 64.81 at second season trials respectively.

#### Pesticides used to control tobacco caterpillar (Table-17):-

**Tobacco caterpillar (*Spodoptera litura*):**- The caterpillars feed voraciously on the leaves, shoots and fruits at night and

become isolated at the later stage of the growth. The pest is confined to nursery beds and is also classed as cutworm. The moth is greyish brown with white markings on the forewings and hind wings with irridiantly white with a brown border. The thorax and abdomen are light brown and display a tuft of hairs in the end. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (table-17):- Cypermethrine 25%EC @ 1-3ml/litre of water (30%), Endosulfon 35%EC @ 1-3ml/litre of water (21%), Dichlorvos 76% E.C.@ 1.5-3ml/litre of water (19%), Cypermethrine 10% EC @ 1-2ml/litre of water (9%) and Chloropyrifos 20% EC @ 2-3ml/litre of water (4%).

#### Pesticides used to control cabbage butterfly (Table-18)

**Cabbage butterfly (*Pieris brassicae*):** - The caterpillars feed voraciously on the leaves, shoots and pods and when they are grown up, they disperse themselves to various parts of the plants. They start feeding from the margin of leaf and proceed to the centre. The whole leaf and plant may be stripped resulting in poor yield and quality of produce. The butterfly is large, yellowish white insect with a pair of black dots on each forewing. The caterpillars are tiny with body covered with short hairs. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (table-18):- Cypermethrine 10%EC @ 1-2ml/litre of water (16%), Acephate 50%SP @1-2gm/litre of water (8%), Endosulfon 35%EC@ 1-3ml/litre of water (9%), Methyl Parathion 50%EC @ 1ml/litre of water (10%) and Phosphamidon 40%EC@ 1-2ml/litre of water (13%).

#### Pesticides used to control cabbage aphid (Table-19)

**Cabbage Aphid (*Lipaphis erysimi*):** - Both the nymphs and adults suck the sap from the tender part of the plants. In cauliflower all the inner space in the head are filled by the aphids, thus making the vegetables unmarketable. The aphids excrete honey dew on which shooty mould grows covering the dorsal leaf surface. The aphids are small, yellowish green and soft insects and usually 2.5 to 3 mm long. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (table-19) :- Malathion 50% EC @ 1.5 ml /litre of water (13%), Dimethoate 30%EC @2-3 ml /litre of water (22%), Quinalphos 25%EC @2-3ml /litre of water (10%), Chlorpyrifos 20% EC@ 2-3ml /litre of water (15%) and Ethion 50%EC @ 1-2ml /litre of water (4%).

#### Pesticides used to control white fly (Table-20)

**White fly (*Aleyrodes proletella*):** - This is a minute pest. The larvae (scales) feed on the underside of the leaves and cause white or yellow patches. On the honey dew secreted by the pest, black mouldy growth develops. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (table-20) :- Quinalphos 25%EC @ 2-3ml /litre of water (17%), Methyl Parathion 50%EC @1ml /litre of water (21%), Chlorpyrifos 20% EC @2-3ml /litre of water (19%), Cypermethrine 25%EC 0.5-1ml /litre of water (25%) and Imidacloprid 17.8%SL @ 3-5ml /5litre of water (10%).

## Diseases of cauliflower (Table-21)

Table 21. Diseases of cauliflower (N=100)

| Diseases of cauliflower      | Number of respondents reported | Percentage of respondents reported |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Downy mildew                 | 51                             | 51                                 |
| Watery soft rot or stalk rot | 17                             | 17                                 |
| Black spot or dark leaf spot | 33                             | 33                                 |
| Hollow heart disease         | 22                             | 22                                 |
| Whiptail                     | 6                              | 6                                  |

More than half of respondents (51%) reported about the downy mildew disease of cauliflower, 17 percent of respondents reported about watery soft rot or stalk rot disease, 33 percent reported about black spot disease, 22 percent of respondents reported about hollow heart disease and at the lowest 6 percent of respondents reported about the whip tail disease of cauliflower. Kumar *et al.* (2016) reported that vegetables are more prone to diseases infection, thereby causing high yield losses. The use of resistant genotypes looks to be the best method for disease management. Integrated Disease Management (IDM) is a combined approach which could be a better alternative to minimize the yield losses due to various diseases and farmers should adopt IDM approach to get disease free vegetable crops and higher profitability. Sasane *et al.* (2012) revealed that in study area 37.50 percent of respondents had adopted recommended plant protection measures for controlling pest, 57.50 percent respondents had partially adopted and 5.00 percent of them had not adopted recommended plant protection measures. Nearly two fifth percent of respondents (36.25%) had adoption on recommended plant protection measures for controlling diseases, 47.50 percent of respondents had partial adoption and 16.25 per cent of them had not adoption on recommended plant protection measures for disease control in cauliflower crop.

### Pesticides used to control downy mildew disease (Table-22)

**Downy mildew** (*Peronospora parasitica*):- The characteristic symptoms of the disease are the appearance of purplish brown spots on the under surface of the leaves. The upper surface of the leaf on the lesion is tan or yellow. The downy fungal growth usually appears on the under surface of the leaves. During the bolting stage, the seed stalks show blackish patches and in severe cases the whole curd is spoiled. The fungus perennates in the infected plant debris as oospores and also as contaminant on the seeds. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (Table-22):- Mancozeb 75%WP @ 2-3gm /litre of water (42%), Copper Oxychloride 50%WDP @2.5-3.5gm /litre of water (19%), Captan50%WP @2-3gm /litre of water (7%) and Hexaconazole5%EC@ 1.5-2.5ml /litre of water (9%).

### Pesticides used to control watery soft rot or stalk rot disease of cauliflower (Table-23)

**Watery soft rot or stalk rot** (*Sclerotinia sclerotiorum*):- The disease causes spots on the leaves, particularly on the base of the petioles and passes into the adjoining part of the stem on which large, greyish-white, elliptical spots arise. Sometimes

the whole surface of the stem is involved. At the point of attack, the seed stalks can break, wither and eventually die. The fungus survives in the soil on the diseased plant debris. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (table-23):- Mancozeb 75%WP @ 2.5-3gm /litre of water (16%), Carbendazim 50%WP @1-2gm/litre of water (12%), Hexaconazole 5%EC @1-2ml/litre of water (5%), Carbendazim 12% +Mancozeb 63%WP@ 1-2gm/litre of water (5%) and Copper Oxychloride50%WDP @ 3-5gm /litre of water (4%).

### Pesticides used for controlling black spot or dark leaf spot disease (Table-24)

**Black spot or dark leaf spot** (*Alternaria brassicae*):- The leaf spots are small, lighter dark coloured which spread rapidly to form circular lesion upto 1 cm in diameter or even more. The spots enlarge in concentric rings. The fungus may appear as bluish growth in the centre during humid weather. The spots are linear on the stems, petioles and pods. Sometimes the cauliflower heads are infested and show browning at the margin of the individual flower or flower clusters. Minute dark spots may appear on the seedlings stem after germination and cause damping off or stunting of the young plants. The fungi are reported to be seed borne. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (table-24):- Mancozeb 75%WP @ 2.5-3gm /litre of water (25%), Carbendazim 50%WP @2-3gm /litre of water (22%), Captan50%WP @2-3gm /litre of water (4%) and Copper Oxychloride 50%WDP @ 3-4gm /litre of water (14%).

### Pesticides used to control hollow heart disease (Table-25)

**Hollow heart disease** (Boron deficiency):- Hollow heart occurs in cauliflower in which small, concentric water soaked areas develop in the stem and in centre and also on the branches of the curd. The head appears brown and the smaller leaves on the curd become deformed. The stems may become hollow with water soaked tissue surrounding the walls of cavity. In more advanced stages, pinkish or rusty brown areas develop on the surface of the curd. The affected curds develop a bitter taste. The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (Table-25):- Mancozeb 75% WP.@ 2-3gm /litre of water (15%), Sodium Borate @1kg/ha (5%), Sodium Borate @10kg/ha (4%).

### Pesticides used to control whiptail disease (Table-26)

**Whiptail** (Molybdenum deficiency):- In molybdenum deficient soils the leaf blades of cauliflower do not develop properly and may be straplike. In severe cases only midrib develops. The young cauliflower plants become chlorotic and may turn white, particularly along the leaf margins; they also become cupped and wither. This disorder is caused due to the deficiency of molybdenum occurring mostly in acidic soils where pH is below 5.0. The growing point is severely deformed and hence does not produce marketable curds. Therefore, application of lime in soil is conducive for pH level enhancement which enhances molybdenum availability in soil.

**Table 22. Pesticides used to control downy mildew disease (N=100)**

| Brand Name   | Pesticides                | Recommended dose | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Dose (per litre of water) |
|--------------|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Dithane M-45 | Mancozeb 75%WP            | 2.5gm            | 42                            | 42                                | 2-3 gm                    |
| Blue copper  | Copper Oxychloride 50%WDP | 4gm              | 19                            | 19                                | 2.5-3.5gm                 |
| Captaf       | Cantan50%WP               | 2.5gm            | 7                             | 7                                 | 2-3gm                     |
| Contaf       | Hexaconazole5%EC          | 1ml              | 9                             | 9                                 | 1.5-2.5ml                 |

**Table 23. Pesticides used to control watery soft rot or stalk rot disease (N=100)**

| Brand Name    | Pesticides                      | Recommended dose per litre of water | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Applied dose (per litre of water) |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Indofill-M-45 | Mancozeb 75%WP                  | 2.5g                                | 16                            | 16                                | 2.5-3gm                           |
| Cyvistin      | Carbendazim 50%WP               | 1gm                                 | 12                            | 12                                | 1-2gm                             |
| Contaf        | Hexaconazole5%EC                | 1ml                                 | 5                             | 5                                 | 1-2 ml                            |
| SAAF          | Carbendazim 12% +Mancozeb 63%WP | 1gm                                 | 5                             | 5                                 | 1-2gm                             |
| Blitox        | Copper Oxychloride50%WDP        | 4gm                                 | 4                             | 4                                 | 3-5gm                             |

**Table 24. Pesticides used for controlling black spot or dark leaf spot disease (N=100)**

| Brand Name   | Pesticides                | Recommended dose per litre of water | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Applied dose (per litre of water) |
|--------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Dithane M-45 | Mancozeb 75%WP            | 2.5gm                               | 25                            | 25                                | 2.5-3gm                           |
| Bavistin     | Carbendazim50%WP          | 2gm                                 | 22                            | 22                                | 2-3gm                             |
| Captan       | Captan50%WP               | 2.5gm                               | 4                             | 4                                 | 2-3gm                             |
| Blitox       | Copper Oxychloride 50%WDP | 4gm                                 | 14                            | 14                                | 3-4gm                             |

**Table 25. Pesticides used to control hollow heart disease (N=100)**

| Brand Name   | Pesticides       | Recommended dose per litre of water                                      | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Applied dose (per litre of water) |
|--------------|------------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Dithane M-45 | Mancozeb 75% WP. | 2.5gm  | 15                            | 15                                | 2-3gm                             |
| Borax        | Sodium Borate    | 0.25-0.5 percent solution of Borax @1-2kg/ha in case of acute deficiency | 5                             | 5                                 | 1kg/ha                            |
| Borax        | Sodium Borate    | 20kg/ha  | 4                             | 4                                 | 10kg/ha                           |

**Table 26. Pesticides used to control whiptail (N=100)**

| Brand Name         | Plant protection chemicals | Recommended dose | Number of respondents adopted | Percentage of respondents adopted | Applied dose |
|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Sodium Molybdate   | Sodium Molybdate           | 1.5kg/ha         | 1                             | 1                                 | 1.5kg/ha     |
| Ammonium Molybdate | Ammonium Molybdate         | 1.5kg/ha         | 4                             | 4                                 | 1.5kg/ha     |

**Table 27. Attacking stages of insect-pests and diseases in cauliflower**

| Insect-pests and diseases    | Attacking stages of crop           |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Insect-pests                 |                                    |
| Diamond back moth            | Early mature stage                 |
| Tobacco caterpillar          | Early mature stage to mature stage |
| Cabbage Butterfly            | Mature stage                       |
| Cabbage aphid                | Mature stage                       |
| White fly                    | Mature stage                       |
| Diseases                     |                                    |
| Downy mildew                 | Mature stage                       |
| Watery soft rot or stalk rot | Early mature stage to mature stage |
| Black spot or dark leaf spot | Early mature stage to mature stage |
| Hollow heart disease         | Mature stage                       |
| Whip tail                    | Early mature stage                 |

**Table 28. Problems during application of pesticides and problems after application of pesticides (N=100)**

| S.No. | Various problems faced by respondents during application of pesticides | Percentage of respondents | S. No. | Various problems faced by respondents after application of pesticides | Percentage of respondents |
|-------|--|---------------------------|--------|---|---------------------------|
| 1.    | Weakness   | 6                         | 1.     | Feeling of burning skin   | 7                         |
| 2.    | Contact of chemical with body  | 8                         | 2.     | Vomiting  | 6                         |
| 3.    | Feeling of burning skin  | 5                         | 3.     | Weakness  | 9                         |
| 4.    | Vomiting   | 4                         | 4.     | Headache  | 10                        |
| 5.    | Pain in body   | 6                         | 5.     | Drowsiness  | 8                         |
| 6.    | Headache   | 8                         | 6.     | No problem  | 60                        |
| 7.    | Itching  | 3                         |        |   |                           |
| 8.    | Bad odour  | 9                         |        |   |                           |
| 9.    | Breathing problem  | 8                         |        |   |                           |
| 10.   | Drowsiness   | 3                         |        |   |                           |
| 11.   | No problem   | 40                        |        |   |                           |

The pesticides used, dose applied and percentage of respondents adopted are the followings (Table-26):- Sodium Molybdate @1.5kg/ha (1%) and Ammonium Molybdate @ 1.5kg/ha (4%).

**Insect-pests and diseases, their attacking stages in cauliflower crop (Table-27):-** The table-29 indicates that the cauliflower crop was mainly attacked by insect-pests and diseases at mature stage.

**Problems during application of pesticides and problems after application of pesticides Table 28:-** The most 40 percent of respondents reported that they had not any problem during application of pesticides whereas at the most 60 percent of respondents replied that they had not any problem after application of pesticides.

### Conclusion

To feed the ever-increasing population of our country-to produce more food was main concern. Cultivation of high yielding varieties is an input intensive technology. Therefore, more fertilizers, pesticides, weedicides, irrigation water etc. were applied to field. Gradually, it had become a great problem. Indiscriminate use of chemicals in agriculture during post green revolution period had brought adverse effect on soil health and environment has created an alarming situation. Therefore, the time has come to follow the following considerations those have emerged from the present investigation: - (1) Short-term training on plant protection aspects of cauliflower cultivation should be conducted. (2) Farmers need more exposure on plant protection aspects. (3) The Govt. extension agencies should have a special attention on retailers' activities (4) Farmers should have more exposure on mass media. (5) Pesticides only be applied to the crop when insect-pests infestation crosses the economic threshold level (ETL). (6) Pesticides manufacturers should have more emphasis on liquid chemicals production. (7) Farmers should have more care on crop during mature stage. (8) Farmers should follow various precautions properly in using pesticides (9) according to nature of insect-pests and diseases, soil treatment should also be considered as an important starting point of plant protection measures (10) seed treatment should be considered as an essential activity of cultivation (11) integrated approach is needed to control diamond back moth of cauliflower (12) integrated approach is needed to control downy mildew disease of cauliflower (13) Farmers knowledge regarding various brands of chemicals should be enhanced (14) farmers are not applying recommended doses of pesticides, therefore, it is an important focus area of extension activities (15) mixed agro-chemicals are gaining popularity day by day due to their effectiveness. Susane *et al.* (2012) suggested that an organized programme in cauliflower production, training, demonstrations and frequent field visits should be taken up by the concern extension agency, so that knowledge and adoption level of recommended production technology of cauliflower growers is enhanced. Jakhar (2014) reported that farmers commonly use chemical pesticides for controlling insect-pests because chemicals have an immediate knock down effect and are easily available in local market. Spraying of inappropriate chemicals, excessive application, inappropriate timing, the

wrong combination of chemicals and spurious chemicals lead to insecticide resistance which causes farmers to spray even more pesticides. Development of insecticide resistance can occur within one or two cropping seasons after the introduction of a new chemical. Nidhi *et al.* (2016) reported that technical guidance should be provided regarding assessment of ETL, training on IPM technologies should be imparted, more number of demonstrations on IPM should be organized on farmers' field and *trycoderma* should be made available at local market were important strategies suggested by the farmers in the study area.

### REFERENCES

- Aswal, J.S. and Sha, B. 2011. Bio-pesticides are eco-friendly alternatives; *Indian Farming*, 60(10): 20-22.
- Chattopadhyay, C. 2015. Extended Summaries; National Seminar on "Sustainable Agriculture for Food Security and Better Environment" 17-18, December, 2015; Department of Agronomy, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, West Bengal.
- Chaturvedi, D.; Dangi, K.L. and Sharma, F.L. 2010. Technical knowledge of cauliflower growers in Udaipur district of Rajasthan; *Rajasthan Journal of Extension Education*, vol. 17&18: 124-127.
- Jakhar, B.L. (2014) Validation of integrated pest management modules against pest complex in cauliflower; *Pestology*, 38(3): 46-49.
- Kumar, L.; Yogi, M. and Shankara, S. 2015. Insect-pests and their bio-control agents in sugarcane ecosystem; *Indian Farmers' Digest*, 48(12): 41-42.
- Kumar, P. ; Akthar, J. and Kandan, A. 2016. Management of seed and seed borne diseases in vegetable crops, *Indian Farmers' Digest*, 49(2): 28-29.
- Lad, S.K. and Peshkar, L.N. 2016. Efficiency of Quinalphos 35% EC against diamond back moth in cauliflower; *Pestology*, 40(3): 31-33.
- Nidhi; Sharma, F.L.; Ghosly, A. and Parmar, S.J. 2016. Strategies for promotion of IPM in cauliflower cultivation in Udaipur district of Rajasthan. Compendium of National Seminar on Contemporary Innovations for Quantum Extension in Agricultural Development; March-18-19; JAU, Junagadh; p-185.
- Pathak, A.R. 2016. Compendium; National Seminar SEEG-2016 on Contemporary Innovations for Quantum Extension in Agricultural Development; 18-19 March, 2016; Department of Agricultural Extension, Junagadh Agricultural University, Gujarat. P-3.
- Sarkar, R.K. 2015. Background of the symposium; National symposium on "Food and Nutrition: Need of the Hour" 25<sup>th</sup> -27<sup>th</sup> February, 2015; Institute of Agricultural Science, University of Calcutta, West Bengal.
- Sengupta, K. 2015. Extended Summaries; National Seminar on "Sustainable Agriculture for Food Security and Better Environment" 17-18, December, 2015; Department of Agronomy, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, West Bengal.
- Senguttuvan, K.; Kuttalam, S., Kumar, M.G. and Gunasekaran, K. 2014. Diamond back moth management in cauliflower at tropical region of Tamil Nadu with chitin synthesis inhibitor. *Pestology*, 38(5): 21-26.

- Singh, J., Kalra, R.K., Sharma, A. and Sanatombi, K.H. 2014. Information seeking and information sharing behaviour of the vegetable growers of Ludhiana district. *Agriculture Update*, 9(3): 377-382.
- Susane, M.S., Tayde, V.V. and Deshmukh, P.R. 2012. Extent of recommended cauliflower production technology by the cauliflower growers. *Agriculture Update*, 7(3&4): 427-429.
- Soni, M., Shrivastava, K.K. and Verma, L.R. 2013. Adoption behaviour of recommended cauliflower production technology by the cauliflower growers. *Agriculture Update*, 8(1&2): 197-200.

\*\*\*\*\*