

Print ISSN : 0972-8813  
e-ISSN : 2582-2780

[Vol. 19(1), January-April, 2021]

# Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and  
Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)



G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar



## **ADVISORYBOARD**

### **Patron**

Dr. Tej Partap, Vice-Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Members**

Dr. A.S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. A.K. Sharma, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. S.K. Kashyap, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. N.S. Jadon, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. K.P. Raverkar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Sandeep Arora, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Alaknanda Ashok, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Home Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. R.S. Chauhan, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. R.S. Jadaun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

## **EDITORIALBOARD**

### **Members**

Prof. A.K. Misra, Ph.D., Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India  
Dr. Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India  
Dr. Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India  
Dr. Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W P Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A  
Dr. B.B. Singh, Ph.D., Visiting Professor and Senior Fellow, Dept. of Soil and Crop Sciences and Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.  
Prof. Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India  
Dr. D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community / Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India  
Dr. Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium  
Dr. Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India  
Dr. G.K. Garg, Ph.D., Dean (Retired), College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IIRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines  
Dr. Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India  
Dr. Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India  
Dr. M.P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur and Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India  
Dr. Martin Mortimer, Ph.D., Professor, The Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom  
Dr. Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Project Coordinator AICRP- LTFE, ICAR - Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India  
Prof. Omkar, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India  
Dr. P.C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, University of South Australia, Australia  
Dr. Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, U.S.A.  
Dr. R.C. Chaudhary, Ph.D., Chairman, Participatory Rural Development Foundation, Gorakhpur, India  
Dr. R.K. Singh, Ph.D., Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India  
Prof. Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.  
Dr. S.N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A.  
Prof. Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India  
Prof. V.D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Academics, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India  
Dr. V.K. Singh, Ph.D., Head, Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India  
Dr. Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological Agricultural Engineering, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.  
Dr. Vinay Mehrotra, Ph.D., President, Vinlax Canada Inc., Canada

### **Editor-in-Chief**

Dr. Manoranjan Dutta, Head Crop Improvement Division (Retd.), National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

### **Managing Editor**

Dr. S.N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Assistant Managing Editor**

Dr. Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Technical Manager**

Dr. S.D. Samantray, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India



## CONTENTS

<b>Study of genetic diversity in bread wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.em.Thell) under late sown irrigated conditions</b> VIJAY KAMAL MEENA, R K SHARMA, NARESH KUMAR, MONU KUMAR and ATTAR SINGH	<b>1</b>
<b>Selection of teosinte (<i>Zea mays</i> subsp. <i>parviglumis</i>) predomestication alleles to inflate maize genetic resources</b> SMRUTISHREE SAHOO, NARENDRA KUMAR SINGH and ANJALI JOSHI	<b>8</b>
<b>Effect of crop establishment methods and nutrient management options on productivity and economics of baby corn (<i>Zea mays</i> L.)</b> ABHISHEK BAHUGUNA and MAHENDRA SINGH PAL	<b>16</b>
<b>Effect of organic and inorganic mulches on soil properties and productivity of chilli (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> L.) crop grown on alfisols</b> K. ASHOK KUMAR, C. INDU, J. NANDA KUMAR REDDY, M. BABY, P. DINESH KUMAR and C. RAMANA	<b>21</b>
<b>Performance of plant growth promotory rhizobacteria on maize and soil characteristics under the influence of TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles</b> HEMA KUMARI, PRIYANKA KHATI, SAURABH GANGOLA, PARUL CHAUDHARY and ANITA SHARMA	<b>28</b>
<b>Bio-efficacy of <i>Ageratum houstonianum</i> Mill. (Asteraceae) essential oil against five major insect pests of stored cereals and pulses</b> JAI HIND SHARMA and S. N. TIWARI	<b>40</b>
<b>Resistance in rice genotypes against brown planthopper, <i>Nilaparvata lugens</i> 14</b> SWOYAM SINGH and S.N. TIWARI	<b>46</b>
<b>Fumigant toxicity of alpha-pinene, beta-pinene, eucalyptol, linalool and sabinene against Rice Weevil, <i>Sitophilus oryzae</i> (L.)</b> JAI HIND SHARMA and S.N. TIWARI	<b>50</b>
<b>Potato Dry Rot: Pathogen, disease cycle, ecology and management</b> SANJAY KUMAR, PARVINDER SINGH SEKHON and AMANPREET SINGH	<b>56</b>
<b>Health status of farmers' saved seed of wheat crop in Haryana</b> S. S. JAKHAR, SUNIL KUMAR, AXAY BHUKER, ANIL KUMAR MALIK and DINESH KUMAR	<b>70</b>
<b>Socio economic impact of rice variety CO 51 on farmers in Kancheepuram and Tiruvarur districts of Tamil Nadu</b> DHARMALINGAM, P., P. BALASUBRAMANIAM and P. JEYAPRAKASH	<b>73</b>
<b>Assessment of students' knowledge level on e-learning, e-resources and IoT</b> S.SENTHIL VINAYAGAM and K.AKHILA	<b>77</b>
<b>An analysis of the factors influencing the opinion of social media users on online education and online purchasing in Namakkal district of Tamil Nadu</b> N. DHIVYA and R. RAJASEKARAN	<b>81</b>
<b>Nutritional status of children in Uttarakhand: A case study</b> ANURADHA DUTTA, AMRESH SIROHI, PRATIBHA SINGH, SUDHA JUKARIA, SHASHI TEWARI, NIVEDITA PRASAD, DEEPA JOSHI, SHWETA SURI and SHAYANI BOSE	<b>86</b>
<b>Performance evaluation of hydraulic normal loading device on varying soil conditions for indoor tyre test rig</b> SATYA PRAKASH KUMAR, K.P. PANDEY, MANISH KUMAR and RANJEET KUMAR	<b>90</b>
<b>Performance evaluation of bullock drawn plastic mulch cum drip lateral laying machine</b> A. V. KOTHIYA, A. M. MONPARA and B. K. YADUVANSHI	<b>96</b>
<b>Performance evaluation of bullock drawn battery powered sowing machine</b> A. M. MONPARA, A. V. KOTHIYA and R. SWARNKAR	<b>103</b>

## Resistance in rice genotypes against brown planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* 14

SWOYAM SINGH and S.N. TIWARI

*Department of Entomology, College of Agriculture, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar - 263145 (U.S. Nagar, Uttarakhand)*

**ABSTRACT:** Nineteen rice genotypes were evaluated by standard seed box screening technique, honeydew test, nymphal survival method and days to wilt test for resistance against brown planthopper (BPH) under glasshouse conditions. Five genotypes, IR 36, IR-65482-7-2-216-1-2-B, PTB 33, RP 2068-18-3-5 and T12 were found to be resistant with a damage score ranging from 1.4 to 4.1. The resistant genotypes showed very less honeydew secretion and nymphal survival rate as compared to the susceptible entries, however, the days taken to wilt was comparatively longer on the resistant entries. Among the entries evaluated, RP 2068-18-3-5 was found to be the most resistant cultivar with a damage score of 1.4, secreting 22.75 mm of honeydew, 23.4 per cent nymphal survival and 18.6 days to wilt, respectively.

**Key words:** Brown plant hopper, days to wilt, genotypes, honeydew excretion, *Nilaparvata lugens*, nymphal survival, rice, resistance, screening, seed box technique

Rice has been the most important cereal crop of India, where almost 90 per cent of its population is entirely dependent on rice. Biotic stress is considered as the major limiting factor challenging the productivity of rice (Singh and Tiwari, 2020). Rice inhabits almost 800 species of insect pest limiting its production in field as well as during storage leading to an annual loss of 35.55 million tonnes (Dhaliwal *et al.*, 2015). Brown plant hopper (BPH), *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal) alone accounts for almost 60 per cent of yield loss both by sucking plant sap and transmitting viruses (Kumar *et al.*, 2012). Pesticides are the most popular approach for management of hoppers among farmers (Garrood *et al.*, 2016). However, injudicious and indiscriminate use of pesticides have resulted in environmental pollution, decreased natural enemies' population dynamics, resistance of many major insects (Yin *et al.*, 2008) and secondary outbreak of many minor insect and pests. In the advent of time increased awareness about the drawbacks of pesticide application have created a thrust for an alternative method of management of BPH. In this context, the concept of host plant resistance has emerged as an alternative approach of management of *N. lugens* since they are simple, easy to implement, environmentally safe and economically viable (Alam and Cohen, 1998; Renganayaki *et al.*, 2002). However, the status of resistance is subjected to vary or break with respect to geographical distribution or time. Thus, with a view to identify larger number of resistant cultivars the present study was undertaken to evaluate the reaction of different cultivars to BPH as well as to ascertain the mechanism responsible for the different degree of resistance.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Rearing of Insect

The mass rearing of the brown plant hoppers was done in glass house under controlled conditions (Temp  $27^{\circ}\pm 2^{\circ}$  C and RH 70-80 %) on the susceptible cultivar Taichung Native 1 (TN-1). The stock culture of BPH is maintained at the Rice Entomology Lab, Dept. of Entomology, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar since last 15 years. For conducting the experiments, 10-15 adults were taken from the stock culture and were released on pots planted with 30-40 days old TN-1 plants. The pots were then transferred to wire mesh rearing cages of dimension 1 x 1.5 x 1 cubic meters. The released adult mate and oviposit on the plants and after a week they were transferred to other plants which was followed by hatching of the eggs and emergence of first instar nymphs. However, for conducting the experiments second instar nymphs were preferred. The main constraint in rearing BPH in the laboratory was attack of several natural enemies' viz. mirid bugs, ants, spiders and lizards which was supervised regularly so as to eliminate them.

#### Planting Material

Rice genotypes were procured from ICAR-Indian Institute of Rice Research (IIRR), Hyderabad under Plant hopper special screening trial (PHSS-2020).

#### Standard Seed Box Screening Technique

The technique aims in mass screening of different genotypes so as to eliminate the susceptible variant and retain the entries with moderate to high level of resistance. In seed box method the seeds were pre-soaked in water for 24 hrs prior to sowing. Sowing is done in plastic trays of

dimensions 42cmx32cmx7cm. The trays accommodate 12 equidistant rows of different cultivars including 2 border rows with susceptible checks (TN-1). After 12 days when the plants attain 3-leaf stage, they were infested with first instar nymphs of BPH in such a way that each seedling gets 6-7 nymphs, respectively. Approximately after 6-7 days, when the border rows with susceptible check shows 90 per cent mortality, scoring was done based on the scoring system developed by International Rice Research Institute (IRRI, 2014).

#### Honeydew excretion test

The excretion of honeydew is most common in homopteran insects which act as an indicator of resistance when compared among different genotypes. The excretion of honeydew is measured with the help of filter paper stained with 4% bromocresol solution in ethanol with a hole at its centre through which a month-old rice cultivar is inserted and covered with mylar sheet. Five one day old females were starved for 2-3 hours and were then released on the rice cultivars. The adult BPH was allowed to feed for 24 hours. On feeding and excreting honeydew blue spots appear on the filter paper. The area of each spot was then calculated graphically.

#### Nymphal survival method

The test depicts the survival percentage of nymphs on different genotypes at 10 one day old nymphs were released on 30 days old rice plant and the numbers of surviving nymphs were monitored and depicted on daily basis until they become adult. The percentage nymphal

survival can be determined by

Nymph survival percentage = (Number of adult emerged/Number of nymphs released) X 100

#### Days to wilt test

The level of tolerance of the above genotypes against the damage of BPH was determined by estimating the relative days to wilting after release of twenty-five 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> instar nymphs on to 30days old cultivar. Observation on plant health was taken daily up to 40 days and days taken by the cultivar to wilt completely after release of nymphs was recorded.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### Standard seed box screening technique

Nineteen entries were screened and evaluated for different mechanism of resistance against *N. lugens* and the results indicated that damage score of the entries ranged from 1.4 to 9.0. None of the entries was found to be immune, however, IR 36, IR-65482-7-2-216-1-2-B, PTB 33, RP 2068-18-3-5 and T12 were found to be resistant with a damage score ranging from 1.4 to 4.1 (Table 1). Apart from that five entries viz., ASD7 (Acc 6303), Chinasaba (Acc33016), IR-71033-121-15, Milyang 63 and Swarnalatha (Acc33964) were found to be moderately resistant with damage score ranging from 5.2 to 6.8 followed by the four entries viz., IR64, Pokkali, TN1 and Ratu Heenati which were designated as moderately susceptible varieties. However, rest all genotypes were susceptible to *N. lugens* damage. The results corroborate the findings of IIRR, 2019 which states RP 2068-18-3-5as

**Table 1. Reactions and mechanism of resistance of different genotypes of PHSS-2020 against Brown plant hopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal.)**

S.No.	Entries	Damage Score (DS)	Honeydew extraction	Percent nymphal survival	Days to wilt	Level of Resistance (LR)
1	ASD7 (Acc 6303)	6.8	175.25	63	9.6	MR
2	Babawee	9.0	288.25	74.4	7.6	S
3	Chinasaba (Acc33016)	5.7	140.75	47.8	13.8	MR
4	IR 36	2.9	78.5	27	18.4	R
5	ARC 10550	9.0	286.5	60.2	7.4	S
6	IR64	7.9	353.5	71.4	11.4	MS
7	IR-65482-7-2-216-1-2-B	3.5	97.25	35.6	12	R
8	IR-71033-121-15	5.6	112.5	44.2	13.6	MR
9	Milyang 63	5.2	117.5	40.2	11.6	MR
10	MUTNS 1	9.0	451.5	76	6.6	S
11	OM 4498	9.0	616.25	86.2	9.2	S
12	Pokkali	7.2	187.25	38.2	9.8	MS
13	PTB 33	4.1	72.5	26.4	14.4	R
14	TN1	8.5	376.75	53.2	9.4	MS
15	Ratu Heenati	7.0	217.5	38.6	8.6	MS
16	Swarnalatha (Acc33964)	5.3	107.75	40.4	10.6	MR
17	RP 2068-18-3-5	1.4	22.75	23.4	18.6	R
18	T12	2.5	58.5	25.8	16	R
19	TN1	9.0	706.75	80.6	7.2	S

(S: susceptible; MS: moderately susceptible; R: resistant; MR: moderately resistant)

the most resistant entry under Pantnagar conditions.

### Honeydew excretion test

The amount of honeydew excreted was measured in mm<sup>2</sup> unit. The amount of sap ingested is directly proportional to the amount of honeydew excreted by the hopper where the susceptible entries excreted more honey dew. In the present study, maximum honey dew was excreted by the susceptible genotypes which ranged from 286.5 mm<sup>2</sup> to 706.75 mm<sup>2</sup> whereas the resistant genotypes excreted relatively lesser amount of honeydew ranging from 22.75 mm<sup>2</sup> to 97.25 mm<sup>2</sup> (Table 1). RP 2068-18-3-5 was found to be the most resistant genotype secreting 22.75 mm<sup>2</sup> honeydew followed by T12 (58.5 mm<sup>2</sup>), PTB 33 (72.5 mm<sup>2</sup>), IR36 (78.5 mm<sup>2</sup>) and IR-65482-7-2-216-1-2-B (97.25 mm<sup>2</sup>), respectively. The results corroborate the findings of Udyashree and Rajanikanth (2018) and Nugaliyadde *et al.* (2014) where a similar trend in honeydew excretion was observed.

### Nymphal survival method

The test was performed to estimate the antibiotic effect of different genotypes against *N. lugens*. The results revealed that the survival percentage among the entries varied from 23.4 to 86.2 per cent. The nymphs were seen to survive less on the resistant entries viz., IR 36, IR-65482-7-2-216-1-2-B, PTB 33, RP 2068-18-3-5 and T12. However, the least survival percentage was observed on RP 2068-18-3-5 (23.4%). The results were more or less similar to the findings of Thamarai and Soundararajan (2017) who reported 26.27 per cent nymphal survival on the resistant check PTB 33. The survival percentage gradually increased when compared to the susceptibility of the rice genotypes where the maximum survival was observed in OM 4498 (86.2%) having a damage score of 9.0.

### Days to wilt test

The experiment was conducted to determine the level of tolerance shown by different genotypes against *N. lugens*. Tolerance is one of the mechanisms of resistance which can be described as the inherent capacity of the cultivar to withstand the damage caused by *N. lugens*. In the present study it was observed that resistance was directly proportional to the number of days taken by the cultivar to wilt. The mean number of days taken by the genotypes to wilt ranged from 6.6 to 18.6 days (Table 1). The resistant entries RP 2068-18-3-5, IR 36 and T12 were seen to be highly tolerant to *N. lugens* since they wilted after 18.6, 18.4 and 16 days, respectively. However, other two resistant entries viz., IR-65482-7-2-216-1-2-B and PTB 33 were comparatively less tolerant to BPH as they wilted after 12 and 14.4 days, respectively. The susceptible entry TN1 wilted just after 7.2 days. The results were in accordance with Bhanu *et al.*, 2014, who also reported that resistant cultivars showed a higher tolerance to BPH since they took longer days to wilt.

### CONCLUSION

Thus, we conclude that out of all the 19 genotypes of PHSS, five genotypes namely IR 36, IR-65482-7-2-216-1-2-B, PTB 33, RP 2068-18-3-5 and T12 were found to be resistant to *N. Lugens* at Pantnagar. However, the screened genotypes must be evaluated further at multilocation to validate the resistant traits.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are highly grateful to the ICAR-Indian Institute of Rice Research (IIRR), Hyderabad for providing the seed material for experimental purpose.

### REFERENCES

- Alam, S.N. and Cohen, M.B. (1998). Detection and analysis of QTLs for resistance to the brown planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens*, in a doubled-haploid rice population. *Theor. Appl. Genet.*, 97: 1370–1379.
- Bhanu, V.K., Reddy, P.S and Satyanarayana, J. (2014). Studies on tolerance of rice culture against brown plant hopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal.). *Indian Journal of Plant Protection*, 42(3): 199–203.
- Dhaliwal, G.S., Jindal, V. and Mohindru, B. (2015). Crop Losses due to insect pests: Global and Indian Scenario. *Indian J Entomol.*, 77:165–168.
- Garrood, W. T., Zimmer, C. T., Gorman, K. J., Nauen, R., Bass, C. and Davies, T. G. (2016). Field-evolved resistance to imidacloprid and ethiprole in populations of brown planthopper *Nilaparvata lugens* collected from across South and East Asia. *Pest Management Science*, 72(1), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.3980>
- IIRR, International Rice Research Institute, Annual Progress Report. (2019). Vol 2. Entomology, All India Coordinated Rice Improvement Project. Indian Institute of Rice Research. Rajendranagar, Hyderabad (India).
- IRRI, International Rice Research Institute (2014). Standard evaluation system for rice (SES). 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Los Banos (Philippines): International Rice Research Institute.
- Kumar, H., Maurya, R.P. and Tiwari, S.N. (2012). Study on antibiosis mechanism of resistance in rice against brown plant hopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stal.). *Ann Plant Prot Sci.*, 20:98–101.
- Nugaliyadde, L., Dez D.S., Abey Siriwardena, Samanmalee, L.G.A., Pathirana, R. and Wilkins, R. (2014). Inheritance of resistance in rice to brown planthopper: Its implications on rice varietal improvement in Sri Lanka. *Annual symposium of the Department of Agriculture, Sri Lanka*, Pp 402-422
- Renganayaki, K., Fritz, A.K., Sadasivam, S., Pammi, S., Harrington, S.E., McCouch, S.R., Kumar, S.M.

- and Reddy, A.S. (2002). Mapping and progress toward map-based cloning of brown planthopper biotype-4 resistance gene introgressed from *Oryza officinalis* into cultivated rice, *O. sativa*. *Crop Sci.*, 42: 2112–2117.
- Singh, S. and Tiwari, S.N. (2020). Sucking Pests of Rice. In: Omkar (eds) Sucking Pests of Crops. Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-6149-8\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-6149-8_2).
- Thamarai, M. and Soundararajan, R.P. (2017). Reaction of rice genotypes against specific population of brown plant hopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stål). *Annals of plant protection science*, 25(1):74-77.
- Udyashree, M. and Rajanikanth, P. (2018). Non-Preference / Antixenosis and Antibiosis Mechanism Contributing to BPH Resistance in Certain Identified Elite Rice Genotypes. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.*, 7(6): 1908-1914.
- Yin, J.L., Xu, H.W., Wu, J.C., Hu, J.H. and Yang, G.Q. (2008). Cultivar and insecticide applications affect the physiological development of the brown planthopper, *Nilaparvata lugens* (Stål) (Hemiptera: Delphacidae). *Environ. Entomol.*, 37: 206–212.

Received: April 5, 2021

Accepted: May 5, 2021