EFFECT OF METHYL PARATHION ON PHASEOLUS AUREUS ROXB. AND ITS PERSISTENCE IN PLANT AND SOIL¹

S. H. RAZA, ZULEKHA BANO AND Y. D. TIAGI²

Ecclogy and Environmental Studies Research Laboratory, Univ. Nicam College, Osmania University, Hyderabad

ABSTRACT

The effect and persistence of the organophosphorus pesticide, methyl parathion on *Phaseolus aureus* Roxb. have been studied. Methyl parathion is toxic to the productivity of the plant even at 10 ppm concentration and *P. aureus* was susceptible to this pesticide.

INTRODUCTION

Organophosphorus pesticides are important class of toxicants capable not only of eradicating disease and improving agricultural production, but also contaminating water, soil and vegetation altering their quality and producing adverse effects on man and environment through their movement persistence, (Middleton, 1965; Lichtenstein, 1965; Varma and Pant, 1976; Singh et. al., 1978; Veeraval and Bhaskaran, 1979 and Wore et. al., 1980). The present investigation was taken up to establish whether P. aureus is susceptible or resistant to methyl parathion by studies on length, biomass and productivity of the plants and the persistence of the pesticide in plant and soil

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plants of P. aureus (local market variety) were grown in 10 m² plots of

the botanical garden of Nizam College, Hyderabad, during April-August, 1979. Mean maximum temperature was 40°C and mean minimum temperature was 28°C. They were grown for 105 days. The spraying operations of methyl parathion were conducted when the standing crop was 15 days old. Concentrations of this chemical used were 0.01, 0.1, 1.0, 10.0 ppm. Untreated plants constituted control. Plant and soil samples were collected at definite intervals (30, 60, 75, 90 and 105 days). Studies on the length of the plant (cm), biomass (g/m²) were carried out by Milner and Elfyn Huges (1968) methods. Persistence of methyl parathion in plant and soil was analysed by the following Material containing the active ingredient (a.i.) of methyl parathion on refluxion with alkali yields acidity. Methyl parathion is produced as dimethyl thiophosphate which is used as base for the estimation of a.i. of this pesticide. Benzene extracted dried material (Zewig,

^{1.} Accepted for Publication on November 30, 1983.

^{2.} Department of Botany, Udaipur University, Udaipur.

The authors are thankful to Professors, K. V. N. Rao, Jafar Nizam (V. C., Kakatiya U.), M. Pattabi Raman, Dr. P. Ramachar and Dr. A. R. Zafar for fac ilities and encouragment. The financial assistance from U.G.C. is gratefully acknowledged.

1963) was transferred into 250 ml. flask and were washed with ethanol. 40 ml. of 0.5 N ethanolic KOH was added and refluxed for 4 hours and the condenser was rinsed with a few ml. of distilled water. After cooling, exactly 40 ml of 0.5 N HCI acid was added and excess acidity was back titrated by using standard NaOH at pH 5. Percentage of a.i. persisting in the plant and soil were calculated by Singh's (1978) formula.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Growth parameters, viz., length of the plant, biomass, productivity are presented in the Table I-III and the recovery of the pesticide in Table IV.

Growth was studied in terms of length (Table I). Due to methyl parathion treatment there was a significant increase in the length. Increase in length was more pronounced at 0.01 ppm than at 10 ppm concentration.

There was increase in the biomass (Table II), with increase in age of the standing crop due to methyl parathion treatment. Biomass harvested at 105 days has shown reduction of biomass at 10 ppm almost to half that of control. Productivity (Table III) computed at

TABLE I EFFECT OF METHYL PARATHION ON LENGTH (CM) OF P. AUREUS

Concentration (ppm)	Final harvest
Control	51.9
0.01	65.0
0.10	55.0
1.00	52.0
10.00	56.0

Note: All the values are the averages of 10 observations.

Analysis of variance

Source of variation	Sums of squares (SS)	Degress of freedom (d.f.) (n-1)	Mean sum of squares (MSS)	F	Probability (P) 5%	Critical Differ- ence (C. 1% D) 5%
Total	2,201.77	24				
Due to Age	1,649.59	4	412.59	50.4**	3.01 4.77	4.286
Due to Concentration	420.24	4	105.06	12.84 **		
Error	130.81	16	8.18			

^{**}Highly significant

Analysis of variance as per original observations drawn for 30, 60, 75, 90 and 105 days age period.

TABLE II

EFFECT OF METHYL PARATHION ON BROKESS (E) ESP OF P. SECOND

Corcentration =				in Cays)	
(ppm)	30	60	75	50	165
Control	18.00	18.15	21.3	162.6	.95.7
0.01	20.46	21.60	32.6	49.5	72.3
0.10	17.76	20.97	32.52	48.3	83.8
1.00	18.96	18.36	21.60	57.3	62.4
10.00	18.63	20.94	25.02	51.4	46.5

Note: Each value is the average of 10 observations.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation					Probability (P)		
2	SS	d.1	MSS	F	5%	1%	C.D
Total	16,671.5	24	Allen				
Due to Age	6,324.9	4	1581.2	2.79 (N. 1			
Due to concentration	1,297.7	4	324.4	0.57 (N. S.	3.01	******	_
Error	9,048.8	16	565.5				

N. S: Not significant.

TABLE III

EFFECT OF METHYL PARATHION ON PRODUCTIVITY OF P. AUREUS

Concentration (ppm)	Productivity (g/m²/d ₄ y)	Relative Productivity (%
Control	0,914	100
0.01	0.694	75.9
0.10	0.788	86.2
1.00	0.594	64.9
10.00	0.443	48.5

Computed from the figures of biomass at 105 days.

the final stage of the harvest has revealed 50 percent reduction at 10 ppm (0.443 g/m²/days). Application of methyl parathion with toxaphene was reported to produce significantly higher yield than methyl parathion alone on cotton plants (Mc Garr and Wolfenbarger, 1969; Weaver and Harvey, 1963 and Wore et. al., 1980). However, no significant effects (Niemczyck and Dundar, 1976) and adverse effects (Roajk et al., 1964) due to methyl parathion treatment on cotton plants were also reported.

Recovery of methyl parathion is

F : Ratio of mean sum of squares

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE RECOVERY OF METHYL PARATHION IN PHASEOLUS AUREUS ROXB. ACCORDING TO AGE

Canomitation		Pla	Plant material				Soil material	atcrial		
1 6 15 105 1 6 15 15 15 15 15 15	Concentration (Low dosage) (ppm)	Days	Water treatment				Days Wa	ter treatm	cnt	
46.9 36.00 35.0 6.6 41.62 38.0 34.25 2.4 46.9 36.00 35.0 6.6 41.62 38.0 34.25 0.02.9 41.5 35.5 26.5 1.0 32.60 30.0 29.11 2.3 41.5 35.5 26.5 1.0 0.326 0.320 0.321 0.021 41.5 35.5 26.5 1.0 0.326 0.320 0.201 0.021 41.5 38.1 0.0355 0.0253 0.0221 0.01 0.326 0.019 0.01647 0.000 41.5 36.5 28.3 0.0262 0.00221 0.01 0.0289 0.019 0.01647 0.000 41.5 36.5 26.2 9.4 0 28.98 19.0 16.47 2.0 41.5 36.5 26.2 9.4 0 28.98 0.019 0.01647 0.000 41.5 36.5 26.2 9.4 0 24.63 15.0 14.63 2.0 41.5 28.3 26.2 9.4 0 24.63 10.019 0.01647 0.000 41.5 26.2 9.4 0 24.63 10.0019 0.01647 0.000 41.5 24.63 2.0 14.63 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 24.63 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 24.63 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 24.63 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 41.5 24.63 2.0 41.5 24.63 24.63 24.63 41.5 24.6			9	15	105	-	9		15	105
(4.69) (3.6) (3.5) (0.66) (4.162) (3.8) (3.25) (0.23) (4.69) (3.5) (2.55 1.0 32.60 39.0 29.11 (6.415) (3.55) (0.255) (0.01) (0.221) (0.221) (6.415) (0.355) (0.221) (0.01) (0.0248) (0.211) (0.2911) (6.0038) (0.00285) (0.00287) (0.019) (0.10167) (0.00167) (6.0038) (0.00282) (0.00287) (0.019) (0.10167) (0.00167) (6.0038) (0.00282) (0.00294) (0.00248) (0.019) (0.10167) (0.00167) (6.0038) (0.00282) (0.00094) (0.00248) (0.0015) (0.00167) (0.00167) (6.0038) (0.00282) (0.00094) (0.00248) (0.0015) (0.00167) (0.00167) (6.0038) (0.00282) (0.00094) (0.00248) (0.0015) (0.00167) (0.00167) Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parts p	00 00	46.9	36.00	35.0	6.6	41.62	38.0	3.	4.25	2.4
41.5 35.5 26.5 1.0 32.60 30.0 29.11 2.3 (0.415) (0.355) (0.265) (0.01) (0.326) (0.326) (0.291) (0.291) (0.038) (0.283) (0.2021) (0.201) (0.0289) (0.019) (0.0191) (0.0211) 38.5 26.2 9.4 20 24.63 15.0 14.63 2.0 (0.00365) (0.00262) (0.00094) (0.002463) (0.0015) (0.001463) (0.00 Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations. Analysis of variance SS df M.SS F 5% & 1 1		(4.69)	(3.6)	(3.5)	(0.66)	(4.162)	(3.8)	٣	3.425)	(0.24)
(0.036)	0.1	41.5	35.5	26.5	1.0	32.60	30.0	55	9.11	2.3
38.0 28.5 22.1 0 28.98 19.0 16.47 2.0 (0.032)		(0.415)	(0.355)	(0.265)	(0.01)	(0.326)	(0.30)	9)	.2911)	(0.023)
10.038 (0.0285) (0.0221)		38.0	28.5	22.1	0	28.98	19.0	16	5.47	2.0
Sec. 2 26.2 9.4 0 24.63 15.0 14.63 2.0 (0.00365) (0.00262) (0.00094) — (0.002463) (0.0015) (0.001463) (0.001463) Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations.		(0.038)	(0.0285)	(0.0221)	j	(0.02898)			(101647)	(0.002)
Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations.	10.0	36.5	26.2	9.4	0	24.63		7	F.63	2.0
Figures in parenthesis are the values in parts per million (ppm.) Each value is the average of 3 observations.		(0.00365)	(0.00262)	(0.00094)	1	(0.00246			0.001463)	(0.00020)
Total 3,810.00 15 15 15 15 15 15 15				An	alysis of varia	nce				
T Total Due to age Due to concentration 375.6 3 125.2 8.4 •• } But to concentration 375.6 3 125.2 8.4 •• } 14.3 Fror Total 2,634.9 15 Due to age Due to concentration 2,634.9 15 Due to concentration 350.2 8 183.40 14.99•• } 88.5 sums of squares GD : Critical difference. ASS: Mean sums of squares	Source of Variance			SS	Jp	MSS	F			B
Due to age 3,300.8 3 1100.3 74.3** 8.9 7 Due to concentration 375.6 3 125.2 8.4 ** 8.8 6.99 7 Frotal 133.6 9 14.8 8.4 ** 8.4 ** 8.9 7 Total 133.6 9 14.8 8.4 ** 8.4 ** 8.9 6.99 7 Due to age 1,994.3 3 664.77 54.18** 8.9 6.99 Due to age 1,994.3 3 183.40 14.99** 8.8 6.99 Error 110.0 9 12.27 8.8 6.99 6.99 SS: Sums of fracters 110.0 9 12.27 8.8 6.99 ASS: Mean sums of squares CD: Critical difference. CD: Critical difference. CD: Critical difference.	PLANT	Total	A COLUMN TO STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	3,810.00	15	15				
Due to concentration 375.6 3 125.2 8,4 •• 5.00 0.33 Error		Due to age		3,300.8	8	1100.3	74.3**	9 06	90 3	7 305
Total		Due to eare	catration	375.6	æ	125.2	8.4 **	00.0	0.33	201.7
Total 2,634.9 15 54.18** 3.86 6.99 Due to age		Error		133.6	6	14.8			1	
Due to age	And the state of t	Total	The second secon	2,654.9	15					
550.2 3 183.40 14.99** \$ 5.00 0.33 110.0 9 12.27 P: Probability CD: Critical difference.	SOIL	Due to age		1,994.3	8	664.77	34.18**	90 6	00 9	091 3
110.0 9 12.27		Due to conce	intration	550.2	s	183.40	14.99**	3.00	0.33	0.10
		Error		110.0	6.	12.27				
		SS : Sums o	f squares			d	: Probability			
MSS: Mean sums of squares		df; degrees	of freedom			CD:	Critical diffe	rence.		
		MSS : Mean s	cums of squares							

represented in Table IV. Application of lower concentrations (Table IV) between 0.01 to 10 ppm of the pesticide resulted in depletion from 6.6 to zero percent in the plant and almost to 2.0 percent in the soil in 105 days which are below the tolerance level and these observations are almost in line with those of Randolph et . al., (1969) in sunflower and Hoelschber et. al., (1968) in cabbage and peas. However, it is explained that toxicity is more pronounced in wet soil than in dry and adsorption is greater in dry soils with high organic matter content (Niemczyck et. al., (1976). The depletion of the organophosphorus pesticidal residues were observed with age, growth of the plants and weather parameters confirming the earlier results of Sloan et. al., (1951) while working on lettuce, cabtage and trunip greens and Wore et. al., (1980) on cotton and hydrolyse parathion residues faster with high pH and temperature of the soil (Singh *et al.*, 1978).

As not all the plants are resistant to this organo-phosphorus pesticide, *P. aureus* is one such which belongs to this category. Thus, *P. aureus* is a susceptible plant to methyl parathion treatment which affected biomass and productivity and they were reduced to half even at 10 ppm concentration when compared to control.

REFERENCES

- N. E. Foster 1968. Ethyl parathica and methyl parathion residues on cabbage and southern peas. J. Econ. Entomol. 61: 56-58.
- Lightenstein, E. P. 1965. Problems associated with insecticidal residues in soil. In C. O. Chichester (Ed.) Research in pesticides. Academic Press, New York.
- McGarr, R. L. and D. A. Wolfenberger 1969.

 Methyl parathion, toxaphene and DDT used alone and in combination for control of several

- cotton insects. J. Econ. Entomol. 62: 1249-1250.
- MIDDLETON, J. T. 1965. The presence, persistence and removal of pesticides in air. In: Recerch in pesticides. C. O. Chichester (Ed.) Academic Press, New York.
- NIEMCZYCK, A. D. AND D. M. DUNDAR 1976. Field observations, chemical control and control toxicity experiments on Ataenius spretulus a grub pest of turf grass. J. Econ. Entomol. 69: 345-348.
- RANDOLF, N. M., H. W. DOROUGH, AND G. L. TEETS 1969. M. Lithion, methyl parathion, diazinon and endosulfan residues in sunflower seeds. J. Econ. Entomol. 62: 462-464.
- ROAJK, B., T. R. PFIMMER, AND H. E. MERKI 1964. Effect of some insecticide formulations on fruiting of the cotton plant. Crop. Sci. 4: 97-98.
- Singh, K. 1973. Application of the relationship of acidity with active ingredient of pesticides and their formulated products in quality control. *Indian J. Agric. Res.* 12: 1-10.
- Singh, K., Shivakant and A. P. Singh 1978. Persistence of methyl and ethyl parathion in soil and plant. Pesticides 12: 39-41.
- SLOAN, M. J., W. A. RAWLINS AND L. B. NORTON 1951. Residue studies of DDT and parathion applied to lettuce for control of the six spotted leaf hopper. J. Econ. Entomol. 44: 691.
- VARMA, S. AND N. C. PANT 1976. Dissipation of endosulfan on mung and arhar crops. *Indian* J. Plant protec. 4: 24-31.
- VARMA, S. AND N. C. PANT 1979. Movement of phorate in soil and its residues and residual toxicity of phorate against the pests of green gram (moong) and red gram (arhar) under lab. conditions. *Pesticides* 13: 27-33.
- Veeraval, R. and P. Bhaskaran 1979. Biological longivity of certain insecticide spray deposits on egg plant (Solanum melongena L.) as evidenced by aphid bioassy. Pesticles 13: 44-45.
- Weaver, J. B. Jr. and G. Harvey 1963. A comparison of toxaphene and DDT with methyl parathion on 49 varieties and strains of cotton. Proc. 15th Ann. Cotton Improvement Conference. Dallas, Texas.
- Wore, G. W., T. F. WATSON, E. BETHY AND N. A. Buck. 1980. Effects of molasses and toxaphene on residual life and efficiency of methyl parathion on cotton. J. Econ. Entomol. 73: 15-17.
- Zweio, G. 1963. Analytical Methods for Pesticides, Plant Growth Regulators and Food Additives. Vol. 2: 323. Academic Press, New York & London.