



## Incidence Pest of Fruit Fly on F<sub>3</sub> Progenies Studies in Ridge Gourd (*Luffa Acutangula* L. Ruxb.)

**L. B Thulasiram<sup>1</sup> and  
S. A. Ranpise<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Teaching Associate (VSC),  
PGIHS, SKLTGHU, Mulugu,  
Siddipet

<sup>2</sup>Department of Horticulture,  
MPKV, Rahuri, Maharashtra



Open Access

\*Corresponding Author  
**L. B Thulasiram\***

### Article History

Received: 15.12.2025

Revised: 20.12.2025

Accepted: 25.12.2025

This article is published under the  
terms of the [Creative Commons  
Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

### INTRODUCTION

The ridge gourd (*Luffa acutangula* L. Ruxb.) is a popular cucurbitaceous vegetable that grown in India in the spring and summer. It is grown commercially and in kitchen gardens in nations like India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Taiwan. It is one of the cheapest vegetables to produce. The crop is an annual, monoecious, cross-pollinating vine with a long taproot system, simple, sharply angled, five-lobed leaves, and dark green fruits with black seeds embedded in spongy flesh and white pulp. (Tasnim *et al.*, 2025). *B. cucurbitae* can result in losses of 30% to 100%, depending on the cucurbit vegetable and season (Dhillon *et al.*, 2005). Pheromone traps are a straightforward and efficient method of monitoring fruit fly population movements, and they have been successfully used all over the world (Alyokhin *et al.*, 2000). Two popular male attractants used to collect *Bactrocera* spp. fruit flies are methyl eugenol (ME) and cue lure (CUE). Most species appear to be attracted to either lure, though some are drawn to both (Dominik *et al.*, 2011).

Among five parents, the incidence of fruit fly was found in almost all the parents. The high incidence of fruit fly was recorded in parent P<sub>5</sub> (NRG-9) (23.27 %), whereas the least incidence of fruit fly was recorded in parent

P<sub>1</sub> (Arka Sumit) (15.63 %) and F<sub>3</sub> progenies (9.36 %) of cross-I P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>2</sub>. Cross-II P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>3</sub> F<sub>3</sub> progenies (10.89 %). In cross-III P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>5</sub> F<sub>3</sub> progenies (8.02 %). The percent incidence was worked out by using the formula

$$\text{Percent incidence} = \frac{\text{Total no. of infested fruits}}{\text{Total no. of healthy fruits}} \times 100$$

## CONCLUSION

Among five parents, the incidence of fruit fly was found in almost all the parents. The high incidence of fruit fly was recorded in parent P<sub>5</sub> (NRG-9) (23.27 %), whereas the least incidence of fruit fly was recorded in parent P<sub>1</sub> (Arka Sumit) (15.63 %) and F<sub>3</sub> progenies (9.36 %) of cross-I P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>2</sub>. Cross-II P<sub>1</sub> x P<sub>3</sub> F<sub>3</sub> progenies (10.89 %). In cross-III P<sub>4</sub> x P<sub>5</sub> F<sub>3</sub> progenies (8.02 %). Parents and three crosses were found to be resistant to fruit flies, a suitable forecasting and warning model could be developed based on the quantity of fruit flies caught in each trap and their relationship to meteorological variables agricultural expenses by reducing crop loss and enhancing insect control.

## REFERENCES

Alyokhin A.V, Messing R.H, Duan J.J. (2000). Visual and olfactory stimuli and fruit maturity affect trap captures of oriental fruit flies (Diptera:

Tephritidae). *J Econ. Entomol.* 93:644-649.

Dhillon M.K, Singh R, Naresh J.S, Sharma N.K. (2005) Influence of physico-chemical traits of bitter gourd, *Momordica charantia* L. on larval density and resistance to melon fruit fly, *Bactrocera cucurbitae* (Coquillett). *Journal of Applied Entomology*. 129:393-399.

Domiak Bernie, Kerruish B, Barchia I, Pradhan U, Gilchrist Anthony, Helen I. (2011) The influence of mixtures of parapheromone lures on trapping of fruit fly in New South Wales, Australia. *Plant Protection Quarterly*. 26:136-140.

Kazi Nazifa Tasnim, Devi Singh, Vikram Singh and Kamin Alexander. Evaluation of ridge gourd hybrids for growth, yield and quality (*Luffa acutangula* L.). *Int. J. Adv. Biochem. Res.* 2025;9(8S):605-609.