

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix Table 1 Lower and upper stop values for economic threshold at 0.0723 error A and B = 0.1, sequential interval procedure of sugarcane stem boring grubs, Dorys-thenes buqueti Guerin.

SAMP	LOWER STOP VALUE	UPPER STOP VALUE	SAMP	LOWER STOP VALUE	UPPER STOP VALUE
1	-	-	51	0	9
2	-	1	52	0	9
3	-	1	53	0	10
4	-	2	54	1	10
5	-	2	55	1	10
6	-	2	56	1	10
7	-	2	57	1	10
8	-	3	58	1	10
9	-	3	59	1	10
10	-	3	60	1	10
11	-	3	61	1	11
12	-	3	62	1	11
13	-	4	63	1	11
14	-	4	64	1	11
15	-	4	65	1	11
16	-	4	66	1	11
17	-	4	67	1	11
18	-	4	68	1	11
19	-	5	69	1	12
20	-	5	70	1	12
21	-	5	71	1	12
22	-	5	72	1	12
23	-	5	73	1	12
24	-	5	74	1	12
25	-	6	75	1	12
26	-	6	76	1	12
27	-	6	77	1	13
28	-	6	78	1	13
29	-	6	79	1	13
30	-	6	80	1	13
31	-	6	81	2	13
32	-	7	82	2	13
33	-	7	83	2	13
34	-	7	84	2	13
35	-	7	85	2	13
36	-	7	86	2	14
37	-	7	87	2	14
38	0	7	88	2	14
39	0	8	89	2	14
40	0	8	90	2	14
41	0	8	91	2	14
42	0	8	92	2	14
43	0	8	93	2	14
44	0	8	94	2	15
45	0	8	95	2	15
46	0	9	96	2	15
47	0	9	97	2	15
48	0	9	98	2	15
49	0	9	99	2	15
50	0	9	100	2	15

Appendix Table 1 (Cont.)

SAMP	LOWER STOP VALUE	UPPER STOP VALUE	SAMP	LOWER STOP VALUE	UPPER STOP VALUE
101	2	15	151	5	21
102	2	15	152	5	21
103	2	16	153	5	21
104	2	16	154	5	21
105	3	16	155	5	21
106	3	16	156	5	21
107	3	16	157	5	22
108	3	16	158	5	22
109	3	16	159	5	22
110	3	16	160	5	22
111	3	16	161	5	22
112	3	17	162	5	22
113	3	17	163	5	22
114	3	17	164	5	22
115	3	17	165	5	22
116	3	17	166	5	23
117	3	17	167	5	23
118	3	17	168	5	23
119	3	17	169	5	23
120	3	17	170	6	23
121	3	18	171	6	23
122	3	18	172	6	23
123	3	18	173	6	23
124	3	18	174	6	23
125	3	18	175	6	23
126	3	18	176	6	24
127	4	18	177	6	24
128	4	18	178	6	24
129	4	18	179	6	24
130	4	19	180	6	24
131	4	19	181	6	24
132	4	19	182	6	24
133	4	19	183	6	24
134	4	19	184	6	24
135	4	19	185	6	25
136	4	19	186	6	25
137	4	19	187	6	25
138	4	19	188	6	25
139	4	20	189	6	25
140	4	20	190	7	25
141	4	20	191	7	25
142	4	20	192	7	25
143	4	20	193	7	25
144	4	20	194	7	25
145	4	20	195	7	26
146	4	20	196	7	26
147	4	20	197	7	26
148	4	21	198	7	26
149	5	21	199	7	26
150	5	21	200	7	26

Appendix Table 2 Analysis of variance on number stalk of sugarcane with various insecticides on plant cane F156 variety at Chonburi province February-April, 1989-1990<sup>1/</sup>.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	1.2770	0.4257	2.43 <sup>NS</sup>
Treatment (t)	5	1.5945	0.3189	1.82 <sup>NS</sup>
Error	15	2.6285	0.1752	
Total	23	5.5000		

C.V. = 20.01 %

<sup>1/</sup>Based on transformed data by using log (x+1)

NS = not significantly different

Appendix Table 3 Analysis of variance on yield of sugarcane with various insecticides on plant cane F156 variety at Chonburi province February-April, 1989-1990<sup>1/</sup>.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	1.0325	0.3442	2.02 <sup>NS</sup>
Treatment (t)	5	1.9765	0.3953	2.33 <sup>NS</sup>
Error	15	2.5499	0.16999	
Total	23	5.5569		

C.V. = 20.29 %

<sup>1/</sup>Based on transformed data by using log (x+1)

NS = not significantly different

Appendix Table 4 Analysis of variance on per cent infested stalk of sugarcane with various insecticides on plant cane F156 variety at Chonburi province February-April, 1989-1990<sup>1/</sup>.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	0.2627	0.0876	1.26 <sup>NS</sup>
Treatment (t)	5	4.1967	0.8393	12.07 <sup>**</sup>
Error	15	1.0428	0.0695	
Total	23	5.5022		

C.V. = 31.08 %

<sup>1/</sup>Based on transformed data by using  $\log (x+1)$

NS = not significantly different

\*\* = significantly different at the 1 % level

Appendix Table 5 Analysis of variance on per cent infested stool of sugarcane with various insecticides on plant cane F156 variety at Chonburi province February-April, 1989-1990<sup>1/</sup>.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	0.2627	0.0876	1.26 <sup>NS</sup>
Treatment (t)	5	4.1967	0.8393	12.07 <sup>**</sup>
Error	15	1.0428	0.0696	
Total	23	5.5022		

C.V. = 14.50 %

<sup>1/</sup>Based on transformed data by using  $\log (x+1)$

NS = not significantly different

\*\* = significantly different at the 1 % level

Appendix Table 6 Analysis of variance on CCS of sugarcane with various insecticides on plant cane F156 variety at Chonburi province February-April, 1989-1990.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	28.0766	9.3589	1.37 <sup>NS</sup>
Treatment (t)	5	30.6909	6.1382	< 1
Error	15	102.8099	6.8540	
Total	23	161.5774		

C.V. = 26.20 %

NS = not significantly different



Appendix Table 7 Analysis of variance the number of stalk on sugar-cane with various insecticides on ratoon cane F156 variety at Chonburi province April-March, 1990-1991<sup>1/</sup>

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	0.8954	0.2985	1.40 <sup>NS</sup>
Treatment (t)	5	1.5719	0.3144	1.47 <sup>NS</sup>
Error	15	3.2092	0.2139	
Total	23	5.6765		

C.V. = 24.44 %

<sup>1/</sup>Based on transformed data by using log (x+1)

NS = not significantly different

Appendix Table 8 Analysis of variance on yield of sugarcane with various insecticides on ratoon cane F156 variety at Chonburi province April-March, 1990-1991<sup>1/</sup>.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	0.9876	0.3292	1.63 <sup>NS</sup>
Treatment (t)	5	1.6168	0.3234	1.60 <sup>NS</sup>
Error	15	3.0302	0.2020	
Total	23	5.2066		

C.V. = 29.63 %

<sup>1/</sup>Based on transformed data by using  $\log (x+1)$

NS = not significantly different

Appendix Table 9 Analysis of variance on per cent infested stalk of sugarcane with various insecticides on ratoon cane F156 variety at Chonburi province April-March, 1990-1991<sup>1/</sup>.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	0.3260	0.1087	< 1
Treatment (t)	5	3.9172	0.7834	6.52**
Error	15	1.8026	0.1208	
Total	23			

C.V. = 42.59 %

<sup>1/</sup>Based on transformed data by using  $\log (x+1)$

\*\* = significantly different at the 1 % level

Appendix Table 10 Analysis of variance on per cent infested stool of sugarcane with various insecticides on ratoon cane F156 variety at Chonburi province April-March, 1990-1991<sup>1/</sup>.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	6.1166	2.0389	1.47 <sup>NS</sup>
Treatment (t)	5	54.3552	10.8710	7.86 <sup>**</sup>
Error	15	20.7446	1.3630	
Total	23	81.2165		

C.V. = 35.31 %

<sup>1/</sup>Based on transformed data by using  $\log (x+1)$

NS = not significantly different

\*\* = significantly different at the 1 % level

Appendix Table 11 Analysis of variance on CCS of sugarcane with various insecticides on ratoon cane F156 variety at Chonburi province April-March, 1990-1991.

SOV	df	SS	MS	F
Replication (r)	3	13.9480	4.6493	< 1
Treatment (t)	5	27.6482	5.5296	< 1
Error	15	114.0598	7.6040	
Total	23	155.6560		

C.V. = 32.10 %