Effects of the Medicinal Plant Leaf Extract on the Rice Weevil,

Sitophilus oryzae (L.)

R. Nalini*, D.S. Rajavel and A. Geetha

Department of Agricultural Entomology Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai 625 104 Tamil Nadu * Corresponding author (email: <u>naliniento@yahoo.co.in</u>)

Abstract

In this study, leaf extracts from eleven medicinal plants were examined for their effect on repellency, mortality, progeny production and loss in grain weight caused by the rice weevil, Sitophilus oryzae (L.). The plant extracts were applied at 0.5% W/V. Orientation of adult weevil to Gloriosa treated grains was less (9.0 nos.), followed by Lippia (14.7) and Piper (16.0) as compared to acetone (31.7) and water controls (30.0). The orientation of rice weevil adult expressed as Excess Proportion Index ranged between -0.11 and -0.54 for the different leaf extracts tested. Adult mortality was maximum in Piper treated grains (38.1%) followed by Lippia (36.2%) and Lantana (34.8%). In Lippia treated grains the mean progeny production was 58.6 numbers and the progeny build up was suppressed by ten times as compared to the water control (585.0 nos.). Minimum per cent loss in grain weight was observed in *Lippia* treated grains (0.4) followed by *Piper* (19.0) and Gloriosa (27.0). Acetone and water control recorded the grain weight loss of 41.7 and 62.5 per cent respectively. It could be concluded from this study that ethanolic extract of Lippia, Piper and Gloriosa possess toxic principles with significant insecticidal and repellent effect and could be a potential grain protectant against S. oryzae.

Rice weevil, *Sitophilus oryzae* (L.), (Curculionidae: Coleoptera) is a major pest of cereals like rice, sorghum, wheat, barley and maize both in field before harvest and in storage. The white apodous grub and the reddish brown adults are internal feeders and cause serious quantitative and qualitative losses to cereal grains. Owing to the advantages of the botanical insecticides over

*Corresponding author: naliniento@yahoo.co.in the synthetic ones in stored produce insect pest management these are extensively studied. Different types of plant preparations such as powders, solvent extracts, essential oils and whole plants are being investigated for their insecticidal activity including their action as fumigants, repellants, anti-feedants, antiovipositants insect growth regulators (Isman, 2000; Weaver and Subramanyam, 2000; Erturk *et al.*, 2004; Koul, 2004; Mordue, 2004; Negahban and Moharramipour, 2007).

Considerable efforts have been made to control rice weevil using the plant derived insecticides. Srinivasan et al. (2003) reported that Calotropis leaf extract recorded very low consumption rate besides exerting a significant effect on the survival of S. oryzae adults. Similarly Roy et al. (2005) showed leaf extract of Blumea lacera as botanical insecticides against lesser grain borer and rice weevil. Ethanol extract of Melgota (Macaranga postulata) was used for repellency and insecticidal activity against the rice weevil (Rahman et al., 2007). The aim of this study was to determine the effect of medicinal plants in suppressing the rice weevil S. oryzae damage in stored rice.

Materials and Methods

Preparation of leaf extract: 500 g of fresh leaves of the 11 medicinal plants viz., 1) Bael, Aegle marmelos; 2) Sweet Basil, Ocimum basilicum; 3) Poduthalai, Lippia nodiflora; Kalihari, 4) Gloriosa superba; 5) Wild sage, Lantana camara; 6) Physic nut, Jatropha curcas; 7) Indian Privet, Clerodendron inerme; 8) Palas, Butea frondosa; 9) Custard apple, Annona squamosa; 10) Adulsa, Adhatoda vasica and 11) Pippal, Piper longum were collected, chopped and soaked in ethanol Later the leaf extracts were for 20 days. decanted individually, condensed with rotoevaporator and stored in brown glass bottles. Plant extracts were prepared to 0.5 per cent concentration using acetone and tested against the rice weevil, S. oryzae.

Test insect: The initial stock culture of adult weevils were collected from farmers store house and maintained at 28 ± 4 ⁰C and 70 ± 5 % relative humidity and under continuous darkness. Adults of S. oryzae were released into 200g of disinfected rice grains in plastic containers @ 25 nos. of mixed age and sex. Mouth of the container was covered with thin cloth and was incubated for 15 days. On the 15th day, the released adults were removed and the rice grains were kept without disturbance for two months for emergence of fresh adults. Newly emerged adults were collected daily and released in separate containers for continuous mass culturing. Adults of 7 - 10davs old age were used for the experimentation.

Details of the laboratory experiments: All the laboratory experiments were conducted at room temperature 28 ± 4^{0} C and $70\pm5\%$ relative humidity in the Storage Entomology Lab, Department of Agricultural Entomology, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai during 2008 - 2009. The laboratory experiments had 13 treatments as follows. For comparison acetone treated and water treated controls were included.

- T₁ Bael, *Aegle marmelos*
- T₂ Sweet Basil, Ocimum basilicum
- T₃ Poduthalai, *Lippia nodiflora*
- T₄ Kalihari, *Gloriosa superba*
- T₅ Wild sage, *Lantana camara*
- T_6 Physic nut, *Jatropha curcas*
- T₇ IndianPrivet, *Clerodendron nerme*
- T₈ Palas, *Butea frondosa*
- T₉ Custard apple, Annona squamosa
- T₁₀ Adulsa, Adhatoda vasica
- T₁₁ Pippal, *Piper longum*
- T₁₂ Acetone control
- T₁₃ Water control

Free choice tests

i. Adult orientation

Under free choice condition, 10g grains treated with different leaf extracts were arranged in circular manner. Three hundred and fifty freshly emerged adult weevils were released in the center. The number of adults oriented towards each treatment was counted at 24, 48 and 72 hours after treatment. Three replications were maintained.

Orientation of adult weevil recorded in the choice-number was expressed in terms of Excess Proportion Index (EPI) (Sakuma and Fukami, 1985). It is the proportion of the difference between the number of insects oriented towards the treatment (Nt) and that of the insects surrounding the control (Nc).

No choice test

i. Adult mortality

Under no choice condition, 10 g of treated grains along with acetone and water control were kept in separate boiling tubes $(24 \times 3 \text{ cm})$ and 10 freshly emerged adults were released in each tube. The adult mortality was recorded at 2, 7 and 14 days after release. Three replications were maintained.

ii. Progeny build up

Similar to adult mortality test, 50g of treated grains were confined with ten freshly emerged adults for three days. Forty days after their confinement, number of F_1 adults present in each treatment was counted to record the progeny build up. Similar, observations were recorded till the F_7 progeny. The experiment was replicated two times.

iii. Loss in grain weight

50 g of treated seeds were taken in containers separately and 10 freshly emerged adults were confined. Grain weight was recorded at monthly interval for eight months. The difference in the initial and final weight was recorded as loss in grain weight. The loss in grain weight was expressed as percentage. Two replications were maintained.

Statistical analysis: All the laboratory experiments were conducted in Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with thirteen treatments and two / three replications. The values collected were transformed either to arcsine or square root or log values depending on the condition. The transformed values were analyzed using single or two factors ANOVA. Mean values were sepaated by Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Results

Free choice test i.Adult orientation

Orientation of adult weevils to grains teated with different leaf extracts, measured as numbers ranged from 9.0 to 24.3. In acetone (31.6.) and water (30.0) treatment orientation of adults was significantly more compared to the leaf extract treated grains. The mean adult orientation to *Gloriosa* treated grains was less (9.0), followed by *Lippia* (14.6) and *Piper* (16.0) (Table1). The adult orientation to grains treated with *Ocimum*, *Lippia*, *Gloriosa*, *Lantana*, *Adhatoda* and *Piper* decreased as the time increased.

The Excess Proportion Index (EPI) was worked out to know the potential value of the plant materials in protecting the grains from stored product pest. The overall EPI values of the different leaf extracts ranged between -0.11 and -0.54. *Gloriosa* extract recorded the highest repellency of -0.54 followed by *Lippia* (-0.34), *Lantana* (-0.34) and *Piper* (-0.32) (Table 1).

No choice test

i. Adult mortality

The per cent adult mortality was maximum at 14 days after confinement and it ranged from 14.8 to 53.8 in treated grains. The mean adult mortality was maximum in *Piper* treated grains (38.1) followed by *Lippia* (36.2) and *Lantana* (34.8) (Table 2). *Lippia* and *Piper* treated grains at 14 days after confinement recorded the maximum adult mortality of 53.8 and 53.5 per cent, respectively, and these values y differed significantly from values of all other treatments.

ii. Progeny production

Lowest adult F_1 to F_7 progeny of *S. oryzae* was recorded in Lippia treated grains and it significantly differed from all other medicinal plant leaf extracts as well as the acetone / water control. In Lippia treated grains the mean adult progeny recorded was 58.6 and the progeny build up was suppressed by ten times as compared to the water control (585). In F_7 generation the adult population in Lippia treated grains reached 78.5 numbers while in all the other treatments, this level was seen in F_2 itself (Table 4). The next best treatments were Gloriosa (312.) followed by Piper (333.7) which suppressed the progeny build up by 1.8 and 1.7 times, respectively, as compared to the water control. The per cent reduction in adult progeny build up was high in Lippia treated grains (89.9%) followed by Gloriosa (46.7%) and Piper (42.9%) (Table 3).

iii. Loss in grain weight

With regard to loss in grain weight, there was no considerable loss in grain weight upto four months. Minimum per cent loss in grain weight was observed in *Lippia* (0.4) treated grains followed by *Piper* (19%) and *Gloriosa* (27.1%). The rest of the treatments recorded grain loss ranging from 31.8 to 41.8%. Grain weight loss in acetone and water control were 41.7 and 62.5%, respectively. Reduction in grain weight loss as compared to the water control was highest in *Lippia* treated grains (99.4%) followed by *Piper* (69.6%) and *Gloriosa* (56.7%) (Table 4).

Discussion

Post harvest losses by insect pests in cereal commodities is significant. Treatment with chemical insecticide has great health hazard. Plants are a rich source of novel natural substances that can be used to develop environmentally safe methods for insect control in storage (Jbilou *et al.*, 2006). These plant material are edible, cheap, biodegradable and generally safe that will not contaminate food products. This study reports on the development of a safe promising grain protectant with medicinal plants for the control of rice weevil in the storage systems.

Of the eleven medicinal plants tested for its orientation, *Gloriosa* treated grains followed by *Lippia* and *Piper* dispayed high repellency. Rahman *et al.* (2007) tested the ethanol extract of melgota, *Macaranga postulata* at different concentrations for their repellency activity and reported that repellent effect was proportional to the concentration and higher concentration had stronger effect. However, repellency effect with be pronounced under multiple choice test and hence by itself can not offer an effective grain protection tactic.

Adult mortality was maximum in Piper extract treated grains followed by Lippia and Lantana. Similar result of botanicals having insecticidal activity and causing adult mortality in rice weevil has been reported by many workers (Srinivasan et al., 2003; Roy et al., 2005 and Rahman et al., 2007). In long term effect, Lippia treated grains recorded lower progeny build up over 7 generations as compared to the water control. These effects could have resulted from lowered fecundity, fertility of adults and maggot and pupal mortality. Srinivasan et al. (2003) reported that Ipomoea had a distinct effect on the growth of S. orvzae adults and the developmental period increased.

Grain weight was observed was also minimum in *Lippia* treated grains followed by

T	Number of adults oriented						
Treatment	24 h	48 h	72 h	Mean			
Bael	24	21	20	21.67 ^{b-e}			
Aegle marmelos	-0.08*	-0.21	-0.20	-0.16			
Sweet Basil	23	21	18	20.67 ^{b-e}			
Ocimum basilicum	-0.10	-0.21	-0.25	-0.19			
Poduthalai	13	16	15	14.67 ^{ab}			
Lippia nodiflora	-0.37	-0.33	-0.33	-0.34			
Kalihari	9	8	10	9.00 ^a			
Gloriosa superba	-0.51	-0.60	-0.50	-0.54			
Wild sage	36	11	13	20.00 ^{b-d}			
Lantana camara	0.13	-0.49	-0.40	-0.34			
Physic nut	23	22	22	22.33 ^{b-f}			
Jatropha curcas	-0.10	-0.19	-0.15	-0.15			
Indian Privet	34	19	30	27.67 ^{c-f}			
Clerodendron inerme	0.10	-0.25	0.00	-0.12			
Palas	17	23	23	21.00 ^{b-e}			
Butea frondosa	-0.24	-0.16	-0.13	-0.18			
Custard apple	26	22	25	24.33 ^{c-f}			
Annona squamosa	-0.04	-0.19	-0.09	-0.11			
Adulsa	25	26	11	20.67 ^{b-e}			
Adhatoda vasica	-0.06	-0.10	-0.46	-0.21			
Pippal	24	13	11	16.00 ^{a-c}			
Piper longum	-0.08	-0.42	-0.46	-0.32			
Acetone control	30	34	31	31.67 ^f			
	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03			
Water control	28	32	30	30.00 ^{ef}			
	1	1	1	1			

Table 1: Influence of medicinal plants leaf extract on the orientation of rice weevil adults

Mean of three replications; In the column, means followed by same letters are not significantly different (P=0.05) by DMRT; * Excess Proportion values

Treatment	Adult mortality (%) * after days					
Trauncht	2	7	14	Mean		
Bael	2.22	7.08	14.78	8.03		
Aegle marmelos	(7.15) ^{n-p}	(14.41) ^{l-n}	(22.47) ^{i-k}	(14.68) ^F		
Sweet Basil	17.41	27.41	46.47	30.43		
Ocimum basilicum	(24.38) ^{h-j}	(31.47) ^{e-h}	(42.97) ^{ab}	(32.94) ^{BC}		
Poduthalai	17.22	37.59	53.78	36.20		
Lippia nodiflora	(24.48) ^{h-j}	(37.72) ^{b-e}	(47.17) ^a	(36.46) ^{AB}		
Kalihari	7.89	17.04	46.67	23.87		
Gloriosa superba	(15.90) ^{k-m}	(24.09) ^{h-j}	(43.09) ^{ab}	(27.69) ^{DE}		
Wild sage	21.63	40.48	42.29	34.80		
Lantana camara	(27.57) ^{f-j}	(39.49) ^{b-d}	(40.51) ^{a-c}	(35.86) ^{AB}		
Physic nut	7.08	17.04	36.53	20.22		
Jatropha curcas	(14.41) ^{l-n}	(24.20) ^{h-j}	(37.15) ^{b-e}	(25.25) ^E		
Indian Privet	8.19	17.45	39.21	21.62		
Clerodendron inerme	(15.41) ^{k-m}	(24.57) ^{h-j}	(38.73) ^{b-e}	(26.24) ^{DE}		
Palas	12.63	31.11	32.67	25.47		
Butea frondosa	(20.48) ⁱ⁻¹	(33.75) ^{c-g}	(34.84) ^{c-f}	(29.69) ^{CD}		
Custard apple	13.70	17.82	28.77	20.10		
Annona squamosa	(21.65) ^{j-1}	(24.89) ^{h-j}	(32.42) ^{d-g}	(26.32) ^{DE}		
Adulsa	7.92	20.78	28.83	19.18		
Adhatoda vasica	(16.13) ^{k-m}	(26.84) ^{g-j}	(32.48) ^{d-g}	(25.15) ^E		
Pippal	24.53	36.38	53.48	38.13		
Piper longum	(29.35) ^{f-i}	(37.08) ^{b-e}	(47.01) ^a	(37.81) ^A		
Acetone control	2.22	5.00	2.00	3.07		
	(7.14) ^{n-p}	(10.59) ^{m-p}	(6.36) ^{op}	(8.03) ^G		
Water control	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
	(0.41) ^p	(0.41) ^p	(0.41) ^p	(0.41) ^H		
Mean	10.97 (17.27) ^C	21.17 (25.35) ^B	32.73 (32.74) ^A			

Table 2. Influence of medicinal plants leaf extract on the mortality of adult rice weevil

[#] Values are subjected to Abbot's correction. * Mean of three replications Figures in the parentheses are are sine transformed values. In the column, means followed by same letters are not significantly different (P=0.05) by DMRT

	Progeny production (in numbers)							
I reatment	F1	\mathbf{F}_2	F3	F4	Fs	F ₆	F ₇	Mean
Bael	28.50	167.50	444.00	620.00	587.50	605.00	576.50	432.71
Aegle marmelos	(1.45) ^a	(2.22)*	(2.62)*	(2.79)*	(2.75)*	(2.77) [*]	(2.76)*	(2.48) ^{DE}
Sweet Basil	24.50	135.00	432.00	550.00	675.00	550.00	540.00	415.21
Ocimum basilicum	(1.35)*	(2.13)*	(2.60)*	(2.72) [*]	(2.81)*	(2.74) [*]	(2.73) ^a	(2.44) ^{CDE}
Poduthalai	10.00	29.00	56.50	110.00	60.00	66.50	78.50	58.64
Lippia nodiflor a	(0.98) ^a	(1.38)*	(1.75)*	(2.01)	(1.78) ^a	(1.82) ^a	(1.89)*	(1.66) ^A
Kalihari	23.50	169.00	436.50	450.00	317.50	387.50	400.00	312.00
Gloriosa superba	(1.35)*	(2.03)*	(2.48)*	(2.53)*	(2.49)*	(2.56)*	(2.54) ^a	(2.28) ^B
Wild sage	18.00	117.00	430.50	475.00	525.00	565.00	557.50	384.00
Lantana camara	(1.26)*	(2.05)*	(2.63)*	(2.68)	(2.72)*	(2.75)*	(2.75)*	(2.41) ^{BCD}
Physic nut	29.50	147.50	455.00	600.00	775.00	750.00	685.00	491.71
Jatropha curcas	(1.47)*	(2.17)	(2.58)*	(2.75)*	(2.88) ^a	(2.87) [±]	(2.81)*	(2.46) ^{DEF}
Indian Privet	28.50	235.00	395.00	600.00	650.00	575.00	457.50	420.14
Cle rode ndron ine m e	(1.16)*	(2.26)*	(2.55)*	(2.76) [*]	(2.80)*	(2.75)*	(2.65)*	(2.42) ^{BCD}
Palas	49.00	172.50	481.00	700.00	750.00	627.50	537.50	473.93
Butea frondos a	(1.69)*	(2.22)*	(2.68)*	(2.83)*	(2.87) [*]	(2.80) [*]	(2.73) [*]	(2.55) ^{DEF}
Custard apple	22.50	175.00	679.00	775.00	600.00	576.00	625.00	493.21
Annona squamosa	(1.33)*	(2.24)*	(2.83)*	(2.88)*	(2.78) [*]	(2.76)*	(2.79) [*]	(2.52) ^{DEF}
Adulsa	33.00	302.50	638.50	600.00	675.00	622.50	590.00	494.50
Adhatoda vasica	(1.42)*	(2.44)*	(2.80)*	(2.78)*	(2.83)*	(2.79)*	(2.77) [∎]	(2.55) ^{DEF}
Pippal	15.00	79.00	414.50	475.00	425.00	437.50	490.00	333.71
Piper longum	(1.17)*	(1.86)*	(2.54)*	(2.66)*	(2.59)*	(2.63)*	(2.69)*	(2.31) ^{BC}
Acetone control	61.50	218.50	507.00	753.00	775.00	642.50	660.00	516.79
	(1.79)*	(2.33)*	(2.70) ^a	(2.88)*	(2.87) [±]	(2.81) [*]	(2.82) ^a	(2.60) ^{EF}
Water control	122.50	417.50	780.00	700.00	825.00	762.50	487.50	585.00
water control	(2.08)*	(2.60)*	(2.89)*	(2.83)*	(2.91)*	(2.88) [*]	(2.69)*	(2.70) ^F
Mara	35.85	181.92	445.69	569.85	587.69	551.35	514.19	
IVIEAN	(1.42) ^A	(2.15) ^B	(2.51) ^c	(2.70) ^c	(2.70) ^c	(2.69) ^c	(2.66) ^c	

Table 3: Influence of medicinal plants leaf extract on the progeny production of rice weevil

*Mean of two replications.

Figures in the parentheses are log transformed values.

In the column, means followed by same letters are not significantly different (P=0.05) by DMRT

Tractor		% Loss in grain weight at DAC					
1 reatment	120	150	180	210	240	NI earl	
Bael	35.62	36.26	38.09	41.43	43.45	38.97	
Aegle marmelos	(36.64)*	(37.03)*	(38.11)*	(40.06)*	(41.22) ^a	(38.61) ^D	
Sweet Basil	29.66	31.10	31.77	32.87	37.31	32.54	
Ocimum basilicum	(32.73)*	(33.61)*	(34.02) [*]	(34.66)*	(37.65)*	(34.53) ^{CD}	
Poduthalai	0.00	0.27	0.36	0.41	0.98	0.40	
Lippia nodiflora	(0.41)*	(2.97) [*]	(2.63)*	(3.64)*	(4.23)*	(2.78) ^A	
Kalihari	19.77	27.50	28.77	29.52	29.70	27.05	
Gloriosa superba	(24.19)*	(31.39)*	(32.21) ^a	(32.70)*	(32.82) ^a	(30.66) ^{BC}	
Wild sage	22.58	32.13	33.64	34.56	36.17	31.82	
Lantana camara	(26.22)*	(34.40)*	(35.35)*	(38.97)*	(36.93)*	(33.76) ^{CD}	
Physic nut	26.02	35.71	43.97	47.20	47.78	40.14	
Jatropha curcas	(30.22)*	(35.85)*	(41.47)*	(43.38)*	(43.71)*	(38.93) ^D	
Indian Privet	23.23	34.63	35.49	37.81	41.21	34.47	
Clerodendron inerme	(28.54)*	(35.56)*	(33.98) ^a	(37.48)*	(39.66)*	(35.04) ^{CD}	
Palas	39.56	40.78	41.52	41.59	43.65	41.42	
Butea frondos a	(38.92)*	(39.65)*	(40.08) ^a	(40.12)*	(41.35)*	(40.02) ^p	
Custard apple	37.83	39.42	40.62	42.53	45.50	41.18	
Annona squamosa	(37.96)*	(38.87)*	(39.59)*	(40.71)*	(42.42) ^a	(39.91) ^D	
Adulsa	32.88	42.09	43.68	44.22	45.91	41.76	
Adhatoda vasica	(34.97)*	(40.37)*	(41.31)*	(41.61)*	(42.59) ^a	(40.17) ^D	
Pippal	14.36	18.95	20.17	20.67	20.95	19.02	
Piper longum	(15.96)*	(25.18)*	(26.08) ^a	(26.45)*	(26.65)*	(24.23) ^B	
Acetone control	31.85	33.63	41.81	47.14	53.96	41.68	
	(34.28)*	(35.42)*	(40.28) ^a	(43.36)*	(47.28) ^a	(40.12) ^p	
Water eastrol	48.58	60.95	66.16	66.72	70.05	62.49	
Water control	(44.18)*	(51.34)*	(54.47) ^a	(54.79)*	(56.84) ^a	(52.32) ^E	
Mare	27.84	33.34	35.85	37.44	39.74		
IVIEAN	(29.63) ^A	(33.97) ^{AB}	(35.35) ^B	(36.76) ^B	(37.95) ^B		

Table 4: Influence of medicinal plants extract on the grain weight loss

Mean of two replications.

Figures in the parentheses are arcsine transformed values.

In the column, means followed by same letters are not significantly different (P=0.05) by DMRT

Piper and *Gloriosa*. *Calotropis* leaf extract recorded very low consumption rate besides exerting a significant effect on the survival of *S. oryzae* adults (Srinivasan *et al.*, 2003).

Several plant extracts have have been shown to display insecticidal properties and can control pests through affecting their biological activities (Schmutterer, 1995; Mostafa *et al.*, 1996; Musabyimana *et al.*, 2001; Tinzaara *et al.*, 2006). Arannilewa *et al.* (2006) reported that the petroleum ether extract of *Aristolochia ringens* (Vahl.) to be a potent bioinsecticide for protecting maize grains from *S. zeamais* infestation and damage.

Our results suggested effectiveness of leaf extract of *Gloriosa* followed by *Lippia* and *Piper* in exerting toxic effect on the rice weevil, *S.. oryzae.*, a major pest of cereals like rice, sorghum, wheat, barley and maize. However, prior to their use as botanical insecticide, toxicity tests against humns and other animals need to be conducted.

Acknowledgement

Authors are thankful to the National Medicinal Plants Board, New Delhi for their financial help rendered to carry out this research work.

References

- Arannilewa, S.T., Ekrakene, T. and Akinneye. J. O. 2006. Laboratory evaluation of four medicinal plants as protectants against the maize weevil, *Sitophilus zeamais* (Mots). *Afr. J. Biotech.* 5: 2032-2036.
- Erturk, O., Vedat, S. and Ahmet Koc, Y.K. 2004. Antifeedant and toxicity effects of some plants extracts on *Yponomeuta malinellus* Zell. (Lepidoptera: Yponomeutidae). *J. Plant Prot. Res.* 44: 125-135.
- Isman, M.B. 2000. Plant essential oils for pest and disease management. *Crop Prot.* 19(10): 603-608.
- Jbilou., R., Ennabili, A. and Sahaya, F. 2006. Insecticidal activity of four medicinal plant extracts against *Tribolium castaneum* (Herbst) (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae). *Afr. J. Biotech.* 5(10): 936-940.
- Koul, O. 2004. Neem: A global perspective.
 In: *Neem* Koul, O. and Wahab, S. (eds.).
 Today and in the new millennium. Kluwar Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 53 (1): 1-19.
- Mordue, A.J. 2004. Present concepts of the mode of action of Azadirachtin from Neem. In: *Neem* Koul, O. and S.Wahab (eds.).

Today and in the new millennium. Kluwar Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 53 (14): 229 -242.

- Mostafa, T.Y., Mahgoub, S.M. and Ahmed, M.S. 1996. The efficiency of certain plant powders against cowpea weevil, *Callosobruchus maculatus* (F.) (Coleoptera: Bruchidae). *Egypt J. Agric. Res.* 74 : 307 – 319.
- Musabyimana, T., Saxena, R.C., Kairu, E.W., Ogol, C.P.K.O. and Khan, Z.R. 2001. Effects of neem seed derivatives on behavioural and physiological responses of the *Cosmopolites sordidus* (Coleoptera : Curculionidae). *Hort. Entomol.* 94: 449 – 454.
- Negahban, M. and Moharramipour, S. 2007. Fumigant toxicity of *Eucalyptus intertexta*, *Eucalyptus sargentii* and *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* against stored-product beetles. *J. Applied Entomol.* 131: 256 – 261.
- Rahman, S.S., Rahman, M., Khan, M.M.R., Begum, S.A., Roy, B. and Shahed, S.M.F. 2007. Ethanolic extract of melgota (*Macaranga postulata*) for repellency, insecticidal activity against rice weevil (*Sitophilus oryzae*). Afr. J. Biotech., 6: 379-383.
- Roy, B., Amin, R. and Uddin, M.N. 2005. Leaf extracts of Shiyalmutra (*Blumea lacera*) as botanical insecticides against lesser grain borer and rice weevil. *J. Biol. Sci.* 5: 201 – 204.
- Schmutterer, H. 1995. The neem tree *Azadirachta indica* A. Juss and other Maliaceous plant sources of unique natural products of integrated pest management medicine, industry and other purposes. VCH, Weinheim, Federal Republic of Germany.
- Srinivasan, R., Uthamasamy, S., Mohan S. and Usha Rani, B. 2003. The effect of three plant products on *Sitophilus oryzae* (L.) in Maize. Plant Prot. Bull. 55: 23-26.
- Tinzaara, W., Tushemereirwe, W., Nankinga, C.K., Gold, C.S. and Kashaija, I. 2006. The potential of using botanical insecticides for the control of the banana weevil, *Cosmopolites sordidus* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). *Afr. J. Biotech.*, 5: 1994 – 1998.
- Weaver, D.K. and Subramanyam, B. 2000. Botanicals. In: Alternative to Pesticides in stored-Product IPM, Subramanyam, B.H. and Hagstrum, D.W. (Eds.). Klumer Academic Publishers, MA, pp: 303 – 320.