

Original Research Article

Insecticidal Activity of Five indigenous Plants Species on Cowpea Weevil [*Callosobruchus maculatus* (Fab.)ricius]

Comment [H1]: In title give full name

Abstract

A study was conducted to evaluate the insecticidal action-activity of five locally available plants, namely: *Azadirachta indica* (Neem), *Cymbopogon citratus* (Lemon grass), *Lantana camara* (Lantana), *Occimum gratissimum* (Scent leaf) and *Tagetes erecta* (African marigold) on cowpea weevil, *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Fab.abricius) using the repellency, adult mortality, anti-oviposition and growth inhibition tests. Results revealed that all test materials exhibited repellency against cowpea weevils. Powdered leaves of neem and scent leaf were noted to be slightly more repellent than the others. Cowpea grains treated with powdered leaves of *T. erecta* exhibited the lowest mortality of the cowpea weevils. Again, *A. indica* and *O. gratissimum* treatment were most effective in anti-oviposition and growth inhibitory action, as well as adult mortality of the weevils. Some of the examined treated cowpea grains (except those treated with *A. indica* and *O. gratissimum*), had larval tunnels. The total development period of the cowpea weevils that emerged from such treated and the untreated seeds was the same (37days). Botanicals are known to have varying degrees of insect inhibition, and in this case *O. gratissimum* and *A. indica* were the most effective.

Formatted: Justified

Keywords: Insecticidal, cowpea weevil, repellency, anti-oviposition, growth inhibition, adult mortality

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Introduction:

Cowpea [*Vigna unguiculata* (L.)] of the Family *Mimosaceae* and Order Leguminales is a legume grain that is related to groundnut, pigeon pea, soybean and bambara nut. Generally, legumes are a major source of diet in the nutrition of many Nigerians, because their edible seeds serve as alternatives to protein, as well as a source of calcium, iron, thiamine and riboflavin (Messina, 1999). However, a major problem with cowpea production is infestation by weevils. The bean weevil [*Callosobruchus maculatus* (Fab.)] is an economically important pest of stored grains of cowpea and pigeon pea, among others (Ofuya and Bamigbola, 1991), resulting to loss in weight, seed viability and nutritive quality of affected seeds. A loss in weight of 30-40% has been reported (Ofuya, 1990) in literature. *C. maculatus* of the family Bruchidae, is a small compact brownish beetle of about 2.5-3.5 mm long. The male beetles are smaller in size than the female (Dobie, et al., 1984).

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Justified

Comment [H2]: Very old reference. For the damage always try to get recent references as pest scenario changes every time.

Comment [H3]: Replace it with some recent reference

The cowpea weevil is a major pest of *Vigna unguiculata* (L.), which attacks cowpea seeds during storage and transport (Ofuya and Bamigbola, 1991). Weevil attack may begin either in the field or storage and may completely destroy the seed. Further infestation in storage is as result of the transfer of infested seeds into the store or from flying weevils making contact with storage facilities, probably attracted by the odour of the stored seeds (Ofuya, 1990)

The life cycle of *Callosobruchus maculatus* is between 30-80 days, depending on the temperature. The female lays eggs on cowpea pods in the field and the duration of egg laying is between 8-10 days (Dobie, et al., 1984). *C. maculatus* undergoes complete metamorphosis with a larval stage of between 21-32 days, while the pupa and adult stages is between 16-25 days. Usually, one to two generations are produced in the field each year and six or more generations are produced in storage each year. The life span is short and the optimum conditions for ovoposition are temperature of 30-35°C with a relative humidity of 70-90% (Dobie, et al., 1984).

Comment [H4]: That much detail is not required as study is mainly related with management aspects of weevil

In storage, pests are difficult to control, however this is often done by burying the entire sac of cowpea in a deep hole or by using insecticides. Presently, effective pest control of stored products are no longer feasible due to high cost of pesticides, environmental pollution, evolution of resistant forms of the pest under control, and contamination of food materials.

Many conventional insecticides have been effective against storage insects, either as dusts or fumigants. Insecticidal dust of malathion, chlorpyrifas, chlorpyrifos-methyl, fenitrothion, carbamate and deltamethian, deltamethrin can protect shelled cowpeas stored in bags or in airtight containers. The use of inert materials like wood ash, silicates and sand, wood ash, diatomaceous earth (diatomite), etc for the control of bruchids, especially *C. maculatus* has been reported by Ofuya (1986). Grains are mixed with sieved ash and placed in a mud granary of clay bar tapped-down to compress the mixture, often covered with an additional layer of ash. A minimum ratio of 3 part or wood ash to 4 part of cowpea significantly reduced the population of *C. maculatus*.

Comment [H5]: Quote some recent references.

The use of botanical pesticides to protect plants and plant products from pests has gained prominence due to obvious advantages: Pesticidal plants are generally much safer than conventional/synthetic pesticides (Ahmad et al, 2019). Plant-based pesticides are renewable in nature and cheaper, they are easily biodegradable or ecologically friendly and non-toxic to other useful organisms. Therefore, they can be transferred into practical applications in natural crop

Formatted: Justified

protection, especially among small-holders (Ahmad et al., 2019; Malik et al., 2012; Mahdi and Rahman, 2009).

A number of indigenous plants in Nigeria have been reported to have pesticidal properties. ~~Sowunmi and Akinusi (1983) and~~ Ivbijaro (1990) used neem kernel powder to protect cowpea seeds from *C. maculatus* damage. Ivbijaro and Agbaje (1986) observed that dry chili (pepper) resulted to moderate adult mortality in *C. maculatus*. Also, Ofuya (1986) reported that dry chili fruit (*Capsicum annum*) and onion scale leaves (*Allium cepa*) afforded some degree of protection against *C. maculatus* in stored cowpea seeds. The same author (Ofuya, 1990) reported that powdered *Nicotiana tabacum*, *Erythrohleum suaveolens*, *Ocimum gratissimum* and *Lantana camara* significantly reduced oviposition and egg hatching in *Sitophilus zeamais*, *Sitophilus oryzae* and *C. maculatus*. Powdered root bark of *Zanthoxylum zanthoxyloides* in water solution was toxic to adult *C. maculatus* by protecting cowpea seeds from predation by the pest (Ogunwolu and Odunlami, 1996). Short exposure of adult bruchids to *Zanthoxylum zanthoxyloides* powder reduced their reproductive fitness (Ogunwolu and Odunlami 1996). ~~Insect repellent and anti-feedant action of *Azadirachta indica* (Neem) on cowpea seeds was attributed to the Azadirachtin and other related compounds (Isman, 2006; Morgan, 2009).~~ The rate of application of these insecticidal plant powders ~~rangeranges~~ generally from less than 1g/kg to 20g/kg of seed (Lale ~~and Vidal~~, 2003). The use of plant powders is impracticable in large scale storage because of the high quantities required. Many of the plants used have known medicinal and pharmacological properties and have been subjected to ~~emperiace~~empirical verification for their effectiveness against *C.allosobruchus maculatus* (Mahdi and Rahman, 2009). The objective of this study is to ascertain the ~~insecticidal properties~~insecticidal properties of *Azadirachta indica* (Neem), *Cymbopogon citratus* (Lemon grass), *Lantana camara* (Lantana), *Ocimum gratissimum* (Scent leaf) and *Tagetes erecta* (African marigold) as grain protectants against cowpea weevil (*C.allosobruchus maculatus*), using repellency, adult mortality, anti-oviposition and growth inhibition tests.

Materials and Method

This experiment was conducted in the Department of Plant Science and Biotechnology, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria, located on latitude 4°79 N and longitude 6° 98 N. Infected cowpea seeds were obtained from the 'Mile Three' market in Port Harcourt, and about

Comment [H6]: Old reference

Comment [H7]: Not required as you are not discussing the mode of action of other plant products.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Justified

Five Hundred (500) of the infected seeds were put into a transparent plastic container, covered tightly and maintained at a temperature of 30-35°C and 50% relative humidity in the laboratory for fast breeding of insects. This was left undisturbed for 35 days, during which period the weevils had grown into full adults.

Fresh and mature leaves of the respective plant materials: *Azadirachta indica*, *Cymbopogon citratus*, *Lantana camara*, *Ocimum gratissimum* and *Tagetes erecta* were sourced and authenticated from the Departmental garden and the Taxonomy Unit of the Department, respectively. The leaves were air dried until crispy, then they were blended and sieved through a 0.5mm mesh. The powders were stored separately in sealed containers until use.

Repellency

Test

The method used was that employed by Garcia (1990) with some modifications. Transparent plastic tubing, 17cm long, were used as test cylinders. Each tubing was plugged at one end (B) with cotton wool containing 2 grams of treatment powder made from the leaves of each test plant, while the other end (A) was plugged with clean cotton ball without the treatment powder. A mixture of ten male and ten female weevils were introduced at the middle of each tubing through a hole at the middle. The hole was covered to keep the weevils inside. Each of the five plant treatments and control were replicated three times, thus making a total of 18 tubing. They were left undisturbed, and the number of weevils that moved towards the untreated half of the tubing were counted every hour for the first five hours, then at 24 hours, 48hrs and 96 hrs. Repellency rating was calculated following the formula:

$$\text{Repellency rating} = \frac{n(1) + n(3) + n(5) + n(7)}{N}$$

Where n = number of insects staying at 0, 1-2, 3-4 and 5-6 cm from the center of the tubing towards the untreated cotton plug, respectively.
1, 3, 5 and 7 = rating scale on the reaction of the insects on different test materials (table.1).
N = Total number of insects introduced per tubing.

Anti-oviposition and growth inhibition test

Two hundred grams of cowpea were placed in 20cm high transparent plastic containers. Ten

grams of powdered leaves of each treatment material was thoroughly mixed with the grains in each container. Each treatment was done in three replicates. A mixture of twenty male and twenty female cowpea weevils were introduced in each container. The female adults were allowed to oviposit on the seeds for 48hrs, after which they were discarded. Five days after, thirty cowpea seeds were taken from each container for close examination using a dissecting microscope. Since the eggs were not very visible, rough jelly-like spots on the grains were used to indicate egg deposition. A tunnel was formed inside the grain when the deposited egg hatched and the larva starts feeding. This was the basis for anti-oviposition effect of the test materials. The total development period of the weevils was gathered by counting the number of days from when the eggs were laid (a day after removal of parent weevils from the jar) to adult emergence.

$$\text{Per cent insect survival} = \frac{\text{number of insects that emerged into adult stage}}{\text{total no. of seeds with eggs on them (represented by seeds with tunnels)}} \times 100$$

Adult

Mortality

Test

One hundred grams of cowpea seeds were admixed with 5g of powdered leaves of each plant treatment into glass jars. The admixtures were shaken manually for 5 mins, and then left undisturbed for an hour. Thereafter, a mixture of twenty male and female weevils were introduced per jar. The untreated cowpea seeds served as control. Each treatment and control were made in three replicates. Adult mortality was monitored at 4, 7, 14 and 24 days after exposure to the treatment.

$$\text{Per cent adult mortality} = \frac{\text{Number of dead insects}}{\text{Total number of insects introduced}} \times 100$$

Results

Repellency Test

With the aid of the scale (Table 1) as a guide, the degree of repellency of each plant test material was ascertained.

Table 1. Scale for the determination of the degree of repellency of the test materials

Rating	Distance (cm) from the center of the tubing towards the untreated cotton plug.	Description
1	0	Ineffective
3	1-2	Slightly repellant (SR)
5	3-4	Moderately repellant (MR)
7	5-6	Highly repellant (HR)

Comment [H8]: Mention the reference for this rating scale

The repellency effect of the plant powder treatment on the weevils is shown in Table 2, and the mean values reveal that *O. gratissimum* had the highest repellency rating of 0.91, followed by *A. indica* (0.88). The least value among the treatments was that of *Tagetes erecta* (0.73), while the Control was lower than them all (0.58). All the values fell below 1.0, but were all higher than that of the control, so they can be said to be slightly repellant. It was also observed from Table 2 that repellency values dropped after 24 hrs for *C. citratus*, *L. camara* and *T. erecta*, and after 4 days (96 hrs) values dropped for all of them, including the Control.

Table 2. Distance (cm) over time (hrs) of the weevils from the center of the tubing towards the untreated cotton plug

Treatments	Exposure duration (hours) to treatment effect								Mean distance (cm)towards untreated
	1	2	3	4	5	24	48	96	
<i>A. indica</i> (Neem leaf)	0.99	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.90	0.92	0.95	0.34	0.88
<i>C. citratus</i> (Lemon grass)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.83	0.63	0.40	0.86
<i>L. camara</i> (Lantana)	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.83	1.00	0.63	1.00	0.4	0.86
<i>O. gratissimum</i> (Scent leaf)	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.00	0.97	0.97	0.73	0.60	0.91
<i>T. erecta</i> (African marigold)	0.9	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.73
Control	0.37	0.83	0.77	0.73	0.83	0.67	0.33	0.1	0.58

Comment [H9]: Use some statistical method for interpretation of result

Anti-oviposition and growth inhibition test

Formatted: Justified

It was observed that some test plants did not indicate anti-oviposition action as shown in Table 3. Despite the deposition of eggs that were observed on the seeds, only a few treated with *C. citratus*, *L. camara* and *T. erecta* indicated larval tunnels. Nevertheless, observation of larva tunnels was used to determine the deposition of eggs. Zero per cent insect survival was recorded in some of the treatments viz: *A. indica* and *O. gratissimum*. *T. erecta* had the highest percentage (10) of weevils from tunnels, after Control;

while both *C. citratus* and *L. camara* had 5%. The recorded total development period (TDP) for these three treatments and the Control was 37 days.

Table 3. Treatment effect on weevil reproduction

Treatments	No. of infected seeds (with eggs) (%)	No. of seeds with tunnels (%)	Total Development period (days)	No. of weevils from tunnels (%)
<i>A. indica</i> (Neem leaf)	6	0	0	0
<i>C. citratus</i> (Lemon grass)	6	2	37	5
<i>L. camara</i> (Lantana)	8	1	37	5
<i>O. gratissimum</i> (Scent leaf)	4	0	0	0
<i>T. erecta</i> (African marigold)	11	4	37	10
Control	36	13	37	22

Adult Mortality Test

The mortality rate of the treatment effect on the adult weevils recorded on the fourth day was the highest in all the treatments, except for Control that had its highest on the 24th day (Table 4). By Day 14, the jars treated with the test plants: *A. indica*, *C. citratus* and *O. gratissimum* already had all the adult weevils dead. At 24 days after insect introduction (DAII), the cumulative percentage mortality of adult weevils over time show that the cowpea treated with *A. indica*, *O. gratissimum*

and *L.camara* had higher mortality (100%, 99.98% and 99.96% respectively) than the rest. *C. citratus* and *T. erecta* had lower mortality rates (88.37% and 89% respectively), while the Control gave the lowest mortality rate of 56.66% (Table 5).

Table 4. Treatment effect on percentage mortality of adult weevils over time

Treatments	Day 4	Day 7	Day 14	Day 24
<i>A. indica</i> (Neem leaf)	75	3.33	21.67	0
<i>C. citratus</i> (Lemon grass)	65	11.7	11.67	0
<i>L. camara</i> (Lantana)	73.3	15	3.33	8.33
<i>O. gratissimum</i> (Scent leaf)	78.3	8.34	13.34	0
<i>T. erecta</i> (African marigold)	30.7	20	20	18.3
Control	3.33	18.33	8.33	26.67

Table 5. Treatment effect on Cumulative percentage mortality of adult weevils over time

Treatments	Day 4	Day 7	Day 14	Day 24
<i>A. indica</i> (Neem leaf)	75	78.33	100	100
<i>C. citratus</i> (Lemon grass)	65	76.7	88.37	88.37
<i>L. camara</i> (Lantana)	73.3	88.3	91.63	99.96
<i>O. gratissimum</i> (Scent leaf)	78.3	86.64	99.98	99.98
<i>T. erecta</i> (African marigold)	30.7	50	70.7	89
Control	3.33	21.66	29.99	56.66

Discussion

Formatted: Justified

The repellency test shows that all the plant test materials had values that fell slightly below 1.0, implying that they were all slightly repellent. *O. gratissimum* however, had the highest value of 0.91. Mc Gowan (1999) mentioned that *O. gratissimum* and its volatile oil were particularly effective in repelling flies, and were found effective as repellent against cowpea weevils. The repellency of the treatments ~~were~~was however observed to decrease as exposure duration lengthened (Table 2). This could be as a result of either the volatilization of chemical compounds present in the powdered leaves, or the weevils adjusting to the odour of the plants. Many plant extracts are known to possess biological compounds such as flavonoids, alkaloids, phenols and similar constituents. The repellency of all the test plants dropped by the end of 24 hrs, except that of *A. indica* that lasted till the end of 48 hrs, and *O. gratissimum* that dropped in repellency during the 48 hr period. Repellency of an average of 8hrs was observed against Anopheles mosquitoes by Asadollahi et al (2019) using similar plants ~~amongst which was C. citratus~~. *A. indica* and *O. gratissimum* were the most effective test plants for anti-ovipository/Growth growth inhibition, and these two test plants again were the most effective on percentage mortality of adult weevils by Day 4; and by Day 24, as all the adult weevils had died in these two treatments as well as in that of *C. citratus*. In all the three tests carried out with the test plants, *O. gratissimum* competed ~~favourably~~favorably with *A. indica*, and was always a little bit ahead in performance.

A. indica is however the most promising source of biopesticide. Its Azadirachtin content being the most potent of its insecticidal compounds, was found effective against more than 200 pests of agriculture, horticulture, vegetable crops and household pests (Isman, 2006; Morgan, 2009), including *C.allosobruchus maculatus*. However, leaves of *A. indica* contain lesser amount of the major active ingredient, azadirachtin than *A. indica* kernels (Busungu and Mushobozy et al, 1991). Kernel of *A. indica* is the richest source of meliacins and contains 0.2 to 0.3% ~~Azadirachtin~~azadirachtin and 30 to 40% oil (Isman, 2006; Saxena et al., 1989). Varma and Dubey (1999) found that the essential oils of *O. gratissimum* showed its insecticidal activity against *Sitophilus oryzae*, *Stegobium panicum* and *T. castaneum*. Also, the essential oil of *A. indica* showed its in vitro fumigant activity in the management of storage fungi and insects of some cereals without exhibiting mammalian toxicity in albino rats. *C. citratus* essential oil was found effective in deterring a wide variety of insects (Mc Gowan, 1999), including cowpea

weevils, *C. maculatus* (Boeke et al., 2004). Marigold (*T. erecta*), *L. camara*, garlic, chili, lemon grass (*C. citratus*) and *O. gratissimum*, among others, repel insects, thus farmers use them as companion crops to food crops because in some cases, their smell acts as repellent.

In conclusion, the powdered leaves of all the test plants exhibited repellency, anti-oviposition/growth inhibition and adult mortality against cowpea weevils, however those of *O. gratissimum* and *A. indica* were more effective. Further studies comparing the other plant parts will [find the fruits and oils be](#) even more effective.

References

- Ahmad, F., Iqbal, N., Zaka, S. M., Qureshi, M. K., Saeed, Q., Khan, K. A., Ghramh, H. A., Ansari, M. J., Jaleel, W., Aasim, M. and Awar, M. B. (2019). Comparative insecticidal activity of different plant materials from six common plant species against *Tribolium castaneum* (Herbst) (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae), Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences, 26(7):1804-1808.
- Asadollahi, A., Khoobdel, M., Zahraei-Ramazani, A., Azarmi, S. and Mosawi, S. H. (2019). Effectiveness of plant-based repellents against different *Anopheles* species: a systematic review. Malar. J. 18:436-456.
- Boeke, S., Barnaud, C., Van Loon, J., Kossou, D., Vanhuis, A. and Dicke, M. (2004). Efficacy of Plant Extracts against the cowpea beetle, *Callosobruchus maculatus*. Int. J. Plant Mgmt. 50(4):251-258.
- Busungu, D. G. and Mushobozy, D. M. K. (1991). The efficacy of various protectants against *Zabrotes subfasciatus* (Boh.) Coleoptera, Bruchidae in common beans. Bean Research, 6: 62-67.
- Dobie, P., Haines, C. P., Hodges, R. J. and Prevett, P. F. (1984). Insects and Arachnids of Tropical Stored Products: Their Biology and Identification. Storage Dept. Tropical Development and Research Institute, London. 272pp
- Garcia, J.R. (1990) Bioassay of Five Botanical Materials against the Bean Weevil, *Callosobruchus chinensis* (L.) on Mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.), Unpublished master's thesis. University of the Philippines at Los Baños, College, Laguna.
- Isman, M. B. (2006). Botanical insecticides, deterrents and repellents in modern agriculture and increasingly regulated world. Annu. Rev. Entomol., 51: 45-66.
- Ivibijaro, M. F. (1990) "The efficacy of seed oils of *Azadirachta indica*, *A. Juss* and *Piper*

guineense Schum and Thonn on the control of *Callosobruchus maculatus*,” *Insect Science and Its Application*, 7(4): 521–524.

Ivbijaro, M. F. and Agbaje, M. (1986). Insecticidal activities of *Piper guineense*. Schum and Thonn, and *Capsicum* species on the cowpea Bruchid *Callosobruchus maculatus* F. *Insect Sci. Appl.* 7(4) 521– 524

Lale, N.E.S and Vidal, S. (2003). Effect of constant temperature and humidity on oviposition and development of *Callosobruchus maculatus* (F.) and *Callosobruchus subinnotatus* (Pic) on Bambara groundnut *Vigna subterranea* (L.) Verdcourt. *Journal of Stored Products Research* 39(5):459-470.

Mahdi, S. H. A. and Rahman, K. (2009)
Insecticidal effect of some spices on *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Fabricius) in black gram seeds. *Univ. J. Zool. Rajshahi Univ.*, 27: 47-50

Malik, K., Nazir, S., Farooq, A., Jabeen, F., Andleeb, S. and Talpur, M. M. M. (2012). Study on the combined insecticidal effect of pyrethroid, *Azadirachta indica* and boric acid on the *Bacillus thuringiensis* efficacy in *Tribolium castaneum* Afr. J. Microbiol. Res., 6: 5574-5581.

Mc Gowan, M. (1999) Herbal Pest Control. Retrieved October 12, 2005 from <http://www.consciouschoice.com/1999/cc1208/herbs1208.html>.

Messina, M. J. (1999). Legumes and Soybeans: Overview of their nutritional profiles and health effects. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 70(Suppl): 439S-50S. Printed in USA. American Society for Clinical Nutrition.

Morgan, E. D. (2009)
Azadirachtin, a scientific gold mine. *Bioorg. Med. Chem.*, 17: 4096-4105.

Ofuya, T. I. (1986). Use of wood ash, dry chilli pepper fruits and onion scale leaves for reducing *Callosobruchus maculatus* (F.) damage in cowpea seeds during storage. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 107:467–468.

Ofuya, T. I. (1990). Oviposition deterrence and ovicodal properties of some plant powders against *Callosobruchus maculatus* in stored cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata*) seeds. *Journal of Agricultural Science Cambridge*, 115: 343–345.

Ofuya T.I. and Bamigbola K.A., (1991). Damage potentials, growth and development of seeds beetle, *Callosobruchus maculatus* (F.) (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) on some tropical legumes. *Tropical Agric (Trinidad)* 68, 33-36.

Ogunwolu, E.O. and Odunlami, A.T. (1996). Suppression of seed bruchid *Callosobruchus maculatus* (F.) development and damage on cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.) with *Zanthoxylum zanthoxyloides* (Lam.) Weterm. (Rutaceae) root bark powder when compared to neem seed powder and pirimiphos-methyl. Crop protection 15: 603-607. Overseas Development Natural Resources Institute, Chatham, Kent, U.K.

Saxena, R.C., Jilani G. and Kareem A.A., (1989) Effects of Neem on Stored Grain Insects in Jacobson (ed.) Forum on Phytochemical Pesticides. Volume I. The neem tree. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.

~~Sowunmi, O. E., and O. A. Akinnusi. (1983). Studies on the use of neem kernel in the control of stored cowpea beetle (*Callosobruchus maculatus* F.) Trop. Grain Leg. Bull. 27: 28 D31.~~

Varma J, and Dubey, N. K. (1999). Insecticidal and repellent activity of some essential oils against *Tribolium castaneum*. Natl Acad Sci Lett. ;20:143–147.