

Bioefficacy of garlic, *Allium sativum* and tobacco *Nicotiana tabacum* on mortality, ovipository inhibition and adult emergence of the cowpea beetle *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Fab.) on cowpea *Vigna unguiculata* (L.) (Walp.)

ABSTRACT

Aims: To evaluate the efficacy of aqueous and ethanolic extracts of garlic and tobacco in the management of the cowpea beetle *Callosobruchus maculatus* and how these affect oviposition by adult females, adult emergence and sex ratio.

Study Design: The study was conducted in a randomised complete block design consisting of six treatments and three replications.

Place and Duration of Study: The experiment was carried out at the Biocontrol Section of Crops Research Institute, Kwadaso Kumasi over a four month period.

Methodology: Aqueous and ethanolic extracts of garlic and tobacco leaves were prepared; these preparations were compared with a standard chemical insecticide, Betallic and a control. Four kilogrammes of untreated cowpea seeds were sorted to obtain whole uninfested grains. Six hundred of the sorted seeds were placed in 1L Kilner jars. Fifty millilitres of each extract were sprayed onto the seeds in their respective jars and allowed to dry. Ten pairs of adult *C. maculatus* were introduced into each jar. Similar set-ups were done with the insecticide and control seeds. Mortality was recorded every 6 hr after treatment for 24 hr. Data were also collected on oviposition, adult emergence and sex ratio.

Results: Garlic-treated seeds did not record any mortality within the first 18 hr; no mortality was recorded in the control seeds, whereas the insecticide-treated seeds recorded 100 % mortality. Significantly fewer eggs were laid on the treated seeds than the control seeds. Sex ratio of the emerged adults varied within the period of observation. Aqueous extracts of the botanicals performed better in terms of insect control and oviposition inhibition than the ethanolic extracts.

Conclusion: Aqueous extracts of both plants produced better results than the ethanolic extracts. Aqueous extract, being cheaper, easier and safer to prepare could be adopted by the average small-scale farmer to manage the storage pest *C. maculatus*.

Key words: Allainin, aqueous extract, insect culture, insecticide, oviposition, sex ratio.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cowpea, *Vigna unguiculata* (L.) (Walp.) is a leguminous crop and one of the most important crops cultivated in the tropics and subtropics. It is one of the most adapted and nutritious legumes [1] grown for human consumption and as food for farm animals [2, 3]. Being a leguminous crop, cultivation of cowpea enriches the nutrient content of the soil by fixing atmospheric nitrogen into nitrates and some vining varieties are excellent nitrates producers [4]. It can also be cultivated as a cover crop and as green manure to improve soil fertility and land conservation purposes [5]. The mature legume contains 23-25% protein, 30-67% carbohydrates, 1.9% fat, 6.35% fibre and small percentage of the B vitamins [6]. The crop is well adapted to the drier regions of West and Central Africa [7], from where it spread to other

43 parts of the world. The nutritional qualities of cowpeas make them important component of
44 the diets of many African countries where other protein sources such as fish and meat may
45 not be readily available and affordable to the rural and urban poor due to their high cost.

46 In Africa, the yield of cowpea has been low due to a number of constraints such as low
47 rainfall, poor seed quality and the incidence of diseases and pests. The incidence of pests on
48 cowpea is due to its high nutritional qualities which make them attractive and highly
49 susceptible to many insects which infest it, both on the field and during the storage period. In
50 Ghana, the problem of poor seed quality has been addressed by the Crops Research Institute
51 (CRI) of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) in collaboration with the
52 International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA). They have jointly released high-
53 yielding cowpea varieties for cultivation by farmers. These varieties are high yielding and
54 have varying degrees of resistance to some of the cowpea pests.

55 Attempts by African farmers to achieve higher yields have been foiled by field and storage
56 pests [8]. The major storage pest of cowpea is *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Coleoptera:
57 Bruchidae). This pest causes significant damage to the stored grains if not protected. Between
58 30 and 50% of cowpea grain can be lost during storage; however, yield reductions caused by
59 insect infestation can be as high as 95% [9]. In Northern Ghana, Golob, [10] observed that
60 damage done by *C. maculatus* to stored cowpea varied from 15-94 %. According to Brooker
61 [11] a single *C. maculatus* can cause up to 3.5 % weight loss in cowpea grains and up to 66 %
62 loss in protein content.

63 The larva of *C. maculatus* feeds on the seed of legumes, causing quantitative and qualitative
64 losses to the farmer. The feeding activities by the larvae are manifested by seed perforation,
65 reduction in weight and market value and viability of the seed to germinate when sown [12].
66 Infestation of cowpea seeds by *C. maculatus* occurs on the field, before harvest [13] and
67 carried into storage. Females prefer laying eggs on mature green pods but will also oviposit
68 on dry mature pods [14]. The length of time cowpea stays on the field before harvest can
69 influence the level of infestation and subsequently the population of *C. maculatus* that will be
70 carried into storage. According to Baidoo *et al.* [13], early harvested cowpea recorded lower
71 infestation than late-harvested cowpea.

72 ~~The~~ destructive activities of *C. maculatus* require protection ~~from this storage pest~~ if the
73 seeds are to be stored for longer periods. Synthetic insecticides have been used to control *C.*
74 *maculatus* and other storage pests. There are a number of problems associated with the use of
75 synthetic insecticides. Some of the insecticides are persistent [15] and each generation of
76 insects become immune to the chemical insecticide leading to resistance in subsequent
77 generations [16]. The most important negative effect to the use of chemical insecticides on
78 storage products is food contamination as a result of indiscriminate use of these insecticides.
79 Thus Mellor and Adams [17] stated that in many developing countries, improper use of
80 pesticides by untrained workers often led to poisoning during application. They therefore
81 concluded that human poisoning is the highest price paid for using pesticides.

Due to the negative effects of eating contaminated food on the health of humans, other more sustainable and healthy means of controlling storage pests must be adopted to reduce the possibility of food contamination. The use of botanical insecticides has been suggested as an alternative to chemical insecticides. Plants from many different families exhibit biological activities against insect pests [18, 19]. These naturally-occurring compounds can affect the physiology of insects, kill insects or cause loss in fecundity and viability of eggs [20]. Botanical pesticides have low persistence, are less toxic to non-target organisms [21] and have low mammalian toxicity. Two of such plants with insecticidal properties are garlic, *Allium sativum* and tobacco, *Nicotiana tabacum*. Garlic produces various sulphur compounds that together with their breakdown products yield a characteristic pungent taste and odour. These compounds have antimicrobial and antifungal effects [22]. Allicin, which is derived from garlic combats fungal infections and parasites, lowers blood cholesterol and treats arteriosclerosis and promotes circulatory functions in humans [22]; however, its insecticidal and repellent properties have not been fully exploited.

Tobacco, *Nicotiana tabacum*, has been used as an important insecticide and insect repellent since the 17th century [23]. Tobacco contains many phytochemicals such as nicotine, nornicotine, anabasine, glucosides, acrolein and pyrene. Even though tobacco contains many chemicals, nicotine is the principal toxic component. It is a quick-acting insecticide which acts as stomach poison and is an important chemical defence mechanism of the plant [24]. In order to store cowpea for longer periods, they must be protected from *C. maculatus* infestation. The most widely used insecticide for protecting cowpea seeds are methyl bromide and phosphine; however, currently there is restriction on the use of phosphine because this chemical has ozone depletion potential [25] as well as reported cases of resistance in some stored products across the world [26]. There is therefore the need to develop safe and environmentally friendly and sustainable means to protect stored products from pest infestation. The population of *C. maculatus* at any time depends on the number of eggs laid by the females of the previous generation. Therefore any control measure that will reduce oviposition by female *C. maculatus* will ultimately reduce the population of this pest. The current study evaluated the efficacy of aqueous and ethanolic extracts of garlic and tobacco in managing the cowpea beetle and how the botanicals affected oviposition by females, adult emergence and sex ratio.

113

114 2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

115 2.1 Culturing of *C. maculatus*

Five hundred grammes of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* var. Asontem) seeds were each placed in 6 L Kilner jars and covered with muslin cloth. Fifty adult *C. maculatus* were introduced into each jar, covered with muslin cloth and secured with a rubber band. The set-ups were allowed to stand for 48 hrs to allow mating and oviposition, after which the insects were sieved out. The seeds were placed backed in the Kilner jars and left standing for 21 days to allow for hatching and adult emergence.

2.2 Preparation of plant extracts

Thirty (30) grammes of garlic was weighed and blended with 200 ml distilled water. The resulting mixture was diluted with water to a volume of 500 ml and stored in a dark cup board for 24 hrs. The same procedure was employed with the ethanolic extract, using ethanol as the solvent. After the storage period, the extracts were filtered using a fine muslin cloth and then through a Whatmann No. 1 filter paper.

Dried tobacco leaves were purchased from the local market. Fifty grammes of it were weighed and 500 ml of distilled water was added. The same quantity of tobacco leaves were used for the ethanolic extract using the same quantity of ethanol. The set-ups were left for 24 hrs after which they were filtered following the steps outlined above.

2.3 Experimental set-up

Four kilogrammes of untreated cowpea seeds (var. Asontem) were sorted to obtain whole, uninfested seeds. The seeds were disinfested by keeping them in the freezer for 24 hrs. The seed were conditioned to room temperature before being used for the experiment. Six hundred of the sorted seeds were placed in 1L Kilner jar, covered with muslin cloth and secured with a rubber band. There were six treatments, each of which was replicated 3 times; the treatments were: garlic in water (GW), garlic in alcohol (GA), tobacco in water (TW) tobacco in alcohol (TA), Betallic insecticide (a.i Permethrin and Pirimiphos-methyl) and a control set-up in which there was no control measure. Fifty millilitres of each extracts were sprayed onto the seeds in their respective jars and allowed to dry before the insects were introduced in to the set-ups. Betallic was applied at a rate of 5 ml/litre. In the control set-up the seeds were sprayed with the same quantity of distilled water. Ten pairs of adult *C. maculatus* were introduced into each jar and left for 24 hrs.

2.4 Data collection

After 24 hrs, the numbers of *C. maculatus* killed in each treatment were recorded after sieving the seeds to recover the beetles. The seeds were placed in their respective jars. The numbers of eggs deposited on 100 seeds were counted daily for 4 days and the means were calculated. Counting of the eggs was done with the aid of a powerful hand lens. The seeds were kept for 25 days after infestation after which the numbers of adults that emerged from each treatment were counted daily until no more adults emerged. Adults that emerged were separated into their various sexes to determine the sex ratio.

2.4.1 Data analysis

Data obtained were subjected to the General Linear Model (GLM) procedure of SAS [27]. Analysis of variance was done on the parameters studied. Where the difference was significant, the means were separated using the Student Neuman's Keul's (SNK) test. Chi

square test was used to determine any significant difference in sex ratio. Significant difference was set at $P \leq 0.05$.

3.0 Results

3.1 Mortality of *C. maculatus*

The percentage of adult *C. maculatus* that died 24 hr after the application of the control measures are shown in Table 1. With regards to garlic-treated seeds, no mortality was recorded within the first 18 hr after application. Mortality after 24 hr was 2.0% and 7.5% for aqueous and ethanol extracts respectively. Similarly tobacco extracts recorded very low mortalities. In the case of Betallic treatment, 57.75 % mortality occurred within the first 6 hrs of application; all the beetles were dead after the 24 hr period. The control set-up did not record any mortality at all.

Table 1: Percent mortality and egg oviposition by *C. maculatus* on cowpea at 24 hours

Treatment	Mortality %	Oviposition
Betallic	100.00 ^a	14.75 ^a ±4.82
Garlic in water	7.50 ^b	82.34 ^c ±34.50
Garlic in alcohol	2.50 ^b	41.25 ^b ±3.99
Tobacco in water	0.00 ^c	44.00 ^b ±8.22
Tobacco in alcohol	12.50 ^b	61.25 ^b ±19.88
Control	0.00 ^c	112.25 ^c ±24.24

Within columns, means with same letter are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$)

3.2 Adult emergence from cowpea seeds

Most of the adult beetles that emerged from the seeds were recorded on the first day. Very few adults emerged from day 2 to 4. The number of adults counted ranged from 120.5 in the untreated (control) seeds to 18.5 in the aqueous tobacco extract. No adult beetles were recorded from the insecticide-treated seeds (Table 2). The differences in adult emergence were significant ($P = 0.0001$). Adult emergence from the aqueous garlic and ethanolic extract of garlic did not differ significantly. Similarly adult emergence from the two tobacco treatments was not significantly different; both however, differed significantly from the garlic-treated seeds. Apart from the 2nd day during which the untreated seeds recorded significantly larger number of emerged adults, the subsequent days recorded fewer adults, the numbers of which were not significantly different.

Table 2: Effects of treatment of cowpea seeds on adult emergence over a 4-day period

Days	Treatments					
	GA	GW	TW	TA	Betallic	Control
1	73.25 ^a	58.50 ^a	18.25 ^b	37.25 ^b	0.00	120.50 ^c
2	3.25 ^a	1.50 ^a	1.25 ^a	4.25 ^a	0.50 ^a	7.50 ^b
3	1.50 ^a	1.50 ^a	0.50 ^a	0.75 ^a	0.00	2.75 ^a
4	1.50 ^a	0.50 ^a	0.25 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.00	2.01 ^a

Within rows, means with the same letters are not significantly different ($P > 0.05$)

3.3 Egg deposition on cowpea seeds

Egg deposition on the treated cowpea seeds varied with regards to the control agent used. The largest number of eggs was deposited on the untreated seeds, whilst the insecticide-treated seeds recorded the least egg deposition (Fig. 1). The numbers of eggs deposited on the different treated seeds differed significantly ($P = 0.035$). Further analysis of the numbers of eggs deposited on the seeds indicated no significant differences among all the seeds treated with the botanicals, but all differed from the untreated control seeds. Significantly fewer eggs were laid on the insecticide-treated seeds.




Fig. 1. Mean numbers of eggs counted per 100 cowpea seeds

3.4 Sex ratio of emerged adults

Mean distribution of males and females is represented in Table 3. Analysis of data using Kruskal-Wallis (Chi square) test showed that on day 1, male distribution recorded a P-value of 0.004, indicating a deviation from the expected 50%, while females recorded a P-value of 0.095, which was not significantly different from the expected number. On day 2 the number of males recorded varied significantly from the expected; females did not vary significantly and

so were closer to the expected 50%. On day 3, the calculated P-values for both sexes did not deviate significantly from the expected 50%, however, the P-value recorded for the males indicated significant deviation from the expected 50%.

Table 3: Mean sex ratio of adult *C. maculatus*

Treatments	Days							
	1		2		3		4	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Garlic in water	9.25	12.00	1.25	2.00	0.50	1.00	1.00	0.75
Garlic in alcohol	8.75	10.75	0.50	1.00	0.75	0.75	0.00	0.50
Tobacco in water	2.75	8.50	0.75	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.00
Tobacco in alcohol	8.50	11.44	2.00	2.25	0.50	0.25	0.00	0.00
Betallic	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Control	9.75	10.25	4.25	3.75	1.50	1.25	0.75	1.25
Total	39.00	52.94	8.75	9.50	3.50	3.50	1.75	2.50
P-value	0.00	0.10	0.05	0.11	0.63	0.36	0.04	0.20
Chi-square	17.19	9.35	11.18	8.90	3.50	5.44	11.73	7.32

*M= male, F= female

4.0 DISCUSSION

In Ghana and other parts of Africa, harvested cowpea is attacked by the storage beetle *Callosobruchus maculatus*. Infestation of cowpea seed by this pest occurs on the field and carried into storage. Infestation of the grains in subsequent generations depends on the population of the previous generation and the extent of egg deposition by adult females. During the study, it was observed that the use of the botanicals could not result in significant mortalities within the 24 hr period compared with the insecticide-treated seeds. Thus in terms of insecticidal activity both did not produce any significant effect against *C. maculatus*. The insecticidal property of any plant depends on the chemical component responsible for mortality. Garlic has been reported to contain several chemicals, including diallyl disulphide and diallyl trisulphide which have been shown to cause mortality in mosquito larvae as reported by Olkowski *et al.* [28]. The killing effect of the botanicals was, however, not as quick as the chemical insecticide because in some of the plant preparations, mortality was observed only after 24 hr of exposure, whereas a very high mortality was recorded only after 6 hr in the chemical insecticide-treated seeds. In a study by Wekesa *et al.* [29], they observed that the rate of mortality of *Sitophilus zeamais* increased with concentration and duration of exposure to essential oils of *Hyptis spicigera* and that total mortality was observed within 48 hr of exposure. The observed low action of the botanicals could be attributed to their inability to quickly enter the insect's internal tissue. These botanicals have to be ingested for effective action in susceptible insect. Death would therefore result only after several days of ingestion of these botanicals. There is therefore a delayed effect between ingestion and mortality. Report by Adedire and Ajayi [30] showed that garlic powder and oil may be toxic to *C.*

maculatus due to the strong choking odour it produces which disrupts normal respiratory activities of susceptible insect leading to asphyxiation and death. Reports by other workers indicate similar effects of botanicals in the control of the maize weevil, *Sitophilus zeamais* [29, 31].

Tobacco has been used as an insect control agent for many years. Even though the plant contains many chemicals, nicotine has been identified as the principal toxic component [24]. Tobacco possesses contact, stomach and respiratory poisoning properties which have been attributed to the presence of nicotine in the plant [32]. Toxicity of susceptible insects to ~~nicotine~~ is achieved through fumigation or direct contact [33]. Being a contact poison, it enters the body through areas such as the tracheal system.

With regard to ovipository inhibition by adult females, seeds treated with ethanolic extract of garlic recorded the least number of eggs among the different plant extracts. The untreated recorded by far the ~~largest~~ number of eggs because these had no control ~~agents~~ to hinder the activities of the insect. The fewer eggs laid on the treated seeds compared with the untreated control seeds was the results of relatively higher mortality of adult *C. maculatus* as well as the repellent properties of the plant materials that reduced sexual communication between the surviving adults [34]. A reduction in contact between the sexes led to reduced mating behaviour and consequently fewer eggs laid. Therefore, even though the use of these botanicals may not entirely reduce the population of insect pests below the economic damaging levels, surviving adults will produce fewer eggs which will ultimately reduce the population of insects of the next generation.

With respect to different treatments of the cowpea seeds on adult emergence, it was observed that the insecticide-treated seeds recorded the least number of emerged adults. In the case of the plant extracts, aqueous preparations of both plants performed better at reducing adult emergence than the ethanolic preparations. This could be attributed to a reduction in potency of the active ingredient when alcohol is used as the solvent for extraction. Earlier report by Abiodun [35] showed that aqueous extract of garlic was more toxic to *S. zeamais* than the ethanolic extract. This he attributed to the fact that the alkyl compounds in the Alliaceae family are readily obtained by distillation with water than with ethanol. It appears that the effectiveness of garlic and tobacco as pest control ~~agents~~ increases with increasing polarity of the solvent used for extraction. Water, being more polar than ethanol was therefore able to extract more of the insecticidal ~~agent~~, which accounted for the better results that were obtained. The effect of tobacco on susceptible insects are said to be ovicidal and inhibitory of larval instar development or both [36]. Boateng and Kusi [37] showed that jatropha seed oil was highly toxic to the eggs of *C. maculatus*, resulting in significant reduction in adult emergence. Ovicidal and larvicidal properties of the tested plant extracts probably killed some of the eggs and also prevented some of those that hatched into larvae from developing into pupae and subsequently adults. The principal component of tobacco is nicotine, and to some extent nornicotine and anabisine. These, according to Isman [21] are synaptic poisons that mimic the neurotransmitter acetylcholine and cause symptoms of poisoning similar to those produced by organophosphate and carbamate insecticides.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Plants with insecticidal properties ~~with insecticidal properties~~ have been used to manage both field and storage pests. The results of the study showed that botanicals have the potential to replace the use of synthetic insecticides in the management of pests of crops. Even though the use of garlic and tobacco could not completely eliminate *C. maculatus* from the cowpea seeds, surviving female adults produced fewer eggs. Aqueous extracts of both plants produced better results than the ethanolic extracts. Aqueous extract, being easier and safer to prepare could be adopted by the average small-scale farmer to manage pests. The use of botanicals on storage products could be adopted to reduce the incidence of food contamination and its negative effects on the health of man which are associated with the use of synthetic insecticides on stored products.

REFERENCES

1. Ehlers JD, Hall AE. Cowpea, (*Vigna unguiculata*)(L.) Walp. Field Crops Research. 1997; 53, 187-204.
2. Singh SR, van Emden HF. Insect pests of grain legumes. Annual Review of Entomology 1979; 24, 255-278.
3. Epidi TT, Nwani CD. Udoh S. Efficacy of some plant species for the cowpea weevil *Callosobruchus maculatus* and *Sitophilus zeamais*. International Journal of agriculture and Biology 2008; 10: 588-590.
4. Baidoo PK, Baidoe-Ansah D. Agbonu I. Effects of neem (*Azadirachta indica* A. Juss) products on *Aphis craccivora* and its predator *Harmonia axyridis* on cowpea American Journal of Experimental Agriculture. 2012; 2(2) 198-206.
5. Quinn J. Myers R. 'Cowpea, a versatile legume for hot dry conditions. Jefferson Institute. 2002; Pp. 1-4.
6. Bressiani R. Nutritive value of cowpea. In: Cowpea research, Production and Utilization. Singh, S. R. and Rachie, K.O. (eds.). John Wiley and Sons Ltd. 1985 Pp 353-359.
7. Colby LS, Steele WM. An Introduction to the Botany of Tropical Crops. 1976. Pp 91-95, London: Longmans. 2nd Edition.
8. Kawuki RS, Agona A, Nampala P, Adipala E. A comparison of effectiveness of

- 302 plant-based and synthetic insecticides in the field management of pod and storage pests
- 303 of cowpea: Crop Protection, 2005; 24, 473-478.
- 304 9. Ilesanmi JO, Gungula DT. Effects of neem and moringa seed oil on cookability and
- 305 palatability of cowpea grains stored for six months. African Journal of Food Science
- 306 2011; 5(9): 522-528.
- 307 10. Golob P. Phosphine: A fumigant for small-scale application in Northern Ghana.1993;
- 308 NRI Report No. 4, 5 pp.
- 309 11. Brooker RH. Observations on three bruchids associated with cowpea in Northern Nigeria.
- 310 Journal of Stored Products Research. 1967; 3:1-15.
- 311 12. Murugan K. Bioefficacy of plant derivatives on the repellency, damage assessment and
- 312 progeny production of the cowpea weevil, *Callosobruchus maculatus* Julius-Khun
- 313 Archive. 2010; 874-880.
- 314 13. Baidoo PK, Mochiah MB, Owusu-Akyaw M. The effect of time of harvest on the
- 315 Damage caused by the cowpea weevil, *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Fab.) (Coleoptera:
- 316 Bruchidae). Journal of Stored Products and Postharvest Research. 2010; 1(3) 24-28.
- 317 14. Messina FJ, Slade AF. Expression of a life history trade -off in a seed beetle depends on
- 318 environmental context. Physiological Entomology. 1999; 24(4) 358-363.
- 319 15. Deedant YO. Problems associated with the use of pesticides: An overview. International
- 320 Journal of Tropical Insect Science. 1994; 93: 735-747.
- 321 16. Georgiou GP, Lagunes-Tajeda A. The occurrence of resistance to pesticides in
- 322 Arthropods. 1991; An index of cases reported through 1989, FAO, Italy 318 pp.
- 323 17. Mellor JW Adams RH Jr. Feeding the under-developed world. A special report.
- 324 Chemical Engineering News. 1984; 62:32-39.
- 325 18. Sekou MK, Charles V, Jean-Pierre S, John TA, Andre B. Efficacy of essential oils of
- 326 *Ocimum basilicum* L. and *Ocimum gratissimum* L. applied as an insecticidal fumigant
- 327 and powder to control *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Fab.) (Coleoptera:Bruchidae). Journal

- 328 of Stored Products Research. 2001; 37(4): 339-349.
- 329 19. Bouda HL, Tapondjou A, Fontem DA, Gumedzoe MYD. Effects of essential oils from
330 leaves of *Ageratum conyzoides*, *Lantana camara* and *Chromolaena odorata* on the
331 mortality of *Sitophilus zeamais* (Coleoptera Curculionidae). Journal of Stored Products
332 Research. 2002; 37(2) 103-109.
- 333 20. Bell WJ, Carde RT. Sexual communication with pheromones. Chemical Ecology of
334 Insects. 1984; Chapman and Hall. NY USA pp 353-383.
- 335 21. Isman MB. Plant essentials for pest and disease management. Journal of Crop Protection
336 2000; 19 (10): 603-608.
- 337 22. Block E. Garlic and other alliums: The Lore and the Science. Royal Society of
338 Chemistry, 2010; Pp 197.
- 339 23. Schmeltz I. Nicotine and other tobacco alkaloids. United States Department of
340 Agriculture. 1971; 3450-3452.
- 341 24. Istvan U. Nicotine and other alkaloids. Plant Protection Institute. Hungarian Academy of
342 Sciences. 1999; 29-30.
- 343 25. Annis PC, Byung-Ho L, Tumaalii F, Choi W. Fumigant toxicity of essential oils
344 from the Myrtaceae family and 1,8 cineole against 3 major stored grain insects.
345 Journal of Stored Products Research. 1999. 40(5): 553-564.
- 346 26. World Meteorological Organization. Scientific assessment of ozone depletion.
347 Geneva, World Meteorological Organization Report.1991; No. 25.
- 348 27. SAS Institute. Statistical Analysis Systems SAS/STAT. 2011; User's Guide Version 9(1)
349 Cary, NC. SAS institute Inc.
- 350 28. Olkowski W, Olkowski H, Daar S. The gardener's guide to common sense pest control
351 1996.
- 352 29. Wekesa I, Onek LA, Deng AL, Hasanali A, Othira JO. Toxicity and repellent potency
353 of extracts of *Hyptis spicigera* extracts on *Sitophilus zeamais* Motschulsky

- 354 (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). Journal of Stored Products and Postharvest Research
355 2011; 2(6): 113-119.
- 356 30. Adedire CO, Ajayi TS. Assessment of the insecticidal properties of some plant extracts as
357 grain protection against the maize weevil, *Sitophilus zeamais*. Nigerian Journal of
358 Entomology. 1996; 13: 93-101.
- 359 31. Owusu Ansah J, Nyarko E, Mensah-Sarbah P. The control of maize grain weevil
360 (*Sitophilus zeamais* Motschulsky) using neem *Azadirachta indica*, *Ocimum gratissimum*
361 and *Lantana camara* leaf powders. 2005; BSc. Dissertation Kwame Nkrumah University
362 of Science and Technology, Kumasi Ghana. 31pp.
- 363 32. Stoll G (1988) Natural Crop Protection in the Tropics, AGRECOL. Margraf Publishers
364 Pp 188.
- 365 33. Rajapakse RHS. The potential of plants products in stored insect pest management.
366 The Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2006; 2(1): 11-20.
- 367 34. Yusuf AU. Comparative efficacy of different plant materials and pirimiphos-methyl in
368 the suppression of *Callosobruchus maculatus* F. (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) development
369 and damage in cowpea seeds. Savannah Journal of Agriculture. 2009; (4) : 50-53.
- 370 35. Abiodun AD. Bioactivity of powder from garlic, *Allium sativum* L. (Alliaceae) and spring
371 onion, *Allium fistulosum* L. (Alliaceae) against *Callosobruchus maculatus* F.
372 (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) on cowpea, *Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp. seeds. Hendawi
373 Publishing Corporation. 2010; Vol. 1: 3-5.
- 374 36. Dauda Z, Maina YT, Richard BI. Insecticidal activity of garlic (*Allium sativum*)
375 (L.) oil on *Callosobruchus maculatus* (F) in post-harvest cowpea, *Vigna unguiculata* (L.)
376 Walp.). Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare 2012; 2(3): 33-34.
- 377 37. Boateng B Kusi F. Toxicity of jatropha seed oil on *Callosobruchus maculatus*
378 (Coleoptera:Bruchidae) and its parasitoid. *Darnamus basalis* (Hymenoptera:
379 Pteromalidae). Journal of Applied Sciences Research. 2008; 4(8): 945-951.