

**Insect pests of leaf amaranth (*Amaranthus hybridus* L and control using oil extracts of *Alium sativum* L, *Xylopia aethiopica* Dunal and *Eucalyptus globulus* L**

**ABSTRACT**

Pest profile of *Amaranthus hybridus* was recorded in a single organic agro-ecosystem in Southwestern Nigeria between November-December in 2016 and January-February 2017, during the dry season. Activities of different pests were monitored to identify those responsible for the most significant damage. Oil extracts of *Alium sativum*, *Xylopia aethiopica* and *Eucalyptus globulus* were prepared and applied on *A. hybridus* as protectants against herbivory by phytophagous insects and damage to foliage were assessed. Thereafter, the extracts were rated based on the mean percentage damage (MPD) recorded in different plots in relation to the treatments. A total of nine pests were recorded from three insect Orders namely, Orthoptera (63%), Coleoptera (13%) and Lepidoptera (25%), they were grouped into Major, Minor or Occasional pests based on their activities. Two lepidopterans, *Spoladea recurvalis* and *Psara basalıs* (Family: Crambidae) were responsible for the most significant damage. All the extracts reduced damage with statistically significant difference ( $P < 0.05$ ) compared with the control. The MPD in *X. aethiopica*-, *A. sativum*- and *E. globulus*-treated plots and the control plots were 10.9%, 8%, 14% and 31.2% respectively, when the amaranth was due for harvest in the first trial. The MPD to the amaranth in the treated plots during the second trial was between 13.6% and 16.3% when harvest was due while the MPD in the control was 54.9%. The

25 performances of *E. globolus* and *X. aethiopica* were comparable and they were  
26 relatively more effective in protecting *A. hybridus* against phytophagous pest attacks.

27 **Keywords:** *Amaranthus hybridus*, Herbivory, Phytophagous insects, Damage, plant extracts

## 28 INTRODUCTION

29 *Amaranthus hybridus* is widely cultivated in Nigeria for its edible leaf which contains  
30 significant amounts of dietary proteins, vitamins and minerals (Akubugwo et al.,  
31 2007). It is well adaptable to the climatic conditions in different agro-ecological zones  
32 in Nigeria. In the South West, which is the major production hub, dry season  
33 amaranth cultivations are restricted to wetland areas or locations with proximity to  
34 water for irrigation. It is a rapid source of income for subsistent and poor-resource  
35 farmers because of its relatively short production cycle (14-21 days), simple method  
36 of cultivation and high market demands. During the dry season, supply of leaf  
37 amaranth often falls short of the demand, the price becomes relatively high  
38 (Emokare et al., 2007) and there are periods when amaranth is completely  
39 unavailable in the market.

40 Insect pests seriously undermine vegetable production in Nigeria, particularly when  
41 they are cultivated for their foliage. Pest density is often high and attacks are severe  
42 in the dry season due to relative scarcity of alternative hosts. Amaranth is attacked  
43 by a myriad of insect pests in a succession that depends on how long the crop is left  
44 in the field (cultivated for leaf or seed) before harvesting. The insect pests that are  
45 responsible for the most economic damage to leaf amaranth in the Southwest belong  
46 to Lepidoptera and Orthoptera Orders (Joseph et al., 2016; Borisade and Uwaidem,  
47 2017a). When leaf amaranth foliage has fully developed, sometimes losses of up to

48 100% can be incurred within one week in pest endemic areas if appropriate pest  
49 control action is not initiated.

50 The major Lepidoptera pests of amaranth, *Spoladea recurvalis* and *Psara basal* lay  
51 their eggs on the abaxial parts of early foliage at night, about one week after the  
52 appearance of the first foliage, thereby concealing infestation or potential  
53 development of pests on the amaranth (James et al., 2010). The eggs hatch into the  
54 larvae in about seven to fourteen days, which feed voraciously on the foliage. Major  
55 damage often occur between 15-21 days after sowing, although earlier attacks are  
56 possible. Apart from the feeding activities that 'skeletonize' the leaves, bulk of the  
57 produce is often contaminated with frass and excrements that further reduce quality.  
58 *Psara basal* especially produce characteristic webbings on the leaves, which  
59 makes the crop completely unmarketable (Borisade and Uwaidem, 2017a).  
60 Grasshoppers and Katydid and many other phytophagous insects that move into  
61 the field are also responsible for damage.

62 The use of chemical insecticides in vegetable pest management and the unsafe  
63 levels of pesticide residues that are left in fresh vegetables are of a serious concern  
64 (Akan, et al., 2013). Increasingly and from time to time, chemical pesticides are  
65 being reviewed and unregistered for use in the management of vegetable pests,  
66 considering their toxicity to non-targets and levels of persistence in the environment.  
67 Chemical pesticides may be especially unsafe for pest management in the Nigerian  
68 leaf amaranth production system, where the production cycle of 14-21 days is far  
69 less than the half-life of the active ingredients in majority of the pesticides in use.  
70 Chemical pesticides of the Organochloride groups and those containing DDT, which  
71 are forbidden in the management of pests in food crops are found in agrochemical  
72 retail outlets in Nigeria, and they are being used in the management of vegetable

73 pests by subsistent farmers. Thus, there is the need to reduce dependence on  
74 inorganic chemicals in the control of leaf amaranth pests by seeking alternative  
75 environment-friendly options.

76 Plants contain organic chemical constituents that protect them against herbivory and  
77 disease pathogens and many of these constituents have great potentials for pest  
78 management. Garlic (*Alium sativum*), *Xylopiya aethiopica* and *Eucalyptus globolus*  
79 are widely distributed tropical plants containing extractable bioactive compounds,  
80 which have been employed in pest control in different studies (Ebadollahi, et al.,  
81 2017; Moshi and Matoju, 2017). *Alium sativum* contains alicin, which is repellent or  
82 toxic to eggs, developmental stages, and adults of many economic pests (Huang et  
83 al., 2017). *Xylopiya aethiopica* and *E. globolus* are also known to contain essential  
84 oils reported to show repellency, ovitoxicity and adulticidal effects against insect  
85 pests (Kouninki et. al., 2007). However, many of the promising evaluations on the  
86 use of extracts of these plants for crop protection were limited to store pests in *invitro*  
87 bioassays. Efficacy of botanical extracts in field pest management is expected to  
88 vary under variable interacting abiotic environmental factors: temperature and  
89 relative humidity, often encountered under field conditions. In the field, pests are not  
90 confined by limited space, a factor which may become a challenge against plant  
91 extracts that are relatively slow in action.

92 Thus, the aim of this study was to record occurrence of pests on *Amaranthus*  
93 *hybridus* within a single organic agro-ecosystem in South-Western Nigeria and  
94 evaluate the propensity of oil extracts of *A. sativum*, *X. aethiopica* and *E. globolus* to  
95 prevent damage.

## 96 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

97 **Description of experimental site**

98 The study was carried out at Ekiti State University Teaching and Research Farms,  
99 Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria (7.6124° N and 5.2731° E), from November to December 2016  
100 and repeated between January and February 2017 during the dry season under  
101 irrigation system. The study area has an average temperature of 25 °C with wide  
102 fluctuations between day and night. The wet season is usually from April –October,  
103 with bimodal rainfall pattern which peaks in June and October, while the dry season  
104 is from November to March. The study area has a history of severe attacks on dry  
105 season amaranth.

106 **Land preparation and experimental design**

107 The land was cleared and plant debris were packed before the preparation of beds.  
108 The size of each bed was two square meter and a space of 0.5 m was left between  
109 the beds. The experiment was a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with  
110 three replications. Thus, the field consisted of nine blocks with three beds each, for  
111 the treatments and three additional blocks assigned to control. Three other separate  
112 blocks were created for the assessment of pest profiles. About 4 kg of poultry  
113 manure was spread on each bed and mixed with the top layer of the soil. Thereafter,  
114 the beds were irrigated, at least once in two days for a period of ten days to facilitate  
115 the decomposition of the poultry manure before sowing. Each block was about 10 m  
116 apart to eliminate the influence of a treatment over the other.

117 **Calculation of seed rate**

118 Crop Density, CD (=number of seeds to be sown per square meter) was determined  
119 by measuring the weight of seeds equivalent to an estimated value using the  
120 proposed formula for standardizing the seed rate of amaranth, Uwaidem and  
121 Borisade (2017b), here summarized.:  $E (g) = \frac{W}{NS} \times \frac{R}{1}$ , where  $E$  = Equivalent weight (g),

122  $W$ =Weight of 1 g amaranth seed,  $NS$  = Counted number of amaranth seed  $g^{-1}$ ,  $R$ =  
123 Required number of plants per bed. One seed of the amaranth used in the current  
124 study weighed 0.000441g. Thus, considering an approximate plant density of 500  
125 stands  $m^{-2}$ , 0.22 g of the amaranth seeds were sown on each bed.

#### 126 **Sowing and post-planting management**

127 Dry sand was passed through 0.5 mm mesh and 100 g of the fine sand was mixed  
128 with the seed for even seed distribution during sowing. A plastic container with a tight  
129 fitting lid (100 ml) was modified for sowing the seeds by creating pin-sized  
130 perforations (~ 0.5 mm) on the lid. The sand-seed mixture was poured into the  
131 plastic and used for broadcasting the seeds. The beds were watered as required  
132 using a Watering Can during afternoon periods until the amaranth was due for  
133 harvest.

#### 134 **Preparation of plant extracts.**

135 Five hundred grams of fresh bulbs of *A. sativum* and dry fruits of *X. aethiopica* were  
136 chopped manually using a knife and poured separately in one litre-glass jar with a  
137 tight fitting lid. Five hundred ml of vegetable oil was poured into each jar to submerge  
138 the contents and kept at  $-4^{\circ}C$  for one hour. Thereafter, the contents of the jar: (*X.*  
139 *aethiopica* fruits + vegetable oil) or (*A. sativum* bulbs + vegetable oil) were blended  
140 to form an oily paste. Fresh *E. globulus* leaves (500 g) were harvested in the  
141 morning and shredded using a knife. The sliced leaves were poured into one litre-  
142 glass jar and 500 ml vegetable oil was poured to cover the leaves. The glass jars  
143 were transferred into Microwave (Model LG i-wave, MS2021F). Microwaving was  
144 done at the Medium-High Power in three 10 minute-sessions, followed by 25 minutes  
145 power-off after each session. The oil was separated by vacuum filtration at  $4^{\circ}C$  and

146 stored in air tight bottles at 4°C. These were used as the stock plant extract in  
147 subsequent assays.

#### 148 **Assessment of pest profile and nature of damage**

149 Visual survey of insect pests on the amaranth was commenced at six days after  
150 sowing and this continued until maturity. Scheduled daily visits to the field was done  
151 in the morning (6:00-9:00 am), afternoon (12:00 noon-3:00 pm) and evening (6:00  
152 pm-8:00 pm), to scout for insect pests. Insect samples were collected and brought  
153 into the Agricultural Entomology Laboratory of the Crop Protection Unit, Faculty of  
154 Agricultural Sciences, Ekiti State University, Nigeria for identification. The nature of  
155 damage and severity of the activities of the pests were visually assessed on the  
156 plant. Camera shot of damage to foliage was processed into a JPEG picture  
157 presented as a photographic data. The pests were classified into three groups:  
158 Major, Minor and occasional pests, based on their occurrence, density and severity  
159 of damage to the crop.

#### 160 **Application of extracts and assessment of damage**

161 The plant extracts were randomly assigned to different blocks and the blocks were  
162 labelled. At ten days after sowing, 50 ml of the extract of each plant was mixed 200  
163 ml water. The resultant mixtures were emulsifiable without the addition of a  
164 surfactant. They were sprayed on the amaranth in each block using a hand operated  
165 Knapsack Sprayer until leaves were dripping. The control plots were sprayed with a  
166 mixture containing 50 ml vegetable oil + 200 ml distilled water. The spraying was  
167 repeated after five days and damage assessment was conducted at 24 days after  
168 sowing, when the leaf amaranth had reached the acceptable maturity standard for  
169 local market sales. Sampling to assess damage was done with a quadrat (Area = 20  
170 cm<sup>2</sup>) thrown randomly at five different positions on each bed and the total number of

171 stands of amaranth within the quadrat area as well as the damaged were counted.  
172 The criteria used for damage assessment was based on the local consumers  
173 acceptable quality standards for leaf amaranth and the reasons for rejection  
174 (Borisade and Uwaidem, 2017a). These were summarized: (a) amaranth stands  
175 showing 2-3 skeletonized leaves (b) the presence of insect faecal contamination or  
176 frass (c) signs of webbings and folded leaves. The recorded number of damaged  
177 amaranth stands within the quadrats were averaged and multiplied by the total area  
178 of the block. Thereafter, the value was expressed as a percentage of the total  
179 number of plants in a block:

180 
$$\text{Percentage damage per block} = \frac{\text{Number of damaged amaranth stands}}{\text{Estimated total number of amaranth per block}} \times \frac{100}{1}$$



## 181 RESULTS

### 182 Pest profile of *Amaranthus hybridus*

183 The pest profile of leaf amaranth within the single organic agro-ecosystem is shown  
184 in **Table 1**. Nine pests from three Orders: Orthoptera, Coleoptera and Lepidoptera  
185 were recorded during the first and the second amaranth production cycles. Only the  
186 adults of the majority of the Orthopterans, such as the Burrowing cricket  
187 (*Velarifictorus micado*), Slant-faced grasshopper (*Orphulella speciosa*), Variegated  
188 grasshopper (*Zonocerus variegatus*) and the Green-striped grasshopper  
189 (*Chortophaga viridifasciata*) occurred on the amaranth. Their frequency of  
190 occurrence was relatively low and they were few in number. Thus, they were  
191 classified as occasional pests, causing non-economically important damage in the  
192 current evaluation. The nymphs and adults of the Angle-winged katydid  
193 (*Microcentrum rhombifolium*), occurred frequently on the amaranth and they were  
194 found voraciously feeding on the leaves causing potentially economic damage. It  
195 was therefore classified as a major pest. Actively flying adults of two types of moth,  
196 *Psara basal*is and the beet webworm moth (*Spoladea recurvalis*) as well as their  
197 larvae occurred at all the sampling periods. The adults of these lepidopterans  
198 occurred most frequently in the evening while a few was found resting under the  
199 leaves during the day. The larvae were voracious feeders and they were responsible  
200 for the most significant damage to the leaves (**Figure 1**).

### 201 Assessment of damage and performance rating of extracts.

202 **Table 2**. shows the mean percentage damage (MPD) to the leafs of *A. hybridus*  
203 sprayed with emulsifiable oil extracts of *X. aethiopica*, *A. sativum* and *E. globolus* at  
204 5, 10 and 15 days after application. There were significant variabilities (P=0.014) in

205 **Table 1. Pest profile of *Amaranthus hybridus* within a single organic system in Southwestern Nigeria**

206

<b>Common name</b>	<b>Scientific name</b>	<b>Order</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>Recorded life stage responsible for damage</b>	<b>Pest status (Based on occurrence, numbers &amp; crop damage activities)</b>
Angle-Wing Katydid	<i>Microcentrum rhombifolium</i> (Sauss.)	Orthoptera	Tettigoniidae	Adult and Nymph	Potential/Major
Crickets	<i>Velarifictorus micado</i> (Sauss.)	Orthoptera	Gryllidae	Adult	Occasional/Minor
Green stripped grasshopper	<i>Chortophaga viridifasciata</i> (De Geer)	Orthoptera	Acrididae	Adult	Occasional/Minor
Slant-faced grasshopper	<i>Orphulella speciosa</i> (Scudder)	Orthoptera	Acrididae	Adult	Minor
Variigated grasshopper	<i>Zonocerus variagatus</i> (L.)	Orthoptera	Pyrgomorphidae	Adult	Occasional/Minor
Darkling beetle	<i>Lagria villosa</i> (Fabr.)	Coleoptera	Lagriidae	Adult	Occasional/Minor
Moth	<i>Psara basalis</i> (Walker)	Lepidoptera	Crambidae	Larvae	Major
Beet web worm	<i>Spoladea recurvalis</i> (L.)	Lepidoptera	Crambidae	Larvae	Major

207

208 **Table 2. Mean percentage damage to *Amaranthus hybridus* treated with oil**  
 209 **extracts of *X. aethiopica*, *A. sativum* and *E. globolus***

FIRST TRIAL				
Days after treatment	<i>X. aethiopica</i>	<i>A. sativum</i>	<i>E. globolus</i>	Control (Vegetable oil)
5	4.28 <sup>a</sup>	1.19 <sup>a</sup>	1.23 <sup>a</sup>	25.37 <sup>b</sup>
10	9.59 <sup>a,b</sup>	25.26 <sup>a,c</sup>	3.94 <sup>b</sup>	41.27 <sup>c</sup>
15	10.19 <sup>a,b</sup>	8.01 <sup>a</sup>	14.00 <sup>a,b</sup>	31.42 <sup>b</sup>
SECOND TRIAL				
Days after treatment	<i>X. aethiopica</i>	<i>A. sativum</i>	<i>E. globolus</i>	Control (Vegetable oil)
5	2.38 <sup>a</sup>	4.76 <sup>a</sup>	3.51 <sup>a</sup>	30.69 <sup>b</sup>
10	6.80 <sup>a</sup>	35.00 <sup>b</sup>	10.32 <sup>a</sup>	32.24 <sup>b</sup>
15	16.30 <sup>a</sup>	18.75 <sup>a</sup>	13.57 <sup>a</sup>	54.88 <sup>b</sup>

210

211 Values in the same row and sub-table not sharing the same superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  in the two-sided test of equality  
 212 for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise  
 213 comparisons within a row of each innermost sub-table using the Bonferroni correction



214

215 **Figure 1. Characteristic damage caused by Lepidopteran pests of *Amaranth*,**

216 ***Psara basalis* and *Spoladea recurvalis***

217 the MPD in relation to the extracts as well as the sampling periods. The MPD in the  
218 control was significantly the highest in the first and the second trials. At 5 days post-  
219 treatment during the first field trial, the MPD recorded in the *X. aethiopica*-, *A.*  
220 *sativum*- and *E. globolus*-treated plots were not significantly different, being 4.28%,  
221 1.19% and 1.23% respectively, while the MPD in the control plot was 25.37%. The  
222 effect of these extracts were also not significantly different in the second trial at five  
223 days post treatment (MPD in treatment, 8.49-19.5%; MPD in control=30.69%). At 10  
224 days and 15 days post-treatment, the MPD in the *X. aethiopica*-treated plots were  
225 not significantly higher, 9.59 % and 10.19% respectively in the first trial. The lowest  
226 MPD were recorded in the *X. aethiopica*- and *A. sativum*- treated plots at 15 days in  
227 the first trial being, 10.19% and 8.01% respectively and without statistically  
228 significant difference. However, significantly higher MPD were recorded in the control  
229 at these sampling periods and the values were 31.42% and 54.88% respectively.

230 Based on the pooled values of MPD recorded at the three sampling periods in the  
231 two successive trials, the extracts were grouped according to their overall  
232 performance using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) (Table 3). The  
233 performances of *E. globolus* and *X. aethiopica* were comparable and they were  
234 relatively more effective in protecting *A. hybridus* against phytophagous pest attacks.

235

236 **Table 3. Ranking of oil extracts of *X. aethiopica*, *A. sativum* and *E. globolus***  
 237 **based on the mean percentage damage recorded on treated *Amaranthus***  
 238 ***hybridus*.**

Tukey's HSD <sup>a,b</sup>	Plant Extracts	N	Subset		
			1	2	3
	<i>E. globolus</i>	18	7.7617		
	<i>X. aethiopica</i>	18	8.2556		
	<i>A. Sativum</i>	18		15.4956	
	Control	18			35.9778
	Sig.		.997	1.000	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed based on observed means.  
 The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 52.881.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 18.000.

b. Alpha = .05.

239

## 240 **DISCUSSION**

241 The study has described the pest profile of leaf amaranth within a single organic  
 242 agro-ecosystem, where 63% of the recorded pests were Orthopterans, 25% were  
 243 Lepidopterans belonging to the Family Crambidae and 13% Coleoptera. The range  
 244 of pests being reported are among those described in earlier studies in other parts of  
 245 Southwestern Nigeria (Ezeh et al., 2015; Oke et al., 2015) except the Darkling beetle  
 246 which has not been widely associated with leaf amaranth. Leaf amaranth pests  
 247 within a single organic agro-ecological region was evaluated in this study and it is  
 248 expected that the pest profile of crops in agro-ecological regions that share  
 249 resemblances in temperature, humidity, vegetation patterns and cropping systems  
 250 would be similar.

251 Biodiversity of insects pests associated with indigenous leaf amaranth species in  
252 Nigeria is increasing (Oke et al., 2015). It is therefore useful to update data on  
253 profiles of major vegetable crops from time to time, in order to identify new pests  
254 which are getting adapted to new crops. Such data would be clearly necessary in the  
255 development of pro-active pest response systems to militate against an outbreak. In  
256 many earlier studies, insects were recorded as pests on amaranth by virtue of their  
257 occurrence, while the levels of damage caused by each pest was often ignored  
258 (Banjo et al., 2003; Oke et al., 2015). The presence of an insect pest on a crop may  
259 not adequately indicate its status and justify its classification as economically  
260 important under a given cropping condition. The recorded pests in this report were  
261 classified into Occasional, Minor, Potential and Major pests using characteristics of  
262 damage on the crop (feeding patterns) to identify activities of individual pests or  
263 groups and visual evaluation of the levels of damage to establish the severity of  
264 attack. It is useful to identify the specific economically important pests that could be  
265 potential targets of a pest control programme. However, the status of a given pest  
266 may change under different cropping systems, climate and human related  
267 environmental perturbations.

268 Incidentally, the insects classified as major pests in this study comprised those  
269 breeding on the amaranth. The results suggested that economically important pests  
270 of amaranth are essentially those that are capable of breeding on the crop or at a  
271 proximity to the crop and capable of completing their life cycle or reaching their  
272 pestiferous life-stage before the host plant is due for harvest, except where migrant  
273 pests are probably involved. Attack on crops can be much severe when more than  
274 one of the life-stages of the pest are responsible for damage, such as the Katydid or  
275 when the habit of the pest inflict qualitative damage in addition to quantitative losses

276 caused by their direct feeding. For example, contamination of leaves with frass,  
277 webblings and excrements was peculiar to *S. recurvalis* and *P. basalis*. Different  
278 instar larvae and adults of the two Lepidopterans-*P. basalis* and *S. recurvalis* were  
279 present, indicating their breeding on the amaranth and they were responsible for the  
280 most significant damage whereas, mainly the adults of the Orthopterans and the  
281 Coleopteran were found on the amaranth. Similar reports on the pest status of *P.*  
282 *basalis* and *S. recurvalis* showed they are serious pests of leaf amaranth in different  
283 agro-ecological regions in Nigeria and other parts of West Africa (James et al.,  
284 2010).

285 The oil extracts of the three plants significantly reduced vegetative damage to *A.*  
286 *hybridus* compared to the control and the results have demonstrated their potentials  
287 for use in the management of vegetable pests at the level of subsistent farming. The  
288 method of extraction described can be applied to other plants with volatile bioactive  
289 components. The three plant materials contain volatile bioactive substances, which  
290 may potentially be lost depending on the method of extraction used. Deep freezing of  
291 the plant materials before milling and reduction processes was done to minimize  
292 adverse effect of temperature during milling on loss of heat-labile, volatile  
293 constituents. Direct blending of the plant materials with vegetable oil was also done  
294 to trap oil-soluble volatiles during the milling process.

295 The levels of damage recorded at five days post-application of the three extracts  
296 were not significantly different statistically. However, between 5-10 days post-  
297 treatment, the MPD increased significantly where *A. sativum* extract was applied.  
298 Abiotic interactions (temperature, UV and relative humidity) (Kumar and Poehling,  
299 2006) are capable of influencing persistence of organic pesticides rapidly, through  
300 their effects on evaporation and chemical decomposition in the field, indirectly



301 affecting overall efficacy. This may be responsible for the increased damage  
302 recorded during sampling at 10 days post-treatment.

303 Insect pests are known to locate their hosts through visual and olfactory cues (Bruce  
304 et al., 2005) and plant extracts with strong odour may interfere with the capability of  
305 pests to accurately locate their targets. However, when the effect of the odour of the  
306 plant extracts subside, there are possibilities that more pests would successfully  
307 locate their food source. It may also be possible that the extracts were toxic to some  
308 of the pests or offered some antixenosis resistance to the plant- that probably  
309 diminished over time. More studies are needed in the development of stable  
310 formulations capable of yielding consistent results under a dynamic or marginal  
311 abiotic influences in the field.

312 The extracted plants; *X. aethiopica*, *A. sativum* and *E. globolus* have been applied  
313 into various uses in folk medicine, pharmacy as well as food components (Konning  
314 et al., 2004; Tattelman, 2005). Although concentrations of these plant materials that  
315 may be toxic to humans are yet to be established and the amounts detectable on  
316 treated plants have not been evaluated, they are not expected to cause bio-toxicity  
317 or environmental contamination problems when applied on edible vegetables. They  
318 can be considered as relatively safe compared with inorganic pesticides.

### 319 **Conclusion**

320 This study compared the effect of the extracts at a single dose and the MPD to the  
321 treated plants over time was used to assess efficacy. More studies are needed to  
322 quantify the actual concentrations of bio-active constituents in the plant materials.  
323 The effects of the extracts against each of the identified pests need to be studied  
324 separately, to evaluate their modes of action, including repellency, toxicity to adults

325 and developmental stages and antixenosis effects. However, the current results are  
326 useful primary information in the design of further *invitro* and field studies.

327 References

- 328 Akan, J. C., Jafiya, L., Mohammed, Z., & Abdulrahman, F. I. (2013).  
329 Organophosphorus pesticide residues in vegetables and soil samples  
330 from Alau Dam and Gongulong agricultural areas, Borno State, Nigeria.  
331 *Ecosystems*, 3, 6.
- 332 Akubugwo, I. E., Obasi, N. A., Chinyere, G. C., & Ugbogu, A. E. (2007). Nutritional  
333 and chemical value of *Amaranthus hybridus* L. leaves from Afikpo,  
334 Nigeria. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 6(24).
- 335 Banjo, A. D., Lawal, O. A., Fapojuwo, O. E., & Songonuga, E. A. (2003). Farmer's  
336 knowledge and perception of horticultural insect pest problems in  
337 Southwestern Nigeria. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 2(11), 434-437.
- 338 Bruce, T. J., Wadhams, L. J., & Woodcock, C. M. (2005). Insect host location: a  
339 volatile situation. *Trends in plant science*, 10(6), 269-274.
- 340 Ebadollahi, A., Sendi, J. J., Maroufpoor, M., & Rahimi-Nasrabadi, M. (2017).  
341 Acaricidal Potentials of the Terpene-rich Essential Oils of Two Iranian  
342 Eucalyptus Species against *Tetranychus urticae* Koch. *Journal of Oleo*  
343 *Science*, ess15258.
- 344 Emokaro, C. O., Ekunwe, P. A., & Osifo, A. (2007). Profitability and production  
345 constraints in dry season amaranth production in Edo South, Nigeria.  
346 *Journal of Food Agriculture and Environment*, 5(3/4), 281.
- 347 Ezeh, A. E., Ogedegbe, A. B. O., & Ogedegbe, S. A. (2015). Insect Pest occurrence  
348 on Cultivated Amaranthus Spp in Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. *Journal*  
349 *of Applied Sciences and Environmental Management*, 19(2), 335-339.
- 350 Huang, Y., Chen, S. X., & Ho, S. H. (2000). Bioactivities of methyl allyl disulfide and  
351 diallyl trisulfide from essential oil of garlic to two species of stored-product

352 pests, *Sitophilus zeamais* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) and *Tribolium*  
353 *castaneum* (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae). *Journal of economic*  
354 *entomology*, 93(2), 537-543.

355 James, B., Atcha-Ahowé, C., Godonou, I., Baimey, H., Goergen, H., Sikirou, R., &  
356 Toko, M. (2010). *Integrated pest management in vegetable production: A*  
357 *guide for extension workers in West Africa*. IITA.

358 James, B., Atcha-Ahowé, C., Godonou, I., Baimey, H., Goergen, H., Sikirou, R., &  
359 Toko, M. (2010). *Integrated pest management in vegetable production: A*  
360 *guide for extension workers in West Africa*. IITA.

361 Joseph, A., Ademiluyi, B. O., Aluko, P. A., & Alabeni, T. M. (2016). Effect of poultry  
362 manure treated and untreated with effective microorganisms on growth  
363 performance and insect pest infestation on *Amaranthus hybridus*. *African*  
364 *Journal of Plant Science*, 10(1), 10-15.

365 Konning, G. H., Agyare, C., & Ennison, B. (2004). Antimicrobial activity of some  
366 medicinal plants from Ghana. *Fitoterapia*, 75(1), 65-67.

367 Kouninki, H., Hance, T., Noudjou, F. A., Lognay, G., Malaisse, F., Ngassoum, M. B.,  
368 ... & Haubruge, E. (2007). Toxicity of some terpenoids of essential oils of  
369 *Xylopi aethiopica* from Cameroon against *Sitophilus zeamais*  
370 Motschulsky. *Journal of Applied Entomology*, 131(4), 269-274.

371 Kumar, P., & Poehling, H. M. (2006). Persistence of soil and foliar azadirachtin  
372 treatments to control sweetpotato whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* Gennadius  
373 (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae) on tomatoes under controlled (laboratory) and  
374 field (netted greenhouse) conditions in the humid tropics. *Journal of Pest*  
375 *Science*, 79(4), 189.

- 376 Moshi, A. P., & Matoju, I. (2017). The status of research on and application of  
377 biopesticides in Tanzania. Review. *Crop Protection*, 92, 16-28.
- 378 Oke, O. A., Odiyi, C. A., & Ofuya, T. I. (2015). Insects associated with underutilized  
379 crop: grain, leafy and ornamental amaranth in Ibadan, Nigeria. *J Agric*  
380 *Ecol Res Int*, 2(2), 145-155.
- 381 Ormeno, E., Goldstein, A., & Niinemets, Ü. (2011). Extracting and trapping biogenic  
382 volatile organic compounds stored in plant species. *TrAC Trends in*  
383 *Analytical Chemistry*, 30(7), 978-989.
- 384 Tattelman, E. (2005). Health effects of garlic. *Am Fam Physician*, 72(1), 103-106.