## Activities of some Ethnobotanicals from North East Nigeria, against Culicine mosquitoes

#### **ABSTRACT**

Mosquito borne diseases are the major cause of economic loss due to high morbidity and mortality in Africa. Elimination of culicine vectors using ethnobotanical extracts is one of the best methods for controlling mosquitodiseases. borne The methanolic petroleum ether extracts and Azadirachtaindica(neem), Hyptissuaveolens(bush tea), Eucarlyptus globulus (pole wire), Citrus senensis (orange), and Ocimumkilimanscharicum(bush scent leaf), were investigated for their effectiveness in control of subfamilies Culicidaemosquitoes' larvae from June 2017 to October 2017. The results showed that the mortality is concentration dependent. Mortality was recorded for both methanol and petroleum ether extracts. Higher mortalities were observed in the methanolic extracts than petroleum ether extracts. The different plant extracts showed high significant differences (p< 0.05) to each other. Hyptissuaveolens proved to be the most effective treatment agent with 100% mortality observed at both 150ppm and 200ppm. The present study has demonstrated larvicidal effects, and the effects were extended pupae emerged from the different treatment which led to the low adult emergence as compared to the control.

# Key words: Larvicidal, Pupicidal, Ethnobotanicals, Culicine mosquito, Methanol, petroleum ether INTRODUCTION

Mosquitoes are the most important insect group in terms of public health importance(Ito et al., 2015). They transmit several numbers of infectious disease like malaria, filariasis, Dengue, Zika virus, Encephalitis, and others, causing millions of deaths every year (Arivoli, 2011), as also reported by Michigan mosquito control organization (MMCO, 2013). Eliminating the vectors of the diseases is an important step in the control of diseases. In time past synthetic pesticides have been developed and effectively used to eliminate mosquitoes and other storage pests (Ito and Utebor, 2018). However, the management of these disease vectors using chemical pesticides has partially failed, due to their efficiency in attaining physiological resistance (Elumalai, *et al.*, 2015). In addition, the application of such chemicals has resulted in long-term harmful effects on non-target organism and other environmental component (Patel, *et al.*, 2012). Most of the mosquito control programs target larval stage in breeding sites, since adulticides may only reduce the adult population temporary (El-Hag, *et al.*, 2001). The conventional chemical method employed for this purpose includes insecticides, insect's growth regulators (IGRs), juvenile hormone compounds (Hariral*et al.*, 2015). In addition, botanical products have been used traditionally by human communities and its application

is easy. They are highly biodegradable and are considered as the safest methods for insects pest control (Ito and Ighere, 2017) and vectors (Ito et al, 2015) These plants are rich source of novel natural substances that can be used to develop environmental safe methods for insect control (Mandal, 2012). In recent time, chemicals derived fromplants, fungus and nanoparticles from biological originshave been projected as weapons of future mosquito control programs as they are shown to be ecological friendly, biodegradable, cheaper, target specific and low toxicity to non-target organisms (Vivekanandhanet al., 2018a, b, c, d e). Moreover, plant-basedproducts are mostly non-toxic to humans and other animals and have a high degree of biodegradable. Botanical can be used as an alternative to synthetic insecticides or along with other insecticides vector control programs. In view of the increasing interest in developing plant-based insecticides as an alternative to chemical insecticides the present study was undertaken to assess the larvicidal potential of the methanol and petroleum ether extracts and their extended effects on the pupae that emerged from the treated larvae.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Study Area

Plants [Azadirachtaindica(neem),Hyptissuaveolens(bush tea), Eucarlyptus globulus (pole wire), Citrus senensis (orange), and Ocimumkilimanscharicum(bush scent leaf)] material were collected from the study areas in June – July 2014 in five states of the north eastern region, Nigeria. The area is situated at latitude 9.082 and longitude 8.6753 andit is about 840KM from the age of the Sahara Desert and 475.5 meters above sea level. It falls within the Sudan savannah zone. The area is large and shares boundary with two other Nigerian geopolitical zones (north central and north western region) and also shares boundary with two (2) countries, including Cameroon, Chad.

### **Selection of Plant Material**

For this study, a survey was carried out and five (5) plant species were selected from the states of North-eastern region (Adamawa, Borno, Gombe and Taraba) of Nigeria, and their organic molecules were extracted and tested against larval and adult mosquitoes. Twenty people were interview from each Local Government Area, for the types of plants and parts of plants that were in use against mosquitoes in the localities. Three local government areas from each state, one from each

geopolitical zone were covered. Plant selection in the study area, were based on interviewing members of the community to specify the indigenous plant species known for their use in the regular control of mosquitoes and other insects in their localities. This species of plants was selected because of their popularity among the local and were ranked following the application of weighted criteria as described by Kweka*etal.*, (2008). The plants were further selected by combining the ethno botanical leads and chemotaxonomic evidence (popularity of plants already used as insecticides by local people and documented evidence of insecticidal constituents in the family to which the candidate species belongs.

#### **Collection of Plant Materials**

Fresh leaves, fruit peels and whole plants were collected in study area and identified at the Federal University Lokoja herbarium. The plants materials were shade dried, pounded into powdered form using mortar and pestle and stored in air tied polytene bags for soxhlet extraction. The extraction of oil with methanol and petroleum ether were done using soxhlet extractor.

#### 3.4 Extraction of crude extracts

Clean boiling flasks (250ml) were dried in the Oven at 110°c for about 30 minutes. Then transferred into desiccators and allowed to cool. About hundred grams each of the pulverized and air-dried plants powder weighed separately into extractor. The flask was filled with 200ml of Methanol, then the extractor plugged tightly with cotton wool. The soxhlet apparatus were then assembled to allow for reflux for about 6hours. After six hours, the thimbles containing the sample were removed with care and the methanol and petroleum ether drained into the various containers for re-use. The various plants extract for both methanol and petroleum ether extracts were concentrated using water bath which removes the methanol and petroleum ether component living behind only the components of the various extracts, which were used for toxicity bioassay (Amusanet. al., 2005).

Mosquitoes collection and taxonomy.....

## TOXICITY BIOASSAY

Third instar larvae were collected from the rice fields and some natural water bodies in Yola, Adamawa State, Nigeria. Larvicidal bioassay was also carried out in insectary prepared for the course of this study in Yola, Adamawa State.One milliliter of various plant extracts was measured and emulsified with 3 drops of Tween . \*80 from a needle tip. The emulsified was made up to 1 liter with distilled water to form 1000ppm stock solutions. For all the stock solutions, serial concentration was prepared. The ranges start from 50ppm, 100ppm, 150ppm, 200ppm. From each concentration, 250ml of all extracts was measured and introduce into separate labeled 500ml of specimen bottles. Twenty3<sup>rd</sup>instars larvae of Culicine mosquitoes were introduced to each beaker. Each treatment had five replicates. Mortality served as the end point of the test and result were used to determine the potential efficacy of the various plant extracts. Larva was considered death if there was no moving or no response to gentle probing with a fine glass rod three times, 10 second each. Mortalities were recorded at after 36 hours post treatment for the various plant extracts and the control (only distilled water).

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine significant differences between the mortality mean values, using Duncan multiple range test. Then LC50 and LC90 values were obtained through use of probit analysis.

#### RESULT

#### Culicine Mosquito Species found during the study

**Table 1,** reveals that 1000 mosquito samples identified, were belong to five genera, *Aedes*500(50%), *Culex*350(350%), *Mansoni africanus*146(14.6%) and *Toxorhynchites* 4(0.4%). Mosquito abundance in relation to species showed, that *Aedes aegypti* 500(30.9%) proved to be the most abundant genus in study area, followed by *Culex* quinquefasiatus 231(23.1%). The least genus observed, was *Toxorhynchites* 4(0.4%)

# Effects of Methanol Extracts on Culicine Development

The biological activity of the methanol and petroleum ether extracts of north eastern ethno-botanicals against the third instar larvae of *Culicine* mosquitoes have been studied. The biological activities included the *larvicidal*, pupal emergency rate, pupal mortality and adult emergence rate. Table 2, shows the biological activities of methanol extracts of ethno-botanicals against the 3<sup>rd</sup> instar larvae of *culicine*. Complete larval mortality (100%) was observed at the higher concentrations (150ppm and 200ppm) of *Hyptis suaveolens* and neem seed extracts (200ppm). The Table also depicts that mortality increased with increase in concentration from 50 -200ppm. The result showed that *H. suaveolens* proved to be the most effective treatment agent used during the experiment and no pupation (0.0%) was observed.

Comment [C1]: Check the table 1! Whether the value is 500 or 309

Comment [C2]: Emergency or emergence?

Formatted: Font color: Red

The effects of methanol extracts were also extended to the pupal stage, and therefore the adult emergence was also affected in all concentrations used, as compared to the control groups. The neem seed, neem stem, *O.killimanscharikum, Hyptissuaveolens and E. gloublus were* showed high percentage of mortalities of 68% or more at 100ppm (Table 2). Neem leaf extract showed 71% at 150ppm. The least among the plant extracts was the orange peels that showed 50% lethality only at the highest concentration (200ppm). A remarkable reduction in adult emergence was observed, at 200ppm of *Hyptissuaveolens*, Neem seeds, *E. globulus*, neem stem and O. *kilimanscharikum*, with percentage emergence of 0%, 0%, 1%, 5%, and 10% respectively. Orange peels and neem leaf proved to be less effective for adult emergence with 47% and 29% respectively.

Table 1: Mosquito Species Abundance in Yola

Mosquito species	Number (%)	100	
1. 1	(11)	Total number (%)	
Aedes aegypti	309(30.9)	500(50)	
Aedes albopictus	191(19.1)		
Culex quiquefasciatus	231(23.1)	350(35)	
Culex fatigans	119(11.9)		
Mansoni africanus	100(10)	146(14.6)	
Toxorhynchites	4(0.4)	4(0.4)	

Key: %= percentage

Table 2: Effects of Methanol Extracts on Culicine Development

Plants	Conc. Levels (PPM)	Larval Mortality %	Pupation %	Pupal mortality (%)	Total mortality %	Adult Emergency %
NS	50	36	64	4	40	60
	100	90	10	3	93	7
	150	93	7	3	96	4
	200	100	-	-	-	-
	Control	0	100	0	0	100
NST	50	20	80	6	26	74
	100	72	28	4	76	24
	150	81	19	0	81	19

Comment [C3]: Emergence!

NL   SO   10   90   0   10   90   95   15   100   48   52   150   67   33   30   67   33   200   71   29   98   0   2   98   0   2   98   0   0   10   0   0   0   0   0   0							
NL       50       10       90       0       10       90         100       48       52       0       48       52         150       67       33       0       67       33         200       71       29       0       71       29         Control       2       98       0       2       98         OK       50       18       82       3       21       79         100       68       32       0       68       32         150       79       21       0       79       21         200       90       10       0       90       10         Control       8       92       0       8       92         OP       50       35       65       0       35       65         100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92          HS       50       50				5	0		
100		Control	5	95	0	5	95
100	NI.	50	10	90	0	10	90
150	1112						
200       71       29       0       71       29         Control       2       98       0       2       98         OK       50       18       82       3       21       79         100       68       32       0       68       32         150       79       21       0       79       21         200       90       10       0       90       10         Control       8       92       0       8       92         OP       50       35       65       0       35       65         100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92          HS       50       50       50       8       58       42         100       70       30       4       74       24         150       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0							
Control         2         98         0         2         98           OK         50         18         82         3         21         79           100         68         32         0         68         32           150         79         21         0         79         21           200         90         10         0         90         10           Control         8         92         0         8         92           OP         50         35         65         0         35         65           100         40         60         0         40         60           150         45         55         3         48         52           200         50         50         3         53         47           Control         0         0         8         8         92           HS         50         50         50         8         58         42           100         70         30         4         74         24           150         100         0         0         100         -           200							
OK       50       18       82       3       21       79         100       68       32       0       68       32         150       79       21       0       79       21         200       90       10       0       90       10         Control       8       92       0       8       92         OP       50       35       65       0       35       65         100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92          HS       50       50       50       8       58       42         100       70       30       4       74       24         150       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0							
100       68       32       0       68       32         150       79       21       0       79       21         200       90       10       0       90       10         Control       8       92       0       8       92         OP       50       35       65       0       35       65         100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92          HS       50       50       50       8       58       42         100       70       30       4       74       24         150       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         200       0       100       0		Control	2	70	O	2	70
100       68       32       0       68       32         150       79       21       0       79       21         200       90       10       0       90       10         Control       8       92       0       8       92         OP       50       35       65       0       35       65         100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92          HS       50       50       50       8       58       42         100       70       30       4       74       24         150       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         200       0       100       0	OK	50	18	82	3	21	79
150				32			32
200       90       10       0       90       10         Control       8       92       0       8       92         OP       50       35       65       0       35       65         100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92         HS       50       50       50       8       58       42         100       70       30       4       74       24         150       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         Control       0       100       0       0       100         EG       50       48       52       8       56       44		150			0		
Control         8         92         0         8         92           OP         50         35         65         0         35         65           100         40         60         0         40         60           150         45         55         3         48         52           200         50         50         3         53         47           Control         0         0         8         8         92           HS         50         50         50         8         58         42           100         70         30         4         74         24           150         100         0         0         100         -           200         100         0         0         100         -           Control         0         100         0         0         100           EG         50         48         52         8         56         44			90		0	90	
OP       50       35       65       0       35       65         100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92         HS       50       50       50       8       58       42         100       70       30       4       74       24         150       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         Control       0       100       0       0       100         EG       50       48       52       8       56       44		Control	8	92	0	8	92
100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92         HS       50       50       50       8       58       42         100       70       30       4       74       24         150       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         Control       0       100       0       0       100         EG       50       48       52       8       56       44							
100       40       60       0       40       60         150       45       55       3       48       52         200       50       50       3       53       47         Control       0       0       8       8       92         HS       50       50       50       8       58       42         100       70       30       4       74       24         150       100       0       0       100       -         200       100       0       0       100       -         Control       0       100       0       0       100         EG       50       48       52       8       56       44	OP	50	35	65	0	35	65
200     50     50     3     53     47       Control     0     0     8     8     92       HS     50     50     50     8     58     42       100     70     30     4     74     24       150     100     0     0     100     -       200     100     0     0     100     -       Control     0     100     0     0     100       EG     50     48     52     8     56     44		100	40	60	0	40	60
Control 0 0 8 8 92  HS 50 50 50 8 58 42 100 70 30 4 74 24 150 100 0 0 100 - 200 100 0 0 100 - Control 0 100 0 0 100  EG 50 48 52 8 56 44			45	55			
HS 50 50 50 8 58 42 100 70 30 4 74 24 150 100 0 0 100 - 200 100 0 0 100 - Control 0 100 0 0 0 100 5 66 50 48 52 8 56 44		200	50	50			47
100 70 30 4 74 24 150 100 0 0 100 - 200 100 0 0 100 - Control 0 100 0 0 100  EG 50 48 52 8 56 44		Control	0	0	8	8	92
100 70 30 4 74 24 150 100 0 0 100 - 200 100 0 0 100 - Control 0 100 0 0 100  EG 50 48 52 8 56 44							
150 100 0 100 - 200 100 0 100 - Control 0 100 0 0 100  EG 50 48 52 8 56 44	HS						
200 100 0 100 - Control 0 100 0 0 100  EG 50 48 52 8 56 44							24
Control 0 100 0 0 100 EG 50 48 52 8 56 44					0		-
EG 50 48 52 8 56 44							-
		Control	0	100	0	0	100
	EG	50	48	52	8	56	44
100 45 5 48 7	LG	100	95		3	98	2
100 95 5 3 98 2 150 98 2 1 99 1				2			
200 99 1 0 99 1							
Control 0 100 0 0 100							

No. of larvae tested = 100; Replication =5; Conc. Level = Concentration levels, ppm= part per million -= all insects dead Keys: HS = Hyptissuaveolens, OP = orange peels, OK = Occimumkilimanscharikum, EG = Eucarlyptus globulus, NS = neem seed, NST = neem stem, NL = neem leaf.

# Larvicidal Effects of Methanol Extract on 3<sup>rd</sup>Instar Larvae of Culicine

The mean percentage mortality in Figure 1 shows significant differences among the treatment agents within the groups. The control showed no significant difference among the group. The treated larvae showed significant differences (P < 0.05) among all the treatment doses.

The results, showed that, the lower the concentration, the lower the mortality and the higher the concentration the higher the mortality. All the larvae treated with 50 to 200ppm doses showed significant differences (P < 0.05) among

all the treatment agents used during the experiment. The Neem seed extract (20) and *H. suaveolens* (20) showed highest effectiveness with 100% mortality at 200ppm followed by means of *E. globulus* (19.8), neem stem extract (19) and *O. kilimanscharicum*(18). *H. suaveolens* (10) and *E. globulus* (10) proved to be the most effective treatment agents used at 50ppm dose, followed by neem seed (7.2) extract and orange peels (7.0) extracts, while neem leaves (2.0) proved to be the most ineffective treatment agent. *E. gloublus* (19) extracts and neem seed (18) prove to be the most effective treatment agents used at 100ppm followed by Neem stem (14.4) extracts, *H. suaveolens* (14.0) and *O. kilimanscharicum* (13.6).

# Effects of Petroleum Ether Extracts on Culicine Development

Table 3 shows the biological effects of petroleum ether extracts of ethno-botanical used against third instar larvae of *culicine*. The highest mortality percentage (100%) was recorded at the higher concentration levels (150 and 200ppm) of *H. suaveolens* and the lowest mortality percentage (20%) was observed at the lowest concentration levels (50ppm) of orange peels. The pupation percentage of treated larvae are far much lower than the pupation of the untreated larvae. The pupation is concentration dependent. The total larval and pupal mortality percent were 50%, 60%, 100% and 100% at 50, 100, 150 and 200ppm of *H. suaveolens* respectively, as compared to 0.00% for the non-treated group.




Figure 1: Larvicidal Effects of methanol Extracts on 3<sup>rd</sup> Instar Larvae of Culicine

Table 3: Effects of Petroleum Ether Extracts on Culicine Development

Names	Conc. levels		Pupation	pupal	Total	Adult
	(PPM)	Mortality	%	mortality	mortality %	Emergency
		%		(%)		%
NS	50	32	78	0	32	68
	100	40	60	0	40	60
	150	70	30	5	75	25
4	200	76	24	6	82	18
	Control	0	100	0	0	100
NST	50	27	73	1	28	72
4	100	30	69	2	32	68
	150	45	55	3	48	52
	200	86	14	5	91	9
	Control	0	100	0	0	100
NL	50	22	78	1	23	77
	100	29	71	0	29	71
	150	49	51	3	52	48
	200	58	42	1	59	41

Comment [C4]: Emergence!

	Control	2.0	98	0	2.	98
OK	50	34	66	4	38	62
	100	40	60	5	45	55
	150	70	30	6	76	24
	200	82	18	10	92	8
	Control	3	97	0	3	97
OP	50	20	80	0	20	80
	100	50	50	4	54	46
	150	60	40	0	60	40
	200	70	30	0	70	30
	Control	0	100	0	0	100
HS	50	42	58	8	50	50
	100	50	50	10	60	40
	150	100	-	- 4	100	-
	200	100	-	-	100	-
	Control	0	100	00	0	100
EG	50	23	77	0	23	77
	100	31	69	0 5 7	36	64
	150	35	65	7	42	58
	200	50	50	10	60	40
	Control	0	100	0	0	100

No. of larvae tested = 100; Replication =5; Conc. Level = Concentration levels, ppm= part per million -= all insects dead Keys: HS = Hyptissuaveolens, OP = orange peels, OK = Occimumkilimanscharikum, EG = Eucarlyptus globulus, NS = neem seed, NST = neem stem, NL = neem leaf.

# Larvicidal Effects of Petroleum ether Extract on 3<sup>rd</sup>Instar Larvae of Culicine

The data presented in figure 2, are the mean values of mortality of *culicine*mosquitoes larvae due to the effects of various of plant extracts of petroleum ether that were tested against the  $3^{rd}$  instar larvae. The control column shows no significant differences among the treatment. The doses showed significant differences (p< 0.05) among themselves. The figure reveals that 50ppm showed significant difference (p< 0.05) among the different extracts and had the lowest means of mortality when compared to other doses used during the experiment, with *H. suaveolens*(8.4) being the most effective treatment agent at this dose. Treatments of 100ppm showed significant difference (p < 0.01) within themselves and *H. suaveolens* (10.4) had the highest mean mortality and neem leaf (5.8) had the least mortality mean at the dose. Treatment of 150ppm showed significant difference (p< 0.001) within themselves and same as 200ppm dose. *Hyptissuaveolens* (20) proved to be the most effective treatment agent followed by neem stem extracts (17.2), neem seed extracts (15) and *O. kilimanscharikum*(16.4) The figure also

depicts that the mean values of 200ppm had the highest mortality means of 15, 17.2, 11.6, 16.4, 13.6, 20 and 10 for Neem seed, neem stem, neem leaves, *O. kilimanscharikum*, orange peels, *H. suaveolens* and *E. globulus* respectively, and higher than lower concentration levels.




Figure 2: Larvicidal Effects of Petroleum Ether Extract on 3<sup>rd</sup>Instar Larvae of Culicine

Effects of solvent used in extraction of extracts on culicine3<sup>rd</sup>instar larvae

The result of the probit analysis shows various degree of effectiveness of some plant extracts used against 3<sup>rd</sup>instar larvae of Culicine mosquitoes. LC50 of petroleum ether extracts 100.25, 115.53, 145.88, 68.44, 114.55, 46.79, and 175.07 of neem seed, neem stem, neem leaf, Ocimum kilimanscharicum, orange peels, Hyptissuaveolens and E. gloublus respectively, and when these were compared with LC50 of methanol extracts 45.91, 68.75, 126.56, 38.52, 141.73. 42.05 and 37.32, the result proved that methanol extracts were more effective than petroleum ether extracts (Figure 3). The figure also showed that E. globulus (37.32) of methanol extracts had the lowest concentration (LC50) that killed 50% of the 3<sup>rd</sup>instar larvae of *culicine* mosquitoes, followed by Ocimumkillimanscharikum(38.52), Hyptissuaveolens (42.05), and neem seed (45.95) of the same methanol extracts, while orange peels (141.73) proved to be the most ineffective treatment agents of the extracts. The result also showed that *E. gloublus* (93.12) and*Hyptissuaveolens (*107.15) of petroleum ether, killed 90% of 3<sup>rd</sup>instar larvae of culicine. The E. globulus of methanol extract showed that 37.32ppm killed 50% and 93.12ppm killed and 90% of 3<sup>rd</sup>instar larvae of culicine larvae that were exposed to it, and this proved that methanol extracts are far better than petroleum ether extracts (175.07 and 676.27ppm) of LC50 and LC90 respectively. Neem leaf (1985.93ppm) and orange peels (526.18ppm) of methanol extracts are the only extracts that showed toxicity effects against 3rdinstar of culicine when compared to their counterpart of petroleum ether extracts of neem leaf (530.05ppm) and orange peels (387.89ppm). All the extracts of both methanol and petroleum ether showed high degree of effectiveness, when compared with control that showed 0.0% mortality of 3rdinstar larvae of culicine.




Figure 3: Effects of solvent used in extraction of plants extracts on *culicine*3<sup>rd</sup>instar larvae

# Discussion

Several diseases are associated with the mosquito-human interaction. Mosquito are the carriers of several diseases that are of major problem in the public health system. The diseases include malaria, arbovirus, encephalitis, dengue fever, hikunguya, west Nile virus, yellow fever, zika virus and so on. These diseases produce significant morbidity in humans and livestock worldwide. The plants tested in this present study are well known to be eco-friendly and are non-toxic to non-targeted species. These plants are grown all over the north eastern state of Nigeria and some have been used as herbal medicine in the region. Moreover, it is proved that these plants have been used as mosquito repellent, through burning of smoke or hanging them inside the rooms. The plants extracts are less

Comment [C5]: -Delete "Chart Title"
- So many Figures or Numbers that will make the reader(s) confused!
-I'd like to suggest that it is better if you show two figures; one for LC50 and the other for LC90!

expensive and highly efficacious for the control of mosquito rather than chemical compound (Kovendan*et al.*, 2012Vivekanandhan et al.,2018a). The present study has shown high bioactivity of both methanol and petroleum ether extracts of the different plants. Such result may offer opportunity for developing alternative to rather expensive and environmental hazardous organic insecticides.

Toxicity of the tested plant extract against 3<sup>rd</sup>instar larvae varied according to the type of plants or the plant part and solvents used for the extraction and also the extracts concentration used. The larval mortality percent increased as the extract concentration increased in all the different plant extracts. The toxicity values of the tested extracts of the different ethnobotanicals on mean value may be arranged in descending order as follows: *Hyptissuaveolen>* Neem seed > E. globulus > neem stem > O. kilimanscharicum> neem leaves > orange peels. These results agree, to some extent with the previous mentioned suggestions of Egunyomiet al. (2010) and Govnidarajan.(2010). Extracts from several other plant species were tested on different mosquito species. The activity of plant extracts on larval mortality of culicine mosquitoes agreed with the result obtained by several researcher (Patel et al., 2012;Kovendanet al., 2012 and Ito et al., 2015). H. suaveolens proved to be the most effective treatment agent with 100% mortality recorded at 150ppm and 200ppm, followed by neem seed that showed 100% mortality at 200ppm.

A remarkable decrease in pupation percent was induced by all plant extracts in the present study. The pupation percentage decreased as the concentration level of the plant extract increased. Moreover, the pupation rate depended on the type of plant species used. The present study showed that the toxic effect of all the ethnobotanical used had been extended to pupae. In addition, ethnobotanicals induced reduction of the adult emergence. The reduction was found to be concentration dependent. This result is comparable to earlier result of Sharma *et al.* (2006) who also used petroleum ether extract of *A. annura* against *An. stephensi* and *culexquinquefasciatus* which also showed the extension of the larvicidal effect to the pupal stage.

The results have shown that all the effect of the treatment agents of methanol and petroleum ether extracts used against culicine are significantly different from each other. The LC50 methanol extracts (37.32, 38.52, 42.05, 45.91, 68.75, and 126.56ppm) of E. globulus, O.kilimanscharicum, H. suaveolens, neem seed neem stem and neem leaf

respectively, showed higher larvicidal effect than their counterpart petroleum ether extracts with LC50 (175.07, 68.44, 46.79, 100.25, 115.53, 145.88ppm). The LC50 (114.5ppm) petroleum ether extracts against culicine mosquito larvae proved to be better than its counterpart of methanol extracts with LC50 (141.73ppm). The 90 values of methanol extracts (93.11, 107.12, 119.83, 198.42, 637.53ppm) of E. globulus, H. suaveolens, neem seed, neem stem, O. kilimanscharicum respectively, are more effective than their counterpart petroleum ether extracts with LC90 (676.27, 121.28, 329.67, 389.72, 1039.66ppm). this agrees with report of Naphtali et al., 2018 and Ngwamah et al., 2018, Dixon 2015 that showed methanol extracts as the best agents against many mosquito species than some of the extracts from other solvents. This may be attributed to high polarity effect of the methanol as reported by Ngwamah et al (2018). In the case of neem leave (198593ppm) and orange peals (526.18ppm) of methanol extracts showed to be less effective against 3<sup>rd</sup> instar larvae of culicine mosquitoes as compared to their counterpart petroleum ether extracts with LC90 (530.05) of neem leaf and orange peals (387.89), this contrary to the findings of Kadri et al (2006), Dixon and Jeena 2017 that reported that higher larvicidal effect of methanol extracts against larval mosquitoes than the petroleum ether extracts, but is in agreement with the report of Komalamisra etal., (2006).

Conclusion

In general, it could be concluded that the crude extractsfrom all the plant material used during this study have larvicidal potential and some of the plant extracts have demonstrated extension of larvicidal effect to the pupal stage, where some pupae later died after pupation. Thislet to the low adult emergence as compared to the negative control. Furthermore, the result of the present study may contribute to the reduction in the application of synthetic chemical pesticides, which will increase the opportunity of natural control of various medically important pesticides by botanical insecticides.

REFERENCES

Amusan A.A.S, Idowu A.B., Arowolo F.S. (2005): Comparative Toxicity effect of bush tea leaves (*HyptisConclu suaveolens*) and orange peel (Citrus sinensis) oil extract on larvae of the yellow fever mosquito Aedes aegypti. *Tanzanian health research bulletin* 7: 174-177

Comment [C6]: Should be "The LC90"

**Comment [C7]:** Check it out whether this value is correct!

- Arivoli, S.andSamuel, T. (2011). Bioefficiancy of *Citrullus colocynthis*(L) shrad (Cucurbitaceae) whole plants extracts against *Anopheles stephensi*, *Aedes aegypti* and *culexquiquefasciatus* (*Diperaculicidea*). International journal of current research, 3 (4): 296-304
- El-Hag, E.L., Abd-Ei, R., El-nadi, A. h. and Zaitoon, A. A. (2001). Effects of methanolic extracts of neem seeds on egg hatchability and larval development of culexpipiens mosquitoes. *Indian veterinary journal*, 78: 199-201
- Egunyomi, A., Gbadamosi, I.T., and Osiname, K.O. (2010). Comparative effectiveness of ethnobotanical mosquito repellents used in Ibadan, Nigerria. *Journal of Applied Biological Sciences*, **36**: pp.2383 -2388
- Elumalai, K., Thangarasu, M., Kaliyamoorthy, K. (2015). Mosquito Larvicidal ovicidal and pupicidal activities of Abusprecatorious Linn (Fabaceae) against dengue vector, Aedes aegyti (linn), malarial vector, Anpheles stephensi (Liston), and Filarial vector, C. quinquefasciatus (SAY) (Diptera: Culicidae. *Journal of current Innovation research*, 1(3): 73-80
- Govnidarajan, M. and Sivakumar, R. (2010). *Adulticidal* and repellent properties of indigenous plantextracts against Culex quinquefaciatus and Aedes aegyti(Dipetraculicideae. Journal of parasitologyresearch, 109(2): 353-367.
- Hariral, C. C., Rathy, M. C. and Sajith, U. (2015). Larvicidal efficacy of medicinal plant extracts against the vector mosquito Aedes albopictus. International of mosquito research, 2(2): 80-82
- Kovendan, K., MuruganK., Donald, R.B and Vicent, S. (2012). Mosquito larvicidal propertis of *orthosiphon thymiflorus* (Roth) *Sleensen*. (family: *Labiatae*) Against mosquito Vectors, *Anopheles Stephensi*, *Culex quinquefasciatus and Aede aegypti*. *Asian pacific Journal of tropical Medicine*, 6(11):299-305.
- Patel, E. K., Gupta, A. and Oswal, R.J. (2012). A review on: Mosquito repellent methods. *International of pharmaceutical, Chemical and Biological Sciences*, **2:** 310-317
- Sharma, P., Mohan, L. and Srivastava, C. N., (2006). Growth inhibitory nature of *Artemiseraannura* extracts against *Culex quiquefasciatus* (Say). *Journal of Asian pacific parasitic entomology*, 9(4): 389-395
- Mandal S. (2012). Mosquito vector management with botanicals—the most effective weapons in controlling mosquito-borne diseases. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine*, 336.
- Ito E.E and Ighere E.J. (2017). Bio-insecticidal Potency of Five Plant Extracts against Cowpea Weevil, *Callosobruchus maculatus* (F.), on Stored Cowpea, *Vigna unguiculata*(L). *Jordan Journal of Biological Sciences*, 10(4): 317-322.
- Ito E.E., Nmor, J.C., Ake J.E.G, and Uteboe K., (2015). Larvicidal Activities of *Pistia stratiotes* (water lettuce) against 3<sup>rd</sup> and 3rdinstar larvae of *Aedes aegypti*. *Advances in Research*, 3(6): 589-595.
- Ito E.E., and Utebor E.K., (2018). Insecticidal Toxicity of Goat Weed, Ageratum conyzoides, Linn. (Asteraceae) on Smoked Fish Weevil, Dermestes maculatus, Degeer (Coleoptera: Dermestidae). Jordan Journal of Biological Sciences, 11(2): 223 – 229.
- Kweta, D. Elimingaya, Franklin.Mosha, AsanterabiLowossa, Aneth M.M., Jovin K., Emmanuel F., Esther E.L., Johns M., Michael, J. M., Charlse P. M., Filemoni, T., Michael A. M., Rajabu, M., Grace C.

- Michael A. M., and Emmanuel A. T. (2008). Ethnobotanicals study of some mosquito repellent plants in the north eastern Tanzania. *Malaria Journal* 7: 152
- Vivekanandhan, P., Venkatesan, R., Ramkumar, G., Karthi, S., Senthil-Nathan, S., and Shivakumar, M.S., (2018).

  Comparative Analysis of Major Mosquito Vectors Response to Seed-Derived Essential Oil and Seed Pod-Derived Extract from *Acacia nilotica*. International *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2018, 15, 388; doi: 10.3390/ijerph15020388
- Vivekanandhan, P., Senthil-Nathan, S., and Shivakumar, M.S., (2017b). Larvicidal, pupicidal and adult smoke toxic effects of *Acanthospermumhispidum* (DC) leaf crude extracts against mosquito vectors. *Journal of Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology*. 101 (2018) 156-162
- Vivekanandhan, P., Deepa, S., Kweka E.J., and Shivakumar, M.S., (2018c). Toxicity of *Fusarium oxysporum*-VKFO-01 derived silver nanoparticles as insecticidal potent against three mosquito vector species (Diptera: Culicidae). *Journal of Cluster Science*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10876-018-1423-1.23456789.
- Vivekanandhan, P., Kavitha, T., Karthi, S., Senthil-Nathan, S., and Shivakumar M.S., (2018d). Toxicity of Beauveria bassiana-28 Mycelial Extracts on Larvae of Culex quinquefasciatus Mosquito (Diptera: Culicidae). International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.2018, 15, 440; DOI:10.3390/ijerph15030440
- Vivekanandhan, P., Karthi, S., Shivakumar, M.S., and Benelli, G., (2018e). Synergistic effect of entomopathogenic fungus *Fusarium oxysporum*extract in combination with temephos against three major mosquito vectors. *Journal of Pathogens and Global Health*. https://doi.org/10.1080/20477724.2018.1438228
- Kadri, A., Felhi., Daoud, A., Hajloui, H., Mnatgui, K. Gharsalah, N. (2017). Solvents extraction effect on phytochemical constituent's profiles, antioxidant and anti-microbial activities and functional group analysis of Ecballium elaterium seeds and peels fruits. Food Science and Technology 37(3): 483-492
- Komalamisra, N., Trongtokit, Y., Rongsriyam, Y. and Apiwathnasorn, C. (2006). Screening for larvicidal activity in some thai plants against four mosquito vector species southeast *Asia Journal of tropical medicine of public health*. 36(6):1412-1422.
- Dixon D., Jeena G, (2017). Comparison of different solvents of phytochemical extraction of Potentials from Datura metel plant leaves. International Journal of Biological Chemistry 11:17-22.
- Naphtali R. S. Ngwamah, J. S. Shitta K. B., Atimi A. Kadala E. (2018). Comparative toxicity effect of some plants extracts against Larva of Anopheline (Diptera: Culicidae) in the north eastern Nigeria. Asian Journal of research in zoology 1 (2): 1.9
- Ngwamah J.S., Naphtali R.S., Pukuma M.S., Atiga A. (2018). Comparative insecticidal activity of five Nigerian plant species in Yola, Adamawa State, Nigeria.International journal of mosquito research 5(5):131-141