

Original Research Article

Infestation and Damage by *Caryedon serratus* (Olivier) on Stored *Tamarindus indica* (Linnaeus) in Kano State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted on the infestation and damage *Caryedon serratus* on stored tamarind pods from September to November, 2014 in three local government areas (Doguwa, Gezawa and Kano Municipal) of Kano State in Nigeria. Structured questionnaires were randomly administered to 60 respondents. A total of 27 samples of tamarind pods were purchased for damage analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the collected data while ordinary least square Regression was used on damage data. Results obtained indicated that un-elevated room storage (in woven sacks) was the preferred (48.3 %) form of tamarind storage practiced (91.7 %), mostly for a period of 1 – 3 months (60 %) of storage before being sold out. More so, about 98.3 % of the respondents were aware of *C. serratus* as pest of tamarind pods. The pods are commonly attacked by such pest (48.3 %) from inception to about 3 months of storage leading to highest damage (36.7 %) levels. The regression analysis revealed that the number of perforations were highly significant ($P < .001$) in relation to the total number of tamarind pods, however, no significant effects observed on pods' weight loss in any of the three locations. The combined models analysis shows Gezawa recorded significantly ($P < .001$) higher number of perforations compared to others which are similar. On the control measures, 46.7 % have reported the application of a control method against *C. serratus* and that dried pepper (20 %) was the most prevalent. Solarization and airtight polythene storage bags were found statistically similar. Only 5 % of the respondents use synthetic chemicals although very effective. The present study revealed that *C. serratus* is a widespread and damaging pest of tamarind in the study areas. Therefore, there is need for a more advanced, cost effective and safe alternative means of control especially from the first three to six months of storage.

Keywords: (Infestation, *Caryedon serratus*, *Tamarindus indica*, Damage)

1. INTRODUCTION

Tamarind (*Tamarindus indica*) is an important tree distributed worldwide in semi-arid tropical regions. The tree produces edible pod-like fruits which are used extensively in cuisines and medicinal purposes in different tropical countries around the world [1]. Apart from being an important tree crop, is also valued as fuel wood, ornamental, medicinal plant, and livestock feed [3]. The fruit pulp which is sweet in taste is used for serving curries, chutneys and sauces, because of its anti-ascorbic properties the pulp is also used in place of lime or lemon in soups. Tamarind kernel powder (TKP) is used as a sizing material in textile and leather industries [2]. In Northern part of Nigeria, roots of tamarind in combination with other native medicines are used for treatment of leprosy and chest pain [4], also the seeds are used for the treatment of dysentery, ulcer, boils, and diabetes, furthermore, the pulp and

27 leaves are used in preparation of soups and refreshing drinks, confections, and ice cream
28 [2].
29

30 Despite these uses and importance, tamarind is reported to be attacked by more than 40
31 different species of insect pests, although only few of them are of economic importance [2].
32 Among these insect pests, fruit borers such as *Paraplis agularis*, *Corcyra cephalonica*, and
33 most importantly *Caryedon serratus* are of prime importance and responsible for low yields
34 due to their ability to infest the crop at different stages (fruits and seeds) in both the field and
35 store. Borer insect pests feed on the fruit pulp internally and leave behind its excreta which
36 deteriorate the quality and market value of the fruits. Hence, studies on tamarind fruit borer's
37 especially *C. serratus* and their losses are essential particularly in places where tamarind
38 plant contribute immensely to livelihood of people. Thus this study was conducted to
39 determine the level of infestation and damage by *C. serratus* on stored tamarind in Kano
40 state.
41

42 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

43 **2.1 Study Area**

44 The survey was carried out in Gezawa, Doguwa and Kano Municipal Local Government
45 areas of Kano state in 2014. In Gezawa (Gezawa central, Wangara and Jogana villages),
46 Doguwa (Burji and Tagwaye villages) and Kano Municipal (Sharada, Rimi, Kurmi and Sheka
47 markets) were selected for the study.
48
49
50
51

52 **2.2 Sampling methods**

53 A Purposive sampling technique was used in selecting the three local government areas in
54 order to target mainly farmers dealing with storage and selling of tamarind in the study area.
55 Twenty respondents were randomly selected in each local government area, thus making a
56 total of sixty (60) respondents for the study. Structured questionnaires were administered to
57 the respondents to elicit information from them on their various activities related to tamarind
58 and problems associated with storage of tamarind. In addition, socio-economic
59 characteristics of the respondents were collected. Local interpretation of the questionnaire in
60 Hausa (in north western Nigeria) was made where the farmers had no grasp of English as
61 their first or primary language.
62
63
64
65
66

67 **2.3.- Laboratory damage assessment**

68 Tamarind fruits were purchased (2 kg sample) from seven good respondents (who answered
69 all questions) in each of the three Local Government Areas to be used for the laboratory
70 study on extent of damage by the pest on tamarind pods. The 2 Kg samples were divided in
71 5 equal portions (400 g each), thereafter three portions were selected randomly as replicates.
72 These samples were examined for damage levels in the laboratory using a scale of low (less
73 than 15 % of the fruits infested with cocoon), medium (15 to 45 % of fruits infested with
74 cocoon) and high (46 % and above infestation) in damage levels.
75
76

77 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

78

79 Data collected were analyzed through descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) to
80 generate summaries and tables, using computer statistical software SPSS for windows
81 version 15. While, damage data obtained from the laboratory samples were subjected to
82 Ordinary Least Squares Regression using "Shazam –Version 9.0" computer statistical
83 software.

84

85 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

86

87

88

Table1: Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age (Years):		
23 – 34	6	10.0
35 – 46	15	25.0
47 – 58	22	36.67
59 – 70	15	25.0
71 – 83	2	3.33
Total	60	100
Sex:		
Male	53	88.3
Female	7	11.7
Total	60	100
Marital Status:		
Married	59	98.3
Single	1	1.7
Total	60	100
Household Size:		
1 – 10	28	46.7
11 – 20	23	38.3
21 – 30	5	8.3
31 – 40	4	6.7
Total	60	100
Level of Education:		
Religious Education	43	71.7
Primary Education	9	15.0
Secondary Education	4	6.7
Adult Education	4	6.7
Total	60	100
Major Occupation:		

Integrated Merchant	26	43.3
Farmer	21	35.0
Seller of Agricultural Products	10	16.7
Labourer	1	1.7
Driver	2	3.3
Total	60	100

89 Source: Field survey, 2014

90

91 3.1 Forms and methods of tamarind storage

92 Majority (85 %) of the respondents store tamarind (Table 2), out of this percentage 46.7%
 93 had 1 – 10 years of experience in tamarind storage, 23.3 % had 11- 20 years of experience,
 94 and 11.7 % and 3.3 % had 31- 40 and 45 – 50 years of experience in tamarind storage
 95 respectively. Majority of the respondents (91.7 %) store their tamarind in a shelled (Figure A)
 96 form while only 8.3 % store the unshelled (Figure B) tamarind.
 97

98 The storage methods for tamarind were observed to be same as those of grains which are
 99 generally being stored in bags (sacks) and packed in well aerated store rooms. Airtight
 100 storage is also found to be effective especially under long-term storage. Six different storage
 101 methods were observed among the respondents out of which majority (48.3 %) were found
 102 to store their tamarind in sacks and inside store rooms (on the floor without an elevation),
 103 while a few of them do store tamarind pods in sacks and place outside under shade without
 104 an elevation. The use of polythene bags inserted inside sacks (11.7 %), was said to be the
 105 most effective method of storage as it is a form of airtight storage which serves as a control
 106 measure commonly used against other insects pests (*C. maculatus*, *Sitophilus sp* etc).
 107 Moreover, considering quantity and length of storage, majority (96 % and 60 %) of the
 108 respondents store 1 to 50 bags of tamarind for a period of 1 to 3 months respectively.
 109

110 The quantity of tamarind stored by each of the respondents varies depending on their
 111 capital, the highest quantity observed was 250 bags and the lowest was 1 bag being put for
 112 storage. Significantly ($P = .05$) highest percentage (96.7 %) of the respondents are storing
 113 from 1 to 50 bags of tamarind pods, while about 3.3 % of the respondents do store over 100
 114 bags (Table 2). Moreover, considering the time of storage, majority of the respondents
 115 interviewed (60 %) store tamarind pods for less than 3 months, 15 % for 4 to 6 months while
 116 15 % for 6 to 9 months and only 10 % store for a period of 10 to 12 months. Nonetheless,
 117 the highest price recorded was ₦5000 per bag and the lowest was ₦1000. Majority of the
 118 respondents (46.67 %) have reported purchasing their tamarind at prices ranging ₦1000 to
 119 ₦2000 per bag while 40 % purchased at prices up to ₦3000 per bag, 11.67 % of the
 120 respondents purchased at prices between ₦3000 to ₦4000 per bag and only 1.67 % make
 121 purchases at prices above ₦4000 per bag.
 122



123

124 **Figures: A Unshelled and B Shelled tamarind pods showing pupal cocoons with**
 125 **damaging perforations by *C. serratus***

126

127 *Source:Field survey, 2014*

128 **Table 2: Forms and methods of tamarind storage by the respondents**

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Storage of Tamarind:		
Yes	51	85.0
No	9	15.0
Total	60	100
Years of Experience in Tamarind Storage		
1 – 10	28	46.7
11 – 20	14	23.3
21 – 30	9	15
31 – 40	7	11.7
45 – 50	2	3.3
Total	60	100
Form of storage:		
Shelled	55	91.7
Unshelled	5	8.3
Total	60	100
Methods of storage applied:		
Sacks in storage room (without elevation)	29	48.3
Sacks in storage room on elevation	6	10.0
Polythene bag in sacks in storage room (without elevation)	7	11.7
Polythene bag only in storage room (without elevation)	8	13.3
Sacks outside storage room under shade (without elevation)	1	1.7
No storage method applied	9	15.0
Total	60	100
Quantity of tamarind stored (in bags):		
1 – 50	58	96.67
51 – 100	0	0

101 – 150	0	0
151 – 200	1	1.67
201 – 250	1	1.67
Total	60	100
Length of storage (in months):		
1 – 3	36	60
4 – 6	9	15
7 – 9	9	15
10 – 12	6	10
Total	60	100
Price of tamarind per bag (in Naira)		
1000 – 2000	28	46.67
2001 – 3000	24	40
3001 – 4000	7	11.67
4001 – 5000	1	1.65
Total	60	100

129 Source: Field survey, 2014

130

131 3.2 Knowledge of Pest and Control Measures Applied by the Respondents

132

133 Almost all of the respondents interviewed (98.3 %) were aware of *C. serratus* as a pest that
 134 attacks tamarind under storage, while 1.7 % does not know anything about the pest (Table
 135 3). Most (48.3 %) of the respondents reported that attack/damage to tamarind pods start at
 136 the inception (1-3 months) of storage. More so, about 36.7 % of the respondents have
 137 observed that high (70 %) damage to tamarind pods is mostly caused by the insect pests
 138 during storage while 33.3 % have observed moderate damage and 30 % have stated the
 139 damage to be low. When control measure is been considered only 46.7 % of the
 140 respondents use one control measure or another to manage *C. serratus* damage on
 141 tamarind pods, out of this proportion only 5 % of the respondents use synthetic pesticides,
 142 while the remaining 41.7 % of the respondents uses other control measures such as
 143 Solarization, use of air tight method and plant powders (Table 3).

144

145 As presented in Table 3 a proportion of about 46.7 % of the respondents were applying
 146 different control measures in an effort to minimize *C. serratus* damage on tamarind pods
 147 during storage, while 53.3 % of them were not applying any form of insect pest control
 148 measure. Some of the various control measures applied includes the application (sprinkling)
 149 of ground red pepper into the bag of tamarind (20 %), sun drying infested tamarind or
 150 solarization (10 %), airtight method using polythene bag (10 %). Storage of the pods on an
 151 elevation (i.e. a wooden platform) and the application of Gammalin (chemical control)
 152 indirectly by applying the powdered formulation on the floor, covering with a mat or sack and
 153 spreading the pods on top, the pods are again covered with another mat or polythene sheet
 154 and left for about 24 hours.

155

156

157

Table 3: Respondents' knowledge of *Caryedon serratus* as a pest of tamarind pod

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Awareness of the pest:		
Yes	59	98.3
No	1	1.7
Total	60	100

Period of Attack:		
At inception of storage (0 – 3 months)	29	48.3
After three months storage	19	31.7
After six months storage	11	18.3
After one year storage	1	1.7
Total	60	100
Level of Damage Caused:		
Low	18	30
Medium	20	33.3
High	22	36.7
Total	60	100
Control Measures:		
Yes	28	46.7
No	32	53.3
Total	60	100
Type of Control Measures Applied		
Ground red pepper	12	20
Solarization	6	10
Good sanitary measure (including elevation)	1	1.7
Air tight method (polythene bag in sack)	6	10
Chemical control (application of Gammalin)	3	5
None	32	53.3
Total	60	100

158 Source: Field survey, 2014

159 **3.3 Regression analysis for pod perforation made by *C. serratus* at the three different**
160 **location**

161
162 The regression analysis for pod perforations made by *C. serratus* at the three locations
163 among samples were highly significant in the three Local Government Areas, with much
164 higher number of perforations from Kano Municipal Local Government Area than those
165 obtained from Gezawa and Doguwa Local Governments (Table 4).
166
167

168 **Table 4: Regression analysis for pod perforation made by *C. serratus* at the three**
169 **sites**
170

Variable	Estimated coefficient	Standard Error	T-ratio	P-value	Partial correlation	Standardized coefficient	Elasticity at means
SWT	19621	0.1266	1.550	0.135	0.314	0.1467	0.6697
NOH	28.597	3.246	8.809	0.000***	0.883	0.8761	0.7393
TNPG	-10800	3729	-2.896	0.008**	-0.525	-0.3027	-0.1239
TNPD	-6657.3	3455	-1.927	0.067*	-0.380	-0.1927	-0.0859

TNPK	-5143.6	0.1084	-	0.640	-0.101	0.0000	-0.1992
			0.4743				

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

SWT = Sample Weight, NOH = Number of Holes, TNPG = Total Number of Pods in Gezawa,
TNPD = Total Number of Pods in Doguwa, TNPK = Total Number of Pods in Kano Municipal

4. DISCUSSION

The low occurrence of women tamarind marketers was as a result of the fact that according to the Hausa and Fulani tribes which are predominant tribes in all of the study areas, males are confined to the most tedious activities of harvesting, bagging, storing and transportation, while females are mostly confined to home retail business and minor storage [5]. However, most of the women still carry out marketing activities in their various homes; these women were met and interviewed within their homes. Majority of the female tamarind marketers sell the tamarind not in its raw form, but rather use it as an important ingredient in the traditional "kunun tsamiya" which is prepared and sold in the morning, afternoon or evening depending on the season and location. In a survey in Kebbi State by [6], similar result was obtained that women in Northern Nigeria are mostly confined to the domestic area, where their main responsibility is cooking and taking care of the young. It is the responsibility of a male head of the household to procure and manage grain when needed by women for cooking, with the exception of widows who manage their own grain supplies.

Relatively higher percentage of the respondents had observed damage on their stored tamarind pods. "High damage" connotes 70 % damage and beyond, "moderate damage" connotes about 50 % damage while "low damage" connotes 30 % damage or less. A research conducted by [7] on damage potential and loss caused by *C. serratus* showed that there was up to 90 % damage and more than 60 % weight loss. Similar results were also reported by [8, 17] that infestation rates of *C. serratus* are so high that farmers stocks are often completely destroyed within months. In Northern Nigeria, insects pierce 30 to 40 % of the pods, and up to 80 % especially in dry conditions [9].

The survey results indicate that higher proportion of loss caused by storage pests is related to the system of storage practiced, for instance, method of processing before storage. Although a greater proportion of respondents (91.7 %) stored their tamarind unshelled, in spite of the evidence that unshelled grain/crops had lower infestation levels. Further investigation is needed to discover why so many farmers store their tamarind in the shelled state. The observation that grain/crop stored in an unshelled form is less susceptible to insect attack is supported by [6; 10, 11 and 18]. However, this depends on the insect species and the host grain or crop [12]. Since threshed grains/crops are more susceptible to pest attack, these group of farmers may need proper treatment with effective control measures.

The period of attack reported by most of the respondents begins at the inception of storage to the first 3 months of storage this was also confirmed by [9]. Elsewhere, extensive pre-season survey of groundnut post-harvest process and storage premises in Zambia indicated that primary infestation from the field was critical in establishment of the bruchid; *C. serratus* in the stores [13, 18] and that the groundnuts lifted early and dried for longer period than usual in the field received consistently higher insect infestation. In compliance with the aforementioned study, the early infestation period observed may be as a result of long storage period. More so, [14] reported that infestation of tamarind pods was recorded right from the field. He also reported that the only possible source of field infestation by *C.*

220 *serratus* might have been due to its laying of eggs on new harvested pod of tamarind (or
221 groundnut) kept for drying in the field and during storage.

222

223 Moreover, the length of storage depends on the season which in turn determines the
224 demand and affects levels of pest infestation during storage. The survey results indicate that
225 majority of farmers stored their tamarind for three months and only 15 % for 4 to 6 and 7 to 9
226 months respectively. Although, the level of insect infestations were reported to significantly
227 affect grains and dried fruits stored for seven to ten months compared to that stored for three
228 months [6, 17]. The period of maximum demand for tamarind occurs during the Muslims'
229 fasting period and during this period storage length is relatively low. The variation in
230 purchase price of the tamarind depends on the season, marketers' proximity to the site of
231 production (farm or wild) and whether or not the marketer owns the tree i.e. presence or
232 absence of middlemen. Those who own the tree or purchase the tamarind directly from
233 wholesalers tend to purchase and sell it at a lower price.

234

235 Nonetheless, the use of pepper is the most popular control measure among the farmers and
236 greater percentage are using ground pepper (20 %). [16] had reported a study in Thailand
237 that in addition to being used as foods flavourings; spices have been used from ancient
238 times to protect stored products pests. Traditionally, pieces of dried spices or ground spices
239 were used to sprinkled over or mix with stored foods. Among the most common spices used
240 in storage food protection are black pepper (*Piper nigrum*), ginger (*Zingiber officinale*) and
241 cloves (*Syzygium aromaticum*). More so, [17] reported in a study on the Indigenous Pest
242 Management Practices among Hill Farmers in India that grains to be stored are first sundried
243 by the farmers and this kills most insect pests.

244

245 Furthermore, 20 % of the respondents use ground pepper as protectant against *C. serratus*,
246 suggesting the opportunities to document, screen and improve plant products for use as
247 protectants for small-scale farmers in the study areas [6]. However, it was obvious that most
248 farmers in the surveyed area did not have a standard method for preparing and applying
249 repellent plant material to their tamarind stores, which could explain why botanicals did not
250 appear to be very effective in reducing insect infestations. This could also be the reason for
251 disagreements among the farmers as to whether botanicals are effective or not. Similarly,
252 [15, 18] had reported that the efficacy of plant materials depend on the pest species, the
253 environmental location of the stores, the plant species and part of the plant used and the
254 method of preparation and application used. Hence, further investigation on the optimal
255 methods of preparation and application of locally available plant botanicals is imperative in
256 order to establish more promising, effective and standard methods. Moreover, the use of
257 chemical insecticide also reported by the respondents to be very effective. This method was
258 said to be very effective in eliminating all insect pests affecting tamarind however, the
259 method is not practiced by most farmers and traders as the chemicals are so expensive and
260 dangerous to handle. More so, none of the respondents reported to employ the use of
261 integrated management by using 2 or more of the aforementioned methods simultaneously,
262 similar report was reported by [6].

263

264 The period from which *C. serratus* begins its attack on tamarinds pods differ as observed by
265 the different respondents that most of the attack occurred at the inception of storage a period
266 of between 0 to 3 months. Therefore, the insect pest could have probably begun its
267 damaging activities on the pods either from the mother tree or the period between 1 to 3
268 months of storage. This could have taken place after 6 months of storage because only
269 1.7% reported to have observed infestation after 1 year of storage. This has contradicted
270 with the findings of [6] that the survey findings indicates that farmers stored their grain
271 between four months and one year (i.e., from one crop season to another), with the majority
272 storing their grains for seven months.

273
274 The study indicated that the population of *C. serratus* was higher in Kano Municipal Local
275 Government area than in Doguwa and Gezawa Local Government Areas, which in a way
276 production centers are indicating that pest number and damage increases with
277 transportation and subsequent storage. Suggesting that pulses need continuous monitoring
278 and protection at all stages of storage as they are prone to attack by several insect pests [6,
279 9]. Pulses stored in farm storage facilities have greater likelihood of pest infestation than
280 storage at a processor's location [6]. Moreover, several factors could also contribute to
281 higher infestation especially in Kano Municipal that the stored tamarind might be poorly
282 treated or not treated at all. Nonetheless, the peak in infestations could coincides the rainy
283 season, which reaches its peak in July and August for instance, [6 and 15] reported a
284 combination of high temperature, relative humidity and moisture content provides favourable
285 conditions for insect perpetuation and development. The major problem arises from the fact
286 that most farmers use inadequate storage methods immediately after harvest and before
287 processing this aggravates infestation and damage during transportation and long-term
288 seasonal storage causing an estimated overall loss of over 30 % [9]. Such situation is greatly
289 magnified in regions where the relative humidity is high, while at temperature of about 32°C
290 the rate of multiplication monthly could increase to about 50 times the original number [6].
291 This means that 50 insects at harvest time could multiply to about 312 million in just four
292 months.

293

294 **5. CONCLUSION**

295

296 The present study has revealed that *C. serratus* is categorized as major pest of tamarind in
297 Kano State, Nigeria with an increasing number of perforations within the first three months of
298 storage in all the three study areas. Hence, tamarind pods need to be protected against
299 infestation and subsequent damage by *C. serratus* from field to the first three months of
300 storage. It has also shown that adoption of modern tamarind storage and processing
301 facilities as well as sound market structures will reduce the colossal losses usually
302 encountered by the producers, marketers and users of the tamarind in Kano State, Nigeria.

303

304 Disclaimer:

305 This paper is based on preliminary dataset. Readers are requested to consider this paper as
306 preliminary research article, as authors wanted to publish the initial data as early as
307 possible. Authors are aware that difference in the infestation level between shelled and
308 unshelled tamarind the respondents is required to get a scientifically established conclusion.
309 Readers are requested to use the conclusion of this paper judiciously as this parameter is
310 absent. Authors also recommend the same for similar future studies.

311 This manuscript was presented in the conference.

312 Conference name: - 48th conference of the Entomological Society of Nigeria

313

314 **6. COMPETING INTERESTS**

315

316 Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

317

318 **Disclaimer: - This manuscript was published in the conference.**

319

320 **Yes, the paper was presented at the 48th conference of the Entomological Society of Nigeria**

321 **held at Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. The title presented is Infestation and Damage by**

322 **Caryedon serratus (Olivier) on Tamarind Pods in Three Local Government Areas of Kano**
323 **State**

324

325

326 7. REFERENCES

327

328

329 1. Pinar, K. *Tamarindus indica* and its Health Related Effects. *Asian Pacific Journal of*
330 *Tropical Biomedicine*. 2014; 4(9): 676-681.

331

332 2. Gupta, AK., Mukherjee, SC. and Akhilesh, N.. New Record of *Cryptophlebia ombrodelta*
333 (Tortricidae:Lepidoptera) on Tamarind, *Tamarindus indica* in Bastar Plateau Zone of
334 Chhattisgarh India. *International Journal of Agriculture Innovations and Research*. 2017; 5
335 (5): 694 – 696.

336

337 3. Michel, A. Trees, Shrubs and Lianas of West African Dry Zones. 2004;. MARGRAF
338 Publishers,Germany. 234 Pp.

339

340 4. Ojo, JA. and Omoloye, AA.. Life History of the Tamarind Weevil, *Sitophilus linearis*
341 (Herbst) Coleoptera: Curculionidae), on Tamarind Seed. *Journal of Insects*. 2015; 1 – 5

342

343 5. Anonymous. Nigerian demographic and health survey. National Population Commission of
344 Nigeria. Abuja, 2004, 11-19.

345

346 6. Utono, IM., Gibson, G. and Coote, C.. A survey of systems of grain storage and
347 Management of insect pests in stored grain in Kebbi state. *Journal of Agriculture and*
348 *Veterinary Science*. 2013; 3(5):51– 61.

349

350 7. Oaya, CS., Malgwi, AM. and Samaila, AEInsecticidal Efficacy of African Rock Fig Leaf
351 Powder (*Ficus congensis* Engl.) against the Groundnut Bruchid (*Caryedon serratus* Olivier)
352 on Stored Groundnut in Yola. *Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science* 2013; 2(1): 24
353 accessed on 02/08/2018. www.iosrjournals.org

354

355 8. Delobel, A. and Matokot, L.. Control of stored groundnut insect pests in African
356 Subsistence farming. International Working Conference on Stored-Product Protection, 5. In:
357 Proceedings of the 5th International Working Conference on Stored-product Protection. 1990,
358 FRA, Bordeaux, pp. 1599-1607, 1990/09/09-14. Retrieved on 15 May
359 2016 from http://horizon.documentation.ird.fr/exltdoc/pleins_textes/pleins_textes_6/b_fdi_334/36512.pdf.

360

361 9. Degri, MM. and Zainab, JA. A Study of Insect Pest Infestations on Stored Fruits and
362 Vegetables in the North Eastern Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Nature*.
363 2013;4(4): 646 – 650.

364

365 10. Gwinner, J., Harnisch, R. and Muck, O. Manual on the prevention of post-harvest grain
366 losses, post-harvest project, Pickhuben 1990, 4, D-2000 Hamburg, 294pp.

367

368 11. Food for Agricultural Organization (FAO). Introduction to general taxonomy and biology/
369 ecology of stored product insect pests. In: Semple, RL., Hicks, PA., Lozare, JV. And
370 Castermans, A. (Eds.). Towards integrated commodity and pest management in grain
371 storage. Training manual for application in humid tropical storage system. 1992.

372

- 373 FAOCooperate document repository. <http://www.fao.org/docrep>. Accessed on 05/03/2018.
374
- 375 12. Lawrence, EW and Pedersen, JR. Effect of threshing different sorghum cultivars on
376 *Sitotiroga cerealella* (Oliv) and *Sitophilus oryzae* (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae and Coleoptera:
377 Curculionidae). *Journal of Stored Product Research*. 1990; 26: 89-96.
378
- 379 13. Rao, R, Rameshwar, GV, Rao, V. and Nigam, SN, Post-Harvest Insect Pests of
380 Groundnut and Their Management. International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid
381 Tropics, 2010; Patancheru, p. 12.
382
- 383 14. Oaya, CS, Malgwi, AM and Samaila, AE. Damage Potential and Loss Caused By the
384 Groundnut Bruchid *Caryedon Serratus* Olivier [Coleoptera: Bruchidae) On Stored Groundnut
385 and Tamarind in Yola. *Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science*. 2012; 1(6): 58-62
386
- 387 15. Belmain, SR. and Stevenson, P. Ethonobotanicals in Ghana: Reviving and Modernizing
388 | Age old farmers practice. *Pesticide Outlook* 2001; (12): 233-238.
389
- 390 16. Chomchalow, N. Protection of stored products with special reference to Thailand. *A. U.*
391 *J. T.* 2003; 7(1):31-47.
392
- 393 17. Chandola, M, Rathore, S. and Kumar, B. Indigenous Pest Management Practices
394 Prevalent among Hill Farmers of Uttarakhand. *Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge*.
395 | 2011; 10(2): 311-315.
396
- 397 18. Okweche, SI; Umoetok, SBA and Ukatu, PO. Comparative efficacy of insecticidal plants
398 on the management of groundnut bruchid (*Caryedon serratus*). *Journal od Agricultural*
399 *Science* 2016; 4(3): 47 - 57
400