

GLOBAL JOURNAL OF BIO-SCIENCE AND BIOTECHNOLOGY

© 2004 - 2013 Society For Science and Nature (SFSN). All rights reserved www.scienceandnature.org

BIOCIDAL ACTIVITIES OF SOME TROPICAL MOSS POWDERS AGAINST *SITOPHILUS ZEAMAIS* MOTCH (COLEOPTERA: CURCULIONIDAE)

J. A. Wahedi¹, A. T. Ande² & P.O. Fatoba³

¹Department of Biological Sciences, Adamawa State University Mubi, Nigeria ²Department of Zoology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria ³Department of Plant Biology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Four bryophytes powders namely, *Calymperes afzelli* Sw., *Thuidium gratum (P. Beauv.)* Jaeg., *Bryum coronatum* Schwaeg and *Barbula lambarenensis* (Hook) Spreng. were evaluated for biocidal activities against maize weevil, *Sitophilus zeamais* Motch, at 5%, 10% and 20% w/w concentrations. All the moss plant materials showed encouraging biocidal principles in respect of toxicity, reduction in oviposition and F1 progeny emergence rate and prolongation of pre-imaginal duration. The bryophytes were very effective and prompt as toxicants and their order of efficacy was *B. coronatum* > *T. gratum* > *C. afzelli* > *B. lambarenensis*. *C. afzelli* and *B. coronatum* prolonged the pre-imaginal duration by 3 to 7 days with increasing treatment concentration. All the bryophyte powders reduced *S. zeamais* oviposition and F1 progeny emergence significantly (P<0.05), but these were not reflected in the capability of the individual to lay eggs or survive in the grain, respectively. A maize grain weight loss that may not be occasioned by a reduction in the food consumption rate of the pre-imaginal stages of *S. zeamais* was also recorded with the bryophyte treatments. The promise and desirability of the use of mosses as protectant against the maize weevil were highlighted.

KEY WORD: Barbula lambarenensis, Biopesticide, Bryum coronatum, Calymperes afzelli, Maize, Sitophilus zeamais, Thuidium gratum.

INTRODUCTION

Maize (Zea mays) is one of the principal sources of carbohydrate to humans and livestock. It also has numerous industrial uses (Arannilewa, 2007). Unfortunately its production is regimented and restricted to the rainy season of the year. This necessitates the need to store it for use when it is out of season. Storage pest activities have, however stood in the way of maximum utilization of maize. One of the major insect pests of maize is Sitophilus zeamais Motch (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). To enhance productivity of maize in the field and in the storage, there is a need to control the activities of pests. Various forms of control have been employed. The most popularly employed control tactic is the chemical method which relies heavily on the use of synthetic insecticide and fumigants. This, unfortunately, is costly, toxic to its users, and other non-target organisms, aids development of resistant strains and is generally not environmental friendly (Jembere, et al., 1995; Okonkwo and Okoye, 1996). Sourcing biopesticides against insect pests from plants has over the years become quite popular and acceptable, as quite a number of promising compounds that are safe and environmentally friendly have been identified (Anon, 1991). Bryophytes, for no notable reason have remained relatively untapped as a source of biocide for insect control despite the assertion by Bernerjee and Sen (1979) that bryophytes more commonly contain inhibitors against bacteria than fungi and the antifungal activity reported in many mosses (Ando and Matsuo, 1984). The objective of this research work was to find out if some common bryophytes have biocidal potentials against S. zeamais.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Calymperes afzelli Sw., Thuidium gratum (P. Beauv.) Jaeg., and Bryum coronatum Schwaegr. located on palm tree stands on the campus of Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo, Nigeria, as well as Barbula lambarenensis (Hook) Spreng., located on a slab around the building of the Computer Science Department University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria, were collected separately and air-dried in a dark cupboard to constant weight. The dry bryophyte samples were subsequently grounded individually in an electric blender to fine powder and stored in dark labeled bottle with screw cap. S. zeamais adults were sourced from a culture raised on maize using a starter population obtained from the Nigeria Stored Product Research Institute (NSPRI), Ilorin, in the Entomology laboratory of the University of Ilorin. Clean maize cobs were obtained from the Biological garden, University of Ilorin, Ilorin Nigeria. The dried maize cobs were shelled and dried to constant weight in an oven at 30° C to 35° C. It was subsequently air dried for 2 hours, wrapped tightly in a polythene bag and stored in a deep freezer for 14 days. The grains were subsequently allowed 5 days of equilibration before use in bioassay.

BIOASSAY

Four replicates treatments were constituted at 0% (Control), 5%, 10% and 20% w/w treatment concentrations of pulverized bryophyte samples on 50g of the equilibrated clean maize by administering 0g, 2.5g, 5.0g and 10.0g, respectively of each pulverized bryophyte sample in a 300ml rearing plastic jar. The mixtures were stirred to ensure uniform coating of the grain by the

powder samples. Ten randomly selected newly emerged adult S. zeamais were subsequently introduced into each plastic jar from the S. zeamais culture for seven days. These were restricted to the jar with muslin cloth. Each jar was inspected daily for adult mortality and the dead individuals withdrawn. On the eighth day all surviving adults were withdrawn and the weight of each jar content noted. Daily mortality rates (%) were calculated as the proportion of dead insects in the total number of survivors the previous day. Absolute mortality rate (%) was calculated as the proportion of the 10 individuals that died after 7 days. Oviposition rate per jar *i.e.* Number of eggs per jar, was determined using the acid fuschin staining method. Ten maize grains from each jar was randomly selected on the tenth day, soaked in warm water for 2-3minutes, drained and subsequently immersed in 0.5% acid fushin stain for 2-5 minutes. The grains were rinsed in water and examined for cherry red gelatinous egg plugs. The number of egg plugs noticed on the ten grains was then extrapolated for the entire jar using an average number of 154 grains per jar. . The F1 adult emergence initiation time and total number of emergence per jar were recorded. Their respective means were calculated as duration of pre-adult life (Days) and emergence number per treatment jar. The weight of the content of each jar after F1 emergence was noted. Percentage weight loss by maize grain per jar was calculated as the difference between initial jar content weight and weight after F1 emergence as a proportion of the initial weight of the jar content.

DATA ANALYSIS

Mean values were obtained from the four replicate and expressed as $X\pm$ SE. The total number of adult days recorded per jar was calculated as total number of day with an adult survivor during the seven days of adult exposure. Number of egg laid per adult day or per adult was calculated by sharing the egg load per jar over the number of adult a days and adult, i.e. 10, respectively. The survival rate was estimated as the proportion of eggs laid per jar that emerged in the F1 generation. The various data obtained were compared with control experiment using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test at P=0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the level of toxicity of the four bryophyte samples to *S. zeamais* in terms of mortality. All the bryophyte samples recorded conspicuous and significantly higher mean absolute mortality values than the control experiment ($12.50\pm0.48\%$). The least mean absolute mortality value of 57.50 ± 0.75 % was recorded with 5% *B. lambarenensis* treatment. *C. afzelli, T. gratum* and *B. coronatum* recorded 100% mean absolute mortality with improved concentration and this encouraging fete was achieved at 10% concentration level with *T. gratum* and *B. coronatum*. The highest mean absolute mortality value recorded with *B. lambarenensis* at 20% concentration was

80.00±0.41%. C. afzelli, T. gratum and B. coronatum were quick acting as they recorded significantly higher mean daily mortality from the day of application. This was particularly noticeable with B. coronatum where 15.00 $\pm 0.29\%$ mean mortality was noticed with all treatment concentrations the first day. T. gratum however achieved 100% S. zeamais mortality earlier, i.e. day 5 at 10% and 20% concentrations. *B. lambarenensis* recorded a slightly significantly higher mortality value on the second day at higher concentrations of 10% and 20%. At the least tested concentration of 5%, however, B. lambarenensis mortality rates, though significantly higher on some days, were not distinctly different from the control readings in the first seven days after treatment. C. afzelli was quite gentle on S. zeamais with mortality spreading over the seven days, but relatively higher on days 3 to 5.

All the bryophyte treatments recorded significant (P<0.05) reduction in number of adult days per jar as compared with the 38.00±2.83 recorded in the control experiment (Table 2). These reductions also showed significant differences with increasing concentrations from 5% to 10%, it was however not sustained at a 20% concentration with all the bryophyte treatments. The order of efficiency regarding adult-day reduction was B. coronatum> C. afzelli =T. gratum >B. lambarenensis. Oviposition rates within each treatment jar showed that the number of eggs laid did not differ with bryophyte type or with treatment concentrations per jar. These were, however, significantly lower (P<0.05) than the 134.75±17.07 recorded in the control jar. The average number of eggs laid per adult as expected followed the pattern showed by oviposition rates per jar. This was however not the case per adult day. S zeamais exposed to bryophytes tend to show higher oviposition rate per adult-day. This was particularly evident with 20% B. coronatum and T. gratum where a higher and almost equal rate was recorded as in control experiment.

Adult emergence was not deterred by the bryophytes but its durations with bryophyte treatments were slightly prolonged than in the control experiment (35 days) and it showed a tendency towards an increase with increasing bryophyte concentrations. C. afzelli and B. coronatum were particularly good, as they delayed adult emergence by at least 3 days at the least concentration and for 5 and 7 days, respectively at 20% concentration. B. lambarenensis, however, could not delay adult emergence at lower concentrations but at 20% it did for 2 days. Adults emergence pattern again showed that significantly (P<0.05) lower number of adults were recorded from bryophyte treatments and these reduced slightly but significantly (P<0.05) with increasing concentrations. T. gratum and B. coronatum were particularly better in this respect. This, however, was a direct reflection of the oviposition level per treatment as survival rate of the egg in control (50.09%) was similar to all the treatments. C. afzelli and T. gratum treatments at 10% concentration enhanced the survival of pre-imaginal stages of S. zeamais substantially.

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				Dail Doot Tr	Daily Mortality (%±S.E)	S.E)			Absolute Mortality	lute
				Post In	Post Treatment Duration (Days)	1 (Days)			INIOIL	Mortanty (%±S.E)
		2. (%) 1	2	ω	4	S	6	7		
	Control 0	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{\mathrm{a}}$	$5.00{\pm}0.50^{\mathrm{ab}}$	$7.50{\pm}0.48^{\rm ab}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$	_	2.50 ± 0.48^{a}
	C. afzelli 5	$2.50{\pm}0.00^{ m ab}$	2.50 ± 0.25^{a}	$15.00{\pm}0.65^{\mathrm{abc}}$	$20.00{\pm}0.71^{\rm b}$	$12.50{\pm}0.25^{ m abc}$	$12.50{\pm}0.75^{\mathrm{ab}}$		<u>S</u>	$77.50{\pm}0.48^{cde}$
		$0.00\pm0.00^{\mathrm{a}}$	$10.00{\pm}0.41^{ m ab}$	20.00 ± 0.71^{bcd}	$15.00{\pm}0.65^{ab}$	$25.00{\pm}0.29^{\circ}$	$7.50\pm0.25^{ m abc}$	L		$87.50\pm0.48^{ m ef}$
	20	$7.50{\pm}0.25^{ m bc}$	$12.50{\pm}0.75^{ m ab}$	22.50 ± 0.85^{bcd}	$15.00{\pm}1.65^{ m ab}$	$20.00{\pm}0.71^{ m bc}$	$2.50{\pm}0.25^{\mathrm{ab}}$	5	_	100.00 ± 0.00^{f}
		$2.50{\pm}0.25^{ m ab}$	$17.50 \pm 0.25^{ m bc}$	$25.00{\pm}0.87^{cd}$	$12.50{\pm}0.75^{ m ab}$	$5.00{\pm}0.29^{\mathrm{ab}}$	$2.50{\pm}0.25^{a}$	$10.00{\pm}0.41^{ m abc}$	े. ह	$5.00\pm0.29^{ m cd}$
		$2.50{\pm}0.25^{ m ab}$	$30.00 \pm 0.41^{\circ}$	$27.50{\pm}0.48^{ m cd}$	$25.00{\pm}0.29^{b}$	$15.00\pm0.65^{\rm sbc}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{\mathrm{a}}$		100.00 ± 0.00^{f}
	20	$12.50 {\pm} 0.25^{ m cd}$	$27.50{\pm}0.25^{\circ}$	22.50 ± 0.75^{bcd}	30.00 ± 0.41^{b}	$7.50{\pm}0.48^{\rm ab}$	$0.00\pm0.00^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$		100.00 ± 0.00^{f}
		$15.00 \pm 0.29^{ m d}$	$27.50 \pm 0.63^{\circ}$	$5.00{\pm}0.50^{ab}$	$17.50{\pm}0.48^{\rm ab}$	$5.00{\pm}0.50^{\rm ab}$	$7.50{\pm}0.48^{ab}$	$5.00{\pm}0.29^{\mathrm{ab}}$	ь С	$82.50{\pm}0.48^{de}$
		15.00 ± 0.29^{d}	$30.00{\pm}0.00^{\circ}$	$5.00{\pm}0.29^{\mathrm{ab}}$	$22.50{\pm}0.48^{b}$	$25.00\pm0.50^{\circ}$	$2.50{\pm}0.25^{\circ}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$		100.00 ± 0.00^{f}
	20	15.00 ± 0.29^{d}	$27.50{\pm}0.63^{\circ}$	35.00 ± 0.29^{d}	20.00 ± 0.41^{b}	$2.50{\pm}0.25^{a}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{ m a}$	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$		100.00 ± 0.00^{f}
		$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$	2.50 ± 0.25^{a}	$15.00{\pm}0.29^{ m abc}$	$15.00{\pm}0.65^{ab}$	$7.50\pm0.25^{\rm ab}$	12.50 ± 0.63^{ab}		с	57.50±0.75 ^b
		$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$	$7.50{\pm}0.48^{\rm ab}$	$10.00{\pm}0.41^{\rm abc}$	$15.00{\pm}0.65^{ab}$	12.50 ± 0.75^{abc}	$12.50{\pm}0.75^{\rm ab}$		б	67.50 ± 0.48^{bc}
	20	$0.00{\pm}0.00^{a}$	$5.00\pm0.29^{\mathrm{ab}}$	17.50 ± 0.48^{abcd}	20.00 ± 0.71^{b}	$15.00{\pm}0.29^{ m abc}$	5.00 ± 0.50^{a}			80.00 ± 0.41^{de}
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LE 2: Mean number of a	ne superscript along c ndult-days, egg laid, h	olumns are not s atchability rates.		ferent at $P = 0$.	.05. eamais and gr	ain weight los:	s per iar with	different br	vophyte treat
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	LE 2: Mean number of Co	n tour tepricares. ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h ic. (%) Mean number	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number		ferent at $P = 0$, nergence of <i>S z</i> f eggs Mean 1	P = 0.05. r of S zeamais and gr Mean number of	ain weight los: Fl emerge	s per jar with a	different br Survival	yophyte treat
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LE 2: Mean number of i Co	ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h ic. (%) Mean number of Adult- days	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j		ferent at $P = 0$. nergence of <i>S z</i> f eggs Mean <i>i</i> ult egg lai	05. <i>eamais</i> and grammer of $\frac{1}{Du}$	ain weight loss p Fl emergence ration Nu	s per jar with nce	different br Survival rate (%) 9	yophyte treat %Weight loss
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	LE 2: Mean number of i Co	ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h ic. (%) Mean number of Adult- days per jar	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j		Ferent at $P = 0.05$. nergence of <i>S zeam</i> feggs Mean numb ult egg laid per adult	05. <i>eamais</i> and gr. number of	grain weight los; Fl emerge Duration l (days)	s per jar with serve with serve	different br Survival rate (%) 9	nryophyte treat % Weight loss
$ \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LE 2: Mean number of a Co Treatment 0 Control 0	ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h ic. (%) Mean number of Adult- days per jar 38.00±2.83 ^c	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 134.75±17.07		ferent at $P = 0$ nergence of S z feggs Mean 1 ult egg lai ult adult 13.48±	$\begin{array}{c} 05. \\ \hline \\ unber of \\ \hline \\ d per \\ \hline \\ 3.42^{b} \\ \hline \\ 3.5 \\ \hline \\ 3.5 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ 3.5 \\ \hline \\ $	ain weight los: Fl emerge ration I ys) 67	3 per jar with nce 2 Number/jar 2 .50±2.92° 2	different br Survival rate (%)	yophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LE 2: Mean number of i Control C. afzelli 5	ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h ic. (%) Mean number of Adult- day: per jar 38.00±2.83 ^c 24.14±15.61 ^{ab}	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 134.75±17.07 34.65±9.69 ^a		ferent at P = 0.05. nergence of S zeam feggs Mean numb ult egg laid per adult 13.48 \pm 3.47 \pm 1.94 ^a	$\begin{array}{c} 05.\\ \hline \\ eamais and gradients and gra$	$\begin{array}{c c} grain weight los;\\\hline Fl emerge\\\hline Duration 1\\ (days)\\ 33.0\pm 2.5 67\\ 39.0\pm 3.5 19\end{array}$	oss per jar with gence Number/jar 67.50±2.92 ^c 19.50±0.65 ^{ab}	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 4 56.28 1	ryophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.08 ^a
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	LE 2: Mean number of i Control C. afzelli 10	ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h nc. (%) Mean number of Adult- day: per jar 24. 14±15.61 ^{ab} 19. 29±16.11 ^{ab}	atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 134.75±17.07 2 34.65±9.69 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a		ferent at $P = 0.05$. nergence of <i>S zean</i> feggs Mean num ult egg laid pe 13.48 \pm 3.47 \pm 1.94° 4.24 \pm 1.47°	$\begin{array}{c} 05.\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ number of \\ \hline \\ \frac{1}{3.42^{b}} \\ 0.94^{a} \\ \frac{3}{3} \\ .47^{a} \\ 38 \end{array}$	grain weight loss F1 emerge Duration 1 (days) 33.0±2.5 67 33.0±2.5 19 38.0±2.0 17	sss per jar with gence 8 Number/jar 8 19.50±0.65 ^{ab} 9 17.50±0.96 ^a 4	different br Survival rate (%) \$ 50.09 2 56.28 41.32	yophyte treat % Weight loss % R8±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.08 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a
	Arreating carrying sar LE 2: Mean number of i Co Control Control Control C. afzelli 5 20	ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h ic. (%) Mean number of Adult- day: per jar 24.14 ± 15.61^{ab} 19.29 ± 16.11^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab}	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 134.75 ± 17.07 34.65 ± 9.69^{a} 42.35 ± 7.37^{a} 30.80 ± 6.29^{a}		ferent at $P = 0$ nergence of S z feggs Mean 1 ult egg lai ult adult 13.48± 3.47±1 4.24±1 3.08±1	$\begin{array}{c} 05.\\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\$	grain weight los: F1 emerge Duration 1 (days) 33.0±2.5 67 38.0±2.0 17 40.0±4.0 18	sss per jar with gence 2 Number/jar 2 57.50±2.92 ^c 3 19.50±0.65 ^{ab} 3 17.50±0.96 ^a 4	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 4 56.28 1 41.32 1 41.32 1	yophyte treat % Weight loss % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.08 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	Arreating carrying sar Control Control Control C. afzelli 5 T. gratum 5	ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h nc. (%) Mean number of Adult- days per jar 24. 14 ± 15.61^{ab} 19.29 ± 16.11^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} $24. 14\pm11.73^{ab}$	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 134.75 ± 17.07 $34.65\pm9.69^{\text{s}}$ $42.35\pm7.37^{\text{s}}$ $30.80\pm6.29^{\text{s}}$ $46.20\pm10.89^{\text{s}}$		ferent at $P = 0.05$. nergence of <i>S zean</i> feggs Mean num ult egg laid pe $3.47\pm1.94^{\circ}$ $4.24\pm1.47^{\circ}$ $3.08\pm1.26^{\circ}$ $4.62\pm2.18^{\circ}$	$\begin{array}{c} 05. \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\$	ain weight los: F1 emerge ration I 0+2.5 67 0+2.0 17 0+2.0 17 0+2.0 18 0+2.0 18	sss per jar with <u>gence</u> Number/jar 67.50±2.92 ^c 19.50±0.65 ^{ab} 17.50±0.96 ^a 18.50±1.56 ^a 18.50±1.56 ^a 24.50±2.22 ^b	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 4 56.28 1 41.32 1 41.32 1 53.03 2	ryophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.08 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a 2.05±0.26 ^a 2.45±0.27 ^a
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	Arreating carrying sar Control Control Control C. afzelli 5 T. gratum 5 10	n rou represents ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h nc. (%) Mean number of Adult- days per jar $38.00\pm2.83^{\circ}$ 24.14 ± 15.61^{ab} 19.29 ± 16.11^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} 16.43 ± 16.69^{ab}	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 34.65 ± 9.69^{a} 42.35 ± 7.37^{a} 30.80 ± 6.29^{a} 23.10 ± 4.45^{a}		ferent at $P = 0.05$. nergence of S zean feggs Mean num ult egg laid pe 13.48 \pm 3.47 \pm 1.94° 4.24 \pm 1.47° 3.08 \pm 1.26° 4.62 \pm 2.18°	$\begin{array}{c} \text{(05.} \\ \hline \\ \text{number of } \\ \hline \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \text{(da)} \\ ($	grain weight loss F1 emerge Duration 1 (days) 33.0±2.5 67 38.0±2.0 17 40.0±4.0 18 36.0±2.0 17 38.0±2.0 17 38.0±2.1 17 38.0±2.	sss per jar with gence 8 Number/jar 8 67.50±2.92 ^c 3 19.50±0.65 ^{ab} 4 17.50±0.96 ^a 4 18.50±1.56 ^a 4 24.50±2.22 ^b 5 24.50±2.22 ^b 5 17.25±1.44 ^a 5	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 4 56.28 1 56.28 1 56.28 1 56.07 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 74.68 1	ryophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.08 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a 2.05±0.26 ^a 2.45±0.27 ^a 1.98±0.14 ^a
10 11.57 ± 13.25^{a} 34.65 ± 3.85^{a} 2.99 20 7.57 ± 11.83^{a} 30.80 ± 10.89^{a} 4.07 5 29.71 ± 8.20^{bc} 46.20 ± 10.89^{a} 1.56 10 18.86 ± 15.59^{ab} 38.50 ± 4.45^{a} 2.04 20 18.14 ± 14.60^{ab} 42.35 ± 3.85^{a} 2.33	All calls call ying sai Control Control Control C. afzelli 5 C. afzelli 10 20 T. gratum 10 20 20 20	ne superscript along c ne superscript along c of Adult-days, egg laid, h nc. (%) Mean number of Adult-day; per jar 24. 14±15.61 ^{ab} 19. 29±16.11 ^{ab} 17. 29±16.21 ^{ab} 17. 29±16.21 ^{ab} 16.43±16.69 ^{ab} 12. 86±14.08 ^{ab}	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 34.65±9.69 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 23.80±6.29 ^b 42.3.10±4.45 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a		Ferent at P = 0.05. nergence of S zean reggs Mean num ult egg laid pe adult 13.48±3.42 3.47±1.94° 3.08±1.26° 4.62±2.18° 2.31±0.89° 4.24±1.47° 18°	$\begin{array}{c} \text{(05.} \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \text{number of } \\ \hline \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	grain weight los: F1 emerge Duration 1 (days) 33.0±2.5 67 38.0±2.0 17 40.0±4.0 18 36.0±2.0 17 38.0±2.5 17 38.0±2.5 17 38.0±3.5 17	$\frac{\text{gence}}{\text{Number/jar}} = \frac{3}{2}$ $\frac{\text{Solution}}{\text{Number/jar}} = \frac{3}{19.50\pm0.65^{\text{ab}}}$ $\frac{57.50\pm0.96^{\text{a}}}{17.50\pm0.96^{\text{a}}}$ $\frac{18.50\pm1.56^{\text{a}}}{24.50\pm2.22^{\text{b}}}$ $\frac{24.50\pm2.22^{\text{b}}}{24.50\pm2.22^{\text{b}}}$ $\frac{24.50\pm2.22^{\text{b}}}{24.50\pm2.22^{\text{b}}}$	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 4 56.28 1 55.28 1 41.32 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 41.32 1 41.32 2	yophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73-0.08 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a 2.25±0.26 ^a 2.25±0.27 ^a 2.45±0.27 ^a 1.98±0.14 ^a
20 7.57 \pm 11.83 ^a 30.80 \pm 10.89 ^a 4.07 5 29.71 \pm 8.20 ^{bc} 46.20 \pm 10.89 ^a 1.56 10 18.86 \pm 15.59 ^{ab} 38.50 \pm 4.45 ^a 2.04 20 18.14 \pm 14.60 ^{ab} 42.35 \pm 3.85 ^a 2.33	All ean number of : Co Treatment Co Control 0 C. afzelli 5 C. afzelli 10 20 20 T. gratum 5 B. coronatum 5	ne superscript along c ne superscript along c of Adult-days, egg laid, h nc. (%) Mean number of Adult-day: per jar 24. 14±15.61 ^{ab} 19. 29±16.11 ^{ab} 17. 29±16.21 ^{ab} 17. 29±16.21 ^{ab} 16.43±16.69 ^{ab} 15. 57±13.97 ^{ab}	atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 34.65±9.69 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 30.80±6.29 ^b 442.35±7.37 ^a 442.35±7.37 ^a 34.65±9.7.37 ^a		Ferent at P = 0.05. nergence of S zean reggs Mean num ult egg laid pe adult 13.48±3.42 3.47±1.94° 3.08±1.26° 4.62±2.18° 2.31±0.89° 3.47±1.47° 3.47±1.47°	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} $	grain weight loss F1 emerge Duration 1 1 (days) 67 33.0±2.5 19 38.0±2.0 17 40.0±4.0 18 36.0±2.5 17 38.0±2.5 17 38.0±2.5 17 38.0±2.5 17 38.0±2.5 17 38.0±2.5 17 38.0±4.0 19	$\frac{\text{gence}}{\text{Number/jar}} = \frac{3}{3}$ $\frac{19.50\pm0.96^{\text{ab}}}{17.50\pm0.96^{\text{a}}} = \frac{3}{24.50\pm0.22^{\text{b}}}$ $\frac{18.50\pm1.56^{\text{a}}}{24.50\pm2.22^{\text{b}}} = \frac{3}{24.50\pm2.22^{\text{b}}}$ $\frac{17.52\pm1.44^{\text{a}}}{17.52\pm1.44^{\text{a}}} = \frac{3}{24.50\pm1.19^{\text{a}}}$	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 4 56.28 1 41.32 1 60.07 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 55.10 2 55.10 2	ryophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.08 ^a 1.73±0.26 ^a 2.05±0.26 ^a 2.45±0.27 ^a 1.98±0.14 ^a 2.15±0.44 ^a 0.98±0.19 ^a
5 29.71 \pm 8.20 ^{bc} 46.20 \pm 10.89 ^a 1.56 10 18.86 \pm 15.59 ^{ab} 38.50 \pm 4.45 ^a 2.04 20 18.14 \pm 14.60 ^{ab} 42.35 \pm 3.85 ^a 2.33	Intreams carrying sar Control Control 0 C. afzelli 5 C. afzelli 10 T. gratum 5 B. coronatum 5 10 10	ne superscript along c ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h rc. (%) Mean number of Adult-day; per jar $38.00\pm2.83^{\circ}$ 24.14 ± 15.61^{ab} 19.29 ± 16.11^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} 16.43 ± 16.69^{ab} 12.86 ± 14.08^{ab} 12.86 ± 14.08^{ab} 15.57 ± 13.97^{ab}	atchability rates, atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 34.65±9.69 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 30.80±6.29 ^b 23.10±4.45 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a		ferent at P = 0. nergence of S z f eggs Mean i ult egg lai adult 13.47±1 3.47±1 3.08±1 4.24±1 3.47±1 3.47±1 3.47±1	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} $	$\begin{array}{c c} \underline{ain \ weight \ los:} \\ \hline Fl \ emerge \\ \hline Fl \ emerge \\ ration \\ 0 \pm 2.5 \\ 0 \pm 2.0 \\ 0 \pm 2.0 \\ 0 \pm 2.0 \\ 0 \pm 2.5 \\ 0$	nce in with in the interval of	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 4 56.28 1 55.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 55.00 1 25.00	ryophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.08 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a 2.05±0.26 ^a 2.45±0.27 ^a 1.98±0.14 ^a 2.15±0.44 ^a 0.98±0.19 ^a 1.38±0.26 ^a
$18.86 \pm 15.59^{ab} \qquad 38.50 \pm 4.45^{a} \qquad 2.04$ $18.14 \pm 14.60^{ab} \qquad 42.35 \pm 3.85^{a} \qquad 2.33$	INTEGRIS CALLYING SAL LE 2: Mean number of ; Co Control Control C. afzelli 5 C. afzelli 5 10 20 T. gratum 10 20 B. coronatum 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	ne superscript along c ne superscript along c of Adult-days, egg laid, h rc. (%) Mean number of Adult-days per jar $38.00\pm2.83^{\circ}$ 24.14 ± 15.61^{ab} 19.29 ± 16.11^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} 16.43 ± 16.69^{ab} 12.88 ± 14.08^{ab} 12.88 ± 14.08^{ab} 15.57 ± 13.25^{a} 11.57 ± 13.25^{a}	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 34.65±9.69 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 30.80±6.29 ^b 42.35±7.37 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a		Ferent at P = 0.05. nergence of S zeam f eggs Mean num ult egg laid pe 13.48 \pm 3.47 3.47 \pm 1.94 ^a 3.08 \pm 1.26 ^a 4.24 \pm 1.47 ^a 3.47 \pm 1.94 ^a 3.47 \pm 1.94 ^a 3.47 \pm 1.18 ^a 3.08 \pm 2.31 \pm 0.89 ^a 3.47 \pm 1.147 ^a 3.08 \pm 2.18 ^a	$\begin{array}{c} \text{(05.} \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \text{number of } \\ \hline \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \text{d per } \\ \hline \\ \text{d a } \\ \\ \text{d a } \\ \hline \\ \text{d a } \\ \\ \text{d a } \\ \hline \\ \text{d a } \\ \\ \ \\ \ \\ \ \\ \ \\ \ \\ \ \\ \ \\ \ \\ \$	$\begin{array}{c c} grain \ weight \ los: \\\hline Fl \ emerge \\ \hline Fl \ emerge \\ \hline 0 \\ (days) \\ (days) \\ 33.0\pm2.5 \\ 38.0\pm2.0 \\ 40.0\pm4.0 \\ 38.0\pm2.0 \\ 38.0\pm2.5 \\ 38.0\pm2.0 \\ 38.0\pm2.0 \\ 12 \\ 38.0\pm2.0 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 1$	ss per jar with <u>gence</u> Number/jar 19.50±2.92 ^c 19.50±0.65 ^{ab} 17.50±2.26 ^b 17.50±1.26 ^b 24.50±2.12 ^b 24.50±2.144 ^a 17.25±1.44 ^a 17.25±1.19 ^a 17.55±0.4.19 ^a 19.55±0.48 ^{ab} 19.55±0.48 ^{ab}	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 4 56.28 1 55.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 53.03 2 55.10	yophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.08 ^a 1.88±0.15 ^a 2.05±0.26 ^a 2.25±0.26 ^a 1.98±0.14 ^a 1.98±0.14 ^a 1.98±0.19 ^a 1.5±0.44 ^a 1.5±0.26 ^a 1.38±0.26 ^a 1.38±0.26 ^a
18.14+14.60 ^{ab} 42.35+3.85 ^a 2.33	Arreams carrying sar Co Treatment Co Control 0 C. afzelli 5 C. afzelli 10 T. gratum 5 T. gratum 10 B. coronatum 10 B. lambarenensis 5	ne superscript along c idult-days, egg laid, h ic. (%) Mean number of Adult-days per jar $38.00\pm 2.83^{\circ}$ 24.14 ± 15.61^{ab} 19.29 ± 16.11^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.21^{ab} 16.43 ± 16.69^{ab} 12.88 ± 14.08^{ab} 15.57 ± 13.25^{a} 11.57 ± 13.25^{a} 11.57 ± 13.25^{a} 29.71 ± 8.20^{bc}	olumns are not s atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 34.65±9.69 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 30.80±6.29 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.89 ^a		Ferent at P = 0. nergence of S z f eggs Mean 1 ult egg lai 3.47 ± 1 3.42 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.08 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.08 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.47 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.47 ± 1 3.47 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.47 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.47 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.47 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.47 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 3.47 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 4.24 ± 1 3.48 ± 1 3	$\begin{array}{c} \text{(05.} \\ \hline eamais \text{ and } gr. \\ \hline \text{number of } \\ \hline d \text{ per } \\ \hline d \\ gamma $	$\begin{array}{c c} ain \ weight los: \\\hline Fl \ emerge \\ ration \\ 0 \pm 2.5 \\ 0 \pm 2.5 \\ 0 \pm 2.0 \\ 0 \pm 2.0 \\ 0 \pm 2.0 \\ 0 \pm 2.0 \\ 0 \pm 2.5 \\ 0 \pm 2.5 \\ 0 \pm 2.0 \\ 0 \pm 2.5 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ 15 \\ $	s per jar with nce S(1) Number/jar S(1) (50+2.92° (50+2.92° (50+1.156° (50+1.156°) (50+1.19°) (50+1	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 41.32 53.03 53.03 54.132 55.10 55	yophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88±1.27 ^b 1.73±0.26 ^a 2.05±0.26 ^a 2.245±0.27 ^a 1.98±0.14 ^a 2.25±0.44 ^a 2.15±0.44 ^a 2.15±0.44 ^a 1.98±0.19 ^a 1.38±0.26 ^a 1.38±0.27 ^a
	All ean number of ; Co Treatment Co Control 0 C. afzelli 5 C. afzelli 5 T. gratum 10 B. coronatum 10 B. lambarenensis 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	ne superscript along c ne superscript along c of Adult-days, egg laid, h rc. (%) Mean number of Adult-day per jar $38.00\pm 2.83^{\circ}$ 24.14 ± 15.61^{ab} 19.29 ± 16.11^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.12^{ab} 17.29 ± 16.12^{ab} 16.43 ± 16.69^{ab} 15.57 ± 13.97^{ab} 15.57 ± 13.25^{a} 11.57 ± 13.25^{a} 11.57 ± 13.25^{a} 11.57 ± 11.83^{a} 29.71 ± 8.20^{bc}	atchability rates, Mean number eggs laid per j 34.65±9.69 ^a 42.35±7.37 ^a 30.80±6.29 ^a 44.25±7.37 ^a 30.80±1.89 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.37 ^a 34.65±7.89 ^a 35.80±10.89 ^a		Ferent at P = 0.05. nergence of S zeam f eggs Mean num egg laid pe adult adult 13.48 \pm 3.47 4.24 \pm 1.47 ^a 3.08 \pm 1.26 ^a 4.62 \pm 2.18 ^a 3.47 \pm 1.47 ^a 3.08 \pm 1.26 ^a 4.62 \pm 2.18 ^a 3.47 \pm 1.47 ^a 3.08 \pm 2.31 \pm 0.89 ^a 3.47 \pm 1.47 ^a 3.08 \pm 2.18 ^a 3.08 \pm 2.18 ^a 4.62 \pm 2.18 ^a 3.85 \pm 0.89 ^a	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} $	grain weight los: Fl emerge Duration I (days) 67 33.0+2.5 67 38.0+2.0 17 38.0+2.0 18 36.0+2.0 17 38.0+2.5 17 38.0+2.5 17 38.0+2.5 17 38.0+2.5 17 38.0+2.5 17 38.0+2.5 17 38.0+2.5 15 38.0+2.0 16 38.0+2.0 16 38.0	ss per jar with <u>gence</u> Number/jar 67.50±2.92 ^c 17.50±0.65 ^{ab} 17.50±1.156 ^a 18.50±1.56 ^a 18.50±1.25±1.44 ^a 17.25±1.44 ^a 19.75±0.41.8 ^{ab} 19.75±0.48 ^{ab} 19.75±0.48 ^{ab} 19.75±1.25 ^{ab} 15.50±0.65 ^a 19.75±1.25 ^{ab}	different br Survival rate (%) 9 50.09 41.32 53.03 74.68 41.32 53.03 74.68 1 41.32 53.03 53.03 53.03 54.10 55.10 5	ryophyte treat % Weight loss 4.88 ± 1.27^{b} 1.73 ± 0.08^{a} 1.88 ± 0.15^{a} 2.05 ± 0.26^{a} 2.48 ± 0.14^{a} 2.15 ± 0.44^{a} 0.98 ± 0.19^{a} 1.38 ± 0.26^{a} 1.38 ± 0.26^{a} 1.45 ± 0.27^{a} 1.45 ± 0.27^{a}

TABLE 1: Daily and absolute mortality rates of S. zeamais exposed to 0%, 5%, 10% and 20% pulverized dry samples of four bryophyte over seven days.

Values are means of four replicates. Means carrying the same superscript alphabet along columns are not significantly different at P=0.05.

Weight loss as a result of the activities of S. *zeamais* on maize grains showed a trend reflecting the number of adults that emerged from the respective treatment jars. Jars treated with bryophytes powders had significantly (P<0.05) lower weight loss when compared with the control experiment. This was however not due to a reduction in the consumption level of the pre-imaginal stages of *S. zeamais*, since weight losses per emerged individual in both cases were comparable and not significantly different.

DISCUSSION

All the bryophyte samples were toxic to S. zeamais at 5% w/w treatment and an optimum toxicity of 100% was recorded with T. gratum and B. coronatum at 10% w/w treatment level. The order of toxicity of the bryophyte was B. coronatum> T. gratum> C. afzelli>B. lambarenensis. The bryophytes also showed their toxic activities quite promptly with C. afzelli, T. gratum and B. coronatum recording significantly higher mean daily mortality the first day of application and absolute mortality was achieved within the first 5 days. This resulted in the sharp reduction in number of adult days recorded in the various treatments as compared with the control experiment. The order of efficacy regarding adult day reduction was B. coronatum> C. afzelli = T. gratum > B. lambarenensis. All the bryophytes reduced S. zeamais oviposition significantly (P<0.05) and these did not differ with type of bryophyte or it's in the capability of the individual to lay eggs. In fact treated S. zeamais recorded higher oviposition rate per adult-day in some cases. The reduction was however due to the paucity of the individuals laying the eggs and not a reduction.

The bryophytes did not deter adult emergence but it prolonged the duration of the *S. zeamais* pre-imaginal stages slightly. *C. afzelli* and *B. coronatum* prolonged the pre-imaginal duration by 3 days at 5% concentration and for 5 and 7 days, respectively at 20% concentration. The significantly (P<0.05) lower number of adult *S. zeamais* emergence noticed with bryophyte treatments may not have been due to mortality of the pre-imaginal stages, since survival recorded in the treatments and control experiments were comparable. Some of the bryophytes, e.g. *C. afzelli* and *T. gratum*, actually enhanced the survival of the pre-imaginal stages of *S. zeamais*.

Weight loss as a result of the activities of *S. zeamais* on maize grains showed a trend that reflected the number of adults that emerged from the respective treatment jars. Jars treated with bryophytes powders had significantly (P<0.05) lower weight loss when compared with the control experiment. Although a weight loss was recorded on the maize grain, this may however not be due to a reduction in the food consumption of the pre-imaginal stages of *S. zeamais*, since weight loss per emerged individual, in both cases, were comparable and not significantly different.

Although quite a number of plant materials have been reported to elicit grain protectant properties against *S. zeamais* (Okonkwo and Okoye, 1996; Okonkwo and Ewete, 1998; Lajide *et al.*, 1998; Arannilewa, 2007), all

these plants are spermatophytes. Biocidal activity of bryophytes is being reported against *S. zeamais* for the first time (?????). All the four lower plants (bryophytes) tested showed some promise as insecticidal materials. Further investigation in this regard is desirous as these plant materials abound in the ecosystem waiting to be tapped for constructive purposes.

CONCLUSION

The four bryophytes plants, *i.e. C. afzelli, T. gratum* and *B. coronatum* and *B. lambarenensis* reduced oviposition and F1 progeny emergence, prolonged the duration of preimaginal stages and elicited prompt toxic activity against *S. zeamais.*

REFERENCES

Ando, H. and Matsuo, A. (1984) Applied Biology. *Advances in Bryology*. **2**, 133-224.

Anon (1991) Recommendations of the symposium on resources for sustainable agriculture. The use of neem and other plant materials for pest control and rural development. *Neem Symposium XVII PacificScience Congress* (Honolulu: East West Centre). pp 1-11.

Arannilewa, S.T. (2007) A simple laboratory prescreens for plants with grain protectant effects against the maize weevil; *Sitophilus zeamais* (Mostch.) Coleoptera: curculionidae). *Agricultural Journal* **2(6)**, 736-739.

Banerjee, R.D. and Sen, S.P. (1979) Antibiotic activity of bryophytes. *The Bryologist*, **82**, 141-153.

Jembere, B., Obeng-Ofori, D., Hassanali, A., Nyamasoyo, G.N.N. (1995) Products derived from the leaves of *Ocimum kilimandscharicum* (Labiatae) as post-harvest grain protectants against the infestation of three major stored product insect pests. *Bulletin of Entomological Research.* **85**, 361-367.

Lajide, L., Adedire, C.O., Muse, W.A. and Agele, S.O. (1998) Insecticidal activity of powders of some Nigerian plants against the maize weevil (*Sitophilus zeamais* Mostch.). *Entomological Society of Nigeria (ESN)* Occasional Publication, **31**, 227-235.

Okonkwo, E.U. and Ewete, F.K. (1998) Comparative evaluation of *Dennettia tripetala* seed powder, pirimiphosmethyl and Aluminium posphide tablet against *Sitophilus zeamais* Motschulsky (Coleopteran: Curculionidae) and their biochemical and organoleptic effects on stored maize. *Nigerian Food Journal* **16**, 29-35.

Okonkwo, E.U. and Okoye, W.I. (1996) The efficacy of four seed powders and the essential oils as protectants of cowpea and maize grains against infestation by *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Fibricius) (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) and *Sitophilus zeamais* (Motschulsky) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) in Nigeria. *International Journal of Pest Management*, **42**(**3**), 143-146.