

# BEHAVIOURAL RESPONSE OF STORED PRODUCT INSECTS TO LIGHT AND BAIT SOURCES IN PADDY STORAGE GODOWN

M SATHIYASEELAN, J JAYARAJ\*, M SHANTHI AND K SUJATHA<sup>1</sup>

Department of Agricultural Entomology; <sup>1</sup>Department of Seed Science and Technology, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Madurai 625104, Tamil Nadu, India \*Email: vu2jrj@rediffmail.com (corresponding author)

### ABSTRACT

This study was carried out at the Central Farm, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai, from July to August 2021. Behavioural response of lesser grain borer *Rhyzopertha dominica*, red flour beetle *Tribolium* spp. and Angoumois grain moth *Sitotroga cerealella* to different light and bait sources revealed that the incandescent light 25W was effective with *R. dominica* (17.08%), *Tribolium* spp. (9.28%) and *S. cerealella* (2.98%) followed by compact fluorescent light (CFL) 18W attracting *R. dominica*, *Tribolium* spp. and *S. cerealella*. The least trapping efficiency was observed with CFL 15W and light emitting diodes (LED) 20W lights. The behavioural response to bait when analysed revealed that maximum attraction was observed in wheat flour 41.41% followed by cracked sorghum (32.14%), sorghum flour (24.09%) and pearl millet flour (24.08%).

Key words: Paddy godown, bait and light trap, *Rhyzopertha dominica*, *Tribolium* spp., *Sitotroga cerealella*, incandescent, CFL and LED lights, wheat flour, attraction, monitoring

Phototactic response is an important tool in IPM programme (Nirmal, 2015). Insect pest control in stored grains is critical for the management of food products, post-harvest grains and processed foods (Kim et al., 2010). These insects have the potential to severely degrade the quality, commercial value, weight and seed viability of stored grains (Dal Bello et al., 2000). The most destructive insects of cereals in storage are the lesser grain borer *Rhyzopertha dominica*, rice weevil Sitophilus oryzae, red flour beetle Tribolium spp. and Angoumois grain moth Sitotroga cerealella (Kim et al., 2010; Ahamed and Raza, 2010; Duehl et al., 2011; Ahmad et al., 2013). Light traps are used to control insects in other stored product insects such as the cigarette beetle Lasioderma serricorne, and the Indian meal moth Plodia interpunctella (Samburaj and Phillips, 2008). Incandescent and black lights have wide wavelength and low electric efficiency, while more efficient light sources such as light-emitting diodes (LED) could be used for making insect light traps (Cohnstaedt et al., 2008). Detection of insect incidence using bait traps with pheromones or food attractants or a combination of pheromone and food attractants may influence IPM (Barak, 1989). Therefore, in the present study, the behavioural response of R. dominica, Tribolium spp. and S. cerealella to LED, CFL and incandescent lights and food baits was evaluated under storage condition.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted at the Central Farm storage godown (14.5x 6.5x 3.5 m), Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai during July to August 2021. The light trap setup consisted of a plastic plate (35 cm dia) on top and a plastic funnel on the bottom, which was linked to the top plate via PVC pipes fastened to it. The light source was positioned in the centre of the top plate. To secure the insects, a polythene cover was tied to the funnel. The entire setup was hung upside down in the godown. The experiment was done using LED, CFL and incandescent light traps of different electrical power of 15, 18, 20 and 25W with an untreated control of trap without light. The light traps were operated for 12 hr from 6 pm to 6 am in all the week days and observed for the number of insects trapped. The trap catches were recorded for 35 days (5 standard weeks). All the light traps were installed at 2 m above the ground level. Insects attracted in each trap were observed and sorted out based on major species. The insects collected in the collection bag were killed by exposure to ethyl acetate. The number of S. cerealella, R. dominica and Tribolium spp. were counted and the trapping efficiency of light sources was calculated using the formula (Dangi, 2004)-

Trapping efficiency (%) =  $\frac{\text{Number of a particular species}}{\text{Total number of all species}} \times 100$ 

Food materials were cracked and crushed grains

and flours of sorghum, wheat, groundnut, rice, maize pearl millet and rice bran were taken and filled in the polythene receptacles of probe trap-like structure which was made of rustproof metal, hollow cylinders of 23 and 5 cm long and dia, respectively; and with 280 evenly spaced 4 mm hole which can hold 50 g food bait, with one end closed by a removable cap. The bait traps filled with 50 g of materials were inserted into the interspace between the staked bags for the insects to drop into the bottom part of the polyethene receptacle attached with traps. The trap catches were recorded for 25 days and the attraction index was calculated using the formula (Smith et al., 1993): Attraction Index (%) =  $((T-C)/N) \times 100$ , where T- no. of insects attracted in treatment; C- No. of insects trapped in the control; and N- Total no. of individuals. The attraction index and the difference in the behavioural response/ orientation of the insects were analysed using completely randomized design (CRD) by one-way ANOVA subjecting the data to arcsine transformation and were separated by using Duncan's Multiple Range Test (DMRT) with SPSS 22.0 software and the differences were regarded as significant at p < 0.05 (Gomez and Gomez, 1984).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Trapping of insect pests of stored paddy observed using different light and bait sources and the relative insect trapping efficiency of various light sources was analysed. The weekly insect trapping efficiency of incandescent light 25W was found to be the maximum for R. dominica (17.08%), Tribolium spp., (9.28%) and S. cerealella (2.98%) followed by CFL 18W 14.98%, 8.60% and 2.32% of R. dominica, Tribolium spp. and S. cerealella, respectively; the lower attraction was due to CFL 15W viz., 3.91, 2.41 and 1.87% of R. dominica, Tribolium spp. and S. cerealella, respectively; while due to LED 20W the attraction was 3.44, 2.54 and 1.33% of R. dominica, Tribolium spp. and S. cerealella, respectively (Table 1). The results indicate varied attraction indices of insects in bait sources. The attraction of S. cerealella towards wheat flour was 23.44% followed by pearl millet flour (9.81%) and rice bran + rice flour (9.55%). A least attraction of S. cerealella was observed in sorghum flour (4.80%); R. dominica was attracted more in cracked sorghum bait (11.72%) followed by pearl millet flour (9.95%) and rice flour (4.23%). For Tribolium spp. higher attraction

Table 1. Trappings of storage pests in light sources

		No. of insects trapped/trap/week*						Trapping
Light sources	Insects collected	28 SW	29 SW	30 SW	31 SW	32 SW	Total	efficiency
								(%)
LED 15W	Rhyzopertha dominica	22.67	24.33	97.00	75.33	66.00	285.33	7.05
	Tribolium spp.	13.67	21.67	28.00	31.67	25.67	120.68	2.98
	Sitotroga cerealella	4.67	6.33	15.00	13.00	13.67	52.67	1.30
CFL 15W	Rhyzopertha dominica	13.67	15.67	34.33	51.67	42.67	158.01	3.91
	Tribolium spp.	9.00	10.33	23.67	29.00	25.67	97.67	2.41
	Sitotroga cerealella	19.00	14.67	10.00	16.00	16.00	75.67	1.87
Incandescent	Rhyzopertha dominica	96.33	88.00	71.00	74.33	64.00	393.66	9.73
15W	Tribolium spp.	13.00	29.67	40.67	40.00	34.33	157.67	3.90
	Sitotroga cerealella	10.00	4.67	14.00	17.67	16.67	63.01	1.56
LED 20W	Rhyzopertha dominica	9.00	14.00	26.67	45.00	44.33	139	3.44
	Tribolium spp.	8.33	15.67	24.67	30.00	24.00	102.67	2.54
	Sitotroga cerealella	3.00	7.33	12.00	14.33	17.33	53.99	1.33
CFL 18W	Rhyzopertha dominica	128.33	120.67	121.00	117.00	119.00	606	14.98
	Tribolium spp.	79.67	73.00	73.33	61.00	61.00	348	8.60
	Sitotroga cerealella	14.33	9.33	16.33	23.67	30.00	93.66	2.32
Incandescent	Rhyzopertha dominica	90.33	139.67	172.67	150.67	137.67	691.01	17.08
25W	Tribolium spp.	62.67	68.33	89.67	82.33	72.33	375.33	9.28
	Sitotroga cerealella	13.67	13.33	22.67	32.00	39.00	120.67	2.98
Control	Rhyzopertha dominica	5.33	8.00	14.67	13.00	13.33	54.33	1.34
(No light)	Tribolium spp.	3.00	5.33	7.00	9.33	9.00	33.66	0.83
	Sitotroga cerealella	1.67	3.00	5.00	5.67	6.67	22.01	0.54
Grand total	_						4044.7	100.00

\*Mean of three replications; SW-Standard week

index to cracked sorghum was 13.72% followed by sorghum flour (11.72%) and the least attraction of *Tribolium* spp. was observed in rice flour (3.66%) (Table 2).

Jeon et al. (2011) observed the behavioural response of the rice weevil Sitophilus oryzae to LED at different intensities and wavelength and observed greater number of weevils getting attracted to blue wavelength (84.3%)followed by green, red, UV and IR. In the present study, LED attracted the least number of insects compared with incandescent and CFL lights. Ultraviolet light 4W installed 1.5 m above ground level in the corners and alleyways of a rice warehouse, combined with the use of a bait trap, accurately detected the presence of lesser grain borer, resulting in timely insecticidal treatment (Mohan et al., 1994). The attraction of R. dominica, S. cerealella, T. castaneum and S. zeamais to light traps (6W blacklight-blue) was evaluated by Nualvatna et al. (2003). The blacklight was preferred by R. dominica over the blacklight-blue and green incandescent lamps. The incandescent 25W was attractive to R. dominica, Tribolium spp. and S. cerealella (29.69, 30.37 and 25.05% respectively), followed by CFL 18W (with attraction of 26.04, 28.16 and 19.45%, respectively) (Table 2).

Phototactic response of T. castaneum, S. zeamais Lasioderma serricorne and Tyrophagus putrescentiae to red LED, and S. cerealella and S. oryzae to blue LED was reported by Park et al. (2017). Present study is in conformity with the findings of Song et al. (2016) who studied the attraction of T. castaneum and S. zeamais to LED in the granary and the attraction with black light bulb (BLB) trap and red LED attracted more T. castaneum and S. zeamais than BLB. Phototactic behavioural responses of the Indian meal moth Plodia interpunctella to seven wavelengths of light-emitting diodes (LEDs); the green LED to P. interpunctella adults was approximately 1.81x more attractive than black light bulb (BLB) as reported by Park and Lee (2016). The attractiveness of wheat flour to S. *cerealella* observed now is comparable with earlier studies indicating that larger grain borer Protephanus truncatus and R. dominica were attracted towards cereal host odour (Bashir et al., 2001; Edde and Phillips, 2006). Cracked wheat alone had attracted S. zeamais six times more than S. oryzae (Likhayo and Hodges, 2000). Maximum attraction of R. dominica (11.72%) and Tribolium spp. (13.72%) was observed due to some attractive compounds present in the cracked sorghum and S. cerealella to wheat flour (23.44%) and pearl

	*Relative attraction index (%)		Total	Licht	<i>R</i> .	Tribolium	S.	Insect	
Attractants	S.	<i>R</i> .	Tribolium	attraction	Light	dominica	spp.	cerealella	response
	cerealella	dominica	spp.	index (%)	sources				(%)
Crushed	5.00	8.46	9.11	22.57	LED 15W	12.26	9.77	10.93	32.96
groundnut	(12.92) <sup>f</sup>	(16.91) <sup>d</sup>	(17.57) <sup>d</sup>			(20.50) <sup>d</sup>	(18.21) <sup>d</sup>	(19.31) °	
Wheat flour	23.44	7.53	10.44	41.41	CFL 15W	6.79	7.90	15.71	30.40
	(28.96) <sup>a</sup>	(15.93) ef	(18.85) °			(15.10) <sup>e</sup>	(16.33) <sup>e</sup>	(23.35) °	
Cracked corn	7.82	9.62	4.32	21.4	Incandescent	16.92	12.76	13.08	42.75
	(16.24) °	(18.07) °	(11.99) <sup>g</sup>		15W	(24.29) °	(20.93) °	(21.20) <sup>d</sup>	
Sorghum flour	4.80	7.57	11.72	24.09	LED 20W	5.97	8.31	11.21	25.49
	(12.65) <sup>f</sup>	(15.97) <sup>e</sup>	(20.02) <sup>b</sup>			(14.15) °	(16.75) <sup>e</sup>	(19.56) <sup>e</sup>	
Rice flour	5.75	4.23	3.66	13.64	CFL 18W	26.04	28.16	19.45	73.65
	(13.87) <sup>e</sup>	(11.87) <sup>h</sup>	(11.02) <sup>h</sup>			(30.68) <sup>b</sup>	(32.05) <sup>b</sup>	(26.17) <sup>b</sup>	
Pearl millet	9.81	9.95	4.32	24.08	Incandescent	29.69	30.37	25.05	85.12
flour	(18.25) <sup>b</sup>	(18.39) <sup>b</sup>	(11.99) <sup>g</sup>		25W	(33.02) <sup>a</sup>	(33.44) <sup>a</sup>	(30.03) <sup>a</sup>	
Rice bran	7.72	5.52	6.98	20.22	Control	2.33	2.72	4.57	9.63
	(16.13) °	(13.58) <sup>g</sup>	(15.32) <sup>e</sup>			(8.79) <sup>f</sup>	(9.50) <sup>f</sup>	(12.34) <sup>f</sup>	
Rice bran +	9.55	7.21	5.36	22.12	-	-	-	-	-
Rice flour	(18.00) <sup>b</sup>	(15.58) <sup>f</sup>	(13.39) <sup>f</sup>						
Cracked	6.70	11.72	13.72	32.14	-	-	-	-	-
sorghum	(15.01) <sup>d</sup>	(20.02) <sup>a</sup>	(21.74) <sup>a</sup>						
Control	0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.52) <sup>g</sup>	(0.52) <sup>i</sup>	(0.52) <sup>i</sup>						
SEd	0.297	0.153	0.159	-	-	0.558	0.347	0.283	-

Table 2. Response of stored product insects to bait and light sources

\*Mean of three replications; \*\*Figures in parentheses arc sine transformed values with formula: 1/4n for 0%; Mean followed by same letter (s) in a column not significantly different by DMRT (p=0.05)

millet flour (11.65%). These results are in line with earlier findings in which *R. dominica* was getting attracted to wheat flour (Ahmad et al., 2013). The trapping efficiency of different light sources observed now demonstrate that these sources can be used as a tool in IPM, and sorghum and pearl millet flour can be exploited for monitoring and mass trapping of insect pests in rice godowns.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the Department of Agricultural Entomology and Central Farm, Department of Agronomy, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Madurai for providing facilities.

#### REFERENCES

- Ahmad F, Ridley A W, Daglish G J, Burrill P R, Walter G H. 2013. Response of *Tribolium castaneum* and *Rhyzopertha dominica* to various resources, near and far from grain storage. Journal of Applied Entomology 137(10): 773-781.
- Ahmed S, Raza A. 2010. Antibiosis of physical characteristics of maize grains to *Sitotroga cerealella* (Oliv.) (Gelechiidae: Lepidoptera) in free choice test. Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences 8(2): 142-147.
- Akash Nirmal. 2015. Evaluation of light traps using different coloured lamps for trapping insects in agroforestry ecosystem. Ph D Thesis, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur. 55 pp.
- Barak A V. 1989. Development of a new trap to detect and monitor khapra beetle (Coleoptera: Dermestidae). Journal of Economic Entomology 82(5): 1470-1477.
- Bashir T, Birkinshaw L A, Hall D R, Hodges R J. 2001. Host odours enhance the responses of adult *Rhyzopertha dominica* to maleproduced aggregation pheromone. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 101(3): 273-280.
- Cohnstaedt L E E, Gillen J I, Munstermann L E. 2008. Light-emitting diode technology improves insect trapping. Journal of the American Mosquito Control Association 24(2): 331.
- Dal Bello G, Padin S, Lastra C L, Fabrizio M. 2000. Laboratory evaluation of chemical-biological control of the rice weevil (*Sitophilus oryzae* L.) in stored grains. Journal of Stored Products Research 37(1):77-84.
- Dangi, H S. 2004. Evaluation of light traps with different light sources on insect trapping in medicinal crops. (Doctoral dissertation, JNKVV, Jabalpur) 85 pp.

Research Communication

- Duehl A J, Cohnstaedt L W, Arbogast R T, Teal P E A. 2011. Evaluating light attraction to increase trap efficiency for *Tribolium castaneum* (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae). Journal of Economic Entomology 104(4): 1430-1435.
- Edde P A, Phillips T W 2006. Potential host affinities for the lesser grain borer, *Rhyzopertha dominica*: behavioral responses to host odors and pheromones and reproductive ability on non-grain hosts. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 119(3): 255-263.
- Gomez K A, Gomez A A. 1984. Statistical procedures for agricultural research: John Wiley and Sons, New York. pp. 318-319.
- Jeon J H, Oh M S, Cho K S, Lee H S. 2012. Phototactic response of the rice weevil, *Sitophilus oryzae* Linnaeus (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) to light-emitting diodes. Journal of the Korean Society for Applied Biological Chemistry 55(1): 35-39.
- Kim S I, Yoon J S, Jung J W, Hong K B, Ahn Y J, Kwon H W. 2010. Toxicity and repellency of origanum essential oil and its components against *Tribolium castaneum* (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae) adults. Journal of Asia-Pacific Entomology 13(4): 369-373.
- Likhayo P W, Hodges R J. 2000. Field monitoring *Sitophilus zeamais* and *Sitophilus oryzae* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) using refuge and flight traps baited with synthetic pheromone and cracked wheat. Journal of Stored Products Research 36(4): 341-353.
- Mohan S, Gopalan M, Sundarababu P C, Sreenarayanan V V. 1994. Practical studies on the use of light traps and bait traps in the management of *Rhyzopertha dominica* (F.) in rice warehouses. International Journal of Pest Management 40(2): 148-152.
- Nualvatna K, Makathan N, Chavapradit C, Kitkuandee K, Uraichuan J. 2003. The use of light traps for attracting stored-product insects in a rice mill and paddy seed stores. Advances in stored product protection. Proceedings. 8th International working conference on stored product protection, York, UK, 22-26 July 2002. pp.244-247.
- Park, J H, Lee H S. 2016. Phototactic behavior 10: phototactic behavioral effects of *Plodia interpunctella* (Hubner) (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) adults to different light-emitting diodes of seven wavelengths. Journal of Applied Biological Chemistry 59 (2): 95-98.
- Park J H, Lee H S. 2017. Phototactic behavioral response of agricultural insects and stored-product insects to light-emitting diodes (LEDs). Applied Biological Chemistry 60(2): 137-144.
- Sambaraju K R, Phillips T W. 2008. Responses of adult *Plodia interpunctella* (Hübner) (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) to light and combinations of attractants and light. Journal of Insect Behaviour 21(5): 422-439.
- Smith C M, Khan Z R, Pathak M D. 1993. Techniques for evaluating insect resistance in crop plants. CRC Press.
- Song, J, Jeong E Y, and Lee H S. 2016. Phototactic behavior 9: phototactic behavioral response of *Tribolium castaneum* (Herbst) to light-emitting diodes of seven different wavelengths. Journal of Applied Biological Chemistry 59 (2): 99-102.

(Manuscript Received: September, 2021; Revised: November, 2021; Accepted: November, 2021; Online Published: January, 2022) Online First in www.entosocindia.org and indianentomology.org Ref. No. e21225