OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

Entomology, Ornithology & Herpetology: Current Research

Research Article

Predatory Efficacy of Selected Plant Extracts and Botanical Synthesized Nanoparticles on *Culex* (L) *fuscanus*

Krishna Dass[1*], Pitchaimuthu Mariappan[2]

[1]*Department of Zoology, Annai Vailankanni Arts and Science College, Tamil Nadu, India;*[2]*Department of Zoology, Rajah Serfoji Government College (Autonomous), Tamil Nadu, India*

ABSTRACT

Chemical based insecticides and bio-pesticides are used to control mosquito larvae and in turn these larvicides posse problems to non-target co-inhabitants. In this regard the present study was carried out to find the influence of *Aegle marmelos, Coleus aromaticus, Colocasia esculenta* and *Wrightia tinctoria* plant extracts and green synthesized silver nanoparticles on the predation of mosquito predator, *Cx (L) fuscanus* which is also a mosquito larva. The study indicates that the plant extracts and green synthesized silver nano-particles have no effect (P<0.05) on the predation of *Cx (L) fuscanus*. Hence use of these plant extract and green synthesized silver nano-particles are recommended to control mosquito larvae along with this predator.

Keywords: Predation; *Cx (L) fuscanus* ; Plant extracts; Nanoparticles

INTRODUCTION

Synthetic insecticides such as DDT, Malathion and temephos used for vector control are non-degradable, non-selective and have harmful effect on non-target organisms the alternative for synthetic insecticide, plant derived natural products have many advantages. Being harmless to non-target organisms they do not cause pollution. They are also biodegradable [1]. The use of these natural chemicals in mosquito control program have no adverse effect on biocontrol agents, since biological control is one of the important management strategies of mosquito control where a variety of predators are in use since, different types of predators are used to control of mosquito larvae. Mosquito predator lists start from mosquito larvae of *Toxorhynchites* to some families of aquatic bugs and beetles, tadpoles, flatworms, nematodes, copepods, fishes, dragonfly nymph etc. Wide spectrums of biological agents are in use as biological agents in mosquito abatement programme [2]. Protozoa, fungi, bacteria and viruses also have been considered as biological control agents [3]. Larvivorous fishes such as *Gambusia holbrooki, Pseudomugil signifier* [4] *Gambusia affinis* [5] and *Poecilia reticulate* [6] are also used in mosquito control programme. Use of these larvivourous fishes show encouraging results [7] and *Gambusia affinis* is known as 'mosquito fish' due to its feed preference.

Pesticide/larvicide applied to control mosquito larvae also has negative consequences on non-target organisms [8]. Pesticides both synthetic chemicals and plant derived chemicals are much in use as mosquito larvicides, have direct or indirect effect on the aquatic inhabitant including predator of mosquito [9]. These larvicides may have an indirect effect on larval predation which is reported earlier by Mariappan [10]. A comprehensive review on the effect of different type of chemical agents and its action on non-target organism are reviewed by Talebi [11].

Before advocating a larvicide in mosquito control programme it should be tested for its activity on non-target organism also. In this regard the present study is aimed to find out the effect of plant extracts (*A. marmelos, C. aromaticus C. esculenta, and W. tinctoria*) and green synthesized silver nano-particles on the predation of mosquito predator, *Cx (L) fuscanus* which is also a mosquito larvae.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Larval predation

The prey *Cx. quinquefasciatus* and the predator *Cx (L) fuscanus* were cultured in laboratory following the method adapted by WHO [12] and the IV instars of predator *Cx (L) fuscanus* were

Correspondence to: Krishna Dass, Department of Zoology, Annai Vailankanni Arts and Science College, Tamil Nadu, India, E-mail: kdassrsgc1987@gmail.com

Received: 04-Jan-2022, Manuscript No. Eohcr-21-40773; **Editor assigned:** 10-Jan-2022, PreQC No. Eohcr-21-40773 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 24-Jan-2022, QC No. Eohcr-21-40773; **Revised:** 28-Jan-2022, Manuscript No. Eohcr-21-40773; **Published:** 04-Feb-2022, DOI: 10.35248/2161-0983.22.11.269

Citation: Dass K, Mariappan P (2022) Predatory Efficacy of Selected Plant Extracts and Botanical Synthesized Nanoparticles on *Culex* (L) *Fuscanus*. Entomol Ornithol Herpetol. 11: 269.

kept in speared containers without feed for a period of 12 hours before performing the experiment. In a series plastic aquarium of 300 ml capacity with 250 ml of test concentrations (Sub lethal concentration of LC50 values, 1/4, 1/5, 1/7 ppm of LC50 values of methanol extract of *A. marmelos, C. aromaticus C. esculenta,* and *W. tinctoria*) (1/2, 1/3, 1/6 concentration synthesized silver nanoparticles using *A. marmelos, C. aromaticus C. esculenta, and W. tinctoria*) were taken. Sub-lethal concentrations were selected on basis of LC50 value obtained based on a series of experiments conducted for plant extracts and green synthesized silver nanoparticles (LC50 values of plant extracts *Aegle marmelos* 151.43 ppm, *Coleus aromatics* 188.36 ppm, *Colocasia esculenta* 165.69 ppm and *Wrightia tinctoria* 210.29 ppm and green synthesized silver nano particles of *Aegle marmelos* 33.40 ppm, Coleus aromatics 36.07 ppm, *Colocasia esculenta* 32.69 ppm and *Wrightia tinctoria* 42.76 ppm for IV instar larvae).

In each aquarium one *Cx (L) fuscanus* (predator) and 10 *Cx. quinquefasciatus* IV larvae (prey) were introduced simultaneously. Number of larvae consumed/killed by the predator was recorded for a period of one hour. A control aquarium was also maintained separately by one predator and 10 *Cx. quinquefasciatus* larvae. These experiments were repeated three times for each test concentration.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This experiment was conducted to study the compatibility of the plant extracts and green synthesized silver nanoparticles as larvicides to use in integrated bio-control programme along with mosquito predator *Cx (L) fuscanus*. *Cx (L) fuscanus* is also mosquito species which is a co-inhabitant of other mosquito larvae.

Experiments were conducted in three types of chosen sub-lethal concentrations for plant extracts and green synthesized silver nanoparticles. The chosen concentrations for plant extracts *A. marmelos* are 23.3, 26.6 and 30; *C. aromaticus* are 23.3, 30, and 30. *C. esculenta* are 26.6, 30 and 30, and *W. tinctoria* are 23.6, 26.3 30 respectively (Table 1). Likewise green synthesized silver nanoparticles *A. marmelos* are 26.6, 26.6 and 30, *C. aromaticus* are 23.3, 26.6 and 30, *C. esculenta* are 26.6, 26.6 and 30 and *W. tinctoria* are 26.6, 30 and 30 respectively (Table 2).

Table 1: Influence of *A. marmelos, C. aromaticus, C. esculenta* and *W. tinctoria methanolic* leaf extracts on the predation of IV instar of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* by *Cx. (L) fuscanus*.

Plant species	Control	Concentration (ppm) (% of consumption)		
		1/4	1/5	1/7
A. marmelos	30.0 ± 3.3	23.3 ± 3.3	26.6 ± 3.3	30 ± 0.0
C. aromaticus	30 .0 ± 0.0	23.3 ± 3.3	30 ± 0.0	30 ± 0.0
C. esculenta	30.0 ± 0.0	26.6 ± 3.3	30 ± 0.0	30 ± 0.0
W. tinctoria	30.0 ± 0.0	23.3 ± 0.0	26.6 ± 6.6	30 ± 0.0

Table 2: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the influence of plant extracts and their concentrations on the predatory efficacy of *Cx. (L) fuscanus* on *Cx. Quinquefasciatus.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Main effect Concentration	149.99	3	49.99	2.6	0.0644*
Plant extract	66.66	3	2.22	1.88	0.3309*
Interaction Concentration × Plant extract	83.33	9	9.25	0.49	0.8677*
Error	60	032	18.75		
Total	900	47			

Note : *Statistically not significant at 0.05% level

There is no mortality (predator and prey) occurred during the period of experiment in the selected sub-lethal concentration of plant extracts and green synthesized silver nano-particles. An average of 30 % larvae was consumed by *Cx (L) fuscanus* in the category of control and 27.45% for plant extracts 27.74% for green synthesized silver nanoparticles. A two way ANOVA was performed to study the effect of plant extracts and green synthesized silver nanoparticles and their concentrations on the predator organism. The analysis indicates that there is no significant difference in the predation of *Cx (L) fuscanus* by the plant extracts. Likewise green synthesized silver nanoparticles also have such effect on the predation of *Cx (L) fuscanus* (Tables 3 and 4).

Table 3: Influence of *A. marmelos, C. aromaticus, C. esculenta* and *W. tinctoria* green synthesized silver nanoparticles on predation of IV instar of *Cx. quinquefasciatus* by *Cx. (L) fuscanus*.

Plant species	Control	Concentration (ppm) (% of consumption)		
		1/2	1/3	1/6
A. marmelos	30.0 ± 0.0	26.6 ± 3.3	26.6 ± 3.3	30 ± 0.0
C. aromaticus	30.0 ± 0.0	23.3 ± 3.3	26.6 ± 3.3	30 ± 0.0
C. esculenta	30.0 ± 0.0	26.6 ± 3.3	26.6 ± 3.3	30 ± 0.0
W. tinctoria	30.0 ± 0.0	26.6 ± 0.0	30 ± 0.0	30 ± 0.0

Table 4: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test the influence of green synthesized silver nano-particles and their concentrations on the predatory efficacy *of Cx. (L) fuscanus* on *Cx. Quinquefasciatus.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Main effect	106.25	3	35.41	2.42	0.0834*
Concentration					
Silver nano-particles	6.24	3	2.08	0.14	0.9335*
Interaction	18.75	9	2.08	0.14	0.9979*
Concentration × Silver nano-particles					
Error	466.66	32	14.58	-	-
Total	597	47	-	-	-

Note : *Statistically not significant at 0.05% level

Insecticides of chemicals origin create several environmental problems in addition to killing non-target organisms such as beneficial natural predators and pollinators. In this regards one should be very careful in integration of biological control and chemical control agents in mosquito control programed. Both agents are must be complement to each other [13]. The effective larvicide and biological control agents are two important components in an integrated pest management system. Since most of the insecticides have a broad spectrum of action, they affect both prey and predator. Selective pesticides are available in few in numbers and these should be identified and integrated in to pest management. A selective pesticide is one that is toxic to pest (target), but has little or no effect on non-target organisms [14]. A list of non-target organism to *Bti* which is used to control mosquitoes is given by Glare and O'Callaghan [15]. Toxicological studies indicate that allethrin group of compounds are toxic to aquatic organisms like fish and stone fly and are less toxic to other aquatic insect larvae and Daphnia. For other species of arthropods the allethrin toxicity ranges from 20 to 2000 ppm [16]. Toxicity of pyrethrum against various fishes was reported and for Salmo gairdneri the toxicity is 0.056 ppm, for *Ictalurus punctatus* it is 0.096 ppm, for *Lepomis macropchirus* it is 0.080 ppm and for stone flies *Pteronarcys californica* it is 0.010 ppm [17]. Further synergistic effect of pyrethroids had been reported 5 times more toxic to rein trout [18]. Brown reported [19] the application of organophosporous has hazardous or unknown effect on associated non-target species. Effects of methanolic extract of *A. monophylla* on non-target organisms have revealed that this extracts is safer to predatory fish's *G. affinis* and *P. reticulata* and aquatic bugs *D. indicus*. Hence it is recommended to use the plants extracts along with these predatory fishes in Integrated Vector Control (IVM) [20]. Three medicinal plants such as *Mammea siamensis, Anethum graveolens* and *Annona muricata* were tested for larvicidal and pupal activity against *Ae. aegypti* and their effect on non-target organisms. The results show that these plants were toxic to *Ae. aegypti* larvae and pupae but had no adverse effect on guppy fish (*Poecilia reticulata*) [21].

Chloroform-methanol extract of *Solanum villosum* was tested for its larvicidal activity against *An. subpictus* larvae and its effect on larvae of *Chironomus circumdatus*. The results indicate that there is no effect of *S. villosum* extract on non-target organism. Crude extract of Jasmine, *Cestrum diurnum* was tested for larvicidal activity against *Cx. quinquefasciatus*. *C. diurnum* extract have a toxic effect on target organisms and no mortality was noticed for non-target organisms, such as Oreochromis niloticus and Chironomid larvae under the laboratory condition [22,23]. They studied the larvicidal activity of green synthesized silver nanoparticles of *Vinca rosea* (L) leaves against the larvae of malaria vector A. stephensi and the filarial vector, *Cx. quinquefasciatus*. They have compared the toxicity of silver nanoparticles on the target (*Cx. quinquefasciatus*) as well as non-target organism, (Poecilia reticulate a predatory fish). Comparative effect of *Alternanthera sessilis, Trema orientalis, Gardenia carinata* and *Ruellia tuberose* leaves was evaluated against target species *(Cx. quinquefasciatus)* and non-target organisms *Diplonychus annulatum* and *Chironomus circumdatus*. There was no significant change in the physiological and behavior of non-target organisms [24]. The studied concentrations had no influence on the survival of non-target organism indicating its safety in field applications on controlling mosquito larvae [25,26]. Impact of pesticides/parricides on non-target arthropods organisms. The present study shows there is no influence of four plants extracts *A. marmelos, C. aromaticus C. esculenta* and *W. tinctoria* and green synthesized silver nanoparticles on the predation of *Cx (L) fuscanus* a non-target organism. The results of this study indicates that both plant extract and synthesized silver nanoparticles have an effect on target organisms and have no adverse effect on non-target organisms [27-35]. It is assumed that the plant extracts are safe to the environment and may be included in the IPM.

CONCLUSION

Singha and Chandra investigated the effect of crude and chloroform: methanol extracts of *Cuminum cyminum, Allium sativum, Zingiber offinale, Curcuma longa* and germinated tuber of Solanum tuberosum on *Toxorhychites splendens, Gambusia affinis, Poecilia reticulate, Diplonychus indicus, Diplonychus annulatum, Anispos bouvieri and Chironomus circumdatus.* Oxidative stress has been associated in several diseases including rheumatoid arthritis cardiovascular diseases, neurodegenerative diseases, diabetics and aging. Natural antioxidants such as phenolics flavonoids compounds may offer resistance against the oxidative stress by scavenging the free radicals, inhibiting lipid peroxidation and by other mechanism. Therefore the present study was undertaken with the aim to show the antioxidant potentials of the studied edible insects.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Redwane A, Lazrek HB, Bouallam S, Markouk M, Amarouch H, Jana M. Larvicidal activity of extracts from Quercus lusitania var. infectoria galls (Oliv). J Ethnopharmacol. 2002;79(2): 261-263.
2. Aditya G, Bhattacharyya S, Kundu N, Saha GK, Raut SK. Frequency-dependent prey-selection of predacious water bugs on Armigeres subalbatus immatures. J Vect Borne Dis. 2005;42(1): 9.
3. Kumar A, Sharma VP, Sumodan PK, Thavaselvam D. Field trials of biolarvicide Bacillus thuringiensis var. israelensis strain 164 and the larvivorous fish Aplocheilus blocki against Anopheles stephensi for malaria control in Goa, India. J Am Mosq Control Ass. 1998;14(4): 457-462.
4. Willems KJ, Webb CE, Russell RC. A comparison of mosquito predation by the fish Pseudomugil signifier Kner and Gambusia holbrooki (Girard) in laboratory trials. J Vector Ecol. 2005;30(1): 87-90.
5. Chatterjee SN, Chandra G. Laboratory trials on the feeding pattern of *Anopheles subpictus, Culex quinquefasciatus* and *Armigeres subalbatus* larvae by Gambusia affinis. Sci Cult. 1997;63: 51-52.
6. Manna B, Aditya G, Banerjee S. Vulnerability of the mosquito larvae to the guppies (Poecilia reticulata) in the presence of alternative preys. J Vector Borne Dis. 2008 ;45(3): 200-206.
7. Amalraj D, Das PK. Estimation of predation by the larvae of *Toxorhynchites splendens* on the aquatic stages of *Aedes aegypti*. Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health. 1998;29(1): 177-183.
8. Stark JD, Banks JE. "Selective" pesticides: are they less hazardous to the environment?. Bio Science. 2001;51(11): 980-982.
9. Hamer A, Lane S, Mahony M. The role of introduced mosquitofish (Gambusia holbrooki) in excluding the native green and golden bell frog (Litoria aurea) from original habitats in south-eastern Australia. Oecologia. 2002;132(3): 445-452.
10. Mariappan P, Narayanan M, Balasundaram C. Mosquito biocontrol: An aid of control of vector-borne diseases. Proceeding of the national seminar on emerging infectious diseases and management, Thiru Vi. Ka. Government Arts College, Thiruvarur, India. 2011; 245-260.
11. Talebi K, Kavousi A, Sabahi Q. Impacts of pesticides on arthropod biological control agents. Pest Technology. 2008;2(2): 87-97.
12. WHO. Guidelines for laboratory and field testing of mosquito larvicides. World Health Organization communicable disease control, prevention and eradication who pesticide evaluation scheme. 2005; 3-36.
13. Chowdhury N, Chatterjee SK, Laskar S, Chandra G. Larvicidal activity of Solanum villosum Mill (Solanaceae: Solanales) leaves to Anopheles subpictus Grassi (Diptera: Culicidae) with effect on non-target Chironomus circumdatus Kieffer (Diptera: Chironomidae). J Pest Sci. 2009;82(1): 13-28.
14. Croft BA. Arthropod biological control agents and pesticides. John Wiley and Sons Inc.1990.
15. Glare TR, O'Callaghan M. Environmental and health impacts of the insect juvenile hormone analogue, S-methoprene. Report for the Ministry of Health New Zealand. 1999.
16. WHO. Vector resistance to pesticides, Fifteenth report of the WHO Expert Committee of Vector Biology and Control. WHO Tech. Rep. Ser. 1992; 818: 1-62.
17. Pillmore Re. Toxicity of pyrethrum to fish and wildlife. Pyrethrum, the natural insecticide. 1973: 143.
18. Bridges WR, Cope OB. Relative toxicities of similar formulations of pyrethrum and rotenone to fish and immature stoneflies. Pyrethrum Post. 1965;8(1): 3-5.
19. Brown MD, Thomas D, Greenwood J.G, Greenwood J, Kay BH. Local authority's evaluation of the environmental consequences of mosquito control programs – acute toxicity of selected pesticides to aquatic non-target fauna. Arbiovirus Research in Australia. 1997;7(1): 31-35.
20. Sivagnaname N, Kalyanasundaram M. Laboratory evaluation of methanolic extract of Atlantia monophylla (Family: Rutaceae) against immature stages of mosquitoes and non-target organisms. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz. 2004;99: 115-118.
21. Promsiri S, Naksathit A, Kruatrachue M, Thavara U. Evaluations of larvicidal activity of medicinal plant extracts to Aedes aegypti (Diptera: Culicidae) and other effects on a non target fish. Insect Sci. 2006;13(3): 179-188.
22. Ghosh A, Chowdhury N, Chandra G. Laboratory evaluation of a phytosteroid compound of mature leaves of Day Jasmine (Solanaceae: Solanales) against larvae of Culex quinquefasciatus (Diptera: Culicidae) and nontarget organisms. Parasitol Res. 2008;103(2): 271-277.
23. Subarani S, Sabhanayakam S, Kamaraj C. Studies on the impact of biosynthesized silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) in relation to malaria and filariasis vector control against Anopheles stephensi Liston and Culex quinquefasciatus Say (Diptera: Culicidae). Parasitol Res. 2013;112(2): 487-499.
24. Rawani A, Ghosh A, Chandra G. Mosquito larvicidal potential of four common medicinal plants of India. Indian J med res. 2014;140(1): 102.
25. Singha S, Chandra G. Mosquito larvicidal activity of some common spices and vegetable waste on Culex quinquefasciatus and Anopheles stephensi. Asian Pac J Trop Med.2011;4(4): 288-293.
26. Price JF, Schuster DJ. Effects of natural and synthetic insecticides on sweetpotato whitefly Bemisia tabaci (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae) and its hymenopterous parasitoids. Fla Entomol. 1991;74: 60-68.
27. Mariappan P, Narayanan M, Balasundaram C. Occurrence of mosquito larvae and its predators in and around Palayankottai, Tamil Nadu. Environ Ecol. 1997; 15(3): 678-682.
28. Huerta A, Medina P, Smagghe G, Castanera P, Vinuela E. Topical toxicity of two acetonic fractions of Trichilia havanensis Jacq. and four insecticides to larvae and adults of Chrysoperla carnea (Stephens) (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae). Commun Agric Appl Biol Sci. 2003;68(4): 277-286.
29. Saber M, Hejazi MJ, Hassan SA. Effects of Azadirachtin/Neemazal on different stages and adult life table parameters of Trichogramma cacoeciae (Hymenoptera: Trichogrammatidae). J Econ Entomol. 2004;97(3): 905-910.
30. Thoeming G, Poehling HM. Integrating soil-applied azadirachtin with Amblyseius cucumeris (Acari: Phytoseiidae) and Hypoaspis aculeifer (Acari: Laelapidae) for the management of Frankliniella occidentalis (Thysanoptera: Thripidae). Environ Entomol. 2006;35(3): 746-756.
31. Babul Hossain M, Poehling HM. Non-target effects of three biorationale insecticides on two endolarval parasitoids of Liriomyza sativae (Dipt., Agromyzidae). J Appl Entomol. 2006;130(6-7): 360-367.
32. Peveling R, Ely SO. Side-effects of botanical insecticides derived from Meliaceae on coccinellid predators of the date palm scale. Crop Prot. 2006;25(12): 1253-1258.

33. Farag NA, Gesraha MA. Impact of four insecticides on the parasitoid wasp, Diaertiella rapae and its host aphid, Brevicoryne brassicae under laboratory conditions. Res J Agric Biol Sci. 2007;3(5): 529-533.
34. Rao GR, Visalakshmi V, Suganthy M, Reddy PV, Reddy YV, Rao VR. Relative toxicity of neem to natural enemies associated with the chickpea ecosystem: a case study. International Journal of Tropical Insect Science. 2007;27(3-4): 229-235.
35. Kraiss H, Cullen EM. Efficacy and nontarget effects of reduced-risk insecticides on Aphis glycines (Hemiptera: Aphididae) and its biological control agent Harmonia axyridis (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae). J Econ Entomol. 2014;101(2): 391-398.