Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)



G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar

ADVISORYBOARD

Patron

Dr. Tej Partap, Vice-Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India Members

Dr. A.S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. A.K. Sharma, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. S.K. Kashyap, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. N.S. Jadon, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. K.P. Raverkar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Sandeep Arora, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Alaknanda Ashok, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Home Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. R.S. Chauhan, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. R.S. Jadaun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

EDITORIALBOARD

Members

Prof. A.K. Misra, Ph.D., Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India Dr. Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India

Dr. Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India

Dr. Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W P Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A

Dr. B.B. Singh, Ph.D., Visiting Professor and Senior Fellow, Dept. of Soil and Crop Sciences and Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.

Prof. Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

Dr. D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community/Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India

Dr. Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium

Dr. Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

Dr. G.K. Garg, Ph.D., Dean (Retired), College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines

Dr. Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India

Dr. Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

Dr. M.P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur and Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India

Dr. Martin Mortimer, Ph.D., Professor, The Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom

Dr. Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Project Coordinator AICRP-LTFE, ICAR - Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India

Prof. Omkar, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India

Dr. P.C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Dr. Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, University of South Australia, Australia

Dr. Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, U.S.A.

Dr. R.C. Chaudhary, Ph.D., Chairman, Participatory Rural Development Foundation, Gorakhpur, India

Dr. R.K. Singh, Ph.D., Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India

Prof. Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.

Dr. S.N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

Dr. Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A. Prof. Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India Prof. V.D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Academics, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India

Dr. V.K. Singh, Ph.D., Head, Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India

Dr. Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological Agricultural Engineering, Texas A& M University, U.S.A.

Dr. Vinay Mehrotra, Ph.D., President, Vinlax Canada Inc., Canada

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Manoranjan Dutta, Head Crop Improvement Division (Retd.), National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

Managing Editor

Dr. S.N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Assistant Managing Editor

Dr. Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Technical Manager

Dr. S.D. Samantray, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

PANTNAGAR JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

Vol. 19(3)

September-December, 2021

CONTENTS

Unrevealing the role of epistasis through Triple Test Cross in Indian mustard NARENDER SINGH, USHA PANT, NEHA DAHIYA, SHARAD PANDEY, A. K. PANDEY and SAMEER CHATURVEDI	330
Testing of InfoCrop model to optimize farm resources for mustard crop under <i>tarai</i> region of Uttarakhand	335
MANISHA TAMTA, RAVI KIRAN, ANIL SHUKLA, A. S. NAIN and RAJEEV RANJAN	
<i>In vitro</i> evaluation of endophytes and consortium for their plant growth promoting activities on rice seeds DAS, J., DEVI, R.K.T. and BARUAH, J.J.	342
Effect of subsurface placement of vermicompost manure on growth and yield of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L. Var. UP 2526) ABHISHEK KUMAR and JAYANT SINGH	348
Assessment of different nutrient management approaches for grain yield, gluten content and net income of common bread wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> l.) in Western Himalayan region of Uttarakhand BHAWANA RANA and HIMANSHU VERMA	359
Suitability assessment of land resources forc assava(<i>Manihot esculentus</i> L.) and yam (<i>Dioscorea spp L.</i>) cultivation in Khana LGA, Rivers State, Southern Nigeria PETER, K.D., UMWENI, A.S. and BAKARE, A.O.	367
Biophysical and biochemical characters conferring resistance against pod borers in pigeonpea PARUL DOBHAL, R. P. MAURYA, PARUL SUYAL and S.K. VERMA	375
Population dynamics of major insect pest fauna and their natural enemies in Soybean SUDHA MATHPAL, NEETA GAUR, RASHMI JOSHI and KAMAL KISHOR	385
Fumigant toxicity of some essential oils and their combinations against <i>Rhyzopertha dominica</i> (Fabricius) and <i>Sitophilus oryzae</i> (Linnaeus) NIDHI TEWARI and S. N. TIWARI	389
Long term efficacy of some essential oils against <i>Rhyzopertha dominica</i> (Fabricius) and <i>Sitophilus oryzae</i> (Linnaeus) NIDHI TEWARI and S. N. TIWARI	400
Management strategies under chemicals, liquid organic amendments and plant extracts against black scurf of potato caused by <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> Kühn in <i>tarai</i> regions of Uttarakhand SURAJ ADHIKARI, SHAILBALA SHARMA, R. P. SINGH, SUNITA T. PANDEY and VIVEK SINGH	408
Effective management strategies against ginger rhizome rot caused by <i>Fusarium solani</i> by the application of chemicals, bioagents and Herbal <i>Kunapajala</i> in mid hills of Uttarakhand SONAM BHATT, LAXMI RAWAT and T. S. BISHT	417

Distribution and morphological characterisation of isolates of <i>Fusarium moniliforme</i> fsp. <i>subglutinans</i> causing Pokkah Boeng disease of sugarcane in different sugarcane growing areas of Udham Singh Nagar district of Uttarakhand HINA KAUSAR, BHAGYASHREE BHATT and GEETA SHARMA	429
Biointensive management of <i>Meloidogyne enterolobii</i> in tomato under glasshouse conditions SHUBHAM KUMAR, ROOPALI SHARMA, SATYA KUMAR and BHUPESH CHANDRA KABDWAL	435
Effect of pre-harvest application of eco-friendly chemicals and fruit bagging on yield and fruit quality of mango KIRAN KOTHIYAL, A. K. SINGH, K. P. SINGH and PRATIBHA	447
A valid and reliable nutrition knowledge questionnaire: an aid to assess the nutrition friendliness of schools of Dehradun, Uttarakhand EKTA BELWAL, ARCHANA KUSHWAHA, SARITA SRIVASTAVA, C.S. CHOPRA and ANIL KUMAR SHUKLA	452
Potential of common leaves of India as a source of Leaf Protein Concentrate RUSHDA ANAM MALIK, SHAYANI BOSE, ANURADHA DUTTA, DEEPA JOSHI, NIVEDITA, N.C. SHAHI, RAMAN MANOHARLALand G.V.S. SAIPRASAD	460
Job strain and muscle fatigue in small scale unorganized agri enterprises DEEPA VINAY, SEEMA KWATRA, SUNEETA SHARMA and KANCHAN SHILLA	466
Drudgery reduction of farm women involved in weeding of soybean crop SHALINI CHAKRABORTY	475
Childhood obesity and its association with hypertension among school-going children of Dehradun, Uttarakhand EKTA BELWAL, K. UMA DEVI and APARNA KUNA	482
Spring water and it's quality assessment for drinking purpose: A review SURABHI CHAND, H.J. PRASAD and JYOTHI PRASAD	489
Spatial distribution of water quality for Indo-Gangetic alluvial plain using Q-GIS SONALI KUMARA, VINOD KUMAR and ARVIND SINGH TOMAR	497
Application of geospatial techniques in morphometric analysis of sub-watersheds of Nanak Sagar Catchment AISHWARYA AWARI, DHEERAJ KUMAR, PANKAJ KUMAR, R. P. SINGH and YOGENDRA KUMAR	505
Evaluation of selected carbon sources in biofloc production and carps growth performance HAZIQ QAYOOM LONE, ASHUTOSH MISHRA, HEMA TEWARI, R.N. RAM and N.N. PANDEY	516
Calcium phosphate nanoparticles: a potential vaccine adjuvant YASHPAL SINGH and MUMTESH KUMAR SAXENA	523
Factors affecting some economic traits in Sahiwal Cattle DEVESH SINGH, C. B. SINGH, SHIVE KUMAR, B.N. SHAHI, BALVIR SINGH KHADDA, S. B. BHARDWAJ and SHIWANSHU TIWARI	528
The effect of probiotics and growth stimulants on growth performance of Murrah Buffalo SAMEER PANDEY, RAJ KUMAR, D.S. SAHU, SHIWANSHU TIWARI, PAWAN KUMAR, ATUL SHARMAand KARTIK TOMAR	532

Fumigant toxicity of some essential oils and their combinations against *Rhyzopertha dominica* (Fabricius) and *Sitophilus oryzae* (Linnaeus)

NIDHI TEWARI and S. N. TIWARI

Department of Entomology, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar-263 145 (U.S. Nagar, Uttarakhand)

ABSTRACT: Experiments were conducted to study the fumigant toxicity of essential oils of mint (*Mentha arvensis*), peppermint (*Mentha piperita*), spearmint (*Mentha spicata*), citronella (*Cymbopogon winterianus*), Nilgiri (*Eucalyptus citriodora*), eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus globulus*), and pine (*Pinus roxburghii*) and their combinations against Lesser grain borer, *Rhyzopertha dominica* (Fabricius) (Coleoptera: Bostrichidae) and Rice weevil, *Sitophilus oryzae* (Linnaeus) (Coleoptera : Curculionidae). All the oils except Nilgiri and eucalyptus oils were highly effective against both the insects at 0.2 per cent (v/w) as they suppressed 90-100 per cent progeny of test insects. Increase in concentration of essential oil to 0.4 per cent enhanced their fumigant toxicity; however, Nilgiri oil remained less effective against both the insects even at this level while eucalyptus oil became moderately and highly effective against *R. dominica* and *S. oryzae*, respectively. All the two, three, four, five, six and seven essential oils combinations were highly effective against *R. dominica* and citronella + Nilgiri, citronella + eucalyptus, Nilgiri + eucalyptus which was less effective against *R. dominica* and citronella + Nilgiri, citronella + eucalyptus, Nilgiri + eucalyptus and peppermint + Nilgiri + eucalyptus oils which showed slightly less efficacy against *S. oryzae*. The mixture of peppermint + eucalyptus, peppermint + pine and eucalyptus + pine at 0.1+0.1 per cent completely checked the progeny production of both the insects.

Key words: Bio-efficacy, essential oils, fumigant-toxicity, herbal fumigants, Rhyzopertha dominica, Sitophilus oryzae

The essential oils of many plant species have been reported to exhibit fumigant toxicity against insect pests of stored grain (Grainge and Ahmed, 1988; Shaaya et al., 1990; Shaaya et al., 1997; Rajendran and Sriranjini, 2008; Tewari and Tiwari, 2008; Geetanjly et al., 2016; Kumar and Tiwari, 2018a; Kumar and Tiwari, 2018b; Joshi and Tiwari, 2019; Sharma and Tiwari, 2021a; 2021b; Geetanjly and Tiwari, 2021). However, such oils have not been found much useful in protection of grain from insect infestation due to various reasons and even after intense research on this subject we do not have any commercial formulation of herbal fumigant in the market. It has been realized that their efficacy is not much appreciable at lower concentration due to which their use at higher concentration may increase the cost of protection tremendously. The cost of essential oils is also known to vary according to plant species and it is not economical to use very costly oils at effective concentration for protection of grain. Furthermore, most of these oils are not equally effective against all major insect pests of stored grain (Tripathi et al. 2002; Gangwar and Tiwari, 2017) due to which infestation of grain by other insects

cannot be ruled out. It has been realized that use of these essential oils in combination or herbal formulation may increase their efficacy against many insect pests due to synergistic or additive effect (Kumar and Tiwari, 2017a; 2017b) and it may also help in reduction of cost by choosing combinations of inexpensive oils. Tewari and Tiwari (2021a; 2021b) reported that the essential oils of Mentha arvensis, Mentha piperita, Eucalyptus globulus, Pinus roxburghii were highly effective against Rhyzopertha dominica (F.) at 0.4 per cent, however, their efficacy was poor against Sitophilus oryzae (L.) at same concentration. Some other oils such as Cymbopogon winterianus and Eucalyptus citriodora used in the same study were less effective against both the insects; however, they are economical as compared to others. Under such conditions, the utility of above-mentioned essential oils may be increased if their effects are made additive or synergistic by using them in various combinations. In the present investigation, an attempt was made to study the fumigant toxicity of various combinations of essential oils against R. dominica and S. oryzae. The investigation may lead to several economical

compositions which may be used for the protection of cereals against infestation of both the insect pests.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiments were conducted in Post Harvest Entomology Laboratory of Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Udham Singh Nagar. Pure cultures of test insects were developed in plastic jars of about 1.0 kg capacity having a hole of 1.8 cm diameter in the center of the lid which was covered by 30 mesh copper wire net for proper aeration. The adults of R. dominica and S. oryzae were reared on the grain of wheat variety UP 2565 which was used after disinfestation in the oven at 60°C for 12 hrs. The moisture content of disinfested grain was measured and adjusted to 13.5 per cent by mixing water in the grain. The quantity of water required to raise the moisture content was calculated by using formula given by Pixton (1967). After mixing the water, the grain was stored in closed polythene bag for a week for moisture equilibration. The grain was then filled in plastic jar and 100 adults were released in each jar which was placed in BOD incubator maintained at $30\pm1^{\circ}$ C temperature and 70 ± 5 per cent relative humidity.

The experiment was conducted on seven essential oils namely, mint oil (Mentha arvensis), peppermint oil (Mentha piperita), spearmint oil (Mentha spicata), citronella oil (Cymbopogon winterianus), Nilgiri oil (Eucalyptus citriodora), eucalyptus oil (Eucalyptus globulus) and pine oil (Pinus roxburghii). These oils were collected from the Medicinal and Aromatic Plants Research and Development Centre, Pantnagar and Central Institute of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, Field Station, Pantnagar. The oils were used alone at 0.20 and 0.40 per cent (v/w) concentration or in two, three, four, five, six and seven oils combinations at 0.20, 0.13, 0.10, 0.08, 0.07 and 0.06 per cent each, respectively and each experiment was conducted twice to confirm the results.

The experiments were conducted in control room at $30\pm1^{\circ}$ C temperature and 70 ± 5 per cent relative

humidity on wheat variety UP 2565 (13.5 per cent moisture content) stored in plastic vials $(10 \times 4 \text{ cm})$ and each treatment was replicated three times. The details of essential oils, their combinations and dose are detailed in Table 1 and 2. Untreated grain was used as control. After filling 50g grain in plastic vials, 20 adults (0-7 days old) of R. dominica or S. oryzae were released in each vial. Measured quantity of oils and their combinations were soaked on Whatman No. 42 filter paper disc (3.5 cm diameter) in the ratio indicated in the Table 1 and 2 after which paper disc were inserted in the vial before closing it to make air tight. After closing the lid, the vial was sealed with the help of paraffin wax strips and cello tape. The insects were allowed to complete one generation after which each vial was opened to record the number of adults emerged in each vial. Suppression of progeny caused by each treatment was calculated by using number of adults emerged in treated vial and control. Mean of per cent inhibition recorded in both the experiments was used to draw any conclusion. Data was analyzed in completely randomized design after log (X+1) transformation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Fumigant toxicity of various essential oils and their combinations against R. dominica is presented in Table 1 which indicates that mint, peppermint, spearmint, citronella and pine oil were highly effective at 0.20 and 0.40 per cent dose against this insect as they suppressed 94.2 to 100 per cent progeny. As per classification illustrated by Tewari and Tiwari (2021a), Nilgiri and eucalyptus oils were least effective at 0.20 per cent due to 36.6 and 63.1 per cent inhibition of progeny, however, the efficacy of both these oils increased at 0.4 per cent, and they became less and moderately effective, respectively. Except mint + eucalyptus, all the combinations of two essential oils were found to be highly effective against R. dominica at 0.20 per cent each as they exhibited 93.7 to 100 per cent mean inhibition. The former combination was found to be less effective due to 72.4 per cent mean inhibition. The fumigation of grain by combinations of three essential oils resulted in 98.6 to 100.0 mean inhibition due to which all these treatments were classified as highly

S. 1	Freatment	Conc.	I Exn	eriment	П Ехре	Mean		
No.		% (v/w)	No. of adults		No. of adults		Per cent	
110.		/u ((////)	emerged	inhibition	emerged		inhibition	
1	Mint	0.2		100.0		96.6	98.3	
1. 2.	Peppermint	0.2	$0.0 (0.0) \\ 0.0 (0.0)$	100.0	6.3(2.0)	90.0 99.1	98.3 99.6	
2. 3.		0.2			1.7 (0.6)	99.1 98.7	99.0 99.4	
	Spearmint Citronella	0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	2.3(1.0)		99.4 94.2	
4. 5.	Nilgiri	0.2	5.3 (1.8) 131.0 (4.9)	96.2 7.9	14.7 (2.7) 64.7 (4.2)	92.1 65.3	94.2 36.6	
5. 6.	Eucalyptus	0.2	88.7 (4.5)	26.1	04.7(4.2) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	63.1	
0. 7.	Pine	0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0	
7. 8.	Mint	0.2	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0	
8. 9.	Peppermint	0.4	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0	
9. 10.	Spearmint	0.4	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0	
10. 11.	Citronella	0.4	1.0(0.6)	99.3	5.0 (1.7)	97.3	98.3	
12.	Nilgiri	0.4	50.0 (3.8)	64.8	26.3 (3.3)	88.7	76.8	
12.	Eucalyptus	0.4	34.7 (3.6)	75.6	0.0(0.0)	100.0	87.8	
13. 14.	Pine	0.4	0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0	
15.	Mint + Peppermint	0.2+0.2	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0	
16.	Mint + Spearmint	0.2+0.2 0.2+0.2	1.0(0.5)	99.3	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	99.7	
17.	Mint + Citronella	0.2+0.2	0.7 (0.4)	99.5	4.0 (1.6)	97.8	98.7	
18.	Mint + Nilgiri	0.2+0.2	0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0	
19.	Mint + Eucalyptus	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	103.0 (4.6)	44.8	72.4	
20.	Mint + Pine	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
20.	Peppermint + Spearmint	0.2+0.2	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
21.	Peppermint + Citronella	0.2+0.2 0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
23.	Peppermint + Nilgiri	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
23. 24.	Peppermint + Eucalyptus	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
25.	Peppermint + Pine	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
26.	Spearmint + Citronella	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	5.3 (1.7)	97.1	98.6	
27.	Spearmint + Nilgiri	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
28.	Spearmint + Eucalyptus	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
29.	Spearmint + Pine	0.2+0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
30.	Citronella + Nilgiri	0.2+0.2	3.7 (1.5)	96.9	6.3 (1.9)	96.6	96.8	
31.	Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.2+0.2	1.7 (0.8)	98.6	2.0 (1.1)	98.9	98.8	
32.	Citronella + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
33.	Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.2 + 0.2	15.7 (2.8)	88.9	2.7 (1.3)	98.5	93.7	
34.	Nilgiri + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	0.7 (0.5)	99.5	2.0 (0.8)	98.9	99.2	
35.	Eucalyptus + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
36.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
37.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
38.	Mint + Peppermint + Nilgiri	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
39.	Mint + Peppermint + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
40.	Mint + Peppermint + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
41.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	2.7 (1.3)	98.5	99.3	
42.	Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
43.	Mint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
44.	Mint + Spearmint + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
45.	Mint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
46.	Mint + Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
47.	Mint + Citronella + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.7 (0.5)	99.5	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.8	
48.	Mint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	3.3 (1.0)	97.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	98.6	
49.	Mint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
50.	Mint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
51.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	3.7 (1.5)	98.0	99.0	
52.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	

Table 1: Fumigant toxicity of some essential oils and their combinations against R. dominica

53.	Peppermint+ Spearmint + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
54.	Peppermint+ Spearmint + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0
55.	Peppermint+ Citronella + Nilgiri	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
56.	Peppermint+ Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0
57.	Peppermint+ Citronella + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0
58.	Peppermint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	5.0 (1.8)	97.3	98.7
59.	Peppermint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
60.	Peppermint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
61.	Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
62.	Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
63.	Spearmint + Citronella + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
64.	Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
65.	Spearmint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
66.	Spearmint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
67.	Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
68.	Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
69.	Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
70.	Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.13 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
71.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint +	0.1 (each)	0.7 (0.4)	99.5	1.0 (0.5)	99.4	99.5
	Citronella	()	()				
72.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	5.3 (1.8)	97.1	98.6
73.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint +	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Eucalyptus						
74.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
75.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	7.0 (2.0)	96.2	98.1
76.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella +	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	4.0 (1.5)	97.8	98.9
/01	Eucalyptus	011 (0001)	010 (010)	10010		2710	, 01,
77.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Pine	0.1 (each)	8.0 (1.6)	94.4	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	97.2
78.	Mint + Peppermint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	· · · ·	0.7 (0.4)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
79.	Mint + Peppermint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
80.	Mint + Peppermint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
81.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.1 (each) 0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	2.3 (1.2)	98.7	99.4
82.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Wight Mint + Spearmint + Citronella +	0.1 (each) 0.1 (each)	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0
02.	Eucalyptus		0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
83.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
83. 84.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronena + The Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each) 0.1 (each)	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0
85.	Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucaryptus Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Pine	()	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0) 0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0
		0.1 (each) 0.1 (each)			· · ·		
86. 87	Mint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus + Pine	()	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
87.	Mint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	2.0(1.1)	98.3 99.2	3.0(1.4)	98.3 100.0	98.3 99.6
88. 80	Mint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	1.0 (0.6)		0.0(0.0)		
89.	Mint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.7	0.0(0.0)	100.0	99.9
90.	Mint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0
91.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella +	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
~ ^	Nilgiri	01(1)		100.0		100.0	100.0
92.	Peppermint + Spearmint+ Citronella +	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Eucalyptus			1000		100.0	100.0
93.	Peppermint + Spearmint+ Citronella +	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Pine						
94.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri +	0.1 (each)	0.7 (0.5)	99.5	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.8
	Eucalyptus						
95.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.7	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
96.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus +	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Pine						
97.	Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri +	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Eucalyptus						
98.	Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0

99.	Peppermint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
100.	Peppermint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.7	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
101.	Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	5.3 (1.8)	95.5	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	97.8
102.	Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.7 (0.5)	99.5	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.8
103.	Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
104.	Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.7	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
105.	Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
106.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.08 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.7	2.3 (1.0)	98.7	99.2
107.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
108.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
109.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
110.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
111.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
112.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	4.3 (1.6)	97.6	98.8
113.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
114.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
115.	Mint + Peppermint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
116.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
117.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.7	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
118.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
119.	Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
120.	Mint + Citronella + Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
121.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
122.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
123.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
124.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
125.	Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
126.	Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
127.	Mint+ Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0

128.	Mint + Peppermint+ Spearmint+	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Citronella+ Nilgiri + Pine						
129.	Mint + Peppermint+ Spearmint+	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine						
130.	Mint + Peppermint+ Spearmint +	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus+ Pine						
131.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella +	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus+ Pine						
132.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella+	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus+ Pine						
133.	Peppermint + Spearmint+ Citronella+	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus+ Pine						
134.	Mint+Peppermint+Spearmint+	0.06 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
	Citronella+Nilgiri+Eucalyptus+Pine						
135.	Peppermint + Eucalyptus	0.1 + 0.1	—	-	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
136.	Peppermint + Pine	0.1 + 0.1	—	-	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
137.	Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 + 0.1	_	-	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
138.	Untreated control	-	142.3 (5.0)	-	186.7 (5.2)	-	
	S.Em.±		2.8 (0.2)	-	1.5 (0.1)	-	
	CD at 5%		7.7 (0.4)		4.1 (0.4)		
*D-4-	in non-onth agona indicate last $(\mathbf{V} \mid 1)$ then after						

*Data in parentheses indicate log (X+1) transformed values

effective. More or less similar effect was noticed in case of four oils combinations on which mean inhibition varied from 92.2 to 100.0 per cent. Treatment of grain by five oils combination exhibited 98.8 to 100.0 per cent mean inhibition while all six and seven oil combinations completely checked the progeny production by *R. dominica*. Most interestingly, fumigation of grain by peppermint + eucalyptus, peppermint + pine and eucalyptus + pine at 0.1+0.1 per cent resulted in complete inhibition of progeny of test insect. The results indicated that most of the combinations are highly effective against *R. dominica*.

The efficacy of various essential oils and their combinations against *S. oryzae* is presented in Table 2. All the essential oils were highly effective against this insect at 0.20 and 0.40 except Nilgiri oil which inhibited 59.3 and 77.2 per cent progeny, respectively. The eucalyptus oil was moderately effective at 0.20 per cent; however, it became highly effective at 0.40 per cent. Among two oil combinations, citronella + Nilgiri and citronella + eucalyptus were moderately effective while combination of Nilgiri + eucalyptus was least effective. All other combinations of two essential oils were highly effective against *S. oryzae* as they inhibited 91.3 to 100.0 per cent progeny of test insect. Except three oils combination of peppermint

+ Nilgiri + eucalyptus which inhibited 87.0 per cent progeny, all other treatments were highly effective against this insect due to 93.0 to 100.0 per suppression of progeny. All the four, five, six and seven oils combination were found to be highly effective against *S. oryzae* as they caused 98.5 to 100.0, 99.7 to 100, 99.9 to 100.0 and 100.0 per cent mean inhibition, respectively. Complete inhibition of progeny was also obtained when the grain was fumigated by peppermint + eucalyptus, peppermint + pine and eucalyptus + pine at 0.1+0.1 per cent. The study revealed that various combinations of essential oils are highly effective against *S. oryzae*.

A comparison of response of *R. dominica* and *S. oryzae* toward various essential oils and their combinations indicated that except few, all other combinations were highly effective against both the major insects pests of stored cereals. The essential oil of Nilgiri was least effective against both the insects at 0.20 per cent, however, its efficacy increased at 0.40 per cent at which it became less effective against both the insects by suppressing 76.8 to 77.2 per cent progeny. The eucalyptus oil was found to be least and moderately effective against *R. dominica* and *S. oryzae*, respectively, at 0.20 per cent, however, it became moderately and highly effective at 0.40 per cent. The combination of mint + eucalyptus was less effective against *R. dominica*

<u>s</u> . т	reatment	Conc.	I Fyn	eriment II Experiment			Mean	
No.	reatment	% (v/w)	No. of adults		No. of adults		Per cent	
110.		70 (v/ w)	emerged	inhibition	emerged		inhibition	
1	Mint	0.2						
1.	Mint	0.2 0.2	0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	99.9 100.0	
2.	Peppermint		0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
3.	Spearmint	0.2	0.0(0.0)	100.0	0.3 (0.3)	99.8	99.9 92.1	
4.	Citronella	0.2	11.3 (2.2)	96.2	12.0 (2.5)	90.0	93.1	
5.	Nilgiri	0.2	129.0 (4.9)	55.9	44.7 (3.8)	62.7	59.3	
6.	Eucalyptus	0.2	98.0 (4.6)	66.5	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	83.3	
7.	Pine	0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	5.3 (1.8)	95.6	97.8	
8.	Mint	0.4	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
9.	Peppermint	0.4	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
10.	Spearmint	0.4	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
11.	Citronella	0.4	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	2.7 (1.3)	97.7	98.9	
12.	Nilgiri	0.4	76.7 (4.3)	73.8	23.3 (3.2)	80.6	77.2	
13.	Eucalyptus	0.4	34.0 (3.5)	88.4	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	94.2	
14.	Pine	0.4	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
15.	Mint + Peppermint	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	99.9	
16.	Mint + Spearmint	0.2 + 0.2	0.7 (0.4)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9	
17.	Mint + Citronella	0.2 ± 0.2	1.7 (0.8)	99.4	2.0 (1.1)	98.3	98.9	
18.	Mint + Nilgiri	0.2 + 0.2	12.7 (2.6)	95.7	13.0 (2.6)	89.1	92.4	
19.	Mint + Eucalyptus	0.2 + 0.2	3.7 (0.8)	98.7	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.4	
20.	Mint + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
21.	Peppermint + Spearmint	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
22.	Peppermint + Citronella	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
23.	Peppermint + Nilgiri	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	2.0 (1.1)	98.3	99.2	
24.	Peppermint + Eucalyptus	0.2 + 0.2	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9	
25.	Peppermint + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
26.	Spearmint + Citronella	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
27.	Spearmint + Nilgiri	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	99.9	
28.	Spearmint + Eucalyptus	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
29.	Spearmint + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
30.	Citronella + Nilgiri	0.2 + 0.2	55.0 (4.0)	81.2	17.0 (2.9)	85.8	83.5	
31.	Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.2 + 0.2	65.7 (4.2)	77.6	3.0 (1.4)	97.5	87.6	
32.	Citronella + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	1.0 (0.6)	99.6	4.0 (1.3)	96.6	98.1	
33.	Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.2 + 0.2	154.3 (5.0)	47.2	20.7 (3.1)	82.7	65.0	
34.	Nilgiri + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	16.7 (1.5)	94.2	14.0 (2.7)	88.3	91.3	
35.	Eucalyptus + Pine	0.2 + 0.2	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	0.0(0.0)	100.0	99.9	
36.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
37.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
38.	Mint + Peppermint + Nilgiri	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
39.	Mint + Peppermint + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
40.	Mint + Peppermint + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.7 (0.4)	99.4	99.7	
41.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
42.	Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
43.	Mint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	15.0 (2.1)	94.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	97.4	
44.	Mint + Spearmint + Pine	0.14 (each)	1.0 (0.5)	99.6	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.8	
45.	Mint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.14 (each)	1.7 (0.9)	99.4	2.3 (1.2)	98.0	98.7	
46.	Mint + Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
47.	Mint + Citronella + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
48.	Mint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	26.3 (3.3)	91.0	6.0 (1.9)	95.0	93.0	
49.	Mint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
50.	Mint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
51.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	
52.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0	

Table 2: Fumigant toxicity of some essential oils and their combinations against S. oryzae

53.	Peppermint+ Spearmint + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
4.	Peppermint+ Spearmint + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
5.	Peppermint+ Citronella + Nilgiri	0.14 (each)	6.0 (1.0)	97.9	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.0
5.	Peppermint+ Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
7.	Peppermint+ Citronella + Pine	0.14 (each)	4.7 (1.7)	99.7	3.3 (1.4)	97.2	98.5
3.	Peppermint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	44.3 (3.8)	84.8	13.0 (2.6)	89.1	87.0
).	Peppermint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.14 (each)	14.3 (1.9)	95.1	1.3 (0.7)	98.8	97.0
).	Peppermint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
Ι.	Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
2.	Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	1.0 (0.5)	99.6	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.8
3.	Spearmint + Citronella + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
1.	Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	6.0 (1.9)	97.9	1.3 (0.8)	98.8	98.4
5.	Spearmint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.14 (each)	1.0 (0.5)	99.6	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.8
5.	Spearmint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
7.	Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.14 (each)	4.3 (1.7)	98.5	6.0 (1.9)	95.0	96.8
3.	Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	1.0 (0.6)	99.1	99.6
9.	Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0(0.0)	100.0	100.0
).	Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.14 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
l.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
2.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
3.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
1.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
5.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
5.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
7.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
3.	Mint + Peppermint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	s 0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
).	Mint + Peppermint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
).	Mint + Peppermint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
Ι.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
2.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
3.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
1.	Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
5.	Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
5.	Mint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
7.	Mint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	5.3 (1.5)	98.1	1.3 (0.8)	98.9	98.5
8.	Mint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
).	Mint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
).	Mint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
l.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.1 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
2.	Peppermint + Spearmint+ Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
5.	Peppermint + Spearmint+ Citronella + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
ŀ.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
5.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
5.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.7 (0.4)	99.7	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
7.	Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0

98.	Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
99.	Peppermint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
100.	Peppermint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine		0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
101.	Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
102.	Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
103.	Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
104.	Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
105.	Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
106.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
107.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
108.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
109.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
110.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
111.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
112.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
113.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
114.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
115.	Mint + Peppermint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
116.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
117.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
118.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
119.	Mint + Spearmint + Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus + Pine+ Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
120.	Mint + Citronella + Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
121.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
122.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
123.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
124.	Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
125.	Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri +	0.08 (each)	1.7 (0.8)	99.4	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.7
126.	Eucalyptus + Pine Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri+	0.08 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
127.	Eucalyptus + Pine Mint+ Peppermint + Spearmint + Citronella + Nilgiri + Eucalyptus	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0

128.	Mint + Peppermint+ Spearmint+	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
120	Citronella+ Nilgiri + Pine	0.07 (1-)		100.0		100.0	100.0
129.	Mint + Peppermint+ Spearmint+ Citronella + Eucalyptus + Pine	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
130.	Mint + Peppermint + Spearmint + Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus + Pine	0.07 (each)	0.7 (0.4)	99.7	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
131.	Mint + Peppermint + Citronella + Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus+ Pine	0.07 (each)	0.3 (0.2)	99.8	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
132.	Mint + Spearmint + Citronella+ Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus+ Pine	0.07 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
133.	Peppermint + Spearmint+ Citronella+ Nilgiri+ Eucalyptus+ Pine	0.07 (each)	0.7 (0.4)	99.7	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	99.9
134.	Mint+Peppermint+Spearmint+Citronella +Nilgiri+Eucalyptus+Pine	0.06 (each)	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
135.	Peppermint + Eucalyptus	0.1 + 0.1	-	_	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
36.	Peppermint + Pine	0.1 + 0.1	-	-	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
137.	Eucalyptus + Pine	0.1 + 0.1	-	-	0.0 (0.0)	100.0	100.0
138.	Untreated control	_	292.7 (5.7)	-	120.0 (4.8)	-	
S.Em.	±		4.2 (0.2)	-	0.7 (0.1)	-	
CD at	5%		11.7 (0.7)	_	1.9 (0.3)	_	

while it was found to be highly effective against S. oryzae. The combinations of citronella + Nilgiri and Nilgiri + eucalyptus was highly effective against R. dominica but it showed moderate and least efficacy, respectively, against S. oryzae. Three oils combination of peppermint + Nilgiri + eucalyptus was found to be highly effective against R. dominica while it was moderately effective against S. oryzae. Rest of the combinations were highly effective against both the insects. Fumigation of grain by combination of peppermint + eucalyptus, peppermint + pine and eucalyptus + pine at 0.10+0.10 per cent resulted in complete suppression of progeny of R. dominica and S. oryzae. Such finding indicated that other combinations may also be highly effective against both the insects at lower concentrations and further attempts should be made to study the fumigant toxicity of various combinations at reduced rate as it may reduce the cost of treatment.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that essential oils of mint, peppermint, spearmint, citronella, Nilgiri, eucalyptus and pine and their two, three, four, five, six and seven oil combinations are highly effective against R. *dominica* and *S. oryzae* due to which they may be

used for protection of grain against these insect pests. It also became very clear that many of these combinations may retain their high fumigant toxicity even at lower concentrations and further experiments should be conducted to reduce their dose without compromising their efficacy. As the cost of the essential oils is known to vary widely, attempt should be made to choose the components which are economical. Furthermore, attempt should also be made to study their efficacy under natural condition in big storage receptacles.

REFERENCES

- Gangwar, P. and Tiwari, S. N. (2017). Insecticidal activity of *Curcuma longa* essential oil and its fractions against *Sitophilus oryzae* L. and *Rhyzopertha dominica* F. (Coleoptera). *Indian Journal of Pure & Applied Biosciences*, 5: 912-921.
- Geetanjly, Chandel, R., Mishra, V. K. and Tiwari, S. N. (2016). Comparative efficacy of eighteen essential oil against *Rhyzopertha* dominica (F.). International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology, 9(3): 353.
- Geetanjly and Tiwari, S. N. (2021). Seasonal

[Vol. 19(3), September-December, 2021]

changes in yield, composition and fumigant action of essential oil of *Murraya koenigii L*. against *Rhyzopertha dominica* (F.) and *Sitophilus oryzae* (L.) *Pantnagar Journal of Research*, 19(2): 204-213.

- Grainge, M. and Ahmed, S. (1988). Hand Book of Plants with Pest Control Properties. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 470p.
- Joshi, R. and Tiwari, S. N. (2019). Fumigant toxicity and repellent activity of some essential oils against stored grain pest *Rhyzopertha dominica* (Fabricius). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 8(4): 59-62.
- Kumar, R. and Tiwari, S. N. (2017a). Fumigant toxicity of essential oil and their combination against *Rhyzopertha dominica* and *Tribolium castaneum* at different days interval in stored wheat. *Journal of Postharvest Technology*, 4 (2): S01-S05.
- Kumar, R. and Tiwari, S. N. (2017b). Fumigant toxicity of essential oils and their combination against *Sitophilus oryzae* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) at different days interval in stored wheat. *Journal of Postharvest Technology*, 4 (2): S06-S10.
- Kumar, R. and Tiwari, S. N. (2018a). Fumigant toxicity of essential oils against four stored grain insect pests in stored paddy seeds. *Indian Journal of Entomology*, 80 (1): 73-77.
- Kumar, R. and Tiwari, S. N. (2018b). Fumigant toxicity of essential oils against *Corcyra cephalonica* and *Sitotroga cerealella*. *Environment* and *Ecology*, 36 (1): 33-37.
- Pixton, S. W. (1967). Moisture content—its significance and measurement in stored products. *Journal of Stored Products Research*, 3(1): 35-47.
- Rajendran, S. and Sriranjini, V. (2008). Plant products as fumigants for stored-product insect control. *Journal of Stored Products Research*, 44(2): 126-135.
- Shaaya, E., Kostjukovski, M., Eilberg, J. and Sukprakarn, C. (1997). Plant oils as fumigants and contact insecticides for the

control of stored product insects. *Journal* of Stored Product Research, 33(1): 7-15.

- Shaaya, E., Ravid, U., Paster, N., Juven, B., Zisman, U. and Pissarev, V. (1990). Fumigant toxicity of essential oils against four major stored product insects. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 17(3): 499-504.
- Sharma, J.H. and Tiwari, S.N. (2021a). Bio-efficacy of *Ageratum houstonianum* Mill. (Asteraceae) essential oil against five major insect pests of stored cereals and pulses. *Pantnagar Journal of Research*, 19(1): 40-45.
- Sharma, J.H. and Tiwari, S.N. (2021b). Fumigant toxicity of alpha-pinene, beta-pinene, eucalyptol, linalool and sabinene against Rice Weevil, *Sitophilus oryzae* (L.). *Pantnagar Journal of Research*, 19(1): 50-55.
- Tewari N. and Tiwari S.N. (2008). Fumigant toxicity of lemon grass, Cymbopogon flexuosus (D.C.) Stapf oil on progeny production of Rhyzopertha dominica F., Sitophilus oryzae L. and Tribolium castaneum Herbst. Environment and Ecoogyl, 26(4A): 1828-1830.
- Tewari N. and Tiwari S.N. (2021a). Effect of sixteen essential oils on the progeny production of *Sitophilus oryzae* (Linnaeus). *Pantnagar Journal of Research*, 19(2): 187-194.
- Tewari N. and Tiwari S.N. (2021b). Bio-efficacy of some essential oils as fumigant against Lesser grain borer, *Rhyzopertha dominica* (Fab.). *Pantnagar Journal of Research*, 19(2): 195-203.
- Tripathi, A.K., Prajapati, V., Verma, N., Bahl, J.R., Bansal, R.P., Khanuja, S.P.S. and Kumar, S. (2002). Bioactivities of the leaf essential oil of *Curcuma longa* (var. Ch-66) on three species of stored product beetles (Coleoptera). *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 95(1): 183-189.

Received: December 7, 2021 Accepted: December 29, 2021