# Larvicidal effect of *Melia dubia* seed extract against the malarial fever mosquito, *Culex quinquefasciatus*

D. Yasodha, M. Manimegalai, S. Binu kumari\* and K. Vijayakumar

PG and Research Department of Zoology, Kongunadu Arts and Science College, Coimbatore- 641 029, Tamilnadu, India. \*E-mail: binu.kumari@rediffmail.com

The most important vector species belong to the genera Anopheles, Culex and Aedes. Culex species transmit Wuchereria bancorfti and arbovirus and Aedes species transmit important vector of yellow fever, Dengue, encephalitis viruses and recently Chigunkunya virus. Among the viruses' species, malaria alone kills 3 million each year, including 1 child every 30 seconds (Shell, 1997). Although mosquito-borne diseases currently represent a greater health problem in tropical and subtropical climate, no part of the world is immune to this risk (Fradin, 2002). Control of such disease is becoming increasingly difficult because of increasing resistance of mosquitoes towards pesticides, health hazard to human beings and also it affect non target organism (Ranson et al., 2001). An alternative approach for mosquito control is the use of natural products of plant origin. The botanical insecticides are generally pest specific, readily biodegradable and usually lack toxicity to higher animals (Bowers, 1992) Hence the present study was taken up to test the efficacy of Melia dubia extracts against the different developmental stages of the mosquito Culex quinquefasciatus.

### Preparation of phytochemical extract

The study was carried out at Kongunadu Arts and Science College, Coimbatore during 2009. The seeds of *Melia dubia* were collected from forest college, Coimbatore. The seeds were shade dried and ground separately to fine powder. The dried and powdered seeds of *M. dubia* were extracted with 500ml of methanol, ethanol, ethyl acetate and petroleum ether each using soxhlet apparatus for 8 hours. The extract was concentrated in a vaccum evaporator to yield a dark brownish, gummy extract. The residue was then made into 1% stock solution with acetone and taken for further bioassay test (Vogal., 1978).

### Maintenance of Larvae

The mosquito, *Culex quinquefasciatus* was maintained in laboratory at 27+2°C, 75- 85% RH under 14 L: 10 D photoperiod cycles. The larva was fed with fish food. The feeding was continuing till the larvae transformed into the pupal stage.

## Larvicidal Bioassay

Bioassay were performed using the different solvent extracts of *Melia dubia* seed on the larval (III<sup>rd</sup> & IV<sup>th</sup> instars) of the mosquito *Culex quinquefasciatus*. From 1% stock solution the following concentrations were prepared (3.0% to 5.5%)by using Acetone.To obtain different concentrations of test medium the crude extract,1 to 10 ml of the stock solution were dissolved in water and mixed thoroughly with the dry ingredients of the diet as suggested by Miller and chamberlain(1989).Each

treatment had five replications and a separate control was maintained. The treatments were taken in 250ml distilled water in 500ml glass beakers. The different larval stages (III<sup>rd</sup> & IV<sup>th</sup> instars) with each replication of 25. A pinch of fish food was provided in all replications.

The larva were allowed to remain in the flasks for 24hrs and the rate of mortality of a larvae were calculated after the experimental period and corrected by Abbott's formula (Abbott, 1925)  $LC_{50}$  and  $LC_{90}$  were determined by probit analysis( Finney,1971) and the data were tabulated.

The results of Culex quinquefasciatus larval susceptibility to the four extracts of Melia dubia is shown in (Table 1). Much research has been conducted on plant derived chemicals which are non-toxic to man and domestic animals and serve as useful basis for the development of safer and more selective mosquito insecticides(Sukumar et al.,1991). The percent mortality values for III<sup>rd</sup> and IV<sup>th</sup> instar larvae of *Culex* quinquefasciatus treated with various concentrations ranging from 3.0 to 5.5 % of the seed extract of Melia dubia and LC50 and LC90 values and their 95 % lower and upper limits of the seed extract for 24 hour exposure of *Culex quinquefaciatus* are given in the table 2 and 3.

Highest mortality of 93 % and 81 % was recorded for third and fourth instar larvae of *Culex quiquefaciatus* respectively at 4.5% concentration. The data were recorded and statistic data regarding LC 50 ,95% confidence limit, LC 90 and chisquare values were calculated. The higest sensitivity of third instar larvae was evident by their lowest LC values (LC50 3.240 and LC 90 4.786 ppm). Least susceptibility was shown by fourth instar larvae (LC50 4.073 and LC90 4.942 ppm ). No mortality was

observed in control. The present findings collaborate with earlier findings of Muthukrishnan *et al* (1997). They observed that the LC 50 values of ethyl acetate extract of Leucas aspera were 75.40,93.09,132.20 and 138.60 ppm against first, second, third and fourth larvae of *C. quinquefasciatus*, respectively.

Sakthi vadivel and Daniel(2008) reported that the petroleum ether extract of Leucas aspara showed the LC50 value between 100 to 200 ppm against the larvae Culex quinquefasciatus, Anophelous of stephensi and Anophelous aegypti. The biological activity of these plant extracts might be due to the various compounds including alkaloids and terpenoides existing in this plant. These compounds may jointly or independently contribute to produce larvicidal activity against Culex quinquefasciatus.

From this it may concluded that plants could be an alternative source for Mosquito larvicides because they constitute a potential source of bioactive chemicals and generally free from harmful effects.

### CONCLUSION

The synthetic insecticides for control mosquito have resulted in environmental hazards and the botanicals form an important alternative for larval and pupal control as they constitute a rich source of bioactive chemicals. Hence. the larvicididal effect of various extracts of *Melia dubia* seed on *Culex guinguefasciatus*. Use of these botanical derivatives in mosquito control instead of synthetic insecticides could reduce the cost and environmental pollution.

### REFERENCES

- Abbot, W.S. 1925. A method of computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. *J. Econ. Entomol.*, 18: 265-267.
- Bowers, W.S. 1992. Biorational approaches for insect control. *Korean Journal of Applied Entomology*. 31: 289-303.
- Finney, D.J. 1971.Probit analysis. Cambridge University Press, London, pp: 68-72.
- Fradin, M.S and J. F. Day. 2002. Comparative efficacy of insect repellents against mosquito bite. *New Englanf Journal of Medicine*. 347(1): 13-18.
- Miller, M.and Chamberlain. 1989..Evolution of traps and parasitoid muscidifurax reptor Girault and Sanders to manage Reuseflies and stable flies on dairy farms.J.Agric.Entomol.10:9-19.
- Ranson, H., L. Rossiter, F. Ortelli, B Jesen, X. Wang, C. W. Roth, F.H. Collins. and J. Hemingway. 2001.

Identification of a novel class of insect glutathione S- transferases involved in resistance to DDT in the malaria vector *Anopheles gambiae*. *Biomedical Journal*. 359: 259-304.

- Sakthivel, M and T. Daniel. 2008.Evaluation of certain insecticidal plants for the control of vector mosquitoes viz.,*Culex quinquefasciatus Anopheles stephensi and Aedes Aegypti.Appl.Entomol. Zool.*,43(1):57-63.
- Shell, E.R. 1997. Resurgence of a deadly diseases. Atlantic monthly. August: 45-60.
- Sukumar, K, J. M. Perich, B. L. Boobar. 1991. Botanical derivatives in mosquito control. A.review. I.Am.Mosquito cont.Assoc.1991.7:210-237.
- Vogel., 1978. Text book of practical chemistry. The English language book society and lougman, London, pp: 1368.

[MS received: 21-02-2011; MS accepted: 12-06-2011]

ဖ
0
<u> </u>
~
2
¥
÷
ŝ
B
ü
ť.
0
3
щ
Ę
S
é
2
n
<b>(</b> )

Solvent extracts			Mortali	ity (%)		
Concentration(%)	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.5
Methanolic	47	57	71	93	I	ı
Ethanol	2 <i>1</i>	68	51	40	72	I
Petroleum ether	-	42	55	99	LL	98
Ethyl acetate	-	-	40	47	78	16

Table 1: Mortality of III Instar larvae of *Culex quinquefasciatus* using different percentage of mortality in different solvents.

# Table 2: Larvicidal activity of different solvents seed extract against III instar larvae of C. quinquefasciatus

Chi-square (df = 4)	1.162	0.036	600.0	0.468
LC <sub>90</sub> ±S.E. (ppm) LCL – UCL	4.55528 (4.14244-5.46279)	6.20538 (5.28845-9.98957)	5.84336 (5.20528-8.14919)	5.24124 15 0/1/0 5 77886)
LC <sub>50</sub> ± S.E. (ppm) LCL − UCL	3.24072 (2.88577-3.52012)	4.00966 (3.45724-4.57229)	3.82060 (2.72027-4.24557)	4.58725 11 33647_A 77387)
Mosquito species		Ç	quinquefasciatus	
Solvents	Methanol	Ethanol	Petroleum ether	Ethvl acetate
Plant			Melia dubia	

105

Plant	Solvents	Mosquito species	$LC_{50} \pm S.E. (ppm) LCL - UCL$	LC <sub>90</sub> ±S.E. (ppm) LCL – UCL	Chi-square (df = 4)
	Methanol		3.60766 (3.19501-4.09386)	5.46918 (4.71770-7.86958)	0.373
	Ethanol	Ċ	4.16444 (3.69992-4.79610)	6.28457 (5.36469-9.88343)	0.131
Mella aubla	Petroleum ether	quinquefasciatus	4.02445 (3.17862-4.43035)	6.03705 (5.35502-8.46011)	0.211
	Ethyl acetate		4.73439 (4.45044-4.93664)	5.64401 (5.28161-7.20834)	5.098

Table 3: Larvicidal activity of different solvents seed extract against IV instar larvae of C. quinquefasciatus