

International Journal of Mosquito Research

ISSN: 2348-5906 CODEN: IJMRK2 IJMR 2019; 6(1): 86-94 © 2019 IJMR Received: 01-11-2018 Accepted: 05-12-2018

Abla Desouky Abd El Meguid Entomology Department, Faculty of Science, Benha University, Qalyubiya, Egypt

Shaymaa Hussein Mahmoud Zoology Department, Faculty of Science, Menoufia University, Menoufia, Egypt

Mohamed Mahmoud Baz Entomology Department, Faculty of Science, Benha University, Qalyubiya, Egypt

Toxicological activity of four plant oils against Aedes caspius and Culex pipiens (Diptera: Culicidae)

Abla Desouky Abd El Meguid, Shaymaa Hussein Mahmoud and Mohamed Mahmoud Baz

Abstract

The toxicological activity of four plant oils, *Matricaria chamomilla*, *Origanum majorana*, *Carum petroselinum and Salvia officinalis* were evaluated against all larval instars and pupae of *Aedes caspius* and *Culex pipiens*. The plant oils were tested at different concentrations of 100, 200, 400, 800 and 1600 ppm at different time intervals (24, 48 and 72hrs). The obtained results showed that, all tested plant oils had prominent mosquitocidal activity against *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens*. Mortality increased by increasing concentration and time of exposure. *M. chamomilla* showed highest larvicidal activity after 24 hrs. for all larval instars of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens*. Higher mortality was observed in 1st instar larvae than all other immature life stages with all oils. The developmental periods were extremely prolonged after treatment with the lowest concentration of all used oils. Adult emergence was completely stopped at 800 ppm of *M. chamomilla* and *C. petroselinum* against *A. caspius*. It was concluded that, the used oils have toxic effects against larvae and pupae of *A. caspius* and *C. Pipiens*, altered developmental periods, pupal rate and adult emergence with superiority of *M. chamomilla* and *C. petroselinum*. It was recommended that, *M. chamomilla* and *C. petroselinum* have the potential to be used for larval and pupal control of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens*.

Keywords: Matricaria chamomilla, Origanum majorana, Carum petroselinum and Salvia officinalis

Introduction

Mosquitoes are the most important hematophagous diptera in terms of public health importance, and major vectors for the severe and highly infection diseases to human such as malaria, filariasis, Japanese encephalitis, dengue and yellow fever etc., causing huge number of deaths around the world (Ghosh *et al.*, 2012; Kamatchi *et al.*, 2016) [11, 14]. WHO has described the mosquito as public enemy number one and reported mosquito-borne diseases across globally infecting more than 700,000,000 people every year (Meenakshi and Jayaprakash 2014) [21].

Culex pipiens is the most common mosquito species in Egypt (Shawarby *et al.* 1968, Soliman 1995, Khater and Shalaby 2008) [30, 33, 17] causing dreadful nuisance and transmitting many dangerous diseases. It is the main vector of filarial worm *Wuchereria bancrofti* as well as Rift valley fever virus (Ramzy *et al.* 2005, WHO 2012) [25, 37].

Aedes caspius is a potential reservoir of Rift Valley Fever Virus (RVF) during interepizootic periods and it is a vector of the Tahyna (TAH) virus in the Mediterranean region (Balenghien *et al.*, 2006; Kamal, 2011) [5, 13].

Mosquito control is a necessary measure to improve environmental quality and public health. The controlling strategies are largely based on synthetic chemical substances. Synthetic organic chemical insecticides were used since long for the control of these vector mosquitoes, resulted in development of resistance, residue contamination of human food, mammalian toxicity and environmental pollution (Domingues *et al.*, 2010; Singh *et al.*, 2014) [8, 32]. Therefore, we need to seek for safe insecticides, or natural products which can be a reliable and environment ecofriendly source of raw materials for that purpose.

According to available literature, studies were carried out for control of mosquitoes using plant oils (Amer and Mehlhorn 2006; Madkour *et al.* 2014; Yadav 2014; Nasir *et al.* 2015;

Correspondence Abla Desouky Abd El Meguid Entomology Department, Faculty of Science, Benha University, Qalyubiya, Egypt Reiner et al., 2016; Sharma et al., 2016) [4, 19, 35, 22, 26, 29] but none of them used M. chamomilla, O. majorana, C. petroselinum and S. officinalis against A. caspius and C. Pipiens. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the toxic effect of different concentrations of M. chamomilla, O. majorana, C. petroselinum and S. officinalis plant oils on all larval instars and pupae of A. caspius and C. pipiens as well as, the alteration of some biological aspects following treatment with sub-lethal concentrations of the tested oils.

Materials and Methods

1. Plant oils

The plant oils; Chamomile Oil (*M. chamomilla*), Marjoram oil (*O. majorana*), parsley (*C. petroselinum*) and Sage oil (*S. officinalis*) were purchased from Agro Green Company and reserved in dark glass bottles at a low temperature (15 °C) until use.

2. Mosquito culture

Mosquito larvae were collected from stagnant water mosquito breeding in various places in Prince Village, Qalyubiya Governorate, Egypt. The collected larvae were identified according to Harbach (1985) [12]. The collected larvae were colonized and maintained continuously for three generations in the laboratory free of exposure to insecticides in dechlorinated water. The colonies were maintained at $27 \pm 2^{\circ}$ C, 72-83% RH under a photoperiod of 14:10 h (light/dark) in the insectary of Entomology Department, Faculty of Science, Benha University according to El-Bokl and Moawad (1996) [9] and Adham *et al.*, (2003) [2]. Two developmental stages, larvae and adult females, were continuously available for the experiments and were maintained at the same laboratory conditions (Baz, 2013) [26].

3. Bioassays of the tested oils

Bioassays were performed with first, second, third and fourth instar larvae and pupae of *A. caspius and C. pipiens*. The plant oils of *M. chamomilla*, *O. majorana*, *C. petroselinum* and *S. officinalis* were tested at 100, 200, 400, 800 and 1600 ppm concentrations. Twenty-five larvae per concentration were transferred to 500 ml glass beaker containing 250 ml of dechlorinated water used for all the experiments. Plant oils were dissolved with an emulsifier (0.1% Tween 80). The experiment was replicated five times with untreated control groups. Mortalities were recorded after 24, 48 and 72 hrs. of exposure period WHO (1981) [36].

Larval mortality counts were determined daily until pupation in order to determine LC_{50} and LC_{90} values. Dead larvae were identified when they failed to move after probing with a needle in the siphon or cervical region. Larvae were also observed for discoloration and unnatural positions. The developmental periods, pupation rates and adult emergences were determined for each plant oil concentration.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out using ANOVA with five factors under significance level of 0.05 for the whole results using SPSS (ver. 22). Data were treated as complete randomization design according to Steel *et al.* (1997) [34]. Multiple comparisons were carried out applying LSD. Statistical data analysis regarding LC₅₀, LC₉₀ and slope were calculated using Finney (1971) [10] Probit analysis software.

Recults

The present results showed that, mortality percentage in larvae of both mosquito species increased by increasing concentration and time of exposure. Data given in table (1) indicated that, the highest mortality was observed in first instar larvae than almost all other immature life stages at the highest concentration of all used oils. 100% and 96.8% mortalities were obtained for the 1st instar larvae of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* after 24 hrs exposure to 1600 ppm of *M. chamomilla* oil compared to 1.6% and 0.8% mortality for the control respectively, followed by 99.2% and 93.6% mortalities after treatment with *C. petroselinum* oil at the same concentration for *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* respectively. On the other hand, the lowest mortalities were recorded in *S. officinalis* oil, 88% and 80% for the 1st instar larvae of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* respectively.

Results in table (2) revealed that, 100% mortality of the first instar larvae of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* was observed after 48 hrs exposure in all oils except for *S. officinalis*. 100% mortality of the second instar larvae of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* was recorded after exposure to 1600 ppm of *M. chamomilla*, *C. petroselinum*. Results in table (3) showed that after 72 hrs, 100% mortality of the first instar larvae was seen for both vector mosquitoes at the highest concentration compared to 1.6% mortality in the control group.

Tables 1, 2 & 3 indicated that *A. caspius* larvae were more susceptible than *C. pipiens* larvae. It was also observed that, there are significant differences between toxicities of different oils against larval instars of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens*, where the highest potential larval mortality was observed in *M. chamomilla* against both mosquito species, the mean toxicities of the oil after 24, 48 & 72 hrs were 8.2, 10.5 and 12.9 followed by *C. petroselinum*, 8.1, 10.1and 12.8respectively, while *S. officinalis* was the least effective.

Table (4) revealed that LC₅₀ values of *M. chamomilla* were 514 and 532 ppm at 24 hrs. and at 48 hrs., LC₅₀ were 310 and 316 ppm, while at 72 hrs, LC₅₀ values were 197 and 188 ppm for the first instar larvae of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* respectively. LC₅₀ value of *S. officinalis* oil against second instar larvae at 24 hrs. was (802 ppm) *C. pipiens* followed by *O. majorana* (800 ppm). LC₅₀ of *C. petroselinum* against third instar larvae was 623 ppm after 24 hrs., however *M. chamomilla* oil was found to be the best after 48 hrs. and 72 hrs. LC₅₀ values were 430 and 278 ppm, respectively for *A. caspius* larvae. *C. petroselinum* was effective where the LC₅₀ value was 649 ppm at 24 hrs, 463 ppm at 48 hrs. and 277 ppm at 72 hrs for the fourth instar larvae of *A. caspius*.

The pupicidal effect of the tested oils against *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* were presented in table (5). Based on LC₅₀ values, *C. petroselinum* and *O. majorana* proved as highly toxic to mosquito pupae and this response was time dependent. The LC₅₀ values of *C. petroselinum* against *A. caspius* pupae were 640 ppm, 482 ppm and 330 ppm at 24, 48 and 72 hrs post-treatment respectively. LC₅₀ values of *O. majorana* against *C. pipiens* pupae were 848 ppm at 24 hrs, 576 ppm at 48 hrs and 354 ppm at 72 hrs. On the other hand, *S. officinalis* was the least effective against both mosquito species where LC₅₀ values were 1478 ppm and 1380 ppm at 24 hrs. post treatment for *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens*, respectively.

Table (6) showed that, larval and pupal durations were dose dependent and the developmental periods were extremely prolonged after treatment with the lowest concentration of all used oils. The longest larval and pupal periods were 24 & 9 days and 19 & 8 days after treatment of *C. pipiens* and *A. caspius* with *C. petroselinum* at 100 ppm, compared to 9 & 2 days and 8 & 2 days of the control respectively. On contrary at 800 ppm of almost all oils decreased larval periods. The percentages of pupation and adult emergence were greatly reduced especially at the highest concentrations. Adult emergence was completely stopped at 800 ppm of *M. chamomilla* and *C. petroselinum* against *A. caspius*.

Discussion

The obtained results showed that, all plant oils used showed prominent mosquitocidal activity against *A. caspius* and *C. Pipiens* larvae and pupae. The biological activity of such plant oils might be due to various compounds that exist in plants, including phenolics, terpenoids and alkaloids which may produce larvicidal and adult emergence inhibition activity against mosquitoes. These results are in accordance with (Pavela, 2008) [23], who studied the larvicidal activities of extracts from 56 species of plants in the Euro-Asiatic region against 4th larval instar of *Culex quinquefasciatus* and observed that, all plant extracts showed larvicidal activity after 24hrs of exposure in a maximal dose of 500 ppm.

The highest larvicidal activity was observed in M. chamomilla, LC₅₀ values were 197, 232, 278 and 297 ppm after 72 hrs. for 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th instar larvae of A. caspius respectively. In this context, (Singh et al. 2011) [31] stated that M. chamomilla is a member of Asteraceae family which possesses various types of phytochemical compounds (flavonoids, sesquiterpines, thiophene derivatives). (Ribeiro et al. 1994) reported that those compounds have been found to be toxic to insects including mosquito larvae. Yadav et al. (2014) [35] evaluated the larvicidal efficacy of Vernonia cinerea extract against Aedes albopictus larvae and stated that the extract was highly effective because it is a member of Asteraceae family which possesses compounds toxic to mosquito larvae. Similarly, Abo El-Mahasen and Mahmoud (2016) [1] evaluated three plant oils; linseed (Linum usitatissimum), watercress (Nasturtium officinale) and black seed (Nigella sativa) as larvicidal natural agents against third instar larvae of Cx. pipiens. Their results showed that all the three tested oils induced larval mortality, watercress oil was the most effective followed by linseed and black seed oil and the effects were dose dependent and time of exposure.

The present study revealed that, mortality increased by increasing concentration and time of exposure, the highest mortality was observed at the highest concentration after 72 hrs. Our results agree with Remia and Logaswamy (2010) [27] who recorded that LC₅₀ was 203.49 ppm for the fourth instar larvae of A. aegypti after 24 hrs. of exposure to Lantana camara and 230.76 ppm on Catharanthus roseus and the same concentration of plant extract gave 100% mortality after 96h post treatment. (Madkour et al. 2014) [19] investigated the activity of petroleum ether extracts of *Dodonaea viscosa*, L camara and Ruta chalepensis against 2nd instar larvae of A. aegypti at 2, 4 and 10 days post-treatment. The results showed acute LC₅₀ (2 days) of 126.2 & 136.9 and chronic LC₅₀ (10 days) of 64.6 & 68.5 ppm for D. viscose and L camara respectively. Prasad et al. (2014) [24] observed that, the LC₅₀ value was 37.15 and 67.61 mg/l in C. roseus flowers and leaves, respectively after 24 hrs. of exposure time and 26.92 and 35.48 mg/l, respectively at 48 hrs. of exposure time. Nasir

et al. (2015) [22] evaluated the efficacy of five essential oils against all larval instars and pupae of *A. aegypti* after 8, 16, 24 and 48 hrs. and observed that, the response of mosquito larvae and pupae was time and concentration dependent. Kamatchi et al. (2016) [14] investigated the toxic effect of *L. camara* and *C. roseus* against *C. quinquefasciatus* and *A. aegypti*. 100% mortality was observed at the highest concentration (1000 ppm) against the four larval instars of both vectors.

The findings of the present investigation revealed that higher mortality was observed in early instars than later ones and A. caspius was more susceptible than C. pipiens. These findings corroborate with earlier findings of Kumar and Maneemegalai (2008) [18] who observed maximum mortality in A. aegypti exposed to L. camara for 24 hrs. than C. quinquefasciatus and the 3rd instar larvae were more susceptible than 4th instar. Maheswaran et al. (2008) [20] reported that the first and second instar larvae of C. quinquefasciatus and A. aegypti were highly sensitive when compared with third and fourth instar larvae treated with Leucas aspera crude extract. Nasir et al. (2015) [22] noticed that the higher mortality was observed in early life stages than later ones. Kamatchi et al. (2016) [14] recorded that LC₅₀ values of C. roseus were 30.28, 38.01, 59.12 & 71.81 and 26.64, 34.64, 53.10 & 72.89 ppm against first, second, third & fourth instar larvae of C. quinquefasciatus and A. aegypti, respectively.

The current study showed that, the developmental periods were extremely prolonged after exposure to the lowest concentrations of all used oils. The prolongation might be due to the effect of these oils on the tissues of insects. Khalaf (1998) [15] reported that, the total carbohydrates, protein and lipids decreased in the last instar larvae of Galleria mellonella caused by treating 3rd larval instar with some plant oils. Furthermore, in the current study the pupal rate and adult emergence were greatly reduced especially at the highest concentration. No adults emerged when the larvae of A. caspius were exposed to 800 ppm of M. chamomilla and C. petroselinum because all larvae and pupae died before developing into the adult stage. Therefore these plant oils were able to disrupt the biology of mosquitoes, in terms of prolonging the larval or pupal stages or prevent development into adult stage. Our results correspond with those reached by Khalaf (1999) [16] who found that, when the larvae of C. pipiens were treated with LC₇₅ of essential oils of L. camara and C. dioscoridis, none succeeded to emerge to adult stage. Bream et al. (2009) [7] studied the effect of Phragmites australis extract against 2nd instar larvae and adults of C. pipiens and found a significant decrease in the percentage of pupation and adult emergence. Al-khalaf and Al-mehmadi (2010) [3] showed that LC₅₀ of Artemisia herba, M. chamomilla and Melia azedarach led to a prolongation of 3rd larval instar of C. quinquefasciatus and affected proportions entering the pupal stage. Madkour et al. (2014) [19] demonstrated that D. viscose and L. camara caused significant high hindrance of subsequent larval development and consequently reduced both pupation and adult emergence. Finally, it can be concluded that, plant oils, M. chamomilla, O. majorana, C. petroselinum and S. officinalis had a toxicological activity against larvae and pupae of A. caspius and C. Pipiens, altered developmental periods, pupal rate and adult emergence with superiority of M. chamomilla and C. petroselinum.

Table 1: Larvicidal effect of different concentrations of M. chamomilla, O. majorana, C. petroselinum and S. officinalis against of A. caspius and C. pipiens larvae after 24 hours.

						Mosquito	larvae					
Plant oils	Conc. (ppm)			A. caspius					C. pipiens			Mean of oil
		1 st instar	2 nd instar	3 rd instar	4 th instar	Mean	1 st instar	2 nd instar	3 rd instar	4 th instar	Mean	
	100	2.00±0.3eAB	1.80±0.2 ^{eBC}	1.60±0.2 ^{eC}	2.20±0.4eA	1.90±0.1e	1.80±0.2 ^{eA}	1.40±0.4 ^{eB}	1.80±0.4 ^{eA}	1.40±0.4 ^{eB}	1.70±0.2e	
	200	4.60±0.2 ^{dA}	4.20±0.4 ^{dB}	4.60±0.9dA	3.80±0.5 ^{dC}	4.30±0.3 ^d	4.20±0.4 ^{dA}	3.20±0.6 ^{dC}	$3.80\pm0.7^{\mathrm{dB}}$	3.20±0.6 ^{dC}	3.70±0.3 ^d	
М.	400	8.60±0.9cA	7.40 ± 0.9^{cB}	7.40±1.1 ^{cB}	6.00±1.1 ^{cC}	7.40±0.5°	7.40±0.7 ^{cA}	6.20±1.5°C	6.60±0.7 ^{cB}	6.20±1.5 ^{cC}	6.50±0.5°	8.2±0.5ª
chamomilla -	800	15.2±0.9bA	14.4±1.7 ^{bB}	14.0±0.5 ^{bC}	11.8±1.3 ^{bD}	13.9±0.6 ^b	15.0±0.9bA	11.2±1.1 ^{bC}	13.8±1.2 ^{bB}	11.2±1.1 ^{bC}	12.7±0.6 ^b	
	1600	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.6±0.4aB	23.8±0.7 ^{aC}	20.8±1.2 ^{aD}	23.6±0.5a	24.2±0.6 ^{aA}	22.0±0.9 ^{aC}	22.8±0.7 ^{aB}	22.0±0.9aC	22.0±0.5a	
	Control	0.40±0.4 ^{fA}	0.80±0.4 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2fB	0.20±0.2 ^{fB}	0.60±0.2f	0.20±0.2fA	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2fA	0.30±0.1 ^f	
	Mean	9.30±1.6 ^A	8.90±1.6 ^B	8.80±1.5 ^B	7.50±1.3 ^C	8.6±0.7	8.80±1.6 ^A	7.40±1.4 ^C	8.20±1.5 ^B	7.40±1.4 ^C	7.8±0.7	
	100	2.00±0.3eA	1.60±0.2 ^{eB}	1.60±0.2 ^{eB}	1.00±0.3 ^{eC}	1.6±0.2e	1.40±0.4 ^{eB}	1.20±0.4 ^{eB}	0.60 ± 0.2^{eC}	1.20±0.4 ^{eB}	1.30±0.2e	
	200	4.20±0.4 ^{dA}	3.80 ± 1.2^{dB}	3.40±0.5 ^{dC}	2.60±0.8 ^{dD}	3.50±0.4 ^d	3.60±0.7 ^{dA}	$3.00\pm0.7^{\mathrm{dB}}$	2.00±0.6 ^{dC}	3.00±0.7 ^{dB}	3.00±0.3 ^d	
	400	8.20±1.2cA	7.00 ± 1.0^{cB}	6.00±1.1 ^{cC}	5.00±0.7 ^{cD}	6.60±0.6°	6.40±1.2 ^{cA}	5.80 ± 0.6^{cB}	4.20±0.9 ^{cD}	5.80 ± 0.6^{cB}	5.30±0.4°	
O.majorana	800	12.8±1.3 ^{bA}	12.0±1.2bB	10.4±1.0 ^{bC}	9.80±0.9 ^{bD}	11.3±0.6 ^b	11.4±1.1 ^{bA}	10.6±0.9bB	8.00±1.1 ^{bD}	10.6±0.9bB	9.80±0.5 ^b	7.0±0.5 ^b
	1600	23.8±0.6 ^{aA}	22.8±1.0 ^{aB}	20.0±0.7 ^{aC}	18.4±1.2 ^{aD}	21.3±0.6a	22.2±0.7 ^{aA}	21.2±0.9aB	18.6±1.2 ^{aC}	21.2±0.9aB	20.1±0.6a	
	Control	0.20±0.2fA	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.20±0.2fA	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.30±0.1 ^f	0.80±0.4 ^{fA}	0.80±0.4 ^{eA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{eB}	0.80 ± 0.4^{eA}	0.60±0.2f	-
	Mean	8.50±1.5 ^A	7.90±1.5 ^B	6.90±1.3 ^C	6.20±1.2 ^D	7.4±0.7	7.60±1.4 ^A	7.10±1.3 ^B	5.60±1.2 ^D	7.10±1.3 ^B	6.7±0.6	
	100	1.60±0.2 ^{eBC}	2.0±0.3 ^{eAB}	1.4±0.4 ^{eC}	2.20±0.4 ^{eA}	1.80±0.2e	1.80±0.2 ^{eA}	1.20±0.4 ^{eB}	1.80±0.2 ^{eA}	1.20±0.4 ^{eB}	1.60±0.2e	
	200	4.60 ± 0.7^{dAB}	4.80 ± 0.4^{dA}	3.60±0.5 ^{dC}	4.40±0.7 ^{dB}	4.40±0.3 ^d	4.20±0.7 ^{dA}	3.40 ± 0.9^{dB}	3.20 ± 0.6^{dB}	3.40 ± 0.9^{dB}	3.50±0.3 ^d	
	400	8.00±1.1 ^{cB}	8.40±1.0 ^{cA}	7.00±0.9 ^{cD}	7.40±0.9 ^{cC}	7.70±0.5°	7.60±0.9 ^{cA}	5.80±0.6 ^{cC}	6.20±0.9cB	5.80±0.6 ^{cC}	6.30±0.4°	1
C. petroselinum	800	15.0±0.9 ^{bA}	15.8±0.9bA	13.0±1.0 ^{bB}	11.6±1.4 ^{bC}	13.9±0.6 ^b	14.0±1.2 ^{bA}	13.2±1.2 ^{bB}	10.6±1.6 ^{bC}	13.2±1.2 ^{bB}	12.0±0.7b	8.1±0.5a
	1600	24.8±0.2 ^{aA}	24.0±0.2 ^{aA}	23.2±0.7 ^{aB}	22.0±1.5 ^{aC}	23.5±0.5a	23.4±0.7 ^{aA}	22.5±0.9aB	21.2±1.0 ^{aC}	22.6±0.9aB	21.6±0.5a	
	Control	0.20±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.2 ^{fA}	0.30±0.1 ^f	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.1 ^f	
	Mean	9.00±1.6 ^B	9.20±1.6 ^A	8.10±1.5 ^C	8.00±1.4 ^C	8.6±0.8	8.60±1.5 ^A	7.70±1.5 ^B	7.20±1.4 ^C	7.70±1.5 ^B	7.5±0.7	
	100	2.00±0.3eA	1.60 ± 0.2^{eB}	1.00±0.3 ^{eC}	$0.60\pm0.4^{\rm eD}$	1.30±0.2e	1.20±0.4 ^{eA}	1.40±0.4 ^{eA}	0.60 ± 0.2^{eB}	1.20±0.4 ^{eA}	0.90±0.2e	
	200	4.60±0.5 ^{dA}	3.60±1.1 ^{dB}	2.60±0.8 ^{dC}	2.20±0.4 ^{dD}	3.30±0.4 ^d	3.80±0.4 ^{dA}	3.40 ± 0.5^{dB}	1.40±0.7 ^{dD}	3.80 ± 0.4^{dA}	2.60±0.3 ^d	
	400	8.60±1.0 ^{cA}	7.00 ± 1.0^{cB}	5.00±0.7 ^{cC}	3.40 ± 0.8^{cD}	6.00±0.6°	6.00±1.1 ^{cA}	5.80±0.9 ^{cA}	3.80 ± 0.6^{cB}	6.00±1.1 ^{cA}	4.60±0.5°	
Salvia officinalis	800	13.4±1.6 ^{bA}	11.8±1.1 ^{bB}	9.80±0.9 ^{bC}	6.80±1.1 ^{bD}	10.5±0.8 ^b	10.8±0.7 ^{bA}	10.6±0.7 ^{bA}	8.00±1.0 ^{bB}	10.8±0.7 ^{bA}	9.00±0.6 ^b	6.3±0.4°
	1600	22.0±0.6 ^{aA}	21.8±1.0 ^{aB}	19.4±1.1 ^{aC}	16.2±0.8 ^{aD}	19.9±0.7a	20.0±0.9aA	19.0±0.9aB	16.6±0.9 ^{aC}	20.0±0.9aA	17.6±0.6a	
	Control	0.20±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.2 ^{eA}	0.30 ± 0.1^{f}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{eA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.1f	
	Mean	8.50±1.4 ^A	7.70 ± 1.4^{B}	6.40±1.3 ^C	4.90±1.1 ^D	6.9±0.6	7.00±1.3 ^A	6.80±1.2 ^A	5.10±1.1 ^B	7.00±1.3 ^A	5.8±0.6	
Mean of	insect			7.86±0.4 ^A					6.94 ± 0.3^{B}			
Mean o	faga	1 st ii	nstar		2 nd instar		3 rd i			4 th instar		
Mean o	i age	8.99±			8.30±0.5 ^B		7.02	±0.5 ^C		6.30±0.3 ^D		

a, b & c: There is no significant difference (P>0.05) between any two means, within the same column have the same superscript letter.

A, B & C: There is no significant difference (P>0.05) between any two means for the same attribute, within the same row have the same superscript letter.

Table 2: Larvicidal effect of different concentrations of M. chamomilla, O. majorana, C. petroselinum and S. officinalis against of A. caspius and C. pipiens larvae after 48 hours.

						Mosquit	o larvae					
Plant oils	Conc. (ppm)			A. caspius				Mean of oil				
		1 st instar	2 nd instar	3 rd instar	4 th instar	1 st instar	1 st instar	2 nd instar	3 rd instar	4 th instar	Mean	
	100	5.60±1.1eA	4.60 ± 0.7^{eB}	3.20 ± 0.4^{eD}	3.60±0.8 ^{eC}	4.30±0.4e	5.60±0.5 ^{eA}	4.40±0.9eB	3.00±0.4 ^{eC}	2.20±0.4 ^{eD}	3.80±0.4e	
	200	8.60±1.1 ^{dA}	7.00±0.8 ^{dB}	6.40±1.2 ^{dC}	6.20±0.9 ^{dD}	7.10±0.5 ^d	8.80±0.7 ^{dA}	8.40±1.1 ^{dB}	5.60±0.7 ^{dC}	5.80±1.0 ^{dC}	7.20±0.5 ^d	
	400	12.6±0.9 ^{cA}	10.2±0.9 ^{cC}	10.6±0.7 ^{cB}	9.20±1.2 ^{cD}	10.7±0.5°	11.8±0.6 ^{cA}	12.0±1.2 ^{cA}	8.80±0.9cB	8.20±0.9 ^{cC}	10.2±0.6c	10.5±0.5ª
Matricaria chamomilla	800	19.2±1.6 ^{bA}	18.2±1.2 ^{bB}	16.0±0.5 bC	13.8±1.5 ^{bD}	16.8±0.8 ^b	20.2±1.4bA	16.6±0.7 ^{bB}	16.2±1.1 ^{bC}	13.0±1.1 ^{bD}	16.5±0.8 ^b	
	1600	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.4±0.6 ^{aC}	22.8±1.0 ^{aD}	24.3±0.3a	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.4±0.4 ^{aB}	21.4±1.4 ^{aC}	24.0±0.5a	
	Control	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.2fA	0.40±0.1f	0.40±0.2fA	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.20±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.1 ^f	
	Mean	11.9±1.6 ^A	10.9±1.6 ^B	10.2±1.5 ^C	9.30±1.4 ^D	10.6±0.8	12.0±1.6 ^A	11.1±1.5 ^B	9.70±1.6 ^C	8.50±1.4 ^D	10.3±0.8	
	100	5.00±0.4eA	3.80 ± 0.4^{eB}	2.80 ± 0.6^{eD}	3.20±0.7 ^{eC}	3.70±0.3e	4.20±0.6 ^{eA}	3.2±0.7 ^{eB}	2.40±0.2 ^{eC}	2.00±0.3 ^{eD}	3.00±0.3e	
	200	7.60±0.7 ^{dA}	6.00 ± 0.5^{dB}	5.00 ± 0.7^{dD}	5.40±0.9 ^{dC}	6.00 ± 0.4^{d}	7.80±0.7 ^{dA}	6.80 ± 0.9^{dB}	5.40±0.9 ^{dC}	5.00±0.8 ^{dD}	6.30±0.5 ^d	
	400	11.8±1.5 ^{cA}	9.20±1.2 ^{cB}	8.80 ± 0.9^{cC}	8.20±1.0 ^{cD}	9.50±0.6°	9.80±0.7 ^{cA}	9.40±0.7 ^{cB}	8.20±0.9 ^{cC}	6.60±0.5 ^{cD}	8.50±0.4°	
Origanum majorana	800	16.4±0.7 ^{bA}	15.4±1.4 ^{bB}	12.8±0.6 ^{bD}	13.4±1.2 ^{bC}	14.5±0.6 ^b	16.0±1.3 ^{bA}	14.6±1.6 ^{bB}	11.8±1.1 ^{bC}	11.2±1.5 ^{bD}	13.4±0.8 ^b	9.3±0.5°
	1600	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.8±0.2 ^{aA}	23.4±0.9aB	21.2±1.0 ^{aC}	23.6±0.5a	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.4±0.4 ^{aB}	22.2±0.7 ^{aC}	20.0±0.9 ^{aD}	22.9±0.5a	
	Control	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40±0.2fA	0.40±0.1f	0.40±0.2fA	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.1f	
	Mean	11.0±1.5 ^B	9.90±1.5 ^B	8.90±1.4 ^C	8.60±1.3 ^C	9.6±0.7	10.5±1.5 ^A	9.80±1.5 ^B	8.40±1.4 ^C	7.50±1.3 ^D	9.1±0.7	
	100	4.20±0.6eB	5.80±1.0 ^{eA}	3.00 ± 0.4^{eD}	3.80±0.6 ^{eC}	4.20±0.4e	3.8±0.8 ^{eA}	3.40±0.6 ^{eB}	3.80±0.6 ^{eA}	3.00±0.5 ^{eC}	3.50±0.3e	
	200	7.00±0.7 ^{dB}	7.80±1.0 ^{dA}	5.60 ± 0.7^{dD}	6.60±0.5 ^{dC}	6.80 ± 0.4^{d}	7.00±1.2 ^{dA}	6.40±1.0 ^{dB}	6.60 ± 0.5^{dB}	5.00±0.7 ^{dC}	6.30±0.4 ^d	
	400	12.8±1.0 ^{cA}	11.2±1.1 ^{cB}	8.80 ± 0.9^{cD}	10.2±0.8 ^{cC}	10.8±0.5°	11.4±0.9 ^{cA}	10.2±0.9 ^{cB}	9.40±0.5°C	7.80±1.1 ^{cD}	9.70±0.5°	
Carum petroselinum	800	18.4±0.8 ^{bA}	16.6±1.5 ^{bB}	15.0±1.3 ^{bC}	13.4±1.8 ^{bD}	15.9±0.8 ^b	17.8±0.7 ^{bA}	14.0±1.1 ^{bC}	15.0±1.6 ^{bB}	12.4±1.4 ^{bD}	14.8±0.7 ^b	10.1±0.5 ^b
	1600	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.8 ± 0.2^{aA}	24.4±0.4 ^{aB}	24.8±0.1a	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	23.6±0.7 ^{aB}	22.6±0.7 ^{aC}	24.1±0.3a	
	Control	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	$0.40\pm0.1^{\rm f}$	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	$0.40\pm0.1^{\rm f}$	
	Mean	11.3±1.6 ^A	11.10±1.5 ^A	9.60 ± 1.6^{B}	9.80±1.5 ^B	10.5±0.8	10.9±1.6 ^A	9.90±1.5 ^B	9.80 ± 1.5^{B}	8.50±1.4 ^C	9.8±0.7	
	100	3.80 ± 0.4^{eB}	5.20±1.1 ^{eA}	3.40 ± 0.7^{eC}	2.20±0.9 ^{eD}	3.70 ± 0.4^{e}	4.60±0.7 ^{eA}	4.80±0.7 ^{eA}	2.20 ± 0.2^{eB}	1.40±0.2 ^{eC}	3.30±0.4e	
	200	5.80 ± 0.6^{dB}	7.60 ± 0.7^{dA}	5.00 ± 0.9^{dC}	4.20±0.9 ^{dD}	5.70 ± 0.5^{d}	7.00 ± 0.8^{dB}	7.40 ± 0.9^{dA}	4.20 ± 0.8^{dC}	3.40 ± 0.5^{dD}	5.50 ± 0.5^{d}	
	400	10.8±1.2 ^{cB}	12.0±1.4cA	8.00±1.1 ^{cC}	6.60±1.0 ^{cD}	9.40±0.7°	10.2±0.9 ^{cB}	10.8±1.0 ^{cA}	7.00 ± 0.7^{cC}	6.20 ± 0.6^{cD}	8.60±0.6°	
Salvia officinalis	800	15.2±1.4 ^{bB}	18.4±1.0 ^{bA}	14.6±1.7 ^{bC}	9.60±1.3 ^{bD}	14.5±1.0 ^b	16.0±1.0 ^{bA}	16.2±0.7 ^{bA}	10.8±1.1 ^{bB}	8.60±0.7 ^{bC}	12.9±0.9b	9.1±0.5°
	1600	24.8±0.2 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	23.8 ± 1.0^{aB}	19.2±0.7 ^{aC}	23.2±0.6a	24.2±0.5aB	24.6±0.4 ^{aA}	19.8±1.2 ^{aC}	17.0±1.1 ^{aD}	21.4±0.8a	
	Control	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.1^{f}	0.60 ± 0.4^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.50 ± 0.1^{f}	
	Mean	10.10±1.5 ^B	11.40±1.6 ^A	9.20±1.5 ^C	7.00±1.2 ^D	9.5±0.7	10.40±1.5 ^A	10.70±1.5 ^A	7.40 ± 1.2^{B}	6.20±1.1 ^C	8.7±0.7	
Mean of inse	ect		-	10.02±0.4 ^A				-	9.45 ± 0.4^{B}	-		
Mean of ag			nstar		2 nd instar			nstar		4 th instar		
wiean or ag	C	11.03	±0.5 ^A	-	10.62±0.5 ^B		9.14	±0.5 ^C		8.19±0.5 ^D		

a, b & c: There is no significant difference (P>0.05) between any two means, within the same column have the same superscript letter.

A, B & C: There is no significant difference (P>0.05) between any two means for the same attribute, within the same row have the same superscript letter.

Table 3: Larvicidal effect of different concentrations of *M. chamomilla*, *O. majorana*, *C. petroselinum* and *S. officinalis* against of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* larvae after 72 hours.

		Mosquito larvae										
Plant oils	Conc. (ppm)			A. caspius					C. pipiens			Mean of oil
		1 st instar	2 nd instar	3 rd instar	4 th instar	Mean	1 st instar	2 nd instar	3 rd instar	4 th instar	Mean	
	100	9.00±0.4 ^{eA}	7.60±1.0 ^{eB}	6.4±0.9 ^{eC}	6.80±0.9 ^{eC}	7.50±0.5e	9.00±0.7 ^{eA}	8.40±1.8 ^{eB}	5.60±0.7 ^{eC}	4.60±0.2 ^{eD}	6.90±0.6e	
	200	11.6±0.8 ^{dA}	10.6±0.9 ^{dB}	9.6±1.2 ^{dC}	9.60±0.9 ^{dC}	10.4±0.5 ^d	12.2±1.0 ^{dA}	11.8±1.7 ^{dA}	8.40±0.9 ^{dB}	8.20±0.7 ^{dB}	10.2±0.7 ^d	
	400	16.4±1.6 ^{cA}	15.0±1.2 ^{cB}	14.2±1.3 ^{cC}	12.8±1.2 ^{cD}	14.6±0.7°	16.4±1.2 ^{cA}	15.8±1.2 ^{cB}	12.8±1.5 ^{cC}	11.8±0.9 ^{cC}	14.2±0.7°	12.9±0.5 ^a
Matricaria chamomilla	800	22.6±0.8bA	21.8±1.0bB	20.4±1.0 ^{bC}	17.6±0.8 ^{bD}	20.6±0.6 ^b	24.0±0.3bA	21.6±1.0 ^{bB}	19.8±1.1 ^{bC}	16.4±0.9 ^{bD}	20.5±0.8b	
	1600	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0a	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.0±0.6 ^{aB}	24.8±0.2a	
	Control	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.4±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.1f	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.60±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.50±0.1f	
	Mean	14.2±1.6 ^A	13.4±1.6 ^B	12.7±1.6 ^C	12.0±1.5 ^D	13.1±0.8	14.5±1.6 ^A	13.9±1.6 ^B	12.0±1.6 ^C	10.9±1.5 ^D	12.8±0.8	
	100	7.80±1.1 ^{eA}	6.20 ± 0.7^{eB}	6.4 ± 0.8^{eB}	5.20±1.1 ^{eC}	6.40±0.5e	6.60±0.9eA	6.40±0.8 ^{eA}	5.40±0.5 ^{eB}	3.80±0.7 ^{eC}	5.60±0.4e	
	200	9.80±1.1 ^{dA}	8.80±1.2 ^{dB}	8.4±0.8 ^{dB}	7.80 ± 1.4^{dC}	8.70±0.6 ^d	9.60±1.4 ^{dA}	10.0±0.9 ^{dA}	8.00±0.9 ^{dB}	7.40±0.7 ^{dC}	8.80±0.5 ^d	
	400	14.4±1.0 ^{cA}	13.6±1.2 ^{cB}	12.4±1.5°C	11.0±1.8 ^{cD}	12.9±0.7°	13.8±1.1 ^{cA}	13.8±1.1 ^{cA}	12.0±1.4 ^{cB}	9.00±1.3 ^{cC}	12.2±0.7c	1
Origanum majorana	800	21.0±0.6 ^{bA}	19.4±1.2 ^{bB}	18.6±1.2 ^{bC}	17.4±1.1 ^{bD}	19.1±0.6 ^b	21.2±0.7 ^{bA}	19.4±0.9bB	17.0±0.7 ^{bC}	15.0±1.1 ^{bD}	18.2±0.7 ^b	11.8±0.5 ^b
	1600	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.6±0.2 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.9±0.1a	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	23.2±0.9 ^{aA}	24.6±0.3a	
	Control	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.4±0.2 ^{fA}	0.60±0.2 ^{fA}	0.50±0.1f	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.1f	-
	Mean	13.1±1.6 ^A	12.2±1.5 ^B	11.9±1.5 ^C	11.20±1.6 ^D	12.1±0.8	12.8±1.6 ^A	12.5±1.5 ^A	11.3±1.5 ^B	9.80±1.4 ^C	11.6±0.8	
	100	8.6±0.7 ^{eA}	8.00±1.1 ^{eB}	6.6±0.8 ^{eC}	6.00±1.1eD	7.30±0.5e	8.00±0.8eA	7.40±1.2 ^{eB}	6.00±0.7 ^{eC}	5.40±0.5 ^{eD}	6.70±0.5e	
	200	11.2±1.1 ^{dA}	10.0 ± 0.8^{dB}	9.2±0.7 ^{dC}	8.6±0.9dD	9.80±0.5 ^d	11.0±0.7 ^{dA}	10.6±0.7 ^{dA}	8.8±1.2 ^{dB}	8.20±1.0 ^{dC}	9.70±0.5 ^d	
	400	16.6±1.6 ^{cA}	14.8±1.9 ^{cB}	14.2±1.2 ^{cC}	11.6±1.2cD	14.3±0.8°	14.8±1.4 ^{cA}	14.0±1.5 ^{cB}	12.8±1.2 ^{cC}	11.4±0.9 ^{cD}	13.3±0.7°	
Carum petroselinum	800	22.8±0.9bA	22.6±0.8bA	19.4±0.9bB	18.8±0.7bC	20.9±0.6 ^b	22.0±0.9bA	20.8±0.7 ^{bB}	19.8±1.1 ^{bC}	16.8±0.9 ^{bD}	19.9±0.6 ^b	12.8±0.5a
	1600	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0aA	25.0±0.0a	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	24.6±0.4 ^{aA}	24.9±0.1a	
	Control	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.4 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.60±0.2fA	0.50±0.1 ^f	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.60±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.50±0.1 ^f	
	Mean	14.1±1.6 ^A	13.5±1.6 ^B	12.5±1.5 ^C	11.8±1.5D	13.0±0.8	13.5±1.6 ^A	13.1±1.5 ^B	12.1±1.6 ^C	11.1±1.5 ^D	12.5±0.8	
	100	7.0 ± 0.8^{eB}	8.60±1.1 ^{eA}	5.2±1.1 ^{eC}	4.60 ± 0.8^{eD}	6.40±0.6e	7.00±1.0 ^{eB}	7.80±1.1 ^{eA}	5.40±0.5 ^{eC}	3.40±0.7 ^{eD}	5.90±0.6e	
	200	9.20 ± 1.2^{dB}	11.6±1.2 ^{dA}	7.8 ± 1.4^{dC}	6.60 ± 1.0^{dD}	8.80±0.7 ^d	9.80±0.7 ^{dB}	10.8±1.0 ^{dA}	7.20±0.9 ^{dC}	5.20±0.4 ^{dD}	8.30±0.6 ^d	
	400	14.0±0.9 ^{cB}	16.0±1.5 ^{cA}	11.6±1.5°C	10.0±1.0 ^{cD}	12.9±0.8°	14.2±1.6 ^{cB}	15.2±1.2 ^{cA}	11.2±1.5°C	8.40±1.0 ^{cD}	12.3±0.9°	
Salvia officinalis	800	19.6±1.4 ^{bB}	22.4 ± 0.7^{bA}	17.6±1.2 ^{bC}	12.6±1.0 ^{bD}	18.1±1.0 ^b	21.2±0.8 ^{bA}	21.2±0.7 ^{bA}	15.8±0.9 ^{bB}	12.0±0.7 ^{bC}	17.6±1.0 ^b	11.6±0.5 ^b
	1600	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	22.0±1.3 ^{aA}	24.2±0.4a	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	25.0±0.0 ^{aA}	22.4±0.7 ^{aB}	21.0±1.2 ^{aC}	23.4±0.5a	
	Control	0.60±0.2 ^{fA}	0.60 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.4 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.40 ± 0.2^{fA}	0.50±0.1 ^f	0.60 ± 0.4^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.40±0.2 ^{fA}	0.60±0.2 ^{fA}	0.50±0.1f	
	Mean	12.6±1.5 ^B	14.0±1.6 ^A	11.3±1.6 ^C	9.40±1.3 ^D	11.8±0.8	13.0±1.6 ^A	13.4±1.6 ^A	10.4±1.4 ^B	8.40±1.3 ^C	11.3±0.7	
Mean of inse	ect			12.47±0.4 ^A					12.04±0.4 ^B		•	
Mean of ag		1 st is	nstar		2 nd instar			nstar		4 th instar		
wieaii oi ag	,c	13.45	±0.6 ^A		13.24+0.5 ^A		11.68	±0.5 ^B		10.66±0.5 ^C		

a, b & c: There is no significant difference (P>0.05) between any two means, within the same column have the same superscript letter.

A, B & C: There is no significant difference (P>0.05) between any two means for the same attribute, within the same row have the same superscript letter.

Table 4: Relative efficiency of the tested plant oils against all larval instars of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* at different time intervals post-treatment.

Dowlad (b)	Oil	1 00		A. c	aspius			С. р	pipiens	
Period (h)	Oli	Age	LC50	Slope	P value	LC90	LC50	Slope	P value	LC90
		1 st	514	2.732	0.200	1513	532	2.530	0.265	1708
	M. chamomilla	2 nd	560	2.757	0.193	1632	720	2.354	0.407	2521
		3 rd	669	2.249	0.355	1899	616	2.386	0.439	2121
		4 th	723	1.957	0.452	3268	851	1.906	0.739	4000
		1 st	565	2.301	0.204	20.37	720	2.481	0.436	2366
	O. majorana	2 nd	649	2.343	0.335	2289	800	2.512	0.586	2589
	О. тајогана	3 rd	808	1.981	0.573	3583	1027	2.423	0.673	3471
24		4 th	952	2.143	0.855	3772	980	1.772	0.472	5184
24		1 st	508	2.624	0.188	1565	574	2.413	0.414	1950
	C. troselinum	2 nd	523	2.374	0.526	1813	651	2.484	0.464	2136
	C. Hoseimum	3 rd	623	2.515	0.409	2013	750	2.083	0.363	3091
		4 th	649	1.997	0.341	2846	875	1.854	0.608	4297
		1 st	677	2.178	0.497	2624	865	1.991	0.799	3808
	S. officinalis	2 nd	587	2.075	0.678	2434	802	2.096	0.664	3281
	S. Officinatis	3 rd	901	2.250	0.725	3344	1160	2.367	0.954	4037
		4 th	1267	2.024	0.650	5446	1727	2.025	0.747	6128
		1 st	310	2.093	0.301	1270	316	1.991	0.456	1389
	M. chamomilla	2 nd	373	2.000	0.154	1427	359	2.054	0.194	1511
	м. спатотии	3 rd	430	2.211	0.329	1634	463	2.312	0.242	1658
		4 th	505	1.831	0.359	2531	599	1.876	0.609	2885
		1 st	365	2.007	0.153	1587	400	2.062	0.100	1676
	O. majorana	2 nd	446	2.167	0.102	1742	461	2.104	0.156	1872
	О. тајогана	3 rd	558	2.054	0.253	2346	616	1.941	0.320	2818
48		4 th	594	1.807	0.583	3038	755	1.821	0.564	3819
40		1 st	389	1.856	0.915	1908	375	2.292	0.290	1360
	C. petroselinum	2 nd	356	1.912	0.108	1667	451	2.138	0.074	1795
		3 rd	623	1.965	0.902	2079	597	1.949	0.249	2714
		4 th	463	1.635	0.093	3787	464	1.955	0.298	2101
		1 st	431	2.166	0.135	1684	419	1.979	0.228	1859
	S. officinalis	2 nd	339	2.122	0.242	1360	388	1.975	0.181	1729
		3 rd	514	2.125	0.171	2062	779	1.812	0.624	3970
		4 th	863	1.722	0.513	4785	1063	1.724	0.778	5883
		1 st	197	2.019	0.460	850	188	2.184	0.293	727
	M. chamomilla	2 nd	232	2.071	0.420	963	213	1.893	0.636	1011
	wi. chamomila	3 rd	278	1.844	0.856	1376	315	1.977	0.639	1401
		4 th	297	1.806	0.178	1521	376	1.897	0.413	1780
		1 st	255	1.779	0.705	1337	280	1.716	0.733	1561
	O. majorana	2 nd	293	1.988	0.467	1294	275	1.974	0.388	1226
	O. majorana	3 rd	723	1.957	0.452	3268	346	1.980	0.173	1537
72		4 th	363	2.055	0.154	1525	467	1.863	0.318	2277
12		1 st	204	1.863	0.510	994	228	1.786	0.657	1192
	C. petroselinum	2 nd	229	2.126	0.269	918	259	1.713	0.762	1450
	C. peiroseimum	3 rd	323	2.024	0.183	1387	297	2.080	0.343	1227
		4 th	277	1.989	0.394	1221	357	1.905	0.210	1679
		1 st	279	1.923	0.440	1292	275	1.644	0.732	1656
	S. officinalis	2 nd	207	2.036	0.465	882	237	1.634	0.875	1444
	5. Officinalis	3 rd	349	2.051	0.191	1470	417	1.641	0.615	2521
		4 th	524	1.576	0.325	3411	650	1.725	0.484	3593

 Table 5: Relative efficiency of the tested plant oils against pupal stage of A. caspius and C. pipiens at different time intervals post-treatment.

Period (h)	Oil No.		A. c	aspius		C. pipiens				
reriou (II)	Oli No.	LC50	Slope	P value	LC90	LC50	Slope	P value	LC90	
	M. chamomilla	1221	1.865	0.934	5944	1246	2.018	0.907	5377	
24	O. majorana	780	1.735	0.630	4271	848	1.691	0.597	4857	
24	C. petroselinum	640	1.688	0.636	3675	1179	1.565	0.680	7773	
	S. officinalis	1478	1.809	0.974	7556	1380	2.006	0.956	6010	
	M. chamomilla	922	1.559	0.605	6120	900	1.779	0.785	4730	
48	O. majorana	666	1.590	0.510	4264	576	1.619	0.672	3566	
40	C. petroselinum	482	1.669	0.209	2825	723	1.757	0.813	3875	
	S. officinalis	1061	1.565	0.683	6992	967	1.800	0.830	4984	
72	M. chamomilla	647	1.590	0.648	4141	610	1.699	0.797	3463	
12	O. majorana	462	1.701	0.284	2621	354	1.689	0.247	2032	

C. petroselinum	330	1.844	0.139	1634	534	1.646	0.634	
officinalis	727	1.550	0.758	4823	682	1.692	0.823	320

Table 6: The effect of plant oils; *M. chamomilla, O. majorana, C. petroselinum* and *S. officinalis* on duration, pupal rate and adult emergence of *A. caspius* and *C. pipiens* after treatment of 1st larval instar.

	G			A. caspius		C. pipiens					
Oil	Conc.	Durati	on (days)	Percent	Percent Adult	Durati	on (days)	Percent	Percent Adult		
	(ppm)	Larval	Pupal	pupation	Emergence	Larval	Pupal	pupation	Emergence		
	control	9	2	92	92	8	2	84	84		
	100	17	6	52	40	23	7	72	56		
M.	200	15	6	48	36	19	6	60	44		
chamomilla	400	10	4	20	8	13	4	32	20		
	800	8	3	8	0	8	3	20	8		
	1600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	control	8	2	96	96	8	2	96	96		
	100	15	5	72	64	20	5	80	72		
O. majorana	200	13	5	64	48	17	5	68	56		
O. majorana	400	10	3	40	28	11	3	40	28		
	800	7	3	32	16	7	3	32	16		
	1600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	control	8	2	84	84	9	2	88	88		
	100	19	8	52	36	24	9	64	48		
<i>C</i> .	200	17	7	44	28	19	7	56	36		
petroselinum	400	12	5	20	8	15	5	20	12		
	800	8	3	4	0	8	4	12	0		
	1600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	control	9	2	96	96	9	2	88	88		
	100	14	5	72	44	15	5	72	44		
S. officinalis	200	12	4	64	36	14	4	64	36		
5. Officinalis	400	9	3	48	24	9	3	48	24		
	800	7	3	24	8	7	3	24	8		
	1600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Acknowledgment

The authors greatly thank Prof. Dr. Mohamed Y. Ramadan, Head of Parasitology Department, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Benha University for his support and valuable advice.

References

- 1. Abo El-Mahasen MM, Mahmoud SH. Effects of some essential oils against *Culex pipiens* larvae. J. Cell Tissue Res. 2016; 16(2):5558-5565.
- Adham FK, Gabre RM, Ayaad TH, Galal FH. The effects of laboratory Hepatozoon gracilis infection on the fecundity, mortality and longevity of *Culex pipiens* Linnaeus (Diptera: Culicidae) in Egypt. J Egy. Soc. Parasitol. 2003; 33(2):353-360.
- 3. Al-khalaf AA, Al-mehmadi RM. Delayed effects of some plant extracts on some biological aspects of *Culex quinquefasciatus* (Diptera: Culicidae). Alex. Sci. Exchange J. 2010; 31(3):209-214.
- 4. Amer A, Mehlhorn H. Larvicidal effects of various essential oils against *Aedes*, *Anopheles* and *Culex* larvae (Diptera, Culicidae). Parasitolo Res. 2006; 99(4):466-472.
- Balenghien T, Fouque F, Sabatier P, Bicout D. Horse, bird, and human-seeking behavior and seasonal abundance of mosquitoes in a West Nile virus focus of southern France. J Med Entomol. 2006; 43:936-946.
- 6. Baz MM. Strategies for mosquito control. Ph thesis, faculty of science, Benha University, Egypt, 2013.
- Bream AS, Hassan MI, Fouda MA, El-Sheikh TM. Toxicity and repellent activity of *Phragmites australis*

- extracts against the mosquito vector *Culex pipiens*. Tunisian J. Plant Protec. 2009; 4(2):157-172.
- 8. Domingues I, Agra AR, Monaghan K, Soares AM, Nogueira AJ. Cholinesterase and glutathione-Stransferase activities in freshwater invertebrates as biomarkers to assess pesticide contamination. Environ Toxicol Chem. 2010; 29:5-18.
- 9. El-Bokl MM, Moawad HM. Evaluation of some plant exracts as mosquito larvicides. Ain Shams Sci, Bull., 1996; 34:351-362.
- 10. Finney DJ. Probit analysis. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1971, 333.
- 11. Ghosh A, Chowdury N, Chandra G. Plant extracts as potential mosquito larvicides. Indian J Med Res. 2012; 135:581-598
- 12. Harbach RE. Pictorial keys to the genera of mosquitoes, subgenera of *Culex* and the species of *Culex* occurring in southwestern Asia and Egypt, with a note on the subgeneric placement on *Culex deserticola* (Diptera: Culicidae). Mosquito systematics. 1985; 17(2):83-107.
- 13. Kamal SA. Observations on rift valley fever virus and vaccines in Egypt. J Virol. 2011; 8:532.
- 14. Kamatchi PA, Maheswaran R, Ignacimuthu S. Evaluation of Larval Toxicity of *Lantana Camara* L. and *Catharanthus Roseus* L. against *Culex Quinquefasciatus* say and *Aedes Aegypti* L. Entomol Ornithol Herpetol. 2016; 5(1):1-5.
- 15. Khalaf AA. Biochemical and physiological impacts of two volatile plant oils on *Muscina stabulans* (Diptera: Muscidae). J Egypt Ger Soc Zool. 1998; 27(E):315-329.
- 16. Khalaf AA. Evaluation of toxicity of two plant volatile

- oils against laboratory and field strains of *Culex pipiens* larvae. J Egypt Ger Soc Zool. 1999: 28(E):61-71.
- 17. Khater HF, Shalaby AA. Potential of biologically active plant oils to control mosquito larvae (*Culex pipiens*, Diptera: Culicidae) from an Egyptian locality. Rev Inst Med Trop S Paulo. 2008; 50(2):107-112.
- 18. Kumar MS, Maneemegalai S. Evaluation of larvicidal effect of *Lantana camara* Linn against mosquito species *Aedes aegypti* and *Culex quinquefasciatus*. Adv. Biol. Res., 2008; 2(3, 4):39-43.
- 19. Madkour MH, Zaitoun AA, Singer FA. Innovative biocontrolling method of dengue fever vector, *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae). J Agric. Sci. 2014; 6(9):208-213
- 20. Maheswaran R, Sathish S, Ignacimuthu S. Larvicidal activity of *Leucas aspera* (Willd) against the larvae of *Culex quinquefasciatus* Say and *Aedes aegypti* L. Int. J Integ. Biol. 2008; 2(3):214-217.
- 21. Meenakshi SV, Jayaprakash K. Mosquito larvicidal efficacy of leaf extract from mangrove plant *Rhizophora mucronata* (Family: Rhizophoraceae) against *Anopheles* and *Aedes* species. J. Pharma. and Phytochem. 2014; 3(1):78-83
- 22. Nasir S, Batool M, Hussain SM, Nasir I, Hafeez F, Debboun M. Bioactivity of Oils from Medicinal Plants against Immature Stages of Dengue Mosquito *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae). Int J Agric Biol. 2015; 17(4):843-847.
- 23. Pavela R. Larvicidal effects of Euro-Asiatic plants against *Culex quinquefasciatus* Say larvae (Diptera: Culicidae). Parasitol Res. 2008; 102:555-559.
- Prasad A, Mathur P, Shrivastava M, Kumar D, Sharma E. Larvicidal efficacy of *Catharanthus roseus* Linn leaves and flowers against the malaria vector *Anopheles* stephensi Liston (Insecta: Diptera: Culicidae). Int J Recent Sci Res. 2014; 5:1620-1623.
- 25. Ramzy RMR, Goldman AS, Kamal HA. Defining the cost of the Egyptian lymphatic filariasis elimination programme. Filaria J. 2005; 4(7):1-11.
- 26. Reiner RC, Achee Jr, Barrera NR, Burkot TR, Chadee DD, Devine GJ. Quantifying the epidemiological impact of vector control on dengue. PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis. 2016; 10(5):1-11.
- 27. Remia KM, Logaswamy S. Larvicidal efficacy of leaf extract of two botanicals against the mosquito vector *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae). Indian J Nat Prod Resour. 2010; 1:208-212.
- Ribeiro A, Santos LMST, Romanaha AJ, Veloso DP, Zani CL. Flavonoids from *Trixis vauthieri* (Asteraceae) extract active in vitro against trypomastigote forms of *Trypanosoma cruzi*. Memó Inst Oswaldo Cruz. 1994; 89:188-196.
- Sharma A, Kumar S, Tripathi P. Evaluation of the Larvicidal Efficacy of Five Indigenous Weeds against an Indian Strain of Dengue Vector, *Aedes aegypti* L. (Diptera: Culicidae). J Parasitol. Res. 2016; (10):1-8.
- 30. Shawarby AA, Mahadi AH, Taha AM, Mahmoud WA, Arafa AS, Ezz el-Arab MA *et al*. Bancroftian filariasis in U. A.R. assessment of control measures 1963-1966. J Egypt Public Health Assoc. 1968; 43:79-99
- 31. Singh O, Khanam Z, Misra N, Srivastava MK. Chamomile (Matricaria chamomilla L.): An overview, 2011; 5(9):82-95.

- 32. Singh RK, Mittal PK, Kumar G, Dhiman RC. Evaluation of mosquito larvicidal efficacy of leaf extract of a cactus plant, Agave sisalana. J. Entomol. and Zool Studies. 2014; 2(1):83-86.
- 33. Soliman BA. Comparative exsheathment of microfilariae of *Wuchereia bancrofti* in certain mosquito species. J Egypt Soc Parasitol. 1995; 25(1):207-212.
- 34. Steel R, Torrie J, Dickey D. Principles and procedures of Statistics: A Biometrical Approach, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, 1997.
- 35. Yadav R, Tyagi V, Tikar SN, Sharma AK, Mendki MJ, Jain AK *et al.* Differential larval toxicity and oviposition altering activity of some indigenous plant extracts against dengue and chikungunya vector Aedes albopictus. J Arthropod-Borne Dis. 2014; 8(2):174-185.
- 36. WHO. Instructions for determining the susceptibility or resistance of mosquito larvae to insecticides. Geneva, WHO, 1981.
- 37. WHO. Weekly epidemiological record. *Relevé* épidémiologique hebdomadaire. 2012; 87:345-356.