# A Comparative Study of Insect Collection Made by Employing Two Different Methods of Collection in an Agro-Ecosystem near Jhunjhunun, Rajasthan, India

# Sima<sup>1</sup>, Meera Srivastava<sup>2</sup>

Laboratory of Entomology, Post Graduate Department of Zoology, Govt. Dungar College, Bikaner 334001, Rajasthan, India

Abstract: As insects play many different roles in an ecosystem, it is important to know their diversity and density in a particular area and also during specific seasons. Deciding which insect trap to use is an important consideration for ecologists and entomologists. During the present study, the relative performances of cage net trap and light trap have been compared for insect collection. The study was undertaken in an agro-ecosystem situated in the Indian desert in Jhujhunu district situated in western Rajasthan. Insects visiting different crops cultivated round the year were collected employing an indigenously designed cage of size ImxImxIm of nylon mesh during day time and light trap comprising of 260 Watt mercury bulb during night. The cage net trap collection comprised of fifteen coleopteran, thirty one lepidopteran, fourteen hemipteran, twenty two hymenopteran, eight dipteran, three dictyopteran, nine orthopteran, five odonates, one neuropteran and one embiopteran, while in light trap collection order Coleoptera was represented by fifteen species, order Lepidoptera by twenty species, order Hemiptera by seven species, order Hymenoptera by three species, order Diptera by three species, order Dictyoptera, Embioptera and Orthoptera by one species each and order Neuroptera by three species. No odonates were observed in light trap collection. Further, the light trap collection comprised of four species which were never documented in cage net collections.

Keywords: Insects, Cage net, Light trap, Agro-ecosystem

#### 1. Introduction

Ecologically, insects play many different roles as pests, predators and parasites, pollinators, decomposers and scavengers and so forth. It is therefore important to know their diversity and density in a particular area and also during specific seasons. But, it seems that few such studies have been conducted, one major limitation being the lack of consensus on methods for insect collection. Deciding which insect trap to use is an important consideration for ecologists and entomologists. During the present study, the relative performances of cage net trap and light trap have been compared for insect collection. The study was undertaken in an agro-ecosystem situated in the Indian desert in Jhujhunu district situated in western Rajasthan.

# 2. The Study Area

The state of Rajasthan is the largest state of Indian republic located between 23°3' to 20'13 N latitude and 69°30' to 78°17'C longitudes. The study area in the form of an agricultural field is located at 28°08'N, 75°24' E and 28.13°N 75.4°E having an average elevation of 323 m (1059 feet) in the district of Jhunjhunun. The agro-ecosystem in the form of crop fields studied lies about 5km away from the city of Jhunjhunun, covering an area of 1000 x 500 m.

# 3. Methodology

The study concentrated on comparing the diversity and density of insect visitors to different crops cultivated round the year employing an indigenously designed cage of size lmxlmxlm of nylon mesh for insect collection during day

time and light trap comprising of 260 Watt mercury bulb was employed for collecting the nocturnal insect species. The insect visitors were surveyed and collected every week from October 2010 to April 2011. For the study, the field area was divided into five stations. The insects collected by the above method were transferred to killing bottles, killed and preserved. The fauna were sorted out and help from the Section of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, Bikaner and Desert regional Station of the Zoological Survey of India, Jodhpur was also taken for identification and for confirmation. Besides, the reference collection in the Department of Zoology, Dungar College was also consulted.

#### 4. Result

During the present survey, insects were collected employing cage net and light trap. The diversity of insects as observed in the collection made by employing these two methods has been presented in Table 1.

The cage net trap collection comprised of fifteen coleopteran, thirty one lepidopteran, fourteen hemipteran, twenty two hymenopteran, eight dipteran, three dictyopteran, nine orthopteran, five odonates, one neuropteran and one embiopteran, while in light trap collection order Coleoptera was represented by fifteen species, order Lepidoptera by twenty species, order Hemiptera by seven species, order Hymenoptera by three species, order Diptera by three species, order Dictyoptera, Embioptera and Orthoptera by one species each and order Neuroptera by three species. No odonates were observed in light trap collection. Further, the light trap collection comprised of four species which were never documented in cage net collections.

Of the total 113 species (10 orders) collected through cage net and light trap, 56 were considered dominant, 26 as frequent, while, 31 as rare forms.

The dominant species included Anomala bengalensis, Onthophagus catta, O. bonasus, Adoretus sp., Ochodeus sp., Peltonotus nasutus, Apogonia ferruginea, Cylindrothorax pictus, Coccinella septempunctata, Menochilus sexmaculatus, Cicindella sp., Myllocerus sp. and Hypolixus truncatulus belonging to order Coleoptera; Danaus chrysippus, Colotis vestalis, C.fieldii, Eurema hecabe, Lampides boeticus, Hymenia recurvalis, Cnaphalocrocis medinalis, Earias insulana, Mythimna separata, Agrotis ipsilon, Chrysodeixis chalcites, Thysanoplusia orichalcea, Heliothis peltigera, Sphenarches caffer, Etiella zinckenella, Utethesia pulchella, and Tephrina sp. belonging to order Lepidoptera ; Nezara viridula, Bagrada hilaris, Piezodorus sp., Dysdercus cingulatus and Lipaphis erysimi belonging to order Hemiptera; Xylocopa fenestrata, X. violacea, Apis cerana, A. mellifera, A. dorsata, A. florea, Dolichoderus affinis, Formica sp., Dorylus sp., Sceliphron brunneum and Enicospilus sp. belonging to order Hymenoptera; Musca domestica, Culex quinquefasciatus and Stichopogon sp. belonging to order Diptera; Chrotogonus sp., Ochrilidia sp., Oxya chinensis, Acheta domesticus and Gryllus assimilis belonging to order Orthoptera; Bradinopyga geminata belonging to order Odonata and Chrysopa sp. belonging to order Neuroptera.

The frequent species observed included Melanotus sp. belonging to order Coleoptera; Junonia orithya, Cryptographis indica, Spodoptera exigua, Scirpophaga nivella, and an unidentified species. A belonging to order Lepidoptera; Aspongopus janus, Alcaeus sp., Andrallus spinidens, Oncocephalus sp., Dysdercus koenigii Aphanus sp. Clavigrella sp. and Pyrilla perpusilla belonging to order Hemiptera; Polistes sp., Delta sp. and an unidentified species C belonging to order Hymenoptera; Musca nibulo, Anthrax sp., Chrysomya megacephala and Chrysomya rufifacies belonging to order Diptera; Schistocerca gregaria and Euconocephalus sp. belonging to order Orthoptera; Pantala flavescens and Agriocnemis femina belonging to order Odonata; Oligotoma sp. belonging to order Plecoptera and rare species included Plocaederus sp. belonging to order Coleoptera; Acherontia styx, Catopsila pomona, Anaphaeis aurota, Papilio demoleus, Euchrysops cnejus, Leucinodes orbonalis, Hesperilla ornata, Pericallia ricini, Creatonotos gangis and unidentified species. B belonging to order Lepidoptera; Myzus persicae belonging to order Hemiptera; Amegila cingulata, Delta campaniforme, Eumenes fraternus, Athalia proxima, Chrysis dugesi, unidentified species A, B, D and E belonging to order Hymenoptera; Tabanus sp. belonging to order Diptera; Mantis religiosa, Deiphobe incise and Periplaneta americana belonging to order Dictyoptera; Acrida sp. and unidentified species A belonging to order Ortoptera; Rhodischnura nursei and unidentified species A belonging to order Odonata; Myrmeleon sp. and Ululodes quadurimaculatus belonging to order Neuroptera during the period of study.

The cage net collection comprised of 109 insect species which have been presented in Table 2. The collection comprised of 15 coleopteran insect species of which 13 were

dominant, one frequent and one rare form ; among 31 lepidopterans, 16 dominant, 4 frequent, and 11 rare forms; among 14 hemipterans, 5 dominant, 7 frequent and 2 rare species; among 22 hymenopterans, 10 dominant, 4 frequent and 8 rare species; among 8 dipterans, 3 dominant, 4 frequent and one rare form; 3 rare dictyopteran; among 9 orthopterans, 5 were dominant, 2 were frequent and 2 were rare forms; among 5 odonates only one was dominant while, 2 were frequent and 2 were rare forms; the single neuropteran species documented was dominant while, the single embiopteran species noted was a frequent form.

The 54 insect species documented in light trap collection which have been presented in Table 3. In light trap collection, 15 coleopteran species were observed of which 6 were dominant, 7 were frequent and 2 were rare forms; among 20 lepidopteran species only 2 were dominant, 11 frequent and 7 were rare forms : the 7 hemipteran species documented were all frequently observed; of the 3 hymenopterans, 2 were dominant and one was rare; among 3 dipterans, 2 were frequent and one was a rare form; one dictyopteran was rarely observed; one orthopteran was frequently observed; of the three neuropterans, one was frequent while, the other 2 were rare forms and the only embiopteran collected through light trap was a frequent form.

# 5. Discussion

During the present study most of the coleopterans, hymenopterans, dipterans (except mosquito), orthopterans (except Acheta) were noted in both type of collections, while members belonging to family Pieridae, Lycaenidae, Danaidae, Papilionidae and Nymphalidae of order Lepidoptera were observed only in cage collections, and certain neuropteran, Dorylus ant and a moth Creatonotus gangis were documented in light trap collections only. Density wise the number of different insects observed was always high in cage net as compared to light trap. Kundu et al. (1961) have also earlier studied the insect populations including Lepidoptera on light trap at Pilani (Rajasthan). A large number of species of butterflies and moths were found to be attracted towards the mercury lamps in Gujarat by Shull & Nadkerny (1964). Southwood (1966) observed that the size of light trap catch is influenced not only by the actual population of the adults present in the environment but also by the changes in the activity of the insects and their responsiveness towards the trap. Shull & Nadkerny (1967) and Nadkerny & Shull (1968) observed a large number of species of butterflies and moths attracted to the mercury vapour lamps in Gujarat. Brightness of moon was found to suppress the light trap catch in a number of noctuid species including Heliothis by Nemac (1971), Persson (1971) and Agee et al. (1972). Coleopterans were found to be attracted more abundantly towards the light trap as compared to other insect orders by Pal & Sachan (1972). The highest catches (927) of Rhinyptia meridionalis through light trap were recorded by Pal (1977) when temperature and relative humidity ranged from 30 to 33°C and 52 to 65 per cent respectively. He further reported Schizonycha ruficollis on light from second fort-night of June coinciding with the onset of rainfall Adoretos lesiophygus highest during month of April, Serica assanensia during August and Aserica sp.

from June to September. Three weather factors viz., temperature, relative humidity and rain fall were studied to affect the flight activity and size of light trap catch of Heliothis armigera by Verma et al. (1982) at Jabalpur. The authors revealed that temperature and relative humidity had no significant effect on flight activity of insects and therefore no influence on trap catches while the trap catch on rainy days was considerably higher as compared to that before and after the rainy day. Vaishampayan & Verma (1982) studied the effect of moon light on light trap catches of Heliothis armigera by using mercury vapour lamp. The authors observed that in all the lunar cycles the trap catch was consistently very low on moonlit nights around full moon. They further suggested a significant linear and negative correlation between the degree of moon phase and light trap catches. Gregg et al. (1993) operated light traps on mountain tops during September to April in Australia and found that the catch consisted mostly of noctuid and sphingid species. The noctuid species included Agrotis infusa, Mythimna convecta, Helicoverpa punctigera, Heliothis armigera, Dasygaster nephelistis and Agrotis munda while sphingids mostly included Hippotion scrofa. Gregg et al. (1994) studied the catches of moths in tower mounted light traps in Northern New South Wales in relation to local and synoptic weather and found catches to be correlated with wind speed, relative humidity and rainfall. They further observed no correlation of catches with temperature but were found to be associated with wind shifts. Vaishampayan & Singh (1995) made studies using light trap on Heliothis armigera at Varanasi and revealed that the adult insects remain active during the period of December to May while during June to November the trap collection was either found to be nil or rare. Population status of some major pests of cotton crop such as Amrasca biguttula biguttula Ishida, Spodoptera litura (Fab.), Helicoverpa armigera (Hubner), Earias spp., Pectinophora gossypiella (Saunders) and Dysdercus cingulatus (Fab.) was monitored by Murugesan et al. (2005) using 100w incandescent yellow and blue light traps during vegetative, flowering and boll development stages of cotton crops in a field at Sivakasi, South Tamil Nadu. The pests were surveyed and statistically analyzed with reference to lower rhythmic light, night mean temperature and rainfall. The number of insects trapped in full night collection of both the yellow blue light traps during new moon period was significantly higher than that during other lunar cyclical periods such as quarter, last quarter and full moon periods. The night catches were positively correlated with a unit change in night mean temperature of the survey days during vegetative stage and negatively correlated with that during flowering and boll developing stages of the cotton crops. Rainfall negatively influenced the catches of A. biguttula biguttula, S. littura, Earias spp. and H. armigera as well as positively influenced P. gossypiella and D. cingulatus. Moreover, the difference of crop damages in between the light trap region and shadow region was also analyzed and determined as factor for trapping efficiency of the light traps.

Bogush (1936) used light trap in determining the insect fauna and controlling the pests. Puttarudriah (1958) reported that the beetles are attracted towards light. Prasad & Thakur (1959) reported that the beetles are attracted towards light.

Vora & Ramakrishnan (1991) studied the phototactic response of *Holotrichia consanguinea*. The authors observed that the beetles *H. consanguinea* were positively phototactic towards lower intensity of light and both sexes were attracted to different colours of light. All these earlier studies give support to the present findings. From the present study conducted, it could therefore be concluded that the technique employed for insect collection is of great significance both for diversity as well as density comparisons.

### References

- [1] Agee, H.R, Webb, J.C. and Toft, H.M. 1972. Activity of boll worm moths influenced by full moon. *Environ. Entomol.*, *1*(*3*) : 384-385.
- [2] Bogush, P.P. 1936. Some results of a study of insects by means of a light trap in central Asia. *Bull.Ent. Res.*, 27:377-380.
- [3] Gregg, P.C., Fitt, G.P. Coombs, M. and Henderson, G.S. 1993. Migrating moths (Lepidoptera) collected in tower-mounted light traps in northern New South Wales. Australia: species composition and seasonal abundance. *Bull. Ent. Res*, 83: 563-578.
- [4] Gregg. P.C.; Fitt, G.P. Coombs, M. and Henderson, G.S. 1994. Migrating moths collected in tower-mounted light traps in northern New South Wales, Australia: influences of local and synoptic weather. *Bull. Ent. Res.*, 84:17-30.
- [5] Kundu, H.L., Datta Gupta, A.K. and Gupta, B.B. 1961. A study of abundance of certain insects of Pilani (Rajasthan), with the help of a light trap. *Proc. Rajasthan Acad. Sci.*, 8(1&2): 79-87.
- [6] Murugesan, S., Murali, S. and Mahadevan, N.R. 2005. Influence of natural factors on the survey of insect pests of cotton crop in South Tamil Nadu using light traps. *Indian Journal of Entomology*, *67(1)*: 39-47.
- [7] Nadkerny, N.T. & Shull, E.M. 1968. Insects attracted to light in the Dangs, South Gujarat. J. Bombay nat. Hist. Sac., 65(3):800.
- [8] Nemac, S.J. 1971. Effect of lunar phases on light trap catch and population of bollworm moths. *J.Econ. Ent.* 64(4): 860-863.
- [9] Pal, S.K. & Sachan, J.N. 1972. Studies on the relative abundance of photo-positive coleopterans at Central Arid Zone Research Institute, Farm, Jodhpur (Raj.) Proc. Winter School (INSA) on development of Rajasthan Desert, C.A.Z.R.I. Jodhpur, February 12-18, 1973.
- [10] Pal, S.K. 1977. Relative abundance of Scarabaeid beetles on light trap. *Indian J. Ent.*, *39*(2): 197-200.
- [11] Persson, B., 1971. Influence of light on flight activity of Noctuids (Lepidoptera) in *South Sweden. Entomolo. Scand.*, 2: 215-232.
- [12]Prasad, S.K. & Thakur, C. 1959. White grub, Lachnosterra consanguinea Blanch, a new menace to sugarcane, *Indian J. Ent.*, 21(3): 324-325.
- [13] Puttarudriah, M. 1958. Glimpses of Agricultural Entomology in Mysore. Agr. Coll Mag. Dharwar, 11: 8-27.
- [14] Shull, E.M. & Nadkerny, N.T. 1964. Collecting moths by mercury vapour lamp in the Surat Dangs, *Gujarat State. J. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc.*, 64: 281-294.

#### Volume 3 Issue 9, September 2014 www.ijsr.net

- [15] Shull, E.M. & Nadkerny, N.T. 1967. Insects attracted to mercury vapour lamp in the Surat Dangs, *Gujarat state*. *J. Bombay nat. Hist. Soc.*, 64 (2): 256-266.
- [16] Southwood, T.R.E. 1996. Ecological methods. University *Printing House, Methuen, London, 223 pp.*
- [17] Vaishampayan, S.M. & Singh, H.M. 1995. Evidences on the ligratory nature of Heliothis armigera (Hubner) adults collected on light trap at Varanasi. *Indian J. Ent.*, *57*(*3*): 224-232.
- [18] Vaishampayan, S.M. & Verma 1982. An influence of moonlight and lunar periodicity on the light trap catches on gram pod borer, Heliothis armigera (Hubner) moths. *Indian J. Ent.*, 44(3): 206-212.
- [19] Verma, R., Vaishampayan, S.M. and Rawat, R.R. 1982. Influence of weather factors on the light trap catch of gram podborer, Heliothis armigera (Hubner) moths. *Indian J. Ent.*, 213-218.
- [20] Vora, V.J. & Ramakrishnan, N. 1991. Attraction of the beetle, Holotrichia consanguinea Blanchard (Scarabaeidae : Coleoptera) to light and host plant. *Indian J. Ent.*, 53 (1): 45-49.

Table 1: Entomofaunal diversity observed in cage net and
light trap collections separately during the period of study

	Cage net	Light trap
Insect species	collection	collection
Order:Coleoptera		
Family:Scarabaeidae		
Anomala bengalensis	+	+
Onthophagus catta	+	+
Onthophagus bonasus	+	+
Adoretus sp.	+	+
Ochodeus sp.	+	+
Peltonotus nasutus Arrow	+	+
Apogonia ferruginea	+	+
Family:Coccinellidae		
Coccinella septempunctata	+	+
Menochilus sexmaculatus	+	+
Family:Curculionidae		
Myllocerus sp.	+	+
Hypolixus truncatulus Fab.	+	+
Family:Cicindelidae		
Cicindella sp.	+	+
Family:Elateridae		
Melanotus sp.	+	+
Family:Cerambycidae		
Plocaederus sp.	+	+
Family : Meloidae		
Cylindrothorax pictus Fab.	+	+
Order:Lepidoptera		
Family:Pieridae		
Catopsila pomona Cramer	+	-
Colotis vestalis Butler	+	-
Colias fieldii Menetries	+	-
Eurema hecabe	+	-
Anaphaeis aurota	+	-
Family:Lycaenidae		
Lampides boeticus Linn.	+	-
Euchrysops cnejus	+	-
Family:Danaidae		
Danaus chrysippus	+	-

Family:Papilionidae		
Papilio demoleus Linn.	+	-
Family:Nymphalidae		
Junonia orithya Linn	+	-
Family:Hesperiidae		
Hesperilla ornata Leach	+	+
Family:Noctuidae		
Earias insulana Boisduival	+	+
Mythimna separata	+	+
· ·	+	+
Agrotis ipsilon Hufnagel		
Chrysodeixis chalcites Esper	+	+
<i>Thysanoplusia orichalcae</i> Fab.	+	+
Heliothis peltigera Schiff	+	+
Spodoptera exigua Hubner	+	+
Pericallia ricini Fab.	+	+
Family:Crambidae		
Leucinodes orbonalis Guenee	+	+
Hymenia recurvalis Cramer	+	+
Cnaphalocrocis medinalis	+	+
Cryptographis indica Saunders	+	+
<b>Family</b> : Pyralidae		
Sphenarches caffer Zell	+	+
Scirpophoga nivella	+	+
Etiella zinckenella Treitschke	+	+
Family:Arctidae	i.	
Utethesia pulchella Linn.	1	+
*	+	+
Creatonotos gangis Linn.	-	
Family:Sphingidae		
Acherontia styx	+	-
Family :Geometridae		
<i>Tephrina</i> sp.	+	+
Unidentified species A	+	+
Unidentified species B	+	-
Order: Hemiptera		
Family: Pentatomidae		
Nezara viridula	+	+
Bagrada hilaris	+	+
Aspongopus janus	+	-
Andrallus spinidens	+	_
Alcaeus sp.	+	_
Piezodorus sp.	+	_
Oncocephalus sp.	+	
<b>Family</b> :Pyrrhocoridae	I	-
	1	
Dysdercus cingulatus Fab.	+	+
Dysdercus koenigii	+	+
Family: Lygaeidae		
Aphanus sp.	+	+
Family : Coreidae		
<i>Clavigrella</i> sp.	+	-
Family:Aphididae		
Lipaphis erysimi	+	+
Myzus persicae	+	-
Family:Fulgoroidae		
Pyrilla perpusilla Walker	+	+
Order:Hymenoptera		
Family:Apidae		
<i>Xylocopa fenestrata</i> Fab.	+	_
Xylocopa violacea	+	
Apis cerana Fab.	+	_
npis cerunu rau.	ļ	

Apis mellifera Linn.	+	-
Apis dorsata Fab.	+	-
Apis florea	+	+
Amegila cingulata	+	-
Family:Formicidae		
Dolichoderus affinis	+	_
<i>Formica</i> sp.	+	_
Dorylus sp.	-	+
Family:Vespidae		
Polistes sp.	+	-
Delta campaniforme	+	_
Eumenes fraternus	+	_
Family: Tenthredinidae		
Athalia proxima	+	_
<b>Family</b> :Sphecidae		
Sceliphron brunneum	+	-
Family:Chrysomididae		
Chrysis dugesi	+	-
Family:Ichneumonidae		
Enicospilus sp.	+	-
Delta sp.	+	-
Unidentified species A	+	_
Unidentified species B	+	_
Unidentified species C	+	_
Unidentified species D	+	-
Contd Unidentified species E	+	+
Order:Diptera	'	
Family:Muscidae		
Musca nibulo	+	
	+ +	-
Musca domestica		-
Family:Bombyliidae	+	-
Anthrax sp. Family:Tabanidae		-
-	+	-
Tabanus sp.		-
<b>Family</b> :Calliphoridae	1	
Chrysomya megacephala Fab.	+	-
Chrysomya rufifacies	+	-
Family: Asilidae	+	
Stichopogon sp.	Τ	-
<b>Family:</b> Culicidae	1	1
Culex quinquefasciatus Say	+	+
Order:Dictyoptera		
Family:Mantidae	1	
Mantis religiosa Linn.	+	-
Deiphobe incisa Werner	+	+
<b>Family:</b> Blattidae		
Periplaneta americana Linn.	+	-
Order:Orthoptera		
Family:Acrididae		
Chrotogonus sp.	+	-
Ochrilidia sp.	+	-
Schistocerca gregaria	+	-
Oxya chinensis	+	-
Acrida sp.	+	-
Family: Tettigoniidae	+	-
Eucenocephalus sp.	+	-
Unidentified species A	+	-
Family:Gryllidae		-
Acheta domesticus	+	+

Gryllus assimilis	+	-
Order:Odonata		
Family:Libellulidae		
Pantala flavescens	+	-
Bradinopyga geminata	+	-
Family:Coenagrionidae		
Agriocnemis femina Brauer	+	-
Rhodischnura nursei Morton	+	-
Unidentified species A	+	-
Order:Neuroptera		
Family:Chrysopidae		
Chrysopa carnea	+	+
Family:Myrmeleontidae		
Myrmeleon sp.	-	+
Family: Ascalaphidae		
Ululodes quadrimaculatus	-	+
Order:Embioptera		
Family:Oligotomidae		
Oligotoma sp.	+	+

Table 2: Total entomofauna (number) observed using cage net trap collections during the period of study

	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Statu
Order:Coleoptera																	
Family Scarabaeidae																	
Anomela bengalensis*	50	34	46	49	31	34	23	21	21	31	30	38	66	31	41	44	D
Onthophagus catta	3	11	26	17	21	31	32	18	3	7	8	3	4	11	26	20	D
Onthophagus bonasus	5	11	14	17	44	39	20	5	2	4	5	5	4	9	13	16	D
Adoretus sp.	14	1	6	14	64	48	43	30	13	12	22	21	17	4	9	13	D
Ochodeus sp.	12	8	7	20	83	62	45	36	5	10	5	26	15	10	8	10	D
Peltonotus nasutus *	58	29	31	47	63	54	48	49	24	32	34	50	59	34	34	42	D
Apogonia ferruginea*	25	39	42	53	126	117	124	99	2	9	17	16	22	21	34	46	D
Family:Coccinellidae																	
Coccinella	359	19	26	28	14	15	20	30	121	163	223	306	354	24	24	20	D
septempunctata																	
Menochilus sexmaculatus	141	5	30	-	11	8	14	9	59	78	74	111	117	18	-	-	D
Family:Curculionidae																	
Myllocerus sp.*	91	37	37	38	47	37	50	42	53	53	65	77	89	30	31	24	D
Hypolixus truncatulus	35	29	29	51	28	32	28	38	21	18	18	20	28	20	30	40	D
Family:Cicindelidae																	
Cicindella sp.*	68	23	30	31	119	101	79	61	40	52	59	55	66	20	24	30	D
Family:Elateridae		1	1		1		1	1	1					1		1	1
Melanotus sp.	-	-	-	-	13	12	5	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1_	F
Family:Cerambycidae		1	1			<u> </u>	ŕ	<u> </u>	1					1		1	ſ
Plocaederus sp.	-	-	L	-	L	1	-	-	I_	-	-	-		-	-	-	R
Family : Meloidae		1	+	<u> </u>	1	ľ –		+	1	<u> </u>	1					1	Ĩ.
Cylindrothorax pictus	4	15	27	67	50	71	76	50	L	1	3	7	5	17	18	16	D
Order: Lepidoptera	т -	15	21	07	50	/1	70	50	-	1	5	/	5	17	10	10	D
Family: Pieridae																	-
Catopsila pomona	2			1	19	8	10	2					1	1		2	R
	2 39	-	-	1	19 56	8 47	52	2 17	- 20	- 21	-	- 33	1 39	3	-	2	к D
Colotis vestalis	39 22	3	-	1 8		47 29			20	21	38		• ·	)	5	2	
Colias fieldii		11	/	~	37		26	12	-	/	14	18	24	12	6	/	D
Eurema hecabe	22	1	4	2	52	46	48	45	2	8	10	14	21	1	4	2	D
Anaphaes aurota	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	2	R
Family: Lycaenidae	20		1		100	10.4	0.0	0.4	-	10	22	41	20	1	2		-
Lampides boeticus	29	-	1	1	129	124	89	84	5	19	23	41	30	1	2	1	D
Euchrysops cnejus	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Family: Danaidae																	
Danaus chrysippus	30	7	11	12	3	15	12	16	10	15	20	17	29	5	13	7	D
Family: Papilionidae																	
Papilio demoleus .	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Family: Nymphalidae																	
Junonia orithya	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	5	13	-	-	-	F
Family:Hesperiidae																	
Hesperilla ornata	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	R
Family:Noctuidae																	
Earias insulana	42	13	24	21	22	25	18	11	18	28	33	29	43	13	24	17	D
Mythimna separata	43	7	8	10	51	54	41	46	21	25	36	43	43	6	7	8	D
Agrotis ipsilon*	76	9	17	17	55	52	35	30	62	57	64	62	71	10	15	14	D
Chrysodeixis chalcites	34	8	9	17	41	54	42	48	19	25	32	38	36	9	13	14	D
Thysanoplusia	157	33	42	58	88	90	81	80	76	90	104	117	163	33	40	45	D
orichalcea*			1	l'		1 °	1	1 · ·			1			Ľ.		1	1
Heliothis peltigera*	66	13	15	18	42	36	40	48	33	55	47	57	61	10	10	10	D
Spodoptera exigua	6	L	-	3	2	-	1	4	1	-	-	2	3	Ŀ	-	-	F
Pericallia ricini	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	I-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	1_	R
Family:Crambidae	-	1	ŕ –		1		1	1	1				F	ŕ	<u> </u>	1	ſ.
Leucinodes orbonalis	-	-	L	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	1	R
Hymenia recurvalis*	- 94	29	34	37	54	48	52	54	- 44	- 71	- 89	- 96	93	30	25	20	D
Cnaphalocrocis medinalis	94 4	29 9	12	8	34	48 2	52 6	10		/ 1	1	1	3	5	23 6	20	F
Cnaphaiocrocis meainails Cryptographis indica	•	2	14	2	5	4 7	0	10	1	2	5	7	2 0	1	0	2	F
	0	F	F	4	F	ľ	F	F	1	2	5	/	0	1	F	F	г
Family:Pyralidae	9	11	0	1	5	7	0	7	4	2	2	7	0	0	0	10	D
Sphenarches caffer	У	11	8	1	5	/	8	/	4	2	2	/	ð	8	У	10	D
Scirpophaga nivella Etiella zinckenella	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	R
	35	2	8	4	15	10	9	17	12	12	22	18	30	5	8	4	D

	14	T.	1.4	7	1.1	1.	la.		N	D		<b>F</b> 1		4	14	7	G
	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan		Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Statu.
Utethesia pulchella	6	14	19	17	14	13	18	22	1	2	/	6	6	10	18	15	D
Family: Sphingidae																	~
Acherontia styx	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Family : Geometridae		<u> </u>															
Tephrina sp.*	194	17	27	32	95	94	97	132	92	124	146	173	198	19	30	36	D
Unidentified species A	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	3	3	1	-	-	-	R
Unidentified species B	2	1		-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	R
Order:Hemiptera																	
Family:Pentatomidae																	
Nezara viridula*	126	10	18	25	22	23	23	31	45	82	81	93	120	10	20	20	D
Bagrada hilaris	85	-	-	3	16	18	24	20	23	56	76	76	85	-	-	-	D
Aspongopus janus	-	-	5	7	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	6	8	F
Alcaeus sp.	-	1	3	1	4	2	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	F
Andrallus spinidens	-	-	1	4	-	-	3	7	-	-	-	1	4	2	-	5	F
Piezodorus sp.	7	4	6	-	39	32	35	24	12	11	18	10	7	3	2	3	D
Oncocephalus sp.	-	-	-	-	3	4	-	6	-	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	F
Family:Pyrrhocoridae																	
Dysdercus cingulatus	40	1	16	23	6	8	4	4	-	15	22	40	39	4	17	10	D
Dysdercus koenigii	-	3	5	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	2	5	4	F
Family:Lygaeidae		L	L														
Aphanus sp.	4	F	ŀ	-	-	-	-	5	1	-	-	3	4	-	-	-	F
Family : Coreidae			T														
Clavigrella sp.	1	-	2	-	4	3	9	9	-	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	F
Family:Aphididae	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1
Lipaphis erysimi	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	24	29	51	-	-	-	D
Myzus persicae	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	R
Family:Fulgoridae		1	1	1													
Pyrilla perpusilla	-	1	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Order:Hymenoptera		1	1														
Family: Apidae					1												
Xylocopa fenestrate	17	13	10	5	7	4	8	12	8	12	19	22	21	15	15	10	D
X. violacea	-	4	11	32	55	59	75	65	1	1	2	2	4	5	9	20	D
Apis cerana	131	<u>.</u>	-	3	11	15	29	30	63	97	-		127	-	-	-	D
Apis mellifera	198	4	14	18	31	45	50	66	85	117	134	148	192	8	8	10	D
Apis dorsata	21			1	5	12	13	27	10	13	20	21	25	-	-	-	D
,	98	16	20	•	-	22	32		45	54		92 92	103	23	-	34	D
Apis florea	98 2	16	28	43	28	22	32	61	45	54	66	-		23	33	34	D
Amegila cingulata	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	8	9	5	-	-		r
Family:Formicidae	6.7	10	1.1	1.5	10	22	20	24	10	10	25	2.4	50	9	<i>(</i>	0	5
Dolichoderus affinis	57	13	11	15	19	22	20	26	13	19	25	34	58	/	6	8	D
Formica sp.	50	11	9	24	23	27	34	24	21	24	31	39	48	10	11	10	D
Family: Vespidae										-							
Polistes sp.	t	2	3	<u> -</u>	3	5	-	ŀ.		3	4	<u>t</u>	F				
Delta campaniforme	1	ŧ	<u>+</u>	-	<u> -</u>	<u> </u>	-	<u> -</u>	<u> -</u>	<u> </u>	2	4		-	<u>-</u>	-	R
Delta sp.	-	3	3	t	-	-	3	-	-	-	6	5	-	1	4	3	F
Eumenes fraternus sp.	-	ŧ	1	3	1	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	R
Family: Tenthredinidae	1	<u> </u>	$\vdash$	L	I		I	I	I	I	<u> </u>					L	
Athalia proxima	5		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	-		-	R
Family:Sphecidae				1													
Sceliphron brunneum	10	12	16	10	2	4	4	1	1	3	16	16	10	15	18	11	D
Family:Chrysomididae																	
Chrysis dugesi	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	R
Family:Ichneumonidae																	
Enicospilus sp.	37	-	-	-	3	4	-	-	16	29	35	57	33	30	-	-	D
Unidentified species A	-	5	7	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Unidentified species B	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	3	4	2	6	4	F
Unidentified species C	-	3	5	2	14	10	6	5	-	2	1	1	2	-	-	-	F
Unidentified species D	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	1	2	4	4	10	-	-	-	F
Unidentified species E	-	2	6	5	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	F
Order:Diptera	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Family:Muscidae	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1		1	1
	3	1_	1	7	3	2	1	2	11	12	16	6	3	L	-	3	F
Musca nibulo			<u> </u>	1	ř		÷	-				1.72	217	0	13	21	D
Musca nibulo Musca domestica	217	9	15	19	84	83	86	1/9	1116	110	1120	1/4	217	9			
Musca nibulo Musca domestica F <b>amily</b> :Bombyliidae	217	9	15	19	84	83	86	79	116	110	120	173	217	9	13	21	-

Contd...

	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Statu.
Family :Tabanidae																	
<i>Tabanus</i> sp.	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	-	-	R
Family:Calliphoridae																	
Chrysomya megacephala	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	6	14	15	23	-	-	-	F
Chrysomya rufifacies	10	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	6	2	7	2	10	-	-	-	F
Family: Asilidae																	
Stichopogon sp.	5	11	12	13	15	20	25	30	1	-	4	6	8	16	18	20	D
Family:Culicidae																	
Culex quinquefasciatus	208	20	23	62	102	114	115	98	136	134	164	182	203	19	24	35	D
Order:Dictyoptera																	
Family:Mantidae																	
Mantis religiosa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	R
Deiphobe incisa	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	R
Family:Blattidae																	
Periplaneta americana	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Order:Orthoptera																	
Family: Acrididae																	
Chrotogonus sp.*	175	27	25	54	87	100	89	79	101	121	140	148	179	26	27	45	D
Ochrilidia sp.*	168	4	10	39	22	21	14	20	51	91	99	123	160	1	5	20	D
Schistocenca gregaria	1	-	-	-	2	3	4	-	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	-	F
Oxya chinensis	33	10	10	9	39	50	58	69	2	4	3	6	33	5	5	10	D
Acrida sp.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	R
Family: Tettigoniidae																	
Eucenocephalus sp.	4	5	4	6	-	4	7	8	-	5	6	9	5	4	5	6	F
Unidentified species A	3	1	-	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	R
Family:Gryllidae																	
Acheta domesticus	10	17	11	27	33	41	37	42	8	10	11	8	10	24	19	29	D
Gryllus assimilis	12	-	6	8	26	31	35	28	-	2	8	14	13	2	3	6	D
Order:Odonata																	
Family:Libellulidae																	
Pantala flavescens	2	-	-	-	-	-	11	4	4	4	3	2	2	-	-	-	F
Bradinopyga geminata	-	5	8	15	3	4	8	10	4	2	6	8	-	6	8	15	F
Family ;Coenagrionidae	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	-	-		R
	8	-	1	-	8	6	5	4	1	10	11	7	10	5	4	-	F
Rhodischnura nursei	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	R
Unidentified species A	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Order:Neuroptera																	
Family:Chrysopidae		1			1			1	1	1	1			1			
Chrysopa carnea	193	10	8	20	22	16	16	15	93	103	122	160	194	13	10	18	D
Order:Embioptera																	
Family:Oligotomidae		1	1		1			1	1	1	1			1			
	8	1	L	L	1		1	1	1	2	4	7	9	1	1	1	F

D-Dominant, F-Frequent, R-Rare D>100 100>F>16 R 16

\* insects attaining pest status

Table 3: 10	Table 3: Total entomotauna (number) observed in light trap collection during the period of study           Mar         Apr         May         Jun         Jul         Aug         Sep         Oct         Nov Dec         Jan         Feb         Mar         Apr         May         Jun         Status																
	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Status
Order:Coleoptera																	
Family:Scarabaeidae																	
Anomala bengalensis	6	10	30	45	20	19	10	1	-	-	_	_	6	9	31	52	D
Onthophagus catta	25	27	28	22	26	19	11	10	-	-	-	-	24	28	27	21	D
Onthophagus bonasus	5	4	5	3	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	5	2	F
Adoretus sp.	6	4	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	3	2	F
Ochodeus sp.	10	10	15	35	40	36	30	20	-	-	-	-	8	9	15	30	D
Peltonotus nasutus	11	-	-	-	7	9	11	6	-	-	-	1	8	7	6	15	F
Apogonia ferruginea	10	15	17	18	16	15	10	2	1	1	-	-	3	17	16	20	D
Family: Coccinellidae																	
Coccinella	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	3	-	-	-	9	F
septempunctata																	
Menochilus sexmaculatus	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			24	5	-	-	F
Family: Curculionidae																	
Myllocerus sp.	15	16	30	8	-	-	-	-	7	15	14	12	13	7	31	21	D
Hypolixus truncatulus	9	10	11	13	15	17	16	15	-	-	-	-	9	9	8	25	D

Table 3. Total entomotauna (number) observed in light tran collection during the period of study

	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Statu
Family: Cicindellidae	with	Apr	muy	Jun	Jui	nug	Sep	001	1000	Dec	Jun	100	with	Δpi	muy	Jun	Siana
Cicindella sp.		4	6	7	7	_	_	_				_	_	_	11	10	F
Family: Elateridae		-	0	,	/	-	-	-	-				-	-	11	10	1
Melanotus sp.										-	-	5	5	2	1		R
Family: Cerambycidae		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	5	1	-	ĸ
				2	1					<u> </u>	<u> </u>						D
Plocaederus sp.	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Family: Meloidae	4	5	6	5	1	2	1			<u> </u>	<u> </u>		3	~	3	11	F
Cylindrothorax pictus	4	Э	6	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	5	3	11	F
										<u> </u>	<u> </u>						
Order: Lepidoptera										<u> </u>	<u> </u>						
Family: Noctuidae	_	~															n
Earias insulana	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Mythimna separata	-	5	5	-	4	3	7	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	3		F
Agrotis ipsilon	45	35	20	10	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	35	20	_	D
Chrysodeixis chalcites	-	5	7	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	F
Thysanoplusia orichalcea	5	3	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3	4	-	F
Heliothis peltigera	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	5	10	3	-	1	-	1	8	F
Spodoptera exigua	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	R
Pericallia ricini	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	R
Family: Crambidae																	
Leucinodes orbonalis	-	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Hymenia recurvalis	5	3	8	10	14	3	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	8	30	F
Cnaphalocrocis medinalis	_	5	-	5	2	1	-	2	<u> </u>	-	-	-	-	5	5	4	F
Cryptographis indica	5	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	3	F
Family: Hesperiidae	~		-						<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				<u> </u>	Ĕ-	ŕ
Hesperilla ornata	1								-								R
	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	к
Family: Pyralidae		2	<i>.</i>	/	-	4		2					2	_			<b>r</b>
Sphenarches caffer	-	3	6	6	/	4	4	2	-	-	-	-	3	6	_	-	F
Scirpophaga nivella	10	15	10	10	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	14	9	5	F
Etiella zinckenella	-	5	3	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5	6	F
Family: Arctidae																	
Utethesia pulchella	12	23	11	16	18	10	5	-	-	-	-	-	10	23	11	15	D
Creatonotos gangis	1	1	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	R
Family : Geometridae																	
Tephrina sp.	10	7	5	5	3	-	-	-	10	10	11	12	10	7	5	-	F
Unidentified species A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	R
Order: Hemiptera																	
Family: Pentatomidae																	
Nezara viridula	-	-	-	5	10	20	15	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	F
Bagrada hilaris	1	1	1	3	5	6	5	-	-	-	-	_	_	1	1	2	F
Family: Pyrrhocoridae	·		-	5	-	0	5	1	-					-	-	Ē	-
Dysdercus cingulatus	_			_	_	_	_		2		4	_	5	6		0	F
Dysdercus cingulaius Dysdercus koenigii		-		-	-	-	-	-	2	-	4	-	2	2	-	9 1	F
		F	F	Ē	Ē	F	Ē	F	<u>′</u>	5	-	Ē	4	,	ŕ—	-	r.
Family: Lygaeidae		<b> </b>	<u> </u>					<b> </b>	──	<u> </u>	Δ	6	5	10	7	6	F
Aphanus sp.	-	F	F	-	-	-	-	F	F	Ē	4	6	5	10	/	6	r
Family: Aphididae	10	┣──	$\vdash$					──	$\square$	$\vdash$	$\vdash$	_	0	$\vdash$	┣──	⊢	-
Lipaphis erysimi	10	È	È	-	-	-	-	<u> -</u>	È	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	/	9	È	È	ŧ—	F
Family: Fulgoridae		<u> </u>	Ļ					L							<u> </u>	<u> </u>	L
Pyrilla perpusilla	5	4	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	3	4	2	F
Order: Hymenoptera																	
Family: Apidae																	
Apis florea	4	1	12	3	-	-	-	-	10	10	10	8	4	1	12	-	F
Family: Formicidae																	
Dorylus sp.	40	40	43	35	37	33	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	40	41	D
Unidentefied sp. C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	R
Order: Diptera				1			1									<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Family: Muscidae		<u> </u>						<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>				<u> </u>	1	1
Musca nibulo	-	4	3	-	-	-	_	-	1	5	3	1	-	4	3	-	F
Musca domesticus	10	5	10	-	-		-	<b>.</b>	Ĺ.	-	-	Ĺ	- 9	4	10	t	F
Family: Culicidae	10	5	10		ŀ			<u> </u>	H-	F	F	-	ŕ		10	ŀ—	ŕ
	10	5	7	17	20	19	10	10	8	10	<u> </u>	5	10	5	7	35	D
Culex quinquefasciatus	10	3	/	17	20	19	10	10	0	10	-	5	10	3	/	55	D
				1				1	1	1 1	1 1				1		
			+ +					1									
Order: Dictyoptera Family: Mantidae Deiphobe incisa																	R

	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Status
Order: Orthoptera																	
Family: Gryllidae																	
Acheta domesticus	10	12	10	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	10	12	11	1	F
Order: Neuroptera																	
Family: Chrysopidae																	
Chrysopa carnea	-	5	-	5	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	F
Family: Myrmeleontidae																	
Myrmeleon sp.	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
Ululodes	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R
quadrimaculatus																	
Order: Embioptera																	
Family: Oligotomidae																	
Oligotoma sp.	-	-	3	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	4	5	F

D-Dominant, F-Frequent, R-Rare D>100 100>F>16 R 16