

An Acad Bras Cienc (2021) 93(3): e20200616 DOI 10.1590/0001-3765202120200616 Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências | *Annals of the Brazilian Academy of Sciences* Printed ISSN 0001-3765 I Online ISSN 1678-2690 www.scielo.br/aabc | www.fb.com/aabcjournal

CROP SCIENCE

Chemical composition and insecticidal activity of the essential oils of *Piper marginatum*, *Piper callosum* and *Vitex agnus-castus*

VANESSA F.S. AYRES, MIDIÃ R. OLIVEIRA, EDSON L.L. BALDIN, GEONE M. CORRÊA, ANDERSON C. GUIMARÃES & RENATA TAKEARA

Abstract: During grain storage, a considerable amount of product is lost because of insects, such as Zabrotes subfasciatus. Currently, to mitigate these risks, studies are searching for plants with potential for the control of agricultural pests, also known as botanical insecticides. In this study, the fumigant toxicity of the essential oils of Piper callosum (PC-EO), Piper marginatum (PM-EO) and Vitex agnus-castus (VA-EO) against Zabrotes subfasciatus was investigated. The essential oils of PC-EO, PM-EO and VA-EO were analysed by gas chromatography (GC-MS), and the major components were 3,4-methylenedioxypropiophenone (10.4%), bicyclogermacrene (10.1%) and germacrene D (9.9%) for PM-EO; safrol (29.3%) for PC-EO; and 1.8-cineol (23.8%) for VA-EO. In fumigation tests, VA-EO killed 100% Zabrotes subfasciatus at a concentration of 0.004 μ L/L air after 24 h of treatment, whereas PC-EO and PM-EO at 0.01 µL/L air caused 100% Z. subfasciatus mortality after 48 h. The VA-EO sample provided the lowest LD_{so} after 24 h (0.17 $\mu L/L$ air), followed by PC-EO (0.78 µL/L air) and PM-EO (1.17 µL/L air). These results demonstrate that the essential oils of these species can be an alternative to control pests in stored products. This is the first report of the fumigant potential of these species against Z. subfasciatus.

Key words: Botanical insecticides, Lamiaceae, Piperaceae, volatile compounds.

INTRODUCTION

The Amazon Region is very important worldwide because it has a rich, biodiverse ecosystem (Sawyer 2015). The essential oils of Amazonian aromatic plants are of great economic importance due to their various applications, such as flavourings, drug adjuvants, insect repellents, antimicrobials and antioxidants (Bizzo et al. 2009, Cook & Lanaras 2016). Among the aromatic plants present in the Amazon rainforest are *Piper callosum* Ruiz & Pav, *Piper marginatum* Jacq (Piperaceae) (Andrade et al. 2009) and *Vitex agnus-castus* L. (Lamiaceae) (Di Stasi & Hiruma-Lima 2002). The essential oil of *Piper callosum* showed several biological activities, such as fungicide (Silva & Bastos 2007), antibacterial (Majolo et al. 2019), schistosomicidal (Gonçalves et al. 2019), larvicide (Andrade et al. 2009), insecticide against *Solenopis saevissima* (Souto et al. 2011) and *Bemicia tabaci* (Fanela et al. 2015).The essential oil of *Piper marginatum* showed antioxidant activity (Bay-Hurtado et al. 2016), antibacterial (Majolo et al. 2019), schistosomicidal (Gonçalves et al. 2019), antileishmanial (Macedo et al. 2020), antiparasitic against *Neochinorhynchus buttnerae* (Santos et al. 2018), larvicidal against *Aedes aegypti* (Autran et al. 2009) and ovicidal potential against *Anticarsia gemmatalis* (Krinski et al. 2018). Essential oil of *Vitex agnuscastus* has antimicrobial activity (Bakr et al. 2020, Gonçalves et al. 2017, Habbab et al. 2016, Eryigit et al. 2015, Stojković et al. 2011), antimutagenic (Sarac et al. 2015) and insecticidal against *Bemisia tabaci* (Fanela et al. 2015).

The essential oils of these medicinal species have not yet been evaluated for their insecticidal potential against *Zabrotes subfasciatus* (Boheman, 1833) (Coleoptera: Bruchidae), the main pest of the bean *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. This species is one of the most produced and consumed beans in Brazil and is considered an important protein source in the diet of Brazilians (Oliveira et al. 1979). However, during grain storage, a considerable amount of product is lost because of insects, such as *Z*. *subfasciatus*.

Several populations of insects are resistant to the currently registered synthetic insecticides (Pimentel et al. 2010, Boyer et al. 2012) that consist largely of phosphines for fumigation and pyrethroids and organophosphates for preventive control. In Brazil, phosphine and pyrethroids are allowed to control Zabrotes subfasciatus in stored beans seeds and grains, according to the Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento (2020). However, they are toxic and dangerous to the environment. Phosphine is very toxic to all forms of animal life. hence exposure of human beings even to small amounts should be avoided. The effectiveness of phosphine can be reduced considerably by development of resistance in insects (Bond 1984).

Currently, studies are searching for chemical compounds in plants with potential for the control of agricultural pests, also known as botanical insecticides (Mazzonetto & Vendramim 2003, Nakano et al. 1981). The advantages of botanical insecticides compared with conventional

insecticides are related to their lower mammalian toxicity and decreased health risk to applicators and their rapid degradability, which reduces residues in the environment and in the treated products (Isman 2006). In this respect, essential oils have been shown to be potentially active as insecticides of plant origin against Z. subfasciatus. After 12-h treatment, essential oils extracted from Chenopodium ambrosioides L. and Ocimum gratissimum L. at 20.0 mL/L of air killed 100% Z. subfasciatus, whereas essential oil of Schinus terebinthifolius Raddi at 100.0 mL/L of air afforded 100% Z. subfasciatus mortality after 24 h (Bernardes et al. 2018). Essential oils of Citrus reticulata, Citrus medica limonum, Citrus sinensis, Copaifera langsdorffii, Baccharis dracunculifolia, Eucalyptus globulus, Eucalyptus citriodora, Cymbopogon citratus and Cymbopogon nardus significantly reduced viable egg-laying and the adult emergence of Z. subfasciatus, depending on the concentrations (Franca et al. 2012). Thus, the present research aims to characterize the chemical constituents of PM-EO. PC-EO and VA-EO and to evaluate their toxicity against Zabrotes subfasciatus.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant material

Piper marginatum Jacq (Piperaceae) was collected at Highway AM 010 km 18 (S 03° 01' 50.5" W 58° 32' 37.3"), *Piper callosum* Ruiz & Pav (Piperaceae) was collected in Lake Serpa (S 03° 04' 28.6" W 58° 28' 36.3"), and *Vitex agnus-castus* L. (Lamiaceae) were collected near Itacoatiara (S 03° 08' 28.8" W 58 ° 26' 54.3") in the state of Amazonas, Brazil. The species were identified by Prof. Ari de Freitas Hidalgo (Faculdade de Ciências Agrárias - UFAM). A voucher specimen of each plant was deposited in the Herbarium of the Universidade Federal do Amazonas (HUAM/ UFAM), under numbers 8266 (P. marginatum), 8267 (P. callosum) and 8268 (V. agnus-castus).

Extraction of essential oil

Fresh leaves (500 g) of *P. marginatum* and *V. agnus-castus* and aerial parts (leaves, branches and inflorescences) of *P. callosum* (500 g) were subject to hydrodistillation for a period of 6 h in a Clevenger-type apparatus. The essential oils were centrifuged for 10 minutes at 3500 rpm to separate the water. After centrifugation, the water was removed with a pipette. The samples were stored in an amber bottle and kept under refrigeration until GC-MS analysis and insecticidal assays. The yields of the extractions were calculated on the basis of the oil volume and the weight of the plant material used.

GC-MS analysis

One microlitre of the extracted oils, dissolved in hexane (5.0 μ L/mL), was injected and analysed by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC-MS) on a Shimadzu QP-2010. The analyses were performed using a DB-5MS column (30 m x 0.25 mm, with an internal film thickness of 0.25 µm). The analysis was performed in electron impact ionization mode. The injector and interface were set at a temperature of 250°C while the oven was programmed with a temperature range from 60º to 240ºC (3ºC/min). Helium (99.999% purity) was used as the carrier gas at a flow rate of 1.3 ml/min. The identification of the constituents was based on the interpretation of mass spectra by comparison with the library database Wiley 7, NIST 08 and FFNSC1.2, calculation of the linear retention index and comparison with the literature (Adams 2007). The linear retention indices were calculated using a homologous series of *n*-alkanes (Van Den Dool & Kratz 1963). The structures were computer-matched with the spectral libraries, and their fragmentation patterns were compared with literature data.

The relative concentrations of the chemical components of essential oils were obtained by normalization of the peak areas (%).

Fumigant toxicity

The evaluation of insecticide activity was performed at FCA/UNESP-Botucatu under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Edson Luiz Lopes Baldin. The essential oils (PM-EO, PC-EO and VA-EO) were applied to a filter paper attached to the bottom of the screw cap of a 50-mL glass vial (fumigation chamber) at concentrations of 0, 0.002, 0.004, 0.006, 0.008 and 0.01 μ L/L air. Four replications were performed for each treatment. Five adult one-day-old *Z. subfasciatus* couples and 10 g of beans were transferred to the vials. The percent adult mortality was recorded 24, 48, and 72 h after treatment.

Statistical analysis

The results were subjected to analysis of variance by the F Test, and the means were compared by the Tukey test ($P \le 0.05$) using the statistical software SISVAR version 5.6. The LD₅₀ was determined by Probit analysis using Stat Plus 2007 Professional Build 4.7.5.0. The Abbott formula was used to calculate the control efficiencies (Abbott 1987).

RESULTS

Chemical constituents of the essential oil of PM-EO, PC-EO and VA-EO

The essential oils of *Piper marginatum* (PM-EO), *Piper callosum* (PC-EO) and *Vitex agnus-castus* (VA-EO) extracted by hydrodistillation in Clevenger apparatus provided yields of 0.64%, 0.23% and 0.09% (mL/g), respectively.

The essential oils were obtained and analyzed by GC-MS to determine its composition. In the PM-EO sample, twentyfive compounds were identified, representing 81.8% of the total essential oil obtained, with predominance of hydrocarbon sesquiterpenes, followed by phenylpropanoids, hydrocarbon monoterpenes and oxygenated sesquiterpenes. The major compounds of PM-EO were 3,4-methylenedioxypropiophenone (10.4%), bicyclogermacrene (10.1%) and germacrene D (9.9%) (Table I).

For PC-EO, twenty-four compounds representing 86.8% of the total essential oil obtained were identified, the majority being represented by hydrocarbon monoterpenes, followed by phenylpropanoids, hydrocarbon sesquiterpenes, oxygenated monoterpenes and oxygenated sesquiterpenes. Safrole (29.3%) α -pinene (19.2%) and β -pinene (14.3%) were the major compounds (Table I).

In the VA-EO sample, twenty-six substances were identified, representing 98.1% of the

total essential oil obtained, the majority being oxygenated monoterpenes, followed by hydrocarbon sesquiterpenes, hydrocarbon monoterpenes and oxygenated sesquiterpenes. The major constituents were 1,8-cineol (23.8%), (*E*) - β -farnesene (14.6%), (*E*)-caryophyllene (12.5%) and sabinene (11.4 %) (Table I).

Fumigant toxicity of PM-EO, PC-EO and VA-EO

The VA-EO sample killed 100% of the insects at a concentration of 0.004 μ L/L air after 24 h of treatment (Table II). However, PC-EO killed 100% of insects after 48 h of treatment at a concentration of 0.01 μ L/L air. The PM-EO sample was the least toxic against *Z. subfasciatus*. At a concentration of 0.01 μ L/L air, PM-EO killed 55% of the insects after 24 h of treatment and caused 97.5% mortality after 72 h. Essential oils of the three species showed toxicity against *Z*.

| Compounds | RIª | RI ^b | PM-EO (%) | PC-EO (%) | VA-EO (%) |
|------------------|------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| α-Thujene | 924 | 924 | - | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| α-Pinene | 932 | 932 | 0.8 | 19.2 | 5.9 |
| Camphene | 948 | 946 | - | 0.6 | - |
| Sabinene | 971 | 969 | - | 2.6 | 11.4 |
| β-Pinene | 978 | 974 | 0.5 | 14.3 | 0.9 |
| Myrcene | 988 | 988 | 0.5 | - | 2.1 |
| α-Phellandrene | 1007 | 1002 | - | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| δ-3-Carene | 1009 | 1008 | 4.2 | - | - |
| α-Terpinene | 1016 | 1014 | - | 1.4 | 0.3 |
| <i>p</i> -Cymene | 1014 | 1020 | - | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Limonene | 1028 | 1024 | - | 0.8 | 2.8 |
| 1,8-Cineol | 1031 | 1026 | - | 2.2 | 23.8 |
| (Z)-β-Ocimene | 1034 | 1032 | 3.8 | - | - |
| (E)-β-Ocimene | 1044 | 1044 | 7.1 | - | 0.6 |
| γ-Terpinene | 1056 | 1059 | - | 3.5 | 0.7 |
| Terpinolene | 1084 | 1088 | - | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| Terpinen-4-ol | 1180 | 1174 | - | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| α-Terpineol | 1186 | 1189 | - | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| Safrole | 1290 | 1287 | - | 29.3 | - |

 Table I. Chemical constituents of the essential oil of P. marginatum, P. callosum and V. agnus-castus.

Table I. Continuation

| δ-Elemene | 1332 | 1335 | 1.9 | _ | _ |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1346 | 1352 | 1.9 | | 7.7 |
| α-Terpinyl acetate | | | - | - | |
| Citronellyl acetate | 1350 | 1354 | - | 1 | 0.6 |
| α-Copaene | 1372 | 1374 | - | 1.2 | - |
| β-Elemene | 1386 | 1389 | 0.6 | - | - |
| Methyl-eugenol | 1401 | 1403 | 0.6 | - | - |
| α-Gurjunene | 1409 | 1409 | - | - | 0.2 |
| (E)-Caryophyllene | 1415 | 1417 | 5.0 | 1.4 | 12.5 |
| α-Humulene | 1450 | 1452 | 0.6 | 0.4 | - |
| (E)-β-Farnesene | 1454 | 1456 | - | 0.4 | 14.6 |
| Alloaromadendrene | 1458 | 1461 | - | - | 0.6 |
| Germacrene D | 1476 | 1480 | 9.9 | 2.6 | - |
| β-Selinene | 1484 | 1489 | 2.2 | - | - |
| (E)-Methyl-isoeugenol | 1496 | 1491 | 0.5 | - | - |
| α-Muurolene | 1495 | 1500 | 1.2 | 0.2 | - |
| Bicyclogermacrene | 1490 | 1500 | 10.1 | 0.1 | 6.6 |
| (<i>E,E</i>)-α-Farnesene | 1505 | 1505 | - | 0.5 | - |
| Germacrene A | 1508 | 1508 | 0.6 | - | - |
| Myristicin | 1516 | 1517 | 4.9 | - | - |
| δ-Cadinene | 1518 | 1523 | - | 0.9 | - |
| 3,4-Methylenedioxypropiophenone | 1533 | 1545 | 10.4 | - | - |
| Elemicin | 1548 | 1555 | 8.4 | 3.0 | - |
| Spathulenol | 1575 | 1577 | 1.5 | - | 0.4 |
| Caryophyllene oxide | 1582 | 1581 | - | - | 0.4 |
| Globulol | 1590 | 1590 | 0.5 | - | - |
| Viridiflorol | 1592 | 1590 | - | - | 0.2 |
| 10- <i>epi</i> -Eudesmol | 1622 | 1622 | 0.6 | - | - |
| Torreyol | 1639 | 1644 | 0.5 | - | - |
| β-Eudesmol | 1650 | 1650 | 4.1 | 2.5 | - |
| α-Cadinol | 1652 | 1653 | - | - | 0.2 |
| Compound c | lass | | | | |
| Monoterpene hydrocarbons | | | 16.9 | 42.6 | 26.0 |
| Oxygenated monoterpenes | | | 0.0 | 2.9 | 36.4 |
| Total monoterpenes | | | 16.9 | 45.5 | 62.4 |
| Sesquiterpene hydrocarbons | | | 32.5 | 7.0 | 34.5 |
| Oxygenated sesquiterpenes | | | 7.4 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| Total sesquiterpenes | | | 39.9 | 9.0 | 35.7 |
| Phenylpropanoids | | | 25.0 | 32.3 | 0.0 |
| Total identified | | | 81.8 | 86.8 | 98.1 |

RI^a= Retention Indices relative to n-alkanes (C8-C25) on the DB-5MS column. RI^b= Retention Indices of the literature (Adams 2007).

subfasciatus. After 24 h of treatment, the VA-EO sample had the lowest LD_{50} (0.17 μ L/L air), followed by PC-EO with an LD_{50} of 0.78 and PM-EO with an LD_{50} of 1.17 μ L/L air (Table III).

DISCUSSION

The chemical composition of PM-EO was different from other specimens reported in the literature. For the specimen occurring in the Brazilian Amazon, (*E*)- β -ocimene (13.5 %), myristicin (9.3 %), β -caryophyllene (6.0 %), (*Z*)- β -ocimene (5,3 %) and 3,4-methylenedioxyphenophenone (5.0 %) were reported as major constituents (Andrade et al. 2008). The essential oil collected in the State of Pará presented myristicin (15.75%) and α -cadinene (7.98%) as major constituents (Krinski et al. 2018). However, the main compounds in the essential oil of a specimen collected in State of Paraíba, Brazil were isoelemicin (21.7%) and apiol (20.1%) (Costa et al. 2010). The essential oil of leaves of *Piper marginatum*, harvested in the Atlantic forest in the State of Pernambuco, Brazil, presented (Z)-asarone (30.4%) and patchouli alcohol (16.0%) as major constituents (Autran et al. 2009). In the present study, we have detected 3,4-methylenedioxypropiophenone (10.4%), bicyclogermacrene (10.1%) and germacrene D (9.9%) as the major constituents of PM-EO.

For PC-EO, the major constituents were safrole (29.3%), α -pinene (19.2%) and β -pinene

| Table II. PM-EO, PC-EO and VA-EO fumigant activity (percentage adult mortality) against Z. subfasciatus. |
|--|
|--|

| EO tested doses (μL/L air) 24 h | | Exposure time | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|---------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| | | 48 h | 72 h | | |
| PM-EO | 0.002 | 25.0±0.5 b | 10.0±0.2 b | 22.5±1.5 b | |
| | 0.004 | 0.0±0.0 b | 0.0±1.0 b | 17.5±2.1 b | |
| | 0.006 | 0.0±0.0 b | 50.0±3.2 a | 77.5±2.6 a | |
| | 0.008 | 50.0±1.0 b | 40.0±4.7 a | 60.0±0.8 a | |
| | 0.01 | 55.0±5.2 a | 60.0±6.7 a | 97.5±0.5 a | |
| PC-EO | 0.002 | 0.0±0.0 d | 7.5±0.9 cd | 17.5±0.9 c | |
| | 0.004 | 10.0±0.8 cd | 32.5±2.2 bc | 50.0±1.6 b | |
| | 0.006 | 30.0±1.15 bc | 67.5±2.1 ab | 80.0±1.4 a | |
| | 0.008 | 42.5±2.63 bc | 77.5±2.2 ab | 100.0±0.0 a | |
| | 0.01 | 85.0±1.00 a | 100.0±0.0 a | 100.0±0.0 a | |
| VA-EO | 0.002 | 65.0±3.7 a | 87.5±1.5 a | 92.5±0.9 a | |
| | 0.004 | 100.0±0.0 a | 100.0±0.0 a | 100.0±0.0 a | |
| | 0.006 | 95.0±0.6 a | 95.0±0.6 a | 100.0±0.0 a | |
| | 0.008 | 97.5±0.5 a | 100.0±0.0 a | 100.0±0.0 a | |
| | 0.01 | 100.0±0.0 a | 100.0±0.0 a | 100.0±0.0 a | |

For each exposure period, the percentages with the same letters do not differ by the Tukey test (P > 0.05).

(14.3%) (Table I). The chemical composition of the PC-EO sample was similar to those of other specimens from other locations (Maia et al. 1987. Almeida et al. 2018). but the concentrations of the compounds were different. For example, the essential oil obtained from leaves collected on the AM-010 road Manaus-Itacoatiara presented safrole (64.0%), β -pinene (12.9%) and α -pinene (6.9%) as major compounds (Maia et al. 1987). Safrole (59.1%), β -pinene (8.3%) and α -pinene (6.5%) were also the major compounds found in the essential oil of a specimen collected in Manaus (Almeida et al. 2018). However, the major compounds of PC-EO were different from those of the specimen collected in Peru, with asaricin (35.9%), safrole (20.2%), methyleugenol (9.7%) and (E)-asarone (7.8%) reported as main constituents (Van Genderen et al. 1999). The diversity in the chemical composition of the essential oils collected in different regions can be attributed to several biotic and abiotic factors (Gobbo-Neto & Lopes 2007).

The major constituents of VA-EO were 1,8-cineol (23.8%), (*E*)- β -farnesene (14.6%), (*E*)-caryophyllene (12.5%) and sabinene (11.4%)

(Table I). The chemical composition of VA-EO was similar to those of other specimens reported in the literature (Neves & Camara 2016, Zoghbi et al. 1999). 1,8-cineol (17.6%) and (*E*)- β -farnesene (13.6%) were the major constituents of essential oil obtained in the State of Pernambuco, Brazil (Neves & Camara 2016). In the essential oil of a specimen collected in the Amazon, the major compounds were 1,8-cineol (33.5%) and sabinene (18.5%) (Zoghbi et al. 1999).

The results obtained in the toxicity test against *Z. subfasciatus* were similar to those obtained with the essential oil of *Chenopodium ambrosioides* L., which killed 100% *Z. subfasciatus* after 12 h of treatment at a concentration of 20.0 μ L/L air (LD₅₀ of 0.8 μ L/L air after 24 h exposure) (Bernardes et al. 2018). Several studies have demonstrated the fumigant action of essential oils against *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) (Mahmoudvand et al. 2011), *Sitophilus granarius* (L.) (Hamza et al. 2016), *Callosobruchus maculatus* F., *Sitophilus zemais* Motchulsky and *Rhyzopertha dominica* F. (Gragasin et al. 2006), which are all insects that attack stored grain products. The fumigant

| | 1 | İ. | 1 | 1 |
|-------|---------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| EO | Exposure time | LD ₅₀ /CI | Slope±SE | X ² |
| PM-EO | 24 h | 1.17 (0.9-1.3) | 4.1 ± 0.7 | 38.0 |
| | 48 h | 0.82 (0.7-0.8) | 3.4 ± 0.5 | 14.6 |
| | 72 h | 0.56 (0.4-0.6) | 3.5 ± 0.5 | 2.4 |
| PC-EO | 24 h | 0.78 (0.7-0.8) | 6.4 ± 1.5 | 14.8 |
| | 48 h | 0.53 (0.4-0.5) | 2.8 ± 0.5 | 1.7 |
| | 72 h | 0.41 (0.3-04) | 2.3 ± 0.3 | 0.6 |
| VA-EO | 24 h | 0.17 (0.04-0.2) | 2.8 ± 0.6 | 4.1 |
| | 48 h | * | * | * |
| | 72 h | 0.04 (-0.09-0.1) | 2.1 ± 0.8 | 5.9 |

Table III. Essential oil LD₅₀ as determined by the fumigant activity assay. against Z. subfasciatus.

LD, Lethal dose (µL/L air); CI, Confidence interval at 95% probability; X², Chi square test. * Data are absent because the insects died within the first hour of the experiment.

action of VA-EO, PC-EO and PM-EO is of great importance as essential oils are relatively safer and greener. In addition, botanical insecticides are more relatively economically viable to conserve stored grains and manage pests in accordance with international biosafety regulations (Bernardes et al. 2018).

The fumigant action of essential oils may be closely linked to their chemical composition, since monoterpenoids are reported as inhibitors of the enzyme acetylcholinesterase (AChE), (Houghton et al. 2006, Rajendran & Sriranjini 2008) responsible for the breakdown of acetylcholine, a neurotransmitter of nerve impulses. (Bruneau & Akaaboune 2006). Studies following the reports of AChE inhibition by the oils of two species of sage, Salvia officinalis and S. lavandulaefolia (Lamiaceae) led to the discovery that 1,8-cineol and α -pinene were the most active compounds with IC_{50} 670 μ M and 630 µM respectively against bovine erythrocyte AChE (Houghton et al. 2006). Besides that, trans-cinnamaldehyde, eugenol, (-)-menthone and (-)-terpinen-4-ol monoterpenes were evaluated and showed a reduction in the progeny of Sitophilus oryzae after 45 and 90 days of treatment (Saad & Abdelgaleil 2018). Some of the purified terpenoid constituents of essential oils are moderately toxic to mammals, but, with few exceptions, the oils themselves or products based on oils are mostly nontoxic to mammals, birds, and fish. In addition, due to their volatility, essential oils have limited persistence in field conditions (Isman 2006). In turn, PM-EO and PC-EO contain the compounds 3,4-methylenedioxypropiophenone and safrole, respectively. These substances have the methylenedioxyphenyl group, characteristic of many other compounds derived from secondary metabolism of plants, as dillapiole occurring in P. aduncum, as well as piperine and piperolein existing in P. nigrum, traditionally used as

botanical insecticides (Mukerjee et al. 1979, Scott et al. 2008). In addition, the phenylpropanoid safrole, major constituent of PC-EO, was responsible for the fumigant action on Sitophilus zeamais Motschulsky and Tribolium castaneum, stored grain pests (Huang et al. 1999). In addition, the complex mixture of chemical substances present in the studied essential oils can be directly related to the insecticidal activity, as they can act synergistically. Therefore, interest in plant products such as essential oils and their compounds has increased in recent vears due to their fumigant action, as it is believed that natural compounds from plant sources may have advantages over conventional fumigants in terms of low toxicity in mammals. rapid degradation and regional availability. (Rajendran & Sriranjini 2008).

CONCLUSIONS

Essential oils of *Piper marginatum*, *Piper callosum* and *Vitex agnus-castus* showed fumigant toxicity on *Z. subfasciatus*, with VA-EO being the most toxic, followed by PC-EO and PM-EO. There was no oviposition in the treatments and exposure times evaluated. The results suggest that essential oils can be used as an environmentally friendly alternative to control pests in stored products. However, further studies are needed to determine which compounds may be responsible for such activities.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Izabel Cristina Casanova Turatti (FCFRP-USP) for their GC-MS analysis, Prof. Ari de Freitas Hidalgo for identification of plants, Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Amazonas (FAPEAM). Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) for financial support, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Universidade de São Paulo, Universidade Estadual Paulista.

REFERENCES

ABBOTT WS. 1987. A method of computing the effectiveness of an insecticide. J Am Mosq Control Assoc 3: 302-303.

ADAMS RP. 2007. Identification of essential oil components by Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectroscopy, 4th ed., Allured Publ Corp: Carol Stream, IL., 804 p.

ALMEIDA CA, AZEVEDO MMB, CHAVES FCM, OLIVEIRA MR, RODRIGUES IA, BIZZO HR, GAMA PE, ALVIANO DS & ALVIANO CS. 2018. *Piper* essential oils inhibit *Rhizopus oryzae* growth, biofilm formation, and rhizopuspepsin activity. Can J Infect Dis Med 2018: 1-7.

ANDRADE EHA, CARREIRA LMM, SILVA MHL, SILVA JD, BASTOS CN, SOUSA PJC, GUIMARÃES EF & MAIA JGS. 2008. Variability in essential-oil composition of *Piper marginatum* sensu lato. Chem Biodivers 5: 197-208.

ANDRADE EHA, GUIMARÃES EF & MAIA JGS. 2009. Variabilidade química em óleos essenciais de espécies de *Piper* da Amazônia. Belém (PA): FEC/UFPA, 448 p.

AUTRAN ES, NEVES IA, SILVA CSB, SANTOS GKN, CÂMARA CAG & NAVARRO DMAF. 2009. Chemical composition, oviposition deterrent and larvicidal activities against Aedes aegypti of essential oils from *Piper marginatum* Jacq. (Piperaceae). Bioresource Technol 100: 2284-2288.

BAKR RO, ZAGHLOUL SS, HASSAN RA, SONOUSI A, WASFI R & FAYED MAA. 2020. Antimicrobial activity of *Vitex agnus-castus* essential oil and molecular docking study of its major constituents. J Essent Oil Bear Pl 23: 184-193.

BAY-HURTADO F, LIMA RA, TEIXEIRA LF, SILVA ICFS, BAY M, AZEVEDO MS & FACUNDO VA. 2016. Atividade antioxidante e caracterização do óleo essencial das raízes de *Piper marginatum* Jacq. Ciênc Nat 38: 1504-1511.

BERNARDES WA, SILVA EO, CROTTI AEM & BALDIN ELL. 2018. Bioactivity of selected plant-derived essential oils against *Zabrotes subfasciatus* (Coleoptera: Bruchidae). J Stored Prod Res 77: 16-19.

BIZZO HR, HOVELL AMC & REZENDE CM. 2009. Óleos essenciais no Brasil: aspectos gerais, desenvolvimento e perspectivas. Quim Nova 32: 588-594.

BOND EJ. 1984. Manual of fumigation for insect control, 3rd ed., Ann Arbor: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 432 p.

BOYER S, ZHANG H & LEMPÉRIÈRE G. 2012. A review of control methods and resistance mechanisms in stored-product insects. Bull Entomol Res 102: 213-229.

BRUNEAU EG & AKAABOUNE M. 2006. Running to stand still: ionotropic receptor dynamics at central and peripheral synapses. Mol Neurobiol 34 137-151.

COOK CM & LANARAS T. 2016. Essential oils: isolation, production and uses. In: The Encyclopedia of Food and Health. Amsterdam: Elsevier, p. 552-557.

COSTA JGM, SANTOS PF, BRITO SA, RODRIGUES FFG, COUTINHO HDM, BOTELHO MA & LIMA SG. 2010. Composição química e toxicidade de óleos essenciais de espécies de *Piper* frente a larvas de *Aedes aegypti* L. (Diptera: Culicidae). Lat Am J Pharm 29: 463-467.

DI STASI LC & HIRUMA-LIMA CA. 2002. Plantas medicinais na Amazônia e na Mata Atlântica, 2ª ed., São Paulo: UNESP, 608 p.

ERYIGIT T, ÇIG A, OKUT N, YILDRIM B & EKICI K. 2015. Evaluation of chemical composition and antimicrobial activity of *Vitex agnus castus* L. fruits' essential oils from West Anatolia, Turkey. J Essent Oil Bear Pl 18: 208-214.

FANELA TLM, BALDIN ELL, PANNUTI LER, CRUZ PL, CROTTI AEM, TAKEARA R & KATO MJ. 2015. Lethal and inhibitory activities of plant-derived essential oils against *Bemisia tabaci* Gennadius (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) biotype B in tomato. Neotrop Entomol 45: 201-210.

FRANÇA SM, OLIVEIRA JV, ESTEVES FILHO AB & OLIVEIRA CM. 2012. Toxicity and repellency of essential oils to *Zabrotes subfasciatus* (Boheman) (Coleoptera, Chrysomelidae, Bruchinae) in *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. Acta Amazon 42: 381-386.

GOBBO-NETO L & LOPES NP. 2007. Plantas medicinais: fatores de influência no conteúdo de metabólitos secundários. Quim Nova 30: 374-381.

GONÇALVES R, AYRES VFS, CARVALHO CE, SOUZA MGM, GUIMARÃES AC, CORRÊA GM, MARTINS CHG, TAKEARA R, SILVA EO & CROTTI AEM. 2017. Chemical composition and antibacterial activity of the essential oil of *Vitex agnus-castus* L. (Lamiaceae). An Acad Bras Cienc 89: 2825-2832.

GONÇALVES R, AYRES VFS, MAGALHÃES LG, CROTTI AEM, CORRÊA GM, GUIMARÃES AC & TAKEARA R. 2019. Chemical composition and schistosomicidal activity of essential oils of two *Piper* species from the Amazon region. J Essent Oil Bear Pl 22: 811-820.

GRAGASIN MCB, WY AM, RODEROS BP, ACDA M & SOLSOLOY A. 2006. Insecticidal activities of essential oil from *Piper betle* Linn. against storage insect pests. Philipp Agric Sci 89: 212-216.

HABBAB A, SEKKOUM K, BELBOUKHARI N, CHERITI A & ABOUL-ENEIN HY. 2016. Essential oil chemical composition of *Vitex agnus-castus* L. from Southern-West Algeria and its antimicrobial activity. Curr Bioact Compd 12: 51-60.

HAMZA AF, EL-ORABI MN, GHARIEB OH, EL-SAEADY AHA & HUSSEIN ARE. 2016. Response of *Sitophilus granarius* L. to fumigant toxicity of some plant volatile oils. J Radiat Res Appl Sc 9:8-14.

HOUGHTON PJ, REN Y & HOWES MJ. 2006. Acetylcholinesterase inhibitors from plants and fungi. Nat Prod Rep 23: 181-199.

HUANG Y, HO SH & KINI RM. 1999. Bioactivities of safrole and isosafrole on *Sitophilus zeamais* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) and *Tribolium castaneum* (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae). J Econ Entomol 92: 676-683.

ISMAN MB. 2006. Botanical insecticides, deterrents, and repellents in modern agriculture and an increasingly regulated world. Annu Rev Entomol 51: 45-66.

KRINSKI D, FOERSTER LA & DESCHAMPS C. 2018. Ovicidal effect of the essential oils from 18 Brazilian *Piper* species controlling *Anticarsia gemmatalis* (Lepidoptera, Erebidae) at the initial stage of development. Acta Sci-Agron 40: 1-10.

MACEDO CG ET AL. 2020. Leishmanicidal activity of Piper marginatum Jacq. from Santarém-PA against *Leishmania amazonensis*. Exp Parasitol 210: 1-7.

MAHMOUDVAND M, ABBASIPOUR H, BASIJ M, HOSSEINPOUR MH, RASTEGAR F & NASIRI MB. 2011. Fumigant toxicity of some essential oils on adults of some stored-product pests. Chil J Agr Res 71: 83-89.

MAIA JGS, SILVA ML, LUZ AIR, ZOGHBI MGB & RAMOS LS. 1987. Espécies de *Piper* da Amazônia ricas em safrol. Quim Nova 10: 200-204.

MAJOLO C, MONTEIRO PC, NASCIMENTO AVP DO, CHAVES FCM, GAMA PE, BIZZO HR & CHAGAS EC. 2019. Essential oils from five Brazilian *Piper* species as antimicrobials against strains of *Aeromonas hydrophila*. J Essent Oil Bear Pl 22: 746-761.

MAZZONETTO F & VENDRAMIM JD. 2003. Efeito de pós de origem vegetal sobre *Acanthoscelides obtectus* (Say) (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) em feijão armazenado. Neotrop Entomol 32: 145-149.

MINISTÉRIO DA AGRICULTURA, PECUÁRIA E ABASTECIMENTO. 2020. http://agrofit.agricultura.gov.br/agrofit_cons/ principal_agrofit_cons (Acessado em 18 de julho de 2020). MUKERJEE SK, SAXENA VS &TOMAR SS. 1979. New methylenedioxyphenyl synergist for pyretrins. J Agric Food Chem 27: 1209-1211.

NAKANO O, SILVEIRA NETO S & ZUCCHI RA. 1981. Entomologia econômica. São Paulo: Livroceres, 314 p.

NEVES RCS & CAMARA CAG. 2016. Chemical composition and acaricidal activity of the essential oils from *Vitex agnuscastus* L. (Verbenaceae) and selected monoterpenes. An Acad Bras Cienc 88: 1221-1233.

OLIVEIRA AM, PACOVA BE, SUDO S, ROCHA ACM & BARCELLOS DF. 1979. Incidência de *Zabrotes subfasciatus* Bohemann, 1853 e *Acanthoscelides obtectus* Say, 1831 em diversas cultivares de feijão armazenado (Col., Bruchidae). An Soc Entomol Bras 8: 47-55.

PIMENTEL MAG, FARONI LRDA, SILVA FH, BATISTA MD & GUEDES RNC. 2010. Spread of phosphine resistance among brazilian populations of three species of stored product insects. Neotrop Entomol 39: 101-107.

RAJENDRAN S & SRIRANJINI V. 2008. Plant products as fumigants for stored-product insect control. J Stored Prod Res 44: 126-135.

SAAD MMG & ABDELGALEIL SAM. 2018. Effectiveness of monoterpenes and phenylpropenes on *Sitophilus oryzae* L. (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) in stored wheat. J Asia-Pac Entomol 21: 1153-1158.

SANTOS WB, MAJOLO C, SANTOS DS, ROSA MC, MONTEIRO PC, ROCHA MJS, OLIVEIRA MIB, CHAVES FCM & CHAGAS EC. 2018. Eficácia *in vitro* de óleos essenciais de espécies de Piperaceae no controle do acantocéfalo *Neochinorhynchus buttnerae*. Rev Bras Hig Sanid Anim 12: 460-469.

SARAC N, UGUR A & SEN B. 2015. *In vitro* antimutagenic activity of *Vitex agnus-castus* L. essential oils and ethanolic extracts. Ind Crop Prod 63: 100-103.

SAWYER D. 2015. População e desenvolvimento sustentável na Amazônia. Brasília: UNFPA/Fundo de População das Nações Unidas, 77 p.

SCOTT IM, JENSEN HR, PHYLOGENE BJR & ARNASON JT. 2008. A review of *Piper* spp (Piperaceae) phytochemistry, insecticidal activity and mode of action. Phytochem Rev 7: 65-75.

SILVA DMMH & BASTOS CN. 2007. Atividade antifúngica de óleos essenciais de espécies de Piper sobre Crinipellis perniciosa, Phytophthora palmivora e Phytophthora capsici. Fitopatol Bras 32: 143-145.

SOUTO RNP, HARADA AY & MAIA JGS. 2011. Estudos preliminares da atividade inseticida de óleos essenciais de espécies

VANESSA F.S. AYRES et al.

de *Piper linneus* (Piperaceae) em operárias de *Solenopis saevissima f* Smith (Hymenoptera: Formicidae), em laboratório. Biota Amazôn 1: 42-48.

STOJKOVIĆ D, SOKOVIĆ M, GLAMOČLIJA J, DŽAMIĆ A, ĆIRIĆ A, RISTIĆ M & GRUBIŠIĆ D. 2011. Chemical composition and antimicrobial activity of *Vitex agnus-castus* L. fruits and leaves essential oils. Food Chem 128: 1017-1022.

VAN DEN DOOL H & KRATZ PD. 1963. A generalization of the retention index system including linear temperature programmed gas-liquid partition chromatography. J Chromatogr A 11: 463-471.

VAN GENDEREN MHP, LECLERCQ PA, DELGADO HS, KANJILAL PB & SINGH RS. 1999. Compositional analysis of the leaf oils of *Piper callosum* Ruiz & Pav from Peru and *Michelia montana* Blume from India. Spectroscopy 14: 51-59.

ZOGHBI MGB, ANDRADE EHA & MAIA JGS. 1999. The essential oil of *Vitex agnus-castus* L. growing in the Amazon region. Flavour Frag J 14: 211-213.

How to cite

AYRES VFS, OLIVEIRA MR, BALDIN ELL, CORRÊA GM, GUIMARÃES AC & TAKEARA R. 2021. Chemical composition and insecticidal activity of the essential oils of *Piper marginatum*, *Piper callosum* and *Vitex agnus-castus*. An Acad Bras Cienc 93: e20200616. DOI 10.1590/0001-3765202120200616.

Manuscript received on April 24, 2020; accepted for publication on September 11, 2020

VANESSA F.S. AYRES¹ https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0446-2897

MIDIÃ R. OLIVEIRA¹ https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-1550-7766

EDSON L.L. BALDIN²

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5912-1339

GEONE M. CORRÊA¹

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9458-8305

ANDERSON C. GUIMARÃES³

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4814-0219

RENATA TAKEARA¹

https://orcid.org/ 0000-0003-1052-1822

¹Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Instituto de Ciências Exatas e Tecnologia, Rua Nossa Senhora do Rosário, 3863, 69103-128 Itacoatiara, AM, Brazil

²Universidade Estadual Paulista, Faculdade de Ciências Agronômicas, Departamento de Proteção Vegetal, Avenida Universitária, 3780, 18610-034 Botucatu, SP, Brazil

³Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Instituto de Ciências Exatas, Avenida General Rodrigo Octávio, 6200, Setor Norte, 69077-000 Manaus, AM, Brazil

Correspondence to: **Renata Takeara** *E-mail: rtakeara@ufam.edu.br*

Author contributions

Vanessa F. dos S. Ayres, Geone M. Correa, Anderson C. Guimarães and Renata Takeara contributed collecting plant sample and essential oil extraction. Vanessa F. dos S. Ayres and Midiã R. de Oliveira contributed in the chemical analysis of the essential oils. Vanessa F. dos S. Ayres, Midiã R. de Oliveira and Renata Takeara wrote the manuscript. Renata Takeara designed the study and supervised the laboratory work. Edson L. L. Baldin contributed in the insecticidal assay and to analysis of the data.

