

Original Research Article

Studies on the relative abundance and diversity of insect species on nine accessions of pepper (*Capsicum* spp.) grown under field conditions

ABSTRACT.

Aim: The aim was to identify the different types and relative abundance of insect species on the nine accessions of pepper, as a guide to instituting control measures against unacceptable crop damage.

Study design: The experimental treatments were deployed in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD), replicated three times.

Place and Duration of Study: Nuclear Agriculture Research Center (NARC) farms and the laboratories of Radiation Entomology and Pest Management Center (REPMC) of Biotechnology and Nuclear Agriculture Research Institute (BNARI). Work done between June-October, 2011.

Methodology: Seeds of the nine pepper accessions (Anloga, Antillas, Archard, Big Sun, Bombardier Forever F1, Legon 18, Poivron California Wonder (PCW) and Sunny F1) were sown in a nursery and transplanted 35 days after germination to an experimental plot measuring 40 m x 11.4 m in the centre of one acre area such that the experimental plot was surrounded by a homogeneously managed terrain. The experimental treatments were deployed in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD), replicated three times. Each replicate was allotted a plot size of 12 m x 11.4 m. Each replicate was subdivided into nine sub-plots, with each sub-plot planted to one accession consisting of 30 plants at a spacing of 0.8 m x 0.6 m. Plots were separated by a distance of 2 m. Field observation was used to study the relative abundance, diversity and behaviour of the insect species on the accessions.

Results: Thirteen different insect species were identified from the vegetative through to the maturity stage with relative abundance ranging from 0.04– 54.29 %. The highest number of insects were found on the accessions Forever F1 (26.2 %) and Anloga (25.9 %). Legon 18 and Sunny F1 registered the highest diversity of insect species, while PCW, Big Sun and Forever F1 recorded the least diversity.

Conclusion: The high abundance of insect pests in the study area coupled with the pest status of the majority (53.28 %) necessitates control measures to prevent economic loss during commercial cultivation in the area.

Keywords: *Capsicum* species, abundance, diversity, accessions, insect, pepper, pest, predator

1. INTRODUCTION

Pepper, also generally known as chilli (and variously as *piment*, *paprika*, *paprika*, *piman* and *pimiento* in French, German, Polish, Japanese and Spanish respectively) is a generic name for a number of solanaceous plants of S. American origin (New World: Mexico, Bolivia) Timbrook (2014) [1]; Kraft et. al., (2013) [2]; Ortiz et. al., (2010) [3]; Eshbaugh (1993) [4] consisting of some 27 species [5]. It belongs to the genus *Capsicum*. Five species (*C. annum*, *C. baccatum*, *C. chinense*, *C. frutescens* and *C. pubescens*) are domesticated and include an array of varieties distinguishable by variations in colour, shape, size and pungency of fruit.

Pepper is cultivated world-wide and used primarily as spice or vegetable in various cuisines. It is also used extensively in both traditional and modern medicinal practice as topical medication for stimulating the circulatory system and as an analgesic in relieving pains [6]. Nutritionally, it is a good source of vitamins B and C as well as Calcium, Magnesium, Phosphorus and Potassium [7].

China, Mexico, Turkey, Indonesia, the USA and Spain are among the world's largest producers. In Africa, Egypt, Nigeria, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and Ghana, are highly ranked. Annual world production in 2012 stood at 302,388 metric tonnes [8].

In recent years pepper has attained the status of a high value crop in Ghana due to high demand from urban consumers. In addition there is a growing export trade in the commodity to European markets. Currently, Ghana is the fifth largest exporter of chili peppers to the European Union, where the demand for chili peppers has been growing annually by 17 percent on average since 2000 [9].

Key among the problems associated with the cultivation of pepper is the occurrence of pests which usually result in the outbreak of many diseases. Indeed, throughout the world, pepper production is affected by over 35 species of insects and mites [10]. In general, insect pests which attack the leaves, stem and fruits of pepper include *Tetranychus urticae* Koch (Acari: Tetranychidae), *Aphis gossypii* (Glover) (Hemiptera, Aphididae), *Bemisia tabaci* (Gennadius) (Hemiptera, Aleyroidae), *Epitrix cucumeris* (Harris) (Coleoptera, Chrysomelidae), *Thrips tabaci* Lindeman (Thysanoptera, Thripidae), *Pseudaletia unipuncta* (Haworth) (Lepidoptera, Noctuidae) and *Ostrinia nubilalis* (Hubner) (Lepidoptera, Crambidae) [11, 12, 13, 14]. Damage from these attacks result in mild to severe stunting, defoliation, flower drop, fruit injury, fruit drop and fruit rot which contribute to reduced fruit yield and quality.

In Ghana, Obeng-Ofori et al., (2007) [15] observed five main insects as major pests of pepper. These include *Lena* sp., *Acanthocoris* sp., *Cletomorpha lancigera* Fabricius (Heteroptera, Coreidae), *Helopeltis bergrothi* Reuter (Heteroptera, Miridae) and *Odontotermes* sp. Norman (1992) [16] also mentioned crickets, cutworms, *Wyzus* sp., *Empoasca* sp. as pests of pepper. Mathew and Karikari (1995) [17] made mention of white fly as a pest of pepper.

Insect damage drastically reduces market value of produce meant for export. In order for Ghana to fully exploit its competitive advantage over other African pepper producers there is a need to maintain high quality of produce. Even though farmers complain incessantly, there is no information on abundance and diversity of insects affecting pepper production in Ghana. This knowledge gap makes it impossible to plan and implement strategies for their effective control. Data on relative abundance and diversity of insects in an area will also serve as safeguard against overtreatment with pesticides.

The objectives of the study were twofold:

- i. To determine relative abundance of these insects on the nine accessions of pepper, as a guide to instituting control measures against unacceptable crop damage.
- ii. To identify different species of insects on nine accessions of pepper grown under field conditions in the Coastal Savannah agro-ecological zone of Ghana.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Study site and Experimental Layout

The study area has been described previously [18]. The field study took place from June, 2011 to October, 2011. The study site is located about 20 km north of Accra (05° 40' 23.4" N and 0° 12' 55.4" W), with an elevation of 76 m above sea level. The vegetation is Coastal Savannah, and the area is characterized by a bimodal rainfall pattern with the major season falling between the months of March and June, and a minor rainy season around October. The mean annual rainfall is 810 mm distributed over less than 80 days, and temperatures are moderate with maximum rarely exceeding 32 °C while the minimum does not fall below 17 °C.

The study was carried out under open field conditions. Seven exotic and two indigenous genotypes were used for the study. The choice of materials was based on their widespread cultivation and economic importance. This included one "Jalapeno-like" type (Archard), four cayenne types (Forever F₁, Sunny F₁, Anloga and Legon 18). Forever F₁ and Sunny F₁ are hybrids) and three "scotch bonnet-like" types (Antillas, Big Sun and Bombardier). Exotic varieties (Archard, Forever F₁, Sunny F₁, Antillas, Big Sun, Poivron California Wonder (PCW) and Bombardier) were purchased from a commercial seed company (Agrisseed®, distributors for Technisem®). Legon 18 (a popular variety released by the University of Ghana) was purchased from Agrimat® (an agricultural input shop) while the other local genotype, Anloga, was sourced from a farmer's field in Keta in the Volta Region of Ghana. The two local accessions served as local checks. Border effects were considered in setting up the research field to cancel out the activities of suspected insects hibernating in neighbouring alternative host plants. The seeds were sown in a nursery and transplanted 35 days after germination to an experimental plot measuring 40 m x 11.4 m in the centre of one acre area such that the experimental plot was surrounded by a homogeneously managed terrain. The experimental treatments were deployed in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD), replicated three times. Each replicate was allotted a plot size of 12 m x 11.4 m. Each replicate was subdivided into nine sub-plots, with each sub-plot planted to one accession consisting of 30 plants at a spacing of 0.8 m x 0.6 m. Plots were separated by a distance of 2 m. The nursery was watered thoroughly during pre-and post-seed germination to facilitate healthy seedling establishment. Polyfeed (Green house grade, 19 : 19 : 19 NPK) was applied at a rate of 40 g per 13 litres of water to the roots to enhance active root formation and shoot growth. Neither pesticide nor fertilizer was applied after transplanting. Observations were recorded once every week, starting from first day of transplanting till last day of harvest, on various insects that were found at different crop growth stages on the nine accessions of pepper.

2.2 Sampling of capsicum entomofauna on pepper

Sampling was done on the occurrence of various pests by observing 10 randomly selected plants at vegetative (15 DAT, 30 DAT), reproductive (60 DAT, 90 DAT and 120 DAT) and maturity (150 DAT) stages of crop growth. Records were made on the different types and numbers of insect species found at various growth stages. The leaves on each selected plant were observed (using naked eye) from the base of the stem to the crown for an inventory of all insects present and their behaviour. The observation was conducted on weekly basis, sampling done from 6.00 am to 9.00am to coincide with

the time of day when insects remain less active. Adult insects encountered were carefully collected into labelled glass vials containing 70% alcohol. Sorting and identification to species level and curation of the insects were done in the laboratory using insect voucher specimens from the Entomological Museum of the Zoology Department, University of Ghana, CAB manual keys and descriptions, as well as literature.

2.3 Data Analysis

The experimental treatments were deployed in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD), replicated three times. A total of 20 observations were recorded for evaluation and statistical analysis. Data were analysed by performing analysis of variance (ANOVA, $P=0.05$), using the statistical package for agricultural sciences, Genstat Software version 12 release 12.1 [19]. The least significant difference (LSD) was used to separate means of treatments that showed significant “F” values. Correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between insects at $p \leq 0.01$. Diversity of the experimental area was calculated using Simpson index, $Ds = 1 - \sum (n_i (n_i - 1)) / (N(N - 1))$ where Ds =Simpson’s index of diversity; N =total number of individuals of all species; n_i =total number of individuals of the species i .

121 **3.0 RESULT**

122 **Table 1. List of insect pests and predators observed at various growth stages of nine accessions of pepper grown on the field.**

Crop Growth stage	Nature of insect	Common name	Scientific name	Damaging stage of pest	Plant part(s) damaged	123 124
Vegetative stage (15 DAT)	Pests	Aphid	<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	Adult	Leaves	
		Flea beetle	<i>Podagrica</i> sp.	Adult	Leaves	
		White fly	<i>Bemisia tabaci</i>	Adult	Leaves	
	Predators	Carpenter ant	<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	None	None	
		Field ant	<i>Formica</i> sp.	None	None	
		Ladybird beetle	<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	None	None	
		Praying mantid	<i>Mantis religiosa</i>	None	None	
		Red Imported Fire Ant (RIFA)	<i>Solonopsis invicta</i>	None	None	
	Pests	Aphid	<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	Adult	Leaves	
		Flea beetle	<i>Podagrica</i> sp.	Adult	Leaves	
		Green stink bug	<i>Nezara viridula</i>	Adult	Fruit, fruit bud	
		Variegated grasshopper	<i>Zonocerus variegatus</i>	Adult	Leaves	
Vegetative stage (30 DAT)	Predators	Carpenter ant	<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	None	None	
		Ladybird beetle	<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	None	None	
Crop Growth Stage	Nature of insect	Common name	Scientific name	Damaging stage of pest	Plant part(s) damaged	

Reproductive stage (60 DAT)	Pests	Aphid	<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	None	Leaves	125
		Flea beetle	<i>Podagrica</i> sp.	None	Leaves	126
		Green stink bug	<i>Nezara viridula</i>	None	Fruit, fruit bud	127
	Predators	Carpenter ant	<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	None	None	128
		Ladybird beetle	<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	None	None	129
						130
Reproductive stage (90 DAT)	Pests	Aphid	<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	Adult	Leaves, fruits	131
		Green stink bug	<i>Nezara viridula</i>	Adult	Fruit, fruit bud	132
						133
	Predators	Carpenter ant	<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	None	None	134
		Ladybird beetle	<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	None	None	135
						136
Reproductive stage (120 DAT)	Pests	Aphid	<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	Adult	Leaves, fruits	137
						138
						139
	Predators	Carpenter ant	<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	None	None	140
		Ladybird beetle	<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	None	None	141
						142
Maturity stage (150 DAT)	Pest	Aphid	<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	Adult	Leaves, fruits	143
		Flea beetle	<i>Podagrica</i> sp.	Adult	Leaves	144
		Green stink bug	<i>Nezara viridula</i>	Adult	Fruit, fruit bud	145
	Predators	Variegated grasshopper	<i>Zonocerus variegatus</i>	Adult	Leaves	146
						147
						148
	Predators	Carpenter ant	<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	None	None	149
		Ladybird beetle	<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	None	None	150
						151

Table 2. Abundance of insect species found on nine accessions of pepper.

Family	Name of insect	Pepper Accessions								TOTAL
		Archard	Legon18	Bombardier	SunnyF1	Antillas	Anloga	PCW	BigSun	ForeverF1

Formicidae	<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	23	44	11	26	20	35	38	17	163	377
	<i>Formica</i> sp.	0	53	21	9	17	91	101	6	114	412
	<i>Solenopsis invicta</i>	1	29	1	1	4	0	2	0	0	38
Aphididae	<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	0	205	26	106	57	451	108	8	305	1266
Coccinellidae	<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	7	14	8	12	10	7	6	7	24	95
Chrysomelidae	<i>Podagrica</i> sp.	13	3	5	2	2	5	1	3	2	36
Pentatomidae	<i>Nezara viridula</i>	0	5	0	63	0	4	0	0	2	74
Acrididae	<i>Omocestus viridulus</i>	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Mantidae	<i>Mantis religiosa</i>	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Pyrgomorphidae	<i>Zonocerus variegatus</i>	0	1	0	6	2	6	0	0	0	15
Aleyrodidae	<i>Bemisia tabaci</i>	0	0	0	2	0	5	0	1	0	8
Pseudococcidae	<i>Phenacoccus</i> sp.	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Scarabaeidae	<i>Cetonia aurata</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL		46	357	74	229	113	604	256	42	611	2,332

155

156 **Table 3. Mean numbers of dominant insect on the nine accessions of pepper**

Pests	Accessions								
	Anloga	Antillas	Archard	Big Sun	Bombardier	Forever F1	Legon 18	PCW	Sunny F1
<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	190.00 ^b	35.30 ^b	1.33 ^a	9.30 ^a	17.70 ^a	86.70 ^b	76.70 ^b	37.70 ^a	56.00 ^a

										157
<i>Bemisia tabaci</i>	1.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.30 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	0.70 ^a	158
										159
<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	20.00 ^a	14.70 ^a	11.00 ^b	10.00 ^a	6.30 ^a	18.70 ^a	22.70 ^a	10.00 ^a	14.00 ^a	
<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	4.00 ^a	6.30 ^a	3.67 ^a	6.00 ^a	3.30 ^a	16.30 ^a	6.30 ^a	4.00 ^a	6.30 ^a	
<i>Nezara viridula</i>	1.00 ^a	0.30 ^a	0.33 ^a	1.00 ^a	1.00 ^a	0.30 ^a	2.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	24.70 ^a	
<i>Podagrica</i> sp.	2.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	4.00 ^a	0.00 ^a	1.30 ^a	0.70 ^a	1.00 ^a	0.30 ^a	1.00 ^a	
S.E.D	40.40	14.59	3.06	4.68	9.82	32.20	20.02	20.67	29.28	
LSD	88.00	31.79	6.66	10.20	21.40	70.15	43.63	45.07	63.80	

Means followed by the same letters within the column are not significant ($P = 0.05$).

In Table 3, *A. craccivora* is significant on Anloga, Antillas, Forever F1 and Legon 18 at $P=0.05$. *Camponotus* sp. shows significant difference on Archard at $P=0.05$. The rest of the insects did not show any significant difference on the nine accessions of pepper at $P=0.05$.

Table 4. Correlation between *Camponotus* sp., *Cheilomenes lunata* and *Aphis craccivora* on nine accessions of pepper.

		<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	<i>Aphis craccivora</i>
<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	Pearson Correlation	1	0.595	0.736
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.212	0.095
	N	6	6	6
<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.595	1	0.931**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.212		0.007
	N	6	6	6
<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	Pearson Correlation	0.736	0.931**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.095	0.007	
	N	6	6	6

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There was significant correlation between *Camponotus* sp. and *A. craccivora* at $p \leq 0.01$ as well as between *C. lunata* and *A. craccivora* at $p \leq 0.01$. However, there was no significant correlation between *Camponotus* sp. and *C. lunata* at $p \leq 0.01$ (Table 4).

Table 5. Abundance and diversity of insect species recorded during the study period.

Name of Insect	No. of Individuals (n_i)	%Abundance	$n_i (n_i - 1)$
<i>Aphis craccivora</i>	1266	54.29	1,601,490
<i>Bemisia tabaci</i>	8	0.34	56
<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	377	16.17	141,752
<i>Cetonia aurata</i>	1	0.04	0
<i>Cheilomenes lunata</i>	95	4.07	8,930
<i>Formica</i> sp.	412	17.67	169,332
<i>Mantis religiosa</i>	5	0.21	20
<i>Nezara viridula</i>	74	3.17	5,402
<i>Omocestus viridulus</i>	3	0.13	6
<i>Phenacoccus</i> sp.	2	0.09	2
<i>Podagrica</i> sp.	36	1.54	1,260
<i>Solonopsis invicta</i>	38	1.63	1,406
<i>Zonocerus variegatus</i>	15	0.64	210
Total	2,332	100	1,929,866

Simpson's index of diversity, $D_s = 0.645$




Fig. 1. Comparative abundance of *Camponotus sp.*, *Cheilomenes lunata* and *Aphis craccivora* at various growth stages on the nine accessions of pepper.

3.1 Abundance of Insect Species on Nine Accessions of Pepper.

Table 1 lists the different types of adult insects (both pests and predators) found at different growth stages of the nine accessions of pepper. Ten different insect species were recorded at the vegetative stage of the nine accessions of pepper. These include pests such as *B. tabaci*, *A. craccivora*, *Podagrica sp.*, *N. viridula* and *Z. variegatus* and predators such as *Camponotus sp.*, *Formica sp.*, *M. religiosa*, *C. lunata* and *S. invicta*. Similarly, five insect species were recorded at the reproductive stage. These include pests such as *A. craccivora*, *Podagrica sp.* and *N. viridula* and predators such as *Camponotus sp.* and *C. lunata*. At the matured stage, *A. craccivora*, *Podagrica sp.*, *N. viridula* and *Z. variegatus* were insect pests identified on the accessions of pepper while *Camponotus sp.* and *C. lunata* were predators found.

A total of 2,332 insect species belonging to eleven families were collected throughout the sampling period on the nine pepper accessions studied (Table 2). The highest collection of 611 insect species was made on Forever F1. This was followed by Anloga. Big Sun attracted the least number of insect species (42). *Aphis craccivora* constituted the dominant group on Anloga with an abundance of 451 followed by Forever F1 which had an abundance of 305 of the same species. *A. craccivora* was found on all the accessions of pepper except Archard (Table 2). Seven insects were predominant on the nine accessions of pepper. These include *A. craccivora* (1,266), *Formica sp.*, (412), *Camponotus sp.*, (377), *C. lunata* (95), *N. viridula* (74), *Podagrica sp.*, (38) and *S. Invicta* (36). Other insect species collected namely *C. aurata*, *Phenacoccus sp.*, *O. viridulus*, *B. tabaci* and *Z. variegatus* had relatively lower abundances, between 1 and 15.

3.2 Diversity of insect species on nine accessions of pepper.

Thirteen (13) different insect species of the families; Formicidae (2 genera), Aphididae (1 genus), Coccinellidae (1 genus) and Chrysomelidae (1 genus), Pentatomidae (1 genus), Acrididae (1 genus), Mantidae (1 genus), Pyrgomorphidae (1 genus), Aleyrodidae (1 genus), Pseudococcidae (1

genus) and Scarabaeidae (1 genus) were recorded. Three genera of insects commonly occurred on all the nine different accessions of pepper (Table 2). There were, however, some groups which were specific and found only on one accession of pepper. For example *Phenacoccus* sp. was found on Legon 18 while *Cetonia aurata* (Linnaeus) (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae) was found only on Forever F1.

The prevalent insects were *Camponotus* sp., *Cheilomenes lunata* (Fabricius) (Coleoptera, Coccinellidae), *A. craccivora*, *Formica* sp., *Podagrica* sp., *Solenopsis invicta* (Buren) (Hymenoptera, Formicidae), *Nezara viridula* (Linnaeus) (Heteroptera, Pentatomidae), and *Zonocerus variegatus* (Linnaeus) (Orthoptera, Pyrgomorphidae). Three species namely, *Camponotus* sp., *C. lunata* and *Podagrica* sp. were found on all the nine accessions of pepper (Table 2). *Aphis craccivora* (Koch) (Hemiptera, Aphididae) was found on all the other accessions except Archard (Table 2).

3.3 Comparative Abundance of three inter-related insect species.

Fig. 1 shows the comparative abundance of three insects, which are inter-related with respect to feeding behaviour on the accessions of pepper throughout the study period namely, *Camponotus* sp., *C. lunata* and *A. craccivora*. In general, the abundance of all three insects was high at 15 DAT but dropped sharply by 30 DAT. This was followed by a gradual rise in abundance for *A. craccivora* and *C. lunata* for the rest of the study period. However, for *Camponotus* sp., the decline in abundance continued till 60 DAT before rising to 1.5 at 120 DAT, followed by another decrease by 150 DAT.

4.0 DISCUSSION

4.1 Abundance of Insect Species on the Nine Different Accessions of Pepper.

A total of 2,332 insects were identified in this study, comprising species belonging to eleven families. In a similar study, Khadijah et al., (2013) [20], recorded a total 774 insect species from 79 families. Also in a similar work done by Ofori et al., (2014) [18] on tomato within the same geographical area but in a different season recorded 10, 562 insects belonging to fourteen different families. The high abundance recorded on the tomato study was largely due to the high percentage of white flies collected (95.5%). But in this present study white fly accounted for 0.34% of the total insect collected. Xavier and Merlindayana (2012) [21] also conducted a similar study and recorded 2660 insects belonging to 44 species and 10 orders. Visual surveys have been shown to be an effective and efficient method for censuring insect species richness and abundance on a variety of host plants including *Heliconia* spp. [22,23].

The study indicated a high abundance of insect species on the nine different accessions of pepper. Some 53.8% of these insects are major insect pests of pepper. These insects are mainly defoliators and sucking insects, capable of inflicting damage to the pepper crop due to their numbers. Riley and Sparks (2008) [24] reported a high abundance of insect species on pepper. The severity of damage to pepper by insect pests is largely due to abundance of the pests, which is related to environmental conditions. In this study, however, beneficial insects such as *C. lunata* and *M. religiosa* were also recorded. Black ants such as *Camponotus* sp. and *Formica* sp. and red ants *S. invicta* were found where aphids were concentrated. Both *Camponotus* sp. and *A. craccivora* exhibited the same trend in distribution and number through the different growth stages. Begon et al., (2011) [25] and Detran et al., (2010) [26] observed a positive correlation between ants and

aphids. Aphids produce a sugar-rich substance known as honeydew, the waste product of their sap diet. Ants derive all or a large part of their nutrients from this honeydew as a source of food.

4.2 Diversity of Insect Species on the Nine Accessions of Pepper.

Thirteen different insect species were found to be associated with the nine accessions of pepper the majority (53.8 %) of which are pests. The estimated Simpson's diversity index (Ds) shows that the experimental area is highly diversified, a reflection of species heterogeneity within the area. Ofori et. al., (2014) [18] in a related study on tomato recorded a lower diversity index around the same geographical area but on a different experimental plot. The high diversity in this present study is due to the many equally or nearly equal abundant species recorded. Butani (1976) [27] reported over 20 insect species on chillies from India of which *A. gossypii* and *A. laburni* were among the most damaging pests. Dagnoko et al., (2013) [28], also recorded 6 different insect species which attack pepper. The high diversity of insects in the study area coupled with the pest status of the majority necessitates prompt institution of control measures to prevent economic loss. Beneficial insects recorded in this study include *C. lunata*, *Camponotus* sp., *Cetonia aurata*, *Formica* sp., *S. invicta* and *M. religiosa*. *C. lunata* has been documented to be predatory on aphids. Mochiah et al., (2012) [29] reported 5 major pests of pepper and one beneficial insect, *Cheilomenes* sp. to be a present on pepper. The major insect pests in their finding were *A. gossypii* mostly located on the under surface of leaves, either singly or in colonies, *T. tabaci* and *B. tabaci*, *Dysdercus supersticiosus* (Fabricius) (Heteroptera, Pyrrhocoridae) and *Z. variegatus*. They also observed in their study that, *Cheilomenes* sp. fed on *A. craccivora*. This supports the predatory behaviour of *Cheilomenes* sp. as observed in the present study. In related studies, other workers Picket et al., (1994) [30] and later Kontodimas and Stathas, (2005) [31] noted that ladybird beetles, or ladybugs are important predators of aphids and could be exploited more effectively as biological control agents.

4.3 Economic Importance of Identified Insect Species on Nine Accessions of Pepper.

In this study, the insect pests recorded were *A. craccivora*, *B. tabaci*, *N. viridula*, *O. virudulus*, *Z. variegatus*, *Podagrica* sp., and *Phenacoccus* sp. These normally cause damage by sucking and defoliation thereby reducing economic yield of pepper.

Butani (1976) [27] identified *A. craccivora* as a pest of pepper at the vegetative stage. Damage caused by this insect resulted in upward curling of leaves. Reddy and Puttaswamy (1985) [32] reported *A. craccivora*, *B. tabaci* and *N. viridula* as major pests found damaging pepper leaves during the vegetative stage of growth. Vasicek et al. (2001) [33] also reported that, among the important pests of pepper, *A. craccivora* were found to be a major pests. Akinlosotu (1977) [34] reported that *Z. variegatus* was a major pest of capsicum at the vegetative stage due to the defoliating effect.

The present findings are also in agreement with Asena (1974) [35], Yasaraknc and Hncal (1997) [36], Halima and Hamouda (1994) [37] all of whom reported that aphids are the major pests of pepper at the reproductive stage. In their study, *A. craccivora* continued to ravage the crop foliage resulting in wilting and chlorosis of leaves. Six major insect pests were associated with the matured stage of the crop in the current study. Of these, *N. viridula* is a major pest of pepper as it uses the pepper fruit as source of food.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Thirteen different insect species were identified on the nine accessions of pepper from the vegetative through to the maturity stage. These comprised six beneficial (*C. lunata*, *Camponotus* sp., *Formica* sp., *S. invicta*, *M. religiosa* and *C. aurata*.) and seven pests (*A. craccivora*, *B. tabaci*,

Podagrica sp., *O. virudulus*, *N. viridulus*, *Phenacoccus* sp. and *Z. variegatus*). Their relative abundance ranged from 0.04– 17.67 % for beneficial insects and 0.09 – 54.29 % for pests. The highest numbers of insects were found on the accessions Forever F1 (26.2 %) and Anloga (25.9 %). Legon 18 and Sunny F1 registered the highest diversity of insect species, while PCW, Big Sun and Forever F1 recorded the least diversity. The high abundance of insect pests in the study area coupled with the pest status of the majority (53.28 %) necessitates prompt institution of control measures, in the case of commercial cultivation, to prevent economic loss.

310

311

312

313 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

314 Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

315

316

317 **REFERENCES**

- 318 1. Timbrook J. The Natural History of Chile Peppers. Santa Babara Museum of Natural
319 History, 2014.
- 320 2. Kraft KH, Jesús Luna-Ruíz J, Gepts, P. A new collection of wild populations of Capsicum in
321 Mexico and the southern United States. Genetic Resources and Crop Evolution.
322 2013;60(1):225-232. doi:10.1007/s10722-012-9827-5.
- 323 3. Ortiz R, Delgado de la Flor F, Alvarado G, Crossa J. Classifying vegetable genetic
324 resources - A case study with domesticated Capsicum spp. *Scientia Horticulturae*
325 2010;126(2):186-191. doi:10.1016/j.scienta.2010.07.007.
- 326 4. Eshbaugh W. Peppers: History and Exploitation of a Serendipitous New Crop Discovery.
327 In: Janick J, Simon JE, editors. New Crops Wiley, New York.1993:132-139.
- 328 5. Walsh BM, Hoot SB. Phylogenetic relationships of *Capsicum* (Solanaceae) using DNA
329 sequences from two noncoding regions: the chloroplast *atpB-rbcL* spacer region and
330 nuclear *waxy* introns; Int. J. Plant Sci. 2001;162:1409-1418.
- 331 6. Winter J, Bevan S, Campbell EA. Capsaicin and pain mechanisms. British Journal of
332 Anaesthesia. 1995;75:157-168.
- 333 7. Anonymous. Nutritive value of Indian foods. 2001. Accessed 13 March 2013. Available
334 www.doctorndtv.com/health/nutritive.value.asp-79k.
- 335 8. FAOSTAT. 2014. Accessed 28th, May, 2014. Available
336 <http://faostat.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx>
- 337 9. Investment Opportunity in Ghana. Chili Peppers in Ghana. Millennium Development
338 Authority. MiDA, 2010. Accessed 24 March, 2014 Available:
339 <https://www.mcc.gov/documents/investmentopps/bom-ghana-english-chili.pdf>
- 340 10. Berke TG, Black LL, Morris RA, Talekar NS, Wang JF. Suggested Cultural Practices for
341 Sweet Pepper. AVRDC. 2003:5.
- 342 11. Nielsen GR. Pepper pests. Plant and Soil Science Department. University of Vermont,
343 USA. 1997:12.
- 344 12. Tom C. Pests of pepper. Cooperative extensive service, North Carolina, USA. 2002.
- 345 13. Redmond WA. Aphids, Spiders and Whiteflies, Microsoft Corporation.2008.
- 346 14. Boucher TJ. Vegetable Integrated pest management, University of Connecticut
347 Cooperative Extension System, 24 Hyde Ave, Vernon, CT 06066. 2009:860:875-3331.
- 348 15. Obeng-Ofori D, Yirenkyi Danquah E, Ofosu-Anim J, editors. Vegetable and spice crop
349 production in West Africa. 1st ed. The City Publishers Ltd. 2007:74.
- 350 16. Norman JC. Tropical Vegetable Crops. Arthur H. Stockwell Ltd. Devon 1992:79-86.

- 351 17. Matthew IP, Karikari SK. Horticulture: Principles and Practices. Macmillan Education Ltd.
352 London and Basingstoke. 1995:128-144.
- 353 18. Ofori ESK, Yeboah S, Nunoo J, Quartey EK, Torgby-Tetteh W, Gasu EK, Ewusie E.
354 Preliminary Studies of Insect Diversity and Abundance on Twelve Accessions of
355 Tomato, *Solanum lycopersicon* L. Grown in a Coastal Savannah Agro Ecological Zone.
356 Journal of Agric Sc. 2014;6(8): (*In press*).
- 357 19. Genstat Software version 12 release 12.1 for PC/Windows (software for statistical
358 analysis), GenStat Procedure Library Release PL20.1; 2009.
- 359 20. Khadijah AR, Azidah AA, Meor SR. Diversity and abundance of insect species at Kota
360 Damansara Community Forest Reserve, Selangor. Academic Journals. 2013;8(9):359-
361 374. Doi 10.5897/SRE12.481.
- 362 21. Xavier IB, Merlindayana. Insect diversity of sugarcane fields in Theni district, Tamilnadu,
363 South India. Intl. J. Adv. Lif. Sc. 2012;2(1):54-57.
- 364 22. Seifert RP, Seifert FH. A community matrix analysis of Heliconia insect communities. Am.
365 Nat. 1976;110:461-483.
- 366 23. Seifert RP, Seifert FH. A Heliconia insect community in a Venezuelan cloud forest.
367 Ecology.1979;60:462-467.
- 368 24. Spark S. Pest Management Strategic Plan for Pepper in Georgia and South Carolina.
369 2008. Accessed 20th March 2014. Available [www.ipmcenters.org/pmsp/pdf/GA-
370 SCpepperPMSP.pdf](http://www.ipmcenters.org/pmsp/pdf/GA-SCpepperPMSP.pdf)
- 371 25. Begon M, Harper JL, Townsend CR. Ecology: From Individuals to Ecosystems. 4th ed.
372 Blackwell Publishing. 2011.
- 373 26. Detrain C, Francois J, Verheggen FJ, Diez L, Wathelet B. Haubruge E. Aphid-ant
374 Mutualism: How Honeydew Sugars Influence the Behaviour of Ant Scouts. Physiological
375 Entomology. 2010:168-174.
- 376 27. Butani DK. Pests and diseases of chilli and their control. Pesticides. 1976;10(8):38-41.
- 377 28. Dagnoko S., Yaro-Diarisso N, Sanogo P. N, Adetula O, Dolo-Nantoumé A., Gamby-Touré
378 K, Traoré-Théra A, Katilé S, Diallo-Ba D. Overview of pepper (*Capsicum* spp.) breeding in
379 West Africa. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2013;8(13):1108-1114.
- 380 29. Mochiah MB, Baidoo PK, Acheampong G. Effects of mulching materials on agronomic
381 characteristics, pests of pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.) and their natural enemies
382 population. Agric. Biol. J. N. Am. 2012;3(6):253-261.
- 383 30. Pickett JA, Wadhams LJ, Woodcock CM. Attempts to control aphid pests by integrated
384 use of semiochemicals. In: Proceedings of the British Crop Protection Conference – Pests
385 and Diseases.1994:1239-1240.
- 386 31. Kontodimas DC, Stathas GJ. Phenology, Fecundity and Life Table Parameters of the
387 Predator *Hippodamia variegata* Reared on *Dysaphis crataegi*. Biocont. 2005;50:223-233.
- 388 32. Reddy DNR, Puttaswamy. Pests infesting chilli (*Capsicum annuum*) in the transplanted
389 crop. Mysore J. Agric. Sci. 1985;17(3):246-251.
- 390 33. Vasicek A, F-de-la R, Paglioni A. Biological and populational aspects of *Aulacorthum*
391 *solani* (Kalt), *Myzus persicae* (Sulz) and *Macrosiphum euphorbiae* (Thomas) (Homoptera:
392 Aphididea) on pepper under laboratory conditions. Boletín de Sanidad Vegetal Plagas,
393 2001;27(4):439-446.
- 394 34. Akinlosotu TA. A check list of insects associated with local vegetables in South Western
395 Nigeria. Res. Bull. Uni. Life Coll. Agr. Train. 1977:18.
- 396 35. Asena N. Investigations on vegetable pests in West and South-West Anatolia. Rev. Appl.
397 Ent. 1974;62(10):1180.
- 398 36. Yasaraknc N, Hncal P. Determining the pest and beneficial species and their population
399 densities on tomato, cucumber, pepper and lettuce greenhouses in Izmir. Bitki Koruma
400 Bul. 1997;37(1/2):79-89.
- 401 37. Halima KMB, Hamouda MHB. Aphids from protected crops and their enemies in Tunisia.
402 Rev. Appl. Ent. 1994;82:1282.
- 403