

DAMAGE AND LOSS CAUSED BY ‘Offa’ (*Rhyparochromus littoralis* Dist.) [HETEROPTERA: LYGAEIDAE] ON GROUNDNUT IN SONG LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF ADAMAWA STATE, NIGERIA

¹Samaila, A. E., ²Malgwi, A.M., ¹Degri, M. M. and ³Oaya, C. S.

¹Department of Agronomy, Federal University Kashere, PMB 0182, Gombe, Nigeria

²Department of Crop Protection, Modibbo Adama University of Technology, PMB 2076 Yola, Nigeria

³Department of Agricultural Production, Adamawa State College of Agriculture, Ganye, Nigeria

Corresponding Author’s Email: akewetaes@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Field experiments were as carried out in four out of six Districts of Song Local Government Area of Adamawa State in Nigeria. The objectives of this research were to establish the damage potential and loss caused by the ‘offa’ [the groundnut sucking bug (*Rhyparochromus littoralis* Dist.)] on groundnut during the 2011, 2012 and 2013 cropping seasons. The experiment was set up as a split plot design (SPD) where all treatments were replicated three times. The main treatment was the groundnut cultivar varieties in the main plots while the sub-treatments are the harvesting times. The data collected were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) on SAS statistical package using the generalized linear model and significant $P = 0.05$, means were separated using Student Neumann-Keuls (SNK) test. Damage caused includes, kernel shriveling, which increases the free fatty acid content of the oil, distortion or discolouration of the kernel, loss in weight and the production of rancid flavor. The percentage reduction of harvested pod and kernels when groundnut was left for 3 – 28 days fell within 24 – 68%. Results obtained from these investigations indicated that *R. littoralis* causes significant damage on groundnut exposed to the insect pest for more than 3 days in the field before picking (decortoring). It was therefore concluded that *R. littoralis* is a potential economic pest, emerging as a serious threat to the harvesting of quality, healthy and edible groundnut in the study area.

Comment [a1]:

Key Words: Damage, Potential, Sucking, Harvested, groundnut, investigation and Decortoring

INTRODUCTION

The reasons for the high level of damage inflicted by insects to groundnut stocks in Africa are known: deficient collecting networks, inadequate basic infrastructures e.g. road, lack of economic incentives for a better grain quality, inadequate storage structures and management, etc (Conway, 1983). Groundnuts reach the central stores with high infestation levels and are often left without care to future insect attacks. As most post-harvest groundnut pests except the groundnut bruchid (*Caryedon serratus*) are unable to penetrate intact pods, leaving the crop in the shell for as long as possible during storage is an effective method of limiting damage.

R. littoralis commonly known as Lygaeid bug, is a pod sucking bug that, belongs to the order Heteroptera and family Lygaeidae which occurs in all groundnut growing areas in Northern Nigeria (Samaila, 2012; Samaila and Malgwi, 2012; Samaila, *et al.*, 2013). The bug is popularly known in the Northern part of Nigeria as ‘shamai’ by the Hausa speaking people while the Yungur speaking people of Adamawa State refer to it as ‘offa’

(Samaila, 2012; Samaila and Malgwi, 2012). Samaila and Malgwi (2013) further observed that from neo nymphal stage to adulthood, this insect attack pods as well as kernels (seeds), while they are still fresh in the field.

They are found in large chambers, under harvested groundnuts left to dry before picking (decorticing) on the field especially, when left for a week or more, the kernels turns out to have small, shrunken seeds, with the testa often turning yellow (Samaila and Malgwi, 2012; Samaila, *et al.*, 2013; and Malgwi and Onu, 2004). In spite of researches on various pests of groundnut, there is paucity of research report on the damage potential and loss in yield caused by *R. littoralis*.

Therefore, the need for this research on *R. littoralis* as a threatening insect pest of groundnut in Song Local Government Area of Adamawa State, Nigeria, where groundnut cultivation is of tremendous economic importance to the poor resource farmers-peasants within the study areas.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiments were carried out in four out of the six Districts of Song Local Government Area, namely Dirma, Dumne, Suktu and Waltadi, the highest groundnut producing areas in Song Local Government Area with a record of high density of 'offa' (*R. littoralis*) as reported by Malgwi et al., and Samaila (2013). Song Local Government Area lies between longitude 12° 41' and 12° 35' North and longitude 9° 44' and 10° 12' East of the Equator in the Northern Guinea Savannah agro-ecological zone of North Eastern Nigeria (Adebayo, 19996).

Field layout

The experiment was set up in a split plot design (SPD), the main treatment was the groundnut in the main plots while the sub-treatments are the harvesting times. All treatments were replicated three (3) times. Groundnuts were planted 40 cm between rows with 1 plant/hill, the plant spacing was 25 cm within rows, again with 1 plant/hill according to the recommendations of Samaila, *et al.*, (2012) and Shankarappa *et al.*, (2009). The plot size for the main treatment was 70 m x 20 m, with each sub-plot being 5 x 4 m.

Cultural practices

At the establishment of rainfall in June/July of the respective cropping seasons (2011, 2012 and 2013), the fields were ploughed and sowed in all locations within the study area. Popular local groundnut cultivars, 'Kampala' which is late maturing was purchased from the Dumne Friday open Market.

|

Data Collected

At maturity, when the groundnut was ready for harvest each sub-plot in the replication was randomly sampled within the main plots and then exposed to infestation for 0, 3, 7, 9, 14, 21 and 28 days after harvesting (DAH).

Sampling Method

Matured groundnut were harvested within the sub-plot treatments and subjected to ~~seven (7)~~ different levels of destructive sampling. Matured nuts were decorticated on the day of uprooting (digging out) from the ground (0), and then the remaining harvested groundnuts were left exposed in the field for 3, 7, 9, 14, 21 and 28 DAH before decortication. The harvested groundnut pods on each subplots sampled were weighed before and after shelling.

The percentage loss was determined by comparing the weight loss of the groundnut that was promptly harvested and dried outside the field with each of the groundnut harvested subsequently and expressed as percentage reduction in yield/ha similar to Samaila, *et al.*, (2012) as follows:-

1. % reduction in yield loss due to infestation by the insect:

$$= \frac{a - b/c/d/e/f/g/h}{a} \text{ respectively } \times 100\%$$

Where:

a = Groundnut Harvested Promptly (0DAH)

b = Groundnut Harvested 3DAH

c = Groundnut Harvested 7DAH

d = Groundnut Harvested 9DAH

e = Groundnut Harvested 14DAH

f = Groundnut Harvested 21DAH

g = Groundnut Harvested 28DAH

Statistical Analysis of Field Work

The data collected were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) using SAS (2003) statistical package software version 8.02 generalized linear model and significant $P = 0.05$ means was separated using Student Neumann-Keuls (SNK) test.

Yield Loss

To estimate the damage (%), each sample was divided into damaged and undamaged pods or kernels and the percent damage was calculated using the following formula by Dick (1987):

$$\text{Damage (\%)} = \frac{\text{Number of damaged pods} \times 100}{\text{Total number of pods}}$$

$$\text{Weight loss (\%)} = \frac{(UNd) - (DNU) \times 100}{U(Nd + Nu)}$$

Where:

Nu = No. of undamaged pods; Nd = No. of damaged pods; U = Dry mass of undamaged pods; D = Dry mass of damaged pods.

Formatted: Justified, Line spacing: single, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

RESULTS

Weight of Groundnut after Harvest

The weight of groundnut pods significantly vary from 0_DAH to 28 DAH proportional to the number of days the pods were exposed to the pest on the field to dry after digging up from the ground. The highest values of unshelled pods were recorded at 0_DAH (6080.00, 5079.67, ~~and~~ 5082.00 and 4719.30)g in Dirma, Dumne, Suktu and Waltadi in 2011, so also in 2012, 0_DAH (6036.33, 5699.67, 5036.33 and 4650.7), in the same vein, in 2013 (5936.00, 5219.67, 5736.00 and 4530.33) 0_DAH in Dirma, Dumne, Suktu and Waltadi shown in Table 1.

The weight of shelled groundnuts varied significantly from (5066.66, 4233.66, 4235.00 and 4719.30) ~~infor~~ 2011, (5030.33, 4749.66, 5036.33 and 4650.7) in 2012, while (4966.06, 4349.33, 5736.00 and 4530.33) in 2013 for Dirma, Dumn, Suktu and Waltadi respectively as shown in Table 2.

The least weight at 0_DAH were recorded in Waltadi (4719.30, 4650.70 and 4530.33) ~~infor~~ 2011, 2012 and 2013 respectively, while Dumne and Suktu display insignificant difference in weight loss as indicated in Tables 1 and 2.

The reduction in weight retrogressed with the increase in number of days the groundnut was exposed to the pest in field from 3 – 28 DAH from the values of (5238.67, 5699.67 and 5499.33)g; (5401.67, 5476.33 and 5205.33)g; (4239.67, 5599.67 and 5522.33)g and (4247.70, 3991.00 and 4230.67)g at 3_DAH in Dirma, Dumne, Suktu and Waltadi respectively. Interestingly, the level of infestation and damage caused in all location followed the same trend with 0 DAH recording the highest weight of harvested groundnuts, while 28_DAH shows the least weight (1840.00, 2085.67 and 2225.33)g; (1185.33, 2135.33 and 2923.33)g; (1942.00, 2535.67 and 3425.33)g and 1025.30, 1245.30 and 1140)g in Dirma, Dumne, Suktu and Waltadi respectively (Table, 1). These trends continue in the same characteristic manner displayed in the shelled groundnuts as shown in Table 2.

Groundnuts harvested on 0_DAH in both shelled and unshelled ~~wereare~~ not significantly different since they were not attacked by the bug, whereas there was significant difference for groundnuts harvested on 28 DAH, which recorded the least weight of both shelled and unshelled groundnut.

Formatted: Left, Line spacing: single

RESULTS

~~Damage Potential of *Rhyparochromus littoralis* Dist~~

Table 1: Mean weight of groundnut kernels ~~caused by *Rhyparochromus littoralis*~~

Harvesting Days	Dirma			Dumne			Suktu			Waltadi		
	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
0DAH	6080.00 ^a	6036.33 ^a	5936.00 ^a	5079.67 ^a	5699.67 ^a	5219.67 ^a	5082.00 ^a	5036.33 ^a	5736.00 ^a	4719.3 ^a	4650.7 ^a	4530.33 ^a
3DAH	5238.67 ^b	5699.67 ^b	5499.33 ^b	5401.67 ^b	5476.33 ^b	5205.33 ^b	4239.67 ^b	5599.67 ^b	5522.33 ^b	4247.7 ^b	3991.0 ^b	4230.67 ^b
7DAH	5036.33 ^c	4776.33 ^c	5076.33 ^c	3837.33 ^c	4224.67 ^c	4411.67 ^c	4038.33 ^c	4866.33 ^c	5346.33 ^c	3485.7 ^c	3387.3 ^c	3580.7 ^c
9DAH	4992.67 ^d	4224.67 ^d	4624.33 ^d	3445.33 ^d	3540.00 ^d	3740.00 ^d	3995.67 ^d	4534.67 ^d	4994.33 ^d	2828.7 ^d	2840.3 ^d	2826.7 ^d
14DAH	3699.33 ^e	3540.00 ^e	3840.33 ^e	2652.33 ^e	3135.33 ^e	3531.33 ^e	3698.33 ^e	3750.00 ^e	3990.33 ^e	2747.7 ^e	2232.7 ^d	2563.67 ^e
21DAH	2776.33 ^f	2135.33 ^f	2935.67 ^g	1274.00 ^f	3085.67 ^f	3123.67 ^f	2875.33 ^f	2875.33 ^f	3935.67 ^g	1040.7 ^f	1343.7 ^e	1240.7 ^f
28DAH	1840.00 ^g	2085.67 ^g	2225.33 ^h	1185.33 ^g	2135.33 ^g	2923.33 ^g	1942.00 ^g	2535.67 ^g	3425.33 ^h	1025.3 ^g	1245.3 ^f	1140.3 ^g
Mean	36383	3523.0	3352.6	2592.4	3255.6	3120.5	2785.6	3215.67	4215.7	2261.9	2217.9	2218.6
C.V.(%)	11.00	11.43	11.63	11.61	14.4	14.67	15.30	17.10	18.69	17.4	16.7	17.6

Means with the same letters in the same column are not significantly different at $P \leq 0.05$ using student Keuls Newman (SNK) test for variables ~~and~~

C.V.=Coefficient of variability.

DAH = days after harvest.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0", Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Table 2: *Effect of R. littoralis On Mean weight of Shelled groundnut kernels*

Harvesting Days	Dirma			Dumne			Suktu			Waltadi		
	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
0DAH	5066.66 ^a	5030.33 ^a	4966.66 ^a	4233.66 ^a	4749.66 ^a	4349.33 ^a	4235.00 ^a	5036.33 ^a	5736.00 ^a	4719.3 ^a	4650.7 ^a	4530.33 ^a
3DAH	4365.56 ^b	4749.67 ^b	4582.67 ^b	4501.33 ^b	4563.66 ^b	4337.66 ^b	3530.66 ^b	5599.67 ^b	5522.33 ^b	4247.7 ^b	3991.0 ^b	4230.67 ^b
7DAH	4196.94 ^c	3980.33 ^c	4230.33 ^c	3837.33 ^c	3924.66 ^c	3676.33 ^c	3365.33 ^c	4866.33 ^c	5346.33 ^c	3485.7 ^c	3387.3 ^c	3580.7 ^c
9DAH	4160.56 ^d	3520.67 ^d	3853.66 ^d	3445.33 ^d	3540.00 ^d	3116.66 ^d	3329.66 ^d	4534.67 ^d	4994.33 ^d	2828.7 ^d	2840.3 ^d	2826.7 ^d
14DAH	3082.66 ^e	2950.00 ^e	3200.33 ^e	2652.33 ^e	3135.33 ^e	2942.33 ^e	3082.33 ^e	3750.00 ^e	3990.33 ^e	2747.7 ^e	2232.7 ^d	2563.67 ^e
21DAH	2313.66 ^f	1779.66 ^f	2446.33 ^g	1274.00 ^f	2085.66 ^f	2603.66 ^f	2479.33 ^f	2875.33 ^f	3935.67 ^g	1040.7 ^f	1343.7 ^e	1240.7 ^f
28DAH	1533.33 ^g	1738.66 ^g	1854.66 ^h	1185.33 ^g	1935.33 ^g	2436.33 ^g	1618.33 ^g	2535.67 ^g	3425.33 ^h	1025.3 ^g	1245.3 ^f	1140.3 ^g
Mean	3531.3	3392.6	3590.6	3018.6	3419.2	3351.7	3091.5	3215.67	4215.7	2261.9	2217.9	2218.6
C.V.(%)	11.00	11.43	11.63	11.61	14.4	14.67	15.30	17.10	18.69	17.4	16.7	17.6

Means with the same letters in the same column are not significantly different at $P \leq 0.05$ using student Keuls Newman (SNK) test for variables ~~and~~

C.V.=Coefficient of variability.

DAH = days after harvest.

Percentage Reduction in Weight

The results on the percentage loss in weight on shelled kernels as a result of damages infected by the groundnut sucking bug *R. littoralis* on weight percentage for each of the data collected at all locations are presented in Table 3. The results at all locations and cropping seasons showed that there was significant difference in loss of weight with increasing number of days the groundnuts were left on the field to dry.

The highest mean weight loss percentage (67.9, 66.2, 65.9) Suktu, (62.5, 65.5 and 67.8) Dumne, (65.8, 63.8 and 64.8) Waltadi and (59.9, 58.8 and 62.5) Dirma, were recorded in 2011, 2012 and 2013 respectively and these were observed on 28DAH, while the least weight loss percentage of (24.2, 25.2 and 24.4) Dirma, (23.4, 25.5 and 26.8) Dumne, (25.9, 25.4 and 24.0) Suktu and (23.6, 25.6 and 26.6) Waltadi for the same cropping seasons observed in all the field trials. However, in all the growing seasons, Suktu recorded 67.9, 66.2 and 65.9 being the highest weight loss in all the cropping seasons of 2011, 2012 and 2013 respectively.

On the whole, the mean as shown in Table 3 confirmed the increasing losses with increase number of days groundnut was left on the field to dry. These trends are consistent all locations from the highest number of days groundnut was left to dry on the field to the least number of days (28 DAH to 3DAH).

Table 3: Mean Percentage Weight (g) Loss of Shelled groundnut kernels

Harvesting Days	Dirma			Dumne			Suktu			Waltadi		
	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
3DAH	24.2 ^e	25.2 ^e	24.4 ^e	23.4 ^e	25.5 ^d	26.8 ^d	25.9 ^d	25.4 ^d	24.0 ^d	27.6 ^d	25.6 ^d	26.6 ^d
7DAH	40.8 ^d	41.6 ^d	44.5 ^d	43.5 ^d	40.8 ^c	42.6 ^c	38.8 ^c	38.4 ^c	38.2 ^c	44.5 ^c	42.5 ^c	43.5 ^c
9DAH	42.8 ^{cd}	42.4 ^{cd}	44.5 ^{cd}	44.5 ^{cd}	45.1 ^b	43.1 ^b	50.1 ^b	50.0 ^b	52.1 ^b	52.8 ^b	50.8 ^b	51.8 ^b
14DAH	43.8 ^{cd}	42.8 ^{cd}	47.7 ^{cd}	47.7 ^{cd}	46.2 ^b	48.2 ^b	54.2 ^b	54.6 ^b	54.8 ^b	53.4 ^b	50.4 ^b	51.4 ^b
21DAH	48.2 ^c	47.3 ^c	52.7 ^c	52.7 ^c	55.4 ^b	56.8 ^b	56.4 ^b	55.4 ^b	56.7 ^b	55.1 ^b	51.1 ^b	52.1 ^b
28DAH	59.9 ^b	58.8 ^b	62.5 ^b	62.5 ^b	65.5 ^a	67.8 ^a	67.9 ^a	66.2 ^a	65.9 ^a	65.8 ^a	63.8 ^a	64.8 ^a
Mean	38.3	43.0	46.1	38.9	46.4	47.6	41.3	48.3	48.6	41.1	47.4	48.4
C.V.(%)	12.4	12.4	12.2	12.2	13.8	13.8	13.8	13.8	13.8	13.6	13.6	13.6

Means with the same letters in the same column are not significantly different at $P \leq 0.05$ using student Keuls Newman (SNK) test for variables

~~and~~ C.V.=Coefficient of variability.

DAH = days after harvest.

DISCUSSIONS

Damage Potential of *Rhyparochromus littoralis* on Groundnut

There is paucity on literature particularly in Nigeria even as a checklist that mentioned *R. littoralis* as a minor/major pest of groundnut prior to this present investigation. *R. littoralis* no doubt is a devastating pest in groundnut fields and just a small population would multiply within a week and cause great damage of up to 80 percent or more loss in yield of groundnut (Malgwi and Samaila and Malgwi, 2012).

Results obtained from this study confirmed that *R. littoralis* is a potential economic pest, emerging as a serious threat to the harvesting of quality and healthy groundnut pods, as opined by Malgwi and Onu, (2004).

The results obtained from the four trial fields showed little or no significant difference from each other. High percentage of damage done to groundnut resulting in huge losses in yield for upto 68% as recorded in the present study point to the fact that *R. littoralis* has also become a major pest of groundnut in Song Local Government Area in Adamawa State, Nigeria which also agree with the findings of Samaila and Malgwi, (2012) on their studies on the groundnut sucking bug *R. littoralis* in Northern Nigeria. The damage potential determined on groundnut in this study poses a serious threat in term of its damage percentage of above 20%, that agrees with the findings of Malgwi and Onu (2004). This further proves that *R. littoralis* is a true pest of groundnut as earlier

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted Table

reported by other researchers (Kalaiyarasan and Palanisamy, 2002; Malgwi and Onu, 2004; Osman *et al.*, 2009; ~~Samaila, 2010~~; Ranga Rao *et al.*, 2010 and Samaila and Malgwi, 2012).

The present study identified *R. littoralis* as a seriously emerging threat to groundnut farming in the study areas and by extension other groundnut producing areas within the same agroecological zones in Nigeria, which is in conformity with the survey conducted by Samaila and Malgwi (2012).

Up to 58.8 – 67.9% loss in weight/yield of groundnut was recorded. The least loss in weight of 24.0 – 26.8 was observed in all the locations is pointer to the fact that this pest is an emerging threat to groundnut production.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the damage caused by *R. littoralis* as observed on the groundnut kernels includes, kernel shriveling, which increases the free fatty acid content of the oil, producing a rancid flavor, while. ~~The percentage loss in yield of the groundnut within the time frame that it groundnut~~ was exposed to the insect pest amounted to approximately 68%. There's therefore the need to work towards the identification of its alternate host in order to understand it's over seasoning strategy, behaviour, dispersal and other knowledge of its possible habitat or niches will help towards the understanding of the complexity of the insect pests.

REFERENCES

- Adebayo, A. A. (1999). Climate II. In Adebayo, A. A. and Tukur, A. L. Eds (1999) Adamawa State in Maps. Paraclete Publishers, Yola
- Dick, K.M. (1987). Losses caused by insects to groundnuts stored in a warehouse in India. *Trop. Sci.* 27, 65-75.
- ~~Conway, J.A. (1983) Notes on the biology and ecology of the groundnut seed – beetle *Caryedon serratus* (Ol) under field conditions in Senegambia. *Trop. Stored prod.* 54:11-13.~~
- ~~ICRISAT (2008) *Groundnut Insect Pest Pod sucking Bug*. <http://www.icrisat.org/vasat/learning-resource>. Accessed May 22, 2010.~~
- Kalaiyarasan, S. and Palanisamy, S. (2004~~2~~). Screening Sesame Germplasm against Sesame Pod bugs (*Elasmolomus sordidus* Fabricius) for resistance. *Madras Agric. J.* 89(7-9): 407 – 409.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0", Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Kalaiyarasam, S. and Palanisamy, S. (2004) Effect of weather factors on seasonal incidence and damage of sesame pod bug, *E. sordidus* (Fabr.). *Annals of Plant Protection Sciences*, ~~Vol. 12: 1. Pp 37 – 40~~ 12(1):37 – 40.

Malgwi, A. M and Onu, J. I (2004). Insect pests of cowpea and groundnut in Girei Local Government Area, Adamawa State. *Nigeria Journal of Entomology* (2004) 21: 137 – 151

Malgwi, A. M., Samaila, A. E., Ilesanmi, J. O. Y. and Oaya, C. S. (2013) Effect of the Groundnut Sucking Bug (*Rhyparochromus littoralis* Dist) on the Oil Content of Groundnut kernels of two Cultivars in Northern Nigeria. *IISTE – Food Science and Quality Management* (Jan. 2013) ~~Vol. 11, PP 11:~~70 – 76 www.iiste.org/fsqm

Osman, A. K., Abdalla, A. M. and Elblaa, T. A. (2009). Biology and damage inflicted by the sesame seed bug, *Elasmolomus sordidus* (Hemiptera: Lygaeidae) on groundnut *Sudan Journal of Agricultural Research* ~~Vol. 14. PP. 14:~~69-80

~~Ranga Rao, G.V. (2010). Postharvest insect pests of groundnut and their management. Information Bulletin No. 84. Patancheru 502 324, Andhra Pradesh, India: International Crops Research Institute for the Semi Arid Tropics. ISBN 978 92 9066 528 1. Order code IBE 084. 20 pp.~~

~~Ranga Rao, G. V., Ramashwar Rao, S. and Nyam, S. N. (2010) Post-harvest Insect pests of groundnut and their Management. Information Bulletin No.84: Patencharu 502 324, Andhra Pradesh, India. International Crops Research Institute for the Semi Arid Tropics. 20pp~~

Samaila, A. E. (2012). The Groundnut Sucking Bug Life Cycle and Biology on Groundnut. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, ISBN 978-3-659-31125-3 Germany.

~~Samaila, A. E., Malgwi, A. M. and Oaya, C. S. (2013) Survey of The Abundance of 'Offa' The Groundnut Sucking Bug (*Rhyparochromus Littoralis* Dist) An Emerging Field Insect Pest of Groundnut in Adamawa Central Senatorial District, Adamawa State Nigeria. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*. 3(5): 110 – 114~~

~~Samaila, A. E. and Malgwi, A. M. (2010) Survey of the Abundance of the Groundnut Sucking Bug (*Rhyparochromus littoralis* Dist): A Field and Storage Pest of Groundnut in Adamawa Central Senatorial District being a paper presented during the 41st Annual Conference of the Entomological Society of Nigeria, (E S.N) held at the Wesley University of Science and technology, Ondo Town, Ondo State. October 2010~~

Samaila, A. E. and Malgwi, A. M. (2012) Biology of the Groundnut Sucking Bug (*Rhyparochromus Littoralis* Dist.) (Heteroptera: Lygaeidae) On Groundnut in Yola, Adamawa State – Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science (IOSR-JAVS)* 1(6):53-57 ~~Volume 1, Issue 6 (Nov. – Dec. 2012), PP 53 – 57~~ www.iosrjournals.org

Samaila, A. E., Malgwi, A. M. and Oaya, C. S. (2013) Survey of The Abundance of 'Offa' The Groundnut Sucking Bug (*Rhyparochromus littoralis* Dist) An Emerging Field Insect Pest of Groundnut in Adamawa Central Senatorial District, Adamawa

Formatted: Right: 0", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering, Widow/Orphan control, Allow hanging punctuation, Font Alignment: Auto, Pattern: Clear

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

State Nigeria. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*. ~~Volume 3: No.5: Pp3(5):~~ -110 - 114

SAS, (2003) Statistical Analysis with SAS/STAT Software for windows 7 server, 2003. Microsoft word, Inc.

Shankarappa, T., Robert, E. R and Virginia, N. (2009) World Geography of Groundnut: Distribution, production, use and trade. www.worldgeography/peanut U.S.A. pp. 1-11

~~Slater, J. A. (1972) The occurrence of *Elasmolomus sordidus* a potential pest of Peanut in Brazil (Hemiptera Lygaeidae) *Biologica* 38: 394—397~~