

Importance of *Spodoptera frugiperda* among Lepidoptera larvae in maize crops in Yamoussoukro (Côte d'Ivoire)

Comment [C. M.1]: Your work is not only on this species of Lepidopterans so there is need to modify the topic

Damage caused by Lepidopteran field pests of maize crop in Yamoussoukro (Côte d'Ivoire)

ABSTRACT

Various larvae of Lepidoptera cause severe damage to maize crops. The dynamics of these maize larvae pests have been studied during all stages of plant development. The trial was carried out on the plots of the farm of the National Institut Polytechnic Houphouët-Boigny in Yamoussoukro. This study aims to monitor the dynamics, determine the importance (frequency and abundance) and assess the damage of Lepidopteran pests of maize. The maize variety EV8728 SR was sown in a completely randomized block pattern with four replicates on 05 September 2020. Insects were collected by direct observation and capture of larvae on the plants. A total of five species grouped into three families, all belonging to the Lepidoptera order, were counted on the plot. *Spodoptera frugiperda* was the most frequent ($C = 20.9\%$) and highly abundant ($Ar = 65.79\%$) species. The other Lepidoptera species were rare ($C < 5\%$). However, *Sesamia calamistis* was very abundant ($Ar=15.22\%$) while *Eldana saccharina* ($Ar=9.44\%$) and *Ostrinia nubilalis* ($Ar=5.25\%$) were abundant. *Helicoverpa zea* is scarcely abundant ($Ar=4.3\%$). Then, three Lepidoptera species (*E. saccharina*, *O. nubilalis* and *H. zea*) were minor pests ($I < 10\%$), while *S. calamistis* was important pest ($I < 25\%$) and *S. frugiperda* was major pest ($I < 75\%$). The populations of the insects fluctuated during crop development. The mean grain yield varied ~~from~~ 2.4 ± 0.42 t/ha to 2.61 ± 0.71 t/ha. Populations of *S. frugiperda* larvae and their damage appear to be more important than those of other Lepidoptera. Knowledge ~~of~~ about the larvae of Lepidoptera maize is the basis for considering an effective and efficient method of managing these pests in order to improve the quality and quantity of maize production.

Keywords: *Spodoptera frugiperda*, Lepidoptera, pests, maize, Côte d'Ivoire

INTRODUCTION

Maize (*Zea mays* L. Poaceae) is one of the most important food crops for both food security and agricultural income of rural populations in West Africa (Midega *et al.*, 2018). It ~~is~~ ^{is} also the most important staple food crop grown predominantly by smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa, (Abate *et al.*, 2017). ~~In this zone, maize occupies~~ occupying more than 36

Formatted: Font: Italic

million hectares of land each year (Abate *et al.*, 2017). In Côte d'Ivoire, maize is mainly produced in the Sudanian and Sudano-Guinean zones by smallholder farmers (Cairns *et al.*, 2013). This crop is in fact the fifth most important food crop in Côte d'Ivoire by tonnage after cassava, plantain, yam and rice (FAO, 2022). National maize production was estimated from 600 000 to 700 000 tonnes per year. However, according to FAO production estimates, and compared to the situation in neighbouring countries, the Ivorian maize sector appears to be rather slow in their growth, slowly growing (RONGEAD, 2014). Despite large production areas and the importance of maize, the average grain yield is less than 1.8 ton/ha (Abate *et al.*, 2017). This may be due to several abiotic and biotic constraints. Among the biotic factors, the damage caused by cereal stem borers is major (Kfir *et al.*, 2002). More recently, however, Nevertheless, an invasive insect *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) also known as the fall armyworm, is becoming a major pest, causing substantial yield losses on maize in the region (Goergen *et al.*, 2016; Kumela *et al.*, 2018). This pest attacks maize and can cause significant damage up to total yield loss (De Almeida *et al.*, 2002). The larvae can feed on many cultivated grasses (Goergen *et al.*, 2016) such as millet, sorghum, rice and sugarcane. It also attacks all above-ground parts of plants including stems, leaves, flowers and ears (De Almeida *et al.*, 2002). Thus, infestations during the development stage of maize lead to yield losses of 15 to 73%, when up to 55 to 100% of the plants are were infested by *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Hruska & Gould, 1997). Furthermore, according to IITA (2016), *Spodoptera frugiperda* larvae appear to be more damaging on maize in West and Central Africa than larvae of most other larvae insect species (IITA, 2016). In Côte d'Ivoire, several Lepidoptera larvae have been reported on maize (Nandjui *et al.*, 2018 ; Moyal & Tran, 2023). Therefore, it is necessary to assess the importance of each Lepidoptera larvae on maize in Côte d'Ivoire. This study aimed to monitor the larval population dynamics, to determine the importance and to assess damage severity of each pest on maize. So, plots were set up and observations were made on plants under natural conditions.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.2]: Move this statement to the appropriate section of your materials and methods.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Experimental design

Twenty (20) elementary plots were set up. The elementary plots covered 81 m² (9m x 9m) and each was 2 m apart from the next plot. Within a plot, there are pots -were separated to 2 m apart. Pots were spaced 0.75 m between rows and 0.5 m on the row. This gave rise to, giving 13 rows and 19 pots per row. So, we had 247 pots per elementary plot, such as a density of 26 667 per hectare. The sowing of the maize variety EV8728 SR was carried out on September

Comment [C. M.3]: This sentence is not clear, please explain.

2020 at two seeds per pot. Subsequently, weeding were done manually during the different stages of plant development (emergence, growth, flowering, fructification and maturation).

Please your write up under this subheading is inadequate. You need to mention specifically the type of design used in this experiment (e. g. Completely Randomized Design Randomized Block Design, Latin Square Design, Split Plot e. t. c). You also need to give clarity on what constitutes your treatments, how many times each treatment was replicated.

Data collectioned

Thirty(30) plants per elementary plot on the central rows, to avoid border effects were observed. Four data were collected: the plants infestation, the damage, the damage severity and the yield. Then, insects were sent to the laboratory for identification. After identification, the occurrence (C) and relative abundance (Ar) of the insects were determined. The occurrence is the ratio of the number of records where the species is found (Pi) to the total number of records (P) (Adja et al., 2014).

$$C (\%) = \frac{P_i}{P} \times 100$$

The authors defined five occurrence classes: ubiquitous species (C = 100%), constant species (50% ≤ C < 100%), frequent species (20% ≤ C < 50%), accessory species (5% ≤ C < 20%) and sparse species (C < 5%).

The relative abundance expresses the ratio between the number of individuals of a species (Ni) considered and the total number of individuals of all species combined (N) (Adja et al., 2014).

$$Ar = \frac{N_i}{N} \times 100$$

They defined five relative abundance classes: very abundant species (Ar ≥ 50%), medium abundant species (10% ≤ Ar < 50%), moderate abundant species (5% ≤ Ar < 10%), little species (1% ≤ Ar < 5%) and Very little species (Ar < 1%).

In addition, damage was assessed by visually estimating the plant health status (unattacked and attacked plants) and the degree of damage caused by insect pests on stems, leaves, flowers and cobs of plants by assigning an index code. Six indexes ranging from 0 to 5 were selected based on the scoring scale proposed by Sally-Sy (2013) and adapted (Table 1). The percentage of plants or cobs attacked per treatment were then calculated according to the damage indices.

Comment [C. M.4]: Please discuss this subheading under the following :
1. Identification, occurrence (C) and relative abundance (Ar) of insect pests on the maize plant

2. Assessment of damage caused by the insect pests

This will help to improve readability of this section of the manuscript.

Comment [C. M.5]: After what length of time ?

Comment [C. M.6]: Please state clearly how you collected data for each of the parameters you itemized here.

Comment [C. M.7]: Insect identification should come under a separate subheading. Details of the taxonomic features used should be given and citation on the identification guide used should be provided.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.8]: Who are they ?

Comment [C. M.9]: Are you sure that you really mean index ? The sentence seem to talk about one index with six codes, categories or levels.....

Table 1. Damage severity index (Sally-Sy., 2013) adapted

Index code	Severity damage	Observation	Estimated health status
0	No visible damage	No visible attack	
1	From 1 to 10% of damage	Isolated attacks	
2	From 10 to 25% of damage	Moderate attacks	
3	From 25 to 50% of damage	Medium attacks	
4	From 50 to 75% of damage	Heavy attacks	
5	More than 75% of damage	Plants destroyed	

Comment [C. M.10]: This value is also contained in code 2

Comment [C. M.11]: This value is also contained in code 3

Comment [C. M.12]: This value is also contained in code 4

Comment [C. M.13]: Do you mean 75% ?

Therefore, a damage intensification index was calculated to determine the species whose damage is detrimental to the crop. This calculation was inspired by the method of Alene *et al.* (2006). Depending on the level of attack, percentages were attributed. They were estimated at 10% for plants with low level attacks, 25% for plants with moderate level attacks, 50% for those with medium level attacks, 75% for severe level attacks and 100% for destroyed plants. The damage intensification index (I) was evaluated.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.14]: Is this different from what you have in Table 1.

What is the difference between damage diversity index, damage intensification index and damage severity index ?

Damage intensification index

$$I = \frac{((N1 \times 10\%) + (N2 \times 25\%) + (N3 \times 50\%) + (N4 \times 75\%) + (N5 \times 100\%))}{(N0 + N1 + N2 + N3 + N4 + N5)}$$

I: damage intensification index per plot ; N0: number of healthy plants; N1: number of plants with low level of attack; N2: number of plants with moderate level of attack ; N3: number of plants showing medium level of attack; N4: number of plants showing severe attacks; N5: number of plants showing very severe attacks.

The values of the damage intensity index were grouped into five classes established by Aléne *et al.* (2006): low damage: ($I_1 \leq 10\%$); moderate damage: ($10\% < I_2 \leq 25\%$); medium damage: ($25\% < I_3 \leq 50\%$); important damage: ($50\% < I_4 \leq 75\%$); and High damage: ($75\% < I_5 \leq 100\%$). Based on this classification of the damage, the following categorization of insect pests has been proposed: as minor pests are those with low intensity of damage (I_1); important pests are those with moderate to medium intensity damage (I_2 and I_3); major pests are those with high or very high intensity of damage (I_4 and I_5). Yield was assessed by the weigh of the dried grains on 30 plots, using an electronic scale with a capacity of 2 kg.

Comment [C. M.15]: You earlier mentioned 20 plots or do you mean 30 plants ? per plot

Data Analysis

The data were analysed using Microsoft Excel 2010 and STATISTICA 10.1 for Windows. The STATISTICA 10.1 software was used to perform the analysis of variance. In the case of a significant difference ($\alpha=0.05$), the Duncan's test was used to identify the different homogeneous groups. For plant damage, the percentage of plants attacked is determined according to the damage indices for each treatment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Specie inventories, occurrence and abundance

Five species of Lepidoptera larvae belonging three families were collected from the maize plants. The most diverse family is the Noctuidae with three species: *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Figure 1a), *Helicoverpa zea* (Figure 1b) and *Sesamia calamistis* (Figure 1c). The other two insects were *Ostrinia nubilalis* (Figure 1d) Crambidae and *Eldana saccharina* (Figure 1e) Pyralidae. All these insects were maize plants pests. Considering the occurrence and relative abundance, *S. frugiperda* was frequent specie ($C = 22.9\%$) and very abundant ($Ar = 64.39\%$). Then, *S. calamistis* was accessory ($C = 5.5\%$) and medium abundant ($Ar=15.46\%$). The other Lepidoptera species were sparse ($C < 5\%$). Then, *E. saccharina* was medium abundant ($Ar=10.31\%$) while and *O. nubilalis* ($Ar=5.15\%$) was moderate abundant and *H. zea* was little abundant ($Ar=4.69\%$) (Table 2).

Comment [C. M.16]: Not clear






Figure 1. Main Lepidoptera larvae collected on maize plant

Larva of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (a), Larva of *Helicoverpa zea* (b), Larva of *Sesamia calamistis* (c), Larva of *Ostrinia nubilalis* (d) and Larva of *Eldana saccharina* (e)

Table 2. Inventory, occurrence and abundance of Lepidoptera larvae collected on maize plants

Families	Species	Occurrence	Relative abundance
Noctuidae	<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>	22.9	64.39
	<i>Sesamia calamistis</i>	5.5	15.46
	<i>Helicoverpa zea</i>	1.67	4.69
Crambidae	<i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i>	1.83	5.15
Pyralidae	<i>Eldana saccharina</i>	3.67	10.31
03	05		100

Comment [C. M.17]: Provide abbreviations as used in description of your Table above.

In addition, you are supposed to refer to the Table where applicable in your description and explanation of the result.

Evolution of populations of Lepidoptera larvae in maize plots

Comment [C. M.18]: Is it really an evolution ?

S. frugiperda larvae were present at the emergence of maize plants with a mean of 4.3 ± 1.66 individuals on 30 plants per elementary plot (Table 3). The larval population of this insect fluctuated from the growth to the maturation (Figure 2). The populations were high during all the maize plant development (3.9 ± 1.43 to 8.1 ± 2.63). *S. calamistis* and *E. saccharina* larval populations decreased from the emergence (2.5 ± 1.32 and 2.55 ± 1.14) to the fructification (0.2 ± 0.4 and 2.5 ± 1.32). Those species were absent at the maturation. However, the populations of *H. zea* and *O. nubilalis* were absent during the emergence and growth (Figure 2). The larvae of those insects appeared during flowering (0.7 ± 0.86 and 0.75 ± 0.78) and increased until maturation (0.8 ± 0.76 and 1.3 ± 0.84) (Figure 2). Furthermore, there were

Comment [C. M.19]: Figure 2 seems to be a repetition of Table 3.

significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between insect larval populations. In addition, *S. frugiperda* larvae were significantly higher than the other species larvae at all the maize plant development (Table 3).

Comment [C. M.20]: Is it for all the insect population ?

Comment [C. M.21]: Table 3 seems to be a repetition of Figure 2




Figure 2. Evolution of the populations of Lepidoptera larvae according to maize plant development

Comment [C. M.22]: Is it really an evolution ?

Table 3. Mean populations of Lepidoptera larvae per plot according to maize plant development

	Emergence	Growth	Flowering	Fructification	Maturation
<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>	4.30±1.66 c	8.05±1.94 d	6.9±4.01 b	8.1±2.63 c	7±2.15 c
<i>Sesamia calamistis</i>	2.55±1.14 b	3.05±1.8 c	1.6±1.63 a	1.05±1.03 b	0.0±0.0 a
<i>Eldana saccharina</i>	2.5±1.32 b	1.65±1.35 b	1.15±1.08 a	0.2±0.4 a	0.0±0.0 a
<i>Helicoverpa zea</i>	0.0±0.0 a	0.0±0.0 a	0.7±0.86 a	0.5±0.69 ab	1.3±0.84 b
<i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i>	0.0±0.0 a	0.0±0.0 a	0.75±0.78 a	1.2±1.51 b	0.8±0.76 b
F	115.613	207.747	32.717	167.922	503.884
P	0,0001	0,00001	0,0001	0,0001	0,0001

Comment [C. M.23]: All the alphabets should come as superscripts.

5.1.3. Assessment of damage and severity caused by Lepidoptera larvae

Comment [C. M.24]: Severity of what ?

During emergence, 78.83% of the plants were healthy (index 0) while 21.17% were attacked (index 1 to 5) on all the plots (Figures 3a and 3b). These attacks were caused by *S. frugiperda* which presented medium damage ($I=32.76$), *S. calamistis* ($I=12.5$) and *E. saccharina* ($I=10.9$) which presented moderate damage. During the growth, 67.5% of the plants

were healthy (index 0) while 32.5% were attacked (index 1 to 5) on all the plots (Figures 3 c and 3d). These attacks were caused by *S. frugiperda* which presented high damage (I=61.96), *S. calamistis* with moderate damage (I=14.25) and *E. saccharina* with minor damage (I=6.45). During flowering, 63% of the plants were healthy (index 0), while 37% were attacked (index 1 to 5) on all the plots (Figure 3e). These attacks were caused by *S. frugiperda* with high damage (I=50.26), *S. calamistis* with moderate damage (I=10.6) and *E. saccharina* (I=4.9), *H. zea* (I=3.25) and *O. nubilalis* (I=3.1) with minor damage. During fructification, 64.67% of the plants were healthy (index 0), while 35.33% were attacked (index 1 to 5) on all the plots (Figure 3f and 3g). These attacks were caused by *S. frugiperda* with high damage (I=62.01) and *S. calamistis* (I=2.25), *E. saccharina* (I=0.55), *H. zea* (I=2.95) and *O. nubilalis* (I=6.85) with minor damage. During maturation, 66.17% of the plants were healthy (index 0) while 33.83% were attacked (index 1 to 5) on all the plots (Figure 3h). These attacks were caused by *S. frugiperda* with high damage (I=52.89), *S. calamistis* (I=4.85), *H. zea* (I=6.85) and *O. nubilalis* (I=4) with minor damage.

Table 4. Damage intensification index of Lepidoptera larvae according to maize plant development

Lepidoptera larvae	Emergence	Growth	Flowering	Fructification	Maturation
<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>	32.76	61.96	50.26	62.01	52.86
<i>Sesamia calamistis</i>	12.5	14.25	10.6	2.25	4.85
<i>Eldana saccharina</i>	10.9	6.45	4.9	0.55	00
<i>Helicoverpa zea</i>	0	0	3.25	2.95	6.85
<i>Ostrinia nubilalis</i>	0	0	6.85	6.85	4




Figure 3. Damage observed on maize at different stages of development Damage at Emergence (a ; b), Growth (c ; d), Flowering (e), Fructification (f ; g) and Maturation (h)

5.1.4. Yield assessment

The yield of dried grains varies between 2.4 ± 0.42 t/ha and 2.61 ± 0.71 t/ha. The weight of 100 seeds varied between 32.67 ± 3.05 and 34.67 ± 0.57 g.

Comment [C. M.25]: Where is the Table or Figure showing this results ?

5.2. Discussion

This study carried out in Yamoussoukro (centre of Côte d'Ivoire) revealed five Lepidoptera larvae (*Spodoptera frugiperda*, *Sesamia calamistis*, *Eldana saccharina*, *Helicoverpa zea* and *Ostrinia nubilalis*) on maize plants. Several Lepidoptera larvae have been reported on maize in Côte d'Ivoire (Bosque-Perez N. A., 1995 ; Nandjui *et al.*, 2018 ; Moyal & Tran, 2023). Among the Lepidoptera insects encountered in this study, *S. frugiperda* is the most recent in Côte d'Ivoire. In fact, outbreaks of *S. frugiperda* were first observed in southwest Nigerian maize fields in January 2016 (IITA, 2016), and shortly thereafter in Benin and Togo (Goergen *et al.*, 2016) and later in Ghana since 2017 (Cock *et al.*, 2017). Depending on the appearance of the migrating adults and climate, fall armyworm can have up to eight

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.26]: Which of the species did you refer to as the fall armyworm ? please specify.

generations per year in maize fields in tropical areas (Busato *et al.*, 2005). It did not enter into diapause. Seasonal migration is a major factor in the life history of fall armyworm and it is considered one of the most mobile noctuid crop pests (Nagoshi & Meagher, 2008). The fall armyworm is a highly polyphagous destructivemigratory pest (De Almeida *et al.*, 2002 ; Georgen *et al.*, 2016) which have and has been an established in all the countries of west africa and in the whole Africa continent (CABI, 2023 ; Kalyebi *et al.*, 2023). The moths generally disperse about 500 km before oviposition, which is sufficient to move from seasonally and colonise various agroecological areas (Senay *et al.*, 2022). Starkly, over half (52.5%) of the African maize area deemed suitable for fall armyworm is also at risk from a further nine pests, while over a third (38.1%) of the area is susceptible to an additional 10 pests (Saney *et al.*, 2022). Three of the Lepidoptera larvae encountered in this study were minor pests. They were sparse and medium abundant (*E. saccharina*) or moderate abundant (*O. nubilalis* and *H. zea*). *S. calamistis* was important pest. It was accessory and medium abundant. *S. frugiperda* was major pest. It was frequent and very abundant. In Kenya, De Groote *et al.* (2020) reported that *S. frugiperda* is an important pest that arrived suddenly and spread very quickly, destroying about a third of the harvest and that farmers estimate the losses it causes at about one-third of their maize crop. Almost all of Africa's maize crop is at risk from the devastating fall armyworm pest (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) (CABI, 2023). This organization have highlighted how almost the entire African maize crop is grown in areas with climates that support seasonal infestations of the pest. Moreover, the yield of dried grains varies between 2.4±0.42 t/ha to 2.61±0.71 t/ha. Nandjui *et al.* (2018) in Côte d'Ivoire, obtained 1.64 to 2.34 t/ha. Balla *et al.* (2019) in India, estimated yield at 1.88 and 1.84 tons/ha, during 2018 and 2019 respectively without accounting for fall armyworm damage. Further, yield losses due to fall armyworm was estimated at 33%. Then, yield loss varied between management strategies, with genetically modified and/or insecticide treated crops typically retaining higher yields (Overton *et al.*, 2021).

CONCLUSION

This study aims to monitor the dynamics, determine the importance (frequency and abundance) and assess the damage of Lepidopteran pests of maize. It^s revealed five species grouped into three families, were counted on the plot. This study showed that *Spodoptera frugiperda* was the major pest on maize plant. It was the most frequent and highly abundant species. *Sesamia calamistis* was important pest and the other Lepidopteran species

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.27]: This statement is not linked to your work or anyother statement in your work.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.28]: This is not clear.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.29]: This is not in your result. Please recast this stetment to suit exactly what you want to express.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.30]: Is this one among the three that you just spoke about ?

Comment [C. M.31]: Your sentences here seem disjointed

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.32]: Which organization are you talking about ?

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.33]: ??????

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [C. M.34]: This is a hanging sentence

(*Sesamia calamistis*, *Eldana saccharina* and *Ostrinia nubilalis*) were minor pests. The populations of the insects fluctuated during crop development. The average dried grain yield varied ~~of~~ from 2.4 ± 0.42 t/ha to 2.61 ± 0.71 t/ha. Populations of *S. frugiperda* larvae and their damage appear to be more important than those of other Lepidoptera. Knowledge ~~of~~ about the larvae of Lepidoptera maize is the basis for considering an effective and efficient method of managing these pests in order to improve the quality and quantity of maize production.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

REFERENCES

Abate, T., Fisher, M., Abdoulaye, T., Kassie, G.T., Lunduka, R., Marenya, P., Asnake, W. (2017). Characteristics of maize cultivars in Africa: how modern are they and how many do smallholder farmers grow? *Agric. Dry food*, 6:30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-017-0108-6>.

Adja N. A., Danho M., Alabi T. A. F., Gnago A. J., Zimmer J-Y, Francis F., Kouassi K. P., Baudoin J-P & Zoro Bi I. A. (2014). Entomofauna associated with the cultivation of African oilseed cucurbits (*Lagenaria siceraria* Molina (Standl. 1930) and *Citrullus lanatus* Thumb (Matsum & Nakai 1916)) and the impact of pests on production. *Annals of the Entomological Society of France (N.S.): International Journal of Entomology*, 50: 3-4, 301-310.

Alène D, Messi J. & Quilici S. (2006). Influence of shade on the susceptibility of seedlings of *Ricinodendron heudelotii* (Baill.) to attacks by *Diclidoplebia xuani* in a natural environment in Cameroon. *Fruit*, 61(4): 273-280. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/fruit:2006025>.

Balla A., Bhaskar M., Bagade P. & Rawal N. (2019). Yield losses in maize (*Zea mays*) due to fall armyworm infestation and potential IoT-based interventions for its control. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, E-ISSN: 2320-7078 P-ISSN: 2349-6800 JEZS, 7(5): 920-927.

Bosque-Perez N.A. (1995). Major insects pests of maize in Africa: biology and control. ITA Research Guide 30. Second edftion. Training Program, International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA). Ibadan, Nigeria. 30 p.

Busato, G.R., Grützmacher, A.D., Garcia, M.S., Giolo, F.P., Zotti, M.J., Bandeira, J.M. (2005). Term requirements and estimates of the number of biotopic strains “milho” and “arroz” of *Spodoptera frugiperda*. *Pesquisa Agropecuaria Brasileira*, 40: 329-335.

CABI (2023). Almost all of Africa's maize crop is at risk from devastating fall armyworm pest, study reveals. *Science News, from research organizations*.

Carins J.E., Hellin J., Sonder K., Araus J.L., MacRobert J.F., Thierfelder C., Prasanna M. (2013). Adapting maize production to climate change in sub-Saharan Africa. *Food security*, 5 : 345-360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-013-0256-x>.

Cock M.J.W., Beseh P.K. Buddie A.G., Cafa G. & Crozier J. (2017). Molecular methods to detect *Spodoptera frugiperda* in Ghana, and implications for monitoring the spread of invasive species in developing countries. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 4103. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-04238>.

De Almeida Sarmiento R, de Souza Aguiar RW, de Souza Almeida Sarmiento, Aguiar R, Vieira SMJ, de Oliveira HG, Holtz AM. (2002). Biology review, occurrence and control of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera, Noctuidae) in corn. *Brazil. Biosci J.*, 18 : 41-8.

De Groote H., Kimenju S.C., Munyua B., Palmes S., Kassie M. & Bruce A. (2020). Spread and impact of fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda* J.E. Smith) in maize production areas of Kenya. *ELSEVIER, Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 292. 106804. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106804>.

FAO (2022).Rapports de synthèse par pays. Système mondial d'information et d'alerte rapide (SMIAR).

Goergen G., Kumar P.L., Sankung S.B., Togola A. & Tamò M. (2016). First report of outbreaks of the fall armyworm *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith) (Lepidoptera, noctuidae), a new alien invasive pest in West and central Africa. *PloS One* (2016) 11 : e0165632. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0165632.

Hruska A. & Gould F. (1997). Fall Armyworm (Lepidoptera : Noctuidae) and *Diatraea lineolata* (Lepidoptera : Pyralidae) : Impact of Larval Population Level and Temporal Occurrence on Maize Yield in Nicaragua. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 90 (2) : 611-622 DOI:10.1093/jee/90.2.611. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jab.v127i1.6>.

IITA (2016). First report of outbreaks of the "Fall Armyworm" on the African continent. IITA Bulletin, No. 2330. <http://bulletin.iita.org/index.php/2016/06/18/first-report-of-outbreaks-of-the-fallarmyworm-on-the-african-continent/>

Kalyebi A., Otim M. H., Tom Walsh T. & Tay W.T. (2013).Farmer perception of impacts of fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda* J.E. Smith) and transferability of its management practices in Uganda. 4(9). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43170-023-00150-w>

Kfir, R., Overholt, W.A., Khan, Z.R., Polaszek, A. (2002). Biology and management of economically important lepidopteran cereal stem borers in Africa. *Ann. Rev. Entomol.* 47, 701-731. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.47.091201.145254>.

Kumela, T., Simiyu, J., Sisay, B., Likhayo, P., Mendesil, E., Gohole, L., Tefera, T. (2018). Farmers' knowledge, perceptions, and management practices of the new invasive pest, fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) in Ethiopia and Kenya. *Int. J. Pest Manage.* <https://doi.org/10.1080/09670874.2017.1423129>.

Midega C. A. O., Pittchar J. O., Pickett J. A., Hailu G. W., Khan Z. R. (2018). A climate-adapted push-pull system effectively controls fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J E Smith), in maize in East Africa. *ELSEVIER, Crop Protection*, 105 : 10-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2017.11.003>.

Moyal P. & Tran M. (2023). Morphological study of the preimaginal stages of maize borer Lepidoptera in the savannah zone of Côte d'Ivoire. *Annals of the Entomological Society of France (N.S). International journal of Entomology*, 25(4): 461-472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21686351.1989.12277602>.

Nagoshi, R.N. & Meagher, R.L., (2008). Review of fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) genetic complexity and migration. *Fla. Entomol.* 91, 546-554. <https://doi.org/10.1653/0015-4040-91.4.546>.

Nandjui J., Adja N. A., Kouadio K. T., N'gouand M-P A. & Idrissou L. (2018). Impact of Soil Fertility Management Practices on Insect Pests and Diseases of Maize in Southwest Cote d'Ivoire. *Journal of Applied Biosciences*, 127: 12809-12820. ISSN 1997-5902.

Overton K., Maino J.L., Day R., Umina P.A., Bett B., Carnovale D., Ekesi S., Meagher R. & Reynolds O.L. (2021). Global crop impacts, yield losses and action thresholds for fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*): A review. *ELSEVIER, Crop Protection*, 145. 105641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2021.105641>.

RONGEAD (2014). Diagnosis of the maize sector in Côte d'Ivoire. Project "Revitalizing production, market access and agricultural advice for the food and commercial sectors of northern Côte d'Ivoire". Cooperation European Union – Republic of Côte d'Ivoire FLEX-FED Program / 2013/324 233. RONGEAD – NGO CHIGATA. www.rongead.org.

Sall-Sy D. (2013). Update on the monitoring of cabbage pests in the Niayes. ISRA/ CDH/ UCAD/ AUMN, Senegal, 25 p.

Senay S.D., Pardey P.G., Chai Y., Doughty L. & Day R. (2022). Fall armyworm from a maize multi-peril pest risk perspective. Forehead. Insect Sci., 19 December 2022. Sec. Invasive Insect Species: 2 – 2022. <https://doi.org/10.3389/finsc.2022.971396>.

UNDER PEER REVIEW