Innate positive chemotaxis to paeonal from highly attractive Chinese medicinal herbs in the cigarette beetle, *Lasioderma serricorne*
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*Lasioderma serricorne*, also known as cigarette beetle, can exploit a wide variety of stored materials as foods, but it is particularly common on tobacco and herbs. This beetle is a dominant pest species of stored Chinese medicinal materials (CMMs) causing high economic damages, making effective control strategies urgently needed. Behavioural manipulation is an important component of Integrated Pest Management. To the best of our knowledge, plant-borne volatile organic compounds (VOCs) have never been explored to develop lures for managing *L. serricorne*. In this study, the behavioural responses of *L. serricorne* to VOCs from four selected CMMs (*Euphorbia kansui*, *Aconitum carmichaelii*, *Eucommia ulmoides* and *Pinellia ternata*) were studied and their components analysed. Then, the olfactory responses of *L. serricorne* to the most abundant VOC identified in the preferred CMM, i.e., paeonal, was tested. *L. serricorne* showed significant differences in its preferences for the VOCs from the four CMMs, i.e., *E. kansui* > *A. carmichaelii* > *E. ulmoides* > *P. ternata*. From the VOCs of *E. kansui*, *A. carmichaelii*, *E. ulmoides*, and *P. ternata*, 77, 74, 56, and 81 molecules, were identified, respectively. Paeonal (23.5%), junipene (17.2%), hexanal (17.1%), and benzeneacetonitrile (14.0%) were the most abundant, respectively. Since paeonal dominated the VOC spectrum of the most preferred CMM, this compound was selected for further studies. *L. serricorne* showed significant positive responses to paeonal tested at various doses, with the most attractive ones being 100 \(\mu\)g and 500 \(\mu\)g. Our findings shed light on the olfactory cues routing the food searching behaviour in the cigarette beetle, providing important information on how *L. serricorne* targets particular CMMs. The high attractiveness of paeonal at low doses tested here may be exploited further to develop novel monitoring and control tools (e.g., lure-and-kill strategies) against this important stored product pest.
have resulted owing to their repeated and overzealous use\(^1\)--\(^11\). In addition, the abuse or intensive use of synthetic chemical pesticides has driven some species to the edge of, or into, extinction\(^11\). The negative ecological and health impacts have attracted research and public opinion attention\(^9\). Therefore, available alternatives to chemical insecticides against stored-product pests are urgently required\(^13\)--\(^18\).

There is a long history of using botanical insecticides to protect stored products from insect pests\(^19\),\(^20\). Various repellents and attractants, which have functional components derived from specific plants, have been applied to manipulate insect behaviour, effectively protecting stored products from pest infestation\(^14\),\(^21\),\(^22\). Thus, there is a keen interest in the development of botanical pesticides\(^23\),\(^24\).

Behavioural manipulation is an important and eco-friendly insect control method aimed to exploit behavioural responses of insects to selected cues from the environment, to manage pest populations\(^21\). Host-plant volatiles can significantly influence host location behaviour of insects\(^25\). For stored-product beetles, several pest species, including Sitophilus granarius Linnaeus (Curculionidae), S. zeamais Motschulsky (Curculionidae), Oryzaephilus surinamensis Linnaeus (Sylvanidae) and Callosobruchus maculatus Fabricius (Bruchidae) are attracted to the volatiles of wheat, peas, maize, chickpeas, or other stored food products\(^26\)--\(^29\). Therefore, it is reasonable to attempt developing effective attractants or repellents based on the components of mixtures of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from specific stored products, which could be used for the management or behavioural manipulation of stored-product pests.

Nowadays, several cues attractive to L. serricorne have been investigated, attempting various monitoring and control approaches\(^30\). About physical stimuli, both sexes are attracted by UV lights, therefore electric traps have been used\(^31\)--\(^33\). Concerning olfactory ones, female pheromones, i.e., anhydrosericorin 2,6-diethyl-3,5-dimethyl-3,4-dihydro-2H-pyran\(^34\) and sericorin 4,6,7,8-tetrahydro-3-oxo-3H-1-benzopyran-3-one as 4S, 6S, 7S\(^35\),\(^36\), have been synthesized and used as to as trap lures for pest monitoring\(^37\)--\(^41\). From a real-world perspective, commercial traps (commonly known as Lasiotrap) and specially designed multisurface traps have been successfully proposed for mass-trapping and delaying cigarette beetle infestation in tobacco stores\(^42\).

Despite the rather wide knowledge about the light cues and sex pheromones attractive to L. serricorne beetles, information on the plant-borne VOCs potentially useful to improve monitoring and mass-trapping tools remains limited. Notably, even if adult females scarcely feed\(^43\),\(^44\), it has been stressed that they are attracted by foods suitable for their oviposition\(^45\). Later, Papadopoulou and Buchelos pointed out that tablets containing herbal extracts can be placed in traps to boost their attractiveness\(^46\). However, the composition of herbal extracts is often hard to standardize from a chemical point of view, due to the large phytochemical variations linked with the plant geographical origin, growing conditions and harvesting time\(^46\),\(^47\). Thus, assessing the effectiveness of pure compounds isolated from botanical products is important for real-world applications. In this scenario, one may argue: what do we really know about the attraction of cigarette beetles to VOCs from stored Chinese medicinal materials (CMMs)? Are selected pure compounds from CMM VOC bouquets attractive to them? Do they show a dose-dependent bioactivity?

Indeed, L. serricorne is usually found in economically important stored products, such as tobacco and traditional CMMs\(^48\),\(^49\). In China, it causes major losses to the CMMs industry during storage in Guizhou Province\(^49\). Nowadays, several cues attractive to L. serricorne have been investigated, attempting various monitoring and control approaches\(^50\). About physical stimuli, both sexes are attracted by UV lights, therefore electric traps have been used\(^31\)--\(^33\). Concerning olfactory ones, female pheromones, i.e., anhydrosericorin 2,6-diethyl-3,5-dimethyl-3,4-dihydro-2H-pyran\(^34\) and sericorin 4,6,7,8-tetrahydro-3-oxo-3H-1-benzopyran-3-one as 4S, 6S, 7S\(^35\),\(^36\), have been synthesized and used as to as trap lures for pest monitoring\(^37\)--\(^41\). From a real-world perspective, commercial traps (commonly known as Lasiotrap) and specially designed multisurface traps have been successfully proposed for mass-trapping and delaying cigarette beetle infestation in tobacco stores\(^42\).

Despite the rather wide knowledge about the light cues and sex pheromones attractive to L. serricorne beetles, information on the plant-borne VOCs potentially useful to improve monitoring and mass-trapping tools remains limited. Notably, even if adult females scarcely feed\(^43\),\(^44\), it has been stressed that they are attracted by foods suitable for their oviposition\(^45\). Later, Papadopoulou and Buchelos pointed out that tablets containing herbal extracts can be placed in traps to boost their attractiveness\(^46\). However, the composition of herbal extracts is often hard to standardize from a chemical point of view, due to the large phytochemical variations linked with the plant geographical origin, growing conditions and harvesting time\(^46\),\(^47\). Thus, assessing the effectiveness of pure compounds isolated from botanical products is important for real-world applications. In this scenario, one may argue: what do we really know about the attraction of cigarette beetles to VOCs from stored Chinese medicinal materials (CMMs)? Are selected pure compounds from CMM VOC bouquets attractive to them? Do they show a dose-dependent bioactivity?

Indeed, L. serricorne is usually found in economically important stored products, such as tobacco and traditional CMMs\(^48\),\(^49\). In China, it causes major losses to the CMMs industry during storage in Guizhou Province\(^49\). Notably, the damage levels vary among the different CMMs, indicating a certain host preference for this pest. However, there is strictly limited information on the behavioral responses of L. serricorne to VOCs from these CMMs and their relative abundances were analyzed by headspace solid-phase microextraction (SPME) coupled with gas chromatography–mass spectrometry (GC–MS), and then the behavioural responses of L. serricorne to the most abundant compound - identified from the most preferred VOC spectrum of CMMs - were tested in Y-tube and six-arm olfactometer assays.

**Materials and Methods**

**Insects rearing.** Lasioderma serricorne was reared in our laboratory since 2015, maintaining the beetles on the CMMs Angelica sinensis Oliver (Apiaceae) and Pinellia ternata Breitenbach (Arales: Araceae) are four widely planted CMMs of important economic value in China that are damaged, to different degrees, by L. serricorne. However, to the best of our knowledge, CMMs-borne olfactory cues routing food location in L. serricorne have been scarcely studied.

Therefore, in this research, to explore the importance of chemical cues routing L. serricorne host preference, the olfactory responses of L. serricorne adults to VOCs emitted from the four CMMs reported above were studied in Y-tube olfactometer bioassays. Furthermore, to develop potential novel lures to be used against L. serricorne for monitoring and control purposes, VOCs from these CMMs and their relative abundances were analyzed by headspace solid-phase microextraction (SPME) coupled with gas chromatography–mass spectrometry (GC–MS), and then the behavioural responses of L. serricorne to the most abundant compound - identified from the most preferred VOC spectrum of CMMs - were tested in Y-tube and six-arm olfactometer assays.

**Odor sources.** CMMs E. kansui, A. carmichaelii, E. ulmoides, and P. ternata (moisture content 11–15%, 11–15%, 8–11%, and 12–14%, respectively) were purchased from the Chinese Traditional Medicine Market (Guiyang City, Guizhou Province, China), and stored free of pesticides or pest infestations. As the main medicinal parts differed from the four CMMs and were stored for medical treatment, the roots from E. kansui and A. carmichaelii, barks from E. ulmoides and tubers from P. ternata were used for experiments in this study.

**Y-tube bioassays.** The olfactory responses of L. serricorne were tested in a Y-tube olfactometer (stem 195 mm long, each arm 130 mm long at a 135° angle, all 15-mm i.d.) using the method recently described by Ndomo-Moualou et al.\(^39\) and Cao et al.\(^35\). Two types of two-way comparisons were made: (1) each CMM (25 g) versus clean air (CA); and (2) all possible CMM pairings (25 g each). Unmated adult L. serricorne (2–3 days old)
were used in these experiments. Air flow was set as 200 mL/min/arm, the air flow was passing through activated charcoal (for purification) and distilled water (for humidification) before entering in each odour chamber and then in each arm of the Y-tube. In total, 50 adults were used to test each odour treatment, with the olfactometer cleaned after each tested beetle, as described by Carpi et al. The arm positions were reversed to avoid positional bias after 5 individuals were tested, and the Y-tube olfactometer was replaced with a fresh one after 10 beetles were tested. All bioassays were conducted between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

To understand whether there was any intrinsic bias within the olfactometer, 24 runs were carried out with CA passing through each empty chamber and with unmated insects, 24 different L. serricorne adults (2–3 days old) were tested individually. The time required for the insect to make a choice was recorded. If the beetle had not made a choice after 30 min, another beetle was tested. The longest time taken for all the responding insects was recorded and used as the maximum run time in subsequent tests.

To understand whether L. serricorne could distinguish between odour stimuli and CA, 30 runs were carried out with 25 g of A. sinensis (feeding materials used for rearing L. serricorne) in one branch and CA in the other branch. Equal numbers of male and female beetles were tested.

**Collection and analysis of volatiles.** The collection and analysis of CMM VOCs were conducted as recently detailed by Cao et al. Different CMMs (each 2.0 g) were placed in glass bottles for 2 h to confine the odour, and then headspace volatiles were collected using a solid-phase microextraction (SPME) fiber. A manual injector and a ∼50/30 μm DVB/CAR/PDMS StableFlex fiber head was inserted into the mouth of the bottle. VOCs were extracted for 40 min at 80 °C, then the fibre head was quickly removed and inserted into the injection port of the gas chromatograph (GC) (250 °C, run in splitless sampling mode). The collected VOCs were analyzed by GC–MS (HP6890/5975 C, Agilent Technologies). An apolar chromatographic column (ZB-5MSI 5% phenyl-95% dimethylpolysiloxane 30 m × 0.25 mm, film thickness 0.25 μm) was used. Temperature was programmed to rise from 40 to 255 °C with a 5 °C/min rate, and then maintained for 2 min. The temperatures of the vaporizing chamber, interface, and quadrupole rod were set at 250 °C, 280 °C, and 150 °C, respectively. The chemical identities of the peaks that were mainly present in CMMs were determined by comparing the mass spectra of compounds with those in databases (NIST 2017 and WILEY 275). Moreover, the coherence of the temperature-programmed retention indices (RIs) with respect to those recorded in Adams and NIST was used as an additional criterion for peak assignment. Spectra and retention times were also compared with those of authentic standards, which were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich, Germany. However, the tentative identification of compounds was not confirmed in this study. Additional parameters were as follows: delay time of solvent, 1.0 min; ion source, EI; ionization potential, 70 eV; emission current, 34.6 μA; voltage of the multiplier, 1671 V; and scanning from 29 to 500 atomic mass units.

**Behavioural responses of L. serricorne to paeonal from E. kansui VOCs.** The VOC mixture from E. kansui was the most attractive to L. serricorne, as assessed by the Y-tube olfactometer bioassays. Therefore, since paeonal was the most abundant compound identified from the VOCs of E. kansui, the behavioral responses of L. serricorne to paeonal were tested as follows.

**Odour treatment.** Paeonal (Sigma-Aldrich, Germany; chemical purity 99%) solutions (i.e., 0.1, 1, 10, 50 and 100 μg l⁻¹) were prepared with mineral oil (Sigma-Aldrich, Germany). Solutions were stored at −20 °C until the testing phase.

**Y-tube bioassays.** The Y-tube olfactometer described above was also used here to test the olfactory responses of L. serricorne to paeonal. Mineral oil was used as a control, a test (at the concentrations detailed above, ranging from 0.1 to 100 μg l⁻¹) or control (10 μl of paeonal solution or mineral oil, respectively) stimulus was adsorbed onto a filter paper disk (1.0-cm diameter) placed in the odor chamber. L. serricorne beetles can choose between a specific dose of the tested stimulus (1, 10, 100, 500, and 1000 μg) and the mineral oil. Bioassays were conducted using the method detailed above; 2–3 days old unmated L. serricorne adults were tested. In total, 50 adults were tested per each cue and compared with mineral oil.

**Six-arm olfactometer bioassays.** The behavioural responses of adult L. serricorne to different doses of paeonal were also evaluated in a six-arm olfactometer in agreement with the method reported in Liu et al. Briefly, the six-arm olfactometer consisted of a central chamber (12-cm internal diameter) with six arms (6-cm length and 1.5-cm internal diameter), each connected to a glass tube (20-cm length and 1.5-cm diameter) that projected outwards at an equidistance, with 60° angles between pairs of tubes. Each arm was connected through Teflon tubing to a glass vessel, which was used to contain a test or control stimulus (10 μl). Paeonal doses of 1, 10, 100, 500, and 1000 μg were used as test stimuli, and the airflow was set at 200 ml/min to drive the odour source to insects. L. serricorne (2–3 days old adults after emergence that were starved for 3 h) were introduced into one branch (L. serricorne) that entered an arm of the olfactometer within 20 min were counted as having made a choice for a particular odour source. The beetles that did not enter an arm within this time were considered ‘non-responders’. After each test, the olfactometer was cleaned, dried and the arms were rotated (60°). Bioassays were replicated six times and were carried out between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. A 25-W light was also placed in the centre, 60 cm above the chamber to eliminate any light bias.

**Statistical analysis.** The null hypothesis that L. serricorne adults showed no preference for either Y-tube arm (a response equal to 50:50) was analysed using a chi-square goodness-of-fit test. Choices made by male and female L. serricorne were examined separately and, if there was no significant difference in the variances between the male and female beetles, then the data were pooled, and the choices were considered, regardless of sex. The
number of insects found in the different arms of the six-arm olfactometer were subjected to Friedman two-way ANOVA by ranks and in the case of significance ($P < 0.05$) the Wilcoxon signed ranks test was used for separation of means. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 18.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

**Human and animal rights.** This research did not involve any human participants and/or animals, only the cigarette beetle, *L. serricorne*.

**Results**

**Behavioural responses of *L. serricorne* to CMMs-borne volatiles.** Y-tube bioassays. When *L. serricorne* were tested for their relative preferences between the two arms of the Y-tube olfactometer linked to chambers with CA, there was no bias in a series of 24 experiments; 12 beetles chose each arm. The mean time for a beetle to make a choice was $132.3 \pm 10.7$ s, and the maximum time was 231 s. When *L. serricorne* were presented to *A. sinensis* versus CA, 21 females chose *A. sinensis* and 9 CA, while 19 males chose *A. sinensis* and 11 CA. Because there was no difference in the response to *A. sinensis* between male and female *L. serricorne*, these results were pooled. *L. serricorne* significantly preferred *A. sinensis* (40) to CA (20) ($\chi^2 = 6.67, df = 1, P = 0.01$). The mean time for *L. serricorne* to make a choice was $103.0 \pm 6.1$ s, and the maximum time was 223 s. Therefore, *L. serricorne* could distinguish between the CMMs odours and CA, and the maximum run time was 231 s. Thus, the responses of *L. serricorne* to volatiles were observed for 240 s (4 min) in the Y-tube olfactometer in following test.

*L. serricorne* showed significant relative preferences for *E. kansui* ($\chi^2 = 8.022, df = 1, P = 0.005$), *A. carmichaelii* ($\chi^2 = 5.000, df = 1, P = 0.025$), *E. ulmoides* ($\chi^2 = 4.667, df = 1, P = 0.031$), and *P. ternata* ($\chi^2 = 5.233, df = 1, P = 0.035$), when compared with CA (Fig. 1).

When CMMs volatiles were compared each other, *L. serricorne* adults significantly preferred *E. kansui* to *A. carmichaelii* ($\chi^2 = 4.261, df = 1, P = 0.039$), *E. kansui* to *E. ulmoides* ($\chi^2 = 4.787, df = 1, P = 0.029$), *E. kansui* to *P. ternata* ($\chi^2 = 7.043, df = 1, P = 0.008$), *A. carmichaelii* to *E. ulmoides* ($\chi^2 = 5.233, df = 1, P = 0.035$), *A. carmichaelii* to *P. ternata* ($\chi^2 = 5.233, df = 1, P = 0.022$), and *E. ulmoides* to *P. ternata* ($\chi^2 = 3.930, df = 1, P = 0.047$) (Fig. 2).

**Analysis of volatiles.** We identified 77 components in the volatile fraction of *E. kansui* (Table 1). The component with the highest relative content was paeonal (23.5%), followed by 3,5-dimethoxytoluene (6.5%) and safrole (5.0%), while none of the other volatiles were present at a greater than 5% content.
| Compounds<sup>a</sup> | Class<sup>b</sup> | Retention index (RI)<sup>c</sup> | Literature RI (ADAMS/NIST17)<sup>d</sup> | E. kansui (%) | A. carmichaelii (%) | E. ulmoides (%) | P. ternata (%) |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Acetaldehyde        | ALD              | 404                       | 412                           | 0.1         | 3.5             |                 |                 |
| Formic acid         | FA               | 518                       | 526                           | 1.1         |                 |                 |                 |
| 2-Methylpropanal    | ALD              | 550                       | 554                           | 0.1         |                 |                 |                 |
| Butanal             | ALD              | 588                       | 593                           | 0.2         | 0.1             |                 |                 |
| 2,3-Butanedione     | KE               | 591                       | 594                           | 0.1         |                 |                 |                 |
| 2-Methylfuran       | FUR              | 602                       | 606                           | 0.1         |                 |                 |                 |
| Acetic acid         | FA               | 610                       | 606                           | 4.1         | 3.5             | 2.0            | 2.8            |
| 2-Butenal           | ALD              | 620                       | 629                           | 0.3         |                 |                 |                 |
| 3-Methylbutanal     | ALD              | 647                       | 651                           | 0.1         |                 |                 | 0.1            |
| 2-Methylbutanal     | ALD              | 660                       | 663                           | 0.1         |                 |                 | 0.1            |
| 2-Methyl-4,5-dihydrofuran | FUR | 670                       | 662                           | 0.1         |                 |                 | 0.1            |
| 1-Penten-3-one      | KE               | 681                       | 680                           | 1.4         |                 |                 |                 |
| 1-Penten-3-ol       | ALC              | 684                       | 686                           | 0.2         |                 |                 |                 |
| 2-Pentanone         | KE               | 688                       | 682                           | 0.2         |                 |                 | 0.2            |
| Pentanal            | ALD              | 699                       | 704                           | 0.1         |                 | 0.6            |                 |
| 2-Ethylfuran        | FUR              | 701                       | 704                           | 0.3         |                 |                 |                 |
| (2E)-Penten-1-al    | ALD              | 754                       | 744                           | 0.4         |                 |                 |                 |
| 1-Pentanol          | ALC              | 760                       | 765                           | 0.1         | 1.5             |                 | 0.2            |
| 1,3-Butanediol      | ALC              | 780                       | 785                           | 1.2         | 0.9             |                 | 0.2            |
| 2,3-Butanediol      | ALC              | 788                       | 785                           | 1.4         | 0.9             |                 | 0.2            |
| Hexanal             | ALD              | 793                       | 801                           | 2.3         |                 | 17.1           | 13.1           |
| Furfural            | FUR              | 833                       | 828                           | 0.1         |                 |                 | 0.1            |
| (2E)-Hexenal        | ALD              | 854                       | 846                           | 0.1         |                 |                 | 0.4            |
| 2-Methylbutyric acid| FA               | 858                       | 862                           | 0.1         |                 |                 |                 |
| 3-Methylbutyric acid| FA               | 863                       | 867                           | 0.2         |                 |                 |                 |
| 1-Hexanol           | ALC              | 868                       | 872                           | 0.1         | 0.1             | 2.1            | 0.1            |
| 2-Heptanone         | KE               | 891                       | 889                           | 0.2         |                 | 0.4            | 0.1            |
| 2-Butylfuran        | FUR              | 892                       | 894                           | 0.2         |                 |                 |                 |
| Cyclohexanone       | KE               | 894                       | 896                           | 0.6         |                 |                 |                 |
| Heptanal            | ALD              | 897                       | 901                           | 0.4         | 0.1             | 1.7            | 0.7            |
| (2E,4E)-Hexadienal  | ALD              | 911                       | 907                           | 0.4         |                 |                 |                 |
| Butyrolactone       | LACT             | 915                       | 915                           | 0.5         | 0.1             |                 | 0.1            |
| 2,6-Dimethylpyrazine| NITR             | 916                       | 919                           | 0.1         |                 |                 | 0.4            |
| Methyl caproate     | EST              | 920                       | 924                           | 0.5         |                 |                 |                 |
| (2E)-Heptanal       | ALD              | 950                       | 957                           | 0.2         | 0.1             | 0.8            | 0.2            |
| Benzaldehyde        | ARO              | 962                       | 952                           | 0.2         | 0.1             | 1.3            |                 |
| 5-Methyl furfural   | FUR              | 969                       | 964                           | 0.1         |                 |                 |                 |
| 1-Heptanol          | ALC              | 976                       | 970                           | 0.6         |                 |                 |                 |
| Hexanoic acid       | FA               | 978                       | 967                           | 1.1         | 2.8             | 2.2            |                 |
| 1-Octen-3-one       | KE               | 979                       | 980                           | 0.1         |                 | 0.1            |                 |
| 1-Octen-3-ol        | ALC              | 980                       | 974                           | 0.2         |                 | 1.0            | 0.8            |
| 2,3-Octanedione     | KE               | 984                       | 986                           | 0.5         |                 |                 |                 |
| 6-Methyl-5-hepten-2-one | KE            | 988                       | 986                           | 0.4         | 0.3             | 0.4            |                 |
| Yomogi alcohol      | MO               | 990                       | 999                           | 1.0         |                 |                 |                 |
| 2-Amylfluran        | FUR              | 998                       | 990                           | 0.3         | 0.1             | 1.0            | 1.4            |
| Octanal             | ALD              | 1003                      | 998                           | 0.3         |                 | 5.2            | 0.7            |
| (2E,4E)-Heptadienal | ALD              | 1012                      | 1005                          | 0.1         |                 |                 |                 |
| (2E,4E)-Heptadienal | ALD              | 1012                      | 1005                          | 0.5         |                 |                 |                 |
| p-Cymene            | MH               | 1025                      | 1020                          | 0.1         | 0.1             | 0.4            |                 |
| Limonene            | MH               | 1030                      | 1024                          | 0.3         | 0.2             | 1.3            |                 |
| 2-Ethylhexanol      | ALC              | 1030                      | 1031                          | 0.1         |                 | 0.3            |                 |
| 1,8-Cineole         | MO               | 1032                      | 1025                          | 0.3         |                 |                 |                 |
| Benzenemethanol     | ARO              | 1036                      | 1035                          | 0.3         | 0.1             |                 |                 |
| (Z)-3-Ocimene       | MH               | 1038                      | 1032                          | 0.1         |                 |                 |                 |
| 3-Octen-2-one       | KE               | 1040                      | 1042                          |             |                 |                 | 1.1            |

Continued
| Compoundsa | Classb | Retention index (RI)c | Literature RI (ADAMS/NIST17)d | E. kansue (%) | A. carmichaelii (%) | E. ulmoides (%) | P. ternata (%) |
|-----------|--------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Benzene acetaldehyde | ARO | 1045 | 1036 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | |
| (E)-3-Octimine | MH | 1049 | 1044 | 0.1 | 0.1 | |
| (2E)-Octen-1-ol | ALD | 1060 | 1059 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 4.7 | 0.2 |
| 2-Acetylpyrrole | NITR | 1064 | 1063 | 0.1 | |
| Acetophenone | ARO | 1065 | 1059 | 0.1 | |
| 1-Octanol | ALC | 1071 | 1063 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.2 | |
| Artemisia alcohol | MO | 1072 | 1080 | 1.2 | |
| (E,E)-3,5-Octadien-2-one | KE | 1073 | 1072 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.4 | |
| p-Cresol | ARO | 1075 | 1079 | 0.1 | |
| Tetramethylylpyrazine | NITR | 1089 | 1087 | 0.5 | |
| Linalool | MO | 1099 | 1095 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | |
| Undecane | ALK | 1100 | 1100 | 0.1 | |
| Nonanal | ALD | 1112 | 1100 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 11.0 | 5.3 |
| Maltol | PYR | 1113 | 1106 | 0.1 | |
| Benzenemethanol | ARO | 1119 | 1116 | 0.2 | 0.2 | |
| Camphor | MO | 1145 | 1141 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 | |
| Benzenacetonitrile | NITR | 1149 | 1142 | 0.2 | 14.0 | |
| Menthone | MO | 1155 | 1148 | 0.1 | |
| Fentanylbenzene | ARO | 1158 | 1160 | 0.3 | |
| (2E)-Nonen-1-ol | ALD | 1164 | 1157 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 1.5 |
| Borneol | MO | 1168 | 1165 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | |
| Benzoic acid | ARO | 1170 | 1172 | | |
| Menthol | MO | 1174 | 1167 | 0.4 | 0.3 | |
| Terpinene-4-ol | MO | 1181 | 1176 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 0.3 | |
| α-Terpineol | MO | 1192 | 1186 | 0.7 | 4.5 | |
| 2-Decanone | KE | 1199 | 1193 | | 0.2 | |
| Dodecane | ALK | 1200 | 1200 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | |
| Decanal | ALD | 1206 | 1201 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Octanol acetate | EST | 1207 | 1211 | 0.1 | |
| (2E,4E)-Nonadienal | ALD | 1216 | 1210 | 0.3 | 0.4 | |
| trans-Carveol | MO | 1221 | 1215 | 0.1 | |
| Pulegone | MO | 1239 | 1233 | 0.4 | |
| (2E)-Decenal | ALD | 1266 | 1260 | 4.9 | |
| Nonanoic acid | FA | 1277 | 1272 | | 1.0 | 0.3 | |
| 3,5-Dimethoxytoluene | ARO | 1280 | 1275 | 6.5 | 0.1 | |
| (E)-Anethole | PP | 1286 | 1282 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.2 | |
| Safrole | PP | 1288 | 1285 | 0.5 | 0.1 | |
| Amyl hexoate | EST | 1289 | 1286 | | 1.0 | |
| 2-Undecanone | KE | 1294 | 1294 | 0.4 | 0.2 | |
| Tridecane | ALK | 1300 | 1300 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | |
| Undecanone | ALD | 1309 | 1305 | | |
| (2E,4E)-Decadienal | ALD | 1319 | 1315 | | |
| α-longipinene | SH | 1355 | 1350 | 0.8 | |
| Eugenol | PP | 1359 | 1356 | 0.2 | 0.1 | |
| 2-Methyltridecane | ALK | 1367 | 1360 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | |
| Longicyclene | SH | 1377 | 1371 | 0.6 | |
| α-Copaene | SH | 1378 | 1374 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Hexyl hexoate | EST | 1388 | 1384 | 0.8 | |
| δ-Elemene | SH | 1394 | 1389 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | |
| Sativene | SH | 1396 | 1390 | 0.6 | |
| Tetradecane | ALK | 1400 | 1400 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.1 |
| Junipene | SH | 1405 | 1404 | 17.2 | 0.4 | |
| (E)-Caryophyllene | SH | 1422 | 1417 | 4.0 | 6.2 | 1.2 | |
| 3-gurjunene | SH | 1435 | 1431 | 0.4 | |
| γ-Elemene | SH | 1433 | 1434 | 1.2 | 0.2 | |

Continued
In the volatile fraction of *A. carmichaelii* we identified 74 components (Table 1). Junipene had the highest relative content (17.2%), followed by isofuranodiene (12.3%) and γ-selinene (9.0%).

The analysis of volatile fraction of *E. ulmoides* gave the fewest components (56 VOCs). The most abundant component was hexanal (17.1%), followed by nonanal (11.0%).

The greatest diversity of VOCs (81 types) was detected in *P. ternata* (Table 1). Benzeneacetonitrile (syn. benzyl cyanide) had the highest relative content (14.0%), followed by hexanal (13.1%) and nonanal (5.3%) (Table 1).

Behavioural responses of *L. serricorne* to paeonal from *E. kansui* VoCs.

**Y-tube olfactometer bioassays.** *L. serricorne* showed significant relative preferences for paeonal at doses of 1 μg ($\chi^2 = 4.261, df = 1, P = 0.039$), 10 μg ($\chi^2 = 5.565, df = 1, P = 0.018$), and 1000 μg ($\chi^2 = 5.000, df = 1, P = 0.025$), and highly significant relative preferences at doses of 100 μg ($\chi^2 = 7.681, df = 1, P = 0.006$) and 500 μg ($\chi^2 = 10.083, df = 1, P = 0.001$), when compared with mineral oil (Fig. 3).

| Compoundsa | Classb | Retention index (RI)c | Literature RI (ADAMS/ NIST17)d | E. kansui (E%)(%) | A. carmichaelii (%) | E. ulmoides (%) | P. ternata (%) |
|------------|--------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Paeonal     | ARO    | 1442                  | 1438                            | 23.5             | 0.9               |                |                |
| (E)-β-Farnesene | SH | 1450                  | 1454                            | 1.2              |                   |                |                |
| Geranyl acetone | MO | 1457                  | 1453                            | 1.3              | 0.7               | 0.3            | 2.5            |
| α-Humulene  | SH     | 1459                  | 1452                            | 3.8              |                   |                | 0.6            |
| αr-Curcumene| SH     | 1483                  | 1479                            | 1.2              | 0.2               | 0.9            |                |
| β-Selinene  | SH     | 1486                  | 1489                            | 3.7              | 0.7               | 1.8            |                |
| α-Zingiberene| SH   | 1495                  | 1493                            | 4.4              |                   |                |                |
| α-Muurolene | SH     | 1499                  | 1500                            | 0.7              |                   |                |                |
| Pentadecane | ALK    | 1500                  | 1500                            | 4.6              | 1.6               | 0.4            | 1.9            |
| β-Bisabolene| SH     | 1509                  | 1505                            | 0.7              | 0.9               | 0.6            |                |
| γ-Cadinene  | SH     | 1516                  | 1513                            | 0.2              |                   |                |                |
| Myristicin   | PP     | 1521                  | 1517                            | 0.6              |                   |                |                |
| β-sesquiphellandrene | SH | 1529                  | 1521                            | 0.3              |                   |                |                |
| Selina-3,7(11)-dien | SH | 1544                  | 1545                            | 9.0              |                   |                |                |
| Germacrene B | SH    | 1556                  | 1559                            | 2.4              |                   |                |                |
| (E)-Nerolidol | SO  | 1566                  | 1561                            | 0.1              |                   |                |                |
| 3-Methylpentadecane | ALK | 1570                  | 1571                            | 0.2              |                   | 0.4            |                |
| Caryophyllene oxide | SO | 1580                  | 1583                            | 0.2              | 0.6               | 0.3            |                |
| 1-Hexadecene | ALKE   | 1592                  | 1588                            | 0.1              |                   |                |                |
| Cedrol      | SO     | 1593                  | 1600                            | 0.2              | 0.4               |                |                |
| Hexadecane  | ALK    | 1600                  | 1600                            | 0.1              | 0.4               |                |                |
| Isofuranodiene | SO  | 1689                  | 1688                            | 12.3             |                   |                |                |
| Heptadecane | ALK    | 1700                  | 1700                            | 0.3              | 0.1               | 0.2            | 0.9            |
| Phytane     | DIT    | 1790                  | 1795                            | 0.2              |                   | 0.6            |                |
| Octadecane  | ALK    | 1800                  | 1800                            | 0.2              | 0.1               |                | 0.6            |
| Hexadecanal | ALD    | 1819                  | 1815                            | 0.1              |                   |                |                |
| Hexahydrofarnesyl acetone | PA | 1840                  | 1845                            | 0.2              | 0.1               | 0.1            | 0.8            |
| Nonadecane  | ALK    | 1900                  | 1900                            | 0.1              |                   | 0.1            | 0.3            |
| Methyl palmitate | EST | 1928                  | 1926                            | 0.4              |                   | 0.1            | 0.7            |
| Cembrene    | DIT    | 1939                  | 1937                            | 0.1              |                   |                |                |
| Hexadecanoic acid | FA  | 1968                  | 1959                            | 2.2              |                   |                |                |
| Eicosane    | ALK    | 2000                  | 2000                            | 0.1              |                   |                |                |
| Isopropyl hexadecanoate | EST | 2028                  | 2023                            | 0.1              |                   |                |                |
| Isopropyl palmitate | EST | 2033                  | 2024                            | 0.4              |                   |                |                |
| Methyl linoleate | EST | 2090                  | 2094                            | 0.2              |                   | 0.6            |                |
| Methyl linolenate | EST | 2106                  | 2098                            | 0.2              | 0.1               | 0.3            |                |
| Tricosane   | ALK    | 2300                  | 2300                            | 0.1              |                   |                |                |

Table 1. VOcs identified from the four Chinese medical materials analysed in this study. Values (%) indicated the mean peak area for each compound estimated during GC-MS analyses. aCompounds are ordered according to their elution from a ZB-5MSI capillary column; bGrouped compounds: ALK, alkanes; ALC, alcohols; ALD, aldehydes; KE, ketons; EST, esters; FA, fatty acids; FUR, furans; ARO, aromatics; ALKE, alkenes; NITR, nitrogen-containing compounds; PA, polyacetylenes; PYR, pyrone; MH, monoterpenes hydrocarbons; MO, oxygenated monoterpenes; SH, sesquiterpene hydrocarbons; SO, oxygenated sesquiterpenes; DIT, diterpenes; PP, phenylpropanoids. cLinear retention index (RI) calculated using a mixture of n-alkanes. dLiterature RIs taken from ADAMS53 or NIST 1754 libraries. eRI taken from Maggi et al.71.
Six-arm olfactometer bioassays. In these experiments, all the paeonal doses tested were more attractive than the mineral oil control (Friedman test: $\chi^2 = 26.722$, df = 5, $P < 0.001$, Wilcoxon tests: $P = 0.027$–0.028) (Fig. 4). Significantly more L. serricorne entered the arm connected to the vessel that contained 100- and 500-$\mu$g paeonal doses over the arm with 1-, 10-, and 1000-$\mu$g doses (Wilcoxon tests: $P = 0.026$–0.027). There was no significant relative difference in attraction between 100- and 500-$\mu$g paeonal doses (Wilcoxon test: $P = 0.136$), nor among 1-, 10-, and 1000-$\mu$g doses (Wilcoxon test: $P = 0.115$–0.674) (Fig. 4).

Discussion
In Y-tube olfactometer bioassays, L. serricorne adults were strongly attracted by VOCs emitted by all CMMs tested in this study, suggesting a strong plasticity of the insect olfactory system in locating suitable food sources. In the Anobiidae family, attraction to a range of CMMs was also reported for the adults of the drugstore beetle, Stegobium paniceum (L.), and it is probably related to the high polyphagia of these species51.

Furthermore, in our behavioural bioassays, L. serricorne adults exhibited significantly different preferences among the four CMMs examined, with the ranking E. kansui > A. carmichaelii > E. ulmoides > P. ternata. Since experiments were carried out in the absence of visual and contact stimuli, this clear ranking preference showed by L. serricorne adults indicated that plant-borne VOCs provide important cues in the selection of a preferred host by this pest. Thus, the results might partially explain why the damage caused by L. serricorne differs in degrees depending on the CMMs species involved57. Different stored-product pests, such as Trogoderma granarium Everts (Coleoptera: Dermestidae), Tribolium castaneum Herbst (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae), C. maculatus, S. zeamais and S. panicum showed different preferences for the volatiles of several stored products27,29,51,58.

Earlier research showed that there were only 13 components identified from the VOCs of E. ulmoides bark, with the most abundant compound nonanal (17.5%)59. However, 56 VOCs were detected in E. ulmoides bark in the present study, with hexanal (17.1%) as the most abundant compound. This discrepancy may be linked to the differences among experimental protocols used in the two studies, as well as to different growing conditions and harvesting time of E. ulmoides plant material, which may significantly affect the VOC bouquet, as already noted for other botanical species. Concerning the other three CMMs in our study, GC–MS analysis revealed that P. ternata had the richest volatile profile with 81 components, followed by E. kansui and A. carmichaelii, with 77, and

Figure 3. Olfactory responses of L. serricorne to different doses of paeonal in Y-tube olfactometer tests. Significant differences: *$P < 0.05$ and **$P < 0.01$ (chi-square test).

Figure 4. Olfactory responses of L. serricorne to different doses of paeonal in a six-arm olfactometer assays. Control was mineral oil. Each box plot indicates the median (red line) and its range of dispersion (lower and upper quartiles and outliers); green lines and blue T-bars show means and standard errors, respectively. Above each box plot, different letters indicate significant differences (Wilcoxon test, $P < 0.05$).
74 compounds, respectively. Furthermore, the most abundant compounds varied among the four CMMs species. Thus, the differing olfactory responses of *L. serricorne* among CMMs species may be related to differences in both the types and air concentrations of volatile components. However, only a limited number of the VOCs emitted by host plants are crucial for host location by phytophagous insects.26,61. Herein, paenonal - identified from the preferred CMM *E. kansui* - was attractive to *L. serricorne* adults at various doses. Furthermore, it showed the highest relative preferences for 100- and 500-μg paenonal doses, indicating that both the types and doses of VOCs from CMMs may influence the beetle olfactory responses.62. Besides, the attractiveness of junipene, hexanal, benzene-acetonitrile (each was the most abundant compound in one of the other CMMs), or other compounds identified in the study also needs to be further studied using electroantennographic assays, behavioural, and field trapping tests.29,63. Potential lures could be developed from these tests, which will aid in the development of new safe and effective trapping strategies to monitor and control this pest. Information about the bioactivity of these compounds on other insects is still scarce. However, it is worthy to note that benzeneacetoniitrile, identified from the volatiles released by adult mature male *Schistocerca gregaria* Forskal (Orthoptera: Acrididae), had strong repellent effects on gregarious mature males64, outlining that the same VOCs can lead to extremely diverse behavioural responses in insects, therefore potential non-target insects arising from the employ of VOCs for monitoring and control should be always considered.65.

Besides, it has been also showed that an important parasitoid of *L. serricorne*, *Lariophagus distinguendus* Forster (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae)66, mainly rely to the VOCs emitted by adult beetle feces when locating its host, stressing that the potential impact of the VOCs proposed for real-world use should be evaluated also on biocontrol agents of the targeted pest, to shed light on potential behavioural changes67,68. In this framework, the attractiveness of VOCs from the CMMs to *L. serricorne* parasitoids deserves further research. Such information would be useful to boost biocontrol management strategies based on the employ of hymenopteran parasitoids to control *L. serricorne* attacking CMMs.

In conclusion, there were three key findings arising from this study. First, Y-tube olfactometer bioassays showed that VOCs from all four CMMs strongly attract *L. serricorne* adults. *L. serricorne* exhibited a significant preference for *E. kansui* VOCs among the four CMMs tested. Second, VOCs differed both in the type and relative content of their components among the CMMs, which may account for the different behavioural responses of *L. serricorne* adults to various CMMs. Finally, *L. serricorne* showed a significant preference for paenonal tested at various doses, with 100- and 500-μg being the most attractive. These results indicated that this olfactory cue plays an important role for food location in cigarette beetles. From an applied point of view, basic knowledge reported here may be useful – pending proper field evaluation in real-world conditions – to develop novel monitoring and control (e.g., “lure and kill” technique) tools for this pest.

In particular, paenonal identified from *E. kansui* VOCs could be exploited alone, as an highly effective lure for both sexes, or in combination with sex pheromone to improve current trapping system for male cigarette beetles41,43-46. Finally, a further intriguing perspective is to use this food-borne VOC attractant to enhance the effectiveness of selected physical cues (UV black light) exploited for monitoring of *L. serricorne* beetles40,46,47.

### References

1. Runner, G. A. The tobacco beetle: an important pest in tobacco products. *Bull US Dept Agric* 737, 49–51 (1919).
2. Umeya, K. Alien insect pests and naturalized natural enemies in Japan. *Zenkoku Nison Kyoku Kyouiku*, Tokyo, Japan (2012).
3. Hill, D. S. Pests of stored products and their control. Bellhaven Press, London, United Kingdom (1990).
4. Ashworth, J. R. The biology of *Lasioderma serricorne*. *J Stored Prod Res* 29, 291–303 (1993).
5. Kim, S., Park, C., Ohh, M. H., Cho, H. C. & Ahn, Y. J. Contact and fumigant activity of aromatic plant extracts and essential oils against *Lasioderma serricorne* (Coleoptera: Anobiidae). *J Stored Prod Res* 39, 11–19 (2003).
6. Cabrera, B. J. Drugstore Beetle, *Stegobium panicum* (L.) (Insecta: Anobiidae). Entomology and Nematology Department, University of Florida/Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences Extension. (Accessed on 5 November 2014) (2001).
7. Zettler, J. L. & Keever, D. W. Phosphine resistance in cigarette beetle (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) with tobacco storage in the southeastern United States. *J Econ Entomol* 87, 546–550 (1994).
8. Jovanović, Z., Kostić, M. & Popović, Z. Grain protective properties of herbal extracts against the bean weevil *Anthonomus grandis* (Horn.). Ind Crop Prod 26, 100–104 (2007).
9. Mitra, A., Chatterjee, C. & Mandal, F. B. Synthetic chemical pesticides and their effects on birds. *Res J Environ Toxicol* 5, 105–108 (2011).
10. Rajendran, S. & Narasimhan, K. S. Phosphate resistance in the cigarette beetle *Lasioderma serricorne* (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) and overcoming control failures during fumigation of stored tobacco. *Int J Pest Manage* 40(2), 207–210 (1994).
11. Saglam, O., Edde, P. A. & Phillips, T. W. Resistance of *Lasioderma serricorne* (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) to fumigation with phosphine. *J Econ Entomol* 108(5), 2489–2495 (2015).
12. Dubey, N. K. & Srivastavab, K. A. Current status of plant products as botanical pesticides in storage pest management. *J Bio Pest* 1, 182–186 (2008).
13. Izzam, M. B. Botanical insecticides, deterrents, and repellents in modern agriculture and an increasingly regulated world. *Annu Rev Entomol* 51, 45–66 (2006).
14. Guo, S. S. S. et al. The chemical composition of essential oils from *Cinnamomum camphora* and their insecticidal activity against the stored product pests. *Int J Mol Sci* 17(11), 1836 (2016).
15. Athanasissu, C. G. et al. Nanoparticles for pest control: current status and future perspectives. *J Pest Sci* 91, 1–15 (2018).
16. Kavaliratos, N. G., Athanasissu, C. G., Peteinatos, G. G., Boukouvala, M. C. & Benelli, G. Insecticidal effect and impact of fitness of three diatomaceous earths on different maize hybrids for the eco-friendly control of the invasive stored-product pest *Prostephanus truncatus* (Horn.). *Environ Sci Poll Res* 25, 10407–10417 (2018).
17. Rombos, C. L. et al. Evaluation of carfenid, an alpha-cypermethrin-coated polyester net, for the control of *Lasioderma serricorne*, and *Ephestia elutella*, in stored tobacco. *J Pest Sci* 91, 751–759 (2018).
18. da Silva, A. P. O. P. et al. Pest Management in Stored Products: The Case of the Cigarette Beetle, *Lasioderma serricorne* (Coleoptera: Anobiidae). In: Lichtenhouse E. (eds) *Sustainable Agriculture Reviews* 27. Sustainable Agriculture Reviews, vol 27. Springer, Cham (2018).
19. Casida, J. E. & Quistad, G. B. Golden age of insecticide research: past, present, or future? *Annu Rev Entomol* 43, 1–16 (1998).
20. Pavela, R. & Benelli, G. Essential oils as ecofriendly biopesticides? Challenges and constraints. *Trends Plant Sci* 21, 1000–1007 (2016).
Papadopoulou, S. C. & Athanassiou, C. G. (2019) 9:6995

Pavela, R., Maggi, F., Iannarelli, R. & Benelli, G. Plant extracts for developing mosquito larvicides: from laboratory to the field, with insights on the modes of action. Acta Trop 193, 236–271 (2019).

Ukk, D. A. et al.Behavioural responses of the maize weevil, Sitophilus zeamais, to host (stored-grain) and non-host plant volatiles. Pest Manag Sci 1, 44–50 (2010).

Trematerra, P., Sciaretta, A. & Tamasi, E. Behavioural responses of Orzyzaephilus surinamensis, Tribolium castaneum and Tribolium confusum to naturally and artificially damaged durum wheat kernels. Entomol Exp Appl 94, 195–200 (2000).

Ndono-Moualeu, A. F., Ulrichs, C. & Adler, C. Behavioral responses of Callosobruchus maculatus, to volatile organic compounds found in the head-space of dried green pea seeds. J Pest Sci 3, 1–10 (2015).

Papadopoulou, S. C. & Buchelos, C. T. Comparison of trapping efficiency for Lasioderma serricorne (E.) adults with electric, pheromone, food attractant and control-adhesive traps. J Stor Prod Res 38(4), 375–383 (2002).

Howe, R. W. A laboratory study of the cigarette beetle, Lasioderma serricorne (F.) (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) with a critical review of the literature on its biology. B Entomol Res 48, 9–56 (1957).

Fletcher, I. W. & Long, J. S. Evaluation of an electric grid light trap as a means of sampling populations of the cigarette beetle. Tobacco Science 17, 37–39 (1973).

Genève, R., Delon, R. & Cocaign, J. M. Comparison of different trap systems as means of sampling populations of Lasioderma serricorne in tobacco warehouses. Annales du Tabac Setais Paris France 21, 99–108 (1987).

Levinson, A. R. & Levinson, H. Z. Restrained pheromone responses of male tobacco beetles Lasioderma serricorne (F.) to 2S,3S-anhydrosericin in presence of 4S,6S,7R-sericin. J Appl Entomol 101, 282–287 (1986).

Chuman, T. et al. Lasioderma chemistry sex pheromone of cigarette beetle Lasioderma serricorne (F.). J Chem Ecol 11, 417–434 (1985).

Mori, M. et al. Inhibitory action of (4S,6S,7S)-isomer to the pheromonal activity of sericinorcin,4S,6S,7S-7-hydroxy-4,6-dimethyl-3-norane. J Chem Ecol 12, 83–89 (1986).

Faustini, D. L. Stored insect control: a biotechnological approach to cigarette beetle monitoring. Tobacco Reporter 112, 44–47 (1985).

Faustini, D. L., Barak, A. V., Burkholder, W. E. & Leos-Martinez, J. Combination-type trapping for monitoring stored-product insects—a review. J Kansas Entomol Soc 63, 539–547 (1990).

Levinson, A. R. & Buchelos, C. T. Population dynamics of Lasioderma serricorne (F.) (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) in tobacco stores with and without insecticidal treatments: a three-year survey by pheromone and unbaited traps. J Appl Entomol 106, 201–211 (2010).

Mueller, D., Pierce, L., Benezet, H. & Krizchik, V. Practical application of pheromone traps in the food and tobacco industry. J Kansas Entomol Soc 63, 548–553 (1990).

Buchelos, C. T. & Papadopoulou, S. C. Evaluation of the effectiveness of a new pheromone trap for monitoring Lasioderma serricorne (E.) in tobacco stores. Anzeiger fur Schädlingskunde/J Pest Sci 72, 92–94 (1999).

Buchelos, C. T. & Levinson, V. Efficacy of multisurface traps and lasio traps with and without pheromone addition, for monitoring and mass-trapping of Lasioderma serricorne (E.) (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) insecticide-free tobacco stores. J Appl Entomol 116, 440–448 (1993).

Milne, D. L. A study of the nutrition of the cigarette beetle, Lasioderma serricorne (F.) (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) and a suggested new method for its control. Journal of the Entomology Society of South Africa 26, 43–63 (1963).

Minor, M. F. Do adult cigarette beetles feed? Tobacco. Science 23, 61–64 (1979).

Kohno, M., Chuman, T., Kato, K. & Noguchi, M. The olfactory response of the cigarette beetle Lasioderma serricorne (F.) to various host foods and cured tobacco extracts. Appl Entomol Zool 18, 401–406 (1983).

Pavela, R., Zabka, M., Vrchotová, N. & Triska, J. Effect of foliar nutrition on the essential oil yield of Thyme (Thymus vulgaris L.). Ind Crop Prod 112, 762–765 (2018).

Pavela, R., Maggi, F., Iannarelli, R. & Benelli, G. Plant extracts for developing mosquito larvicides: from laboratory to the field, with insights on the modes of action. Acta Trop 193, 236–271 (2019).

Papadopoulou, S. C. & Athanassiou, C. G. Laricophasis distinguendus (E.) (Hym., Chalcidoidea, Pteromalidae) an ectoparasitoid of Lasioderma serricorne (F.) (Col., Anobiidae), found for the first time in tobacco stores in Greece. J Pest Sci 77, 183–184 (2004).

Li, C., Li, Z. Z., Cao, Y., Zheng, X. W. & Zhou, B. Partial characterization of stress-induced carboxylesterase from adults of Stegobium panicum and Lasioderma serricorne (Lasioderma serricorne (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) subjected to CO2-enriched atmosphere. J Pest Sci 82, 7–11 (2009).

Steiner, S., Steidle, J. L. M. & Ruther, J. Host-associated kairomones used for habitat orientation in the parasitoid Laricophasis distinguendus (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae). J Stored Prod Res 43, 587–593 (2007).

Cao, Y. et al. Olfactory responses of Stegobium panicum, to different Chinese medicinal plant materials and component analysis of volatiles. J Stored Prod Res 76, 122–136 (2018).

Carpita, A. et al. (2Z)-9-Tricosene identified in rectal glands extracts of Bactrocera oleae males: first evidence of a male-produced female attractant in olive fruit. Naturwissenschaften 99, 77–81 (2012).

Adams, R. Identification of Essential Oil Components by Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry, 4th ed. Allured Publishing Corp., Carol Stream, IL, USA (2007).

NIST 17, Mass Spectral Library (NIST/EPA/NIH). National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, USA (2017).

Liu, X. F. et al. Volatiles released by Chinese liquorice roots mediate host location behaviour by neonate Porphyrophora hologne, (Hemiptera: Margarodidae). Pest Manag Sci 72(10), 1959–1964 (2016).

Collins, L. E., Wakefield, M. E., Chambers, J. & Cox, P. D. Progress towards a multi-species lure: comparison of behavioural bioassay methods for multi-species attractants against three pests of stored grain. J Stored Prod Res 40, 341–353 (2004).

Li, C. Population ecology toxicoLOGY of control atmosphere against pest in stored Chinese medicine material. PhD thesis, Guizhou University (2008).

Seifelmayer, Y. E., Hopkins, T. L. & Mills, R. B. Olfactory responses of adult Tribolium castaneum (Herbst), to volatiles of wheat and millet kernels, milled fractions and extracts. J Chem Ecol 8, 1463–1472 (1982).

Lin, I., Jiang, H. M. & Lu, J. Q. Analysis of Volatile Components of Bark and Leaves of Eucommia ulmoides by HS-SPEME-GC-MS. J Anhui Agric Sci 46(10), 165–166, 169 (2018).

Dickens, J. C. Orientation of Colorado potato beetle to natural and synthetic blends of volatiles emitted by potato plants. Agric Forest Entomol 12, 167–172 (2000).

Tasin, M., Backamani, A. C., Bengtsson, M., Ioriatti, C. & Wittgall, P. Essential host plant cues in the grapevine moth. Naturwissenschaften 93, 141–144 (2006).

Cha, D. H. et al. Eavesdropping on plant volatiles by a specialist moth: significance of ratio and concentration. PLoS ONE 6, e17033 (2011).
63. Germinara, G. S., De Cristofaro, A. & Rotundo, G. Electrophysiological and behavioral responses of *Theocolax elegans* (Westwood) (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae) to cereal grain volatiles. *Biomed Res Int* **2016**, 1–8 (2016).
64. Seidelmann, K., Luber, K. & Ferenz, H. J. Analysis of Release and Role of Benzyl Cyanide in Male Desert Locusts, *Schistocerca gregaria*. *J Chem Ecol* **26**(8), 1897–1910 (2000).
65. Kaplan, I. Attracting carnivorous arthropods with plant volatiles: The future of biocontrol or playing with fire? *Biol Control* **60**, 77–89 (2012).
66. Steidle, J. L. M. & Schöller, M. Olfactory host location and learning in the granary weevil parasitoid *Lariophagus distinguendus*, (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae). *J Insect Behav* **3**, 331–342 (1997).
67. Benelli, G., Pacini, N., Conti, B. & Canale, A. Following a scented beetle: larval faeces as a key olfactory cue in host location of *Stegobium panicum* (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) by *Lariophagus distinguendus* (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae). *Chemoecology* **23**, 129–136 (2013).
68. Niedermayer, S., Pollmann, M. & Steidle, J. L. M. *Lariophagus distinguendus* (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae) ( Förster) - Past, Present, and Future: The History of a Biological Control Method Using *L. distinguendus* against Different Storage Pests. *Insects* **7**(3), 1–9 (2016).
69. Miyatake, T. *et al*. Monitoring and detecting the cigarette beetle (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) using ultraviolet (LED) direct and reflected lights and/or pheromone traps in a laboratory and a storehouse. *J Econ Entomol* **109**(6), 2551–2560 (2016).
70. Hironaka, M. *et al*. Adults of *Lasioderma serricorne* and *Stegobium panicum* (Coleoptera: Anobiidae) are attracted to ultraviolet (uv) over blue light LEDs. *J Econ Entomol* **110**(4), 1911–1915 (2017).
71. Maggi, F. *et al*. A forgotten vegetable (*Smyrnium olusatrum* L., Apiaceae) as a rich source of isofuranodiene. *Food Chem* **135**(4), 2852–2862 (2012).

**Acknowledgements**

Two anonymous reviewers kindly improved an earlier version of our manuscript. We thank the Regional First-class Discipline Construction of Guizhou Province (No. [2017]85), the Program for Academician Workstation in Guiyang University (20195605), Discipline and Master's Site Construction Project of Guiyang University financed by Guiyang City (SH-2019), and the Training Project for High-Level Innovative Talents in Guizhou Province (No. 2016 [4020]) for financial support.

**Author Contributions**

All authors conceived and designed the research. Y.C., Y.J.Z., S.L.L. and H.Y. collected the data. Y.C., G.B., F.M. and G.S.G. analysed the data. Y.C., G.B. F.M. and G.S.G. wrote the manuscript. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

**Additional Information**

**Competing Interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

**Publisher’s note:** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article’s Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2019