Abstract:



Egyptian Journal of Plant Protection Research Institute

www.ejppri.eg.net



Efficiency of varied formulations of zinc phosphide (1%) against *Rattus norvegicus* (Rodentia: Muridae) under laboratory and field conditions

Abou-Hashem, A.A.M. and Fatma, K. Khidr Plant Protection Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Dokki, Giza, Egypt.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History Received: 9 / 11 / 2021 Accepted: 30/ 12 /2021

Keywords

Efficiency, formulations, zinc phosphide, *Rattus norvegicus* and Egypt.

Laboratory and field studies were carried out to show efficiency of varied formulations of zinc phosphide (1%) against Rattus norvegicus (Berkenhout) (Rodentia: Muridae) . The gained data cleared that the average of daily bait consumption of zinc phosphide and malathion as tracking powder by males of the Norway rat was 4.0 gram and 3.2 gram for females. The data cleared also the same concentration gave 80% kill for males and complete kill of females with average 1.7 day to death for both sexes. The mortality because of 1% zinc phosphide mixed with malathion 1% gave 90 % kill of R. norvegicus for both sexes. The obtained data cleared that the palatability of zinc phosphide formulations was (17.2% and 19.0%), (18.1% and 17.5%) and (12.0% and 20.3%) for cake, crushed maize and wax block for Norway rat males and female respectively. There were 49 active burrows of R. norvegicus were chosen, divided into 12 burrows were treated with cake ,12 treated with crushed maize, 16 treated with tracking powder and 10 treated with wax block, the number reopened burrows were 2, 4, 4 and 4 for the mentioned formulations, respectively. The data showed that zinc phosphide cake was the more effective (83%), and then tracking powder (75%), crushed maize, (66.7%) and the lowest effect was the wax block (50%) on the numbers of R. norvegicus. Applied zinc phosphide formulations plus snap traps gave a high control against Norway rats.

Introduction

Until the late 1940s the acute toxicants were the only rodenticides available. They are still widely used today, and users preferred by many users despite their relatively low efficacy. Rodents that succumb to acute toxicants do so quickly, within a few hours usually and having consumed only a small amount of bait.Most uneducated users, incorrectly, interpret the sight of dead rodents soon after placing small amounts of baits, with only low labour inputs, as a proof of cheap and effective control. The effect of zinc phosphide against different species of rodents was studied by several investigators (Bradfield and Gill, 1984; Abdallah *et al.*, 1991 and Asran, 2001).

Formulation research must be directed to distinguish as far as possible different mechanisms between of availability and activity. If the toxicant is applied directly to the target rodents, it may possible to available. T its activity and at the same time retard for reduce its loss. As a matter of fact, the modification of the activity by formulation is essentially a matter of altering its availability to the pest. Since the problems of rodents in Egypt are seriously increasing in both agricultural and public health aspects reseason must be directed to reach a quick and effective way of control.

An attempt is made in this study to formulate baits in the form of zinc phosphide, using local raw materials wherever it is possible, that could be considered as successful methods to ensure the activity of the toxicant.

Materials and methods

1. Tested chemicals materials:

The used Zinc phosphide was brought from Abou Zaapal Company it has94% active ingredient. Meanwhile the Malathion powder 1% was provided by Kafer El-Zayat company. The other materials were brought from the market such as, crushed maize ,wheat flour , cotton seed oil and paraffin wax.

2. Tested formulations:

2.1. Zinc phosphide cack (48.5 crushed maize +48.5 flour +2 oil cotton seeds+ 1% zinc phosphide). **2.2.** Zinc phosphide crushed maize as bait (1% zinc phosphide +crushed maize). **2.3.** 1% Zinc phosphide + malathion 1% as tracking powder. **2.4.** Zinc phosphide wax block.

3. Tested animals:

The experimental animals Norway rat, *R. norvigecus* were brought from different fields in Ismailia district, Ismailia Governorate .Rats were individually reared acclimatized under laboratory conditions .Active and healthy rats of both sexes were chosen for each formulation 10 (5 males and 5 females). The rats were weighed to the nearest gram and sex determined. Animals were retained in individual cages, 42, 24, 17 cm small animals or obviously pregnant individuals were omitted from the experiment.

4. The procedure:

For bait tow feeding system were carried to determine the efficiency against the Norway rat, free and obliged feeding test. The choice feeding test was described by Htun and Brooks (1979), two cups were to individually caged animals, and one contains plain bait wheat and the other poison bait. Fifty grams of treated and untreated food was provided daily, for non choice feeding test introduce 50 gram from poisoned bait only (One cup). The bait consumption was calculated to the nearest .01 gram daily .The consumed bait were computed to the body weight of the tested rat. The third group (Control), 5 males and 5 females were caged singly with plain bait and enough water for the whole period of the experimental. Mortality and the mean death leant in day were observed and recorded for 2 weeks. Also, in the case of free choice test the palatability percentages was calculated according to the following equation:

	Consumed weight of poison bait
% Palatability =	x 100
	Consumed weight of poison bait+
	Consumed weight of plain bait

Water was available to the tested rat through the experiments. Mortality was observed daily and recorded for three weeks after poisoning. The mean death length in days was calculated. In non choice test, bait consumption was recorded daily and weighed to the nearest 0.01 gram. Another group of 5 rats, 5 mice and 5 meriones of both sexes were caged singly with unpoisoned bait and enough water for the whole period of the experiments.

5. Tracking powder:

Rodents, R. norvegicus, Mus musculus and Meriones shawi placed individually in cages at least 24 hrs before the treatment. The test commenced when the travs of tracking powder (1% zinc phosphide +1% malathion) were placed in the tunnels. Ten mature animals (5 males and 5 females) were used forced to touch tracking powder for 4 days .The consumed powder by each animal was estimated daily. Survived animals were observed for additional 10 days. mortality an percentages and day to death calculated for each treatment.

6. Field trials:

Two traditional areas were chosen at Nafisha village at Ismailia district (Found active burrows of *R. norvigecus*) to apply zinc phosphide formulations, cake, crushed maize, tracking powder and wax block. Twenty traps per one Fadden were put beside every formula of zinc phosphide to calculate the total efficiency for both zinc phosphide formula plus traps.There were 49 active burrows of *R. norvigicus* were chosen, divided into 12 burrows were treated with cake ,12 treated with crushed maize, 16 treated with tracking powder and 10 treated with wax block.

The efficiency calculated as follow:

Closed burrows after treatment

------ X100 Total active burrows before treatment

Results and discussion 1. Laboratory trials:

The recorded data in Table (1) showed that the effect of certain concentration of 1% zinc phosphide and malathion 1% as a tracking powder against of R. norvigicus. The data cleared that the average of daily bait consumption of zinc phosphide and malathion tracking powder by males of the Norway rat was 4.0 gram and 3.2grm for females.The data cleared also 1he same concentration gave 80% kill for males and complete kill of females with average 1.7 day to death for both sexes. The compiled results in Table (2) showed that the applied zinc phosphide formulations, crushed maize, wax block, and cake (1% concentration) under two feeding systems, choice and non-choice test against the investigated rodents. The data cleared that R. norvigecus males and females consumed in average 3.25 gram. 3.9 gram. 1.9 gram. Under choice test, and 4.24, 4.5 and 2.3 gram under non choice test for the applied formulations cake, crushed maize and wax block respectively (Table 3). The applied, crushed maize gave (100% and 100%) kill and wax block(80% and 80%) kill for both males and females of Norway rat under non choice and choice feeding test. The average time to death was (3.12 day and 2.55 day), (2.5 day and 1.5 day) and (4.12 day and 2.9 day) for cake, crushed maize and wax block against males and females of Norway rat for free and obliged feeding system. The obtained data cleared that the palatability of zinc phosphide formulations was (17.2% and 19.0%), (18.1% and 17.5%) and (12.0% and 20.3%) for cake, crushed maize and wax block for Norway rat males and female respectively. Samol (1972) found that cracked corn was better accepted than a pellet formulation. Asran (1994) found that in his toxicity studies to zinc phosphide (zn3p2) on some Egyptian rodents in both choice and non choice tested animals could be arranged in descending order according to their susceptibility to zinc phosphide at 1% concentration as follows ; M. musculus

> *A. niloticus* > *R. rattus* > *R. norvigecus.* Abd El-Razek (1997) found that the whole used concentrations of zinc phosphide gave entirely kill for each of male and female of the climb rat for either choice or no-choice feeding test.

2. Field trials:

The recorded data at Table (4) cleared that the applications of the zinc phosphide formulations, cake, crushed maize, tracking powder and wax block at the field inside the burrows of R. norvegicus and their efficiency comparing with traps efficiency. There were 49 active burrows of R. norvegicus were chosen,, divided into 12 burrows were treated with cake ,12 treated with crushed maize, 16 treated with tracking powder and 10 treated with wax block, the number reopened burrow were 2, 4, 4 and 4 for the mentioned formulations respectively. The data showed that zinc phosphide cake was the more effect (83%), and then tracking powder (75%), crushed maize, (66.7%) and the lowest effect was the wax block on the numbers of R. norvegicus. The compiled data at Table (4) showed that the efficiency of the snap traps which put after phosphide zinc formulations treatment. It gave 75% efficiency after wax block treatment. Also, the results cleared that the efficiency of traps were 70%, 65% and 65% after zinc phosphide cake, crushed maize and tracking powder treatments. Generally, applied zinc phosphide formulations plus snap traps gave a high control against Norway rats. Ocampo and Lontoc (2006) found that all the rodenticides treated plots had significantly lower rat damage compared with the untreated. There was significant reduction in rat activities based on tracking of feeding census. Khan (2007) found that after 5 applications of the bait, the rodent activity decreased by 90-96 %, except for zinc phosphide treatment the rodent activity decreased by 76.04%.

, 2021
Khidr
m and
u-Hasher
Abc

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$																										
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Table (1): Effect of 1% Zinc phosphide concentration and matathion 1% as tracking powder on certain rodents under laboratory condutions. Rodents Sex Av. weight Av. Cons. of powder Av. Cons. of powder in Mortality Day to death Rodents Sex Av. weight Veight Av. Cons. of powder Av. Cons. of powder in Mortality Day to death Rodents Sex Av. weight Av. Cons. of powder in Mortality Day to death		Mean.	1.5	2.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0		ath	Mean					3.25	3.0	3.12	2.5	2.5	2.5	4.0	4.25	4.12	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		ax. I	0	0	0	0	0	0		me to de	Max.					4.5	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.8	5.0	6.0	5.5		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$. M	2.	2.	5.	0	0	0	ce test).	Π'n	Min.					2.0	2.5	2.25	1.5	1.0	1.25	3.0	2.5	2.8		
RodentsSexAv. weightWith reduction%Max.MeanMin.Max.MeanMortalityRodentsSexAv. weightWinMax.MeanMin.Max.MeanMin.%RatusBeforeAfterMinMax.MeanMin.Max.Mean%RatusMales27524610.51.96.14.013.416.415.180norregicusFemales209194.67.02.53.93.28.720.314.990Average242215.3-2.152.13.65.55.150.0ControlMales215.3215.3-3.26.55.150.0ControlFemales114.120.33.14.99.00Average143134.9-3.25.150.0Average141.5114.9-3.25.150.0Zinc ph.SexWeightWeightAv. cons.Av. cons.Av. cons.Av.MatZinc ph.SexWeightAv. cons.Av. cons.Av. cons.Av.Palatability%Mortality%Zinc ph.SexWeightAv. cons.Av. cons.Av. cons.Av.Av.Palatability%Mortality%Zinc ph.Sex214.0209.33.1<	GIIOININI			Min	1.0	2.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	ns (Choi	ality%						80	80	80	00	80	06	80	80	80
RodentsSexAv. weightAv. Cons. of powder in A.RodentsSexAv. weightWeightNo.No.Av. Cons. of powder in A.RatusBeforeAfterAv. Cons. of powderAv. Cons. of powder in A.RatusMales27524610.51.96.14.0RatusMales27524610.51.96.13.013.416.4RatusMales27524610.51.96.13.03.31.4.9RatusMales215215.32.03.611.120.314.9Average134.5-3.85.24.23.5Average174.5174.9-3.36.55.15Average174.5174.9-3.25.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.36.55.15Average174.5174.9-3.25.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.36.55.15Average174.5174.93.26.55.15Average214.0209.32.193.54.2Avera	atuly cut	Mortality	%		80	100	06	0.0	0.0	0.0	r condition	% Mort						~	~	~	1	~		~	~	~
and (1)A. Cons. of powderA. Cons. of powderA. Cons. of powderRodentsSexAv. weightWeightAv. Cons. of powderAv. Cons. of powderAv. Cons. of powderRattusBeforeAfterA.MinMax.MeanMin.Max.Av. Cons. of powderRattusRattusEemales27524610.51.96.14.013.416.4RattusFemales215215.3-2.53.93.25Average134.5-3.86.55.15Average174.5174.9-3.25.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.25.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.25.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.25.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.25.24.2Average174.5174.93.25.24.2Average174.5174.93.25.24.2Average214.0209.33.1Av <cons.< th="">Av<cons.< th="">Av<cons.< th="">Av<cons.< th="">AvForm.Beforeafterfluctuation % of poison<th< td=""><td></td><td>/der in</td><td>y eight</td><td>Mean</td><td>15.1</td><td>14.8</td><td>14.9</td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td>laboratory</td><td>alatability⁶</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>17.2</td><td>19.0</td><td>18.0</td><td>18.1</td><td>17.5</td><td>17.7</td><td>12.0</td><td>20.3</td><td>15.9</td></th<></cons.<></cons.<></cons.<></cons.<>		/der in	y eight	Mean	15.1	14.8	14.9			1	laboratory	alatability ⁶						17.2	19.0	18.0	18.1	17.5	17.7	12.0	20.3	15.9
and the concent and mature to a variable prover on certain RodentsNo. CRodentsSexAv. weightWeightAv. Cons. of powderAv. CRodentsSexAv. weightAv. Cons. of powderAv. CBeforeAfterMinMax.MeanMin.RatusBeforeAfter10.51.96.14.013.4norvegicusFemales209194.67.02.53.93.511.1ControlMales21524610.51.96.14.013.4Average215215.3-2.03.63.111.1ControlMales134.53.86.55.15-Average174.5174.93.86.55.15-Average174.5174.93.86.55.15-ControlMales174.5174.93.86.55.15-Average174.5174.93.86.56.14.013.4ConcNeightWeightAv. cons.Av. cons.Av. cons.Av. cons.Av. cons.Males214.0209.33.24.118.511.00CackMales231.2230.33.63.611.2RunMales231.53.33.14.118.5Average250.4209.33.6 <th< td=""><td></td><td>ons. of pov</td><td>Kg. of bod</td><td>Max.</td><td>16.4</td><td>24.3</td><td>20.3</td><td></td><td>ı</td><td>ı</td><td><i>icus</i> under</td><td>- Av. P</td><td>ons. of</td><td>plain</td><td>oait gr</td><td>k gr b</td><td>W</td><td>78.5</td><td>47.9</td><td>63.2</td><td>61.6</td><td>77.3</td><td>69.5</td><td>49.6</td><td>43.4</td><td>46.5</td></th<>		ons. of pov	Kg. of bod	Max.	16.4	24.3	20.3		ı	ı	<i>icus</i> under	- Av. P	ons. of	plain	oait gr	k gr b	W	78.5	47.9	63.2	61.6	77.3	69.5	49.6	43.4	46.5
Any. weightAvy. weightAvy. weightAvy. WeightAvy. Cons. of powderRodentsSexAvy. weightWeightAvy. Cons. of powderBeforeAfterAfterMinMax.MeanRattusMales2752467.02.53.93.2TorvegicusAverage242220.38.72.25.03.6Average242220.38.72.25.03.6Average215215.3-2.63.93.25Average174.5174.9-3.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.24.2Average174.5174.9-3.24.2Average214.0209.32.193.51.4Average214.0209.32.193.51.4Average232.2232.13.053.24.2Average232.13.053.51.41.4Average232.2232.32.193.51.4Average232.32.193.514.81.4Average232.23.33.11.81.4Average231.5231.4240.83.31.4 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Av. C</td><td>gram /</td><td>Min.</td><td>13.4</td><td>8.8</td><td>1.11</td><td>•</td><td>-</td><td>ı</td><td>gavron si</td><td>V.</td><td>s. of c</td><td>son</td><td>t gr h</td><td>grb //</td><td>N</td><td>6.3</td><td>0.0</td><td>1.2</td><td>0.</td><td>6.4</td><td>5.7</td><td>8.</td><td>.1</td><td>0.</td></t<>		Av. C	gram /	Min.	13.4	8.8	1.11	•	-	ı	gavron si	V.	s. of c	son	t gr h	grb //	N	6.3	0.0	1.2	0.	6.4	5.7	8.	.1	0.
and (1): Effect of 10 and (1)RodentsSexAv. weightWeightAv. Cons. of power power power of power of power power of power of power of power of power of power power of power power of power power of power of power power power of power power power power power of power	, in the second	vder	ram)	Mean	4.0	3.2	3.6	3.25	5.15	4.2	nst Rattu	V	con	poi	bai	/k 5	-	16	12	14	11	16	13	9	11	6
Any weightAny weightAvy. WeightAvy. WeightAvy. WeightAvy. ControlRattusMales 275 246 10.5 1.9 MinRattusMales 275 246 10.5 1.9 MinRattusMales 275 246 7.0 2.5 2.2 norvegicusFemales 209 134.6 7.0 2.5 2.2 NorvegicusAverage 215.3 $2.15.3$ $ 3.2$ Average 174.5 174.9 $ 3.2$ Able (2): Efficiency of certain zinc phosphide formulations (1% concentraZinc ph.SexWeightWeight $4v$. cons.Sinc ph.SexWeight 3.6 3.2 3.2 CackMales 214.0 209.3 3.19 3.5 CarkMales 214.0 209.3 3.6 3.25 Max blockMales 231.5 221.4 3.6 3.25 Max blockMales 231.5 221.4 4.4 3.8	<u>, u auning</u>	ons. of pov	dividual (g	Max.	6.1	3.9	5.0	3.9	6.5	5.2	ition) agaii	Av. cons.	of plain	bait				16.8	12.8	14.8	18.5	17.9	18.2	11.0	9.0	10.0
Rodents Sex Av. weight Weight Ratus Before After Weight Ratus Males 275 246 10.5 Ratus Males 275 246 10.5 Ratus Average 242 220.3 8.7 Control Males 215 215.3 - Average 215 215.3 - Average 174.5 174.9 - Average 174.5 174.9 - Average 215.417.9 - - Average 215.5 215.3 - Average 174.5 174.9 - Average 214.0 200.3 8.7 Average 214.5 174.5 - Average 214.0 209.3 2.19 Form. Before after fluctuation% Average 232.2 2.25.1 3.05 Cack Males 214.0 209.3 Carshed Males 231.5 2.19 Average 232.2 2.25.1 3.05 Max Mock Males 231.5 2.14		AV. C	day/ino	Min	1.9	2.5	2.2	2.6	3.8	3.2	o concentra	Av. cons.	of poison	bait				3.5	3.0	3.25	4.1	3.8	3.9	1.5	2.3	1.9
Rodents Sex Av. weight Rattus Males 275 246 Rattus Males 215 215.3 Routrol Males 215 215.3 Control Males 215 214.6 Average 215 214.9 Average 174.5 174.9 Average 214.0 209.3 Cock Males 204 Average 232.2 225.1 Average 231.5 221.4 Average 265.9 255.9		Weight	reduction%		10.5	7.0	8.7	-	·		mulations (1%)	Weight	ctuation%					2.19	3.8	3.05	3.3	4.4	3.8	2.9	3.4	2.6
Rodents Sex Av. wei Rattus Males 275 Rattus Males 275 Rattus Average 242 Routrol Males 215 Average 174.5 Average 174.5 Average 214.0 Zinc ph. Sex Form. Before afte Cack Males 214.0 Cack Males 214.0 Cack Males 232.2 Crushed Males 231.5 Max block Males 231.5 Average 231.5 221.	י י	ght		After	246	194.6	220.3	215.3	134.5	174.9	hide for		r flue					e.	8	.1	is	4	6	9	4	0.
Rodents Sex Rattus Males 2 Rattus Males 2 Rotrol Females 2 Routrol Males 2 Sex Males 2 Sex Males 2 Sex Males 2 Sex Males 2 Cortrol Sex Males Sex Males 232.2 Crushed Males 231.5 Max block Males 231.5	· · ·	Av. wei		fore	75	60	42	15	34	4.5	c phospl	/eight	e afte					209.	240	225.	290	221.	255.	217.	200	209
Bodents Sex Rattus Males Rattus Males norvegicus Female Average Average Control Males Average Average Zinc ph. Sex Form. Females Crushed Males Crushed Males Males Average Crushed Males Max block Males	identid a			Bei	2	s 2	e 2	2	s 1	e 17	tain zine	М	Befor					214.0	250.4	232.2	300.4	231.5	265.9	221.8	207.5	214.7
Rodents Rattus norvegicus Control Form. Form. Cack Uack Wax block	2 T 10	Sex			Males	Female	Averag	Males	Female	Averag	ncy of cert	Sex						Males	Females	Average	Males	Females	Average	Males	Females	Average
i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	Tanta (T) Mar	Rodents			Rattus	norvegicus		Control			Table (2): Efficie	Zinc ph.	Form.					Cack			Crushed	maize		Wax block		

ditio 4 2 R 1.... 10/ . , • . ahida , £ 10/ U CC 5 Table

Egypt. J. Plant Prot. Res. Inst. (2021), 4 (4): 702 –707

•	ne to death	. Mean	2.25	2.55	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	3.25	2.9			Efficien-	cy%	B	10	65	65	75
nice test)	Tin	Max	3.0	3.0	3.0	7	7	7	3.5	4.0	3.75			o, of	ped	3nights	_			
(Non cho		Min.	1.5	2.1	1.8	1	1	1	1.5	2.5	2.0		Traps	Av. No	entra	rodents/S	14	13	13	15
atory conditions	Mortality%		100	80	06	100	100	100	80	80	80	I Governorate.		otal No. of pre	applied	trap/fed.		ç	07	
er labor:	f poison	gr b w										Ismailia	۷%₀	\mathbf{T}_{0}						
egicus und	Av. cons. of	bait gr /k	53.3	40.5	49.3	62.2	50.7	55.9	20.2	20.2	22.3	rodents in	Efficiency	(A)			83	66.7	75	50
attus norv	eight Av. cons. of poison											tain field		No of	eopened	burrow	2	4	4	S
gainst R		bait	7.5	6.2	6.8	11.2	10.1	10.6	4.5	5.2	4.8	ainst cer	anb		ı					
ration) a												l traps ag	ws techni	rows						
o concent		uation%	4.6	3.9	4.24	3.55	5.32	4.5	2.4	2.2	2.3	bhide and	Burrov	ctive bur			12	12	16	6
tions (1%	M	flucti			7							inc phosp		No. of a						
formula		after	134.3	129.8	132.05	173.5	188.4	180.9	217.6	203.0	210.3	: of 1% zi								
phosphide	Weight	Before	140.8	135.0	137.9	179.9	199.0	189.4	223.0	207.5	215.2	rmulations	rmulation				ck	l maize	powder	block
certain zinc	Sex		Males	Females	Average	Males	Females	Average	Males	Females	Average	different fo	Zn. Ph. foi				Ca	Crushed	Tracking	Wax I
mey of c						ze						ency of								
Table(3) : Efficie	Zinc ph. Form.		Cack			Crushed mai			Wax block			Table (4) : Effici	Species				\$	Kattus	•	norvegicus

Tracking powder = mixture from 1% Zn ph.+ 1% malathion

References

- Abd El-Razek, E. (1997): Some ecological and toxicological studies on certain Egyptian rodents, Master of Science in Agricultural (Zoology). Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azhar University.
- Abdallah, M. D.; Kandil, M. A.; El-Deep, H. I. and Gaber, W. M. (1991): Laboratory and field studies with zinc phosphide on different rodent species for the Arab Conference of Plant Protection, Cairo Dec., pp. 494-500.
- Asran, A. A. (1994): Susceptibility and palatability of some Egyptian rodents to zinc phosphide, Agricultural Research Review. Egypt. J. Agric. Res., 72 (1): 141-146.
- Asran, A. A. (2001): Effect of zinc phosphide and malathion 1% mixture as a tracking powder on some rodents under laboratory conditions. Fayoum J. Agric. Res. and Dev. Vol.15, No. 1, January 2001.
- Bradfield, A.A.G. and Gill, J. E. (1984): Laboratory trials of five rodenticides for the control of

Mescocricetus auratus water house. J. Hyg., 93 (2): 398-394.

- Htun, P. and Brooks, J. E. (1979): Laboratory evaluation of zinc phosphide as rodenticides against *Bandicota bengalensis*. Pans, 25 (3): 246-250.
- Khan, A. A. (2007): Comparative evaluation of two anticoagulant and two acute rodenticides in sugar cane fields, Sarhad. Journal of Agriculture, 23 (3): 713-718.
- Ocampo, P. P. and Lontoc, B. M. (2006): On form pulsed baiting with coumatetralyl for the control of rice field rats. Philippine- Entomologist, 20 (1): 81-93.
- Samol, H. H. (1972): Rat damage to sugarcane in Florida. Proc. Int. Soc. Sugar Cane Technol., 14:575-580.
- Wahab, A. E. S. K.; Asran, A. A. and Keshta, T. M. (1997): Laboratory trials on effect of the different concentrations of zinc phosphide on the wild and albino house mouse, *Mus musculus* 1.. Al –Azhar J. Agric. Res., 25: 261-268.