2

3

4

5

6

7

1	
2	
3 ⊿	
5	
б	
7	
0 9	
10	
11	
13	
14	
15	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
22	
23	
25	
26	
27	
20 29	
30	
31	
33	
34	
35	
37	
38	
39 40	
41	
42	
43 11	
45	
46	
47 48	
49	
50	
51 52	
53	
54	
55 56	
57	
58	
59 60	
61	
62	
63 64	

Electrophysiological and Behavioral Responses of Vine Weevil, *Otiorhynchus sulcatus* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae), Adults to Host Plant Odors

Joe M. Roberts^{1,2} · Jhaman Kundun¹ · Charlotte Rowley¹ · David R. Hall³ · Paul Douglas³ · Tom W. Pope¹

- 8 ¹ Centre for Integrated Pest Management, Harper Adams University, Newport, Shropshire,
- 9 TF10 8NB, United Kingdom
- ¹⁰ ² Centre for Applied Entomology and Parasitology, School of Life Sciences, Keele
- 11 University, Keele, Staffordshire, ST5 5BG, United Kingdom
- ³ Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich, Central Avenue, Chatham Maritime,
- 13 Kent, ME4 4TB, United Kingdom
- 14
- 15 Corresponding author
- 16 Dr Joe Roberts

1

65

17 jroberts@harper-adams.ac.uk

19 Abstract

Vine weevil, Otiorhynchus sulcatus F. (Coleoptera: Curculionidae), is an economically important pest species in many soft-fruit and ornamental crops. Economic losses arise from damage to the roots, caused by larvae, and to the leaves, caused by adults. As adults are nocturnal and larvae feed below ground, infestations can initially be missed, and controls may, as a result, be applied too late. In the absence of a vine weevil sex or aggregation pheromone being identified, the development of an effective semiochemical lure for better management of this pest is likely to focus on host-plant volatiles. Here, we investigate the electrophysiological and behavioral responses of adult vine weevils to volatile organic compounds (VOCs) originating from their preferred host plant Euonymus fortunei, and synthetic VOCs associated with this host when presented individually or as blends. Consistent electroantennographic responses were observed to a range of generalist VOCs. Behavioral responses to VOCs, when presented individually, were found to be influenced by the concentration of the compound to which the weevils were exposed. Vine weevil adults showed directional movement towards a mixture of seven plant volatiles (methyl salicylate, 1-octen-3-ol, (E)-2-hexenol, (Z)-3-hexenol, 1-hexanol, (E)-2-pentenol, and linalool) even though either no response or negative responses were recorded to each of these compounds when presented individually. Similarly, vine weevils showed directional movement towards a 1:1 ratio mixture of (Z)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol. Results presented here point to the importance of blends of generalist compounds and concentrations of VOCs in the optimization of a lure.

Key Words – Vine weevil, *Euonymus fortunei*, monitoring, electroantennography, air entrainment, olfactometry.

44 Introduction

Vine weevil (also known as black vine weevil), *Otiorhynchus sulcatus* F. (Coleoptera: Curculionidae), is one of the most economically important pest species of soft-fruit and ornamental crops globally (van Tol et al. 2012). Vine weevils are female and reproduce via thelytokous parthenogenesis, resulting in very little genetic diversity within the species (Lundmark 2010). The flightless adults lay their eggs at night into cracks in the soil or growing medium (Smith 1932). Upon hatching, the larvae complete four to nine molts before pupating in earthen cells (Masaki and Ohto 1995). Typically, vine weevils are a univoltine species, but as a winter diapause is not required and their development rate is temperaturedependent (Son and Lewis 2005), overlapping generations may occur in protected environments. Crop damage and economic losses are the result of feeding on plant roots, corms and rhizomes by larvae and on leaves by adults (Moorhouse et al. 1992).

The conventional method of controlling vine weevil has been with synthetic chemical insecticides incorporated into plant growing media for larval control and foliar applications at dusk to target the adults (van Tol et al. 2012). Despite the widespread use of these insecticides, vine weevil has remained an important pest. Furthermore, repeated applications of insecticides in fruit crops can have negative impacts on beneficial arthropods (Solomon et al. 2001), resulting in outbreaks of secondary pests (van Tol et al. 2012). Over recent years there is has been a move to use entomopathogenic nematodes and fungi to control vine weevil larvae (e.g. Ansari et al. 2008; Georgis et al. 2006; Shah et al. 2006; Willmott et al. 2002), but management of adult weevils still typically relies on the use of broad-spectrum insecticides (Moorhouse et al. 1992; van Tol et al. 2012).

A key component of an integrated pest management (IPM) program is to base the use
of control methods on careful monitoring of pest numbers in relation to action thresholds (e.g.
Kogan 1998). For vine weevil, this is made difficult by the nocturnal activity of the adults

and the fact that the larvae feed below ground. Consequently, growers often do not observe vine weevils within crops through direct monitoring before significant damage has already occurred (van Tol et al. 2012). During the day adult weevils can be found in leaf litter, under pots or other suitable refuges. This behavior has been exploited using grooved boards placed on the ground (Gordon et al. 2003; Li et al. 1995), corrugated card wrapped around stems of larger bushes (Phillips 1989), and plastic crawling insect 'traps' (Pope et al. 2018) that provide adult weevils with artificial refuges and so help to focus monitoring efforts. Indirect monitoring of adult weevils is based on the presence of damage in the form of characteristic 'leaf-notching' from adult feeding to determine whether a crop is infested (Moorhouse et al. 1992), but this approach also leads to a delay in detecting the presence of adult weevils within crops, allowing oviposition to occur before control measures can be applied (van Tol et al. 2012).

Development of an effective semiochemical lure would improve vine weevil monitoring reliability and sensitivity, which may contribute to development of novel control methods such as autodissemination of entomopathogenic fungi (Pope et al. 2018). Identification of semiochemicals suitable for use as a vine weevil lure has proved challenging. As vine weevil reproduce asexually they do not produce a sex pheromone (van Tol et al. 2012). However, adults display strong aggregation behavior (Kakizaki 2001; Pickett et al. 1996) and attraction to conspecifics in a laboratory bioassay has been reported by van Tol et al. (2004b) and Nakamuta et al. (2005). Although male-produced aggregation pheromones have been identified from several weevil species (e.g. Blight and Wadhams 1987; Faustini et al. 1982; Gunawardena et al. 1998; Jayaraman et al. 1997; Rochat et al. 1991; Tumlinson et al. 1969), an aggregation pheromone for the vine weevil has not yet been identified.

Attraction of vine weevil to kairomones from host plants has also been investigated. Attraction to weevil frass has been reported by Pickett et al. (1996) and van Tol et al. (2004b), and it is possible this may explain the attraction of vine weevils to conspecific weevils. Although considered to be polyphagous, vine weevil adults show preferences for plants such as yew, Taxus baccata (L.) and spindle tree, Euonymus fortunei (Turcz.) Hand.-Maz. (van Tol and Visser 2002; van Tol et al. 2012), and two compounds identified in volatiles from *E. fortunei*, (Z)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol, have been found to increase numbers of weevils in the area around traps (van Tol et al. 2012). These studies suggest that vine weevil adults use olfactory cues to locate host plants and for aggregation. Here we report on the electrophysiological and behavioral responses of adult vine weevils to volatile chemical stimuli originating from host plants and synthetic chemical compounds, presented both individually and as blends, with the aim of informing development of an effective lure for improved monitoring and potentially control of this pest.

Methods and Materials

Insect Cultures Adult vine weevils, Otiohynchus sulcatus F., were collected from commercial strawberry crops grown in Shropshire and Staffordshire UK during the summer in 2012, 2017 and 2018. Recovered vine weevils were maintained on branches of yew, Taxus baccata (L.), and moist paper towels inside insect cages (47.5 x 47.5 x 47.5 cm) (Bugdorm, MegaView, Taiwan) placed in a controlled environment room (20 °C; 60% RH; L:D 16:8 h) (Fitotron, Weiss Technik, Ebbw Vale, Wales).

Collection of Volatiles For collection of volatiles from intact plants during 2012, potted E. fortunei plants (Homebase, Buckinghamshire, UK) carrying approximately 50 g foliage were enclosed individually in a polyethyleneterephthalate oven bag ($37 \times 25 \text{ cm} \times 12 \mu$ thick; J

Sainsbury plc, London, UK) (Stewart-Jones and Poppy 2006). Charcoal-filtered air (600
ml/min) was pumped into the bag to maintain positive pressure while air was drawn out (500
ml/min) through a collection filter containing Porapak Q (200 mg, 50-80 mesh; Supelco,
Gillingham, Dorset, UK) held between two silanized glass wool plugs in a disposable glass
pipette (4 mm i.d.). Six collections were carried out over a period of 24 h in a controlled
environment room at 25 °C, 12:12 h L:D and 50% relative humidity.

During 2018, volatiles were collected from samples of cut branches of *E. fortunei* as used in the bioassay experiments. Cut stems (approx. 60 g) from one of the authors' garden in Kent, UK, were contained in round-bottomed flasks (3 liter) maintained in a controlled environment room as above. Air was drawn into the flask through an activated charcoal filter (20 cm x 2 cm; 8-10 mesh) and out through a filter containing Porapak Q as above. Collections were made for 6 h and then a further 18 h from four samples.

Volatiles were eluted from the Porapak Q filters with dichloromethane (2 x 0.5 ml;
Pesticide Residue Grade; Fisher Scientific, Loughborough, UK), concentrated approximately
five times by evaporation under a gentle stream of purified nitrogen, and stored at -20 °C
before analysis. All collections were analyzed by GC/MS before and after concentration to
confirm that no impurities had been introduced and no significant changes in composition
had occurred during concentration. In other work, this concentration step caused a 15% loss
of limonene but no detectable loss of less volatile compounds such as decyl acetate.

137For GC/EAG analyses, the collections estimated to contain most material were used.138For collections from intact plants in 2012, this was one made from 50 g plant material over13918 h, estimated to contain 4.4 ng/g plant material/h of the major component, (E,E)-α-140farnesene, by comparison with an external standard. For collections from cut plants in 2018,141the collection was made from 54 g plant material for 21 h, estimated to contain 5.9 ng/g/h142(E,E)-α-farnesene.

Analysis by Gas Chromatography coupled to Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS) Analyses were carried out on a CP3500 GC coupled to a CP2200 Ion Trap Detector (Varian, now Agilent Technologies, Cheadle, UK). The GC was fitted with a fused silica capillary column (30 mm x 0.25 mm x 0.25 µm film thickness) coated with DBWax (Supelco). Manual injections (1 µl) were made in splitless mode (220 °C), with oven temperature programmed from 40 °C for 2 min then at 10 °C/min to 240 °C. Compounds were identified according to their mass spectrum, retention index relative to retention times of *n*-alkanes, and co-chromatography with authentic compounds.

The enantiomeric composition of linalool present in collections of volatiles from E. fortunei was determined by GC with flame ionization detection (FID) using a fused silica capillary column (25 mm x 0.32 mm i.d. x 0.25 µm film thickness) coated with a cyclodextrin stationary phase (Chirasil-DEX CB; Varian). Injection was splitless (220 °C), detection was by FID (250 °C), and carrier gas was helium (2.4 ml/min). The oven temperature was programmed at 60 °C for 2 min then at 5 °C/min to 200 °C. Retention times of (R)-(-)- and (S)-(+)-linalool were 11.39 min and 11.48 min, respectively.

Analysis by Gas Chromatography coupled to Electroantennography (GC/EAG) Analyses were carried out with a HP6890 GC (Agilent Technologies) fitted with flame ionization detector (FID) and fused silica capillary columns (30 m x 0.25 mm x 0.32 µm film thickness) coated with DBWax and DB1 (Supelco). Injections onto the DBWax column were in splitless mode (220 °C), with the oven temperature programmed from 50 °C for 2 min and then at 10 °C/min. to 250 °C for analyses in 2012 and from 50 °C for 2 min and then at 20 °C/min. to 250 °C for analyses in 2018. The effluents of the two columns were combined with a glass push-fit Y-tube connector (Agilent Technologies) connected to a second Y-tube connector

with deactivated fused silica tubing (10 cm x 0.32 mm i.d.). One arm of this connector was connected with fused silica tubing (50 cm x 0.32 mm i.d.) to the FID (250 °C) and the other to an equal length of deactivated silica tubing passing through a heated transfer line (250°C; Syntech, Hilversum, The Netherlands, now Kirchzarten, Germany) into a glass tube (4 mm i.d.) through which air passed (500 ml/min) over the EAG preparation.

Electroantennogram recordings were made with a portable INR-02 device (Syntech) connected as a second detector of the GC for A/D conversion. Glass electrodes containing electrolyte solution (0.1 M potassium chloride with 1 % polyvinylpyrrolidone) were attached to silver wires held in micromanipulators. Vine weevils were anaesthetized using carbon dioxide before excising the head using a scalpel. The reference electrode was inserted into the back of the head and the circuit was completed by bringing the recording electrode into contact with the tip of one antenna. Both the FID and EAG signals were collected and analyzed with EZChrom software (Elite v3.0; Agilent Technologies).

This system was used both for analyses of collections of volatiles from E. fortunei plants (2 µl injected) and for measurement of EAG responses to synthetic compounds. For the latter, the test compound (10 ng) was injected with 1-hexanol (10 ng) as internal standard eliciting a strong EAG response from vine weevil antennae in our system.

Chemicals Unless stated otherwise, chemicals were purchased from Sigma Aldrich (Gillingham, Dorset, UK) and were > 95% pure by GC analysis. 1-Octen-3-ol was from International Flavors and Fragrances (Haverhill, Suffolk, UK). (E)-4,8-Dimethyl-1,3,7nonatriene (DMNT) was synthesized by Wittig reaction of methylphosphonium bromide with geranial prepared by oxidation of geraniol with pyridinium dichromate in dichloromethane. (*E*,*E*)-4,8,12-Trimethyl-1,3,7,11-tridecatetraene (TMTT) was synthesized analogously from (E,E)-farnesal prepared by oxidation of (E,E)-farnesol. Pure (E,E)- α -farnesene was obtained

by washing apples in hexane followed by chromatography on silica gel eluted with hexane. Germacrene-D was a major component (40%) of ylang-ylang essential oil (Holland and Barrett, Nuneaton, Warwks, UK) with (E,E)- α -farnesene (45%) and β -caryophyllene (15%). Cadinols were isolated from Hinoki essential oil from Chamaecyparis obtusa (Shieh et al. 1981) by liquid chromatography on silica gel eluted with a gradient of diethyl ether in hexane. The fraction eluted with 50% diethyl ether in hexane contained 16% tau-cadinol and 32% alpha-cadinol according to their mass spectra and GC retention times in GC/MS analyses (El-Sayed 2019).

Y-tube Olfactometer Bioassays The behavioral responses of adult vine weevils to chemical stimuli were tested using a Y-tube olfactometer (Sci-Glass Consultancy, Bere Alston, UK) (Supplementary Information Fig. S1) based upon the design previously used by van Tol et al. (2002). The stem length was 120 mm, arm length 190 mm and internal diameter 18 mm. Airflow in each arm was 600 ml/min and odor sources were held in Drechsel bottles (500 ml). Euonymous fortunei plant material (20 g) was cut from the plant and the cut stem wrapped in moist cotton wool and aluminum foil. Synthetic compounds were diluted in paraffin oil (Fisher Scientific) to give the required amount in 10 µl which was applied to Whatman glass microfibre filters (934-AH grade; 47 mm diameter; Sigma Aldrich). Test samples equilibrated in the Drechsel bottles for 1 h prior to tests.

All bioassays were undertaken in complete darkness in a controlled environment room (20 °C; 60 % RH; 16:8 h L:D). Prior to their use in a bioassay, vine weevils were starved for a minimum of 24 h unless stated otherwise. Groups of 40 vine weevils were introduced into the olfactometer via a release chamber (100 mm diameter). Each pair of odor sources was tested six times with fresh individuals for 20 min, and the numbers of weevils reaching the end of each arm during this time were recorded. The positions of the odor

sources were alternated between replicates to eliminate directional bias. After each pair of odor sources had been tested six times, all glassware was thoroughly cleaned by rinsing with warm water followed by HPLC-grade acetone (Sigma Aldrich) before baking in a glassware oven at 120 °C for 15 min.

Nine compounds were tested individually at source loadings of 0.1 mg, 1 mg and 5 mg to provide a wide range of doses that caused significant behavioral effects in previous work by Karley et al. (2012). These were (Z)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol, compounds reported to be attractive to vine weevil by van Tol et al. (2012), and methyl salicylate, 1-hexanol, (Z)-3-hexenol, (E)-2-hexenol, (E)-2-pentenol, (\pm) -linalool, and 1-octen-3-ol, compounds found to elicit strong EAG responses from vine weevil in our own work. Two blends were tested at loadings of 1 mg total: a binary blend of equal amounts of (Z)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol (van Tol et al. 2012) and a blend of equal amounts of the other seven electrophysiologically active compounds: methyl salicylate, 1-hexanol, (Z)-3-hexenol, (E)-2-hexenol, (E)-2-pentenol, linalool and 1-octen-3-ol.

Statistical Analyses All statistical analyses were performed using R (Version 3.5-3) (R Core Team, 2019). Y-Tube olfactometer bioassay data were analyzed using an exact binomial test against the null hypothesis that the number of vine weevils reaching the end of either olfactometer arm had a 50:50 distribution. Prior to performing statistical analyses, the replicated results from each of the odor pairs tested were pooled with non-responding individuals being excluded from statistical analyses.

Results

Y-Tube Bioassay with Host Plant Material Vine weevils starved for at least 24 h exhibited a preference for the Y-tube olfactometer arm containing air blown over E. fortunei plant

material with 83 % of responding individuals choosing this arm over the clean-air control arm (*P* < 0.001).

GC/EAG and GC/MS Analyses of Volatiles from Euonymus fortunei In analyses of volatiles from E. fortunei by GC coupled to EAG recording from a vine weevil antenna, 22 reproducible responses were observed in analyses of volatiles from intact plants (Fig. 1) and 20 responses in analyses of volatiles from cut branches (Fig. 2). The identities of the compounds responsible are summarized in Table 1 along with their relative proportions present in the collections used for GC/EAG analyses. There were responses to 13 compounds present in both sets of samples: aldehydes hexanal, (Z)-3-hexenal, heptanal, (E)-2-hexenal, octanal, nonanal, and decanal; alcohols 1-hexanol, (Z)-3-hexenol, (R)-(-) linalool; aromatic 1,2-dimethoxybenzene (veratrole), sesquiterpene (E,E)- α -farnesene; and the oxylipin *cis*-jasmone. (E,E)- α -Farnesene was the most abundant compound in both sets of samples, although the EAG response to this was always relatively weak (Figs. 2 and 3).

In analyses of volatiles from intact plants, responses were also observed to ketones 6methyl-5-hepten-2-one and geranyl acetone; alcohols 1-octen-3-ol and 2-ethyl-1-hexanol; acetic acid; sesquiterpene α -cadinol; and three unidentified compounds present at very low levels. Acetic acid and 2-ethyl-1-hexanol were also present in collections of volatiles from cut plants, although no EAG response was observed, while the other compounds were not detected in volatiles from cut plants.

In analyses of volatiles from cut plants, responses were also observed to alcohols (E)-2-hexenol, benzyl alcohol and 2-phenylethanol; acids hexanoic acid and 2-ethylhexanoic acid; methyl salicylate; and indole. Of these compounds, only methyl salicylate was detected in samples of volatiles from intact plants.

EAG responses were not observed to other relatively ubiquitous plant volatiles present in one or both sets of collections, such as (E)-ocimene, (Z)-3-hexenyl acetate, copaene, α - and β -caryophyllene, and (*E*)-nerolidol, or to the stress-related volatiles DMNT and TMTT.

(E)-2-Pentenol, (Z)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol, compounds reported from E. fortunei by van Tol et al. (2012), could not be detected (<0.1%) in any of the collections from intact plants (6 samples) or cut plants (8 samples) by comparison of GC retention times and mass spectra with those of authentic standards (Table 2).

GC-EAG Analysis of Synthetic Chemicals In experiments during 2012, consistent EAG responses were observed to (E)-2-pentenol, (Z)-2-pentenol, (E)-2-hexenol, (Z)-3-hexenol, 1-hexanol, 1-octen-3-ol, (±)-linalool, and methyl salicylate (Table 2 and Supplementary Material Figs. S2, S3), while (E,E)- α -farnesene and methyl eugenol elicited responses approximately 50 % of the time they were tested (Table 2). No response was observed to 34 281 DMNT or β -caryophyllene, consistent with the absence of responses to these compounds in volatiles from E. fortunei (Table 2 and Supplementary Material Figs. S2, S3).

Subsequent experiments during 2018 confirmed the consistent response to 1-hexanol and showed a similarly consistent response to *cis*-jasmone (Table 2 and Supplementary Material Fig. S4). Analysis of the cadinol fraction from Hinoki essential oil showed a consistent response to tau-cadinol but not to α -cadinol (Table 2 and Supplementary Material Fig. S5), in contrast to what was observed previously in GC-EAG analyses of volatiles from intact E. fortunei plants. No EAG response was observed to indole (Table 2) even though a response was sometimes observed to this compound in volatiles from cut E. fortunei plants (Fig. 1 and Table 1).

Y-Tube Bioassays When tested at 0.1 mg at source, significantly more vine weevils moved to the control arm relative to the treatment arm for five of the nine chemical compounds tested : 1-hexanol (P < 0.001), (Z)-3-hexenol (P = 0.02), (E)-2-hexenol (P < 0.001), 1-octen-3-ol (P< 0.001), and (Z)-2-pentenol (P = 0.02) (Fig. 3). For the other four compounds, methyl salicylate, (E)-2-pentenol, linalool and methyl eugenol, there was no significant difference between the numbers in control and treatment arms (P > 0.05) (Fig. 3).

When tested at 1 mg at source, significantly more weevils were recorded in the control arm relative to the number in the treatment arm for three chemicals: 1-octen-3-ol (P <0.001), linalool (P < 0.001), and 1-hexanol (P = 0.02) (Fig. 4). Significantly more weevils were recorded in the treatment arm for two of the compounds: (Z)-2-pentenol (P = 0.03) and methyl eugenol (P = 0.001), while there was no significant difference between the numbers in control and treatment arms for (E)-2-pentenol, (Z)-3-hexenol, (E)-2-hexenol, and methyl salicylate (P > 0.05) (Fig. 4).

When tested at 5 mg at source, seven of the nine chemical compounds tested evoked a behavioral response in the vine weevils. Significantly more weevils were recorded in the control arm relative to the treatment arm for five compounds: methyl salicylate (P < 0.001), (E)-2-hexenol (P < 0.001), linalool (P < 0.001), 1-octen-3-ol (P < 0.01), and methyl eugenol (P < 0.001) (Fig. 5). Significantly more weevils were observed in the treatment arm relative to the number in the control arm for two compounds: 1-hexanol (P = 0.01) and (Z)-2pentenol (P < 0.001) (Fig. 5). There was no significant difference between the number of weevils in the control and treatment arms of (Z)-3-hexenol and (E)-2-pentenol (P > 0.05).

Two blends of chemicals were tested at 1 mg total at source (Fig. 6). With a binary blend of equal amounts of (*Z*)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol, a significantly greater number of the responding vine weevils demonstrated a preference for the olfactometer arm containing the treatment over the control arm (P = 0.01). Similarly, with a seven-component blend

containing equal amounts of methyl salicylate, 1-hexanol, (Z)-3-hexenol, (E)-2-hexenol, (E)-2-pentenol, linalool and 1-octen-3-ol, significantly more of the weevils responding were recorded in the treatment arm (P < 0.001) (Fig. 6).

Discussion

Vine weevil larvae and adults are polyphagous (Masaki et al. 1984; Smith 1932), although adults show a strong preference for certain plant species in the families Rosaceae, Ericaceae and Taxaceae (van Tol et al., 2004a). Olfactory cues play an important role in these behavioral responses, with vine weevil adults preferring the odor of *E. fortunei* over blank controls and other potential hosts such as Fragaria or Rhododendron (van Tol et al., 2004a). The results presented here confirm that adult vine weevils move toward air streams containing VOCs originating from *E. fortunei*. Furthermore, it is apparent that it is the blend of generalist compounds and the concentrations of VOCs that are important in determining whether a positive behavioral response is elicited.

In GC-EAG analyses of volatiles from intact and cut E. fortunei plants, consistent EAG responses from vine weevil antennae were observed to 13 common plant volatiles present in both sets of collections. These were seven aliphatic aldehydes, three alcohols, one sesquiterpenes, one aromatic and the oxylipin, *cis*-jasmone. In GC-EAG analyses of volatiles from intact plants, 9 additional EAG responses were observed. These additional EAG responses included those to 6-methyl-5-heptenone and geranyl acetone, which are, paradoxically, characteristically emitted by damaged plants (War et al. 2011). In analyses of volatiles from cut plants, as used in the laboratory bioassays, additional EAG responses were observed to three alcohols, two acids, methyl salicylate, and indole. Several of the volatiles eliciting EAG responses in this study, such as (Z)-3-hexenol, (E)-2-hexenol, 1-octen-3-ol, and (E,E)- α -farnesene, have previously been detected from GC-EAG analyses of volatiles from

crushed and variously damaged *E. fortunei* plants (van Tol et al. 2012). Other relatively ubiquitous plant volatiles detected in one or both sets of collections, such as (E)-ocimene, β -caryophyllene, germacrene D and the stress-related volatiles DMNT and TMTT, did not elicit EAG responses despite being previously reported to do so (van Tol et al. 2012). van Tol et al. (2012) also reported EAG responses to (Z)-2-pentenol, methyl benzoate, estragole, 4-tertbutylcyclohexanol, 2-phenoxyethanol and methyl eugenol presented in E. fortunei air entrainments. These volatiles were never detected in our analyses even though they were specifically looked for by comparison with mass spectra and GC retention times of the authentic compounds. This may in part be due to the poor resolution of the GC peaks in the analyses of van Tol et al. (2012), and questionable structural assignments in this earlier study - e.g. (E)-ocimene does not elute after DMNT on the column used.

Results of GC-EAG analyses of volatiles from *E. fortunei* plants were supported by similar analyses of a selection of synthetic compounds using vine weevil antennae. In particular, strong and consistent EAG responses were observed to alcohols 1-hexanol, (E)-2hexenol, (Z)-3-hexenol, 1-octen-3-ol and linalool. These results are similar to those reported by van Tol and Visser (2002). Strong and consistent EAG responses were also observed in this study to *cis*-jasmone, which has not previously been reported. DMNT and β -caryophyllene did not elicit EAG responses, as observed in GC-EAG analyses of the plant volatiles, but (Z)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol, although not detected in the GC-EAG analysis of the plant volatiles, did elicit EAG responses.

Despite their absence in our study samples, both (*Z*)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol were tested in Y-tube olfactometer bioassays as van Tol et al. (2012) reported that release of (*Z*)-2-pentenol on its own or as 1:1 ratio mixture with methyl eugenol from boll weevil traps in strawberry crops increased numbers of vine weevil adults in the area surrounding the traps. This response could result from orientated movement of vine weevil adults from distance

towards the release point of these VOCs or be due to the VOCs arresting the weevils after a chance arrival in the area close to the traps (Kennedy 1977). The olfactometry results presented here confirm that vine weevil adults do indeed show orientated movement towards both compounds when 1 mg was presented individually. For (*Z*)-2-pentenol, when 5 mg was presented a similar response was recorded but at 0.1 mg weevils were found to move away from this odor source. In addition, when 1 mg of a 1:1 ratio mixture of (*Z*)-2-pentenol and methyl eugenol was presented, vine weevils were again found to orientate towards this odor.

The apparent sensitivity to concentration seen for (Z)-2-pentenol was also seen for the other individual compounds tested, which elicited either no or negative behavioral responses depending on the concentration presented. The only exceptions were (E)-2-pentenol, which did not elicit a behavioral response at any of the loadings tested, and 1-hexanol, to which weevils responded positively only at the 5 mg loading. Few studies have investigated the importance of plant VOC concentration in determining the behavioral responses of phytophagous insects during host plant location or selection (Dicke and Baldwin 2010). For example, a meta-analysis of using plant VOCs to manipulate phytophagous insect pest behavior does not list concentration as a factor influencing insect behavior in any of the 34 published studies analyzed (Szendrei and Rodfriguz-Saona 2009). Despite this, it has been argued that VOC concentration is important (e.g. Bruce et al. 2005). Often in the case of individual compounds where an insect encounters higher concentrations than would be found in nature a misleading response may be recorded, as demonstrated in electrophysiological experiments (e.g. Anderson et al. 1995; Blight et al. 1995; Hansson et al. 1999; Larsson et al. 2005). Nonetheless, in this study negative behavioral responses were recorded to many plant VOCs considered common throughout the plant kingdom at either low or high concentrations (War et al. 2011). The results presented in this study suggest that the concentration of individual VOCs can influence the behavioral response of vine weevil adults under controlled

laboratory conditions. Webster et al. (2010) reported similar results for the black bean aphids (Aphis fabae) responding to different concentrations of individual VOCs identified from their host plants.

With green leaf volatiles (GLVs) dominating the list of VOCs detected by vine weevil adults, the EAG results presented here appear to support the hypothesis that this group of plant volatiles play a role in host-plant location by phytophagous arthropods (Bruce et al. 2005). With either no or negative behavioral responses to compounds when presented individually, vine weevil adults responded positively to a mixture of equal amounts of seven plant volatiles (methyl salicylate, 1-octen-3-ol, (E)-2-hexenol, (Z)-3-hexenol, 1-hexanol, (E)-2-pentenol, and linalool) when 1 mg of the blend was presented. As such, these olfactometry results with individual and simple blends of VOCs demonstrate that components of a host-plant blend may not be recognized when perceived outside the context of that blend as suggested by Bruce and Pickett (2011). This is again comparable to the study by Webster et al. (2010) who found black bean aphids respond positively to a nine-component blend of host plant VOCs that evoked a negative behavioral response when presented individually.

In the absence of a vine weevil sex or aggregation pheromone, the development of an effective semiochemical lure for vine weevil adults is likely to focus on host-plant volatiles. As the VOC's known to be detected by vine weevil adults are found in many plant families, rather than those that are taxonomically characteristic, it seems likely that optimization of a lure must focus on the blend and the concentration of each component in it. The fact that both blends tested here elicited positive behavioral responses suggests that there is redundancy in the composition of the blends used by vine weevil adults to recognize host plants with the potential to substitute some compounds with others (Bruce and Pickett 2011). Further work is required to identify a blend of VOCs that is effective enough to be deployed within crops as a lure to attract adult vine weevils into traps for monitoring or control purposes.

417	
$\frac{1}{2}{3}$ 418	Acknowledgements This work was funded by AHDB Horticulture [Project numbers SF/HNS
⁴ ₅ 419	127 and HNS 195]. We thank Tom Shepherd, Robbie McLaren, Scott N. Johnson, and Alison
⁶ 7 8 420	Karley from the James Hutton Institute (Scotland) for kindly providing a list of candidate
9 10 421	chemical compounds to test in this study.
12 422 13	
14 15	
16 17 19	
18 19 20	
21 22	
23 24 25	
25 26 27	
28 29	
30 31 22	
32 33 34	
35 36	
37 38 39	
40 41	
42 43	
44 45 46	
47 48	
49 50	
51 52 53	
54 55	
56 57	
58 59	
61 62	
63 64 65	18

² 424	Anderson P, Hansson BS, Lofqvist J (1995) Plant-odour-specific receptor neurons on the
425	antennae of female and male Spodoptera-littoralis. Physiol Entomol 20:189-198
426	Ansari MA, Shah FA, Butt TM (2008) Combined use of entomopathogenic nematodes and
) 427	Metarhizium anisopliae as a new approach for black vine weevil, Otiorhynchus
² / ₃ 428	sulcatus, control. Entomol Exp Appl 129:340-347
429	Blight MM, Pickett JA, Wadhams LJ, Woodcock CM (1995) Antennal perception of oilseed
430 [']	rape, Brassica napus (Brassicacea), volatiles by the cabbage seed weevil
431	Ceutorhynchus assimilis (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). J Chem Ecol 21:1649-1664
² / ₃ 432	Blight MM, Wadhams LJ (1987) Male-produced aggregation pheromone in pea and bean
433	weevil, Sitona lineatus (L.). J Chem Ecol 13:733-739
2 434	Bruce TJA, Pickett JA (2011) Perception of plant volatile blends by herbivorous insects -
435	finding the right mix. Phytochemistry 72:1605–1611
436	Bruce TJA, Wadhams LJ, Woodcock CM (2005) Insect host location: a volatile situation.
437	Trends Plant Sci 10:269-274
438	Dicke M, Baldwin IT (2010) The evolutionary context for herbivore-induced plant volatiles:
, , 439	beyond the 'cry for help'. Trends Plant Sci 15:167-175
440	El-Sayed AM (2019) The Pherobase. www.pherobase.com
441	Faustini D, Giese W, Phillips J, Burkholder W (1982) Aggregation pheromone of the male
442	granary weevil, Sitophilus granaries (L.). J Chem Ecol 8:679-687
) 443	Georgis R, Koppenhöfer AM, Lacey LA, Bélair G, Duncan LW, Grewal PS, Samish M, Tan,
444	L, Torr P, van Tol RWHM (2006) Successes and failures in the use of parasitic
445	nematodes for pest control. Biol Control 38:103-123
, , ,	
}))	
-	
B E	19

1	446	Gordon SC, Woodford JAT, Grassi A, Zini M, Tuovinen T, Lindqvist I, McNicol JW (2003)								
2 3	447	Monitoring and importance of wingless weevils (Otiorhynchus spp.) in European red								
4 5 6	448	raspberry production. IOBC/WPRS Bull 26:55-60								
7 8	449	Gunawardena NE, Kern F, Janssen E, Meegoda C, Schäfer D, Vostrowsky O, Bestmann HJ								
9 10	450	(1998) Host attractants for red weevil, Rhynchophorus ferrugineus: Identification,								
11 12 13	451	electrophysiological activity, and laboratory bioassay. J Chem Ecol 24:425-437								
14 15	452	Hansson BS, Larsson MC, Leal WS (1999) Green leaf volatile-detecting olfactory receptor								
16 17 18	453	neurones display very high sensitivity and specificity in a scarab beetle. Physiol								
19 20	454	Entomol 24:121-126								
21 22 23	455	Jayaraman S, Ndiege IO, Oehlschlager AC, Gonzalez LM, Alpizar D, Falles M, Budenberg								
23 24 25	456	WJ, Ahuya P (1997) Synthesis, analysis, and field activity of sordidin, a male-								
26 27	457	produced aggregation pheromone of the banana weevil, Cosmopolites sordidus. J								
28 29 30	458	Chem Ecol 23: 1145-1161								
31 32	459	Kakizaki M (2001) Aggregation behavior of black vine weevil female adults (Otiorhynchus								
33 34 35	460	sulcatus (Fabricius)) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) occurring in Japan. Akita; Japan,								
36 37	461	Society of Plant Protection of North Japan. 201-203								
38 39 40	462	Karley A, Shepherd T, Hall D, McLaren R, Johnson S (2012) Characterising vine weevil								
41 42	463	aggregation pheromone for use in traps at soft fruit and nursery sites. Agriculture and								
43 44	464	Horticulture Development Board (AHDB).								
45 46 47	465	https://horticulture.ahdb.org.uk/sites/default/files/research_papers/SF-								
48 49	466	HNS%20127%20final%20report%202012.pdf								
50 51 52	467	Kennedy JS (1977) Behaviourally discriminating assays of attractants and repellents. In:								
53 54	468	Chemical Control of Behaviour: Theory and Application. Eds: McKelvey JJ and								
55 56 57	469	Shorey HH. Wiley Interscience, New York. pp. 215-229								
58 59										
60 61										
62 63 64		20								
65										

1	470	Kogan M (1998) Integrated pest management: Historical perspectives and contemporary								
2 3	471	developments. Annu Rev Entomol 43:243-270								
4 5 6	472	Larsson MC, Leal WS, Hansson, BS (2001) Olfactory receptor neurons detecting plant								
7 8	473	odours and male volatiles in Anomala cuprea beetles (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). J								
9 10 11	474	Insect Physiol 47:1065-1076								
11 12 13 14 15	475	Li SY, Fitzpatrick SM, Henderson DE (1995) Grooved board traps for monitoring the black								
	476	vine weevil (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) in raspberry fields. J Ent Soc British								
16 17 18	477	Columbia 92:97-100								
19 20	478	Lundmark M (2010) Otiorhynchus sulcatus, an autopolyploid general-purpose genotype								
21 22 23	479	species. Hereditas 147:278-282								
23 24 25	480	Masaki M, Ohto K (1995) Effects of temperature on development of the black vine weevil,								
26 27	481	Otiorhynchus sulcatus (F.) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). Res Bull Plant Prot Service								
28 29 30	482	Japan 31:37-45								
31 32	483	Masaki M, Ohmura K, Ichinohe F (1984) Host range studies of the black vine weevil								
33 34 35	484	Otiorhynchus sulcatus (Fabricius) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). Appl Entomol Zool								
36 37	485	19:95-106								
38 39 40	486	Moorhouse E, Charnley A, Gillespie A (1992) A review of the biology and control of the								
41 42	487	vine weevil, Otiorhynchus sulcatus (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). Ann Appl Biol								
43 44 45	488	121:431-454								
46 47	489	Nakamuta K, van Tol RWHM, Visser JH (2005) An olfactometer for analyzing olfactory								
48 49	490	responses of death-feigning insects. Appl Entomol Zool 40:173-175								
50 51 52	491	Phillips P A (1989) Simple monitoring of black vine weevil in vineyards. California								
53 54	492	Agriculture, 43:12-13								
55 56 57	493	Pickett JA, Bartlett E, Buxton JH, Wadhams LJ, Woodcock CM (1996) Chemical ecology of								
58 59	494	adult vine weevil. Second International Workshop on Vine Weevil, (Otiorhynchus								
60 61 62										
63 64		21								
65										

1	495	sulcatus Fabr.) (Coleoptera: Curculionidae), Braunschweig, Germany, May 21-23,
1 2 3	496	1996. 316: 41-45
4 5 6	497	Pope TW, Hough G, Arbona C, Roberts H, Bennison J, Buxton J, Prince G, Chandler D.
7 8	498	(2018) Investigating the potential of an autodissemination system for managing
9 10 11	499	populations of vine weevil, Otiorhynchus sulcatus (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) with
12 13	500	entomopathogenic fungi. J Invertebrate Path 154:79-84
14 15 16	501	R Core Team (2019) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. URL:
10 17 18	502	https://www R-project.org.
19 20 21	503	Rochat D, Malosse C, Lettere M, Ducrot P, Zagatti P, Renou M, Descoins C (1991) Male-
21 22 23	504	produced aggregation pheromone of the American palm weevil, Rhynchophorus
24 25	505	palmarum (L.) (Coleoptera, Curculionidae): Collection, identification,
26 27 28	506	electrophysiogical activity, and laboratory bioassay. J Chem Ecol 17:2127-2141
29 30	507	Shah FA, Ansari MA, Prasad M, Butt TM (2006) Evaluation of black vine weevil
31 32	508	(Otiorhynchus sulcatus) control strategies using Metarhizium anisopliae with
33 34 35	509	sublethal doses of insecticides in disparate horticultural growing media. Biol Control
36 37	510	40:246-252
38 39 40	511	Shieh B, Lizuka Y, Matsubara Y (1981) Monoterpenoid and sesquiterpenoid constituents of
41 42	512	the essential oil of Hinoki (Chamaecyparis obtusa (Sieb. et Zucc.) Endl.). Agric Biol.
43 44 45	513	Chem (Japan), 45:1497-1499
45 46 47	514	Smith FF (1932) Biology and control of the black vine weevil. Technical Bulletin of the
48 49	515	United States Department of Agriculture Washington, 325: 45pp
50 51 52	516	Solomon MG, Jay CN, Innocenzi PJ, Fitzgerald D, Crook D, Crook AM, Easterbrook MA,
53 54	517	Cross JV. (2001) Review: natural enemies and biocontrol of pests of strawberry in
55 56 57	518	Northern and Central Europe. Biocontrol Sci Technol 11:165-216
58 59		
60 61		
62 63		22
64 65		

1	519	Son Y, Lewis EE (2005) Modelling temperature-dependent development and survival of							
1 2 3	520	Otiorhynchus sulcatus (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). Agric For Entomol 7:201-209							
4 5	521	Stewart-Jones A, Poppy GM. (2006) Comparison of glass vessels and plastic bags for							
0 7 8	522	enclosing living plant parts for headspace analysis. J Chem Ecol 32:845-864							
9 10	523	Szendrei Z, Rodriguez-Saona C (2009) A meta-analysis of insect pest behavioural							
11 12 13	524	manipulation with plant volatiles. Entomol Exp Applic 134: 201-210							
14 15	525	van Tol RWHM, Visser JH (2002) Olfactory antennal responses of the vine weevil							
16 17 18	526	Otiorhynchus sulcatus to plant volatiles. Entomol Exp Applic 102:49-64							
19 20	527	van Tol RWHM, Visser JH, Sabelis M (2002) Olfactory responses of the vine weevil,							
21 22 22	528	Otiorhynchus sulcatus, to tree odours. Physiol Entomol 27:213-222							
23 24 25	529	van Tol RWHM, van Dijk N, Sabelis MW (2004a) Host plant preference and performance of							
26 27	530	the vine weevil Otiorhynchus sulcatus. Agric For Entomol 6:267-278							
28 29 30 31 32	531	van Tol RWHM, Visser JH, Sabelis MW (2004b) Behavioural responses of the vine weevil,							
	532	Otiorhynchus sulcatus, to semiochemicals from conspecifics, Otiorhynchus salicicola,							
33 34 35	533	and host plants. Entomol Exp Applic 110:145-150							
36 37	534	van Tol RWHM, Bruck DJ, Griepink FC, De Kogel WJ (2012) Field attraction of the vine							
38 39 40	535	weevil Otiorhynchus sulcatus to kairomones. J Econ Entomol 105:169-175							
41 42	536	Tumlinson JH, Hardee DD, Gueldner RC, Thompson AC, Hedin PA, Minyard JP (1969) Sex							
43 44	537	pheromones produced by male boll weevil: isolation, identification, and synthesis.							
45 46 47	538	Science 166:1010-1012							
48 49	539	War AR, Sharma HC, Paulraj MG, War NY, Ignacimuthu S (2011) Herbivore-induced plant							
50 51 52	540	volatiles. Plant Signal Behav 6: 1973-1978							
53 54	541	Webster B, Bruce T, Pickett J, Hardie J (2010) Volatiles functioning as host cues in a blend							
55 56	542	become nonhost cues when presented alone to the black bean aphid. Anim Behav							
57 58 59	543	79:451-457							
60 61									
62 63 64		23							
65									

1	544	Willmott DM, Hart AJ, Long SJ, Edmondson RN, Richardson PN (2002) Use of a cold-active
2 3	545	entomopathogenic nematode Steinernema kraussei to control overwintering larvae of
4 5 6	546	the black vine weevil Otiorhynchus sulcatus (Coleoptera: Curculionidae) in outdoor
7 8	547	strawberry plants. Nematology 4:925-932
9		
11		
12		
13		
⊥4 15		
16		
17		
18		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
25		
26		
27		
29		
30		
3⊥ 32		
33		
34		
35 36		
37		
38		
39 40		
41		
42		
43 44		
45		
46		
48		
49		
50 51		
52		
53		
54 55		
56		
57		
58		
60		
61		
62		
03 64		24
65		

Table 1 Compounds identified in GC-EAG analyses of volatiles from intact and cut plants of *Euonymous fortunei* and relative amounts (EAG responses numbered as in Figs. 1 and 2; RI
is retention index relative to retention times of *n*-alkanes on polar GC column; DMNT is 4,8dimethyl-1,3,7-nonatriene; TMTT is 4,8,12-trimethyl-1,3,7,11-tridecatetraene)

Intact plants				Cut plants				
EAG response	RT (min)	RI	Area (%)	EAG response	RT (min)	RI	Area (%)	Compound
1	4.79	1074	1.2	1	3.97	1086	0.48	hexanal
2	5.55	1136	2.0	2	4.47	1147	0.54	(Z)-3-hexenal
3	6.15	1185	1.4	3	4.85	1193	0.31	heptanal
4	6.60	1220	0.7	4	5.11	1226	1.58	(E)-2-hexenal
	7.06	1255	2.2					(E)-ocimene
5	7.57	1293	1.0	5	5.67	1301	0.32	octanal
	7.82	1312	3.7		5.79	1317	3.98	DMNT
	7.97	1323	1.3					(Z)-3-hexenyl acetate
<i>.</i>	0.00	1242	0.1					6-methyl-5-hepten-2-
6	8.23	1343	2.1					one
7	8.41	1356	0.0	6	6.10	1358	1.07	1-hexanol
8	8.84	1389	4.7	7	6.33	1388	3.63	(Z)-3-hexenol
9	8.98	1399	4.2	8	6.43	1402	1.98	nonanal
				9	6.48	1409	0.54	(E)-2-hexenol
10	9.50	1441	0.0		6.70	1443	0.35	acetic acid?
11	9.66	1454	0.0					1-octen-3-ol
12	10.18	1496	1.6		7.03	1495	1.07	2-ethyl-1-hexanol
13	10.31	1507	4.4	10	7.13	1510	2.43	decanal
					7.17	1516	1.99	copaene
14	10.86	1551	0.8	11	7.39	1550	2.32	(R)-(-)-linalool
	11.46	1600	1.7					hexadecane
	11.58	1610	1.3		7.84	1623	1.79	β-caryophyllene

						8.28	1700	1.25	α -caryophyllene
1 2		12.80	1720	2.8					ethyl-benzaldehyde
3 4						8.40	1721		germacrene D
5 6 7	15	12.88	1727	0.8	12	Q 15	1730	1 28	1,2-dimethoxy-
7 8 0	15	12.00	1727	0.8	12	0.45	1750	1.20	benzene
9 10 11		13.00	1738	0.5		8.50	1739	1.14	α-muurolene
12 12		13.14	1750	2.3		8.55	1747	1.14	farnesene isomer
14 15	16	13.19	1754	15.6	13	8.61	1758	25.99	(E,E) - α -farnesene
16 17		13.54	1786	2.7	14	8.85	1800	0.65	methyl salicylate
18 19		13.82	1811	0.6					TMTT
20 21					15	9.12	1852	0.45	hexanoic acid
22 23	17	14.34	1863	2.1					(<i>E</i>)-geranyl acetone
24 25					16	9.31	1889	0.92	benzyl alcohol
26 27					17	9.51	1928	0.70	2-phenylethanol
28 29						9.61	1948	1.94	benzyl cyanide
30 31						9.70	1965	0.20	trans-jasmone
32 33	18	15.28	1956	0.0	18	9.73	1971	1.99	cis-jasmone
34 35					19	9.89	2002	0.20	2-ethylhexanoic acid
36 37		16.14	2044	0.8		10.09	2044	6.06	(E)-nerolidol
38 39		17.44	2183	1.8					tau-cadinol
40 41	19	17.99	2245	1.4					α-cadinol
42 43	20	18.92	2353	0.0					unknown
44 45					20	12.01	2468	3.31	indole
46 47	21/22	20.94	2588	0.0					unknown
48 49 552									
50 51 553									
52 53									
54 55 56									
50 57 58									
50 59									
61 62									
63 64	26								
65									

554 1	Table 2 Frequency of EAG responses of vine weevil to 10 ng of synthetic compounds
$\frac{2}{3}$ 555	delivered by GC-EAG (number of times a response was observed out of the total number of
4 5 556	runs); RI is retention index relative to retention times of <i>n</i> -alkanes on polar GC column;
7 8 557	DMNT is 4,8-dimethyl-1,3,7-nonatriene; TMTT is 4,8,12-trimethyl-1,3,7,11-tridecatetraene)

Compound	RT (mins)	RI	Frequency of EAG response		
2012 Experiments					
DMNT	6.82	1310	0/2		
(E)-2-pentenol	6.88	1315	3/4		
(Z)-2-pentenol	6.98	1323	4/4		
1-hexanol	7.41	1356	16/16		
(Z)-3-hexenol	7.85	1389	4/4		
(E)-2-hexenol	8.11	1410	18/18		
1-octen-3-ol	8.67	1455	2/2		
linalool ^a	9.87	1552	4/4		
β-caryophyllene	10.59	1612	0/16		
germacrene-D	11.88	1727	0/16		
(E,E) - α -farnesene	12.22	1757	5/16		
methyl salicylate	12.56	1788	4/4		
methyl eugenol	14.91	2018	1/2		
2018 Experiments					
1-hexanol	6.09	1358	15/15		
cis-jasmone	9.72	1973	14/14		
tau-cadinol	10.79	2196	5/5		
α-cadinol	11.08	2261	0/5		
indole	12.00	2468	0/2		

11

17 18

55 559

⁵⁷ 560

^a Present as a minor component in ylang ylang essential oil













Supplementary Material

Click here to access/download Supplementary Material Roberts et al Supplementary Info .docx