

Pakistan Veterinary Journal

ISSN: 0253-8318 (PRINT), 2074-7764 (ONLINE) DOI: 10.29261/pakvetj/2023.123

SHORT COMMUNICATION

In vitro Evaluation of Acaricidal Efficacy of Selected Essential Oils against Dermanyssus gallinae

Radomir Ratajac^{1†}, Aleksandar Pavlićević^{4†}, Jelena Petrović¹, Igor Stojanov¹, Dejan Orčić², Filip Štrbac^{3*} and Nataša Simin²

¹Department of Drug Analysis and Veterinary Toxicology, Scientific Veterinary Institute "Novi Sad" Novi Sad, Serbia; ²Department of Chemistry, Biochemistry and Environmental Protection, Faculty of Sciences, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia; ³Institute for Multidisciplinary Research, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia; ⁴"Aves mit" d.o.o., Bajmok – Subotica, Serbia

[†]These authors share the first authorship

*Corresponding author: filip.strbac@imsi.bg.ac.rs

ARTICLE HISTORY (23-363) A H

Received:August 19, 2023Revised:November 3, 3023Accepted:November 6, 2023Published online:December 28, 2023Key words:AcaricidesAcaricidesDermanyssus gallinaeEssential oilsContact effectResidual effect

A B S T R A C T

Intensification of poultry production has been associated with an increase in parasite prevalence and adaptation of an invasive external parasitic species, such as the poultry red mite (Dermanyssus gallinae). The studies of biological efficacy (contact and fumigant) and level of toxicity to mites indicated that the external application of essential oils (EOs) can be an alternative to acaricides. In this study, the results of acaricidal efficacy of eight selected EOs - Lavandula angustifolia Mill., Laurus nobilus L., Mentha x piperita L., Mentha spicata L., Ocimum basilicum L., Salvia officinalis L., Satureja montana L. and Thymus vulgaris L. are presented. Their chemical profiles were analyzed by gas chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (GC-MS). The acaricidal efficacy of EOs (6% concentration) was tested on adult mites over 10 days in laboratory conditions using the Petri-dish method, through direct exposure for 1 min (contact toxicity) and subsequent exposure for 1 h (residual toxicity). The most effective EO in direct exposure-contact, after 48 h of observation, was S. montana (100% toxicity), while the greatest residual effect was observed in T. vulgaris (11% toxicity). The obtained results showed high efficacy of the EOs against the mites through direct contact and thus their great acaricidal potential. However, the activity was lost with subsequent exposure, indicating the absence of prolonged effect. Possible ways to overcome this problem are discussed further in this paper. In any case, the present study confirmed the acaricidal potential of herbal medicines that can be used in the integrated control of poultry red mite.

To Cite This Article: Ratajac R, Pavlićević A, Petrović J, Stojanov I, Orčić D, Štrbac F and Simin N, 2024. In vitro evaluation of acaricidal efficacy of selected essential oils against dermanyssus gallinae. Pak Vet J, 44(1): 93-98. http://dx.doi.org/10.29261/pakvetj/2023.123

INTRODUCTION

Dermanissus gallinae De Geer (1778), commonly known as the poultry red mite, is a haematophagous ectoparasite of poultry that can cause high mortality among fledglings as well as adult birds. The accelerated growth of poultry farming in recent decades has led to an escalation of *D. gallinae* prevalence, which has been accompanied by a remarkable adaptive potential of the parasite. Nowadays it represents one of the most significant problems in the egg production industry, especially in Europe. High-level infestations can lead to large economic losses and clinical manifestations of diseases (anaemia, chronic stress and death due to blood loss) (Kilpinen, 2015; George *et al.*, 2015). In addition, mites can serve as vectors of poultry pathogens of both bacterial (*Erysipelothrik rhusiopathiae*, Salmonella subsp. enterica ser. Gallinarum) and viral (Avian influenza virus, Fowlpox virus) origin (Sparagano et al., 2014; Schiavone et al., 2022).

To address this problem, various control measures are being implemented by poultry farmers. So far, mite control is primarily based on the application of synthetic acaricides (phoxim, cyfluthrin, fluralaner), followed by silica-based products, inert oils, and high temperatures. Since all these measures have some limitations, a combination of two or more measures in the form of integrated pest control is most commonly used (Quilicot *et al.*, 2020). The use of some chemical acaricides has recently been banned due to increased resistance of mites, safety issues, side effects on non-target species, and the presence of residues in food and environmental contamination (Marangi *et al.*, 2012; Sparagano *et al.*, 2014; George *et al.*, 2015). These motivated researchers to look further for alternatives such as the utilization of plant-derived acaricides, exploitation of biological resources (bacteria, fungi, and predatory mites) and development of vaccines (Decru *et al.*, 2020; Imran and Alsayeqh, 2022). Although these scientific advances offer promising opportunities to mitigate the effect of *D. gallinae* infestations, only some solutions are present on the market, while others have remained at the pre-commercial stage (Sparagano *et al.*, 2014).

Plants produce a variety of natural products (secondary metabolites). These compounds have important biological functions, providing protection for plants from herbivores or pathological microbes, and serving as attractants for pollinators and seed-dispersing animals. Many plantderived products (PDPs), such as essential oils and extracts, are generally harmless to non-target organisms. Although they have a long history of safe application in human medicine (Isman 2016), the first study focused specifically on poultry mites was conducted by Kim et al. (2004) followed by extensive further investigations by various researchers, whereby acaricidal potential has been demonstrated for several classes of PDPs. Furthermore, their contact and fumigant toxicity and repellent activity have been investigated, either as an individual treatment or in combination with other control measures.

Essential oils (EOs) are complex mixtures of volatile compounds obtained from aromatic plants (Štrbac et al., 2021). In previous studies, many EOs have shown significant acaricidal activity. Their pharmacological properties origins from chemical composition, i.e., the bioactive compounds they contain, and which may belong to various chemical groups (hydrocarbon terpenes, terpenoids, phenylpropanoids etc). However, the presence and percentage representation of certain compounds of EOs is highly variable depending on plant variety, climate, and environmental conditions, which leads to the differences in their biological activities (Fokou et al., 2020; de Sousa et al., 2023). The aim of this study was to investigate the acaricidal activity of eight EOs from the Balkan Peninsula (Southern Europe) and to evaluate their potential and limitations to be included in formulations for rational control of *D. gallinae* in the poultry industry.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Essential oils and chemical analyses: The EOs of Lavandula angustifolia Mill. (lavender), Laurus nobilus L. (laurel), Mentha x piperita L. (peppermint), Mentha spicata L. (spearmint), Ocimum basilicum L. (basil), Salvia officinalis L. (sage), Satureja montana L. (winter savory) and Thymus vulgaris L (thyme) were obtained from Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops, Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia. The oils were extracted from dry plant material by steam distillation. Plant material of L. angustifolia, S. officinalis and L. nobilus originated from Montenegro, and other species from Serbia. Qualitative and semiquantitative chemical characterization of EOs was performed using Agilent Technologies 6890N gas chromatograph coupled with Agilent Technologies 5975B electron ionization mass-selective detector (GC-MS analyses), as described by Štrbac et al. (2022).

Acquisition of mites: Biological tests were performed on adult female *D. gallinae*, obtained by mechanical removal from cages of highly infested farms located in Vojvodina (northern Serbia), and which had not received any treatment two months before the experiment. Mites were identified using the identification keys (morphological characteristics) provided by Moss (1968) and Di Palma *et al.* (2012). A quantity of *D. gallinae*, approximately 4-5 cm³ per sample, was placed in a five-litre nylon bag. The bag was first expanded to allow air in, closed by tying and then delivered to the laboratory on the same day. The bags were then opened and placed on insulated trays. After an adaptation period of 24 h, *D. gallinae* mites were used for the experiments.

Evaluation of essential oils toxicity *in vitro:* Toxicity bioassay was carried out using the Petri-dish method (Pavlićević *et al.*, 2017) with some change. 100 (experimental groups, five replicates, n=20/repeat) plus 20 (negative control groups) live newly fed adult female mites of *D. gallinae* for each EO examination were used. The mites were treated with one dilution of EOs (6%) diluted in water with 0.1 % Tween 80. Water with 0.1 % Tween 80 was used as negative control.

The contact toxicity test was performed by directly spraying mites in Petri-dishes (\emptyset 55 mm) with the tested aqueous emulsion of EOs, for one minute. After exposure, the mites were transferred to clean Petri-dishes, where they remained until the end of the test. The dishes were equipped with filter paper to remove excess liquid from the specimens and prevent suffocation, simulating the effect of impurities and absorbent surfaces in poultry farms.

The residual toxicity test was performed by subsequently exposition of mites during one-hour. The inner surface of the Petri-dishes was sanded and degreased, after which the tested EOs were applied and distributed evenly. The dishes were strained at room temperature and the mites were introduced into the test containers after 24 hours of drying. After the one-hour exposure, the mites were transferred to clean Petri-dishes for observation.

Subsequently, all Petri dishes were covered with their lids and sealed with layer of Parafilm and finally kept at 23 ± 1 °C and humidity $54\pm5\%$, with a 16:8 light: dark cycle. Mite mortality in dishes was assessed after 48 h, to monitor the acaricidal activity of EOs. Mites were classed as dead if they exhibited no movement after repeated agitation with an entomological pin under a mounted lens at $4\times$ magnification.

Statistical analyses: The results represent the cumulative number of dead mites for 48 h after treatment. The percentage of mortality (dead mites/total mites \times 100) with Standard Deviation (±SD) was calculated for each treatment. Data in percentages were subjected to arcsine transformation and analysed by t-test and ANOVA using Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet Software 2010. The Student t-test was used to compare mortality in the control and treatment groups. For comparison of mortality between treated groups, One-way ANOVA with Tukey-Kramer as a post-hoc test was used with a p-value threshold of 0.05.

RESULTS

Analyses of the chemical composition of Eos: The GC-MS analyses clearly show the complex chemical composition of the EOs tested (Table 1). The identified compounds, their representative percentages and total number varied among investigated samples. The identified compounds were present in different percentages and belong to different chemical classes such as monoterpene hydrocarbons, alcohols, phenols, ketones, esters and acetates, whereby sesquiterpenes were present in significant amounts only in *O. basilicum* EO. Due to the large number of identified compounds, only those with abundance that exceeding 1% in at least one oil are shown.

Acaricidal activity of the EOs: The comparison of acaricidal activity of 6% aqueous emulsions of the EOs against *D. gallinae*, at different exposure times - 1 min (contact toxicity) and 60 min (residual toxicity) after 48 h, is shown in Fig. 1. After 1 min of exposure, all EOs showed significant (P<0.05) contact toxicity to *D. gallinae* except *O. basilicum* oil. After 60 min of exposure, only *T. vulgaris* showed significant (P<0.05) residual toxicity to *D. gallinae*.

Due to the weak acaricidal effect after exposure of 60 min, these results were excluded from further statistical analysis. Exposure of one min to the investigated EOs led to a statistically significant acaricidal effect (ANOVA, P<0.05). Tukey Kramer post-hoc analysis showed that *S. montana*, *T. vulgaris* and *S. officinalis* expressed equal activity (P>0.05), which is higher than the activity of other EOs (P<0.05). *L. nobilis* showed moderate acaricidal activity, while *M. spicata*, *M. x piperita* and *L. angustifolia* showed similar (P<0.05) but lower activity compared to the other samples. *O. basilicum* showed no acaricidal effect on mites considering that there was no statistically significant difference in comparison with the control group (P>0.05) (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

A various in vitro, and a smaller number of in vivo studies conducted to date suggest that EOs possess acaricidal activity against D. gallinae (Kim et al., 2004; George et al., 2010a; Magdaş et al., 2010; Soares et al., 2015; Tabari et al., 2020; Roczeń-Karczmarz et al., 2022). Despite important differences in the research methodology, in vitro assays are generally focused on simulating farm conditions and how the information obtained can be useful in poultry production. In the present study, one-minute exposure (contact toxicity) simulates the situation in which mites are directly exposed with their entire bodies to the external application of EO. Absorbent surfaces (e.g., floors) and ambient impurities have the ability to absorb the applied aqueous emulsion, allowing D. gallinae to leave the treated surface. Exposure for 60 min (residual toxicity) simulates the situation in which the mites are subsequently exposed to the formulation by coming out of hiding and contact with the treated surfaces. The exposure time is limited to 1 h because the mites try to escape from these areas due to the nature of their movement and the possible irritation caused by the EO.

During the examination of the EOs acaricidal properties, researchers used different exposures (1 min - 72 h) and concentrations or doses per unit of area or volume (mg/cm²; mg/cm³). In the present study, the concentration of the aqueous EO emulsions, expressed in %, was used instead of the dose per unit area, since this is the simplest way to prepare the solutions under practical conditions of use. The concentration of 6%, which is higher than the concentrations usually used in other studies, was chosen to reliably evaluate the residual effect on subsequently exposed mites. Therefore, *in vitro* methodology used in the present study is novel, and it is performed in the attempt to simulate in the best possible way the conditions in the field.

Other studies have also demonstrated acaricidal efficacy of selected EOs against D. gallinae. Kim et al. (2004) demonstrated 100% (thyme and mint) and 89% (lavender) efficacy at a dose of 0.07 mg/cm² after 24-h exposure (by contact). At a dose of 0.21 mg/cm², efficacy was 97.39% (peppermint) and 32.05% (sage), while a dose of 0.35 mg/cm² gave efficacy of 100% (lavender), 67% (sage), 62% (peppermint), and 56% (basil). George et al. (2010a) also demonstrated efficacy after 24-h exposure as follows: 100% (thyme), 77.80% (winter savory), 64.74-89.96% (lavender), 32.05% (sage) and 20.88% (spearmint). Roczeń-Karczmarz et al. (2022) found that pure EOs of thyme and lavender, applied at maximum (100%) concentration at a dose of 0.28 mg/cm² and an exposure of 48 h, had an efficacy of over 90%. EOs of lavender and peppermint, applied at a dose of 0.6 mg/cm² and an exposure of 72 h, had an efficacy of 100% and 65%, respectively (Magdas et al., 2010). These results suggest that acaricidal activity depends mainly on the plant species from which the EO was obtained, i.e., its chemical composition. From this point of view, compounds such as p-cymene, carvacrol, thymol, a-thujone and 1,8-cineole were highly represented in the most effective oils (thyme, winter savory, sage, and laurel).

Botanical formulations offer a strong alternative to chemicals such as organophosphates and pyrethroids in the control of ectoparasites such as *D. gallinae* (Abbas *et al.*, 2018; Puvača *et al.*, 2019; Radsetoulalova *et al.*, 2020). Thus, the results of the present and other studies suggest a strong direct effect of most tested EOs against *D. gallinae*, although the exact mechanism of action should be further investigated. In addition, plant-based formulations are most likely less susceptible to resistance development (due to active ingredients from various chemical groups) and more acceptable in terms of the residues in animal products and the environment in comparison with chemicals (Borges and Borges, 2016; Abbas *et al.*, 2018; Puvača *et al.*, 2019).

However, the use of EOs in the treatment of ectoparasites has some limitations. As shown in the present study, the residual effect is still significantly lower than contact (direct) effect. This can be explained by the unstable nature of EOs, as their active ingredients are prone to evaporation and destabilization (Maes *et al.*, 2019; Nehme *et al.*, 2021). Direct action (alone) can only achieve short-term results which is most likely not sufficient, suggesting that efficacy and duration of prolonged action are important factors for successful control of *D. gallinae*. On the other hand, some EOs such as thyme can still be effective acaricides despite low residual toxicity, due to their fast effect (George *et al.*, 2010b). Moreover, EOs of

Table I: Chemical	composition (% of tot	al peak area) of teste	l essential oils determined	l by gas chromatograp	hy-mass spectrometry.
-------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

LA LN MP MS OB SM SO TV 932 α-Pinene 1.03 ^{ab} 6.20 0.90 0.54 0.10 1.16 3.16 2.47 946 Camphene 0.18 9.40 0.36 0.16 0.04 - 0.02 - 971 Sabinene 0.18 9.40 0.36 0.16 0.04 - 0.02 - 976 β-Pinene 0.07 - 0.46 0.16 - 2.32 0.25 - - - - - - - 2.32 0.27 - 0.46 0.16 - 1.17 4.37 0.18 1.52 2.22 1.26 0.26 1.026 1.17 4.37 0.18 1.52 2.22 1.26 0.20 4.172 1028 Linonenee 1.06 - 1.17 4.37 0.18 1.52 2.22 1.26 0.22 1.26 1028	Al*	Compound	% of total peak area							
932 c -Pinene 1.03^{sh} 6.20 0.94 0.01 1.16 3.16 2.47 Sabinene 0.18 9.40 0.35 0.16 0.04 -5.36 0.66 -1.03 0.44 5.36 0.16 -0.04 -0.04 -0.02 -2.32 0.25 -1.023 $p.Cymene$ 0.07 -0.46 0.16 -2.32 0.25 -1.023 $p.Cymere$ 0.54 1.61 0.11 0.35 0.19 42.83 0.90 41.72 1023 $p.Cymere$ 0.54 1.66 -1.7 -1.7 -1.7 -1.66 -1.7 -1.66 -1.7 -1.66 -1.7 -1.66 -1.7 -1.67 -1.66 -1.7 -1.67 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.63 -1.6			LA	LN	MP	MS	OB	SM	SO	TV
946 Camphene 0.58 0.49 0.03 - 0.03 0.44 5.36 0.62 971 Salinene 0.08 9.40 0.36 0.16 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.04 0.01 0.05 0.19 0.66 1.16 0.18 0101 α.7 Erpinene 0.07 - 0.46 0.16 - 2.32 0.25 - 0102 p-Cymene 0.54 1.61 0.11 0.35 0.19 4.283 0.00 41.72 01021 Innonene 1.06 - <	932	α-Pinene	1.03 ^{ab}	6.20	0.90	0.54	0.10	1.16	3.16	2.47
971 Sabinene 0.18 9.40 0.36 0.16 0.44 - 0.02 - 1016 α.Terpinene 0.07 - 0.46 0.16 - 2.32 0.25 - 1023 p-Cymene 0.04 1.66 -	946	Camphene	0.58	0.49	0.03	-	0.03	0.44	5.36	0.62
976 9-Pinene 1.09 5.06 1.15 0.67 0.19 0.66 1.16 0.18 0.23 - 1023 p-Cymene 0.54 1.61 0.11 0.35 0.19 2.32 0.23 - 1023 p-Cymene 0.54 1.61 0.11 0.35 0.19 2.32 0.30 41.72 1026 Linonene 1.06 - 1.17 4.37 0.18 1.52 2.22 1.26 1028 Linonene 1.02 Sylvestrene 0.19 - 3.63 0.20 4.37 1105 Grimone 3.72 4.32 - - - 3.63 - - - 3.63 - - - - 1.61 0.69 - -	971	Sabinene	0.18	9.40	0.36	0.16	0.04	-	0.02	-
1016 a Terpinene 0.07 - 0.46 0.16 - 2.32 0.23 · 1027 Sylvestrene - 1.64 0.11 0.35 0.19 42.83 0.90 41.72 1028 Limonene 1.06 - 1.17 4.37 0.18 1.52 2.22 1.26 1028 Limonene 1.06 - 0.17 4.37 0.18 1.52 2.22 1.26 1035 c.S-Crimen 3.20 - 0.67 0.33 3.52 0.32 0.02 14.59 0.66 - 1.10 0.36 - - - - - - 3.64 - 0.20 4.37 - - - - 3.63 - - 1.61 0.41 - - - - 3.63 - - - - - - 3.63 - - - - - - - - <td>976</td> <td>β-Pinene</td> <td>1.09</td> <td>5.06</td> <td>1.15</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>0.19</td> <td>0.66</td> <td>1.16</td> <td>0.18</td>	976	β-Pinene	1.09	5.06	1.15	0.67	0.19	0.66	1.16	0.18
1023 p-Cymene 0.54 1.61 0.11 0.35 0.19 42.83 0.90 41.72 1027 Sylvestrene - 1.66 - 3.63 0.72 4.32 - - - - - - - - - 3.63 0.60 - - 3.63 0.61 0.61 0.61 0.61 0.61 0.61 0.61 0.61 0.61 0.61 </td <td>1016</td> <td>α-Terpinene</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>-</td> <td>0.46</td> <td>0.16</td> <td>-</td> <td>2.32</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>-</td>	1016	α-Terpinene	0.07	-	0.46	0.16	-	2.32	0.25	-
1027 Sylvestrene 1.66 -	1023	b-Cymene	0.54	1.61	0.11	0.35	0.19	42.83	0.90	41.72
1028 Límonene 1.06 - 1.17 4.37 0.18 1.52 2.22 1.26 1039 G:-Ocimen 3.20 - 0.19 - 3.8.8 -	1027	Sylvestrene	-	1.66	-	-	-	-	-	-
1029 1.8-Cinecle 17.29 53.30 5.22 0.53 3.52 0.73 8.40 0.66 1035 cis-Ocimen 3.20 - 0.19 -	1028	Limonene	1.06	-	1.17	4.37	0.18	1.52	2.22	1.26
1035 ci-Ocimen 3.20 - 0.19 - 111	1029	1,8-Cineole	17.29	55.30	5.22	0.53	3.52	0.73	8.40	0.66
1056 γ-Terpinene 0.27 - 0.67 0.32 0.02 14.59 0.36 - 1106 Δrhujone - - - 62.80 1.20 0.20 4.37 1116 Δrhujone - - - - 38.8 - 1116 Δrhujone - - - - 38.4 - 1113 Gamphor 4.76 - - - 37.3 19.75 0.22 1163 Isomenhone - - 9.39 0.50 -	1035	<i>cis</i> -Ocimen	3.20	-	0.19	-	-	-	-	-
1100 Linabol 37.52 4.32 - - 62.80 1.20 0.20 4.37 1106 α-Thujone - - - - - - 38.8 - 1116 β-Thujone - - - - - 38.8 - 1143 Camphor 4.76 - - - 0.73 - 19.75 0.22 1163 Isomenthone - - 9.39 0.50 - <td>1056</td> <td>v-Terpinene</td> <td>0.27</td> <td>-</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>0.32</td> <td>0.02</td> <td>14.59</td> <td>0.36</td> <td>-</td>	1056	v-Terpinene	0.27	-	0.67	0.32	0.02	14.59	0.36	-
1106 α-Thujone - - - - - - - - - 38.8 - 1114 β-Thujone - - - - - 5.07 - 1143 Gamphor 4.76 - - - 0.73 19.75 0.22 1152 Menthone - - 9.39 0.50 - </td <td>1100</td> <td>Linalool</td> <td>37.52</td> <td>4.32</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>62.80</td> <td>1.20</td> <td>0.20</td> <td>4.37</td>	1100	Linalool	37.52	4.32	-	-	62.80	1.20	0.20	4.37
1116 β-Thujone - - - - - 5.07 - 1143 Camphor 4.76 - 0.73 - 19.75 0.22 1152 Menthone - 22.00 1.28 - - - - - 1163 Isomenthone - - 9.39 0.50 - <t< td=""><td>1106</td><td>α-Thuione</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>38.8</td><td>-</td></t<>	1106	α-Thuione	-	-	-	-	-	-	38.8	-
1143Camphor4.760.73-19.750.221152Menthone22.001.281164Borneol14.29.390.501164Borneol14.21.271.890.691171Menthol32.554.201176Terpinen-4-ol6.711.893.261.160.460.780.34-1182iza-Menthol1.290.131191α-Terpineol1.961.560.460.120.51 <t< td=""><td>1116</td><td>β-Thuione</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>5.07</td><td>-</td></t<>	1116	β-Thuione	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.07	-
1152Menthone22.001.281163Isomenthone9.390.501164Borneol14.21.271.890.691171Menthol32.554.201176Terpinen4-ol6.711.893.261.160.460.780.341182izo-Menthol1.290.131191 α -Terpineol1.961.560.460.120.511193Dihydro carveol1.73 <td< td=""><td>1143</td><td>Camphor</td><td>4.76</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>0.73</td><td>-</td><td>19.75</td><td>0.22</td></td<>	1143	Camphor	4.76	-	-	-	0.73	-	19.75	0.22
1163Isomenthone9.390.501164Borneol14.21.271.890.691171Menthol32.554.201176Terpinen-4-ol6.711.893.261.160.460.780.34-1182izo-Menthol1.290.131191a.Terpineol1.961.560.460.120.511.711193Dihydro carveol8.671196trans-4-Caranone3.781204trans-bihydrocarvone1.491214Carvone4.450.101244Carvone0.74-1.86125Linaly1 acetate6.11 </td <td>1152</td> <td>Menthone</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>22.00</td> <td>1.28</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	1152	Menthone	-	-	22.00	1.28	-	-	-	-
1164Borneol14.21.271.890.691171Menthol32.554.2011711182izo-Menthol1.260.460.120.51117.7111.7311.7111.7	1163	Isomenthone	-	-	9.39	0.50	-	-	-	-
1171Menthol32.554.201176Terpinen-4-ol6.711.893.261.160.460.780.34-1182izo-Menthol1.1290.131191 α -Terpineol1.961.560.460.120.5111.711193Dihydro carveol1.731196trans-4-Caranone8.671197Methyl chavicol4.450.10 <td>1164</td> <td>Borneol</td> <td>14.2</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>1.27</td> <td>1.89</td> <td>0.69</td>	1164	Borneol	14.2	-	-	-	-	1.27	1.89	0.69
1176Terpinen-4-ol6.711.893.261.160.460.780.34-1182izo-Menthol1.290.131191 α -Terpineol1.961.560.460.120.511.1711193Dihydro carveol1.731196trans-4-Caranone8.67 </td <td>1171</td> <td>Menthol</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>32.55</td> <td>4.20</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	1171	Menthol	-	-	32.55	4.20	-	-	-	-
1182izo-Menthol.1.290.131191 α -Terpineol1.961.560.460.120.511.711193Dihydro carveol1.731.711193Dihydro carveol1.731196trans-d-Caranone8.671194trans-Dihydrocarvone1.49 </td <td>1176</td> <td>Terpinen-4-ol</td> <td>6.71</td> <td>1.89</td> <td>3.26</td> <td>1.16</td> <td>0.46</td> <td>0.78</td> <td>0.34</td> <td>-</td>	1176	Terpinen-4-ol	6.71	1.89	3.26	1.16	0.46	0.78	0.34	-
1191 α -Terpineol1.961.560.460.120.511.711193Dihydro carveol1.731196trans-4-Caranone8.671197Methyl chavicol8.671204trans-Dihydrocarvone4.450.101238Pulegone4.450.10	1182	izo-Menthol	-	-	1.29	0.13	-	-	-	-
1193Dihydro carveol1.731196trans-A-Caranone8.671197Methyl chavicol3.781204trans-Dihydrocarvone1.491238Pulegone4.450.101244Carvone64.441255Linalyl acetate6.110.74-1.86-1293Menthyl acetate3.1591293Menthyl acetate1303Carvacrol1327izo-Dihydro carveol acetate	1191	α-Terpineol	1.96	1.56	0.46	0.12	0.51	-	-	11.71
1196trans-4-Caranone8.671197Methyl chavicol3.781204trans-Dihydrocarvone1.491238Pulegone4.450.101244Carvone4.450.101244Carvone64.441255Linalyl acetate6.110.74-1.861284Bornyl acetate6.110.74-1.861292Thymol0.74-1.861303Carvacrol<	1193	Dihydro carveol	-	-	-	1.73	-	-	-	-
1197Methyl chavicol3.781204trans-Dihydrocarvone1.491238Pulegone4.450.101234Carvone64.441255Linalyl acetate6.111284Bornyl acetate6.11	1196	trans-4-Caranone	-	-	-	8.67	-	-	-	-
1204trans-Dihydrocarvone1.491238Pulegone4.450.101244Carvone64.441255Linalyl acetate6.110.74-1.86-1284Bornyl acetate0.74-1.86-1292Thymol31.591293Menthyl acetate10.031.011303Carvacrol3.111327izo-Dihydro carveol acetate0.181.761348 α -Terpinyl acetate0.181.761348 α -Terpinyl acetate0.181.761348 α -Terpinyl acetate1.721348 α -Terpinyl acetate0.53-2.780.930.922.463.950.821344 α -trans-Bergamotene1.131434 α -trans-Bergamotene1.421452 <t< td=""><td>1197</td><td>Methyl chavicol</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>3.78</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></t<>	1197	Methyl chavicol	-	-	-	-	3.78	-	-	-
1238Pulegone4.450.101244Carvone64.441255Linalyl acetate6.11<	1204	trans-Dihydrocarvone	-	-	-	1.49	-	-	-	-
1244Carvone64.441255Linalyl acetate6.111284Bornyl acetate0.74-1.86-1292Thymol31.591293Menthyl acetate10.031.0131.591293Menthyl acetate10.031.0131.591293Menthyl acetate10.031.011303Carvacrol28.111327izo-Dihydro carveol acetate3.111383 β -Bourbonene11.55 <td>1238</td> <td>Pulegone</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>4.45</td> <td>0.10</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	1238	Pulegone	-	-	4.45	0.10	-	-	-	-
1255Linalyl acetate6.111284Bornyl acetate1284Dinyl acetate1284128612831293Menthyl acetate12831203Carvacrol12833 <td>1244</td> <td>Carvone</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>64.44</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	1244	Carvone	-	-	-	64.44	-	-	-	-
1284Bornyl acetate0.74-1.86-1292Thymol31.591293Menthyl acetate10.031.0131.591303Carvacrol10.031.0131.591303Carvacrol28.111304 α -Terpinyl acetate3.111383 β -Bourbonene-11.55	1255	Linalyl acetate	6.11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1292Thymol31.591293Menthyl acetate10.031.011303Carvacrol10.031.011303Carvacrol28.111327izo-Dihydro carveol acetate3.111348 α -Terpinyl acetate-11.551383 β -Bourbonene0.181.761390 β -Elemene0.181.721418 β -Caryophyllene0.53-2.780.930.922.463.950.821434 α -trans-Bergamotene1436 γ -Elemene1.13-4.151435 α -Humulene1.13-4.151452 α -Humulene3.661503 α -Bulnesene2.981639 α -e	1284	Bornyl acetate	-	-	-	-	0.74	-	1.86	-
1293Menthyl acetate10.031.011303Carvacrol28.111327izo-Dihydro carveol acetate3.111348 α -Terpinyl acetate-11.551383 β -Bourbonene0.181.761390 β -Elemene1.721418 β -Caryophyllene0.53-2.780.930.922.463.950.821434 α -trans-Bergamotene1436 γ -Elemene1.13-4.151436 γ -Elemene1.13-4.151436 γ -Elemene1.13-4.151452 α -Humulene1.131479 γ -Muurolene2.981503 α -Bulnesene2.171639 α -epi-Cadinol- <t< td=""><td>1292</td><td>Thymol</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>31.59</td></t<>	1292	Thymol	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31.59
1303Carvarol28.111327izo-Dihydro carveol acetate3.111348 α -Terpinyl acetate-11.551383 β -Bourbonene-11.551383 β -Bourbonene0.181.76 <td< td=""><td>1293</td><td>Menthyl acetate</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>10.03</td><td>1.01</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td></td></td<>	1293	Menthyl acetate	-	-	10.03	1.01	-	-	-	
1327izo-Dihydro carveol acetate3.111348 α -Terpinyl acetate-11.55<	1303	Carvacrol	-	-	-	-	-	28.11	-	-
1348α-Terpinyl acetate-11.55 <td>1327</td> <td>izo-Dihydro carveol acetate</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>3.11</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	1327	izo-Dihydro carveol acetate	-	-	-	3.11	-	-	-	-
1383β-Bourbonene0.181.761390β-Elemene1.721418β-Caryophyllene0.53-2.780.930.922.463.950.821434 α -trans-Bergamotene2.111436 γ -Elemene1.421436 γ -Unulene1.13-4.15-1452 α -Humulene1.13-4.15-1479 γ -Muurolene4.451503 α -Bulnesene3.661512 γ -Cadinene2.171639 α -epi-Cadinol2.17 γ of total identified compounds97.199.096.697.793.898.197.896.3	1348	α -Terpinyl acetate	-	11.55	-	-	-	-	-	-
1390 β-Elemeneβ-Elemene1.721418 β-Caryophyllene 0.53 - 2.78 0.93 0.92 2.463.95 0.82 1434 (434) α-trans-Bergamotene 2.11 1436 (436) γ-Elemene 2.11 1436 (436) γ-Elemene 1.42 1436 (452) γ-Elemene 1.13 - 4.15 1452 (477) γ-Muurolene 4.45 1503 (3-Bulnesene 3.66 1512 (501) (501) 2.17 1639 (501) (501) 2.17 1639 (501) (501) 2.17 1639 (501) 2.17 1639 (501) 2.17 1639 (501)1639 (5	1383	β-Bourbonene	-	-	0.18	1.76	-	-	-	-
1418 β-Caryophyllene 0.53 - 2.78 0.93 0.92 2.46 3.95 0.82 1434 α-trans-Bergamotene - - - 2.11 - - - 1436 γ-Elemene - - - - 1.42 - - - 1436 γ-Elemene - - - - 1.42 - - - 1452 α-Humulene - - - - 1.13 - 4.15 - 1479 γ-Muurolene - - - - 4.45 - - - 1503 α-Bulnesene - - - - 3.666 - - - 1512 γ-Cadinene - - - - 2.17 - - - 1639 α-epi-Cadinol - - - 2.17 - - - 1639 α-epi-Cadinol - - - 2.17 - - -	1390	β-Elemene	-	-	-	-	1.72	-	-	-
1434 α -trans-Bergamotene2.111436 γ -Elemene1.421452 α -Humulene1.13-4.15-1479 γ -Muurolene4.451503 α -Bulnesene3.661512 γ -Cadinene2.981639 α -epi-Cadinol2.17 α -of total identified compounds97.199.096.697.793.898.197.896.3Total number of identified compounds2714313342172715	1418	β-Carvophyllene	0.53	-	2.78	0.93	0.92	2.46	3.95	0.82
1436 γ -Elemene1.421452 α -Humulene1.13-4.15-1479 γ -Muurolene4.451503 α -Bulnesene3.661512 γ -Cadinene2.981639 α -epi-Cadinol2.17 γ of total identified compounds97.199.096.697.793.898.197.896.3Total number of identified compounds2714313342172715	1434	α -trans-Bergamotene	-	-	-	-	2.11	-	-	-
1452 α -Humulene1.13-4.15-1479 γ -Muurolene4.451503 α -Bulnesene3.661512 γ -Cadinene2.981639 α -epi-Cadinol2.17 α of total identified compounds97.199.096.697.793.898.197.896.3Total number of identified compounds2714313342172715	1436	v-Elemene	-	-	-	-	1.42	-	-	-
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1452	α-Humulene	-	-	-	-	1.13	-	4.15	-
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1479	v-Muurolene	-	-	-	-	4.45	-	-	-
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1503	α-Bulnesene	-	-	-	-	3.66	-	-	-
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1512	v-Cadinene	-	-	-	-	2.98			-
% of total identified compounds 97.1 99.0 96.6 97.7 93.8 98.1 97.8 96.3 Total number of identified compounds 27 14 31 33 42 17 27 15	1639	g-ebi-Cadinal	_	-	-	-	2.70	-	-	_
Total number of identified compounds 27 14 31 33 42 17 27 15	1007	% of total identified compounds	- 97 I	- 99.0	- 96.6	- 97 7	93.8	- 98 1	- 97.8	96.3
		Total number of identified compounds	27	14	31	33	47	17	27	15

*AI - arithmetic retention index; LA – Lavandula angustifolia; LN - Laurus nobilus; MP - Mentha x piperita; MS – Mentha spicata; OB - Ocimum basilicum; SM - Satureja montana; SO – Salvia officinalis; TV - Thymus vulgaris; *Only compounds that are prevalent by more than 1% in at least one essential oil are shown in the table; ^bCompounds present in more than 1% are shown in bold.

Table 2:	Tukey-Kramer	post-hoc anal	ysis of mortalit	y after I min	exposure to EOs
----------	--------------	---------------	------------------	---------------	-----------------

Essential oils				Essential oils			
	MP	LN	LA	TV	MS	OB	SM
LN	0.2193						
LA	I I	0.2647					
TV	2.98E-05	0.03087	4.04E-05				
MS	0.4676	0.001552	0.4038	9.87E-08			
OB	0.1501	0.000227	0.1209	1.62E-08	0.9969		
SM	6.83E-07	0.000881	9.18E-07	0.8768	3.01E-09	5.58E-10	
SO	0.002489	0.5755	0.003334	0.7665	7.53E-06	1.11E-06	0.1052

* LA – Lavandula angustifolia; LN - Laurus nobilus; MP - Mentha x piperita; MS – Mentha spicata; OB - Ocimum basilicum; SM - Satureja montana; SO – Salvia officinalis; TV - Thymus vulgaris

thyme and lavender showed high persistent activity against *D. gallinae* 30 days after application on filter paper, with the effects at 72h of 100% and nearly 80%, respectively (Nechita *et al.*, 2015). In a study of Tabari *et al.* (2020), EOs of *Litchi chinensis* and *Syzygium aromaticum* showed promising toxic effects up to 4 days after application.

In the context of the residual efficacy, the results of previous study conducted for banned acaricide carbaryl, in

a 0.1% aqueous solution, showed its high efficacy for 70 days (Pavlićević *et al.*, 2016). The SiO₂ formulation had a prolonged efficacy of 80% even after 60 days. The residual effect of a 20% aqueous emulsion P 547/17, on a galvanized sheet substrate and in an inclined position, was 57% after one month and remained at the same level in the following month (Pavlićević *et al.*, 2017, 2018), In practice, a facility treated twice with selected inert oils, will

Fig. 1: Average mortality rate (%) of *Dermanyssus gallinae* adult mites after exposure to examined essential oils (± SD).



require one or two more treatments depending on the conditions. If the conditions are fully met, no treatment at all is required during the one-year exploitation of a new flock (Pavlićević *et al.*, 2016).

One of the possible solutions to prolong the effect of EOs against D. gallinae is to combine different EOs or their ingredients to obtain a synergistic effect. Thus, in a study of Amer et al. (2020), a formulation containing garlic oil (2.5%), rosehip oil (4.2%), rapeseed oil (4.8%) and polysorbate (14.0%) showed a rapid and strong acaricide effect in contact sprays in vitro, while there was a significant improvement in the groups treated with plant oils in vivo. Another option is to use multiple applications over several consecutive days, as in the study performed by Chun et al., (2018), where five external treatments with Chamaecyparis obtusa (Siebold & Zucc.) Endl. EO resulted in a control effect of about 80% for 18 days. Three treatments with RP03[™], a formulation consisting of 20% neem oil, were effective in controlling D. gallinae for slightly more than 2 months in facilities inhabited by laying hens (Camarda et al., 2018).

Given the unstable and volatile properties of EOs, encapsulation techniques can effectively reduce the degradation of EO active ingredients, evaporation, smell and odour, whereby they can provide a slow and continuous release of active substances (Maes et al., 2019; Linh et al., 2022). For example, encapsulated carvacrol with yeast cell walls showed high acaricidal activity against common tick in domestic animals, Rhipicephalus microplus Canestrini (Acari: Ixodidae), while exhibiting volatilization lower (Lima et al., 2017). Α microencapsulated formulation of Cymbopogan winterianus Jowitt ex Bor EO with gelatin: acacia showed promise for mosquito repellency due to its relatively slow release rate (Songkro et al., 2018). These examples suggest the usefulness of encapsulation in controlling ectoparasites including D. gallinae, although further studies should confirm these considerations.

In the end, EOs may play an important role in environmentally friendly integrated pest management,

which implies the use of safe, non-chemical methods and measures in the prevention and treatment of diseases caused by pest species, and the use of chemical acaricides only after these measures have failed (Decru et al., 2020). Moreover, it may also refer to the combination of different methods. Thus, the combination of ivermectin (0.25 mg/ml) and allicin (a compound commonly found in garlic EO) (1 mg/ml) exhibited very high in vitro acaricide rates of 98.7%, 98.4%, 99.4% and 99.9% on days 7, 13, 21 and 28 after treatment, respectively (Kang et al., 2023). EOs can also be combined with other alternative methods, especially those that have a delayed, but long-term effect as in the case of entomopathogenic fungi (Gay et al., 2020). For example, Beauveria bassiana (Bals.-Criv.) Vuill. (Hypocreale: Cordycipitaceae) has been combined with different EOs, whereby the combination with E. globulus Labill at very low concentration (0.2%) proved to be a highly promising option for the control of D. gallinae (Immediato et al., 2016).

Conclusions: The present study demonstrated that EOs have high activity against *D. gallinae*, as the results of the contact toxicity tests showed. However, their unstable and volatile nature allows only short-term effect. Therefore, methods and strategies to increase their residual effect are needed before their widespread individual use in practice is possible. Alternatively, EOs can still be an important part of an integrated pest management of *D. gallinae* designed to achieve sustainable, rational control of this important parasite.

Authors contribution: RR, AP, JP and IS made substantial contributions to the basic idea, while the conduct of the research was made possible by RR and AP. NS and DO are responsible for the procurement of EOs and the GC-MS analyses, while the experiment (*in vitro* acaricidal effect) was designed and conducted by RR and AP with great advisory assistance from JP and IS. For interpreting the results and drawing conclusions are responsible RR, FŠ and AP, while the final version of the manuscript was drafted by AP and FŠ with the assistance of all co-authors who revised the manuscript.

Acknowledgements: This research was funded by Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of Republic of Serbia by the Contract of implementation and funding of research work of NIV-NS in 2023, Contract No: 451-03-47/2023-01/200031.

REFERENCES

- Abbas A, Abbas RZ, Masood S, et *al.*, 2018. Acaricidal and insecticidal effects of essential oils against ectoparasites of veterinary importance. Bol Latinoam Caribe Plantas Med Aromat 17:441-52.
- Amer AMM, Amer MM, Mekky HM, et al., 2020. Effect of combined plant essential oils on *Dermanyssus gallinae*: In vitro and in vivo study. World Vet | 10:199-206.
- Borges DGL and Borges FDA, 2016. Plants and their medicinal potential for controling gastrointestinal nematodes in ruminants. Nematoda 3:e92016.
- Camarda A, Pugliese N, Bevilacqua A, et al., 2018. Efficacy of a novel neem oil formulation (RP03TMRP03[™]) to control the poultry red mite Dermanyssus gallinae. Med Vet Entomol 32:290–7.
- Chun IL, Park GS, Choe HS, et al., 2018. Effect of spraying Chamaecyparis obtusa essential oil on the elimination of red mite (Dermanyssus gallinae) in laying hens. Korean J Poult Sci 45:193-200.
- Decru E, Mul M, Nisbet AJ, et al., 2020. Possibilities for IPM strategies in European laying hen farms for improved control of the poultry red mite (Dermanyssus gallinae): Details and state of affairs. Front Vet Sci 7:565866.
- De Sousa DP, Damasceno ROS, Amorati R, et al., 2023. Essential oils: Chemistry and pharmacological activities. Biomolecules 13:1144
- Di Palma A, Giangaspero A, Cafiero MA, et al., 2012. A gallery of the key characters to ease identification of *Dermanyssus gallinae* (Acari: Gamasida: Dermanyssidae) and allow differentiation from *Ornithonyssus sylviarum* (Acari: Gamasida: Macronyssidae). Parasit Vectors 5:104.
- Fokou JBH, Dongmo PMJ and Boyom FF, 2020. Essential oil's chemical composition and pharmacological properties. In: Essential Oils–Oils of Nature (E El-Shemy, ed): Intechopen, London, UK, chapter 2.
- Gay M, Lempereur L, Francis F, et al., 2020. Control of Dermanyssus gallinae (De Geer 1778) and other mites with volatile organic compounds, a review. Parasitology 147:731-9.
- George DR, Sparagano OAE, Port G, et al., 2010a. Environmental interactions with the toxicity of plant essential oils to the poultry red mite *Dermanyssus gallinae*. Med Vet Entomol 24:1-8.
- George D, Olatunji G, Guy JH, et al., 2010b. Effect of plant essential oils as acaricides against the poultry red mite, *Dermanyssus gallinae*, with special focus on exposure time. Vet Parasitol 169:222–5. (Short communication)
- George DR, Finn RD, Graham KM, et al., 2015. Should the poultry red mite *Dermanyssus gallinae* be of wider concern for veterinary and medical science? Parasit Vectors 8:178.
- Immediato D, Figueredo LA, latta R, et al., 2016. Essential oils and Beauveria bassiana against Dermanyssus gallinae (Acari: Dermanyssidae): Towards new natural acaricides. Vet Parasitol 229:159–65.
- Imran A and Alsayeqh A, 2022. Anticoccidial efficacy of *Citrus sinensis* essential oil in Broiler chicken. Pak Vet J 42:461-6.
- Isman MB, 2016. Pesticides based on plant essential oils: Phytochemical and practical considerations. In: Medicinal and Aromatic Crops: Production, Phytochemistry, and Utilization (Jeliazkov VD and CC Cantrell, eds): ACS Publications, USA, pp:13-26.
- Kang JW, Chae HY and Hossain MA, 2023. Poultry red mite eradication potential of ivermectin and allicin combination treatment. Vet Med Sci 9:1292-6.
- Kilpinen O, 2015. How to obtain a bloodmeal without being eaten by a host: The case of poultry red mite, *Dermanyssus gallinae*. Physiol Entomol 30:232–40.

- Kim SI, Jee-Hwan Y, Jun-hyung T, et al., 2004. Acaricidal activity of plant essential oils against Dermanyssus gallinae (Acari: Dermanyssidae). Vet Parasitol 120:297–304.
- Lima ADS, Maciel AP, Mendonça CDJS, et al., 2017. Use of encapsulated carvacrol with yeast cell wals to control resistant strains of *Rhipicephalus microplus* (Acari: Ixodidae). Ind Crops Prod 108:190-4.
- Linh NT, Qui NH and Triatmojo A, 2022. The effect of nanoencapsulated herbal essential oils on poultry's health. Arch Razi Inst 77:2013-21.
- Magdaş C, Cernea M, Baciu H, et al., 2010. Acaricidal effect of eleven essential oils against the poultry red mite *Dermanyssus gallinae* (Acari: Dermanyssidae). Sci Parasitol I 1(2):71-5.
- Maes C, Bouquillion S and Fauconnier ML, 2019. Encapsulation of essential oils for the development of biosourced pesticides with controlled release: A review. Molecules 24:2539.
- Marangi M, Morelli V, Pati S, et al., 2012. Acaricide residues in laying hens naturally infested by red mite *Dermanyssus gallinae*. PloS One 7:e31795.
- Moss WW, 1968. An illustrated key to the species of the acarine genus Dermanyssus (Mesostigmata: Laelapoidea: Dermanyssidae). J Med Entomol 5:67-84.
- Nechita IS, Poirel MT, Cozma V, et al., 2015. The repellent and persistent toxic effects of essential oils against the poultry red mite, *Dermanyssus gallinae*. Vet Parasitol 214:348-52.
- Nehme R, Andrés S, Pereira RB, et al., 2021. Essential oils in livestock: From health to food quality. Antioxidants 10:330.
- Pavlićević A, Pavlović I, Stajković N, et al., 2016. Evidence for resistance to carbaryl in poultry red mites from the Republic of Serbia and Montenegro. Scientific Papers: Animal Science and Biotechnologies 49:222-5.
- Pavlićević A, Ratajac R, Dotlić M, et al., 2017. An innovative formulation of paraffin and silicone oils for the control of the red poultry mite (Dermanyssus gallinae) – examination of the efficiency under laboratory conditions. Arch Vet Med 10:63-79.
- Pavlićević A, Ratajac R, Tomić DH, et al., 2018. Dermanyssus gallinae eradication approach – application of inert compounds and integral animal health protection. Arch Vet Med 11:3-15.
- Puvača N, Petrović A, Tomić DH, et al., 2019. Influence of essential oils as natural poultry red mite (*Dermanyssus gallinae*) repellents. Agron Technol Eng Manag 2:168-77.
- Quilicot MAM, Gottstein Ž, Prukner-Radovčić E, et al., 2020. Plantderived products for the control of poultry red mite (*Dermanyssus* gallinae De Geer, 1778) – a review. Worlds Poult Sci J 76:549-61.
- Radsetoulalova I, Hubert J, Hampel D, et al., 2020. Active components of essential oils as acaricides against *Dermanyssus gallinae*. Br Poult Sci 61:169-172.
- Roczeń-Karczmarz M, Demkowska-Kutrzepa M, Zdybel J, et al., 2022. Comparison of the effectiveness of selected essential oils with mineral oil and spinosad on *Dermanyssus gallinae*. Pol J Vet Sci 25:261-8.
- Schiavone A, Pugliese N, Otranto D, et al., 2022. Dermanyssus gallinae: the long journey of the poultry red mite to become a vector. Parasit Vectors 15:29.
- Soares LB, Tucci EC, Gonçalez E, et al., 2015. Acaricide and fungicide effects of the Artemisia vulgaris essential oil. Annu Res Rev Biol 5:285-92.
- Songkro S, Yapong P, Puechpan P, et al., 2018. Microencapsulation of citronella oil for mosquito repellent: Preparation and evaluation of release characteristics. Songklanakarin | Sci Technol 40:767-75.
- Sparagano OAE, George DR, Harrington DWJ, et al., 2014. Significance and control of the poultry red mite, *Dermanyssus gallinae*. Annu Rev Entomol 59:447–66.
- Štrbac F, Bosco A, Amadesi A, et al., 2021. Ovicidal potential of five different essential oils to control gastrointestinal nematodes of sheep. Pak Vet J 41:353-58.
- Štrbac F, Krnjajić S, Maurelli MPM, et al., 2022. A potential anthelmintic phytopharmacological source of Origanum vulgare (L.) essential oil against gastrointestinal nematodes of sheep. Animals 13:45.
- Tabari MA, Rostami A, Khodashenas A, et al., 2020. Acaricidal activity, mode of action, and persistent efficacy of selected essential oils on the poultry red mite (*Dermanyssus gallinae*). Food Chem Toxicol 138:111207.