

## DIVERSITY OF ANTS (HYMENOPTERA: FORMICIDAE) IN TIRUVALLUR DISTRICT OF TAMIL NADU, INDIA

Nagarajan. D<sup>1</sup>, S. Prabakaran<sup>1</sup> and Soundararajan V<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Marine Biology Regional centre, Zoological Survey of India, Chennai-600028, Tamil Nadu

<sup>2</sup>ICFRE - Tropical Forest Research Institute, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh

\*Email - [prabakaranzsi@yahoo.co.in](mailto:prabakaranzsi@yahoo.co.in)

### ABSTRACT

This study provides a wide-ranging list of ant species (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) from the Tiruvallur district, Tamil Nadu State, India. The study's main goal was to assess the diversity of ant species across a range of environments, such as hills, farms, and residential areas. Samples have been collected in leaf litter, rotting logs, beneath the soil, inside woody stems, and under rocks. A total of 34 species have been identified across 17 genera and 6 subfamilies. The subfamily Formicinae was the most prevalent with 14 species, followed by Myrmicinae (11 species), Pseudomyrmicinae (3 species), Dolichoderinae (2 species), Ponerinae (2 species), and Myrmeciinae (1 species).

### Keywords:

Diversity, Formicidae, Ants family, Ants Ecosystem management, Ants and Tiruvallur District..

### INTRODUCTION

Ants are a very prevalent group of invertebrates worldwide, displaying a vast array of eating patterns, nest-building techniques, and interactions with creatures in all trophic levels. Certain species exhibit specialized behaviors, while being omnivores in general and consuming a diverse range of foods such as seeds, plant exudates, dead animals, and live prey. These consist of growing fungus or consuming pollen (Kaspari, 2000). They are deeply involved in many ecological processes and are thus essential to terrestrial ecosystems. These tiny insects, which are often seen in gardens and houses, make up much to half of all insect biomass across the globe and are both ubiquitous and ecologically dominating (Anderson, 2021). Ants belong to the largest family, Formicidae, within the order Hymenoptera. Globally, this family includes 22 subfamilies, with 17,139 species and subspecies across 516 genera (antweb.org). Early fundamental works on Indian ants include those by Jerdon (1851 and 1854) and Forel (1900a, 1900b, 1901, and 1913). Notably, one of the most important contributions to our understanding of Indian ants is still Bingham's 1903

research. There are 10 subfamilies, 864 species, and 110 genera reported from identified in India (antwiki.org).

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ants were collected from several parts of the Tiruvallur district, Tamil Nadu State including Tiruttani, Gummidipoondi, Poondi, Ponneri, Pallipattu, and Uthukkottai. This work's research period starts with the north-east monsoon, which runs from October to December 2023, and ends with the dry season, which runs from February to the beginning of June 2024.

### How to Cite:

Nagarajan. D, S. Prabakaran and Soundararajan V (2024). Diversity of Ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) In Tiruvallur District of Tamil Nadu, India. *Biolife*. 12(3), 4-11.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13839764>

Received: 11 August 2024; Accepted: 15 September 2024;  
Published online: 21 September 2024

We collected ant samples using every technique imaginable, but in particular, Pitfall traps, the Winkler extractor, and Hand picking. The samples were preserved in 70% ethyl alcohol at the Marine Biology Regional Centre of the Zoological Survey of India, Chennai, Tamil Nadu State, India.

## RESULTS

The analysis of ant species collected from six locations in the Tiruvallur district reveals significant biodiversity (Table-1). Among the 34 species identified, *Tapinoma sessile*, *Camponotus compressus*, *Camponotus sericeus*, *Formica rufa*, *Oecophylla smaragdina*, *Monomorium minimum*, *Novomessor cockerelli*, *Pheidole megacephala*, *Solenopsis invicta*, *Trichomyrmex criniceps*, *Tetraponera allaborans*, and *Tetraponera nigra* were found in all six locations, indicating their widespread distribution.

Conversely, species like *Anoplolepis gracillipes*, *Camponotus irritans*, *Camponotus japonicus*, *Camponotus maculatus*, *Camponotus pennsylvanicus*, *Oecophylla longinoda*, *Myrmecia pilosula*, *Meranoplus bicolor*, *Monomorium pharaonis*, *Solenopsis geminata*, *Dinoponera gigantea*, and *Tetraponera rufonigra* showed more localized distributions, being absent in one or more locations. This variation suggests differing habitat preferences and adaptability among the species. The presence of multiple species across diverse locations underscores the ecological richness of the Tiruvallur district and highlights the importance of habitat conservation to maintain this biodiversity.

Order: Hymenoptera Linnaeus, 1758

Super family: Formicoidea Latreille, 1809

Family: Formicidae Latreille, 1809

**Sub family:** Dolichoderinae Forel, 1878

**Genus:** *Linepithema*

1. *Linepithema humile* (Mayr, 1868)  
*Iridomyrmex humilis arrogans* Chopard, 1921  
*Iridomyrmex riograndensis* Borgmeier, 1928

**Genus:** *Tapinoma*

2. *Tapinoma sessile* (Say, 1836)  
*Bothriomyrmex dimmocki* Wheeler, W.M., 1915  
*Formica gracilis* Buckley, 1866  
*Formica parva* Buckley, 1866  
*Tapinoma boreale* Provancher, 1887

*Tapinoma boreale* Roger, 1863

**Sub family:** Formicinae Lepeletier, 1836

**Genus:** *Anoplolepis*

3. *Anoplolepis gracillipes* (Smith, F., 1857)  
*Formica longipes* Jerdon, 1851  
*Formica trifasciata* Smith, F., 1858  
**Genus:** *Camponotus*
4. *Camponotus angusticollis* (Jerdon, 1851)  
*Camponotus prismaticus* Mayr, 1862  
*Formica ardens* Smith, F., 1858  
*Formica impetuosa* Smith, F., 1858
5. *Camponotus compressus* (Fabricius, 1787)  
*Camponotus quadrilaterus* Roger, 1863  
*Formica callida* Smith, F., 1858  
*Formica indefessa* Sykes, 1835
6. *Camponotus herculeanus* (Linnaeus, 1758)  
*Camponotus herculeanus altaica* Ruzsky, 1915  
*Camponotus herculeanus caucasicus* Arnol'di, 1967  
*Camponotus herculeanus eudokiae* Ruzsky, 1926  
*Camponotus herculeanus jacuticus* Karavaiev, 1929  
*Camponotus herculeanus montanus* Ruzsky, 1904  
*Camponotus herculeanus nadigi* Menozzi, 1922  
*Camponotus herculeanus sachalinensis* Forel, 1904  
*Camponotus herculeanus shitkowi* Ruzsky, 1904  
*Camponotus herculeanus whymperi* Forel, 1902  
*Formica atra* Zetterstedt, 1838  
*Formica intermedia* Zetterstedt, 1838
7. *Camponotus irritans* (Smith, F., 1857)  
*Camponotus agnatus* Roger, 1863
8. *Camponotus japonicus* Mayr, 1866  
*Camponotus herculeanus manczshuricus* Emery, 1925  
*Camponotus japonicus miltotus* Wheeler, W.M., 1929  
*Camponotus japonicus sanguinea* Karavaiev, 1929  
*Camponotus japonicus wui* Wheeler, W.M., 1929
9. *Camponotus maculatus* (Fabricius, 1782)  
*Camponotus sexpunctatus liengmei* Forel, 1894  
*Formica cognata* Smith, F., 1858  
*Formica lacteipennis* Smith, F., 1858
10. *Camponotus mendax* Forel, 1895  
*Camponotus pseudolus* Forel, 1902
11. *Camponotus pennsylvanicus* (De Geer, 1773)  
*Camponotus herculeanus herculeanopennsylvanicus* Forel, 1879  
*Camponotus herculeanus mahican* Emery, 1925

12. *Camponotus rufoglaucus* (Jerdon, 1851)  
*Camponotus redtenbacheri* Mayr, 1862

13. *Camponotus sericeus* (Fabricius, 1798)  
*Formica aurulenta* Latreille, 1802  
*Formica pyrrocephala* Motschoulsky, 1863

**Genus: Formica**

14. *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761  
*Formica apicalis* Smith, F., 1858  
*Formica dorsata* Panzer, 1798  
*Formica ferruginea* Christ, 1791  
*Formica gaullei* Bondroit, 1917  
*Formica piniphila* Schenck, 1852  
*Formica rufa meridionalis* Nasonov, 1889  
*Formica rufa rufopratensis* Forel, 1874

**Genus: Oecophylla**

15. *Oecophylla smargdina* (Fabricius, 1775)  
*Formica macra* Guérin-Méneville, 1831  
*Formica virescens* Fabricius, 1775  
*Formica viridis* Kirby, W., 1819  
*Formica zonata* Guérin-Méneville, 1838

16. *Oecophylla longinoda* (Latreille, 1802)  
*Oecophylla brevinodis* André, 1890

**Genus: Paratrechina**

17. *Paratrechina logicornis* (Latreille, 1802)  
*Formica gracilescens* Nylander, 1856  
*Formica vagans* Jerdon, 1851  
*Paratrechina currens* Motschoulsky, 1863  
*Prenolepis longicornis hagemanni* Forel, 1901

**Sub family: Myrmeciinae Emery, 1877**

**Genus: Myrmecia**

18. *Myrmecia pilosula* Smith, F., 1858  
*Halmamyrmecia pilosula* Wheeler, 1922  
*Myrmecia ruginoda* F. Smith, 1858  
*Ponera ruginoda* F. Smith, 1858  
*Promyrmecia pilosula* Clark, 1943

**Sub family: Myrmicinae Lepeletier de Saint-Fargeau, 1835**

**Genus: Meranoplus**

19. *Meranoplus bicolor* (Guérin-Méneville, 1844)  
*Meranoplus bicolor fuscescens* Wheeler, W.M., 1930  
*Meranoplus bicolor lucidus* Forel, 1903  
*Meranoplus dimicans* Walker, 1859  
*Meranoplus villosus* Motschoulsky, 1860  
*Myrmica tarda* Jerdon, 1851

**Genus: Monomorium**

20. *Monomorium minimum* (Buckley, 1867)  
*Monomorium metoecus* Brown & Wilson, 1957  
*Myrmica atra* Buckley, 1867

21. *Monomorium Pharaonis* (Linnaeus, 1758)  
*Atta minuta* Jerdon, 1851  
*Formica antiguensis* Fabricius, 1793  
*Myrmica contigua* Smith, F., 1858  
*Myrmica domestica* Shuckard, 1838  
*Myrmica fragilis* Smith, F., 1858  
*Myrmica vastator* Smith, F., 1857

**Genus: Novomessor**

22. *Novomessor cockerelli* (André, 1893)  
*Aphaenogaster sonora* Pergande, 1893

**Genus: Pheidole**

23. *Pheidole megacephala* (Fabricius, 1793)  
*Atta testacea* Smith, F., 1858  
*Formica edax* Fo rskål, 1775  
*Myrmica agilis* Smith, F., 1857  
*Myrmica laevigata* Smith, F., 1855  
*Myrmica suspiciosa* Smith, F., 1859  
*Myrmica trinodis* Losana, 1834  
*Oecophthora perniciosus* Gerstäcker, 1859  
*Oecophthora pusilla* Heer, 1852  
*Pheidole janus* Smith, F., 1858  
*Pheidole laevigata* Mayr, 1862

24. *Pheidole pallidula* (Nylander, 1849)  
*Oecophthora subdentata* Mayr, 1853  
*Pheidole pallidula emeryi* Krausse, 1912  
*Pheidole pallidula obscura* Santschi, 1936  
*Pheidole symbiotica* Wasmann, 1909  
*Xenoaphaenogaster inquilina* Baroni Urbani, 1964

**Genus: Solenopsis**

25. *Solenopsis geminata* (Fabricius, 1804)  
*Solenopsis mandibularis* Westwood, 1840  
*Solenopsis cephalotes* Smith, F., 1859  
*Crematogaster laboriosus* Smith, F., 1860  
*Diplorhoptrum drewseni* Mayr, 1861  
*Myrmica saxicola* Buckley, 1867  
*Solenopsis eduardi* Forel, 1912  
*Solenopsis edouardi perversa* Santschi, 1925

26. *Solenopsis Invicta* Buren, 1972  
*Solenopsis saevissima wagneri* Santschi, 1916

27. *Solenopsis xyloni* McCook, 1879  
*Solenopsis geminata maniosa* Wheeler, W.M., 1915  
*Solenopsis geminata pylades* Forel, 1904

**Genus: *Trichomyrmex***

28. *Trichomyrmex criniceps* (Mayr, 1879)  
*Holcomyrmex criniceps niger* Forel, 1902  
*Holcomyrmex criniceps ruber* Forel, 1903
29. *Trichomyrmex glaber* (Andre, 1883)  
*Holcomyrmex glaber clarus* Forel, 1902  
*Holcomyrmex glaber glabrocriniceps* Forel, 1902

**Sub family: Ponerinae Lepeletier, 1835**

**Genus: *Dinoponera***

30. *Dinoponera gigantea* (Perty, 1833)  
*Ponera grandis* Guérin-Méneville, 1838  
*Ponera gigantea* Perty, 1833

**Genus: *Leptogenys***

31. *Leptogenys processionalis* (Jerdon, 1851)  
*Lobopelta distinguenda andrei* Emery, 1887  
*Ponera ocellifera* Roger, 1861

**Sub family: Pseudomyrmecinae Smith, 1952**

**Genus: *Tetraoponera***

32. *Tetraoponera allaborans* (Walker, 1859)  
*Cerapachys ceylonica* Motschoulsky, 1863  
*Cerapachys femoralis* Motschoulsky, 1863  
*Eciton minutum* Jerdon, 1851  
*Eciton rufipes* Jerdon, 1851  
*Sima allaborans longinoda* Forel, 1909  
*Sima allaborans sumatrensis* Emery, 1900  
*Sima compressa* Roger, 1863  
*Sima subtilis* Emery, 1899
33. *Tetraoponera nigra* (Jerdon, 1851)  
*Sima nigra fergusonii* Forel, 1902  
*Sima nigra insularis* Emery, 1901  
*Sima nigra krama* Forel, 1912  
*Tetraoponera atrata* Smith, F., 1852  
*Tetraoponera petiolata* Smith, 1877
34. *Tetraoponera rufonigra* (Jerdon, 1851)  
*Sima rufonigra ceylonensis* Forel, 1909  
*Sima rufonigra testaceonigra* Forel, 1903  
*Sima rufonigra yeensis* Forel, 1902.

**Diversity Indices**

The diversity indices for different locations in the Tiruvallur district reveal notable variations in ant biodiversity (Table-2). Gummidipoondi exhibits the highest species richness (Taxa\_S = 31) and diversity (Simpson\_1-D = 0.9532, Shannon\_H = 3.238), indicating a more balanced and diverse ant community. This is further supported by its high Evenness ( $e^{H/S} = 0.8221$ ) and Equitability ( $J = 0.9429$ ), suggesting that species are more evenly distributed. In contrast, Uthukkottai shows the lowest species richness (Taxa\_S = 21) and diversity (Simpson\_1-D = 0.9251, Shannon\_H = 2.756), with a lower Evenness ( $e^{H/S} = 0.7496$ ) and Equitability ( $J = 0.9053$ ), indicating a less balanced community with certain species potentially dominating.

The dominance index (Dominance\_D) values further highlight these differences, with Gummidipoondi having the lowest dominance ( $D = 0.04675$ ), suggesting minimal dominance by any single species. Conversely, Poondi and Uthukkottai have higher dominance values ( $D = 0.06577$  and  $0.07488$ , respectively), indicating a higher likelihood of certain species being more prevalent. The Margalef and Fisher\_alpha indices also reflect these trends, with Gummidipoondi showing higher values (Margalef = 5.059, Fisher\_alpha = 8.01) compared to Uthukkottai (Margalef = 3.74, Fisher\_alpha = 5.809), underscoring the greater species richness and diversity in Gummidipoondi. These indices collectively illustrate the varying ecological dynamics and biodiversity across the different locations in the Tiruvallur district.

The analysis of ant species and diversity indices from various locations in the Tiruvallur district highlights significant biodiversity and ecological variation. Gummidipoondi stands out with the highest species richness and diversity, indicating a well-balanced ant community with minimal dominance by any single species. In contrast, Uthukkottai shows the lowest species richness and diversity, suggesting a less balanced community with certain species potentially dominating. The presence of widespread species across all locations, such as *Tapinoma sessile* and *Camponotus compressus*, underscores their adaptability, while the localized distribution of others points to specific habitat preferences. Overall, these findings emphasize the ecological richness of the Tiruvallur district and the importance of habitat conservation to maintain this biodiversity.

Table 1: Ant species collected from six various locations of the Tiruvallur district.

S. No	Species	Tiruttani 13.1746° N, 79.6117° E	Gummidipoondi 13.4110° N, 80.1170° E	Poondi 13.2081° N, 79.8815° E	Ponneri 13.3340° N, 80.1944° E	Pallipattu 13.3371° N, 79.4397° E	Uthukkottai 13.3339° N, 79.8917° E
1.	<i>Linepithema humile</i> (Mayr, 1868)	*	*	*	*	*	-
2.	<i>Tapinoma sessile</i> (Say, 1836)	*	*	*	*	*	*
3.	<i>Anoplolepis gracillipes</i> (Smith, F., 1857)	-	*	-	-	*	*
4.	<i>Camponotus angusticollis</i> (Jerdon, 1851)	*	*	*	*	*	-
5.	<i>Camponotus compressus</i> (Fabricius, 1787)	*	*	*	*	*	*
6.	<i>Camponotus herculeanus</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	*	*	*	*	-	*
7.	<i>Camponotus irritans</i> (Smith, F., 1857)	*	-	-	*	*	*
8.	<i>Camponotus japonicus</i> Mayr, 1866	*	*	-	*	*	*
9.	<i>Camponotus maculatus</i> (Fabricius, 1782)	*	*	-	*	-	-
10.	<i>Camponotus mendax</i> Forel, 1895	*	*	*	*	*	*
11.	<i>Camponotus pennsylvanicus</i> (De Geer, 1773)	*	*	-	-	*	-
12.	<i>Camponotus rufoglaucus</i> (Jerdon, 1851)	*	*	*	*	*	*
13.	<i>Camponotus sericeus</i> (Fabricius, 1798)	*	*	*	*	*	*
14.	<i>Formica rufa</i> Linnaeus, 1761	*	*	*	*	*	*
15.	<i>Oecophylla smaragdina</i> (Fabricius, 1775)	*	*	*	*	*	*
16.	<i>Oecophylla longinoda</i> (Latreille, 1802)	-	*	*	*	-	-
17.	<i>Paratrechina logicornis</i> (Latreille, 1802)	*	*	*	-	*	*
18.	<i>Myrmecia pilosula</i> Smith, F., 1858	*	*	*	-	-	-
19.	<i>Meranoplus bicolor</i> (Guérin-Méneville, 1844)	-	*	*	*	-	-
20.	<i>Monomorium minimum</i> (Buckley, 1867)	*	*	*	*	*	*

.....Table 1: Ant species collected from six various locations of the Tiruvallur district.

S. No	Species	Tiruttani 13.1746° N, 79.6117° E	Gummidiipoondi 13.4110° N, 80.1170° E	Poondi 13.2081° N, 79.8815° E	Ponneri 13.3340° N, 80.1944° E	Pallipattu 13.3371° N, 79.4397° E	Uthukkottai 13.3339° N, 79.8917° E
21.	<i>Monomorium Pharaonis</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	*	-	*	-	-	*
22.	<i>Novomessor cockerelli</i> (André, 1893)	*	*	*	*	*	-
23.	<i>Pheidole megacephala</i> (Fabricius, 1793)	*	*	*	*	*	-
24.	<i>Pheidole pallidula</i> (Nylander, 1849)	*	*	*	-	*	*
25.	<i>Solenopsis geminata</i> (Fabricius, 1804)	-	-	*	*	*	-
26.	<i>Solenopsis Invicta</i> Buren, 1972	*	*	*	*	-	*
27.	<i>Solenopsis xyloni</i> McCook, 1879	*	*	*	*	-	-
28.	<i>Trichomyrmex criniceps</i> (Mayr, 1879)	*	*	*	*	*	*
29.	<i>Trichomyrmex glaber</i> (Andre, 1883)	*	*	*	-	*	*
30.	<i>Dinoponera gigantea</i> (Perty, 1833)	-	*	-	-	*	-
31.	<i>Leptogenys processionalis</i> (Jerdon, 1851)	*	*	-	*	*	*
32.	<i>Tetraponera allaborans</i> (Walker, 1859)	*	*	*	*	*	*
33.	<i>Tetraponera nigra</i> (Jerdon, 1851)	*	*	*	*	*	*
34.	<i>Tetraponera rufonigra</i> (Jerdon, 1851)	-	*	*	-	-	-

## DISCUSSION

Tiruvallur district, Tamil Nadu was surveyed recently in six distinct fields. Seventeen genera belonging to various ant subfamilies were found throughout the study conducted to identify 34 species in total. Within the formicidae family, specifically, two genera were found in the subfamily Dolichoderinae, five genera in Formicinae, one genus in Myrmeciinae, six genera in Myrmicinae, two genera in Ponerinae, and one genus in Pseudomyrmecinae. The Myrmicinae and

Formicinae subfamilies were found to be very dominant. This dominance indicates that the ants of the Myrmicinae and Formicinae families are especially common or suited to this area. The diversity observed indicates a potentially rich ant community in Tiruvallur district, Tamil Nadu. However, further investigation is required to completely comprehend the scope and ramifications of this variety. Future research ought to look at the entire spectrum of ant species present in the region and their functions in soil aeration, seed dispersal and pest management, among other ecosystem services.

**Table 2: Diversity indices for different locations of Tiruvallur district, Tamil Nadu.**

S. No	Diversity indices	Tiruttan i	Gummidipoond i	Poondi	Ponneri	Pallipatt u	Uthukkotta i
1.	Taxa_S	28	31	27	25	25	21
2.	Individuals	413	376	263	282	274	210
3.	Dominance_D	0.06284	0.04675	0.06577	0.07595	0.05104	0.07488
4.	Simpson_1-D	0.9372	0.9532	0.9342	0.924	0.949	0.9251
5.	Shannon_H	3.064	3.238	2.965	2.816	3.075	2.756
6.	Evenness_e^H/ S	0.7647	0.8221	0.7183	0.6681	0.8659	0.7496
7.	Brillouin	2.927	3.078	2.784	2.66	2.902	2.583
8.	Menhinick	1.378	1.599	1.665	1.489	1.51	1.449
9.	Margalef	4.482	5.059	4.666	4.254	4.276	3.74
10.	Equitability_J	0.9195	0.9429	0.8996	0.8747	0.9553	0.9053
11.	Fisher_alpha	6.789	8.01	7.542	6.623	6.691	5.809
12.	Berger-Parker	0.155	0.1117	0.1255	0.1454	0.07664	0.1429
13.	Chao-1	28	31	27	26	25	21.5

## Conflicts of Interest

Authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

## Acknowledgements

We extend our sincere thanks to the Director, Zoological Survey of India, Kolkata and the Officer in charge, Marine Biology Regional Centre, Zoological Survey of India, Chennai for their support and encouragement.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Andersen, A. N. (2021). Diversity, Biogeography and Community Ecology of Ants: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Diversity*, 13(12), 625.
- [2] Antweb.org., [www.antweb.org](http://www.antweb.org), viewed on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2023.
- [3] Bharti. H, Guénard. B, Bharti.M, Economo. E. P. 2016 An updated checklist of the ants of India with their specific distributions in Indian states (Hymenoptera, Formicidae). *ZooKeys*, 551: 1–83.
- [4] Bingham, C. T. 1903. *The Fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma. Hymenoptera 2. Ants and Cuckoo-Wasps: 506pp.* London.
- [5] Forel, A. 1900a. Un nouveau genre et une nouvelle espèce de Myrmicide. *Ann. Soc. Entomol. Belg.* 44: 24-26.
- [6] Forel, A. 1900b. Ponerinae et Dorylinae d'Australie récoltés par MM. Turner, Frogga, Nugent, Chase, Rothney, J.-J. Walker, etc. *Ann. Soc. Entomol. Belg.* 44: 54-77.
- [7] Forel, A. 1901a. Les Formicides de l'Empire des Indes et de Ceylan. Part VIII. *The Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society.* 13:462-477.
- [8] Forel, A. 1913a. Fourmis de Rhodesia, etc. récoltées par M. G. Arnold, le Dr. H. Brauns et K. Fikendey. *Ann. Soc. Entomol. Belg.* 57: 108-147.

- [9] **Jerdon, T. C. 1851.** A catalogue of the species of ants found in southern India. *Madras Journal of Literature and Science*, 17: 103-127.
- [10] **Jerdon, T.C. 1854.** A catalogue of the species of ants found in southern India. *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, 13(2): 45-56.
- [11] **Kaspari, M. (2000).** A primer on ant ecology. In Agosti, D., Majer, J. D., Alonso, L.E., Schultz, T.R. (Eds.), *Ants: standard methods for measuring and monitoring biodiversity* (pp. 9-24). Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press