



REVIEW ARTICLE

CULTIVATING SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS: INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT (IPM) FOR SAFER AND GREENER AGRONOMY

Shikha Sharma

Faculty of Agriculture, Agriculture and Forestry University, Rampur, Chitwan, Nepal
*Corresponding Author Email: sajsharma44@gmail.com

This is an open access journal distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License CC BY 4.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History:

Received 19 June 2023
Revised 25 July 2023
Accepted 02 August 2023
Available online 04 August 2023

ABSTRACT

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) provides a sustainable and ecologically sound approach to address the continuous threat posed by pests in agriculture. This comprehensive review explores the implementation of IPM within agronomic systems, covering a range of strategies such as cultural practices, biological control, host plant resistance, and physical/mechanical control. Cultural practices involve modifying agricultural operations to create an unfavorable environment for insect multiplication and prevent pest population buildup, while biological control utilizes beneficial insects to combat pests. Host plant resistance entails developing crop varieties with inherent resistance to pests, reducing the need for chemical interventions. Physical and mechanical control methods offer eco-friendly alternatives, involving physical barriers and trapping techniques to manage localized pest outbreaks. Decision-making in IPM involves evaluating pest populations, economic thresholds, and phenological forecasts to determine appropriate control measures. Success stories demonstrate the real-world application and potential benefits of IPM in diverse agricultural settings. However, challenges such as limited farmer knowledge and access to resources, as well as resistance management, hinder widespread adoption. Exciting opportunities lie in digital technologies, precision agriculture, biotechnological innovations, and climate-resilient strategies. Strengthened farmer training, public-private collaborations, and informed decision-making are crucial for the successful future of IPM, ensuring sustainable food production and global food security.

KEYWORDS

Crop protection, Biodiversity conservation, Non-chemical, Sustainability

1. INTRODUCTION

Agricultural productivity is crucial for meeting the ever-growing global demand for food, fiber, and bioenergy. However, the continuous threat posed by pests to crop production remains a significant challenge faced by farmers worldwide (Popp et al., 2013). Pests, including insects, diseases, weeds, and other organisms, can cause substantial yield losses, compromising food security and economic stability. Traditional pest control measures, predominantly relying on chemical pesticides, have proven effective in the short term but often lead to detrimental consequences such as environmental pollution, pesticide resistance, and harm to beneficial organisms (Tudi et al., 2021).

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) has emerged as a sustainable and ecologically sound approach to address these challenges in agronomy. It is a decision-based approach that uses multiple tactics to control pests across various classes while considering ecological and economic factors (Ehler, 2006). IPM seeks to harmonize various pest control practices, promoting the efficient and judicious use of pest management strategies while minimizing the reliance on chemical pesticides (Dhawan & Peshin, 2009). The new integrated pest management model's goal is to achieve sustainable food production and food security by striking a harmonious balance among economic viability, environmental safety, and social acceptability in pest management strategies, departing from the traditional environmentally friendly focus (Muhie, 2022). By emphasizing ecological principles and adopting a multidisciplinary framework, IPM strives to strike a balance between effective pest control and the preservation of ecosystem health.

In this comprehensive review, we explore the different components and approaches involved in IPM implementation within agronomic systems. Our objective is to provide an overview of the effective integration of IPM into modern agriculture, covering diverse strategies such as cultural practices, biological control, host plant resistance, and chemical control. Additionally, we will examine case studies and success stories from various regions to demonstrate the real-world application and potential benefits of IPM. Furthermore, this review will address the future directions of IPM and the research needs necessary to refine and expand its scope in light of changing agricultural landscapes and pest dynamics.

2. PEST IDENTIFICATION AND MONITORING

Accurate pest identification and systematic monitoring are vital pillars of successful Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in agronomy. Precise identification of pests is crucial for selecting appropriate control measures and avoiding unintended harm to beneficial organisms (Arif et al., 2017). Collaborating with entomologists, plant pathologists, and agronomists enhances the accuracy of pest identification, ensuring reliable data for making informed control decisions. Implementing various monitoring techniques, such as pheromone traps, sticky traps, visual inspections, automated sensor networks, and remote sensing, provides valuable insights into pest population dynamics and potential economic impact (Prete et al., 2021). By integrating these foundational steps into their pest management practices, farmers can optimize resource allocation, predict pest outbreaks, and respond promptly to maintain crop health.

Incorporating accurate pest identification and systematic monitoring into IPM practices empowers farmers and agronomists to decide properly in

Quick Response Code



Access this article online

Website:
www.csmj.com.my

DOI:
10.26480/csmj.02.2023.103.108

pest management (Preti et al., 2021). By using tools like taxonomic keys and digital resources, they can distinguish pests from beneficial organisms, reducing the risk of ineffective control strategies. Regular pest monitoring with techniques like pheromone traps and sticky traps aids in early detection, preventing excessive damage and allowing for timely interventions (Britton et al., 2010). By using these foundational aspects of IPM, farmers can ensure sustainable and effective pest management, safeguarding crop yields and environmental balance.

3. CULTURAL CONTROL

Cultural practices in pest management involve modifying agricultural operations to create an unfavorable environment for insect multiplication and prevent pest population buildup to enhance crop productivity. These practices aim to manage pests while considering pest biology and plant interactions, ensuring compatibility with other measures and economic viability (Devi et al., 2023). According to Lella & Jagadeesh, these practices encompass primary measures directly targeting insects, such as draining fields or planting trap crops, as well as secondary practices, including land preparation and weeding, which indirectly reduce pest populations (Lella & Jagadeesh, 2023). Various important cultural practices adopted for insect pest management include crop rotation, crop alternation, mixed cropping, soil tillage, incorporation of cover crops, and the application of mulches, irrigation and drainage management, proper spacing, timing of planting and harvesting etc. (Chandola et al., 2011).

3.1 Crop Rotation

Crop rotation is a cultural practice that entails periodically changing the types of crops grown in a field to disturb the life cycles of pests and diminish the growth of pest populations. Planting botanically dissimilar crops in proximity to each other can help mitigate the movement of pests between fields and related crops. This practice reduces pest movement by limiting the availability of necessary resources for insect species, thereby discouraging their spread (Devi et al., 2023). Implementing a diversified 4-year crop rotation has successfully reduced wheat midge populations and minimized damage to wheat crops by discouraging continuous wheat cropping and forcing female midges to search for suitable hosts over longer distances (Senevirathna et al., 2023). An investigation by Aleem et al, has consistently demonstrated that incorporating non-host crops into crop rotation effectively decreases the occurrence and intensity of fall armyworm infestation in maize fields (Aleem et al., 2023).

3.2 Tillage and Soil Management Practices

Tillage and soil management practices within the framework of cultural practices in IPM contribute to effective pest control by manipulating soil conditions, nutrient availability, and ecological interactions that directly influence pest populations. Use of no-tillage systems has been shown to significantly reduce fall armyworm populations in maize fields compared

to conventional tillage systems, possibly due to reduced soil disturbance and decreased exposure of eggs to natural enemies (Regan et al., 2020). Additionally, deep tillage and ridge-tillage practices have demonstrated effectiveness in suppressing fall armyworm populations by increasing soil disturbance and promoting exposure of eggs and larvae to predators and parasitoids (Wang et al., 2022)

3.3 Use of cover crop

Cover crops are diverse plant species integrated into cropping systems, serving multiple purposes such as soil conservation, weed management, pest management, and improved water and soil quality (Hobbs et al., 2007). Leguminous cover crops, in particular, offer the additional benefit of providing nitrogen to crops through biological nitrogen fixation, enhancing nutrient availability and reducing the need for synthetic fertilizers (Chu et al., 2017).

Cover crops, as a cultural control approach in pest management, can attract beneficial insects but may also inadvertently attract certain pest species. For example, incorporating a living green cover crop before planting corn or soybean can inadvertently enhance seedcorn maggot populations, as the maggots feed on germinating seeds in the soil (Cullen & Holm, 2013).

4. BIOLOGICAL CONTROL

Biological control strategies are essential components of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), harnessing the natural allies found in the agroecosystem to combat pests. Beneficial insects, like predators and parasitoids, play a crucial role in controlling pest outbreaks and reducing crop damage (Lewis et al., 1997). For example, Biological control efforts against *Tuta absoluta* involved releasing parasitoids *Trichogramma cacoeciae* and *T.bourarachae* in tomato crops, resulting in significant reductions of 87% and 78% in leaf damage, respectively. Additionally, the predatory mirid *Nesidiocoris tenuis* showed promise in reducing *Tuta absoluta* egg density and demonstrated its ability to control multiple pests on tomato crops (Rwomushana et al., 2019). By creating habitats for these natural enemies and reducing pesticide use, farmers can enhance their effectiveness. Microbial biopesticides, derived from microorganisms, offer targeted and eco-friendly alternatives to chemical pesticides, sparing non-target organisms and the ecosystem (Khurshid et al., 2022). Conservation efforts further support this approach, preserving biodiversity and ecological balance. Conservation biological control in rice environments has successfully reduced pesticide use, encourage the use of specific insecticides and enhanced crop habitats to boost the populations of natural enemies, thereby strengthening the efficiency of natural pest control (Hajjar et al., 2023). Thoughtfully integrating these biological control methods enables farmers to cultivate sustainable pest management practices, ensuring robust crop yields and environmental health.

Table 1: Role of beneficial insects

S.N	Beneficial Insect	Pest Target	Impact on pest
1.	Ladybugs, Damsel bug	Aphids	Able to control aphid populations on crops.
2.	Lacewings	Thrips, Mites, whitefly	Feed on thrips and mites reducing damage
3.	Parasitoid Wasps	Various Insect Pests	Lay eggs inside or on pests, killing them as offspring develop
4.	Ground Beetles	Cutworms, Slugs	Hunt and consume cutworms and slugs.
5.	Hoverflies	Aphids	larvae prey on aphids, providing natural pest control

Source: (Getanjaly et al., 2015)

5. PHYSICAL AND MECHANICAL CONTROL

Table 2: Example of some agronomic pest controlled by physical means

S.N	Name	Physical control methods	References
1.	Spiralling Whitefly	Employing yellow sticky traps to capture whiteflies and selectively removing leaves to manage the nymphal and pupal stages of the pest.	(Barbedo, 2014)
2.	Aphids	Using barrier plant	(Hooks & Fereres, 2006)
3.	Stem Borer	Using the push-pull strategy approach	(Bhattacharya, 2017)
4.	Leaf minor	Adoption of white nets and floating row covers as measures to reduce the pest population.	(Majumdar et al., 2010)
5.	Tobacco Cutworm	Hand picking	(Shah & Dhaliwal, 2012)
6.	Wireworm	Employing sex pheromone traps and strategically planting sensitive crops in low-risk areas.	(Barsics, 2013)
7.	Fall Army worm	Manually removing and crushing egg masses, practicing early planting	(Kansiime et al., 2019)

Physical and mechanical control methods are essential components of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), offering eco-friendly alternatives to chemical pesticides. Physical barriers like row covers, insect screens, and netting act as defensive measures, preventing pests from accessing crops and protecting plants from flying pests like aphids and caterpillars (Boiteay & Vernon, 2001). Mechanical pest control techniques involve using traps, such as sticky traps, pheromone traps, and light traps, to physically trap and remove pests from the agricultural environment. These targeted approaches are particularly useful for managing localized pest outbreaks and minimizing harm to non-target biota and the ecosystem (Raza et al., 2017). For instance, *Tuta absoluta* can be controlled using pheromones mainly through mass trapping, which involves attracting and capturing pests using pheromone lures in combination with large-capacity traps (Rwomushana et al., 2019).

Incorporating thermal and non-chemical treatments, physical and mechanical control methods complement other IPM strategies, contributing to a comprehensive pest management approach. Heat treatments, which involve exposing infested areas to high temperatures, are effective in stored product pest management without relying on chemical fumigants (Rajendran, 2020). Additionally, non-chemical treatments, like hand-picking and vacuuming, offer practical solutions for managing pests in home gardens and small-scale farming operations (Thakur et al., 2021).

6. HOST PLANT RESISTANCE

Host plant resistance in Integrated Pest Management (IPM) involves developing crop varieties with inherent resistance to pests, reducing the reliance on chemical interventions and promoting sustainable agriculture. For instance, by incorporating specific resistance genes, such as those conferring resistance to the brown plant hopper, into rice varieties, farmers can effectively combat this pest without excessive reliance on chemical pesticides (Naylor & Ehrlich, 1997). Breeding for pest-resistant crops employs selective crossbreeding to incorporate desirable resistance traits and advances in genetic engineering have facilitated the transfer of specific resistance genes into crops (Uzogara, 2000). The result is the development of genetically modified (GM) crops with enhanced pest resistance, providing an effective tool for managing pest pressures while maintaining desirable agronomic traits (Anderson et al., 2019). To achieve successful resistance breeding, a comprehensive understanding of plant-insect interactions is essential (Moudou et al., 2017). Genetic engineering plays a crucial role in introducing or enhancing specific resistance genes, exemplified by Bt crops that produce insecticidal proteins (Ranjekar et al., 2003). By integrating host plant resistance with other IPM approaches, agriculture can foster resilient systems with reduced environmental impact and minimized reliance on chemical pesticides.

7. DECISION-MAKING IN IPM

In the context of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), decision-making is based on established protocols that involve evaluating the density of pest populations, economic thresholds, and phenological forecasts to determine the appropriate course of action for pest management (Binns & Nyrop, 1992). Effective decision-making is a critical component of IPM that ensures the successful control of pests while minimizing environmental impact and economic costs. This process involves monitoring pest populations and using economic thresholds (ETs) to determine the most appropriate time for intervention. By comparing pest populations to established ETs, farmers can make informed decisions about implementing pest control measures when the expected costs of pest damage exceed the costs of control (Kaur & Kaur, 2020). Integration of different pest control strategies is another key aspect of IPM decision-making, where multiple methods, including biological control, cultural practices, and chemical control, are combined to create a comprehensive and sustainable approach to pest management. Such integration optimizes the effectiveness of pest control while preserving beneficial organisms and reducing reliance on chemical pesticides (Barzman & Barberi, 2015; Baker et al., 2020). Additionally, the use of IPM decision support systems (DSS) aids farmers in making data-driven decisions by analyzing real-time data and recommending suitable control strategies based on specific conditions. DSS facilitates timely preventive actions and efficient pest management, empowering farmers to tackle pest challenges effectively (Wallhead & Jhu, 2017; Aiello et al., 2018).

8. IPM TRAINING FOR FARMERS

The successful adoption of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices heavily relies on the knowledge, skills, and awareness of farmers, and this is where farmer training and extension services play a pivotal role. Farmer training programs offer crucial insights into pest identification, biology,

and ecological interactions within the agroecosystem. By understanding the life cycles and behaviors of pests and beneficial organisms, farmers can develop effective IPM plans tailored to their specific crop and region. These training sessions also provide hands-on learning opportunities, allowing farmers to familiarize themselves with various IPM techniques, such as biological control, cultural practices, and physical/mechanical control. Armed with this knowledge, farmers gain the confidence to implement IPM strategies effectively and make informed decisions about pest management (Dhawan & Peshin, 2009; Timprasert et al., 2014).

Simultaneously, extension services act as vital channels for knowledge dissemination, facilitating a smooth flow of information between research institutions and farmers. Extension agents play a crucial role in updating farmers about the latest advancements and innovations in IPM practices (Ofuoku et al., 2008). By providing on-site support and consultations, extension services ensure that IPM solutions are customized to address the specific challenges faced by farmers, aligning with local conditions and constraints. Effective extension services focus on behavior change communication, encouraging farmers to willingly adopt IPM practices. By addressing attitudes and beliefs related to pest management, extension agents can foster the acceptance and long-term adoption of IPM strategies. Combining the efforts of farmer training and extension services through participatory approaches like Farmer Field Schools (FFS) enhances knowledge transfer and promotes community-driven IPM adoption. Through FFS, farmers engage in experiential learning, collectively addressing real-life pest management challenges and fostering farmer-to-farmer knowledge sharing (Simpson & Owens, 2002).

9. ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT OF IPM

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) presents a viable substitute to conventional pesticide-based approaches in modern agriculture, aiming to effectively control pests while minimizing environmental impacts and ensuring economic viability (Barzman et al., 2015). This section explores the long-term cost-effectiveness and sustainability of IPM compared to chemical-intensive methods, providing valuable insights for policymakers and farmers.

Cost-Effectiveness of IPM: IPM reduces pesticide use, leading to cost savings for farmers. It promotes the utilization of natural enemies and pest-resistant crop varieties, lowering input costs and enhancing crop yield and quality. For instance, implementing a group of IPM practices in mango cultivation has led to enhanced mango yields and increased mango profit margin for farmers (Midingoyi et al., 2019). Additionally, IPM's diversified approach minimizes pest resistance development, reducing associated management costs.

Environmental Sustainability of IPM: IPM's emphasis on non-chemical methods results in reduced chemical residues in food products, safeguarding consumer health. It preserves beneficial organisms, biodiversity, and ecosystem services like pollination and natural pest control. Furthermore, IPM minimizes water and soil pollution, contributing to sustainable agriculture. The survey results among Massachusetts cranberry growers revealed a substantial number of participants (92%) believed that IPM could minimize pesticide residues in food and an even higher percentage (96%) acknowledged its potential to minimize pesticide residues in the environment. Additionally, 96% of the respondents believed that IPM practices could contribute to the preservation of beneficial insects (Blake et al., 2007).

10. SUCCESS STORY OF IPM

- The successful implementation of IPM tactics in Basmati rice fields in Baraut, Uttar Pradesh, India, resulted in reduced pest populations, decreased pesticide use, and improved rice yields. The collaborative effort involving inter-disciplinary teams and the adoption of biological control agents and cultural practices showcased the effectiveness of IPM in providing sustainable pest management solutions (Vennila et al., 2016).
- Widespread application of *Pandora neoaphidis*, an entomopathogenic fungus, led to epizootics that effectively controlled *Sitobion avenae* aphid populations on cereal crops, resulting in improved yield and reduced reliance on synthetic pesticides in Europe (Saussure et al., 2023).
- The study conducted in a maize field in the West Pasaman District demonstrated the successful implementation of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) package for controlling fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*), resulting in higher economic benefits compared to non-IPM methods (Yurina et al., 2023).

- Using virulent entomopathogenic nematodes (*Heterorhabditis indica* 1 NBA11H38) as an alternative and sustainable method for controlling *Spodoptera frugiperda* in maize fields, holds great promise as an effective biocontrol agent (Patil et al., 2022).
- The implementation of integrated pest management (IPM) modules in rice crops in Sitapur district, Uttar Pradesh, India, resulted in reduced environmental risks, with less effect on natural enemies, increased crop yields, and decreased weed populations compared to the farmer's practice (NIPM) (Arora et al., 2019).
- The successful implementation of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) using Silicon (Si) soil amendment has been demonstrated as an effective and sustainable strategy to enhance plant resistance against rice stem borers (*Diatraea saccharalis*) in rice crops
- The implementation of Integrated Pest Management strategies, such as encompassing host plant resistance, utilization of natural plant products, incorporation of biopesticides, and implementation of precision agronomic approaches, has shown successful results in controlling insect pests in sorghum cultivation in various regions, including India, USA, and East Africa (Chavula, 2022).
- The successful application of integrated pest management (IPM) through farmer field schools and participatory research for potato late blight control at the International Potato Center yielded remarkable results, including a notable 32% average enhancement in potato productivity and income in Peru and comparable positive outcomes in various other countries (Ortiz et al., 2019). This success story exemplifies how IPM can effectively combat the intricate potato disease, highlighting the significance of farmer engagement and participatory approaches in implementing sustainable pest management solutions.
- Successful community-level integrated pest management (IPM) in Junagadh reduced white grub damage in groundnut crops, saving farmers money around Rs.10,000-15,000 per hectare in 2018 (Harish et al., 2023).

11. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF IPM

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) presents a promising framework for sustainable pest control in agronomy, but its implementation faces challenges. Limited knowledge and awareness among farmers, unequal access to resources, difficulties in pest monitoring, and resistance management are significant obstacles to widespread adoption (Parsa et al., 2014). However, there are exciting opportunities for the future of IPM. Leveraging digital technologies, precision agriculture can enhance real-time monitoring and targeted interventions. Biotechnological innovations like gene editing offer the potential to develop crops with improved pest resistance. Climate-resilient IPM strategies, strengthened farmer training, and public-private collaborations hold promise for sustainable pest management. By addressing challenges and embracing these opportunities, IPM can revolutionize pest control and ensure a safer and greener future for agriculture.

12. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Integrated Pest Management (IPM) has emerged as a sustainable and ecologically sound approach to address the continuous threat posed by pests in agriculture. By integrating multiple tactics and considering ecological and economic factors, IPM aims to harmonize between effective pest control and the preservation of ecosystem health. Through cultural practices, biological control, host plant resistance, physical and mechanical control, and informed decision-making, farmers can optimize pest management while minimizing environmental impacts and reliance on chemical pesticides. The success stories of IPM implementation worldwide demonstrate its effectiveness in enhancing crop yields, reducing pesticide use, and promoting environmental sustainability. However, challenges such as limited knowledge and unequal access to resources pose obstacles to widespread adoption. Looking ahead, embracing digital technologies, precision agriculture, and biotechnological innovations offer exciting opportunities for the future of IPM. By intensifying farmer training, strengthening public-private collaborations, and developing climate-resilient strategies, IPM can revolutionize pest control, contributing to a safer and greener future for agriculture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the academic community for their

valuable contributions in the form of research papers, publications, and scholarly works. Their work provided the foundation for this review article and greatly contributed to its development.

FUNDING

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Aiello, G., Giovino, I., Vallone, M., Catania, P., Argento, A., 2018. A decision support system based on multisensor data fusion for sustainable greenhouse management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 172, Pp. 4057-4065. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.02.197>
- Aleem, K., Imran, M., Bashir, S., Pernia, A., Manzoor, M., Anwar, M. S., Iqra, M., 2023. Integrated Pest Management Strategies For Invasive Fall Armyworm. *Agrobiological Records*, Pp. 53-59.
- Anderson, J. A., Ellsworth, P. C., Faria, J. C., Head, G. P., Owen, M. D., Pilcher, C. D., Meissle, M., 2019. Genetically engineered crops: importance of diversified integrated pest management for agricultural sustainability. *Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology*, 7, Pp. 24. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2019.00024>
- Arif, M. J., Gogi, M. D., Sufyan, M., Nawaz, A., Sarfraz, R. M., 2017. Principles of insect pests management. *Sustainable Insect Pest Management*, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan, Pp. 17-47.
- Arora, S., Sehgal, M., Srivastava, D. S., Arora, S., Sarkar, S. K., 2019. Rice pest management with reduced risk pesticides in India. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 191(4), Pp. 241.
- Baker, B. P., Green, T. A., Loker, A. J., 2020. Biological control and integrated pest management in organic and conventional systems. *Biological Control*, Pp. 140, 104095. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2019.104095>
- Barbedo, J.G. A., 2014. Using digital image processing for counting whiteflies on soybean leaves. *Journal of Asia Pacific Entomology*, 17: Pp. 685-694.
- Barsics, F., Haubruge, E., Verheggen, F. J., 2013. Wireworms' management: an overview of the existing methods, with particular regards to *Agriotes* spp. (Coleoptera: Elateridae). *Insects*, 4(1), Pp. 117-152. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects4010117>
- Barzman, M., Barberi, P., Birch, A. N. E., Boonekamp, P., Dachbrodt-Saaydeh, S., Graf, B., Sattin, M., 2015. Eight principles of integrated pest management. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, 35, Pp. 1199-1215.
- Bhattacharyya, M., 2017. The push-pull strategy: A new approach to the eco-friendly method of pest management in agriculture. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*. 5(3): Pp. 604-607
- Binns, M. R., Nyrop, J. P., 1992. Sampling insect populations for the purpose of IPM decision making. *Annual review of entomology*, 37(1), Pp. 427-453.
- Blake, G., Sandler, H. A., Coli, W., Pober, D. M., Coggins, C., 2007. An assessment of grower perceptions and factors influencing adoption of IPM in commercial cranberry production. *Renewable agriculture and food systems*, 22(2), Pp. 134-144.
- Boiteau, G., Vernon, R. S., 2001. Physical barriers for the control of insect pests. In *Physical control methods in plant protection*, Pp. 224-247. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 10.1007/978-3-662-04584-8_16
- Britton, K. O., White, P., Kramer, A., Hudler, G., 2010. A new approach to stopping the spread of invasive insects and pathogens: early detection and rapid response via a global network of sentinel plantings. *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science*, 40.
- Chandola, M., Rathore, S., Kumar, B., 2011. Indigenous pest management practices prevalent among hill farmers of Uttarakhand. *Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge*, Pp. 311-315.
- Chavula, P., 2022. Successes of Integrated Pest Management in Sorghum Production: A Review.

- Chu, M., Jagadamma, S., Walker, F. R., Eash, N. S., Buschermohle, M. J., Ducan, L. A., 2017. Effect of Multispecies Cover Crop Mixture on Soil Properties and Crop Yield. *Agriculture and Environmental Letters*, 2(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.2134/ael2017.09.0030>
- Cullen, E. M., Holm, K. M., 2013. Aligning Insect IPM Programs with a Cropping Systems Perspective: Cover Crops and Cultural Pest Control in Wisconsin Organic Corn and Soybean. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food System*, 37(5), Pp. 550-557. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2012.762438>
- Devi, D. L., Mandal, K. S., Dadaro, S. D., Kumar, V., 2023. Cultural Practices: An Urgent Need in IPM for Sustainable Crop Production. *Just Agriculture*, Pp. 78-86.
- Dhawan, A. K., Peshin, R., 2009. Integrated pest management: concept, opportunities and challenges. *Integrated Pest Management: Innovation-Development Process: Volume 1*, Pp. 51-81. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8992-3_2
- Ehler, L. E., 2006. Integrated pest management (IPM): definition, historical development and implementation, and the other IPM. *Pest Management Science*. doi:10.1002/ps.1247
- Getanjaly, V. L. R., Sharma, P., Kushwaha, R., 2015. Beneficial insects and their value to agriculture. *Research Journal of Agriculture and Forestry Sciences* ISSN, 2320, 6063.
- Hajjar, M. J., Ahmed, N., Alhudaib, K. A., Ullah, H., 2023. Integrated Insect Pest Management Techniques for Rice. *Sustainability*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054499>
- Harish, G., Maheshala, N., Kurella, A., Reddy, K. K., Jasrotia, P., Prahara, C. S., Savaliya, S. D., 2023. Integrated Community Approach for Successful Management Of White Grubs in Groundnut: Success Story. *Indian Journal of Entomology*, Pp. 01-04. <https://doi.org/10.55446/IJE.2023.647>
- Hobbs, P. R., Sayre, K., Gupta, R., 2007. The Role of Conservation Agriculture in Sustainable Agriculture. *Philosophical Transaction B*, Pp. 543-555. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2007.2169>
- Hooks, C. R., Fereres, A., 2006. Protecting crops from non-persistently aphid-transmitted viruses: a review on the use of barrier plants as a management tool. *Virus research*, 120(1-2), Pp. 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virusres.2006.02.006>
- Kansiime, M. K., Mugambi, I., Rwomushana, I., Nunda, W., Lamontagne-Godwin, J., Rware, H., Day, R., 2019. Farmer perception of fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda* JE Smith) and farm-level management practices in Zambia. *Pest management science*, 75(10), Pp. 2840-2850. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.5504>
- Kaur, T., Kaur, M., 2020. Integrated pest management: A paradigm for modern age. *Pests, Weeds and Diseases in Agricultural Crop and Animal Husbandry Production*. 10.5772/intechopen.92283
- Khursheed, A., Rather, M. A., Jain, V., Rasool, S., Nazir, R., Malik, N. A., Majid, S. A., 2022. Plant based natural products as potential ecofriendly and safer biopesticides: A comprehensive overview of their advantages over conventional pesticides, limitations and regulatory aspects. *Microbial Pathogenesis*, 105854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpath.2022.105854>
- Lella, N., Jagadeesh, K., 2023. Ecological IPM strategies for management of pests of rice. *The Pharma Innovation*, Pp. 3814-3818.
- Lewis, W. J., Van Lenteren, J. C., Phatak, S. C., Tumlinson Iii, J. H., 1997. A total system approach to sustainable pest management. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 94(23), Pp. 12243-12248. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.94.23.12243>
- Majumdar, A., 2010. Large-Scale Net-House for Vegetable Production: Pest Management Successes and Challenges for a New Technology; Alabama Cooperative Extension System: Auburn, AL, USA, 350
- Midingoyi, S. K. G., Kassie, M., Muriithi, B., Diiro, G., Ekesi, S., 2019. Do farmers and the environment benefit from adopting integrated pest management practices? Evidence from Kenya. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 70(2), Pp. 452-470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12306>
- Mouden, S., Sarmiento, K. F., Klinkhamer, P. G., Leiss, K. A., 2017. Integrated pest management in western flower thrips: past, present and future. *Pest management science*, 73(5), Pp. 813-822. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4531>
- Muhie, S. H., 2022. Novel approaches and practices to sustainable agriculture. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafr.2022.100446>
- Naylor, R., Ehrlich, P. R., 1997. Natural pest control services and agriculture. *Nature's Services: societal dependence on natural ecosystems*, Pp. 151-174.
- Ofuoku, A. U., Egho, E. O., Enujeke, E. C., 2008. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) adoption among farmers in central agro-ecological zone of Delta State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 3(12), Pp. 852-856.
- Ortiz, O., Nelson, R., Olanya, M., Thiele, G., Orrego, R., Pradel, W., Xie, K., 2019. Human and technical dimensions of potato integrated pest management using farmer field schools: International Potato Center and partners' experience with potato late blight management. *Journal of Integrated Pest Management*, 10(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jipm/pmz002>
- Parsa, S., Morse, S., Bonifacio, A., Chancellor, T. C., Condori, B., Crespo-Pérez, V., ... & Dangles, O. (2014). Obstacles to integrated pest management adoption in developing countries. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(10), 3889-3894. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1312693111>
- Patil, J., Linga, V., Vijayakumar, R., Subaharan, K., Navik, O., Bakthavatsalam, N., ... & Sekhar, J. (2022). Biocontrol potential of entomopathogenic nematodes for the sustainable management of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in maize. *Pest Management Science*, 78(7), 2883-2895. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6912>
- Popp, J., Pető, K., & Nagy, J. (2013). Pesticide productivity and food security. A review. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, 33, 243-255.
- Preti, M., Verheggen, F., & Angeli, S. (2021). Insect pest monitoring with camera-equipped traps: Strengths and limitations. *Journal of pest science*, 94(2), 203-217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10340-020-01309-4>
- Rajendran, S. (2020). Insect pest management in stored products. *Outlooks on Pest Management*, 31(1), 24-35. https://doi.org/10.1564/v31_feb_05
- Ranjekar, P. K., Patankar, A., Gupta, V., Bhatnagar, R., Bentur, J., & Kumar, P. A. (2003). Genetic engineering of crop plants for insect resistance. *Current Science*, 84(3), 321-329.
- Raza, M. F., Yao, Z., Dong, X., Cai, Z., & Zhang, H. (2017). Citrus insect pests and their non chemical control in China. *Citrus Research & Technology*, 38(1), 122-138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4322/crt.ICC117>
- Regan, K. H., Voortman, C. A., Wallace, J. M., & Barbercheck, M. E. (2020). Prevalence of early- and late-season pest damage to corn in cover crop-based reduced-tillage organic systems. *Environmental Entomology*, 49(5), 865-875. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/ee/nvaa071>
- Rwomushana, I., Beale, T., Chipabika, G., Day, R., Gonzalez-Moreno, P., Lamontagne-Godwin, J., ... & Tambo, J. (2019). Tomato leafminer (*Tuta absoluta*): impacts and coping strategies for Africa. *Tomato leafminer (Tuta absoluta): impacts and coping strategies for Africa*.
- Saha LR, Dhaliwal GS. *Handbook of Plant Protection*, 2nd Edition, Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi, India 2012.
- Saussure, S., Hjelkrem, A. G. R., Klingen, I., Meadow, R., & Holst, N. (2023). Are fungal epizootics a sign of successful biological control of cereal aphids?. *Journal of Pest Science*, 1-16.
- Senevirathna, K. M., Gulley, K. N., & Mori, B. A. (2023). Management of the Orange Blossom Wheat Midge, *Sitodiplosis mosellana*, in Western Canada. *Plant Health Cases*, 2-9. doi:10.1079/planthealthcases.2023.0002
- Simpson, B. M., & Owens, M. (2002). Farmer field schools and the future of

- agricultural extension in Africa. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, 9(2), 29-36.
- Thakur, K., Sharma, A., & Sharma, K. (2021). Management of agricultural insect pests with physical control methods. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, 10, 306-314.
- Timprasert, S., Datta, A., & Ranamukhaarachchi, S. L. (2014). Factors determining adoption of integrated pest management by vegetable growers in Nakhon Ratchasima Province, Thailand. *Crop protection*, 62, 32-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2014.04.008>
- Tudi, M., Daniel Ruan, H., Wang, L., Lyu, J., Sadler, R., Connell, D., ... & Phung, D. T. (2021). Agriculture development, pesticide application and its impact on the environment. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(3), 1112.
- Uzogara, S. G. (2000). The impact of genetic modification of human foods in the 21st century: A review. *Biotechnology advances*, 18(3), 179-206. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0734-9750\(00\)00033-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0734-9750(00)00033-1)
- Vennila, S., Ajanta, B., Vikas, K., & Chattopadhyay, C. (2016). Success stories of integrated pest management in India. <http://krishi.icar.gov.in/jspui/handle/123456789/7370>
- Wallhead, M., & Zhu, H. (2017). Decision support systems for plant disease and insect management in commercial nurseries in the Midwest: A perspective review. *Journal of Environmental Horticulture*, 35(2), 84-92. <https://doi.org/10.24266/0738-2898-35.2.84>
- Wang, P., He, P.-c., Hu, L., Chi, X.-l., Keller, M. A., & Chu, D. (2022). Host selection and adaptation of the invasive pest *Spodoptera frugiperda* to indica and japonica rice cultivars. *Entomologia Gernalis*, 42(3), 403-411. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1127/entomologia/2022/1330>
- Yurina, N., Syahrawati, M., Arneti, A., & Busniah, M. (2023). The Environmentally IPM Package for Controlling Fall Armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) in Maize Field. *JPT: JURNAL PROTEKSI TANAMAN (JOURNAL OF PLANT PROTECTION)*, 7(1), 55-64. <https://doi.org/10.25077/jpt.7.1.55-64.2023>

