SUNSHINE AGRICULTURE e-Newsletter

ISSN (E): 2583 – 0821

Sun. Agri.:e- Newsletter, (2025) 5(9), 62-65

Article ID: 439

Towards Eco-friendly Pest Management: Advances in Agricultural Entomology

A. Vindhya[1*], Gurugubelli Sesil[2], Shrikant Hari Ban[3], Deepali Desai[4] and Nagendra Kumar[5]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Entomology, Dr. YSR Horticultural University, Andhra Pradesh
[2]M.Sc. Scholar, Department of Entomology, Professor Jayashankar Telangana Agricultural University, Hyderabad, Telangana
Senior Research Assistant, Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, Dhule, Maharashtra
[4]M.Sc. Scholar, Department of Seed Science and Technology, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa, Bihar
[5]Associate Professor, Department of Entomology, PGCA, RPCAU, Pusa, Bihar

Open Access

*Corresponding Author
A. Vindhya*

Available online at
www.sunshineagriculture.vitalbiotech.org

Article History
Received: 1. 09.2025
Revised: 5. 09.2025
Accepted: 10. 09.2025

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural production across the world is under constant threat from insect pests that feed on crops, transmit diseases, and reduce both yield and quality. Traditionally, the main defense against these pests has been the widespread use of synthetic chemical pesticides. While these chemicals have provided short-term protection and boosted productivity, their overuse has created serious challenges such as pesticide resistance, resurgence of secondary pests, contamination of soil and water, loss of biodiversity, and adverse impacts on human and animal health. The growing demand for safe food and sustainable farming systems has therefore placed ecological pest management at the center of modern agricultural entomology.

Eco-friendly pest management is not a single method but an integrated approach that emphasizes harmony with natural processes. It combines biological control using natural enemies, microbial and botanical biopesticides, semiochemicals like pheromones, habitat manipulation strategies such as push–pull systems, and advanced genetic tools including RNA interference and sterile insect techniques. Recent advances in precision agriculture, digital monitoring, and climate-based forecasting further empower farmers to make informed decisions that minimize pesticide applications and conserve beneficial organisms.

Agricultural entomology, the study of insect biology, ecology, and interactions with crops, provides the scientific foundation for these innovations. By understanding insect behavior, life cycles, and ecological roles, entomologists are developing pest management strategies that are targeted, species-specific, and environmentally benign. For instance, parasitoid releases, pheromone traps, and viral biopesticides are now commercially available tools that not only protect crops but also preserve pollinators and other beneficial insects.

ISSN (E): 2583 – 0821

The transition towards eco-friendly pest management is not merely an option but a necessity in the context of climate change, market demand for residue-free produce, and global commitments to biodiversity conservation. As agriculture faces the dual challenge of feeding a growing population while reducing environmental footprints, advances in agricultural entomology are offering practical, sustainable, and scientifically grounded solutions.

2. Major eco-friendly approaches & recent advances

2.1 Biological control (classical, augmentative, conservation)

- **What:** Use of predators, parasitoids, pathogens, and entomophagous nematodes to reduce pest populations.
- **Advances:** Better mass-rearing, quality control, and release strategies; augmentative releases in greenhouses and open fields; improved understanding of compatibility between agents (e.g., entomopathogenic fungi + parasitoids). Commercial suppliers now offer tightly characterized strains and release protocols.

Strengths: self-sustaining suppression (for established agents), low non-target risk. **Limitations:** establishment failure in some contexts, slower action than chemicals.

2.2 Microbial & botanical biopesticides

- **What:** Products based on bacteria (e.g., *Bacillus thuringiensis*), viruses (NPVs, granuloviruses), entomopathogenic fungi (e.g., *Beauveria*, *Metarhizium*), nematodes, and botanical extracts (neem, pyrethrum).
- **Recent progress:** Improved formulations (UV protectants, microencapsulation), strain screening, adjuvants to increase persistence, and combined-use strategies within IPM. Regulatory pathways and commercial pipelines for microbial products have expanded.

2.3 Semiochemicals (monitoring, lures, mating disruption, push-pull)

- **Use cases:** species-specific monitoring (pheromone traps), mass trapping, mating disruption in orchards, attract-and-kill systems, and landscape-scale "push-pull" using repellent and trap plants.
- **Advances:** Better dispenser longevity, species-specific blends, and integration with monitoring-based spray thresholds. Mating disruption has shown measurable reductions in some orchard pests when deployed correctly. Push-pull (intercropping Desmodium and Napier/Brachiaria) remains a proven, low-input strategy for stemborers/Striga in smallholder maize systems.

2.4 Genetic, RNAi and Sterile Insect Approaches

- **RNA interference (RNAi):** topical or plant-delivered dsRNA to silence essential pest genes; high species specificity reduces non-target risk. Efficacy varies by insect order and ecological conditions; formulation, uptake, environmental persistence, and cost remain active research areas.
- **Sterile Insect Technique (SIT):** mass-release of sterilized males to reduce breeding — a highly effective, species-specific method for some fruit flies and area-wide programs. Recent economic analyses and field programs show SIT is a viable part of area-wide management for certain pests.

2.5 Precision monitoring & decision support

- **Sensors & traps:** automated trap counts, pheromone-based early warning systems.
- **Remote sensing & modelling:** satellite/ UAV data + weather models to predict pest outbreaks and optimize application timing.
- **Decision support tools:** smartphone apps, threshold-based advisories, and cloud platforms help farmers apply control only when needed — core to minimizing chemical inputs.

3. Comparative view — quick reference table

Approach	Mode of action	Typical targets	Pros	Cons
Biological control (parasitoids/predators)	Predation/parasitism	Aphids, caterpillars, whiteflies	Low non-target risk, self-sustaining	Variable establishment; slower
Microbial biopesticides (Bt, fungi, viruses)	Infection/toxicity	Caterpillars, beetles, aphids (some)	Specific, low residues	Weather-sensitivity; variable speed
Botanical insecticides (neem, pyrethrum)	Multi-target toxic/repellent	Broad	Readily available, often lower mammalian toxicity	Short persistence; formulation needed
Semiochemicals (pheromones)	Behavior manipulation	Moths, some beetles	Highly species-specific; monitoring & mating disruption	Species-limited; deployment logistics
Push-pull / cultural methods	Behavioral diversion / habitat manipulation	Stemborers, some weeds (Striga)	Low input; co-benefits (fodder, N fixation)	Need knowledge & seed inputs
RNAi / genetic control	Gene silencing / sterility	Emerging targets (species-dependent)	High specificity	Delivery & regulatory hurdles
SIT (Sterile Insect Technique)	Sterile male releases	Fruit flies, some moths	Area-wide suppression; species-specific	Infrastructure & cost intensive

4. Representative biopesticides & actives

Type	Example product/agent	Typical use
Bacterial	*Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) formulations	Caterpillars on vegetables/maize
Fungal	*Beauveria bassiana, Metarhizium anisopliae*	Sucking & chewing pests; soil pests
Viral	NPV (e.g., *Helicoverpa* NPV)	Lepidopteran outbreaks
Nematode	*Steinernema, Heterorhabditis* spp.	Soil-dwelling larvae, grubs
Botanical	Azadirachtin (neem), pyrethrum	Broad-spectrum, repellent, antifeedant

5. Case studies (succinct)

Push–Pull for maize (East Africa) — Intercropping maize with repellent Desmodium and surrounding with Napier/Brachiaria "pull" plants reduces stemborer pressure and suppresses Striga, often doubling yields for smallholders when properly implemented; a robust example of behavior-based, low-cost pest management.

SIT for fruit flies / area-wide programs — Economic analyses and operational programs (e.g., Medfly, Mexfly) demonstrate SIT's value in area-wide management and quarantine contexts, particularly when integrated with monitoring and sanitation. Costs and infrastructure are non-trivial but can be justified by market access and reduced chemical use.

Pheromone mating disruption in orchards — Several recent field trials report reduced catches and lower fruit damage when mating disruption is deployed with appropriate density and monitoring; success is species- and context-dependent.

Emerging RNAi field tests — RNAi shows promise for species-specific control, but variability in uptake among insect orders and the need for robust formulation/delivery remain research priorities; public perception and regulatory frameworks are evolving.

6. Implementation challenges & research priorities

1. Efficacy & consistency: many biologicals work under certain environmental conditions; research should focus on formulation, UV protection, and co-formulants.
2. Integration & compatibility: coordinating biological control agents with selective chemicals, cultural practices, and precision tools needs location-specific protocols.
3. Scaling & economics: SIT and some biotechnologies require investment; cost-benefit studies and public–private partnerships help adoption.
4. Regulation & public acceptance: RNAi and genetically based tools face regulatory hurdles and perception issues — transparent risk assessment and stakeholder engagement are essential.
5. Capacity & extension: farmer training, seed systems (e.g., Desmodium), and local supply chains for biocontrol agents must be strengthened for widespread adoption.

ISSN (E): 2583 – 0821

7. Practical guide — choosing the right mix

- Identify pest complex and natural enemy presence.
- Start with monitoring (pheromone/yellow sticky traps) + thresholds.
- Prioritize conservation (habitat, reduce disruptive sprays).
- Introduce augmentative biocontrol or microbial biopesticides where monitoring indicates need.
- Consider push-pull or intercrops where suited.
- Use RNAi/SIT only where infrastructure, regulation, and cost-benefit are favorable.
- Evaluate outcomes and adapt (adaptive IPM).

CONCLUSION

Eco-friendly pest management represents a transformative shift in agriculture, moving away from indiscriminate chemical use toward strategies that work in partnership with nature. Advances in agricultural entomology have unlocked a diverse toolbox that includes biological control agents, microbial and botanical pesticides, pheromone-based monitoring and mating disruption, cultural practices such as push–pull, and emerging innovations like RNA interference and sterile insect techniques. When combined with precision agriculture and digital decision-support systems, these approaches not only protect crops from pests but also conserve beneficial insects, safeguard soil and water quality, and reduce risks to human health. The success of this transition, however, depends on farmer awareness, supportive policies, effective extension services, and continued research to improve efficacy, affordability, and scalability. Ultimately, eco-friendly pest management is not just a scientific approach but a sustainable pathway to ensure food security, ecological resilience, and environmental stewardship for future generations.

REFERENCES

Bale, J. S., van Lenteren, J. C., & Bigler, F. (2008). Biological control and sustainable food production. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 363(1492), 761–776.

Chandler, D., Bailey, A. S., Tatchell, G. M., Davidson, G., Greaves, J., & Grant, W. P. (2011). The development, regulation and use of biopesticides for integrated pest management. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 366(1573), 1987–1998.

Khan, Z. R., Midega, C. A. O., Amudavi, D. M., Hassanali, A., & Pickett, J. A. (2008). On-farm evaluation of the ‘push–pull’ technology for the control of stemborers and *Striga* weed on maize in western Kenya. *Field Crops Research*, 106(3), 224–233.

Klassen, W., & Curtis, C. F. (2005). History of the sterile insect technique. In V. A. Dyck, J. Hendrichs & A. S. Robinson (Eds.), *Sterile Insect Technique: Principles and Practice in Area-Wide Integrated Pest Management* (pp. 3–36). Springer, Dordrecht.

Kogan, M. (1998). Integrated pest management: Historical perspectives and contemporary developments. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 43(1), 243–270.

Palli, S. R. (2021). RNA interference in controlling insect pests and disease vectors: Progress and challenges. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 66, 499–520.