Integrated Pest Management – Strategies and Tradeoffs for long-term crop health and livestock management

Paula Andrea Martínez, Department of Earth Sciences, University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez Campus, 277 Boulevard Alfonso Valdés Cobián, Mayagüez - 00680, Puerto Rico

Abstract

Agricultural pests are damaging to our crops and livestock. Pest management involves a number of strategies to mitigate the damage caused by pests in the field. While some control strategies are effective, others need to be revisited for their efficacy and environmental impact. This review article is focused on integrated pest management programs that have been developed and adopted by farmers around the world. Integrated pest management involves a number of biological control and chemical control strategies, each with their inherent tradeoffs and associated costs. It is important to discuss these tradeoffs to understand the efficacy of each pest control strategy which can be adopted in a given field. It is worth noting that there is no unified solution that works best for all crops and livestock. Rather a holistic approach is needed combining the One Health mission and integration of all pest management strategies to come up with a workable solution. Awareness among farmers about the evolving research in integrated pest management is also important to ensure transfer of knowledge and early adoption in the farms. This review highlights the various biological and chemical control strategies under the umbrella of integrated pest management.

Introduction

Agricultural pests are organisms that harm crops and livestock, diminishing productivity and quality. These pests include insects, mites, nematodes, fungi, bacteria, viruses, rodents, birds, and weeds. Pest management is essential in agriculture, as it affects crop productivity, environmental health, and human well-being [1-9]. It involves a range of strategies and practices designed to control pest populations and mitigate their impact on agriculture, human health, and the environment. Effective pest management strikes a balance between controlling pests and ensuring environmental protection and human safety [8-15].

Conventional pest management frequently depends on chemical pesticides to control pest populations. While this method is effective in the short term, it can cause environmental damage, pesticide resistance, and health risks. In contrast, Integrated Pest Management emphasizes sustainable practices and the use of multiple control methods to achieve long-term pest control with minimal negative impacts [13-19]. Integrated pest management is an environmentally sensitive approach that utilizes comprehensive information about pest life cycles and their interactions with the environment. This knowledge, combined with various pest control methods, is used to manage pest damage in the most economical way while minimizing hazards to people, property, and the environment. Integrated pest management is applied in agricultural, residential, and commercial settings to manage pests sustainably and responsibly [12-20].

Components of Integrated Pest Management

Firstly, consistent monitoring and precise identification of pests are essential [1-5]. This process aids in distinguishing between detrimental pests and beneficial organisms. A fundamental tenet of integrated pest management is preemptive pest prevention. This goal is attainable through cultural practices such as crop rotation, planting resistant varieties, and ensuring soil health. When pest management becomes necessary, these programs assess the most efficient control methods with minimal risk. Integrated pest management employs techniques such as biological control, mechanical measures, chemical interventions, and subsequent evaluation of their effectiveness [17-25].

Strategies used in Integrated Pest Management

In biological control approaches, natural predators or parasites are employed to manage pests, while mechanical control utilizes physical methods such as traps, barriers, or manual removal. Chemical control, when necessary, involves the judicious use of pesticides to minimize risks to human health, beneficial organisms, and the environment. Following the implementation of pest management strategies, regular evaluations are conducted to assess effectiveness and make adjustments as needed.

Integrated pest management offers several advantages [20-32]. It enhances environmental protection by reducing reliance on chemical pesticides, thereby decreasing pollution and harm to non-target species. It provides economic benefits to farmers by emphasizing prevention and reducing the need for costly chemical treatments. This approach promotes sustainable agriculture through the use of long-term, environmentally sound pest control methods, thereby minimizing health risks associated with exposure to harmful pesticides.

Biological Control Use in Integrated Pest Management

Biological control, also referred to as biocontrol, plays a crucial role in Integrated Pest Management by utilizing living organisms to regulate pest populations [21-30]. This approach harnesses natural predators, parasites, or pathogens to manage pests, thereby reducing reliance on chemical treatments. Within an integrated pest management framework, biological control is frequently integrated with other methods to achieve effective and sustainable pest control. The selection of suitable biological control agents and strategies depends on the specific pest, environmental conditions, and the objectives of the pest management program.

Biological control strategies in integrated pest management offer several advantages. They diminish the necessity for chemical pesticides, thereby minimizing environmental contamination and safeguarding biodiversity. Once established, natural enemies can provide prolonged pest control with minimal intervention. Furthermore, biological control agents tend to target specific pests, which mitigates the risk of harming non-target species.

There are various types of biological control agents employed in pest management [21-29]. Classical biological control involves introducing a natural enemy from the pest's native habitat to a new environment where the pest has become problematic. The objective is to establish a sustainable population of the natural enemy capable of long-term pest control. Augmentative biological control, on the other hand, entails releasing natural enemies periodically to supplement existing populations. Conservation biological control focuses on modifying the environment or practices to support and enhance the effectiveness of natural enemies. This can include strategies such as planting nectar-rich plants to attract beneficial insects, reducing pesticide use to avoid harming natural enemies, and providing habitats for predators.

Examples of biological control agents include predators, parasites, and pathogens [32-40]. Predators are organisms that consume a large number of prey during their lifecycle. Examples include ladybugs (which prey on aphids), lacewings, and predatory beetles. Parasitoids are insects whose larvae live as parasites and eventually kill their hosts, such as parasitoid wasps that lay eggs inside or on host insects like caterpillars or aphids. Pathogens encompass bacteria, viruses, fungi, and nematodes that cause diseases in pest populations.

Chemical Control Use in Integrated Pest Management

In integrated pest management, chemical control entails the precise and strategic application of pesticides to regulate pest populations [38-44]. Although the aim is to reduce chemical use, they are occasionally essential to manage pest levels effectively. When employed, chemical control methods are chosen and administered in a manner that mitigates risks to human health, non-target organisms, and the environment.

There are several principles governing the chemical control of pests in agriculture [35-44]. Chemicals are utilized only when pest populations reach a threshold that can cause significant economic damage or health concerns, known as the economic threshold, thereby preventing unnecessary pesticide application. Pesticides are applied with precision and targeted methods to minimize their quantity and reduce impacts on non-target species. This may involve spot treatments or the use of specific formulations designed to target particular pests. Chemical control is integrated with other pest management techniques such as biological control, cultural practices, and mechanical methods to achieve effective and sustainable pest control.

The selection of pesticides is based on criteria including effectiveness, specificity, and environmental impact [12-19]. Preference is given to pesticides that pose lower risks to humans and non-target organisms, with reduced environmental persistence. To prevent pests from developing resistance to pesticides, integrated pest management programs frequently rotate between different types of chemicals and incorporate non-chemical approaches. This approach helps to maintain the efficacy of available pesticides over time. It is also important to practice safe and effective use of pesticides. Applying pesticides at the optimal time in the pest's life cycle is key to maximizing effectiveness. Using techniques such as soil application, foliar sprays, or systemic treatments is also important to ensure efficient pesticide delivery. Applying the correct amount of pesticide is needed to avoid overuse and reduce environmental impact. Using personal protective equipment and following safety guidelines to protect applicators and others from exposure is also important in the field.

Evaluation of Integrated Pest Management Strategies

Assessment plays a crucial role in integrated pest management as it verifies the effectiveness, sustainability, and environmental responsibility of pest control strategies [13-19]. Regular evaluations enable the adjustment of techniques and practices to achieve optimal outcomes. Effective assessment is fundamental to the success of an IPM program. By methodically evaluating pest management activities, outcomes, and effects, practitioners of IPM can make well-informed decisions that improve the efficacy, sustainability, and economic feasibility of their pest management strategies. This continuous process of evaluation and adjustment underscores integrated pest management as a dynamic and adaptable approach to pest control.

The evaluation of an integrated pest management program follows several distinct steps [1-8]. Initially, it is crucial to establish clear and measurable objectives for pest management, such as achieving targeted reductions in pest populations, minimizing crop damage, or reducing pesticide usage. Regular monitoring of pest populations, crop health, and environmental factors is essential, including meticulous documentation of pesticide applications, releases of biological controls, and other management interventions. Evaluating pest levels and assessing damage on the farm is critical, comparing these findings against established thresholds to gauge the effectiveness of pest control measures in reducing pest populations and mitigating damage.

It is also essential to evaluate the efficacy of various control approaches employed (biological, cultural, mechanical, chemical). This includes assessing their impact on non-target species and the environment, as well as monitoring the development of pesticide resistance or resistance to other control methods. Conducting a Cost-Benefit Analysis is crucial to calculate the expenses associated with implementing the pest management program, encompassing monitoring activities, control measures, and labor costs. These costs should be weighed against economic gains, such as increased crop yields, reduced damage, and lower pesticide expenditures. Additionally, assessing the environmental implications of pest management operations, including potential soil, water, or air contamination, is vital. Lastly, it is imperative to evaluate the health and safety of workers and the community, taking into account exposure to pesticides and other control measures.

Continuous evaluation of any integrated pest management program offers numerous advantages [17-23]. Ongoing assessment facilitates the identification of the most efficient control methods and practices, thereby enhancing pest management outcomes. Regular evaluation enables timely adjustments to the program, ensuring its adaptability to evolving pest pressures and environmental factors. By assessing the long-term consequences of pest management activities, integrated pest management programs can promote sustainable practices that safeguard natural resources and biodiversity. Cost-benefit analysis ensures the efficient allocation of resources, maximizing economic returns while minimizing unnecessary expenditures. Monitoring and evaluation also aid in identifying and mitigating risks associated with pest management, including issues like pesticide resistance, impacts on non-target species, and potential human health hazards.

Challenges in the Biological and Chemical Control of Pests

Establishing a population of natural enemies can pose challenges, particularly in environments that do not support their survival [35-44]. Biological control methods may require time to effectively manage pest populations, which may not be feasible in situations requiring immediate action. Continuous monitoring is essential to ensure the efficacy of biological control agents and to make necessary adjustments.

Chemical control in agricultural settings presents its own set of challenges [27-34]. Improper pesticide use can lead to contamination of soil, water, and unintended organisms. Exposure to pesticides poses health risks to applicators and others. Over-reliance on pesticides can result in the development of resistant pest populations, reducing long-term effectiveness. Moreover, pesticide use can be costly, potentially increasing expenses over time if relied upon as the primary method of control. In integrated pest management programs, chemical control is considered a last resort after exploring and implementing other methods. Decisions regarding pesticide application are based on thorough monitoring and evaluation of pest populations, environmental conditions, and the specific context of the pest issue. By integrating chemical control with other strategies in integrated pest management, effective and sustainable pest control can be achieved.

There are also challenges associated with evaluating integrated pest management strategies [21-32]. Such programs encompass multiple control methods and environmental variables, making evaluation intricate and multifaceted. Gathering accurate and comprehensive data demands considerable time, resources, and expertise. Variations in pest populations and environmental factors can complicate efforts to draw consistent conclusions. Additionally, some benefits of pest management initiatives, such as enhanced soil health and biodiversity, may manifest gradually, necessitating sustained commitment to evaluation efforts [10-19].

Conclusion

Integrated Pest Management is valued for its comprehensive and sustainable approach to pest management. By integrating diverse methods and prioritizing prevention, these strategies yield economic, environmental, health, social, and agricultural benefits. It promotes sustainable farming practices, preserves natural resources, and enhances community well-being, establishing it as a valuable global pest control strategy. However, the adoption of integrated pest management varies significantly worldwide across sectors and regions, influenced by agricultural practices, economic factors, policy frameworks, and levels of awareness.

Several factors drive the adoption of these strategies. Increasing awareness of the environmental impacts of chemical pesticides, including pollution and biodiversity loss, plays a significant role. Government regulations promoting sustainable agriculture and restricting pesticide use further encourage the adoption of integrated pest management practices. Farmers are recognizing the potential long-term cost savings and improved crop yields associated with pest management. Additionally, rising consumer demand for sustainably produced and pesticide-free food products reinforces the adoption of IPM practices. This article explored common pest management strategies, highlighting their multifaceted impacts and alignment with both short-term and long-term objectives.

References

[1]. Mitchum MG. Soybean Resistance to the Soybean Cyst Nematode Heterodera glycines: An Update. Phytopathology. 106(12):1444-1450, 2016.

[2]. Wezel, A., S. Bellon, T. Dore, C. Francis, D. Vallod, and C. David. Agroecology as a science, a movement and a practice. A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development 29: 503–515, 2009.

[3]. Yoshida, S. and Shirasu, K. Plants that attack plants: molecular elucidation of plant parasitism. Curr. Opin. Plant Biol. 15, 708-713, 2012.

[4]. Parashar, A., Plant-in-chip: Microfluidic system for studying root growth and pathogenic interactions in Arabidopsis. Applied Physics Letters, 98, 263703, 2011.

[5]. Underwood, W. and Somerville, S. C. Focal accumulation of defenses at sites of fungal pathogen attack. J. Exp. Bot. 59, 3501-3508, 2008.

[6]. Beeman, Z. Njus, G. L. Tylka, Chip Technologies for Screening Chemical and Biological Agents against Plant-Parasitic Nematodes, Phytopathology, 106 (12), 1563-1571, 2016.

[7]. X. Ding, Z. Njus, T. Kong, et al. Effective drug combination for Caenorhabditis elegans nematodes discovered by output-driven feedback system control technique. Science Advances. 2017, eaao1254.

[8]. Niblack TL, Arelli PR, Noel GR, Opperman CH, Orf JH, Schmitt DP, Shannon JG, Tylka GL. A Revised Classification Scheme for Genetically Diverse Populations of Heterodera glycines. J Nematol. 34(4):279-88, 2002.

[9]. J. Saldanha, A. Parashar, J. Powell-Coffman, Multi-parameter behavioral analyses provide insights to mechanisms of cyanide resistance in Caenorhabditis elegans, Toxicological Sciences 135(1):156-68, 2013.

[10]. Niblack TL, Lambert KN, Tylka GL. A model plant pathogen from the kingdom Animalia: Heterodera glycines, the soybean cyst nematode. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 44:283-303, 2006.

[11]. R. Lycke, A. Parashar, Microfluidics-enabled method to identify modes of Caenorhabditis elegans paralysis in four anthelmintics. Biomicrofluidics. 7(6), 64103, 2013.

[12]. Carr JA, Parashar A, Gibson R, Robertson AP, Martin RJ, Pandey S. A microfluidic platform for high-sensitivity, real-time drug screening on C. elegans and parasitic nematodes. Lab Chip. 11(14):2385-96, 2011.

[13]. Fang, Y., Ramasamy, R. P. Current and prospective methods for plant disease detection. Biosensors 5 (3), 537–561, 2015.

[14]. J. Jensen, Z. Njus, G. Tylka, Video Analysis Software To Measure Nematode Movement With Applications For Accurate Screening Of Nematode Control Compounds. Journal of Nematology, Volume 48, Issue 4, pp. 335-336, 2016.

[15]. J.P. Jensen, U. Kalwa, G.L. Tylka, Avicta and Clariva Affect the Biology of the Soybean Cyst Nematode, Heterodera glycines. Plant Disease,102(12):2480-2486, 2018.

[16]. Sankaran S, Mishra A, Ehsani R, Davis C (2010) A review of advanced techniques for detecting plant diseases. Comput Electron Agric 72:1–13

[17]. D. Cruz, D. Mayfield, Z. Njus, M. Beattie, L. Leandro and G. Munkvold, "Sensitivity of Fusarium species from soybean roots to seed treatment fungicides". Phytopathology Conference, 104(11), 29-29, 2014.

[18]. S. Pandey, Marvin H White, Parameter-extraction of a two-compartment model for whole-cell data analysis, Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 120(2), 131-143, 2002.

[19]. Vishal Patel, Austin Chesmore, Christopher M. Legner, Santosh Pandey, Trends in Workplace Wearable Technologies and Connected-Worker Solutions for Next-Generation Occupational Safety, Health, and Productivity, Advanced Intelligent Systems, Article ID 2100099, 2021.

[20]. Velkov VV, Medvinsky AB, Sokolov MS, Marchenko AI. Will transgenic plants adversely affect the environment? J Biosci. 2005 Sep;30(4):515-48.

[21]. Santosh Pandey, Upender Kalwa, Taejoon Kong, Baoqing Guo, Phillip C. Gauger, David Peters, Kyoung-Jin Yoon, "Behavioral Monitoring Tool for Pig Farmers: Ear Tag Sensors, Machine Intelligence, and Technology Adoption Roadmap", Animals, Vol. 11, Issue 9, pages 2665, 2021.

[22]. S. Pandey, Analytical modeling of the ion number fluctuations in biological ion channels, Journal of nanoscience and nanotechnology, 12(3), 2489-2495, 2012.

[23]. Akwete Bortei-Doku, Marvin H. White, Simulation of biological ion channels with technology computer-aided design. Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine, 85, 1, 1-7, 2007.

[24]. Christopher M. Legner, Gregory L Tylka, Santosh Pandey, Robotic agricultural instrument for automated extraction of nematode cysts and eggs from soil to

improve integrated pest management, Scientific reports, Vol. 11, Issue 1, pages 1-10, 2021.

[25]. B. Chen, A. Parashar, Folded floating-gate CMOS biosensor for the detection of charged biochemical molecules, IEEE Sensors Journal, 2011.

[26]. Santosh Pandey, Augustine Beeman, Leland E Harker, Jared P Jensen, Upender Kalwa, Taejoon Kong, Zach L Njus, Gregory L Tylka, Christopher M. Legner. Methods, apparatus, and systems to extract and quantify minute objects from soil or feces, including plant-parasitic nematode pests and their eggs in soil. US Patent 10,900,877, January 26, 2021.

[27]. Ding X, Njus Z, Kong T, et al. Effective drug combination for Caenorhabditis elegans nematodes discovered by output-driven feedback system control technique. Science Advances. eaao1254, 2017.

[28]. Njus Z, Kong T, Kalwa U, et al. Flexible and disposable paper- and plastic-based gel micropads for nematode handling, imaging, and chemical testing. APL Bioengineering. 1(1):016102, 2017.

[29]. Buckelew LD, Pedigo LP, Mero HM, Owen MD, Tylka GL. Effects of weed management systems on canopy insects in herbicide-resistant soybeans. J Econ Entomol. 2000 Oct;93(5):1437-43.

[30]. Upender Kalwa, Christopher M. Legner, Elizabeth Wlezien, Gregory Tylka, and Santosh Pandey, "New methods of cleaning debris and high-throughput counting of cyst nematode eggs extracted from field soil", PLoS ONE, 14(10): e0223386, 2019.

[31]. Z. Njus, D. Feldmann, R. Brien, T. Kong, U. Kalwa, "Characterizing the Effect of Static Magnetic Fields on C. elegans Using Microfluidics", Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology, Vol. 6, No. 9, pp. 583-591, 2015.

[32]. J. A. Carr, R. Lycke, A. Parashar, Unidirectional, electrotactic-response valve for Caenorhabditis elegans in microfluidic devices. Applied Physics Letters, 98, 143701, 2011.

[33]. J. Saldanha, A. Parashar, J. Powell-Coffman, "Multi-parameter behavioral analyses provide insights to mechanisms of cyanide resistance in Caenorhabditis elegans", Toxicological Sciences 135(1):156-68, 2013.

[34]. Mytelka, L.K. 2000. Local systems of innovation in a globalized world economy. Industry and Innovation 77(1): 15–32, 2000.

[35]. Owen MD, Zelaya IA. Herbicide-resistant crops and weed resistance to herbicides. Pest Manag Sci. 61(3):301-11, 2005.

[36]. Joseph, A., Lycke, R. Decision-making by nematodes in complex microfluidic mazes. Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology 2(6), 409-415, 2011.

[37]. R. Lycke, Microfluidics-enabled method to identify modes of Caenorhabditis elegans paralysis in four anthelmintics, Biomicrofluidics 7, 064103, 2013.

[38]. T. Kong, S. Flanigan, M. Weinstein, U. Kalwa, C. Legner, “A fast, reconfigurable flow switch for paper microfluidics based on selective wetting of folded paper actuator strips”, Lab on a Chip, 17 (21), 3621-3633, 2017.

[39]. Parashar A, Lycke R, Carr JA. Amplitude-modulated sinusoidal microchannels for observing adaptability in C. elegans locomotion. Biomicrofluidics. 5(2):24112, 2011.

[40]. Wezel, A., and V. Soldat. A quantitative and qualitative historical analysis of the scientific discipline of agroecology. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability 7: 3–18, 2009.

[41]. J. Saldanha, J. Powell-Coffman. The effects of short-term hypergravity on Caenorhabditis elegans. Life Science Space Research, 10:38-46, 2016.

[42]. J.P. Jensen, A.Q. Beeman, Z.L. Njus et al. Movement and Motion of Soybean Cyst Nematode Heterodera glycines Populations and Individuals in Response to Abamectin. Phytopathology. 108(7):885-891, 2018.

[43]. Lombardo L, Coppola G, Zelasco S. New Technologies for Insect-Resistant and Herbicide-Tolerant Plants. Trends Biotechnol. 34(1):49-57, 2016.

[44]. Hall, A.J., Sulaiman, R.V., Clark, N.G. and Yoganand, B. From measuring impact to learning institutional lessons: An innovation systems perspective on improving the management of international agricultural research. Agricultural Systems 78: 213–241, 2003.