Scientia Review, Vol. 01(04), October 2025, pp. 1-3

Scientia Review

Website: www.scientiafoundation.in

POPULAR SCIENCE ARTICLE

Biointensive Pest Management in Agriculture

Himadri Rabha *[1] & Nabadeep Saikia[2]

[1]Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Assam Agricultural University, Lalpool, Udalguri, Assam, 784514

[2]Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Assam Agricultural University, Jhargaon, Morigaon, Assam, 782411

Email: himadri.rabha@aau.ac.in

Received: 17 September 2025
Revised: 25 September 2025
Accepted: 27 September 2025
Published online: 17 October 2025

Article ID: SR01030

Citation: Rabha, H. & Saikia, N. (2025). Biointensive Pest Management in Agriculture. *Scientia Review*, 1(4), 1-3

Abstract

Biointensive Pest Management (BIPM) has emerged as a sustainable and ecologically grounded alternative to chemical-based pest control in modern agriculture. It focuses on preventing pest outbreaks by strengthening the natural balance of agroecosystems through cultural, biological and mechanical methods. Rather than eradicating pests, BIPM aims to maintain them below economic thresholds using nature's own regulatory mechanisms. The discussion emphasizes that biointensive pest management is not just a set of practices but a philosophy that redefines the relationship between farming, nature and sustainability.

Keywords: Biointensive Pest Management, Ecological Balance, Sustainable Agriculture, Biological Control, Integrated Pest Management

Introduction

Pests have always been one of the biggest threats to global food security, causing substantial yield losses and economic damage every year. For decades, farmers relied heavily on chemical pesticides to manage these threats. While these inputs provided immediate relief, their long-term impacts have been devastating from the emergence of pesticide-resistant pests and loss of biodiversity to contamination of soil, water and food (Pimentel, 2005). Such outcomes have sparked the search for more sustainable approaches to pest management.

Biointensive Pest Management (BIPM) represents a new paradigm one that treats the farm as a living ecosystem rather than a production factory. It builds upon the principles of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), but goes further by emphasizing ecological literacy, prevention and resilience (Lewis *et al*., 1997). Instead of reacting to pest problems with chemicals, BIPM encourages farmers to prevent those problems by creating environments that naturally suppress pests and support beneficial organisms.

As agriculture faces increasing pressure to feed a growing population without compromising environmental integrity, the biointensive approach provides a practical and scientifically robust pathway toward sustainability. This paper explores how BIPM works, what principles it relies on and how it can reshape the future of pest management.

Concept and Principles of Biointensive Pest Management

At its core, BIPM is based on the understanding that every pest problem is a symptom of ecological imbalance. When crops are stressed, soils are degraded, or beneficial organisms are absent, pest populations can explode. The goal of BIPM is not to eliminate pests entirely but to keep their numbers below levels that cause economic harm by restoring natural balance in the ecosystem (Altieri & Nicholls, 2018).

The guiding principles of BIPM can be summarized as follows:

1. **Prevention before intervention:** Healthy plants and diverse ecosystems are less prone to pest outbreaks.
2. **Ecological balance:** Encourage natural enemies of pests to maintain long-term stability.
3. **Multiple strategies:** Combine cultural, mechanical, biological and behavioural controls rather than depending on one tactic.
4. **Minimal chemical use**: Resort to pesticides only when necessary and choose safer, bio-based options (Zehnder *et al.*, 2007)

5. **System thinking:** Manage the entire agroecosystem rather than treating pests in isolation.

In essence, BIPM reflects the idea that farming should work *with nature*, not against it.

Components and Strategies of BIPM

BIPM strategies can be broadly divided into **preventive** and **curative** measures. Preventive measures focus on avoiding pest establishment, while curative ones deal with pest suppression when populations exceed thresholds.

Preventive (Proactive) Strategies

Cultural Practices

Simple changes in farming practices can drastically reduce pest pressure. Crop rotation, for instance, breaks pest life cycles and reduces soil-borne diseases. Intercropping and mixed cropping confuse pests and create habitats for natural enemies. Balanced fertilization and timely planting enhance crop vigor, making plants more tolerant to pest attacks (Drinkwater *et al.*, 1998).

Habitat Management and Biodiversity

BIPM promotes "ecological engineering" designing farms that attract beneficial insects and pollinators. Maintaining flower strips, hedgerows and shelterbelts provides nectar, pollen and refuge for predators and parasitoids (Landis *et al.*, 2000). This diversified landscape not only controls pests but also enriches farm biodiversity.

Soil Health and Organic Amendments

Healthy soils harbor diverse microbial communities that naturally suppress many pathogens. Organic amendments such as compost, green manure and biofertilizers strengthen root systems and induce resistance against pests (Bulluck & Ristaino, 2002). Thus, soil management forms the foundation of biointensive farming.

Resistant Varieties

Using pest-resistant cultivars is a reliable, cost-effective method for prevention. Resistant crops reduce pest establishment and minimize the need for chemical sprays. When combined with ecological practices, varietal resistance can be more durable and effective.

Curative (Reactive) Strategies

Biological Control

The use of living organisms to control pests is the most visible aspect of BIPM. Predators such as ladybird beetles (*Coccinellidae*), parasitoids like *Trichogramma chilonis* and microbial agents such as *Bacillus thuringiensis* are widely used to manage pest populations (Eilenberg *et al.*, 2001). These agents work selectively, avoiding harm to non-target species.

Biopesticides and Botanicals

Plant-derived products like neem (*Azadirachta indica*) and microbial formulations based on *Beauveria bassiana* and *Metarhizium anisopliae* have gained popularity as environmentally benign alternatives to synthetic pesticides (Isman, 2006). They degrade quickly and fit seamlessly into organic and biointensive systems.

Behavioural Manipulation

Techniques such as pheromone traps, light traps and mating disruption help farmers monitor pest populations and control them before they cause damage. These tools provide early warning systems and minimize unnecessary pesticide use.

Mechanical and Physical Controls

Hand-picking of larvae, using sticky traps and installing nets or barriers are practical ways to manage pests in small-scale systems. Such physical interventions can be labour-intensive but highly effective when combined with other methods.

Implementation of BIPM

Effective implementation of BIPM requires both scientific understanding and farmer participation.

1. **Agro-Ecosystem Analysis (AESA):** Farmers regularly observe their fields to understand pest–natural enemy interactions and make informed decisions.
2. **Threshold-Based Interventions:** Pesticides or curative measures are applied only when pest levels cross the economic threshold.
3. **Farmer Field Schools (FFS):** Training programs empower farmers to make ecological decisions, promoting learning-by-doing (van den Berg & Jiggins, 2007).
4. **Integration with Organic Farming:** BIPM naturally aligns with organic and conservation agriculture, forming the ecological backbone of sustainable food systems.

Benefits of Biointensive Pest Management

BIPM provides multiple benefits that extend beyond pest control:

- **Environmental benefits:** It reduces pesticide residues, conserves biodiversity and improves ecosystem health.

- **Economic gains:** Lower chemical costs, fewer crop losses and improved soil fertility enhance farm profitability.
- **Social well-being:** Safer working conditions and healthier food for consumers.
- **Climate resilience:** Ecologically balanced systems are better able to withstand climatic stresses (Pretty *et al.*, 2011).

Research across Asia, Africa and Latin America have shown that BIPM-based systems can maintain stable yields while minimizing external inputs (Gurr et al., 2003).

Challenges and the Way Forward

Despite its promise, BIPM faces several challenges. Many farmers are unaware of its principles or lack access to reliable bio-inputs. The market for biocontrol products is still limited in many regions and institutional support for farmer training remains inadequate. Furthermore, transitioning from pesticide-heavy systems to ecological ones requires patience, knowledge and monitoring.

To strengthen BIPM adoption, there is a need for:

- Stronger research extension partnerships.
- Local production units for biocontrol agents.
- Policy incentives and subsidies for bio-based products.
- Integration of digital pest surveillance tools for timely decision-making (Kremen & Miles, 2012).

By combining traditional wisdom with modern ecological science, BIPM can help create farming systems that are productive, sustainable and environmentally responsible.

Conclusion

Biointensive Pest Management is not merely a pest control technique it is a comprehensive philosophy of sustainable farming. It seeks harmony between agricultural productivity and ecological integrity by emphasizing prevention, biodiversity and biological regulation. As chemical pesticides lose their effectiveness and the environmental costs of conventional farming rise, BIPM offers a path toward resilient and regenerative agriculture. With adequate research support, farmer education and policy backing, BIPM has the potential to transform the way the world grows food naturally, sustainably and responsibly.

References

Altieri, M. & Nicholls, C. (2018). *Biodiversity and pest management in agroecosystems*. CRC press.

Bulluck Iii, L. R. & Ristaino, J. B. (2002). Effect of synthetic and organic soil fertility amendments on southern blight, soil microbial communities and yield of processing tomatoes. *Phytopathology*, *92*(2), 181-189.

Drinkwater, L. E., Letourneau, D. K., Workneh, F. A. H. C., Van Bruggen, A. H. C. & Shennan, C. (1995). Fundamental differences between conventional and organic tomato agroecosystems in California. *Ecological applications*, *5*(4), 1098-1112.

Eilenberg, J., Hajek, A. & Lomer, C. (2001). Suggestions for unifying the terminology in biological control. *BioControl*, *46*(4), 387-400.

Gurr, G. M., Wratten, S. D. & Luna, J. M. (2003). Multi-function agricultural biodiversity: pest management and other benefits. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 4(2), 107–116.

Isman, M. B. (2006). Botanical insecticides, deterrents and repellents in modern agriculture and an increasingly regulated world. *Annual review of entomology*, *51*(1), 45-66.

Kremen, C. & Miles, A. (2012). Ecosystem services in biologically diversified versus conventional farming systems: benefits, externalities and trade-offs. *Ecology and Society*, 17(4), 40.

Landis, D. A., Wratten, S. D. & Gurr, G. M. (2000). Habitat management to conserve natural enemies of arthropod pests in agriculture. *Annual review of entomology*, *45*(1), 175-201.

Lewis, W. J., van Lenteren, J. C., Phatak, S. C. & Tumlinson, J. H. (1997). A total system approach to sustainable pest management. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 94(23), 12243-12248.

Pimentel, D. (2005). Environmental and economic costs of the application of pesticides primarily in the United States. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 7, 229–252.

Pretty, J., Toulmin, C. & Williams, S. (2011). Sustainable intensification in African agriculture. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 9(1), 5–24.

Van den Berg, H. & Jiggins, J. (2007). Investing in farmers—the impacts of farmer field schools in relation to integrated pest management. *World development*, *35*(4), 663-686.

Zehnder, G., Gurr, G. M., Kühne, S., Wade, M. R., Wratten, S. D. & Wyss, E. (2007). Arthropod pest management in organic crops. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 52(1), 57–80.