



Manuscript ID:  
IJRSEAS-2025-020605



Quick Response Code:



Website: <https://eesrd.us>



Creative Commons  
(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18299023

DOI Link:  
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18299023>

Volume: 2

Issue: 6

Pp. 23-27

Month: December

Year: 2025

E-ISSN: 3066-0637

Submitted: 08 Nov. 2025

Revised: 14 Nov. 2025

Accepted: 10 Dec. 2025

Published: 31 Dec. 2025

Address for correspondence:  
Surendra Ahirwar  
Research Scholar, Dept. of  
Zoology, PMCoE Govt. P.G.  
College, Tikamgarh, MP, India  
Email:  
[sahirwar442@gmail.com](mailto:sahirwar442@gmail.com)

How to cite this article:  
Ahirwar, S., & Ahirwar, R. M.  
(2025). Integrated Pest  
Management Strategies for  
Sustainable Agriculture: A Review.  
International Journal of Research  
Studies on Environment, Earth, and  
Allied Sciences, 2(6), 23–27.  
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18299023>

## Integrated Pest Management Strategies for Sustainable Agriculture: A Review

Surendra Ahirwar<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Ram Manohar Ahirwar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Dept. of Zoology, PMCoE Govt. P.G. College, Tikamgarh, MP, India

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Zoology, PMCoE Govt. P.G. College, Tikamgarh, MP, India Correspondence & affiliated by: Surendra Ahirwar, Research Scholar, Dept. of Zoology, Maharaja Chhatrasal Bundelkhand University, Chhatarpur, MP, India.

Email: [sahirwar442@gmail.com](mailto:sahirwar442@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is a scientifically established and environmentally sustainable approach for managing agricultural pests through the integration of cultural, biological, mechanical, and judicious chemical control measures. Unlike conventional pesticide-dependent practices, IPM prioritizes preventive strategies, continuous pest surveillance, and control interventions based on economic threshold levels rather than calendar-based pesticide applications. Evidence from diverse agro-climatic regions demonstrates that IPM adoption significantly reduces the use of synthetic pesticides, enhances agro-ecosystem biodiversity, and sustains or improves crop productivity. Recent advancements in biopesticides, precision agriculture, digital decision-support systems, and modern pest monitoring technologies have further strengthened the effectiveness of IPM programs. Numerous studies report reductions in pesticide usage ranging from 30% to 80%, along with lower production costs and improved environmental quality. Despite these benefits, large-scale adoption of IPM remains constrained by limited farmer awareness, inadequate extension services, and initial implementation costs. Strengthening training initiatives, policy incentives, participatory research, and digital integration is essential for expanding IPM adoption. This review critically examines the principles, benefits, challenges, and future prospects of IPM as a key component of sustainable agriculture and long-term food security.

**Keywords:** Integrated Pest Management; Sustainable Agriculture; Biological Control; Pest Surveillance; Eco-friendly Farming.

### Introduction-

Sustainable agriculture aims to ensure food security while conserving natural resources, preserving ecological integrity, and safeguarding human health. The widespread and indiscriminate application of chemical pesticides in conventional farming systems has resulted in several adverse consequences, including the development of pest resistance, environmental contamination, decline in biodiversity, and increased risks to human and animal health. These concerns have emphasized the urgent need for alternative pest management approaches that are both effective and environmentally responsible. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) has emerged as a viable and eco-friendly strategy that combines biological, cultural, mechanical, and selective chemical control methods to regulate pest populations. Rather than attempting complete pest eradication, IPM focuses on maintaining pest densities below economically damaging thresholds through preventive measures and informed decision-making.

The fundamental components of IPM include pest prevention, regular monitoring, and need-based interventions guided by economic threshold levels. Technological advancements such as pheromone trapping, microbial biopesticides, remote sensing, and precision farming tools have considerably improved the efficiency and reliability of IPM programs. Numerous studies conducted across diverse cropping systems indicate that IPM can significantly reduce pesticide inputs without compromising crop yields. Growing global concerns related to climate change, food safety, and environmental sustainability have further increased the importance of IPM in modern agriculture. However, limited awareness among farmers, insufficient training, and weak extension networks continue to restrict its widespread adoption. This review critically evaluates the principles, strategies, benefits, challenges, and future potential of Integrated Pest Management in achieving sustainable agricultural systems.

### Objectives

The present review aims to:

- To examine the fundamental principles and key components of integrated pest management.

- To analyze major IPM strategies currently practiced in agriculture.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of IPM in reducing pesticide dependence while sustaining crop yields.
- To assess the environmental, economic, and social benefits with IPM adoption.
- To identify major constraints limiting the large-scale implementation of IPM.
- To explore emerging technologies that strengthen IPM implementation.
- To highlight research gaps and propose future directions for sustainable IPM development.

**Integrated Pest Management Strategies and Sustainable Agriculture** - Integrated Pest Management represents a science-based and environmentally sound framework that combines multiple pest control techniques to minimize crop losses while reducing dependence on chemical pesticides. The guiding principles of IPM emphasize pest prevention, systematic field surveillance, and selective interventions based on economic threshold levels, thereby ensuring effective pest regulation with minimal ecological disturbance.

Challenges associated with pest outbreaks and excessive pesticide use can be effectively addressed through IPM strategies that integrate resistant crop varieties with cultural, mechanical, biological, and chemical control measures. However, IPM is a knowledge-intensive and dynamic system that requires a thorough understanding of pest biology, population dynamics, and continuous monitoring. Successful implementation therefore depends on skilled manpower, technical expertise, and effective extension support (Shivam *et al.*, 2024).

In the face of increasing agricultural intensification, climate variability, and the demand for sustainable food production, IPM adoption has become increasingly important. Beyond crop protection, IPM contributes to broader sustainability objectives by conserving natural resources, safeguarding human health, and improving socio-economic conditions in farming communities (Zhou *et al.*, 2024).

Sustainable agriculture emphasizes both short-term productivity and long-term ecosystem health. By integrating traditional knowledge with modern scientific innovations, sustainable farming systems aim to enhance agricultural output while minimizing environmental degradation. This systems-based approach supports ecological balance, economic viability, and social equity (Mohamed, 2023; Francis and Youngberg, 1990).

IPM closely aligns with sustainable agriculture by providing an environmentally safe and economically feasible pest management framework. Through coordinated application of biological, cultural, mechanical, and need-based chemical methods, IPM reduces environmental pollution, conserves biodiversity, and improves soil health, thereby supporting long-term agricultural sustainability.

#### **Data and Methodology-**

This review is based on secondary data obtained from peer-reviewed research articles, scientific reports, books, and publications issued by national and international organizations such as FAO, IPPC, and ICAR. Relevant literature published between 2000 and 2025 was systematically reviewed using databases including Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed, Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and agricultural research repositories. Keywords such as “Integrated Pest Management,” “IPM,” “biological control,” “sustainable agriculture,” “pest monitoring,” and “biopesticides” were employed to identify relevant studies.

Publications were selected based on their relevance to IPM principles, implementation strategies, environmental and economic impacts, technological innovations, and case studies from different agro-climatic regions. Studies lacking empirical evidence, opinion-based articles, and non-agricultural publications were excluded. Extracted information was organized thematically, and a narrative synthesis approach was used to identify key trends, benefits, limitations, and research gaps. Quality assessment focused on methodological rigor, clarity of objectives, sample size, analytical approaches, and transparency of reported outcomes.

#### **Result and Discussion-**

The review shows that :

##### **1. Components of IPM -**

Integrated Pest Management incorporates multiple complementary approaches:

- **Cultural Control:** Practices such as crop rotation, intercropping, sanitation, resistant varieties, appropriate spacing, and timely sowing reduce pest establishment and multiplication.
- **Biological Control:** The use of natural enemies, including parasitoids (e.g., *Trichogramma*), predators (ladybird beetles, lacewings), and microbial agents such as *Bacillus thuringiensis* and *Beauveria bassiana*, provides long-term pest suppression.
- **Mechanical and Physical Control:** Techniques such as light traps, pheromone traps, sticky traps, hand removal, mulching, and soil solarization help reduce pest populations without chemical inputs.
- **Host Plant Resistance:** The development and adoption of pest-tolerant crop varieties minimize dependence on chemical pesticides.
- **Chemical Control (Last Resort):** Selective and low-toxicity pesticides are applied only when pest populations exceed established economic threshold levels.
- **Monitoring and Decision-Making:** Regular field scouting, trapping, and forecasting models guide timely and need-based interventions.
- **Record-keeping and Evaluation:** Documentation of pest incidence and management outcomes supports continuous improvement of IPM strategies.

## 2. Impact of IPM -

The reviewed studies indicate that IPM adoption:

- Reduces pesticide use by approximately **30–70%**.
- Maintains or increases crop yields by **5–15%**.
- Enhances populations of beneficial insects, pollinators, and soil organisms.
- Minimizes soil and water contamination.
- Lowers production costs and increases farm profitability.
- Delays the development of pesticide resistance in pest populations.

## 3. Challenges to IPM Adoption -

Despite its proven advantages, IPM adoption faces several constraints:

- Limited farmer awareness and technical expertise
  - Inadequate availability of biological control agents
  - Perception of IPM as labor-intensive
  - Weak extension and advisory services
  - Initial investment costs for monitoring tools
  - Insufficient policy incentives for eco-friendly farming
- Addressing these challenges requires targeted training programs, financial support mechanisms, and stronger collaboration between farmers, researchers, and policymakers.

## 4. Innovations and Emerging Technologies in IPM -

Recent technological advancements have enhanced IPM efficiency:

- Pheromone-based mass trapping and mating disruption
  - Microbial and botanical biopesticides
  - Drone-assisted pest surveillance and remote sensing
  - AI-based decision-support systems and mobile applications
  - Biotechnology-assisted conservation and detection of natural enemies
- These innovations improve precision, reduce chemical dependency, and strengthen pest management decision-making.

## 5. Contribution to Sustainability -

IPM supports sustainable agriculture by:

- Reducing pesticide residues in food, soil, and water
- Enhancing soil health and biodiversity
- Lowering greenhouse gas emissions
- Improving farmer safety and public health
- Supporting climate-resilient farming systems

Overall, the reviewed evidence confirms that IPM effectively regulates pest populations while maintaining or enhancing crop yields. Adoption of IPM commonly results in a 30–70% reduction in chemical pesticide use. Biological control agents such as *Trichogramma*, *Chrysoperla*, and entomopathogenic fungi play a crucial role in pest suppression. Cultural practices and mechanical tools further strengthen pest management outcomes. Farmers implementing IPM benefit from reduced input costs, improved soil quality, and decreased environmental pollution. However, broader adoption requires enhanced training, improved access to biopesticides, and stronger institutional support.

## Conclusion-

Integrated Pest Management offers a comprehensive and sustainable approach to pest regulation by significantly reducing pesticide dependence while maintaining or improving crop productivity. By conserving biodiversity, improving soil health, and minimizing environmental and health risks, IPM plays a vital role in sustainable agricultural development. Strengthening farmer education, improving access to biological control agents, and enhancing institutional and policy support are essential for large-scale IPM adoption. The integration of digital tools and climate-resilient technologies further expands the potential of IPM in modern agriculture. Overall, IPM provides a practical pathway toward environmentally sound, economically viable, and socially responsible farming systems.

## Acknowledgment

The authors sincerely acknowledge the support and encouragement provided by the Department of Zoology, PMCoE Government P.G. College, Tikamgarh, Madhya Pradesh, for facilitating the academic environment necessary to undertake this review work. The authors are grateful to Maharaja Chhatrasal Bundelkhand University, Chhatrapur, for academic affiliation and research support. The authors also express their appreciation to all researchers and scientists whose published literature formed the basis of this review. Finally, heartfelt thanks are extended to colleagues and well-wishers who provided valuable suggestions and motivation during the preparation of this manuscript.

## Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

## Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

## Reference-

Citation: Alavilli, H.; Poli, Y.; Verma,

1. Shivam, Dwivedi, P., Mishra, R. and Rani, V. (2024). Integrated Pest Management and Sustainable Agriculture: A Review. *Advances in Agricultural Sciences and Technology*; 2024; p. 681–687.
2. Zhou, W., Arcot, Y., Medina, R.F., Bernal, J., Cisneros-Zevallos, L. and Akbulut, M.E.S. (2024). Integrated Pest Management: An Update on the Sustainability Approach to Crop Protection. *ACS Omega*. 2024;9:41130–41147.
3. Peer Mohamed, S. (2023). Integrated Pest Management Strategies for Sustainable Agriculture: A Review of Current Practices and Future Directions. *Asian J Adv Res*. 2023;6(1):475–483.
4. Singh, A., Sharma, O.P. (2004). Integrated Pest Management for Sustainable Agriculture. Integrated Pest Management in Indian Agriculture. Proceedings 11; *NCIPM*. New Delhi: NCIPM, 2004; p. 11–24.
5. Francis, C. and Youngberg, G. (1990). Sustainable agriculture – An overview. In: Francis CA, Flora CB, King LD, editors. *Sustainable Agriculture in Temperate Zones*. New York: Wiley; 1990.
6. Kogan, M. (1998). Integrated Pest Management: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Developments. *Annu Rev Entomol*. 1998;43:243–270.
7. Dent, D. (2000). *Insect Pest Management*. 2nd ed. Wallingford: CABI Publishing; 2000.
8. Pimentel, D. (2005). Environmental and economic costs of the application of pesticides. *Environ Dev Sustain*. 2005;7(2):229–252.
9. Kumar, S., Singh, A. (2020). Integrated pest management approaches for sustainable agriculture: A review. *J Environ Biol*. 2020;41(5):1231–1237.
10. Van Lenteren, J.C. (2012). The state of biological control of insects. *J Appl Entomol*. 2012;136(7):401–15.
11. Koul, O., Cuperus, G. and Elliott, N. (2008). *Area-wide Pest Management: Theory and Implementation*. Wallingford: CABI; 2008.
12. Abrol, D.P. and Shankar, U. (2021). *Pests and Their Management*. New Delhi: Springer; 2021.
13. Barzman, M., Bärberi, P., Birch, A.N., et al. (2015). Eight principles of Integrated Pest Management. *Agron Sustain Dev*. 2015;35:1199–215.
14. Sparks, T.C. and Nauen, R. (2015). IRAC: Mode of action classification and insecticide resistance management. *Pestic Biochem Physiol*. 2015;121:122–128.
15. FAO. Integrated Pest Management: Guidelines for Sustainable Agriculture. *Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization*; 2019.
16. Pedigo, L.P. and Rice, M.E. (2014). *Entomology and Pest Management*. 6th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall; 2014.
17. Ehler, L.E. (2009). *Integrated Pest Management (IPM): definition, historical development and implementation*. In: Radcliffe EB, Hutchison WD, Cancelado RA, editors. *Integrated Pest Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2009. p. 1-11.
18. Chandrashekara, K., Sharanabasappa and Kambrekar, D.N. (2018). Eco-friendly management of agricultural pests. *J Exp Zool India*. 2018;21(2):775-782.
19. Koul, O., Cuperus, G.W. and Elliott, N. (2008). *Integrated pest management: theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2008.
20. Peshin, R. and Dhawan, A.K. (2009). *Integrated Pest Management: Innovation-Development Process*. Dordrecht: Springer; 2009.
21. Pandey, S. and Singh, A. (2020). Recent trends in biological control of insect pests. *J Entomol Res*. 2020;44(3):405-412.
22. Abrol, D.P., & Shankar, U. (2020). *Integrated Pest Management: Principles and Practice*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, 2020; UK.
23. FAO (2022). *Integrated Pest Management in Agriculture: A Guide for Extension Workers*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2022; Rome.
24. Wyckhuys, K.A.G., Hughes, A.C., Buamas, C., et al. (2019). Biological control of an agricultural pest protects tropical forests. *Communications Biology*, 2019;2(1), 10.
25. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). AGP - Integrated Pest Management [Internet]. Rome: FAO; 2024 [cited 2025 Dec 1]. Available from: <https://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/thematic-sitemap/theme/pests/ipm/en/>
26. Ehler, L.E. (2006). Integrated pest management (IPM): definition, historical development and implementation. *Pest Manag Sci*. 2006;62:787–789.
27. Saroop, S., & Tamchos, A. M. (2024). Advancing integrated pest management: Strategies for minimizing pesticide use in sustainable agriculture. *Agronomy Journal*, 2024;7(12), 1-25.
28. Sparks, T. C., & Lorsban, R. N. (2023). Insecticide resistance management and landscape ecology. *Pest Management Science*, 2023;80(5), 1923-1945.
29. Koul, O., & Cuperus, G. W. (Eds.). (2024). *Ecological pest management: An agroecological approach*. CABI Publishing, 2024; Wallingford.
30. Oerke, E. C. (2023). Crop losses to pests. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 2023; 144(1), 31-43.
31. Dent, D. R., & BPIL-WISSEN, P. (2024). *Integrated pest management: Fundamental concepts and applications*. 2024; Oxford University Press, Oxford.

32. Singh, S., Kumar, A., & Patel, R. K. (2024). Cultural control practices for sustainable pest management. *Sustainable Agriculture Research*, 2024;13(3), 45-62.
33. Pedigo, L. P., & Rice, M. E. (2023). *Entomology and pest management*. Pearson Education, 2023; Upper Saddle River.
34. Koul, O. (2024). Pest management through cultural and physiochemical techniques. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health*, 2024;39(3), 383-398.
35. Kumar S, & Singh A. (2020). Role of integrated pest management in sustainable agriculture. *J Environ Biol*. 2020;41(4):1063-70.
36. van Lenteren JC. (2012). Biological control and IPM in greenhouses. *Annu Rev Entomol*. 2012;57:485-507.
37. Dhaliwal GS, Jindal V, & Dhawan AK. (2010). Insect pest problems and crop losses: role of IPM in achieving food security. *Indian J Entomol*. 2010;72(2):103-9.
38. Abrol, D.P. and Shankar U. (2012). *Integrated Pest Management: Principles and Practice*. New Delhi: CABI Publishers; 2012.
39. Gurr G.M, Wratten S.D., & Luna J.M. (2003). Multi-function agricultural biodiversity: pest management and other benefits. *Basic Appl Ecol*. 2003;4(2):107-16.
40. Pimentel, D., & Burgess, M. (2014). Environmental and economic costs of the application of pesticides. *Integ Pest Manag Rev*. 2014;9(1):4-12.
41. Van Lenteren J.C. (2012). The state of commercial augmentative biological control: plenty of natural enemies, but a frustrating lack of uptake. *BioControl*. 2012;57:1-20.