



# Agro-ecological Alternatives for Fall Armyworm Management in Maize: A Review

R. Sowmiya <sup>a\*</sup>, R. Krishnan <sup>b</sup> and R. Karthikeyan <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Agronomy, Vanavarayar Institute of Agriculture, Pollachi, India.

<sup>b</sup> Nammazhvar Organic Farming Research Center, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, India.

<sup>c</sup> Department of Agronomy, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, India.

## Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijecc/2024/v14i84358>

## Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/120078>

Review Article

Received: 28/05/2024

Accepted: 02/08/2024

Published: 10/08/2024

## ABSTRACT

Maize, scientifically known as *Zea mays*, stands as one of humanity's most vital and versatile crop, with a rich history dating back thousands of years. Its journey from a wild grass to a staple food crop reflects its adaptability and resilience in various climates and soil conditions worldwide. But, the infestation of fall armyworm (FAW) in maize represents a significant agricultural challenge globally, including India. Its expansion to India was initially discovered in maize fields at the College of Agriculture in Shivamogga, Karnataka, in 2018. Fall Army Worm (FAW) is regarded a major maize pest due to its ravenous feeding habits and crop damage. Originating from the Americas, the fall armyworm has spread rapidly across continents, facilitated by its ability to migrate long distances

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [sowmiagro94@gmail.com](mailto:sowmiagro94@gmail.com);

and adapt to diverse environmental conditions. In maize fields, fall armyworm larvae feed voraciously on leaves, tassels, and kernels, causing substantial yield losses if left unchecked. Their feeding activity not only reduces crop yields but also increases vulnerability to secondary infections and reduces the overall quantity and quality of maize produced. Effective management of fall armyworm infestations in maize often requires a multi-pronged approach, integrating cultural, biological, and chemical control methods. Furthermore, the majority of Indian farmers are smallholders who are unable to afford chemical pesticides that are harmful to the environment. This review delves into the emerging landscape of agro-ecological alternatives aimed at mitigating the impact of this destructive pest.

**Keywords:** Agro-ecological approaches; fall armyworm; maize; pest management.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Maize and Fall armyworm

Maize is a popular cereal crop due to its high nutritional value as a staple meal, animal feed, and fuel [1]. Asia accounts for around 32% of global maize production [2], with China ranking second with 40 million ha. Maize growers in Asia are smallholders; however the majority of the maize is grown for animal feed. It has been discovered [3] that the low maize yield is attributable to major restrictions such as a lack of efficient pest management techniques, moisture stress, low fertility, and poor cultural practices. More than 40 insect species have been identified as maize pests. *Spodoptera frugiperda*, an invaded species, is the primary insect pest of maize, resulting in extremely low yields.

The insect, fall armyworm (FAW), has been reported to inflict serious damage to maize crops in America. During 2016, it became an invasive pest in Africa and expanded swiftly over the continent in 2016 and 2017. In 2018, it was detected in Yemen and India [2], [4]. The research work [5] confirmed the pest's presence for the first time in Karnataka, India. In early 2019, the pest was identified in five Asian countries, including China. The insect is known to affect maize, cotton, rice, and sorghum, among other crops. A study states that there are 353 FAW host plants from 76 families, primarily Poaceae, Asteraceae, and Fabaceae, during a survey in Brazil [6].

### 1.2 Fall Armyworm Biology

The fall armyworm is a noctuid moth native to North and South America that has long been a major production concern [7]. The pest is polyphagous and migrates over great distances.

It can cover more than 100 kilometers in a single night. It feeds on a wide variety of host plants [8], [9]. FAW eggs can be identified by their clustered egg laying habit, which ranges from a few to hundreds in number. Female moths lay eggs on the lower surface of leaves and cover them with scales. The incubation period for eggs varied from 2 to 3 days, with a mean of 2.50 days [5].

FAW eggs have a dome shape with a flattened base. The eggs measure around 0.4 mm in diameter and 0.3 mm in height. The female moth deposits the majority of her eggs within the first four to five days of her life, but some can take up to three weeks. The fall armyworm moth has both migratory and localized dispersion habits. They can travel more than 500 kilometers before oviposition [10]. The number of eggs laid by a female over its life cycle ranged from 1342 to 1844 when the larvae fed on millet or maize leaves, and 1839 eggs when it fed on cotton leaves. The larvae cause harm to maize plants, while the adults disseminate the pest by reproducing rapidly and travelling large distances [11].

After hatching, each larva travels through six instars that last 14 to 19 days [5]. The larvae start out green and gradually develop brown and black. It featured four black dots on the eighth segment of larvae, which resembled a square. A fully developed caterpillar can be as long as a matchstick (4 to 5 cm) [12]. The epidermis of larvae is rough and granular in texture, and the last instar larva has an inverted Y form [10].

The caterpillar has three pale yellow stripes down the back of its dark head. In addition to a pair of prolegs at the end of its body, the larvae have four pairs of fleshy abdominal prolegs [12]. The larvae hatch from the eggs and feed vertically on the plant or horizontally on nearby plants, causing the pest to spread throughout the

farm [13], [14]. Larval development lasted 11 to 50 days depending on temperature and habitat [15]. In the words of [16], the larvae fall from the plant and burrow into the soil to a depth of three inches, where they remain in the pre-pupal stage for two to four days. They pupate after 7-10 days. The pupal stage lasts approximately 9 to 12 days [5].

As stated by [17], the adult moth's top forewings are mottled dark grey with a white patch near the dorsal tip, while the lower forewings are light grey to brown in colour. As with other Noctuids, the moths are most active at night. The antennae are filiform. In the study by [10], the female moth's forewings range in colour from greyish brown to faint mottling of grey and brown. The hind wing of the male and female moths is silver-white with a short border. The average adult lifespan is 10 days, with a range of 7 to 21 days, and depending on the climate, two to ten generations can be completed in a single cropping cycle.

The reproduction is efficient in tropical climate due to its warmer temperature where the FAW can produce up to ten generations per year, whereas temperate climates produce only two or three generations each year. According to the studies by [18], [19], the least temperature required for egg, larva, and pupa development is 13.8°C. The pest thrives and reproduces all year in warmer places where hosts are always accessible and temperatures rarely fall below specified thresholds.

### 1.3 Fall Armyworm and Plant Damage

The FAW larvae were placed in maize plants at 8 to 10 leaf stage and monitored FAW damage and yield for two years. In the first year, 98% affected plants resulted in a 15% production decrease. There was no change in yield when 31% of the corn was affected. During the second year, 100% maize infestation resulted in an 18% yield drop [20]. The response of yield to various levels of infestation in three vegetative phases of irrigated maize grown under hydric stress was studied in Nicaragua. Insecticides were employed to protect maize from FAW and the neotropical cornstalk borer. The maximum infected treatment in all three phases resulted in a 34% loss in yield [21]. Maize yields were reduced by 15 to 73% when FAW infestation was strong during the mid to late growth stages [22].

Larvae are cannibalistic at high larval numbers, resulting in only one later instar larva per maize plant. The pest may survive and expand on immature leaves, whereas grown leaves are unsuitable for foraging. So, they eat ear, silk, and cob. It was found that over 90% of larvae recovered within 1.1 m of a maize plant 14 days after being contaminated with an egg mass [23].

The research [24] states that the fall armyworm larvae live on immature leaves, whorls, tassels and cobs. The FAW damage causes skeletonized leaves and windowed whorls in the late vegetative stages. The full-grown larvae in mature plant whorls can feed on maize cobs, leading to decreased output and quality [25]. The hatched larvae graze on the leaves on which the eggs were deposited but once matured; they disperse to other plants [12]. The first and second instar larvae scrape the leaves, causing windowing damage, but the later instar larvae create ragged holes in the growing leaves from the whorl.

The results of an NCIS study [26] published by the US Department of Agriculture in the Corn Loss Adjustment Standards Handbook in 2013, which revealed that 70% defoliation at the 12 leaf stage is expected to result in a 15% yield drop. A 25% defoliation before the 18th leaf stage may result in a yield drop of less than 5%. The effect of fall armyworm incidence on maize in Ghana [27] was assessed and the findings revealed that the larval population was larger throughout two cropping seasons (May to June; September and October). FAW mostly targets maize, but can also be seen on rice, onion, millet, sorghum, tomato, and brinjal. The pest targets all phenological stages of maize, with the vegetative stage being the most severe. It has also been reported that fall armyworm larvae can reduce yield by 34 to 38% [28].

## 2. FALL ARMYWORM MANAGEMENT

The extent of damage is determined by geographical region, planting season, cultivar planted, and cultural practices used [29]. The maize plant's ability to compensate for foliar damage is determined by its genetics, nutrition, and water availability. The relationship between FAW infestation and maize yield was influenced by maize varieties, plant density, and agronomic techniques. The FAW infestation was observed to be significant in late planted maize as the moths seek the vegetative stage. If maize

seedlings are cut by 5% or the whorls of plants (during the first 30 days) are damaged by 20%, an appropriate management mechanism must be taken to prevent future damage [30].

#### a) Chemical control

The primary method for managing fall armyworm is to use synthetic pesticides [31]. Keeping the plants larva-free throughout the vegetative stage can reduce the amount of sprays necessary during the silking stage [32]. Besides increasing production costs, the continued use of synthetic insecticides to manage crop pests can lead to pest resistance and have serious environmental consequences [33], [34]. To manage FAW in maize, methyl parathion, chlorpyrifos, methamidophos, and phoxim was used in Mexico [35].

A study conducted in Makueni, Machakos, and Kenya on the usage of agricultural pesticides in maize cultivation reported that 0.5% and 2% of farmers had used herbicides and insecticides, respectively. The World Bank conducted the same surveys in six countries: Ethiopia, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Uganda between 2010 and 2012. The results showed that 16% of farmers employed agrochemicals in all crops [36]. Small farmers in Africa utilize very little insecticide for pest management due to a lack of awareness, unavailability of efficient products, and expensive costs [37].

The findings [38] detailed that the use of chemical pesticides for FAW management is ineffective because the pest's frass is so heavy that it forms a plug, reducing the efficacy of chemicals and possibly not reaching the whorl where the larvae feed. Chemical pesticides should not be sprayed during the day because the pest is only active at night. The pest fall armyworm is controlled through the use of genetically modified maize, which contains the gene responsible for producing poisons that kill FAW. This strategy outperformed 85% of maize grown in the United States, Brazil, and Argentina [39]. In the southern United States, it is common practice to use chemical insecticides three to four times a week to control FAW in sweet corn [25]. The use of chemical control methods without addressing the threshold level can result in resistance development, plant damage, and human and environmental risks [40]. Application of dry sand mixture with trichlorfon to the whorls

of a plastic bottle is effective and is utilised by farmers in Ethiopia and Kenya [41].

The investigation [42] found that applying Radiant, Tracer, Karate, and Ampligo resulted in over 90% death of FAW larvae after 72 hours of application. Of the chemical combinations used in the study, no larvae were discovered on treatments with Karate 5 EC in the second spraying, and less than one larva was identified in all chemical treatments after the third spray. Chemical insecticides are recommended when larvae are less than 31 mm long, 75% of the whorl has feeding damage, and the plants are stressed [12].

In the study [27], it is noticed that the most common pest management practice is the use of insecticides. During severe infestations, pesticide applications began in the second week and varied in frequency from once a week to every other week. Maize yields were lower in years when the autumn armyworm outbreak was reported.

The efficiency of several pesticides against the autumn armyworm in India was studied [43]. The results showed that the most lethal insecticides are emamectin benzoate, chlorantraniliprole, and spinetoram, with potency ratios of 119, 38, and 15 respectively. When these pesticides were administered in the field, they found that chlorantraniliprole, spinetoram, and emamectin benzoate had the lowest number of larvae per plant which resulted in highest yields.

#### b) Intercropping and natural enemies

The study [44] states that the availability or lack of natural enemies determines whether a considerable number of autumn armyworms infest a crop. Maize intercropped with beans reduced FAW infestation in maize by 20-30% [45]. It has been observed that predators account for 73% of FAW pupal mortality [46]. A report states that the parasitoid *Chelonus insularis* (Cresson) (Hymenoptera; Braconidae) killed 42% of FAWs [47] and the endoparasitic nematodes (Mermithidae) parasitized up to 71% of FAW larvae [48].

According to [49], the majority of small farmers growing maize in Africa use cultural pest control methods such as planting date manipulation, crop residue destruction, tillage methods, the use of locally available substances, and intercropping

[50]. The maize grown closer to hedges of *Gliricidia*, *Crotalaria*, *Calliandra*, and *Croton* had a lower degree of stem borer attack [51].

The investigation [52] elucidates the larval growth and feeding behavior of FAW on various crops, including maize, sorghum-sudangrass (SSG), cowpea, and sunflower. It was discovered that larvae reared on the cover crop sunflower were smaller than those grown on maize. Cowpea and sunflower larvae had longer to grow, and their pupae weight was 20 to 25% lower than that of maize and SSG. It confirms that cowpea and sunflower have the potential to diminish FAW populations by prolonging larval development. This, in turn, slows the timing of FAW infestation in the subsequent maize planting season.

Adopting plant diversity in cropping systems in which one crop attracts the pest whereas the other repels the pest is push-pull method. *Desmodium* (Leguminaceae) releases volatiles that repel pests, whereas Napier grass, a trap crop, attracts pests. The study [53] demonstrated that the combination of different agricultural systems and natural enemies keeps FAW populations at low levels in Central America for smallholders. Growing wild flowers along field borders enhances the availability of food for natural enemies, which increases their abundance and lowers FAW survival [54], [55].

In the words of [56], crop diversification is one of the management options for FAW. Crop diversity on a temporal and spatial scale minimizes pest incidence by boosting the population of beneficial arthropods. The maize intercropped with pumpkin had less FAW infections than sole maize [57]. However, it was found that a greater infestation of FAW in pumpkin intercropped maize [58]. According to [59], several companion plants produce semiochemicals that either repel or attract pests from the primary crop.

The intercropping reduces herbivore populations while increasing the natural enemy count, hence reducing crop damage [60]. The investigation [61] on the mortality of FAW eggs and larvae over a three-year period showed that egg mortality ranged between 73 and 81% due to dislodgement, unviability, and predation. More than 95% of larvae died during the early larval stage as a result of flooding and dislodgement caused by rainfall and predation.

Growing crops with woody perennials is another strategy to increase habitat diversity and protect natural enemies. Trees increase the diversity of vertebrate natural enemies such as bats and birds, which could be predators of FAW moths [62]. The synthetic pesticides had a deleterious impact on pollinators and natural enemies [63], [64].

The findings of [31], [65] and [66] stated intercropping systems, botanical pesticides, and beneficial bacteria are the most effective alternatives to insecticide use. Growing beans as a companion crop provide a distinct biological niche for FAW larvae while also releasing semiochemicals that prevent the FAW pest and oviposition [67]. Many parasites are sensitive to chemical pesticides. In the study conducted in Florida [68], the parasitism level of FAW ranged from 1% (sprayed field) to 95% (unsprayed field).

The use of push-pull technology (PPT) to manage FAW in Uganda was studied [69]. When compared to mono-cropped maize (95%), climate-smart (36%) and standard PPT (38%) treatments had lower FAW infestation rates. FAW attack proved to be lower in the seedling stage with less tillage, and as plant height increased, the infestation became similar to the tillage treatments used. Intercropping maize with beans or peanuts reduced FAW infection by 30%. This demonstrates that intercropped maize receives higher protection than monocrop maize.

The effectiveness of a climate-adapted push-pull system against autumn armyworms in Africa was investigated [70]. The results showed that the climate-adapted push-pull maize crop had fewer fall armyworm infestations and produced more than the monocrop maize. The average number of larvae per maize plant was also found to be lower than for solitary maize. Rotating maize with non-host crops such as sunflower and bean can help reduce FAW attacks [2]. According to [71], *Cotesia icipe* is the most common larval parasitoid of FAW in Ethiopia, accounting for 33.8 to 45.3%. Planting additional crops among maize plants can improve overall plant health by contributing to soil health, interfering with host search by releasing repellent volatiles, inhibiting larval movement between rows, and increasing the number of natural enemies by providing food and shelter [72]. A study conducted [58] to quantify FAW damage to smallholder maize crops in two districts of Eastern Zimbabwe. FAW incidence was greater in pumpkin-intercropped

maize. FAW damage was shown to be lower in zero-tillage systems with frequent weeding. Of the three models used in the study, two that used limited tillage, manure, and compost showed lesser FAW damage.

The investigation [73] on bean intercropping and the application of botanical extracts to control fall armyworm infestations in maize. The study found that the control group had the highest FAW infestation in maize, followed by dwarf and climbing bean intercropping. The pesticide and black pepper extract treatments resulted in the lowest infestation. Maize yields were shown to be greater in the pesticide and black pepper extract treatments, followed by bean intercropping, with the lowest yield recorded in the control.

#### **c) Time of planting**

The time of planting of maize have influence on the levels of infestation and loss in yield caused by maize stalk borers [74]. The fall armyworm can cause severe damage by feeding on the leaves and stems of more than 100 plant species during June to August when the minimum temperature exceeds 10°C [8]. The study [75] on the difference in the incidence of maize pest during different sowings taken showed that the eggs of shoot fly were found in greater amount during the months of September, March and April. The pin holes and activity of hairy caterpillar were found to be higher in the month of August. The larval population and the damage were found to be minimum in the month of June.

Early planting of crops reduces the pest pressure at the time of growing season. But early planting is connected with the risk of crop failure due to irregular rainfall at initial stages. So, the small holder farmers hesitate to take early sowings and choose to take either delayed sowing or staggered planting [76]. However, it was found [58] that the planting dates have no influence on FAW damage. The FAW pest requires warm, humid areas with heavy rainfall for its population growth as it cannot breed at temperatures lower than 10°C [66].

The study [77] on the infestation of stalk borer on leaves was higher in summer than on spring and winter when tested with two different maize genotypes. They also observed that the tunnel length and exit holes increased with the progress of planting time from first week of January to March in both the maize genotypes used for

study. Further, they found that under natural field conditions, the infestation was higher at high temperature of 25-31°C and vegetative stages were more vulnerable to the damage of maize stem borer than the later stages. The FAW heavily infest the ears of maize that are sown late than early plantings [78]. The early planting after the first effective rains usually provides better growing conditions for maize, making use of more heat units at the beginning of the cropping season. Control of pests in early planted crops derives from low pest pressure at this time of the season [72].

#### **d) Soil fertility and plant health**

Soils with good organic matter content and minerals encourage the balanced release of nutrients which guarantees overall plant health. This, in turn fights the pest and disease attack. The soil fertility management can have many influences on plant quality which in turn can affect the abundance and damage of insects [79]. The reallocation of minerals can affect oviposition, growth rates, survival and reproduction of insects. A report [80] states that ants found in fields of healthy soil biota killed over 95% of FAW pupae. The cultivation practices that cause nutrition imbalances can reduce pest resistance [81]. Besides affecting the amount of damage that plants receive from herbivores, the soil nutrient availability also affects the ability of plants to recover from herbivory [82]. The use of high quality seed and balanced fertilization to ensure healthy plants which in turn fight back the pest attack [83].

The use of synthetic fertilizers can reduce plant resistance to pests which may increase pest population and can increase the need for insecticide application [84]. A research [85] told that balanced mineral nutrition makes crop more resistant to pest and diseases. Besides repelling the pest, the legume intercropping can enhance the soil health by improving the soil fertility status [86], [87]. Practices such as mulching, no or low tillage or other soil management techniques and the soil predators may help reduce survival of FAW pupae in soil [88].

#### **e) Other management practices**

The diatomaceous earth is one of the safest and effective naturally occurring insecticides [89]. The diatomaceous earth sticks to the insect body and harms the cuticle by absorption and a lesser

degree by abrasion. It results in the death of insect because of water loss. The locally available materials are used by small holder farmers all over the world to control FAW. They include local botanical extracts, soil, wood ash, sand, soaps, lime and oils. The effectiveness of neem seed powder was studied [90].

An investigation [91] got 100% larval mortality of FAW with the water extracts of *Carica papaya* seed at 10% concentration. The plant oils of *Corymbia citriodora* and *Eucalyptus urograndis* had negative effect on FAW larvae in maize [92]. The research [93] studied the influence of neem based bio-pesticide on the larva of FAW. The outcome showed that the use of neem oil and synthetic insecticide lufenuron reported higher mortality when tested in four and six day old *S. frugiperda* caterpillars. The study [94] reported that hexane, acetone and ethanol extracts of *Tagetes erecta* produced 48%, 60% and 72% mortality of FAW larvae. A research attained mortality of FAW larvae (82%) with *Polygonum hydropiperoides* extract at 50g/100 ml of water [95]. The use of botanical insecticides is harmless, inexpensive and environment friendly than the chemical ones which cause higher cost, pest resistance to pesticides and disturbances in the environment [96].

A research [97] on the effects of various inert powders on FAW showed that the use of bentonite caused 93% and diatomaceous earth caused 47% mortality of FAW. The other biological methods are the use of predatory insects, parasitoids, use of genetically modified crops, pheromone trapping of male moths and *S. frugiperda* Multiple Nucleo Polyhedro Virus (SMNPV) prevents the pest from mating [38].

The study [98] reported that the ethanolic extracts of *Argemone ochroleuca* caused mortality of FAW larva due to reduced feeding and larval growth. The sand, ash, sawdust and dirt are used in the whorls by the small holder farmers of America are effective against FAW larva [2]. The farmers in America and Africa use lime, salt, oil and soaps to manage FAW. Flooding the maize fields after harvest kills the FAW pupae in the soil. During regular monitoring of the field, the egg masses of the FAW are hand-picked and killed were shown slightly successful [99].

The research work [100] disclosed that *Metarhizium anisopliae* and *Beauveria bassiana* are verified effective against fall armyworm eggs and second instar larvae. The fifteen percent of farmers in Ethiopia have done only handpicking of egg masses and larva for FAW management [41]. The use of botanicals like *A. indica*, *Schinnus molle* and *Phytolacca dodecandra* recorded more than 95% of larval mortality after 72 hours of application [42]. A bioassay test done [101] observed that *Nicotiana tabacum* shown the highest larval mortality (66%) and *Lippia javanica* also showed 66% larval mortality by contact toxicity test.

### 3. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the review of agro-ecological alternatives for fall armyworm management in maize underscores the importance of sustainable, nature-based approaches in confronting this pervasive agricultural challenge. By emphasizing strategies such as biological control, crop diversification, habitat management, and integrated pest management (IPM), this study highlights the potential to reduce reliance on synthetic pesticides while promoting biodiversity and ecosystem resilience. At the same time, it is important to introduce, validate, and deploy low-cost, environmentally safer, and effective technological interventions to control the pest.

### DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of the manuscript.

### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

### REFERENCES

1. Abebe Z, Feyisa, H. Effects of nitrogen rates and time of application on yield of maize: Rainfall variability influenced time of N application. International Journal of Agronomy; 2017.

2. FAO. Fall armyworm monitoring and early warning system (FAMEWS) platform; 2018.
3. Tufa B, Ketema H. Effects of different termite management practices on maize production in Assosa district. Benishangul Gumuz Region, Western Ethiopia. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*. 2016;6(26):27-33.
4. Ganiger P, Yeshwanth H, Muralimohan K, Vinay N, Kumar A, Chandrashekara K. Occurrence of the new invasive pest, fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith)(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), in the maize fields of Karnataka, India. *Current Science*. 2018;115(4):621-623.
5. Sharanabasappa D, Kalleshwaraswamy CM, Maruthi MS, Pavithra HB. Biology of invasive fall armyworm *Spodmanteoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on maize. *Indian Journal of Entomology*. 2018;80(3):540-543.
6. Montezano DG, Sosa-Gómez D, Specht A, Roque-Specht VF, Sousa-Silva JC, Paula-Moraes Sd, Peterson JA, Hunt T. Host plants of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in the Americas. *African entomology*. 2018;26(2):286-300.
7. Nagoshi RN, Meagher RL, Hay-Roe M. Inferring the annual migration patterns of fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in the United States from mitochondrial haplotypes. *Ecology and evolution*. 2012;2(7):1458-1467.
8. Pogue MG. A world revision of the genus *Spodoptera* Guenée:(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Vol. 43: American Entomological Society Philadelphia. 2002;43:1-201.
9. Johnson S. Migration and the life history strategy of the fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* in the western hemisphere. *International Journal of Tropical Insect Science*. 1987;8(4-5-6):543-549.
10. Prasanna B, Huesing J, Eddy R, Peschke V. Fall armyworm in Africa: A guide for integrated pest management. CIMMYT, Mexico; 2018.
11. Barros EM, Torres JB, Ruberson JR, Oliveira MD. Development of *Spodoptera frugiperda* on different hosts and damage to reproductive structures in cotton. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*. 2010;137(3):237-245.
12. CABI. *Spodoptera frugiperda* (fall armyworm); 2019. Available:https://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/29810
13. Ali A, Luttrell RG, Pitre HN, Davis M. Distribution of fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) egg masses on cotton. *Environmental Entomology*. 1989;18:881-885.
14. Ali A, Luttrell RG, Pitre HN. Feeding sites and distribution of fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) larvae on cotton. *Environmental Entomology*. 1990;19:1060-1067.
15. Hogg DB, Pitre HN, Anderson RE. Assessment of early-season phenology of the fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in Mississippi. *Environmental Entomology*. 1982;11(3):705-710.
16. Pitre HN, Hogg DB. Development of the fall armyworm on cotton, soybean and corn (*Spodoptera frugiperda*). *Journal of the Georgia Entomological Society*. 1983;18:187-194.
17. Oliver A. Biology and illustrated key for the identification of twenty species of economically important noctuid pests. Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin No. 1981;733.
18. Early R, González-Moreno P, Murphy ST, Day R. Forecasting the global extent of invasion of the cereal pest *Spodoptera frugiperda*, the fall armyworm. *NeoBiota*. 2018;40:25-50.
19. Li XJ, Wu MF, Ma J, Gao BY, Wu QL, Chen AD, Liu J, Jiang YY, Zhai BP, Early R. Prediction of migratory routes of the invasive fall armyworm in eastern China using a trajectory analytical approach. *Pest Management Science*. 2020;76(2):454-463.
20. Cruz I, Turpin F. Yield impact of larval infestations of the fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) to midwhorl growth stage of corn. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. 1983;76(5):1052-1054.
21. Hruska AJ, Gladstone SM. Effect of period and level of infestation of the fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda*, on irrigated maize yield. *Florida Entomologist*. 1988;249-254.
22. Hruska AJ, Gould F. Fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) and *Diatraea lineolata* (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae): Impact of larval population level and temporal



- occurrence on maize yield in Nicaragua. Journal of Economic Entomology. 1997;90(2):611-622.
23. Pannuti L, Paula-Moraes S, Hunt T, Baldin E, Dana L, Malaquias J. Plant-to-plant movement of *Striacosta albicosta* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) and *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in maize (*Zea mays*). Journal of Economic Entomology. 2016b;109(3):1125-1131.
  24. Goergen G, Kumar P, Sankung S, Togola A, Tam M. First report of outbreaks of the fall armyworm *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith) (Lepidoptera, noctuidae), a new alien invasive pest in west and central Africa. PLoS One. 2016; 11(10):e0165632.
  25. Capinera JL. Fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith) (Insecta: Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Publication EENY098. Florida (FL): UF/IFAS Extension Service, University of Florida; 2017.
  26. Hruska AJ. Fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) management by smallholders. CAB Reviews. 2019;14(043):1-11.
  27. Koffi D, Kyerematen R, Eziah VY, Osei-Mensah YO, Afreh-Nuamah K, Aboagye E, Osae M, Meagher RL. Assessment of impacts of fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on maize production in Ghana. Journal of Integrated Pest Management. 2020;11(1):20.
  28. Nelly N, Hamid H, Lina E. The use of several maize varieties by farmers and the infestation of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Noctuidae: Lepidoptera). IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science. 2021;662.
  29. Sarmento RdA, Aguiar RdS, Aguiar R, Vieira S, de Oliveira H, Holtz A. Biology review, occurrence and control of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera, Noctuidae) in corn in Brazil. Bioscience Journal (Brazil). 2002;18:41-48.
  30. Fernández J. Nota corta: Estimación de umbrales económicos para *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith)(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) en el cultivo del maíz. Invest. Agric. Prod. Prot. Veg. 2002;17: 467-474.
  31. Cook D, Leonard B, Gore J. Field and laboratory performance of novel insecticides against armyworms (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Florida Entomologist. 2004;87(4):433-439.
  32. Foster R. Strategies for protecting sweet corn ears from damage by fall armyworms (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in southern Florida. Florida Entomologist. 1989;146-151.
  33. Pérez CJ, Alvarado P, Narváez C, Miranda F, Hernández L, Vanegas H, Hruska A, Shelton AM. Assessment of insecticide resistance in five insect pests attacking field and vegetable crops in Nicaragua. Journal of Economic Entomology. 2000;93(6):1779-1787.
  34. Xu Q, Xu H, Qin F, Tan J, Liu G, Fujiyama S. Relay-intercropping into tomato decreases cabbage pest incidence. Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment. 2010;8:1037-1041.
  35. Malo EA, Bahena F, Miranda MA, Valle-Mora J. Factors affecting the trapping of males of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) with pheromones in Mexico. Florida Entomologist. 2004;87(3):288-293.
  36. Muhammad L, Mwabu D, Mulwa R, Mwangi W, Langyintuo A, La Rovere R. Characterization of maize producing households in Machakos and Makueni Districts in Kenya. Country report-Kenya, Nairobi; 2010.
  37. Midega CA, Nyang'au IM, Pittchar J, Birkett MA, Pickett JA, Borges M, Khan ZR. Farmers' perceptions of cotton pests and their management in western Kenya. Crop protection. 2012;42:193-201.
  38. Day R, Abrahams P, Bateman M, Beale T, Clotey V, Cock M, Colmenarez Y, Corniani N, Early R, Godwin J. Fall armyworm: impacts and implications for Africa. Outlooks on Pest Management. 2017;28(5):196-201.
  39. Briefs I. Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops in 2017: Biotech crop adoption surges as economic benefits accumulate in 22 years. ISAAA brief. 2017;53:25-26.
  40. Togola A, Meseka S, Menkir A, Badu-Apraku B. Measurement of pesticide residue from chemical control of the invasive *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in a maize experimental field in Mokwa, Nigera. International Journal of Environmental

- Research and Public Health. 2018;5(5): 849.
41. Kumela T, Simiyu J, Sisay B, Likhayo P, Mendesil E, Gohole L, Tefera T. Farmers' knowledge, perceptions, and management practices of the new invasive pest, fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) in Ethiopia and Kenya. *International Journal of Pest Management*. 2019;65(1):1-9.
  42. Sisay B, Tefera T, Wakgari M, Ayalew G, Mendesil E. The efficacy of selected synthetic insecticides and botanicals against fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda*, in maize. *Insects*. 2019; 10(2):45.
  43. Deshmukh S, Pavithra H, Kalleshwaraswamy C, Shivanna B, Maruthi M, Mota-Sanchez D. Field efficacy of insecticides for management of invasive fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith)(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on maize in India. *Florida Entomologist*. 2020;103(2):221-227.
  44. Luginbill P. *The fall army worm: US Department of Agriculture*. 1928;34:1-91.
  45. Van Huis A. *Integrated pest management in the small farmer's maize crop in Nicaragua: Wageningen University and Research*; 1981.
  46. Pair S, Gross Jr H. Field mortality of pupae of the fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith), by predators and a newly discovered parasitoid, *Diapetimorpha introita*. *Journal of the Georgia Entomological Society*. 1984;19:22-26.
  47. Wheeler G, Ashley T, Andrews K. Larval parasitoids and pathogens of the fall armyworm in Honduran maize. *Entomophaga*. 1989;34(3):331-340.
  48. Castro M, Pitre H, Meckenstock D. Populations of fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith), larvae and associated natural enemies in sorghum and maize cropping systems in southern Honduras. *Tropical Agriculture*. 1989;66:259-264.
  49. Van den Berg J, Nur A, Polaszek A. *Cultural control African Cereal Stemborers: Economic importance, taxonomy, natural enemies and control*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK. 1998.
  50. Abate T, Van Huis A, Ampofo, J. Pest management strategies in traditional agriculture: an African perspective. *Annual review of entomology*. 2000;45(1):631-659.
  51. Girma H, Rao M, Sithanatham S. Insect pests and beneficial arthropods population under different hedgerow intercropping systems in semiarid Kenya. *Agroforestry systems*. 2000;50(3):279-292.
  52. Meagher Jr, Nagoshi RR, Stuhl C, Mitchell E. Larval development of fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) on different cover crop plants. *Florida Entomologist*. 2004;87(4):454-460.
  53. Wyckhuys KA, O'Neil RJ. Population dynamics of *Spodoptera frugiperda* Smith (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) and associated arthropod natural enemies in Honduran subsistence maize. *Crop protection*. 2006;25(11):1180-1190.
  54. Wyckhuys KA, O'Neil RJ. Influence of extra-field characteristics to abundance of key natural enemies of *Spodoptera frugiperda* Smith (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in subsistence maize production. *International Journal of Pest Management*. 2007;53(2):89-99.
  55. Hay-Roe MM, Meagher RL, Nagoshi RN, Newman Y. Distributional patterns of fall armyworm parasitoids in a corn field and a pasture field in Florida. *Biological Control*. 2016;96:48-56.
  56. Seran TH, Brintha I. Review on maize based intercropping. *Journal of agronomy*. 2010;9(3):135-145.
  57. González MTG, Rojas JAR, González LC, Jiménez DE. Policultivo (maíz-calabaza) en el control de *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Smith) en Fomento, Sancti Spiritus. *Centro Agrícola*. 2010;37(1):57-64.
  58. Baudron F, Zaman-Allah MA, Chaipa I, Chari N, Chinwada P. Understanding the factors influencing fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda* JE Smith) damage in African smallholder maize fields and quantifying its impact on yield. A case study in Eastern Zimbabwe. *Crop protection*. 2019;120:141-150.
  59. Khan ZR, Midega CA, Bruce TJ, Hooper AM, Pickett JA. Exploiting phytochemicals for developing a 'push-pull' crop protection strategy for cereal farmers in Africa. *Journal of experimental botany*. 2010;61(15):4185-4196.
  60. Letourneau DK, Armbrecht I, Rivera BS, Lerma JM, Carmona EJ, Daza MC, Escobar S, Galindo V, Gutiérrez C, López

- SD. Does plant diversity benefit agroecosystems? A synthetic review. Ecological applications. 2011;21(1): 9-21.
61. Varella AC, Menezes-Netto AC, De Souza Alonso JD, Caixeta DF, Peterson RKD, Fernandes OA. Mortality dynamics of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) immatures in maize. 2015;10(6).
  62. Maine JJ, Boyles JG. Bats initiate vital agroecological interactions in corn. Proceedings of the National Academy of sciences. 2015;112(40):12438-12443.
  63. Rundlöf M, Andersson GK, Bommarco R, Fries I, Hederström V, Herbertsson L, Jonsson O, Klatt BK, Pedersen TR, Yourstone J. Seed coating with a neonicotinoid insecticide negatively affects wild bees. Nature. 2015;521(7550):77-80.
  64. Potts SG, Imperatriz-Fonseca V, Ngo HT, Aizen MA, Biesmeijer JC, Breeze TD, Dicks LV, Garibaldi LA, Hill R, Settele J, Vanbergen AJ. Safeguarding pollinators and their values to human well-being. Nature. 2016;540(7632): 220-229.
  65. Dalvi LP, Andrade GS, Pratisoli D, Polanczyk RA, de Melo RL. Compatibility of biological agents to control *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Revista Agrarian. 2011;4: 79-83.
  66. Stokstad E. New crop pest takes Africa at lightning speed. American Association for the Advancement of Science. 2017;356:473-474.
  67. Ndakidemi B, Mtei K, Ndakidemi PA. Impacts of synthetic and botanical pesticides on beneficial insects. Agricultural Sciences. 2016;7(06):364-372.
  68. Meagher RL Jr, Nuessly GS, Nagoshi RN, Hay-Roe MM. Parasitoids attacking fall armyworm (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in sweet corn habitats. Biological Control. 2016;95: 66-72.
  69. Hailu G, Niassy S, Khan Z, Ochatum N, Subramanian S. Maize–legume intercropping and push–pull for management of fall armyworm, stemborers, and striga in Uganda. Agronomy Journal. 2018;110(6):2513-22.
  70. Midega CA, Pittchar JO, Pickett JA, Hailu GW, Khan ZR. A climate-adapted push-pull system effectively controls fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith), in maize in East Africa. Crop protection. 2018;105:10-15.
  71. Sisay B, Simiyu J, Malusi P, Likhayo P, Mendesi E, Elibariki N, Wakgari M, Ayalew G, Tefera T. First report of the fall armyworm, *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), natural enemies from Africa. Journal of Applied Entomology. 2018;142(8):800-804.
  72. Harrison RD, Thierfelder C, Baudron F, Chinwada P, Midega C, Schaffner U, Van den Berg J. Agro-ecological options for fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda* JE Smith) management: Providing low-cost, smallholder friendly solutions to an invasive pest. Journal of Environmental Management. 2019;243:318-330.
  73. Tanyi CB, Nkongho RN, Okolle JN, Tening AS, Ngosong C. Effect of intercropping beans with maize and botanical extract on fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) infestation. International Journal of Agronomy; 2020.
  74. Van Rensburg J, Walters MC, Giliomee J. Geographical variation in the seasonal moth flight activity of the maize stalk borer, *Busseola fusca* (Fuller), in South Africa. South African Journal of Plant and Soil. 1985;2(3):123-126.
  75. Biradar S, Kotikal, Y, Balikai R. Seasonal incidence of insect pests and their natural enemies on maize. International Journal of Plant Protection. 2011;4(2):402-405.
  76. Thierfelder C, Rusinamhodzi L, Setimela P, Walker F, Eash NS. Conservation agriculture and drought-tolerant germplasm: Reaping the benefits of climate-smart agriculture technologies in central Mozambique. Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems. 2016;31(5):414-428.
  77. Bhandari G, Thapa R, Giri Y, Manandhar H. Effect of planting dates of maize on the incidence of borer complex in Chitwan, Nepal. Journal of Agriculture and Forestry University. 2018;2:107-118.
  78. Bilbo, TR. Development of *Helicoverpa zea* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in Transgenic Corn Producing Bt Toxins and Implications for Resistance. Clemson University; 2019.
  79. Jones F. Pests, resistance and fertilizers. Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> colloquium of the international potash institute on fertilizer use and plant health, Bern, Switzerland; 1976.

80. Perfecto I. Ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) as natural control agents of pests in irrigated maize in Nicaragua. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. 1991;84:65-70.
81. Magdoff F, Van Es, H. Building soils for better crops. Sustainable Agriculture Network Beltsville; 2000.
82. Meyer GA. Interactive effects of soil fertility and herbivory on *Brassica nigra*. *Oikos*. 2000;88(2):433-441.
83. Morales H, Perfecto I, Ferguson B. Traditional fertilization and its effect on corn insect populations in the Guatemalan highlands. *Agriculture, ecosystems and environment*. 2001;84(2):145-155.
84. Yardım EN, Edwards CA. Effects of organic and synthetic fertilizer sources on pest and predatory insects associated with tomatoes. *Phytoparasitica*. 2003;31(4):324-329.
85. Chaboussou F. *Healthy crops: a new agricultural revolution*: Jon Carpenter Publishing; 2004.
86. Proctor J, Edwards ID, Payton RW, Nagy L. Zonation of forest vegetation and soils of Mount Cameroon, West Africa. *Plant Ecology*. 2007;192(2):251-269.
87. Vanlauwe B, Bationo A, Chianu J, Giller KE, Merckx R, Mokwunye U, Ohiokpehai O, Pypers P, Tabo R, Shepherd KD. Integrated soil fertility management: Operational definition and consequences for implementation and dissemination. *Outlook on agriculture*. 2010;39(1):17-24.
88. Rivers A, Barbercheck M, Govaerts B, Verhulst N. Conservation agriculture affects arthropod community composition in a rainfed maize–wheat system in central Mexico. *Applied soil ecology*. 2016;100:81-90.
89. Ebeling W. Sorptive dusts for pest control. *Annual Review of Entomology*. 1971;16(1):123-158.
90. Maredia K, Segura O, Mihm J. Effects of neem, *Azadirachta indica* on six species of maize insect pests. *International Journal of Tropical Pest Management*. 1992;38(2):190-195.
91. Archundia SLF, Pérez AJ, León CL, Brito, RF. Efecto tóxico de semillas de cuatro variedades de *Carica papaya* (Caricaceae) en *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Folia Entomológica Mexicana*. 2006;45(2):171-177.
92. Souza TF, Fevero S, Conte CdO. Bioatividade de óleos essenciais de espécies de eucalipto para o controle de *Spodoptera frugiperda* (JE Smith, 1797)(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Revista Brasileira de Agroecologia*. 2010;5(2):157-164.
93. Tavares WS, Costa MA, Cruz I, Silveira RD, Serrao JE, Zanuncio JC. Selective effects of natural and synthetic insecticides on mortality of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) and its predator *Eriopsis connexa* (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae). *Journal of Environmental Science and Health Part B*. 2010;45(6):557-561.
94. Salinas-Sánchez DO, Aldana-Llanos L, Valdés-Estrada ME, Gutiérrez-Ochoa M, Valladares-Cisneros G, Rodríguez-Flores E. Insecticidal activity of *Tagetes erecta* extracts on *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Florida Entomologist*. 2012;95(2):428-432.
95. Delgado Cáceres LR, Gaona Mena EF. Control of *Spodoptera frugiperda* Smith (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) with extracts of *Polygonum hydropiperoides* Michx (Ka'atái) under laboratory conditions. *Investigacion Agraria*. 2012;5-9.
96. Arya M, Tiwari R. Efficacy of plant and animal origin bioproducts against lesser grain borer, *rhizophorthera dominica* (fab.) in stored wheat. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research* 2013;4(5):649-653.
97. Constanski KC, Zorzetti J, Santoro PH, Hoshino AT, Neves PMOJ. Inert powders alone or in combination with neem oil for controlling *Spodoptera eridania* and *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) larvae. *Semina: Ciências Agrárias*. 2016;37(4):1801-1810.
98. Martínez AM, Aguado-Pedraza AJ, Viñuela E, Rodríguez-Enríquez CL, Lobit, B Gómez P, Pineda S. Effects of ethanolic extracts of *Argemone ochroleuca* (Papaveraceae) on the food consumption and development of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Florida Entomologist*. 2017;100(2):339-345.
99. Rwomushana I, Bateman M, Beale T, Beseh P, Cameron K, Chiluba M, Clottey V, Davis T, Day R, Early R. Fall armyworm: Impacts and implication for

- Africa. Evidence NoteUpdate. CAB International; 2018.
100. Akutse KS, Kimemia JW, Ekesi S, Khamis FM, Ombura OL, Subramanian S. Ovicidal effects of entomopathogenic fungal isolates on the invasive Fall armyworm *Spodoptera frugiperda* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Journal of Applied Entomology. 2019;143:626-634.
101. Phambala K, Tembo Y, Kabambe VH, Stevenson PC, Belmain SR. Bioactivity of common pesticidal plants on fall armyworm larvae (*Spodoptera frugiperda*). Plants. 2020;9(1):112.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/120078>