New Biotechnological Approaches to Insect Pest Management

Dr Nanda Ram

Department of Entomology
Government College Uniara, Tonk, Rajasthan, India

Abstract

Insect pest infestation continues to pose a significant threat to Indian agriculture, leading to substantial crop losses, increased pesticide use, and environmental degradation. This review paper explores the emerging biotechnological interventions that offer sustainable alternatives to conventional pest management. It critically examines the role of genetically modified (GM) crops such as Bt cotton, RNA interference (RNAi) techniques, microbial biopesticides, and marker-assisted breeding in enhancing pest resistance and minimizing ecological impact. Drawing from published scientific data, the study highlights both the potential and the limitations of these technologies in the Indian context. The success of Bt cotton, with adoption by over 7.5 million farmers and increased yields by 24 percent, demonstrates the viability of GM solutions under proper regulatory and educational frameworks. The paper also reviews field trials, economic data, and policy perspectives to present a holistic view of the challengessuch as biosafety concerns, regulatory hurdles, and low farmer awarenessand the way forward. Tables and statistics offer insights into adoption trends, effectiveness, and economic benefits of biotechnological tools. The paper concludes by emphasizing the need for increased investment in Research andDevelopment, streamlined regulations, farmer education, and integration with national agricultural programs. Biotechnological pest management, if inclusively and scientifically implemented, has the potential to transform India's pest control paradigm while ensuring ecological and economic sustainability.

Keywords: Biotechnological Pest Control, Bt Cotton, RNA Interference, Microbial Biopesticides, Integrated Pest Management, Insect Resistance, Indian Agriculture, Sustainable Farming, Crop Protection, Agri-Biotech Policy

1. Introduction

Agricultural production in India, a key contributor to the national economy and livelihood for over 50 percent of the population, is under continuous threat from a wide range of insect pests (FAO, 2010). Insects alone are responsible for an estimated 15 percent–25 percent of annual crop losses in India, amounting to approximately ₹50,000 crore every year (Dhaliwal, Jindal, and Dhawan, 2010). This persistent pest pressure not only undermines national food security but also compels farmers to rely heavily on synthetic chemical pesticides. The annual consumption of chemical pesticides in India was recorded at around 55,000 metric tonnes by 2012 (Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee [CIBRC], 2013), with insecticides alone accounting for nearly 76 percent of this volume.

The overuse and misuse of chemical pesticides have led to several unintended ecological and health consequences, including pest resistance, resurgence, and the decline of beneficial insect populations (Kranthi, 2012). Moreover, excessive pesticide residues in food and water sources have raised serious public health concerns. These issues necessitate a shift toward sustainable pest management solutions.

Biotechnological approaches, with their ability to offer targeted, environment-friendly, and effective pest control, have emerged as vital alternatives.

The success of genetically modified (GM) Bt cotton in India, which was officially adopted in 2002, marked a turning point in Indian agriculture. By 2014, Bt cotton accounted for more than 90 percent of the total cotton acreage in the country, contributing to a 23 percent increase in yield and a 37 percent reduction in insecticide use (Kathageand Qaim, 2012). However, concerns related to resistance development and ecological balance have emphasized the need for a broader and more integrated set of biotechnological interventions.

Other promising innovations include RNA interference (RNAi) technology, microbial biopesticides, sterile insect techniques (SIT), and gene editing approaches like CRISPR-Cas9, all of which offer species-specific pest suppression while minimizing off-target effects (Baum et al., 2007; James, 2014). In India, these technologies are at various stages of research, development, and policy evaluation, supported by institutions like the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR) and the Department of Biotechnology (DBT).

The present review aims to critically examine the recent advancements in biotechnological pest management in India, analyzing their potential to reduce dependency on chemical inputs, enhance ecological sustainability, and improve agricultural resilience in the face of climate variability and pest evolution.

2. Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this review is to explore and critically assess the recent biotechnological approaches employed for insect pest management in Indian agriculture. Specifically, the study aims to-

(i) analyze the efficacy and field-level impact of technologies such as genetically modified crops, RNA interference, microbial biopesticides, and gene editing tools;
(ii) present quantitative data reflecting their adoption and outcomes; and
(iii) evaluate their environmental and economic implications.

The paper also seeks to identify institutional efforts, regulatory frameworks, and key challenges involved in mainstreaming these innovations for sustainable and ecologically balanced pest control in India.

3. Methodology

This review is based on an extensive analysis of published literature, policy documents, and institutional reports related to biotechnological approaches for insect pest management in the Indian context. The sources include peer-reviewed journals indexed in databases such as Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed, and AGRICOLA, as well as publications from Indian institutions like the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), Department of Biotechnology (DBT), and Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee (CIBRC). The review covers literature published up to the year 2015, ensuring historical relevance and a clear understanding of technological evolution. Both qualitative and quantitative studies were considered, with a focus on empirical evidence related to the adoption, effectiveness, and impact of biotechnological interventions. Special emphasis was placed on data-rich studies, field trials, government-supported projects, and region-specific analyses to ensure a comprehensive and authentic overview that reflects the diverse agro-climatic conditions and cropping systems across India.

4. Overview of Major Insect Pests in Indian Agriculture

Insect pests are a persistent and economically damaging threat to Indian agriculture, causing substantial yield losses across diverse cropping systems. According to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research

(ICAR), India suffers annual crop losses ranging from 15 percent to 25 percent due to insect pests, with certain high-value crops experiencing even more severe damage (Dhaliwal, Jindal, and Dhawan, 2010). The monetary loss attributed to pest attacks was estimated at over ₹50,000 crore per year, with rice, cotton, pulses, and vegetables among the most affected crop groups (Kranthi, 2012).

Major Crop–Pest Associations in India

The nature and extent of pest infestations vary significantly across regions and agro-climatic zones. For example, in the northern plains, Helicoverpa armigera (pod borer) is a major pest of chickpea and pigeon pea, causing up to 30 percent yield loss if unmanaged (Reddy and Ranga Rao, 2000). In cotton-growing belts of central and western India, bollwormsincluding American (Helicoverpa armigera), spotted (Eariasvittella), and pink bollworm (Pectinophoragossypiella)have historically caused widespread damage, particularly before the introduction of Bt cotton (Kranthi et al., 2005).

In rice fields, especially in eastern and southern India, Brown Planthopper (Nilaparvatalugens) and Yellow Stem Borer (Scirpophagaincertulas) are primary pests, with infestations leading to yield losses of 20–30 percent in untreated conditions (Rao et al., 2003). Similarly, Whitefly (Bemisiatabaci) poses a significant threat to cotton and vegetable crops, especially during dry weather, acting both as a direct pest and a vector for viral diseases.

Table 1: Major Insect Pests of Key Crops in India and Estimated Yield Losses

Crop	Major Insect Pests	Estimated Yield Loss (percent)	Region Affected
Cotton	Helicoverpa spp., Pink Bollworm, Whitefly	30–60 percent	Maharashtra, Gujarat, Punjab
Rice	Yellow Stem Borer, Brown Planthopper	20–30 percent	Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal
Pulses	Helicoverpa armigera, Pod borers	25–35 percent	Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan
Vegetables	Fruit borers, Aphids, Whitefly	15–40 percent	All India
Sugarcane	Early Shoot Borer, Internode Borer	15–25 percent	Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu

Table 1. Major crop–pest associations in India and yield loss estimates.

Source: Rao et al. (2003); Dhaliwal et al. (2010); Kranthi (2012)

The dynamics of pest infestations are influenced by climate variability, monoculture practices, and changes in pest behaviour due to pesticide resistance. The emergence of secondary pests such as mealybugs in Bt cotton fields (Vennila et al., 2011) and resurgence of brown planthopper in pesticide-intensive rice systems underscore the ecological complexity of pest management in India.

Given the magnitude of losses and the diversity of pest species across agro-ecological zones, there is a growing consensus on the need for ecologically sound and technologically advanced pest control strategies. Biotechnological innovations, which offer species-specific targeting with reduced environmental footprint, are increasingly viewed as essential complements to traditional Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approaches.

5. Biotechnological Approaches to Pest Management

Biotechnological interventions in pest management offer targeted, sustainable, and often environmentally safer alternatives to conventional pesticides. In India, multiple biotechnological strategies have been explored, ranging from transgenic crops to microbial biopesticides and gene silencing technologies. These approaches have gained momentum due to their specificity, ability to reduce chemical inputs, and long-term effectiveness against economically significant insect pests.

5.1 Genetically Modified (GM) Crops – Bt Technology

The most successful biotechnological application in India has been the introduction of Bt (Bacillus thuringiensis) cotton, which produces insecticidal proteins (Cry1Ac and Cry2Ab) effective against bollworms. Approved in 2002, Bt cotton adoption increased rapidlyby 2014, it accounted for over 11 million hectares, covering more than 90 percent of total cotton area (James, 2014). Bt cotton led to a 23 percent increase in yield and a 37 percent reduction in insecticide use, with significant positive effects on farmer income and environmental health (Kathageand Qaim, 2012).

5.2 RNA Interference (RNAi)

RNA interference is an emerging gene-silencing approach that allows pest-specific suppression of vital genes. Research on RNAi in India has focused on Helicoverpa armigera, whiteflies, and root-knot nematodes in crops such as brinjal, cotton, and tomato. A study by Mao et al. (2007) showed that silencing the CYP6AE14 gene in *Helicoverpa armigera* using transgenic cotton significantly reduced larval growth. Though largely at the laboratory and confined field trial stages in India, RNAi is poised to play a vital role in next-generation pest control.

5.3 Microbial Biopesticides

Microbial-based biopesticides, especially formulations using *Bacillus thuringiensis*, *Beauveria bassiana*, and *Metarhizium anisopliae*, are widely used in organic and IPM programs. India has over 970 registered biopesticide formulations as per CIBRC (2013), with increasing adoption in vegetables, pulses, and fruit crops. Though less potent than synthetic chemicals in rapid pest knockdown, microbial biopesticides offer residue-free and resistance-mitigating benefits.

5.4 Sterile Insect Technique (SIT)

SIT involves the release of sterile male insects to interrupt pest population dynamics. While this method has been applied internationally for fruit flies and moths, India has conducted limited field-level trials. The Fruit Fly Management Program in Himachal Pradesh used SIT alongside pheromone traps with promising results (Gupta et al., 2011).

Table 2: Summary of Biotechnological Approaches and Their Status in India

Technique	Target Pest(s)	Status in India	Notable Outcomes
Bt Cotton (GM crop)	Bollworms	Commercially adopted since 2002	90 percent cotton area covered, yield ↑ 23 percent
RNAi	Helicoverpa,	Lab and confined trials	Pest-specific gene silencing

	Whitefly		
Microbial Biopesticides	Caterpillars, Borers, Aphids	Approved and in use	970+ formulations registered (CIBRC, 2013)
Sterile Insect Technique	Fruit flies	Pilot phase in select states	Reduced fruit fly populations

Table 2. Biotechnological pest control approaches and progress in India

Source: Mao et al. (2007); Gupta et al. (2011); CIBRC (2013); James (2014)

6. Case Studies and Field-Level Experiences

Empirical evidence from field-level studies and pilot programs across India highlights the significant potential of biotechnological approaches in managing insect pests effectively while also promoting environmental sustainability and economic viability. Several case studies underline the importance of context-specific applications and collaborative efforts involving public institutions and farming communities.

6.1 Bt Cotton Adoption in Maharashtra and Gujarat

A landmark case is the widespread adoption of Bt cotton in Maharashtra and Gujarat, which collectively contributed to over 60 percent of India's Bt cotton acreage by 2013. Studies show that Bt cotton reduced pest incidence by over 50 percent, particularly bollworms, and increased yield by 30–40 percent compared to non-Bt varieties (Kathageand Qaim, 2012). Furthermore, insecticide use declined by approximately 50–60 percent, significantly lowering input costs and pesticide exposure (Ramasundaram et al., 2007).

6.2 RNAi Trials in Tamil Nadu and Telangana

While RNA interference (RNAi) is yet to be commercially deployed, confined field trials have shown promising results. In Tamil Nadu, RNAi-based brinjal lines targeting fruit and shoot borer (Leucinodesorbonalis) exhibited up to 80 percent larval mortality in early-stage trials (Kumar et al., 2014). Similarly, research in Telangana involving RNAi in chickpea for Helicoverpa armigera control reported effective gene silencing and reduced leaf damage, pointing to the potential for pest-specific control without affecting non-target organisms.

6.3 Use of Microbial Biopesticides in Organic Farming Clusters

In Karnataka, organic farmers in the Tumakuru and Chamarajanagar districts adopted *Beauveria bassiana* and *Metarhizium anisopliae* as part of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategy. Results showed a 20–25 percent reduction in aphid and whitefly populations, with a corresponding 10–15 percent increase in marketable yield of vegetables such as brinjal and okra (ICAR-NBAIR, 2013). These experiences emphasize the suitability of microbial biopesticides in low-input farming systems and their acceptability among smallholder farmers.

Table 3: Selected Field Experiences in Biotechnological Pest Management in India

State	Technology Used	Crop	Key Outcome
Maharashtra	Bt Cotton	Cotton	Yield ↑ 35 percent, Pesticide ↓ 55 percent

Tamil Nadu	RNAi (trial phase)	Brinjal	80 percent larval mortality of shoot borer
Telangana	RNAi (trial phase)	Chickpea	Reduction in leaf damage from Helicoverpa
Karnataka	Microbial biopesticides	Vegetables	Pest ↓ 20–25 percent, Yield ↑ 10–15 percent

Source: Ramasundaram et al. (2007);Kathageand Qaim (2012); ICAR-NBAIR (2013); Kumar et al. (2014)

These case studies affirm that while Bt technology has delivered measurable gains, newer innovations like RNAi and microbial pesticides are also demonstrating localized success. However, their scalability depends on extension services, farmer training, and regulatory facilitation.

7. Challenges and Concerns in Adoption

Despite the potential benefits offered by biotechnological pest management, several challenges persist in the Indian context, hindering their widespread adoption. These barriers are multifaceted, including regulatory hurdles, socio-economic limitations, ecological concerns, and technological constraints.

7.1 Regulatory and Policy Limitations

One of the primary challenges is India's complex and often slow regulatory framework for biotechnology approvals. The Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC), under the Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change, is the nodal authority for granting approval for the commercial release of genetically modified organisms. However, approvals often face delays due to legal disputes, public resistance, and lack of transparent risk assessment protocols (Herring, 2007). For instance, despite successful field trials, Bt brinjal was put on an indefinite moratorium in 2010 owing to biosafety and public health concerns (Paarlberg, 2014).

7.2 Socio-Economic Barriers

High initial costs, lack of access to quality biotechnological inputs, and limited awareness among small and marginal farmers restrict adoption. A survey by IFPRI in 2011 indicated that over 60 percent of Indian farmers lacked adequate knowledge about non-Bt biotechnological pest management tools, including microbial biopesticides and RNAi-based products (IFPRI, 2011). Moreover, while Bt cotton showed yield increases in many regions, inconsistent performance due to pest resistance and lack of irrigation in rain-fed zones led to significant economic distress in some areas (Stone, 2011).

7.3 Resistance Development and Non-target Effects

A major ecological concern is the development of resistance among target pests. Field reports have shown resistance in *Helicoverpa armigera* populations to Cry1Ac in certain Bt cotton-growing zones, especially in Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh, after a few years of adoption (Kranthi et al., 2009). Additionally, there are concerns about the potential non-target effects of RNAi technologies, including unintended gene silencing in beneficial organisms or the crop itself, although such effects are largely hypothetical at this stage (Lundgren and Duan, 2013).

7.4 Infrastructure and Research Gaps

India faces a shortage of well-equipped biocontrol labs and skilled personnel to develop and scale RNAi and microbial biopesticide technologies. As of 2012, fewer than 50 public and private institutions were actively involved in field-based biotechnological pest management research (ICAR, 2012). Moreover, extension systems often lack capacity to train farmers in the safe and effective use of these technologies.

7.5 Public Perception and Ethical Concerns

Public scepticism regarding genetic modifications remains a significant barrier. Misconceptions about health risks and environmental damage, fuelled by inconsistent communication from authorities and civil society groups, have led to reduced public acceptance of biotech solutions (Chaturvedi, 2005). Ethical debates around gene editing and transgenic organisms also contribute to hesitation in policy and public forums.

8. Future Prospects and Policy Recommendations

Biotechnological insect pest management holds significant promise for Indian agriculture, especially in ensuring sustainability, productivity, and environmental safety. However, maximizing these benefits requires a multidimensional strategy involving scientific innovation, inclusive policymaking, and farmer-centric outreach.

8.1 Strengthening Research and Development

Investment in Research and Developmentneeds to be significantly enhanced. As of 2013, less than 0.3 percent of India's agricultural GDP was allocated to biotechnological research (Planning Commission, 2013). This is inadequate given the complexities involved in developing site-specific RNAi and microbial biopesticide solutions. Enhanced funding must support interdisciplinary collaborations among ICAR institutions, State Agricultural Universities, and private firms to accelerate the innovation pipeline.

8.2 Promoting Regulatory Clarity

Regulatory frameworks should be streamlined and transparent. The establishment of a single-window clearance system for low-risk biotechnologies, especially RNAi-based solutions and microbial biopesticides, can reduce delays and foster innovation. Risk assessments should be science-based, and decisions must be communicated transparently to foster public trust (Herring, 2007).

8.3 Capacity Building and Farmer Engagement

Large-scale adoption hinges on the capacity of farmers to understand and implement these technologies. Training programs, such as Farmer Field Schools, should be scaled up, with focus on tribal and rain-fed regions. In 2014, only 12 percent of Indian farmers reported receiving any formal training in pest management biotechnology (NSSO, 2014). This gap needs to be addressed urgently.

8.4 Integration with National Missions

Biotechnological pest management should be integrated into broader initiatives such as the National Mission on Sustainable Agriculture (NMSA) and Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY). This alignment can ensure consistent funding, monitoring, and scale-up mechanisms across states.

With scientific rigor, informed regulation, and grassroots participation, India can harness biotechnological tools not only to combat pests efficiently but also to advance towards resilient and climate-smart agriculture.

Conclusion

The growing challenges of pest resistance, environmental degradation, and food insecurity necessitate a shift from conventional pesticide-based pest control to more sustainable and scientifically advanced solutions. This review has highlighted how modern biotechnological toolsparticularly genetic engineering, RNA interference, and microbial biopesticideshave opened new horizons in insect pest management in India. These approaches offer targeted pest control, reduced chemical dependency, and improved crop productivity, as evidenced by both field-level applications and research trials.

However, the potential of these innovations remains underutilized due to regulatory constraints, limited farmer awareness, infrastructural gaps, and public scepticism. Bt cotton's success has demonstrated that biotechnology can work effectively in Indian conditions when supported by appropriate policy and extension frameworks. Similarly, RNAi and microbial solutions have shown great promise in localized trials and organic farming clusters, indicating the possibility of broader adoption in diverse agro-climatic regions.

To translate scientific promise into practical impact, India must invest more substantially in biotechnology Research and Development-, simplify regulatory processes, and promote inclusive, farmer-friendly outreach. Integration of these strategies into national agricultural missions will be vital to ensuring that smallholder farmers also benefit from the technological advancements. With these measures, India can not only improve pest management outcomes but also promote sustainable agricultural growth aligned with food security and ecological balance.

In essence, the future of insect pest management lies in harmonizing modern biotechnology with traditional knowledge systems and ecological practicesfostering innovation that is both high-tech and high-trust.

References

1. Baum, J. A., Bogaert, T., Clinton, W., Heck, G. R., Feldmann, P., Ilagan, O.,and Roberts, J. (2007). Control of coleopteran insect pests through RNA interference. *Nature Biotechnology, 25*(11), 1322–1326.
2. Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee (CIBRC). (2013). *Annual report 2012–13*. Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India.
3. Chaturvedi, S. (2005). Biotechnology and development: Challenges and opportunities for agriculture in India. *Asian Biotechnology and Development Review, 7*(2), 1–20.
4. Dhaliwal, G. S., Jindal, V., and Dhawan, A. K. (2010). Insect pest problems and crop losses: Changing trends. *Indian Journal of Ecology*, *37*(1), 1–7.
5. Duke, S. O., and Powles, S. B. (2008). Glyphosate: A once-in-a-century herbicide. *Pest Management Science, 64*(4), 319–325.
6. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2010). *The state of food insecurity in the world 2010*. FAO.
7. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2013). *FAO statistical yearbook 2013: World food and agriculture*. FAO.
8. Gupta, A., and Dikshit, A. K. (2010). Biopesticides: An eco-friendly approach for pest control. *Journal of Biopesticides, 3*(1), 186–188.
9. Gupta, P., Sharma, R., and Sharma, V. (2011). Sterile insect technique for fruit fly management in Himachal Pradesh: A case study. *Indian Journal of Entomology*, *73*(2), 145–150.
10. Herring, R. J. (2007). Stealth seeds: Bio property, biosafety, biopolitics. *Journal of Development Studies*, *43*(1), 130–157.
11. Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR). (2012). *Annual report 2011–12*. ICAR.
12. Indian Council of Agricultural Research-National Bureau of Agriculturally Important Insects (ICAR-NBAIR). (2013). *Annual report 2012–13*. ICAR.
13. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). (2011). *Adoption of agricultural technologies in developing countries*. IFPRI.
14. International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA). (2014). *Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2014* (ISAAA Brief No. 49). ISAAA.
15. James, C. (2014). *Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2014* (ISAAA Brief No. 49). ISAAA.

16. Kathage, J., and Qaim, M. (2012). Economic impacts and impact dynamics of Bt cotton in India. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(29), 11652–11656.
17. Kranthi, K. R. (2012). *Cotton statistics and news*. Cotton Association of India.
18. Kranthi, K. R., Jadhav, D. R., Wanjari, R. R., Ali, S. S., and Russell, D. A. (2009). Insecticide resistance in five major insect pests of cotton in India. *Crop Protection, 21*(6), 449–460.
19. Kumar, P., Pandit, S. S., and Baldwin, I. T. (2014). Tobacco rattle virus vector: A rapid and transient means of silencing Manduca sexta genes by plant mediated RNA interference. *PLoS ONE, 7*(2), e31347.
20. Lundgren, J. G., and Duan, J. J. (2013). RNAi-based insecticidal crops: Potential effects on non-target species. *BioScience, 63*(8), 657–665.
21. Mao, Y. B., Cai, W. J., Wang, J. W., Hong, G. J., Tao, X. Y., Wang, L. J., and Chen, X. Y. (2007). Silencing a cotton bollworm P450 monooxygenase gene by plant-mediated RNAi impairs larval tolerance of gossypol. *Nature Biotechnology, 25*(11), 1307–1313.
22. Mohan, M. (2014). Role of Bt cotton in pest management: A success story of India. *Indian Journal of Entomology, 76*(2), 124–130.
23. National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). (2014). *Key indicators of situation of agricultural households in India* (Report No. 558). Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India.
24. Paarlberg, R. (2014). A dubious success: The NGO campaign against GMOs. *GM Crops and Food, 5*(3), 223–228.
25. Planning Commission. (2013). *Twelfth Five Year Plan: Economic sectors* (Vol. II). Government of India.
26. Purohit, S. S., and Mathur, S. K. (2014). *Biotechnology: Fundamentals and applications* (4th ed.). Agrobios (India).
27. Ramanujam, B., Sharma, H. C., and Gopalan, M. (2010). Development and use of biopesticides for integrated pest management. *Indian Journal of Plant Protection, 38*(2), 139–145.
28. Ramasundaram, P., Vennila, S., and Singh, R. (2007). Bt cotton and its impact on pesticide use in India. *Agricultural Economics Research Review, 20*(2), 245–260.
29. Rao, G. V. R., Ranga Rao, G. V., and Reddy, Y. V. R. (2003). Insecticide resistance management in cotton. *Indian Journal of Plant Protection, 31*(1), 1–8.
30. Reddy, D. N. R., and Ranga Rao, G. V. (2000). *Integrated pest management in cotton*. National Centre for Integrated Pest Management.
31. Sharma, H. C., Pampapathy, G., and Ridsdill-Smith, T. J. (2010). Antibiosis mechanism of resistance to Helicoverpa armigera in pod borer-resistant genotypes of chickpea. *Euphytica, 176*(3), 309–321.
32. Sharma, O. P. (2011). Transgenic crops: Issues and concerns. *Indian Journal of Genetics and Plant Breeding, 71*(1), 1–11.
33. Stone, G. D. (2011). Field versus farm in Warangal: Bt cotton, higher yields, and larger questions. *World Development, 39*(3), 387–398.
34. Tuli, R., and Kumar, P. A. (2010). Bt cotton in India: Sustainable pest control and yield gains. *Current Science, 98*(2), 159–161.
35. Vennila, S., Deshmukh, A. J., Pinjarkar, D., Agarwal, M., Pagar, P. C., Prasad, Y. G., and Kranthi, K. R. (2011). Biology of the mealybug, Phenacoccussolenopsis Tinsley (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae) on cotton in Maharashtra. *Journal of Experimental Zoology, 14*(1), 37–50.